

**FAITH
OF OUR
FATHERS**

**WORD
AND
WORK**

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

A COMPENDIUM OF SCRIPTURE TEACHING ON PROPHECY AND UNITY
EXTRACTS, CLEAR AND RARE, FROM THE “FATHERS” AND THE REFORMERS
PRECIOUS REPRINTS FROM THE MEN OF THE “RESTORATION MOVEMENT”
WITH SPECIAL ARTICLES BY THE EDITOR AND OTHERS
ON THE FELLOWSHIP PROBLEMS OF OUR DAY

“...till we all attain unto the unity of the faith
and of the knowledge of the Son of God”

EDITED BY E. L. JORGENSEN

Order from

THE WORD AND WORK, PUBLISHERS

2518 Portland Avenue

Louisville 12, Kentucky

(Please send 50c per copy to cover handling, packing and postage)

FAITH OF OUR FATHERS

Faith of our fathers! living still
In spite of dungeon, fire and sword;
O how our hearts beat high with joy
Whene'er we hear that glorious word!

Faith of our fathers, holy faith,
We will be true to thee till death.

Our fathers, chained in prisons dark,
Were still in heart and conscience free;
How sweet would be their children's fate
If they, like them, could die for thee!

Faith of our fathers! we will love
Both friend and foe in all our strife;
And preach thee too, as love knows how,
By kindly words and virtuous life.

PREFATORY

These "precious reprints" appeared first serially, month by month, in *Word and Work* from 1945 through 1952. At each year-end they were re-edited and reissued in pamphlet form; and, by means of funds (now expended) out of the personal, inherited estate of our friend and brother, Don Carlos Janes, many thousands of the yearly pamphlets were distributed—far and wide and free of charge.

Now, at long last, these eight yearly pamphlets have been gathered and fully indexed, to form this book. The nominal figure of 50c has been fixed—not to represent the value of the volume, but to cover handling, packing and postage, and to prevent indiscriminate and wasteful ordering.

It was, of course, not possible to re-edit the pamphlets for the book, as the number needed for that purpose had been printed each year and laid aside for final binding. But, for the sake of greater accuracy and utter fairness, there appears herein, on page 354, a page of last-minute notes and "errata," which the reader should examine before proceeding into the volume itself. The complete indexes will be found on pages 349 to 353.

It goes without saying that any book compiled as this book was compiled (month by month, and year by year) will lack something in the way of order, sequence, unity, and editorial perfection—even of uniformity of paper stock available through these eight years. (Fortunately, by reprinting portions, we have been able to attain uniformity of the main type-faces used.) Also, there is bound to be no little repetition—of argument, if not of actual words—in the essays from many different writers on similar themes. But the materials are here as they were printed; and may the good Lord bless them to many a heart through many a year, as they have already brought help and blessing, and a better understanding, to the thousands who have seen them in the monthly or yearly form.

It gives me profound pleasure to preserve and to present herein—to all, but especially to the young ministers of Christ—some of the highest, truest, noblest religious literature of all time, and much of the most beautiful as well. All praise to God that I have been permitted life, health, and means to pursue the research and to finish the work.

—E. L. J.

PREFATORY

These "precious reprints" appeared first serially, month by month, in *Word and Work* from 1945 through 1952. At each year-end they were re-edited and reissued in pamphlet form; and, by means of funds (now expended) out of the personal, inherited estate of our friend and brother, Don Carlos Janes, many thousands of the yearly pamphlets were distributed—far and wide and free of charge.

Now, at long last, these eight yearly pamphlets have been gathered and fully indexed, to form this book. The nominal figure of 50c has been fixed—not to represent the value of the volume, but to cover handling, packing and postage, and to prevent indiscriminate and wasteful ordering.

It was, of course, not possible to re-edit the pamphlets for the book, as the number needed for that purpose had been printed each year and laid aside for final binding. But, for the sake of greater accuracy and utter fairness, there appears herein, on page 354, a page of last-minute notes and "errata," which the reader should examine before proceeding into the volume itself. The complete indexes will be found on pages 349 to 353.

It goes without saying that any book compiled as this book was compiled (month by month, and year by year) will lack something in the way of order, sequence, unity, and editorial perfection—even of uniformity of paper stock available through these eight years. (Fortunately, by reprinting portions, we have been able to attain uniformity of the main type-faces used.) Also, there is bound to be no little repetition—of argument, if not of actual words—in the essays from many different writers on similar themes. But the materials are here as they were printed; and may the good Lord bless them to many a heart through many a year, as they have already brought help and blessing, and a better understanding, to the thousands who have seen them in the monthly or yearly form.

It gives me profound pleasure to preserve and to present herein—to all, but especially to the young ministers of Christ—some of the highest, truest, noblest religious literature of all time, and much of the most beautiful as well. All praise to God that I have been permitted life, health, and means to pursue the research and to finish the work.

—E. L. J.

INTRODUCTORY

This volume, aptly titled "Faith of Our Fathers," is a wonderful and exceedingly valuable collection of writings of the "fathers" of the Restoration Movement, from Alexander Campbell down to more recent times (including much material also from earlier reformers), dealing with two great themes: the great theme of Prophecy, and another great theme, scarce second in importance, namely the Principles of Christian Unity. A number of years back Cardinal Gibbons wrote a book of Roman Catholic propaganda, which he named "The Faith of Our Fathers." Promptly there appeared a volume in reply, entitled "The Faith of Our Forefathers," which by more ancient testimony effectively exposed the false claims of Romanism. Now, in this compendium of ancient and modern writings, the faith of our forefathers is seen to be as clear and strong for the true and simple teaching on prophecy as is the "faith of our fathers" on other lines. In connection with these excerpts, the reader is constantly reminded that none of these human views and teachings are presented to prove any point of doctrine concerning prophecy. Only by the word of God can any spiritual truth be known and Christian doctrine be established. (See paragraph 2, page 3, and paragraph 3, page 5.) To be sure, the faithful utterances of great and able men tend to confirm and clarify our faith in the truths we have learned from the scriptures, and to point out things in the word of God which we might not have seen for ourselves. In this respect also these reprints and quotations will be found very helpful. But back of it all lies another lesson and purpose. This whole treatise calls attention to the freedom which simple Christians have always prized and enjoyed—to search the scriptures for themselves, and to hold their convictions without fear. This freedom is a precious heritage of the children of God, never to be surrendered. Even the apostles themselves, after they had delivered their inspired message, did not undertake to interfere with the faith of their converts. (2 Cor. 1:24, "Not that we have lordship over your faith, but are helpers of your joy.") And with this freedom necessarily goes toleration. For if I am free under God, so is my brother. If I differ with him on any point I may expect him to bear with me; and if he differs from me I must respect him and bear with him in love. Yea, we will be helpful to each other—each pointing out to the other the point of difference and its correction; thus building up each other in love, and, holding the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, approaching more and more to the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God—not only in matters of prophecy, but on all questions of truth. (Eph. 4:3, 13.)

The "fathers" before us had, it seems, a clearer vision of the fundamental principles of non-sectarian New Testament Christianity, and the true unity of God's people than has been manifest in later years. See for example the brief articles, "Campbell on Forbearance," and "Campbell on Opinions" on pages 5, 6, 36, 206, and numerous examples of his gracious and respectful attitude toward brethren who differed with him on various questions; as also his long forbearance with Dr. Thomas in his factious spirit and wild distortions of gospel-truth. See also on pages 210-212 the excellent article by Robert Richardson on "Opinions," taken from the *Millennial Harbinger*.

The intrinsic value of the articles from the *Millennial Harbinger* and other sources must not be overlooked. Articles by A. Campbell and his co-workers and other writers in the M. H.; the writings of James Challen; the very remarkable articles by Dr. Barclay, by Moses E. Lard, by Robert Milligan, and the exceptionally able discussion of the Restoration of Israel by J. W. McGarvey; and, of later times, Dr. Brents on the Millennium; J. A. Harding on the same theme, and on the Second Coming of Christ; and the excellent contributions by some living preachers—notably by the editor and compiler of "Faith of Our Fathers," E. L. Jorgenson—all these alone would put the value of the volume beyond compute. It is a treasury of priceless writings, many of them rare and inaccessible elsewhere. It presents a panorama of Christian thought and teaching from earliest times to the present. There is no other such volume extant in the brotherhood. Its unique importance commends it to every Christian, preacher or teacher, student or learner. In our day especially, when controversy over prophetic questions has been made the excuse for disfellowshipping and ostracising brethren, and the "Church of Christ" shows signs of degenerating to the status of a creed-bound sect, such a book as this is of vital importance indeed.

To the attention of the reader, I would commend especially the "Preamble" by E. L. J. on pages 2 and 3. It is, as Brother Jorgenson says, far more than a question of unity by which our generation is confronted. If there is a false idea of liberty which destroys unity, there is also a false unity which destroys our God-given liberty. I have stated elsewhere that the free Christian must not subscribe even to what he believes to be the truth under duress. If a true Christian were required, in order to fellowship, to sign a statement containing all which at the moment he himself knows and believes, his answer would be, "No—I subscribe to no human conception of truth, but I subscribe to the New Testament alone." This volume, "Faith of Our Fathers" is full of such heroic Christian independence and God-pleasing liberty. In the preparation and publication of this great book, Brother Jorgenson has done an inestimable service to the brotherhood and for the cause of Christ.

R. H. Boll.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

**Being the rare and precious reprints from noted
pioneer preachers which ran serially through the
Word and Work magazine in 1945; 36 pages**

**"till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge
of the Son of God."—Eph. 4:13.**

**One copy, postpaid, 10¢
20 copies for one dollar**

The Word and Work, Publishers

**1046 Dudley Avenue
LOUISVILLE 4, KENTUCKY**

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

PREAMBLE

(E.L.J.)

With this issue of the Word and Work we begin the “precious reprints” from the Janes Collection. And we are happy that, together with the great regular features of this magazine, they are to reach a greatly extended list of readers. The one outstanding end and purpose of the reprints is to foster unity and effect a better understanding.

There is no hiding or evading the fact that a very serious unity question has been raised in certain quarters in connection with prophetic truth: must sincere disciples break fellowship and separate over such secondary differences, or may we not “receive” each other nevertheless, and cooperate on the basis of Christian love?

“I therefore, the prisoner in the Lord, beseech you to walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called, with all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love; giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.”—Eph. 4:1-3.

It is much more than a unity problem. The whole question of simple, undenominational Christianity is involved.

It is a question of Religious Freedom, of our liberty in Christ.

“For freedom did Christ set us free: stand fast therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage.”—Gal. 5:1.

It is a question whether the members of the churches of Christ shall continue as brethren of the free and simple congregations, or whether their faith is to be controlled from the outside by those who seem to think they have lordship over our faith. (Matt. 23:8, 9.)

It is a question between the one true, unsectarian, undenominational church of the New Testament, as against the incipient sectarianism which springs up in every movement unawares, and which would reduce the Church of Christ to a mere sect *called* “Church of Christ.”

The question is *not* primarily who is right and what is right, doctrinally, on the millennial question and the Second Coming; but whether the plain unity ground of the New Testament (Eph. 4:1-3), together with the sane, established unity practices of the faithful fathers, is all to be thrown overboard in our day, in favor of a new system of creeds and super-rulers (2 Cor. 1:24), in a kind of miniature Romanism.

We shall try to demonstrate in an orderly way (from what is perhaps the world’s largest collection of great literature on this line)

ture on this line) that these same differences—both in faith and teaching—have continued all along among disciples; and that never before, so far as history discloses—at least in this latest “Restoration”—have they been urged to draw the line; to condemn humble brethren who (right or wrong) believe Revelation 20:1-6 in its plain, grammatical sense; to “mark” and ostracize sincere Christian men and women—even ordinary “laymen”—for no reason except that they are “pre-millennial” (in the simple, fundamental *dictionary meaning* of the word: “Coming before the millennium”)—yes, even men and women who disavow any and all ecclesiastical connection with any premillennial sect or party as such.

We shall not, in these pioneer reprints, undertake to prove directly what is right, doctrinally, on prophetic questions; only the word of God can settle that. But, in the interest of freedom and unity, we shall show abundantly that separations over such issues is a new thing among disciples, a definite departure from the history and practice of the most illustrious leaders of the Restoration movement; and that these teachings are not divisive in themselves—they “cause trouble” only where there is some one, pro or con, to make them the occasion.

That there are hundreds and thousands of brethren, including many ministers, who openly hold the right *principles* on these lines, and the true New Testament unity ground—of this we are positively sure, from our contacts with them, East, West, North, and South—throughout the length and breadth of the land. And we have abundant reason to think that there are hundreds of others who hold these unity principles to themselves. Lacking in courage they may be, and they are; but they are only waiting for the time and for the freedom when they can speak out and take a stand without what seems to them the loss of influence, place, and livelihood.

It may be difficult for courageous men to see their point of view; but it is not entirely beyond comprehension when one considers all that is involved in taking such a stand.

Any movement, current or future, to “blackball” and separate disciples without just cause is so “unnatural,” so unscriptural, and so un-Christlike that it can hardly survive a second generation—the younger, coming generation of Christian men and women. It is like a monstrous, crooked, leaning house that finally falls of its own unbalanced weight.

To this good end, then—that is, to the cause of Christian unity, forbearance, and better understanding among all who truly love the Lord—to this end these pages are dedicated. This month, it is the attitude, the spirit, and the interest of the great Reformer, Alexander Campbell, that we historically exhibit.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

FIRST REPRINT

THE INDEPENDENT STUDENT

(Italics ours)

Certain exchanges have of late quoted freely from Alexander Campbell on the "Second Coming" and the "Millennium," but chiefly from his writings in the early "forties" of the last century. At that time America was in the midst of the Miller date-setting delusion: the Campbell arguments of that period are far from a full representation of that growing student's maturer views, and of his interest in prophecy.

Campbell declares explicitly that the changes of 1848 were "such as to command us to break silence on subjects we have never before presumed to meddle with," adding: "Now is the time for the students of prophecy to keep their vigils, to trim their lamps and watch."

In 1854 he said, "We have had it (the subject of the millenium) often before our minds, and are glad to see it is eliciting more attention than formerly"; again, "We design to give to this great theme much attention, and to spare no pains to assist our readers in the investigation of the prophetic oracles."

In 1855, "We are glad to see a continually increasing interest in that theme. . . . We feel constrained to contribute our labors to that subject, now annually growing in its claims, and by the signs of the times demanding our special interest and attention."

In 1856, "Whatever is taught in the oracles of God respecting the present or future condition of the Christian profession, demands our most grave and serious consideration. . . . It is indispensable that we understand our times, and their position on the chart of prophetic development."

In the same year, he wrote, "That the Redeemer shall come out of Zion and turn away ungodliness . . . from Jacob is an express oracle indicative of some special and glorious interposition of the Lord Jesus — which may usher in what we usually call *'the personal reign of Christ'—the subjection of all nations to him.*"

In 1866, the last year of his life, he wrote, "The signs of the times are surely portentous, and all meditative spirits cannot but long to look into the deep significance of the long unfulfilled but yet sure words of prophecy, to see if they give us any foreshadowing of that which is to come. The cry comes up from the waiters, watchers, 'Watchman, what of the night?' . . . We have already promised to furnish our readers with the results of our own reflections on this subject, and will, the Lord willing, keep it constantly before mind and heart, for their benefit. Let us search diligently what manner of times are coming upon us."

Alexander Campbell never fossilized. At first disparaging the subject (Millennium), at least for that particular time, he soon became an earnest student of prophecy and an ardent advocate of pro-

phetic truth. His life is a story of *growth* — "in grace and knowledge of the truth."

An interesting bit of biography occurs in Frazee's "Reminiscences," to the effect that in the winter preceding his death, Campbell preached a sermon in his sleep. It was of a half hour or more in length, and (according to Sister Campbell) one of the most eloquent sermons ever delivered by the great preacher. The theme was one which had more and more engrossed his mind in waking hours, exceeding precious to him. That theme was—"The Second Coming of Christ."

In this strain of growing knowledge and increasing interest the great reformer continues with increasing urgency up into 1860. (These references are only samples.)

May we say again: the *Word and Work* does not quote Campbell, Lipscomb, nor any other man as doctrinal authority, nor do we in all matters claim doctrinal agreement with men from whom we quote: they were perhaps all mistaken on some points, as probably we all are today. But it is in their spirit of *interest in God's whole Word, their growth in knowledge, and their attitude of forbearance* toward those who differed, that we would commend them as examples.

It seems apropos to give here a fine paragraph concerning Campbell's growth and freedom, quoted by S. H. Hall in the *Gospel Advocate*, from an Editorial in *Firm Foundation*:

"Campbell's religious career was a sort of evolution. He kept on learning, and he changed only as he learned. His colossal intelligence and his deeply spiritual environment from his boyhood contributed to make him a very profound student of both philosophy and religion during his entire life. He studied the Bible and aimed at being scriptural rather than consistent. He felt that if one's ideal is to be consistent with himself, he could never learn, or at least could never in his practice apply, any new thing. In this he was right. Otherwise one in practice of a false religion could not change — it would be inconsistent with his former practice. Campbell insisted on individual freedom — for every one to go to the Bible personally, read what it says, and do what it requires — without any inhibitions from lordly bishops, prelates, priests, or preachers. And he was in this undoubtedly right."

CAMPBELL ON FORBEARANCE

"I know we all use this term forbearance in a very unwarranted sense, and that it is difficult to find a term every way appropriate to communicate correct ideas on the subject. To bear with, or allow a brother to exercise his own judgment, is no doubt all that you intend by this term, and this is certainly inculcated in the apostolic writings. And I am willing to carry this principle to its greatest possible extent, though, as you say, there is and must be a stopping place. So long as any man, woman, or child declares his confidence in Jesus of Nazareth as God's Son, that He was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification; or, in other words,

that Jesus is the Messiah, the Savior of man; and so long as he exhibits willingness to obey Him in all things according to his knowledge, so long will I receive him as a Christian brother and treat him as such."—(Quoted from Campbell's reply to Bishop Semple.)

CAMPBELL ON OPINIONS

"*Question:* Are men never to be called to an account for their opinions?

"*Answer:* No. There is no instance of this kind in the Jewish or Christian Scriptures — God alone is judge of thoughts and private opinions.

"*Question:* But if private opinions are expressed, are they not to become matters of discipline?

"*Answer:* By no means, unless a person expresses them for the sake of compelling others to receive them, or to exclude them from their fellowship if they do not receive them. In that case he is answerable, not for his opinions but for his practices. He is a factionist, is seeking his own honor, making a party, and on these accounts sins against the Christian constitution; and such a person, on a second admonition, is to be rejected."—*Millennial Harbinger Abridged*, Vol. II, pp 38, 39.

SRYGLEY'S STATEMENT

Interesting, to say the least (in connection with "Opinions"), is the statement made by F. B. Srygley near the end of his career:

"What right has any one to say that one who believes an error should stop trying to teach it?

"If one is in error, I have no right to ask him to cease preaching error until he learns that it is error; then he should stop teaching it."—F. B. Srygley, *Gospel Advocate*, March 30, 1939.

CAMPBELL COMMENDS PREMILLENNIAL BOOK

We conclude this installment of "Precious Reprints" with this remarkably friendly and tolerant Review by Campbell of a strictly "premillennial" book.

Though Campbell was not "premillennial," at least not yet, nor even inclined that way (for during the early forties, in discussing Miller's date-setting delusions, he leaned heavily toward the common "post-millennial" view—that Christ's personal coming follows the millennium); yet, he was great and gracious enough to commend the Begg brothers, and their "premillennial" book, offering to handle orders for it, and even substituting a lengthy resume of that book in the *Harbinger* for one of his own featured essays on prophecy! We feel that, in the interest of true unity, the space here devoted to this incident in the great reformer's life is well assigned.—E. L. J.

"THE COMING OF THE LORD"

"A connected View of Some of the Scriptural Evidence of the Redeemer's speedy Personal Return and Reign on Earth with his glorified Saints, during the Millennium; Israel's Restoration to Pales-

time; and the Destruction of Antichristian Nations, with remarks on various Authors who oppose these Doctrines. — By James A. Begg.

"The above volume was handed to us the other day by the brother of its author, who is preparing to republish it in America. We read it through with our usual despatch. We must say that we never read any work on prophecy with more interest, nor, upon the whole, with greater satisfaction — though our measure of knowledge of prophecy will not yet permit us to yield assent to all that it contains. But could we make out even a long list of exceptions to this work, such are its merits as still to render it worthy of a very cordial recommendation to the students of prophecy.

"The author seems well balanced, temperate, modest, argumentative. He is a *layman* too — no small recommendation in this age of clerical pretensions. *If the reader is not willing to admit of the general return of Israel and Judah to their own land, of the literal coming of Jesus Christ, and of the literal resurrection of all the dead saints before the commencement of the Millennium, he may expect to find the most formidable array of scripture and argument against him he ever had to encounter in any 278 pages he has read on the subject of prophecy.* — Subscriptions taken at this office. Published by Wm. Begg, Cannonsburg, Pa.

"Indicative of the principles upon which this work proceeds, and as a substitute for one of our Essays on Prophecy, we will, with full approbation, give the following extracts. The reader will see how they tally with what has already been said upon the method of interpreting prophecy." *Millennial Harbinger*, 1832, pp. 255-257.

Later, Campbell referred again to Begg and his "theory":

"I have had the pleasure of an intimate and fraternal acquaintance with our sensible and estimable Bro. (Wm.) Begg, commencing many years since. He is a good man, well read in Bible literature, and zealous in the defense of the whole truth as he understands it. . . . Few men are superior to him in Christian knowledge, decision of character and perseverance. . . . Brother Begg has a brother in Scotland, who is distinguished for his zeal, diligence, and perseverance to that theory.

"I would not be understood as now opening my pages to that view of his kingdom yet to come, purposing, however, soon to enter that subject. I prefer to dispose of other matters, more immediately and imperiously demanding our attention. At a proper time, we may hear from him on that subject, too." — *Millennial Harbinger*, 1854, pp. 556-558.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 2

It should be interesting indeed, and edifying, especially to our younger readers, to learn something of the “dangers, toils and snares” through which our fathers passed, and by which the simple gospel and the free church have come down to us. And, inasmuch as example is always more effective than precept, it should forward materially the cause of Christian Unity, to learn of the love and forbearance by which our fathers held together through many differences and difficulties.

To this cause then (as stated last month), and to this good end, these pages are devoted.

Now, since it was our studied purpose for this month, anyway, to exhibit further Alexander Campbell's position on fellowship, and to illustrate the famous reformer's spirit of tolerance; and since an esteemed contemporary journal has recently (without reference to our series) brought up the case of Campbell vs. Dr. Thomas, it seems fitting that we should here attempt to clarify this historical case—for our readers and for posterity.

It is quite true that A. Campbell and John Thomas held differing views on the subject of The Throne of David. But Campbell did not break fellowship with Thomas *over this difference* (nor even over Thomas' early “Re-baptism” practice). Campbell taught explicitly (and never changed his views on this point) that the Lord Jesus now sits “on the Throne of David as King of kings, and also on the throne of God; for he has all crowns upon his head, and affirms that all authority in heaven and on earth is given to him.” On the other hand, Dr. Thomas seems to have taught that the Throne of David was and is that sovereignty which David once held, under God, over literal Israel. In this, the two men differed. But (we repeat it) *it was not this difference over which they broke fellowship*. And the reformer's criticisms of Thomas' teaching on this subject (which he said he mentions “only in passing” (Harbinger, 1852, pp. 64, came many years after Thomas had been rejected as a factious heretic for other reasons; and only after years of opportunity had effected no repentance or humbling in the doctor. The “Big-head,” “love of notoriety,” “passion for notoriety”—such were the terms applied to Thomas in a foot-note in 1852, where also the “Throne of David” difference was discussed. But the break came far back in the thirties, and finally in 1838, after long forbearance, and only after Thomas had “crossed the Rubicon”—himself broken with the Reformation brethren—and set out to lead a faction away after him, in his heresies of “soul-sleeping,” annihilation of the wicked, and other errors similar to the system which we now call “Russellism.”

We give first a reprint from the editor of the Word and Work, 1934, page 30:

THE CASE OF DR. THOMAS

The passion of religious controversy often seeks to fasten the odium of an ill-savored name or parallel upon brethren, in order to gain an unjust, unfair advantage. This should never be among brethren. Now as to Dr. Thomas of a century ago, his teaching, though professedly based on the Bible, and holding some Biblical doctrines, does not come under the head of Christianity. It was simply a human cult, evolved by peculiar methods of "interpretation." Its Christ is not our Christ but a mere creature, who had no existence previous to his birth on earth, and who when he died passed wholly out of existence, subsequently to be raised from the dead. According to Dr. Thomas, man is but body and breath. He denied also the personality of the Holy Spirit, and the existence of a personal devil; also what we believe to be the Bible teaching concerning the cross and the blood of Christ, eternal punishment, and other important truth. This man began by teaching the peculiar "re-baptism doctrine" still held by some of the brethren; and deliberately building up a hostile sect and faction in the church. After long forbearance, all loving brotherly admonition failing, he was finally disowned and distellowshipped by Campbell and his associates.

Confirmation concerning the errors of Dr. Thomas will be found in an historical work by Frederick Hodge, "The Plea and The Pioneers of Virginia." Hodge entitled one chapter, "Defection of Dr. Thomas," pointing out that—

The defection began in 1835* on only one point of contention: the re-immersion of all the Baptists who would have fellowship with us. In the Sycamore church, Richmond, where he was in charge, Thomas pressed this teaching and immersed deacons, a preacher of note, and many others. Campbell declared the "uselessness of the act," but didn't want to give publicity to "the defection." Later he reviewed him at length, concluding: There are but few brethren of whose reasonings and views I could speak so freely: whose errors or mistakes—(Oh! that I had a softer name!)—I could notice with more freedom and more hopes of success."

Campbell's kindly review did him no good, it seemed, and it was after this "Defection" that Thomas taught theories such as the following:

- "1. The soul is the breath of life and dies with the body.
- "2. In the resurrection, both soul and body will be raised and stand before the judgment seat of Christ; between death and

*This date is important, since the point and purpose is to show that the Campbell-Thomas break came many years before Campbell's strictures on Dr. Thomas' "Throne of David" teaching in 1852.—J.

the resurrection the soul sleeps, and is not active or conscious.

"3. In the resurrection all arise and judgment is pronounced, the wicked will be totally annihilated, and the righteous remain for ever with God. Thus the resurrection and eternal life are for the righteous only."

And here, in Campbell's own language, we exhibit Campbell's real reasons for the break with the "big-headed" heretic:

"I either read in some newspaper, or heard from some correspondent, some months since, stating that 'Dr. Thomas had left the reformation ground; set up for himself, and had constituted a new church of a few members.' -----"

"If I am not greatly mistaken, the Doctor has set out for a new party, founded on the annihilation of the wicked, infants, idiots, pagans, and Jews. Infants, idiots, and pagans will never rise from the dead; and the unjust hearers of the gospel, when raised, shall be judged and literally destroyed, or reduced to everlasting insensibility. To this gospel the Doctor is now devoted, and of course will regularly assail us and all who will not succumb to his speculations. I sincerely pity the man, and will leave him to his own reflections."

"This gentleman, no longer building upon the foundation with us, but having set out to form a party for himself, has openly completed the character of a schismatic as delineated by the Apostle Paul, and as such is to be rejected by all the brethren."—*Millennial Harbinger*, 1843, pp 230, 419, 420.

No, it was not because of Dr. Thomas' teaching on "The Throne of David" (right or wrong) that Campbell disfellowshipped him. And, in reading the whole connected story in the *Harbinger*, one gains the unmistakable impression that Campbell's harsh footnote (*Harbinger*, 1952, page 64) would never have been written against Thomas had not the doctor proved himself years earlier an incorrigible schismatic otherwise, both in doctrine and in conduct.

We close this exhibit with the famous reformer's rejection of the whole creedal principle (now threatening again the simple church) and his statement of what he termed the only "bond of Christian union":

"Our opposition to creeds arose from a conviction that, whether the opinions in them were true or false, they are hostile to the union, peace, harmony, purity, and joy of Christians ----."

"The principle which was inscribed on our banners when we withdrew from the ranks of the sects was 'Faith in Jesus as the true Messiah, and obedience to him as our Lawgiver and King, the only test of Christian character, and the only bond of Christian union, communion, and co-operation, irrespective of all creeds, opinions, commandments, and traditions of men.'"
—*Christian System*, pp 8, 9.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 3

Our “precious reprint” this month is taken from the *Millennial Harbinger* of 1864, pages 43, 44, 174-180.

First, we exhibit Campbell’s commendation of his successor-editor, W. K. Pendleton, who had already been his trusted co-editor for twenty years.

Next, three months later, Pendleton’s commendation and virtual endorsement of J. C. Waller’s strictly “premillennial” article, “Speedy Coming of Christ.”

Finally, the wonderful Waller article itself, complete as used by Pendleton, in the *Harbinger*, and worthy of all study on its own merits.

For clearness, we have set the Campbell and Pendleton notes in small (8 point) type; while the Waller article appears in type like this (10 point).

That the gifted Pendleton wished to throw the weight of his editorial influence on the side of Waller’s scripture reasoning seems perfectly clear, even while deploring “the evil effects of enthusiastic dogmatism” (have we not all seen the “evil effects” of such dogmatism and date-setting?). The only part of the article which he saw fit to criticize is that which he calls “an offering to Calvinistic orthodoxy,” impertinent to the subject proper. On the other hand, he reminds us that “the author argues with great plainness and point”; that “the subject is one which must ever deeply interest the children of the kingdom”; that it is our duty “to search the Scriptures for the signs of his coming, and to wait and watch as those who expect and desire his coming”; that he wishes to excite the reader “to examine the whole of his (Waller’s) argument on all the points discussed”; and finally he concludes with the mention of “a legitimate and wholesome interest in the subject.”—E. L. J.

CAMPBELL’S SEMI-VALEDICTORY

I do not address you, dear readers, to bid you a final farewell, yet I feel that this is, in some sort at least, a semi-valedictory. I have been for forty-one long, laborious, anxious years a hard-working Editor. I have not only written much and endured much contradiction of sinners, but in travels, in speaking, in thinking, in feeling, and in suffering for the interests of our noble cause, I may say with the great Apostle, my life has, in no small degree, “superabounded.”

The *Harbinger*, henceforth, will be conducted and published by my long and well-approved associate and co-laborer, Prof. W. K. Pendleton. I need not say that I have the fullest confidence in his fidelity and ability. He has been my co-editor for twenty years, and it is needless for me to say anything in special commendation of his scholarship, his enlarged Christian knowledge, his sound judgment, his great prudence, his devotion to the broadest and most permanent interest of our cause, and his high moral courage in proclaiming and defending the principles of

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

temperate disposition, his firmness and fixedness of principle, his life-long apostolic Christianity. He has been my reliable counsellor in much of the labor of my life, and my constant and unswerving co-operant in all the great interests of the cause for which we plead. It is with peculiar gratification that I find him thus prepared and willing to go on with a work from which I feel that it is time for me to retire; and it is my earnest prayer that a generous and confiding brotherhood will hold up his hands, and give him courage and confidence to persevere to the end.—*Millennial Harbinger*, January, 1864, pp. 43, 44.

"SPEEDY COMING OF CHRIST"

(Pendleton's Review)

This is the title of a *duodecimo* volume by J. C. Waller, of Louisville, Ky. It advocates the personal appearing of Christ, as introductory to the Millennium, and his reign during the thousand years personally on the earth with the risen, translated and glorified saints; and all this, according to chronological calculations of the prophetic periods, as near at hand. As introductory, the author gives us several chapters on the fall and recovery of man, in which he develops and defends the theory of a limited and unconditional atonement. We do not see that this has any logical connection with the question of the second coming, which must be treated as a subject of specific, positive revelation; and receive it therefore and let it pass as a free-will offering to Calvinistic orthodoxy.

The proper subject of his book, the author argues with great plainness and point. By much repetition of scriptures, and an almost prolix elaboration of formal syllogisms, he has succeeded in placing fully and clearly before the mind of even the cursory reader, the positions and the proofs upon which the pre-millennial adventists rely for their expectations. The subject is one which must ever deeply interest the children of the kingdom; and much as we deplore the evil effects of enthusiastic dogmatism on a subject which we believe the Author of our faith has intentionally left obscure as to many of its features, and indeterminately indefinite as to its **precise time**, still we think it our duty, and indeed an almost necessary fruit of an active faith and lively hope to search the Scriptures for the signs of his coming, and to wait and watch as those who expect and desire his appearing. It is only the infidel scoffer who throws the chilling breath of indifference over the subject, and pushes it from him as a vain and idle dream. These ought not to shake our faith, but be taken rather as a confirmation of the prophecy; for we are assured that "in the last days scoffers shall come, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation."

The question upon which the greater part of the controversy on this subject hinges, is as to the time of the personal coming of Christ, relatively to the millennium: that is, whether it shall **precede or succeed the thousand years**. The author, of course, contends for the former; and as we wish to excite our readers to examine the whole of his arguments on all the points discussed, we cannot do better than to lay before them some extracts from his chapter on this question. He says (page 128):

WALLER'S ARGUMENT

"It seems to be a belief very general, if not universal, among the professed believers of the sacred Scriptures, that a time, yet future, will come, when this earth, now cursed for man's sake, shall be restored to its Eden-like harmony and beauty. When the barren and waste places shall become as the garden of Jehovah's first planting; and be made again to rejoice and blossom as the rose. When no briars, nor thorns, nor noxious growth, shall again mar or despoil

its fair surface. Where now there are parched and thirsty plains, there then shall be refreshing pools and springs of water. Where thorns and thistles were wont to grow, there shall *then* the rose and myrtle blossom. Then the inhabitants shall no more build, and another inhabit; or plant, and another eat the fruit of his labor. But every one shall sit under his own vine and fig-tree, and none shall make them afraid. Wars will then cease unto the ends of the earth; and the sword of the warrior shall be beaten into a plow-share, and his spear into a pruning hook for the use of the husbandman. The fierce warrior shall then become the peaceful tiller of the soil. No more shall carnivorous beast prey upon his inoffensive victim. Then the rapacious leopard and the wolf shall lie down with the lamb and the kid; and the calf and young lion and the fatling shall feed, and dwell together in safety; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. The poisonous reptile shall then lose its venom, and the sucking child may in safety play with the asp, and the weaned child upon the serpent's den. And then shall the peace of paradise, and the beauty of Eden, be again restored to this now sin-stricken and groaning earth.

“This will be the long promised time of peace and safety, and sabbatical rest to the people of God. The time when 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, and they shall possess the kingdom. If these things be so, and we with confidence rely upon it—and what reader of the Bible doubts it?—then may we not with equal confidence believe that the Lord our Redeemer shall be King over all the earth in that day?

“If the truth of such a happy period yet future, is admitted and believed; and that Christ will be King in the earth at that glorious millennial day, should there be any question as to his *visible, personal presence*? We think not. We think that both reason, and the testimony of the sacred Scriptures, upon which alone we can found our reason, furnish ample assurance that the Prince of Peace will be personally present and visible to all, in his millennial kingdom.

“We may, we think, safely affirm from an abundance of scriptural authority, that there will be no permanent general peace on this earth until the Prince of Peace shall come. There can be no general peace until Satan, the enemy of peace, shall be bound and cast out of this earth, with his myriad of unclean spirits that do his bidding, that the world be no longer deceived by them. This, we are assured, Christ, the mighty angel who has the keys and can shut and no one can open, will do, when He comes with his holy angels and all his saints to raise the bodies of the sainted dead, and change the righteous living and to establish his millennial kingdom on the earth.

“We are told as plainly as words can tell it, that when Satan shall be bound and cast into the bottomless pit, and shut up, that he shall deceive the nations no more for a thousand years; that *then*, the

sainted dead—*they who sleep in Jesus*—whose spirits Christ will bring with him, shall live and reign *with Christ* a thousand years. This the inspired author explains to be, "*the first resurrection.*" And then adds: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power, but *they* shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall *reign with him* a thousand years."

"If Christ reigns with his saints during the millennium, he must come at its commencement. And if Satan is to be bound during the millennium, and the angel that comes and binds him is Christ, then Christ comes at the beginning of that period. And if the reign of a thousand years, in which Satan shall be shut up, is that kingdom which Christ as the '*nobleman*' went into a far country to receive, and for which we are directed to pray, then Christ comes at the commencement of that period; for the apostle Paul places his '*appearing and kingdom*' together. He says (2 Tim. 4:1): 'I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the *quick and the dead* at his *appearing and kingdom.*'"

"It is nowhere mentioned, nor intimated in the sacred record, that the saints shall '*possess the kingdom*' in the personal absence of the King of glory. But on the contrary, it is said, 'When the Lord shall build up Zion,' and establish his people in the earth, 'He will *appear in his glory.*' * * * When the Son of man came first, it was as a servant, in humiliation and suffering, and he was not then glorified, but learned obedience by the things which he suffered; but when he shall come the second time, he will come in his glory, with his holy angels and all his saints with him. Then he shall arise and have mercy upon Zion; for the time to favor her, yea, the set time, shall then have come.

"They, therefore, who believe the set time to favor Zion, mentioned in this connection, relates to the millennium, even if they do hold that it is the result of the spread of the gospel, with the influence of the Spirit in the conversion of the world, must nevertheless accept this also, that whenever that shall occur and by whatever means 'the Lord shall *build up Zion,*' 'He will *then appear in his glory.*'"

"The connected details in the order of events given by our Lord in his great prophecy, delivered on the mount in answer to the inquiry of his disciples as to what should be the sign of his coming and of the end of the world, precludes an intervening millennium of holiness, happiness, and peace on the earth, before the coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven. This we think will clearly appear by a careful attention to the order of events as our Lord gave it. In concluding his prophetic description of the days of vengeance upon the Jewish people, our Lord proceeds to say: 'Then shall be great distress in the land and wrath upon this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles, *until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.*' And '*immediately after the tribulation of those days* shall the sun be darkened, and the moon

shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of heaven shall be shaken: and *then* shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and *then* shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man *coming* in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.’

“The order of events as they were to occur, as detailed by our Lord himself, is: first, the destruction of Jerusalem, with great distress among the Jews in the land; then they are to be led away captive into all nations, and their city and land to be trodden down by the Gentiles until the *times of the Gentiles be fulfilled*. Then, as recorded by Matthew in continuation of the discourse, *immediately after* this long captivity and consequent *tribulation*, and the *times* allotted for the treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentiles, there will be darkness upon the earth, the sun, moon and stars failing to give their light; *then*, not before, but at that time, shall appear the *sign* of the Son of man in heaven, amid the surrounding darkness that shall cover the earth, and thick darkness the people. And *then*, at that time, shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they *then* shall see the Son of man himself coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.

“Here we may ask with emphasis; where, or at what time, from the carrying away of the Jews captive in all nations, and the treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentiles, to a time ‘*immediately after* the tribulation of those days,’ when Christ is seen ‘*coming* in the clouds of heaven,’ can there be found space for an intervening thousand years of holiness, happiness, and peace on earth? There is not in our Lord’s discourse, pointing out the order of events that are to precede his coming, any intimation of, or space for, such happy intervening millennial period. Nay more, the connecting order in the events preceding his coming, on the contrary, wholly excludes it.

“If an event so marked as the millennium—a thousand years of holiness, happiness, and peace on the earth—which must of necessity terminate the captivity of the Jews and the treading down of their city by the Gentiles, had been contemplated by our Savior as a period to precede his coming, he would not certainly have entirely omitted to mention it, or to at least leave space for it. But on the contrary, his statement that the coming of [the Son of] man should follow *immediately after the tribulation* consequent upon the captivity of the Jews, and the *times* of the Gentiles, in which Jerusalem should be trodden down by them, precludes even the possibility of such an intervening millennium.

* * *

“In 1 Corinthians 15:22, 23, we have this language: ‘For as *in Adam* all die, even so *in Christ* shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterwards *they that are Christ’s at his coming*.’ And in verses 51, 52, ‘Behold, I show you a mystery: We shall not all sleep, but we shall be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet

shall sound, and the *dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.*'

"Here we are taught that the resurrection of the righteous *dead*—'they that are Christ's'—and the change of the righteous *living*, take place at the *coming of Christ*, when the last trumpet shall sound. This is shown to be the *first resurrection*, in contradistinction to 'the rest of the dead,' by the 43d verse, thus: '*It is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory.*' So that all who are included in, and referred to, by the pronoun "*it*," are to be *glorified* by the coming of Christ, for *they* are '*raised in glory.*' They who contend that the apostle is here speaking of a resurrection which is general, and common to all mankind alike, must perceive the difficulty of answering, or avoiding, the conclusion that all mankind will be *glorified*, and therefore saved. We see not how such a conclusion can be avoided, if the premises are admitted. But the apostle was not speaking of a general resurrection, and therefore no such conclusion is involved. He was only speaking of the *dead in Christ*—'*they that are Christ's at his coming;*' whose bodies though '*sown in dishonor,*' will at the coming of Christ be '*raised in glory.*'

"In corroboration of these views, the apostle, in 1 Thess. 3:13, says: 'To the end he may establish your hearts unblamable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the *coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints.*' And again in chapter 4:14, 17, 'For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that *sleep in Jesus will God (Christ) bring with him.* For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent (go before) them which are asleep. For the Lord *himself* shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God: and the *dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain,* shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.'

"We have given this extended quotation because there is a minute, detailed account of the order of Christ's *coming* in the clouds of heaven, with all his saints—they that sleep in Jesus; the resurrection of their bodies; the change in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, of the righteous living, and their being caught up together to meet the Lord in the air. Here are made to synchronize the resurrection of the dead in Christ, and the change of the righteous living, and the coming of Christ with all his saints to commence his glorious millennial reign on earth.

"In Revelation 20, we learn that the binding of Satan and the first resurrection, whatever that resurrection may mean, take place at the same time; and by the consent of all, both take place at the commencement of the millennium. The apostle tells us that the dead are divided into two classes; the first class '*lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.*' '*This*' he defines to be '*the first resurrection.*' 'But the rest of the dead *lived not again* until the thou-

sand years were *finished*.' During this period, Satan was to be bound and shut up, 'that he deceive the nations no more till the thousand years should be fulfilled.'"

In a few pages more the author states the three distinct views of the **resurrection** to which the apostle refers in 1 Cor. 15; and rejecting the **metaphorical**, which makes it consist in the **saints living in the spirit and temper of the martyrs**, and also the **spiritual**, which makes it consist in **rising from a spiritual death by resurrection**, he defends the **third** or literal rising of those that have died in Christ, from **literal death**, by the following argument. (p. 145):

"As the first resurrection, or rising of the righteous dead, takes place at the beginning of the millennium, and synchronizes with the binding of Satan and the first resurrection synchronizes with the coming of Christ; therefore, Christ comes at the *beginning* of the millennium. And again: Either Christ will come and bind Satan, and raise the righteous dead at the commencement of the millennium, or the dead in Christ will remain in their graves, and Satan continue at liberty to deceive the nations *during* the millennium; the dead in Christ *will not* remain in their graves, and Satan *will not* continue at liberty *during* the millennium; therefore, Christ will come and bind Satan, and raise the sainted dead, at the *commencement* of the millennium.

"From all this, we conclude, and we think with sufficient reason for doing so, that a period approaches, distinctly marked and pointed out in the sacred word, and which we believe is near at hand, when our long absent Lord—the Son of man—will come *himself* in the clouds of heaven, according to his promise, and raise the *bodies* of the sainted dead, and change those of the righteous living, and enter upon his glorious millennial reign of peace, on this *now* bloodstained and sin-polluted, but *then* redeemed and beautified earth.—*Then*, not till then, will wars cease unto the ends of the earth, and happiness and peace prevail in every land. Then, too, will every hill and vale of this then renewed earth with its Paradise regained and Eden restored, be vocal with praises to Him who hath caused these once wildernesses and solitary places to rejoice and blossom as the rose, and hath brought peace on earth and good will to men."

Our space constrains us to close our examination of this book here. Our object has been simply to excite what we regard as a legitimate and wholesome interest in the subject of which it treats, that Christians may not, in the overwhelming passions of the hour, forget that "all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is only of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of God, abideth forever." (1 John 2:16, 17.) **This shall be in the last time.—Millennial Harbinger**, April, 1864, pp. 174-180.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 4

Attitude of John F. Rowe and Ruble

So far, the "precious reprints" of this department have been chosen from the older, earlier "Restoration" writers. But for the sake of interest and variety, our August reprint is taken from two writers of the not-too-distant past: Wm. Ruble's exposition of certain passages of prophecy, touching the two resurrections, and the millennial reign; and John F. Rowe's wholehearted commendation of Ruble and his book.

In 1896, John F. Rowe of Cincinnati, Editor of *The Christian Leader*, published a large book by Wm. Ruble entitled, "*Letters to Jews and Gentiles.*" The book, though not without its faults, was widely read, and even yet is in demand among disciples.

The author was an out-and-out believer in the kingdom reign on earth, following the Second Coming; and he sets forth this faith in no uncertain terms.

The *Leader's* gifted editor and publisher, John F. Rowe, must have been either in substantial agreement with Ruble on these lines; or else he was a man of such largesse and Christian magnanimity as to make us all ashamed of the narrowness of spirit so common in our day.

Since it is the *spirit of unity* that we especially seek to inculcate in these reprints; and since a better attitude through mutual understanding is our main objective, we here exhibit, first what Rowe had to say in his "Introduction" about Ruble and his book—(could praise be higher or commendation more complete?) And following this, we offer Ruble's remarks on the following passages: Rev. 11: 15-18; 1 Cor. 15:23, 24; Rev. 20:1-6; Matthew 19:28.

The great leaders of the "Restoration Movement" were certainly "a far piece" from separation over prophecy in John F. Rowe's day! But every religious movement crystallizes at last into a sect; and the one reason for this, above all others, is in that word, "intolerance"; in other words, the loss of Christian love (Eph. 4:1-3). Let us not forget that the very "movement" which at present stands opposed to this sectarian spirit in the churches (a movement that is far wider than the millennial faith) will end up at last as a party or a sect—unless the greatest humility of spirit and the deepest Christian love may be, and may continue to be, the marks and chief characteristics of its advocates.—E. L. J.

ROWE'S INTRODUCTION

"In several respects this is a rare and wonderful book. There is nothing like it in print, so far as our knowledge extends. It is unique and original. It is characterized by much that is new to the

casual reader, and on every page the reader is taken by surprise; not because the facts and principles are of recent discovery, but because of new combinations of thought, a resetting of old thoughts, of that which is both analytic and synthetic, and especially making plain that which has been hidden in obscurity by incompetent interpreters of God's word. The author deals in facts, not in opinions and speculations. He proves his propositions, in every case, by incontrovertible testimony - - -.

"The erudite author has here presented a work to the world which, as to a comprehensive grasp of Bible knowledge, as to breadth of mental vision, as to critical acumen, as to historical researches, as to prophecy and fulfillment, as to the fate of nations and empires, as to an exposition of the scheme of redemption, and as to originality of thought and irresistible logical deductions, excels by far any work of the kind we have ever read." (pp. III, IV.)

RUBLE'S REMARKS

Now, I am ready to proceed a little further with the things that followed immediately after the beginning of the sounding of the seventh trumpet, as recorded. (Rev. XI. 15-18.)

Immediately following the statement that "the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ," is the statement, that "the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that you should give a reward unto your servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear your name, small and great; and that you should destroy them who desolate the earth."

John does not here state that these "dead," who are to be judged at this time, are the righteous dead, but such is the legitimate inference from the clauses in which he designates those who are to be rewarded. Nor does the last clause, which deals with those who desolate the earth, and are to be destroyed, indicate that those desolators had already died in the flesh. I infer that they are the notorious and incorrigibly wicked who are upon the earth when the Lord comes, who call upon the rocks and mountains to fall upon them, and hide them "from the face of him who sits upon the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: for the great day of his wrath has come; and who shall be able to stand?" They are to be destroyed as men in the flesh.

That those dead who are to be judged when the Lord comes are the righteous dead and not all the dead, is inferred from I Cor. xv. 23, 24: "Christ the firstfruits of the resurrection; afterwards they who are his at his coming"; then, at the end, I understand him here to affirm three resurrections: 1. Christ's resurrection; 2. They who are his when he comes the second time; 3. At the end of the world, when all come forth, they who have done evil and are not Christ's as well as the righteous dead who lived and died during the personal reign of Christ,

That such is the fact seems to be more fully corroborated in Revelation xx. 4-6, where he says: "I saw thrones, and they who sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them who were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, who had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark in 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 till the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that has part in the first resurrection: on such the second death has no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

The first resurrection of Revelation is Paul's second resurrection of Corinthians. Then, we must take it as a settled fact that our Lord Jesus Christ reigns over the earth a thousand years, and that during this time all the kingdoms of this world are to be in subjection to him. Now, in verse 4 we have another fact brought out, that the saints are to judge the earth. John says: "I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them." Daniel (vii. 22) says about the same thing: "And judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom."

And the Lord says to his twelve apostles: "You are they who have continued with me in my temptations. And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father has appointed unto me; that you may eat and drink with me at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Luke xxii. 28-30). Of the same conversation Matthew says this: "Jesus says to them, Verily I say unto you, That you who have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, you also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Matt. xix. 28).

We can, then, take it as a settled fact that after the Lord comes again, and sits upon his glorious throne and reigns over the earth, his glorified saints, who take part in the first resurrection, not only reign with their Lord, but are active and spiritual members of his kingdom, and joint-heirs in his inheritance. (Rom. viii. 17.)—*Letters to Jews and Gentiles*, by Wm. Ruble; published by John F. Rowe, 1896.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 5

In the *Millennial Harbinger* of 1832, pages 322-324, the Editor (A. Campbell) gave his readers the following thought-provoking article from the pen of James A. Begg of England.

Introducing the short article (or rather, the short portion concluded from the preceding issue of the *Harbinger*), Campbell offers the opening paragraph from his own pen. It not only demonstrates the editor's latitude of mind and spirit toward brethren who differ on prophecy—the spirit which we ourselves especially seek to inculcate in this series; but it leans definitely to the principle of accepting prophecy in its plain and “proper” meaning—that is, the simple grammatical sense. But here is Campbell's own statement, followed by Begg's fine article.—E. L. J.

“The subject of prophecy is daily eliciting more attention, and an increase of light must be the result of the discussions now in progress. In this, as in other matters, we desire to give our readers all sides; not merely the views consonant with our own, but those from which we must dissent. In this way they are better prepared to judge for themselves. The views of this author are rendered much more plausible from the fact that his principal rules of interpretation will give the results which have been approved by the fulfilments already agreed upon; and therefore, had he written one hundred years before the coming of the Messiah, or two thousand years ago, he would have come to the results which distinguished the times of the Messiah. But as we have given place to him, we shall reserve a more full examination of this work until a more convenient season.”—Editor, *Millennial Harbinger*, 1832, p. 322.

LITERAL FULFILMENT OF PROPHECY

By James A. Begg

The legitimate conclusion from this literal fulfilment of Prophecy in times past surely is, that predictions concerning the future will have a similar accomplishment; and that as Jesus was really born of “a virgin,” so will he also “come with the clouds of heaven,” when there will be “given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him.” Is. vii. 14—Dan. vii. 13, 14. That, in the day of his power, he will as certainly come to Egypt “riding on a swift cloud,” as, in his humiliation, he entered Jerusalem seated on an ass. Is. xix.¹—Zech. ix. 9. That as “the spirit of whoredoms in the midst of Israel” has hitherto blinded them, that “they have not known the Lord,” they shall “know that the Lord of hosts hath sent” him, when he shall inherit Judah, his portion in the Holy Land. Hos. v.⁴—Zech. ii. 11, 12. That as, when formerly he tabernacled with men, he brake not the

bruised reed nor quenched the smoking flax, so shall he yet "go forth as a mighty man, stirring up jealousy like a man of war." Is. xlii. 3, 13. That as he really submitted to oppression and affliction, while "he opened not his mouth," so will he, in the day of his fierce anger, "destroy and devour at once." Is. liii. 7; xlii. 14. That as the humble Shiloh truly came ere the scepter had departed from Judah, so will the Lord, when he builds up Zion, appear in his glory. Gen. xlix. 10 - Ps. cii. 16. That as, when formerly he appeared in our world, the Jewish nation saw in him no form nor comeliness," so will he be "the desire of all nations" when he comes again. Is. liii. 2 - Hag. ii. 7. That as, at his first coming, he was truly "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," he will, at his return, "rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in his people." Is. liii. 3; lxxv. 19. That as the children of Israel have really remained "many days without a king and without a prince," so they will, in the same sense, have this reproach removed, when, in the latter days, they "shall return and seek the Lord their God, and The Beloved, Their King." Hos. iii. 4, 5. That as he who "Is to be Ruler in Israel" was really born in Bethlehem, so, when he has "returned unto Zion, he will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem." Micah v. 2 - Zech. viii. 3. That as "the city and the Sanctuary" were really destroyed by "the people of the prince" who came to execute the vengeance of God, so will the House of the Lord of hosts "be built" again when he is "returned to Jerusalem with mercies." Dan. ix. 26 - Zech. i. 16. That as really as his disciples "hid their faces from him" in the hour of his distress, shall "many people and strong nations come to seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the Lord." Is. liii. 3 - Zech. viii. 22. That as on Calvary he really "made his soul an offering for sin," so will he reign "in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously." Is. liii. 10; xxiv. 23.

What valid reason can be offered for putting a spiritual interpretation on the one class of predictions, in the above series, which was not extended to the other? Notwithstanding the unbelief of the Jews, those concerning his sufferings and death were fulfilled to the very letter; and what is there in the language of the other which should induce us to adopt a system of interpretation so opposite in its nature? This mode of spiritualizing certain prophecies appears the more exceptionable when we perceive, that while one clause of a sentence is allowed to have a literal significance, another is understood spiritually, although there be nothing observable which can direct to such a change - the system being still farther encumbered by the difficulty of managing certain portions which will in no way bend to such accommodation as it requires. Have we, then, no reason to fear that in thus introducing an unauthorized system of prophetic interpretation, we may be "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men"? Instead, therefore, of unreasonably persisting in adherence to such opinions, and putting upon prophecy a meaning it cannot bear, let us inquire whether the more natural

and more obvious sense be not that which the Spirit of God designed. The answer to this inquiry may perhaps be read in the fact, that prophecy has hitherto been fulfilled in its proper sense; while the consequences of abandoning this mode of interpretation by the Jews, form a beacon which ought ever to be kept in view. By overlooking the plain declarations of his sufferings and death, they would not receive the despised Nazarene as their anointed Lord. Let us not, in defiance of their punishment, reject the more numerous declarations of his coming and kingdom in glory. Let Christians attend to the lofty descriptions of the holy prophets—let them weigh their united evidence—let them examine the multitude of these predictions, and the sublimity which pervades them—let them consider the harmony with which they all bear testimony to His coming and abiding with his people—and let them then reflect whether it is probable that all these promises, clear as they seem, and literally as prophecy has hitherto been fulfilled, do not in reality imply, and afford evidence of the truth of Christ's personal reign on earth during the Millennium.—*Millennial Harbinger*, 1832, pp. 322-324.

THE DESTINY OF ISRAEL

By J. T. Barclay

(Missionary to Jerusalem)

Dear Brother Campbell: Deeply impressed with the belief that we are on the eve of a "novus ordo seclorum"—a conviction unconsciously engendered by contemplating the signs of the times, in connection with the "sure word of prophecy"—I have felt constrained to bestow much thought upon the subject of the special duties that devolved upon the present generation in relation to God's ancient people. * * * *

But inasmuch as I find myself in a fearful minority, allow me therefore to state—however unseemly it may appear—that I entirely dissent from the views most generally held in relation to the present position and future destiny of Israel. It is usually maintained, to a greater or less extent, as you are aware, that by a kind of irreversible decree in the eternal counsels of the divine will, the whole Hebrew race—inclusive alike of the branch of Israel and the branch of Judah—are so far heaven-abandoned and judicially blinded, as not only to be perpetual outcasts from the material heritage of Israel, but from the spiritual favor of God also, and even incapable of Christianization: that they are not fit subjects for social amelioration or political enfranchisement: that it is not agreeable to the will of Heaven that they should be restored to their ancient patrimony—lying under the interdiction of an everlasting curse—as is alleged: that they have no claim whatever upon our consideration; and are, in no way, concerned in the introduction of the millennium, and the future government of the world.

Now, in opposition to all such outrageous ostracism, proscrip-

tion and perversion, I can but enter my decided protest, and contend most earnestly, on the contrary, that though the curse of heaven now rests upon both the land and the nation of Israel, it is ordained to be removed; and this noble race fully restored to their Fatherland—there re-enfranchised, and finally invested with the scepter of universal dominion, as chief of nations: that so far from being hopelessly offcast and irreclaimably doomed, not only is the resumption and conversion of this elect race possible, but probable in the highest degree; it is not only so, but absolutely certain: that the time is coming, and probably nigh at hand, when every Jew on earth shall be brought within the pale of salvation: that the universal conversion of Israel, however, does not occur while they are dispersed abroad, but is almost restricted to Palestine: that the conversion of the world being held in abeyance by our neglect of Israel, human instrumentality should be speedily put in requisition for their restoration—if not by an appeal to governmental interference by diplomacy and negotiation, at least by the social combination of the friends of Israel: And that such an ingathering and colonization of Israel is an honor specially devolved upon America, and particularly that class of her citizens whose motto is, "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible."

* * * And in quite recent issues of the Harbinger, we are permitted to rejoice in such expressions as these [Barclay then quotes from the pen of A. Campbell as follows]: "The subject of the millennium is one of thrilling interest to the Christian community. We have it often before our minds, and are glad to see that it is eliciting more attention than formerly, both in our own country and in the old world."

* * * "We design to give this great theme much attention, and to spare no pains to assist our readers in the investigation of the prophetic oracles; for the time has come when many run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased; and we are evidently approaching a new crisis in the ecclesiastical affairs of the world." * * * "It will undoubtedly soon be, if not already, one of the most engrossing topics of our generation." * * * * —*Millennial Harbinger*, December, 1860, pp. 661-668.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 6

In the *Millennial Harbinger* of 1832, Alexander Campbell reprinted the following able article on “The Literal Interpretation of Prophecy,” by James A. Begg. Much more also, along the same line and from the same author, he reprinted in the *Harbinger*.

We give first Campbell’s remarkable introductory note of approbation; then the main article by Begg, followed by a shorter one which Campbell introduced by urging a “second reading” of the first, and last of all (after Campbell’s approbation again), we exhibit another paragraph by Begg in which prophecies of the first and second Coming are wonderfully conjoined.—E. L. J.

THE APPROBATION

Indicative of the principles of interpretation on which the work proceeds, and as a substitute for one of our Essays on prophecy, we will, with full approbation, give the following extracts. The reader will see how they tally with what has been already said upon the method of interpreting prophecy.—Editor, *Millennial Harbinger*.

THE LITERAL FULFILMENT OF PROPHECY

“In endeavoring to ascertain the meaning of scripture prophecy, it is important to observe, that, from the very nature of most of its predictions, they are only capable of a literal interpretation. Were Christians to attend with care to their contexts, and even to circumstances introduced in the various prophecies sometimes spiritualized, they would find in these alone checks sufficient to prevent such a perversion of their meaning and design. But it is also farther to be observed, that to explain away all the predictions concerning the *glory* of Christ, is to justify His rejection by the Jews, notwithstanding of the plain declaration of his humility and sufferings. For, if we are at liberty to spiritualize all the prophecies which foretell his reign in glory, how can we blame them for adopting a similar mode of interpreting other predictions not more clear and far less numerous? Besides, this is a method of interpretation which seems not only repugnant to reason, but is quite inconsistent with that literal fulfilment which prophecy has hitherto received. If all past predictions, except where figures are obviously used, have had their fulfilment *literally*, even when the minuteness of prophecy was extreme, on what principle of interpretation is a mode of fulfilment yet unprecedented now to be expected? We can point to a long series of predictions which have been literally fulfilled, and to others which are being so at this very day, in their utmost minutiae, and can see no reason to suppose that those which, for aught we can tell, may relate to the ensuing month or the ensuing year, are not to have a literal

fulfilment also, as no intimation is given by the Spirit of Prophecy of a period at which this mode of their accomplishment shall cease. Thus alone can the criterion divinely given, by which to distinguish the *true* prophet from the *false*, be of any avail; "If thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the Lord hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously." Deut. 18: 21, 22. And the minuteness with which prophecy has hitherto been fulfilled, proves how safely the rule may be applied. The past dealings of God in this respect, which show the perfect correspondence between the prediction and its accomplishment, have, however, been much neglected; and hence, perhaps, the unwillingness so often displayed, believingly to receive the promises he has bestowed, without the intervention of our own limitations; and hence, also, our unbelieving fears to submit divine predictions concerning the future to the ordeal which Jehovah himself has prescribed.

"* * * Or, taking history as evidence, we might trace the literal fulfilment of prophecy in the rise and fall of empires—the scenes of their splendor, and the means of their overthrow. We might refer to the judgments poured on cities famed of old, and in the height of their glory when denounced of the Lord: of Nineveh, of Babylon, of Tyre, of Jerusalem, and others; and might gather thence evidence incontrovertible of the literal fulfilment of prophecy in circumstances the most improbable to human foresight—by means the most unlikely in human estimation—and with a specification of incidents so apparently insignificant as would, perhaps, never have been recorded had not the minds of historians been under the immediate control of him whose omniscience they thus unwittingly attested. The very improbability of such prophecies ever being fulfilled, renders their accomplishment a more glorious display of that divine attribute which Jehovah claims as peculiarly his own, and in proof of which he even appeals to prophecy. * *

"These remarks derive much confirmation from a recent publication by the Rev. Alexander Keith, titled, *Evidence of the Truth of the Christian Religion Derived from the Literal Fulfilment of Prophecy*; from which, did our limits permit, we should gladly have availed ourselves of extracts. But for the illustrations of our views, we prefer making a selection of scripture predictions concerning the humiliation of Christ, with reference to their fulfilment. (He cites Gen. 49:10; Isa. 6:14; Matt. 1:20; Micah 5:2; Matt. 2:1; Zech. 9:9; Matt. 21:1; Isa. 53:2; Jno. 1:11; Isa. 53:3; Matt. 26:56; Psalms 20:6; Matt. 27:29; Luke 22:11; Isa. 50:6; Matt. 25:67; Mic. 5:1; Matt. 27:30; Isa. 53:7; Matt. 27:12; Isa. 53:3; Mark 15:15. * * * See pp. 259, 260.)

"Prophecy has hitherto been literally fulfilled, and there is the same ground as ever for believing it will still continue to be so * * *

"But from the continued operation of the same principle—of which up to the present hour we are not left without exemplification

—and from the entire absence of all authoritative intimation of any intended alteration, we may reasonably infer—nay, we are bound to believe, that in this respect no such change is designed, and that any interpretation assuming this as its basis, is altogether unwarranted.

"In maintaining the literal fulfilment of prophecy, we are not, however, to be understood as denying that the prophetic scriptures contain many *figures*, which are only to be explained as figurative language must always be. In pleading for the literal fulfilment of prophecy, we are only asking for it the same principle of interpretation that is extended to other compositions. In every case, except that of interpreting God's word, it would be considered as the highest injustice to an author to change entirely the meaning of the language ordinarily employed, simply because figures occasionally occurred; nor would any one consider himself warranted to interpret even the figures themselves otherwise than in consistency with the connecting statements given, discriminating the one from the other. Yet without the least pretense to *divine authority* for the principle, statements in scripture, given wholly or partially in unfigured language, are equally subjected to the spiritualizing process, and meanings extracted which nothing less than a *new revelation* could enable the reader to discover; or rather, it may be said, which is *itself* a new revelation, having never been in the written language, to be in any way elicited from it.

"Although the Apostle Paul speaks of the seed of Abraham (Rom. 11:17-24) *under the figure* of "branches broken off," and to be yet again "*grafted* into their own *olive tree*," no one supposes that the use of such a figure is a reason for denying that the *literal* Israel is there meant. Yet such is the very treatment given to the Old Testament prophecies.

"But fidelity to the word of God requires, that where figures do *not* occur, figurative interpretations be *not* introduced; and where figures *are* introduced, that they be really interpreted as such."—*Mil. Har.*, 1832, pp. 255-262.

UNITY AMONG THOSE WHO DIFFER

By Barton W. Stone

Dear Brother Campbell:

Hitherto our discussion has proceeded in the mild spirit of the gospel; nor do I fear that we shall depart from it, if truth be our object. If nothing more be effected by this discussion, I hope we shall convince the world of what has been deemed impracticable, if not impossible, that Christians can love one another, and dwell together in unity, and yet differ in sentiment. I hope also that we shall give an example of that moderation and forbearance which the scriptures teach, yet so uncommon among its professors in the present cavilling age.—*Millennial Harbinger*, 1841, p. 248.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 7

TWELVE SHORT REASONS

The remarkable and powerful argument that follows was offered by Campbell to his readers as a reprint in the *Millennial Harbinger* in 1832. It is much more than a defense of "the literal interpretation of prophecy"; it is a master essay on the pre-millennial advent of the Lord. Campbell's brief introduction shows that he regarded it "worthy of a very candid and attentive consideration."—E. L. J.

The following *Twelve Reasons* for the literal interpretation of prophecy afford a condensed view of the reasonings of that host of writers and preachers now agitating the British Isles, on the personal appearance of the Saviour anterior to the Millennium. The pamphlet containing them was forwarded to us by Mr. Begg. We have also received other files of English periodicals, and expect soon to receive others, declarative of the rapid progress of these sentiments in England and Scotland. In the following *Reasons* there are some applications of scripture which are of questionable propriety; but, upon the whole, they are worthy of a very candid and attentive consideration.—Editor, *Millennial Harbinger*.

TWELVE SHORT AND GENERAL REASONS

Why those passages in scripture which refer to the Second Advent of our Lord, previous to the Millennium, should be interpreted

literally: Extracted from the Works of Messrs. Noel,

Cunninghame, Begg, A Spiritual Watchman, etc.

Published by James Nisbet, London, 1831.

I. Every part of the Jewish Tabernacle was typical of things to be established in and for the church *in this earth*. Its sacrifices were types of Christ's perfect sacrifice; its priesthood a shadow of his priestly office; the tabernacle itself a complex volume of hieroglyphics; the Holy of Holies a type of heaven itself. Now as every other part of the tabernacle was typical of what was to be accomplished in this earth, it is to be inferred that the Spirit of God, in directing the erection of a typical heaven upon earth in the midst of the camp of Israel, in which the glory of the Lord was visibly present, did thereby clearly signify to the church that there is a period in the dispensation of the fulness of times, when heaven itself, or the glorious manifestation of Jehovah, *shall come down to this earth* by the personal presence in it of the Lord Messiah.

II. Jesus is entered into heaven in the character of our High Priest. All the morning of the great day of Atonement, the Jewish High Priest was employed in offering sacrifices, first for himself, and then for the people. He then entered into the Holy of Holies with the blood of the victims, having first taken a censer of coals from the

brazen altar, and strewed incense on it, that he might go within the vail amidst the cloud of smoke which this sweet perfume emitted. During the time of his disappearance, the people mourned, and were humbled on account of their sins. But as soon as he had sprinkled the blood, and offered the incense, *he put on his gorgeous robes, and coming forth to bless the people*, turned their sorrow into joy. In all this he typified the true High Priest, who is not entered into the holy place made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, and that with his own blood, and the incense of his own intercession, there to appear in the presence of God for us. During his personal absence, his church on earth is in a depressed and suffering condition. It is a time of humiliation and a conflict, warfare and reproach, under which they are upheld, and comforted, by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. But as the great High Priest of his church, the Saviour has another office to perform, which is, *to come forth to bless them*, to complete their redemption in body as well as in soul, and to bring their days of mourning to an end. This he will do, when in the true gorgeous robes of his Priesthood he shall appear in his glory. * * *

III. In typical illustration it is an invariable rule that the *type* is always inferior in worth, and in the scale of creation, to the *Antitype*. Thus Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, etc. show how the less is always the type of the greater. Even the sun, moon, and stars, are inferior in the scale of creation to the sovereignties which they represent. Now it is strongly insisted on by those who are opposed to a *literal* interpretation, that the decisive passage, Daniel 7: 13, 14, is simply a *figure*, denoting the conversion of the world by the spread of the Gospel. * * * It is clear that there can be no dispute concerning the time of this Advent, as to whether or no it precedes the Millennium. The only question is, whether it be a spiritual or a personal coming? Now throughout the scriptures, Christ is the *great antitype*; yet if this be not taken in its plain literal sense, Christ would appear merely as a type of the progress of his own Gospel in the heart of man, and therefore a type signifying something infinitely inferior in dignity to that which was pointed out by the morning and evening lamb of the daily sacrifice.

IV. In the scriptures the reigning of the saints with Christ is not referred to merely as a state of future prosperity which the church in the latter days was to expect, but as the comfort and encouragement, of the people of Christ in *every age*; as something in which they were *personally interested*, and as intimately connected with the resurrection from the dead. The truth is, this is the glory to which the *suffering church* * * * is elected, being predestined not only to be partakers of Christ's mercies, but to be partakers of the throne of his glory.

V. All the prophecies which relate to the sufferings and humiliation of the Saviour were fulfilled *literally*. Why then should not those prophecies which relate to his exaltation and reign upon

earth be in like manner literally accomplished? If we are at liberty to spiritualize all those prophetic declarations which foretell Christ's reign in glory, how can we blame the Jews for adopting a similar mode of interpreting other predictions not more clear and less numerous? * * *

VI. To those who oppose the literal interpretation of the passages in scripture which refer to the approaching Advent of our Lord, it must appear singular that there is not in the Gospels or Epistles the slightest reference to such a period of peace and purity as the Old Testament prophecies everywhere represent, as still to be enjoyed *on earth*. Yet in the New Testament, so interwoven are the intimations of the coming of our Lord, and resurrection of the saints, with all reference to the millennium, that if these events are placed *after* that happy time, *then* undeniably there is not the most distant allusion to it. If Paul refers to the Millennium when the sons of Abraham shall be grafted into their own olive tree, it is when the Deliverer shall come out of Zion, Rom. 11:26. If Peter alludes to it, as the times of restitution, it is when the Lord shall *send* Jesus Christ, Acts 3:20. If the same Apostle refers to the Millennium, when the promise of God, uttered by the prophet Isaiah, should be fulfilled, of new heavens and a new earth, when Jerusalem shall be created a joy, and her people a rejoicing (Isa. 65:17, 18), still with these new heavens and new earth our views are again directed to the coming of the day of God, which day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, 2 Peter 3:8-13.

VII. On the supposition that Christ was not to return till after the Millennium, it would appear surprising that he should not have included that long term of holiness and happiness among the signs which shall precede his coming, Matt. 24. After the world has for thousands of years been torn by dissension, and been the scene of every wickedness, such a lengthened period of universal purity and peace must have proved a very notable sign. But the words "*immediately after the tribulation of those days*," Matt. 24:30, prove that the coming of the Saviour shall precede the commencement of the Millennium, and therefore its existence could not have been given as a sign of his approach.

VIII. When the disciples asked (Acts 1:6) Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? (and this question was put after their understandings had been opened, that they might understand the scriptures, Luke 24:45) our Saviour did not reprove them for cherishing expectations inconsistent with his design, as he did on occasions when this was really the case; but on the contrary gave them every reason to believe that their hopes were well founded. This also proves that at the period of his ascension, the Apostles did expect that he should personally restore the kingdom to Israel.

IX. The Jewish church, overlooking the series of predictions which related to Christ's humiliation, and fixing their attention only

on those which foretold his exaltation, expected with perfect unanimity from Daniel 7:14, and other prophetic passages, that the Messiah would come as a glorious king to reign in the midst of them—ignorant that he must *first* suffer many things. The ancient Christian church did in like manner understand the passages of the Old Testament, now adduced by those who advocate a literal translation, as signifying the real, personal, and glorious advent of the Messiah. This strong fact is proved by the writing of St. Barnabas, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Cyril of Jerusalem, Tertullian, etc. It has been justly remarked by an anonymous writer on another subject, that "those who lived nearest to the Apostles must have best known the minds of the Apostles." * * *

X. In the New Testament there are three noun substantives used to signify the advent. *Apokalupsis*, revelation; *Epiphaneia*, appearance; *Parousia*, coming, or presence. [Citations are given.] A review of these passages will satisfactorily prove that these words are used to signify the second personal coming of our Lord; nor does it appear that any of these words is ever used to denote the spiritual or figurative appearance of any person. It is remarkable, too, that the word *Epiphaneia* was particularly employed by the Greeks to denote the appearance of their gods with circumstances of outward splendor. Now, the coming of our Lord to destroy the man of sin previous to the Millennium, in 2 Thess. 2:8, is expressed by the union of two of the above nouns: *te epiphaneia tes parousias autou*," "by the bright shining of his coming": and if neither of these nouns can singly denote a spiritual advent, much less can they when conjoined; and if each of them, when employed separately, means a personal manifestation and presence, much more must they when united. Since, therefore, the glorious coming of Christ takes place at the destruction of Antichrist, and since this destruction occurs (by the unanimous consent of the church of God in all ages) before the Millennium, it follows that Christ comes in glory to judge the world before that period.

XI. When the Lord and his Apostles would inculcate the necessity of watchfulness upon those who profess to acknowledge him as their Master, the language is remarkable. They do not address them in such words as these, "Watch, for death is hastening"; "Be ready, for shortly you must leave this earth"; but thus they do warn them: "Watch, therefore, for ye know not the hour your Lord doth come." "Be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of man cometh." In fact, death is a subject to which the Lord and his Apostles seldom refer, and which they do not bring forward as an incentive to watchfulness and preparation. *The coming of the Lord*, the second and glorious *appearing* of the divine Saviour—this it is which they urge upon us, and by the consideration of which, in connection with the events which are then to take place, they endeavor to overcome the inherent slothfulness of our nature,

and stir us up to activity in the work of God, and to watchfulness over our hearts and spirits. * * *

XII. The first event which distinguishes the advent of our Lord, Matt. 25:31, is, that he shall *sit on the throne of his glory*. If it is not *till the advent* that he shall thus sit on the throne of his glory, it necessarily follows that he is not *now sitting on that throne*. Accordingly he himself assures us, Rev. 3:21, that the throne where he now sits is that of his Father (in heaven): and his words necessarily imply that this session on his own throne is yet a future event. If we further inquire what is the identical throne on which Messiah, the Son of Man, shall sit, we find an answer in the well known prophecy of Isaiah 9:7: "He shall sit upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and establish it." Confirmatory of which, are also the words of Gabriel to his virgin mother, Luke 1:32: "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever." Unless, then, we identify the throne of David with that of the Eternal Father, which would be blasphemy, we must acknowledge that the session of Messiah on his own throne is a distinct event, and belonging to another period.

The judgment in Matt. 25:31 commences therefore when the Son of Man sits upon the throne of his father David. Now, is any light thrown upon the chronology of this stupendous event by other passages of Scripture? In Matt. 19:28 will be found the following remarkable words, spoken by our Lord to His Apostles: "Verily, I say unto you, that ye who have followed me, in the regeneration, *when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory*, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." In the parallel text of Luke 22:28, 30, there is to be found the additional circumstance that it is in the kingdom of our Lord that this promise is to be fulfilled: "Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations, and I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table, in my kingdom, and sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Now the precise time when this kingdom of the Son of Man shall be established is manifest from Dan. 7:13, 14, wherein the prophet sees the Messiah brought near to the Ancient of Days, and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him. And that this event coincides with the beginning of the Millennium is generally acknowledged as a main and leading principle of prophetic chronology, even by the opponents of literal interpretation. We read of no other kingdom given to the Son of Man than the one mentioned in this passage of Daniel, and the corresponding texts of the Apocalypse; and at the close of the dispensation of the kingdom, we learn that he delivers it up to the Father, that God may be all in all, 1 Cor. 15:24.—*Millennial Harbinger*, 1832, pages 438-444.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 8.

PROPHECIES

Two things are constantly kept before our minds in selecting these “precious reprints” from the vast amount of material on hand.

First, they must reflect the pioneer spirit of unity—the open-minded, tolerant, inquiring, and interested attitude of the Restoration leaders on questions of prophecy. In fact, our chief purpose is to inculcate this truly Christian attitude among disciples today, and so to point the way to spiritual unity.

Second, they must be of highest excellence in themselves, instructive and thought-provoking, and well worth the reader's time on their own merits. Accordingly, they are chosen from those who wielded a pen of power in their day, and who, to this day, have never been surpassed as Christian journalists.

Our reprint this month is from Campbell's *Millennial Harbinger* of 1831. It is signed by one “Daniel,” a pseudonym under which this brother contributed a very long series of articles to the *Harbinger*. This is No. 8 in a series entitled “Prophecies.”—E. L. J.

“PROPHECIES”

“The apparent impossibility of the moral means which the simple testimony of God furnishes to the subversion of the rulers of the darkness of this world, to the dethronement of spiritual wickedness, elevated to high place by the corrupt and corrupting politics of nations sold to their hierarchies, teach us to look somewhere else than to modern missionary exertions for giving that triumph to Christianity with which every page of prophecy relative to the reign of a thousand years is replete. What moral means, unaided by the judgments of God, unaccompanied by miracles, have ever achieved a victory over any portion of mankind, so great as that promised to the world during the reign of Jesus? Not an island on the globe, not a city in any age or country, has seen, or tasted, or felt, such a moral revolution as that guaranteed by the Prince of the kings of the earth, when the kingdoms of the world, when the dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven, shall be given to the holy ones of the Most High.

“Can any man in his sober senses, with the history of modern Europe before him (to say nothing of Asia and Africa, enslaved to idolatry or sold to Mahomet), suppose, or promise to himself, that a few sectarian missionaries, sustained by a divided and secular church, can so revolutionize the world as to introduce a *moral*, much less a *literal* reign of Christ over all the race of men? If every sectarian proclaimer from both Christian continents should become a missionary, and the whole be landed in Asia and Africa, and go to work there with all the energies which they employ at home; I say, could

they do more among Pagans than they do among the sons and daughters of Christians at home? Could they in five hundred years produce a better state of society among Turks and Pagans than they have produced in Britain and America? Alas! what have they done in Britain and the United States? How few of this population are even within the pale of sectarian altars! how few live soberly, righteously, and godly in the world! It would require more than all the moral influence of all the teachers of religion on both continents to give good morality to Europe and America. * * *

"Daniel, the great prophet, a man greatly beloved of the God of saints, saw in his clearer visions that *the little horn*, that power which spake so blasphemously against God and the saints—that horn which had the eyes of a man and the mouth of more than a man, which spake great things, and whose look was more stout than any of the ten horns; he saw this horn *prevail* as well as make war against the saints, *until the Ancient of days came*, and judgment was given to the saints—(there were saints when the Lord came), and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom. Into the hand of him personated by the horn the saints were given for a time, and times, and the dividing of a time; during all of which periods he thought to change times and laws, and to *wear out* the saints of the Most High. But he saw the thrones cast down and the Ancient of days appeared—the judgment was set. His throne was like the fiery flame, and its wheels as burning fire; a fiery stream issued and came forth from before him; thousand thousands ministered to him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set and the books were opened. What followed this appearance of the Ancient of days, and this opening of the judgment? The greatness of the kingdom, the kingdom and the dominion, was then given to the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him. Thus we see that the saints were to be kept down and worn out by *the little horn*, without any intermission, till the judgment of the anti-Christian world. Then the Lord with his thousands of thousands appears in their behalf and gives them the victory over their enemies.

"To this agree also the plainer intimations of Paul in his epistle to the Thessalonians. The man of sin and son of perdition exalts himself, sits in the temple of God. The Lord consumes him by his word, but he is only consumed by the word of his mouth. He is not destroyed until the brightness of his coming. The Lord suddenly comes in his glory and sends him to perdition. Thus Daniel and Paul teach us that the sudden appearance of the Lord precedes the perdition and destruction of that usurper who has so long triumphed on the throne of Jesus. He usurps the throne of him whom God placed upon his holy hill, whom he exalted a Prince and Saviour. He has long presumed to legislate for, and to dispense forgiveness to, those called Christians. But he will be utterly cast down and destroyed, for strong is the Lord who will take vengeance upon him.

"But Jewish Prophets speak of the coming of Jesus in a way which precludes the application of their words to any moral, or metaphorical, or figurative coming. Thus says Zechariah, 14:4, 5: 'And his feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the East; and the Mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof, towards the East and towards the West, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove towards the North, and half of it toward the South.' These sayings are certainly not applicable to his *first coming*; for the events here described then happened in no sense. From this mount he ascended literally, and the angels said he should descend (as literally) as they had seen him ascend to heaven. Behold he comes in clouds; all kindreds shall see him and bewail his approach: for behold his reward is with him. As he ascended from Mount Olivet he will descend to it. They shall then say, 'Blessed be he that comes in the name of the Lord.'

"When he descends to put down all bad government, all influences opposed to his reign, as the Lord of the whole earth, to avenge his enemies—then the earth shall shake; mountains and hills shall be moved out of their places, and shall flow down at his presence." * * * —"Daniel," *Millennial Harbinger*, 1831, pp. 261-266.

"THE LORD WILL REBUKE MANY PEOPLE"

The prophecies, in no period of the church's history, were so much studied as at the present day. Societies are forming in Britain for the especial purpose of getting at a systematic way of studying the all-engrossing future. Knowledge will increase and is increasing on this most interesting part of God's communications to man. Sixty volumes are already in the hands of one society, from sixty authors, advocating substantially the same views exhibited in the essays of Daniel, vol. 1. Be they right or wrong, one thing is becoming most evident to all the students of God's government over men, that the time is at hand when *the Lord will rebuke many people*, and destroy the policies which are now destroying the earth. We begin to doubt the permanency of our own political institutions; and men are now proving that no parchments, constitutions, or forms of government, can throw efficient barriers in the way of the cupidity, ambition, and pride of man. * * *

He will, therefore, overturn all the kingdoms of this world—all authorities and powers on earth, called by whatever name, which in anywise contravene the justice, peace, and good-will among men which he always inculcated, and which he has made the paramount law in the constitution of human society. * * * —*Editor, Mil. Har.*, 1833, page 12.

FOURTH OF JULY — SCOTT'S ADDRESS

By A. Campbell

"A number of disciples, principally members of the Church of Christ, in Pittsburg, agreed to have a love-feast on Monday the fifth of July, instant. They chose that day in honor of the fourth of July, 1776. Grateful to Heaven for the blessings which that day vouchsafed the citizens of this country, they thought the Christians participating in them ought religiously call to mind the goodness of God in granting that deliverance. . . .

"More than a hundred and twenty disciples, with sundry visitors and many children, dined together in an arbor about two miles from the city. The day was spent in joy and gladness of heart, singing the praises of the Lord, and in conversing about the good things of the heavenly country. . . .

"After dinner brother Walter Scott delivered a very interesting discourse on *"the great and notable day of the Lord,"* which is to introduce the Millennium. Many citizens assembled to hear the discourse. After which we proceeded to the river, where five persons were immersed into the ancient faith. Thus closed one of the most joyful anniversaries of our national independence which we have ever witnessed. Every incident of the day was pleasing and agreeable, and the whole celebration was well adapted to promote the edification and comfort of every disciple of the Prince of Peace."—*Millennial Harbinger*, pp. 299, 300.

CAMPBELL ON OPINIONS

(Compare the paragraph on page 6)

Reason and experience unite their testimony in assuring us that, in the same proportion as individuals labor to be of one opinion, they disagree. The greater the emphasis laid upon opinions, the more rapidly they generate. The nearest approaches to a unity of opinion which I have ever witnessed, have appeared in those societies in which no effort was made to be of one opinion; in which they allowed the greatest liberty of opinion, and in which they talked more and boasted more of the glory and majesty of the great facts, the wonderful works of God's loving kindness to the children of men, than of themselves, their views and attainments. * * *

If I were to attempt to produce the greatest uniformity of opinion, I would set about it by paying no respect to opinions, laying no emphasis upon them, admiring and condemning no opinion as such. But if I wished to produce the greatest discrepancies in opinion, I would call some damnably dangerous, others of vital importance; and I would always eulogize the sound, and censure the erroneous in opinions. We all know that strife is like the bursting forth of water—it always widens the channels; and many a broil in churches, neighborhoods, and families, would have been prevented if the first indication had been sympathetically attributed to the infirmity of human nature. Editor, *Millennial Harbinger*, 1830, pp. 149, 150.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 9* — First Reprint of 1946

Our "precious reprints" for January are chosen from those offered to the readers of *Truth Advance* in the Aug.-Sept. issue (1945) of that journal. The editor, Stanford Chambers, gave over that entire issue to such reprints, together with a few well-said paragraphs from his own pen, and his notes between the quotes. The whole constitutes a very great and useful labor — almost an "opus" on the subject.

CHAMBERS' ARTICLE

My farm training and the plain, simple way of life, has ever been a cause for great gratitude. It developed a love of freedom. The sign, "Keep off the grass," was never encountered till middle teens, rarely then. Its application to "the green pastures" of Holy Writ never encountered until a much later date. Freedom within those pastures was ever considered a Christian's new-birthright. "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good," one's duty and privilege. "Study to show thyself approved unto God," was ever imperative, a fixed aim. "All is yours," whether the sermon on the mount or the prophecy on the mount; whether the Book of Acts or the Book of Revelation. The importance of working, watching, praying, preparing for the undated return of our Lord has been an under-scored responsibility.

There is such a thing as heresy, yet to label a thing heresy does not make it so; on the other hand, a doctrine may pass as altogether orthodox in certain circles and yet not be the truth. The charge of "heresy" has been found quite convenient as a weapon against the truth itself, and is very generally resorted to when the opposer is conscious of his argument falling short of its purpose. Christianity itself has been subject to the keen edge of this weapon through all the centuries since Pentecost. Both the heretic and the heresy are surely to be refused. An error, however, is not necessarily heresy, though every error is injurious in one way or another. To be forever opposing even error is not all there is of virtue; yet may we ever be admonished to "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." "Thy word is truth."

"Pre," "Post," or "Anti"

Here are three prefixes for the term millennial, derived from the word millennium, meaning a thousand years. (It is like our word "century" for hundred years. Neither the word century nor the word millennium is in our English Bible, but hundred years is, likewise thousand years. (The right to use one term is the right to use the other). So people are either "pre-millennial," "Post-millennial," or "anti-millennial." This last term has been shortened to "a-millennial" [meaning non- or un-millennial]. Yes, you are one or the other, just as you are an immersionist or an affusionist re-

* A pamphlet containing the eight preceding articles, published in 1945, may be obtained free for the asking. See note on page 84.

garding the matter of baptism. By "the millennium" is meant, in the controversies that are on, "the thousand years" of the twentieth chapter of Revelation.

If one is looking for the coming of the Lord Jesus before the millennium he is "pre-millennial." If he is looking for the millennium before His coming he is "post-millennial." If he denies that there will be "a millennium" he is "a-millennial." If Jesus is coming again, it will be before the millennium or after the millennium, or else there is no millennium. What is the truth on this subject to which so much space is being devoted in these days, *especially by the negative?*

A fair seeker for the truth on any matter is just as willing that it be the one way as the other, as God wills or reveals. The writer finds no Scripture which puts the coming of Christ *after* the millennium. All the exhortations and admonitions (and they are almost without number) are to watchfulness and readiness. "Establish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord is at hand," says James. He may come at any time. "No one knoweth the day nor the hour." All such admonitions disallow our placing the millennium between us and His coming. How then could one be a "post-millennialist"? Finding in Holy Writ both the millennium (or "the thousand years") and the Coming Again, how could one be "a-millennial"? How be otherwise than "pre-millennial?"

"WHERE DID YOU LEARN IT?"

I cannot recollect who first called my attention to the Revelation passage concerning "the thousand years." Perhaps no one did. I began as soon as I came to Christ to read His Testament through. Before ever being called a preacher I remember making use of this passage in trying to save a "good moral man" who was boasting that in the resurrection he would "stand up as tall as the rest." I turned to Rev. 20:5 and showed him that unless he repented he would not stand up with true children of God at all; that "the rest of the dead lived not till the thousand years should be finished." Thus read the Bible to me at that early age. Not long after that a preacher declared that the millennium was already on. Evidence was the peace sentiment, the settling of labor disputes and other problems by arbitration, etc. I could not agree. Not long after came another proclaiming that Satan was bound already. That to me was news! I wished to know when. He said, at Pentecost. I cited 1 Peter 5:8 as stating a fact long after Pentecost. I recall these occurrences as proof that I was "pre-millennial" while yet a boy, though never having heard such a term for it. And this is true of many.

The first human writing I ever read on prophetic lines was by George Campbell. I could not find warrant for his year-for-a-day theory nor for his date-setting. Time soon swept away his dates and disproved his theory, yet I never heard him called a heretic. Nor was J. L. Martin called a heretic, mistaken though it turned out that he was on "The Voice of Seven Thunders" and other voices of Revelation. Surely he made an honest effort to understand "what the

prophets have spoken." And who would deny that that was more commendable than to discourage the study of such a vast portion of God's book as His prophets occupy, telling the people that it was never meant that unfulfilled prophecy should be understood. Jesus said, commenting on Daniel, "Let him that readeth understand." (Matt. 24:15.) Even Daniel, then, is understandable.

MOSES E. LARD

I cannot recall definitely when I first read Lard (on Romans), but there seemed nothing strange to me in such a statement as, e.g., "At His coming the holy dead will be raised, the righteous living will be changed, and the millennium will have set in." So had my Bible spoken to me. All know that much more to the same effect could be quoted from Lard. This is enough to show that without question he was premillennial. Order of events: the Lord's coming, resurrection of "those that are Christ's at his coming," and His ushering in of the millennium. No one denies Lard was pre-millennial.

T. W. BRENTS

It was while in the Nashville Bible School that I first saw the writings of Dr. Brents. His statement on Rev. 20, "If it does not express a literal reign with Christ for a literal thousand years, we know not what assemblage of words would be capable of expressing that thought," seemed to me but the natural thing to say on the passage. No one could say such a thing today and not be set down as pre-millennial. Such was T. W. Brents, of course.

HARDING AND LIPSCOMB

These men were not speculators. They were free and not bound; neither were they appeasers. Never were they found declaring themselves in such a way as to preclude or discourage full and free investigation of any Bible question. Such was the freedom they fought for and maintained right well in their day.

Lipscomb repeatedly declared that he had not made thorough study of prophecy, yet on matters on which he had reached conviction he unhesitatingly came out; and his comment on Acts 3:21, 22, for instance, is quite revealing: "Heaven must receive Him until 'the times of restoration of all things.' Then 'the restoration of all things' must be when Jesus returns again to earth—the restoration of all things to their original relation to God. . . . When Jesus comes again, the will of God will be done on earth as it is in heaven, and all things in the world be restored to harmonious relation with God, the supreme Ruler of the universe." Pre-millennial teaching: no "post millennialist" or "a-millennialist" are ever found saying such a thing.

HARDING

Harding, without reservation, taught (e.g., on the parables of the talents and the pounds) that the faithful are to be made rulers when Jesus returns, and about this matter he was enthusiastic.

But we have found some who question that J. A. Harding ever taught that Jesus is to come before the millennium. Here is a quo-

tation which should dispel such doubts. If not, more can be given. After commenting on the Revelation passage he says, "These facts point clearly to this period of a thousand years as the Sabbath rest that remains for the people of God . . . this glorious thousand years with which time ends, during which all the saints of all the ages will reign with Christ in perfect freedom from the temptation to sin. That this millennial reign will be on earth is clearly indicated by the fact that at the beginning of it Christ and His saints are on the earth, and so are they at the end of it. Compare Rev. 19:11-21 with Rev. 20:1-10. Read also 1 Cor. 15:20-28; 1 Thess. 4:13-18; 2 Thess. 2:7-9; Matt. 24:29-31."—Editorial in *The Way*, Oct. 1903.

That Stone, Barclay, Creath, Scott and other pioneers could be similarly quoted will not be denied. Let the reader bear in mind that we are not just here concerned as to whether these men were right or wrong; what we are saying is that the men called "pioneers" taught the things which in our day are being pronounced by some (who have become articulate) as "heresy." Certainly, that which is called "The Restoration Movement" was born pre-millennial. If the teaching was not heresy then, neither is it heresy now. If they are heretics who thus teach now, so were they heretics who taught so then—they whose names appear above. Those being marked to-day find in the teaching of "the pioneers" every point of doctrine to which present day markers object.

DANIEL SOMMER

From my boyhood I read Daniel Sommer and heard him. His book "Questions, Answers and Remarks" dates back to the beginning of our century. On Revelation we read: "What shall we say to those who declare that Christ will not come again till at the end of the Millennial Age? (So declare all post-millennialists.—S. C.) We may say, 'Ye do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.' All such by implication deny that the resurrection mentioned in 1 Cor. 15:12-54 and 1 Thess. 4:13-17 means 'the first resurrection' . . . Then when John declares, in contradistinction from the righteous dead, 'But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished,' the testimony on this subject is complete" . . .

All these references we have previously given; others as well. Our point in quoting representative men is not to prove what we teach, for the Scriptures are our sole authority; but to show that they do greatly err who make out that the teaching that Christ's coming is to precede the millennium is a new and strange teaching, and therefore heresy. The teaching is not only as old as the so-called "Restoration Movement," but as old as Christianity itself. The early church was set in an attitude of waiting and hoping for His return, and in that expectancy and hope they purified themselves. Under the power of inspired, apostolic Gospel preaching "they turned from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, who delivereth us from the wrath to come."

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 10.

The Editor of *Gospel Advocate* makes the following announcement in that journal, issue of Jan. 24, 1946:

MILLIGAN ON HEBREWS

"We are glad to announce that one of our long-cherished ambitions is all but realized. For the last two or three years we have been planning a reprint of Robert Milligan's most valuable "Commentary on Hebrews," but lack of paper and other shortages prevented it. If things proceed normally, as we expect, we shall be able to fill orders for this volume by February 10, or within the next three weeks.

"This edition is an exact reprint of the original, on good paper, bound in durable cloth."

We have before us a copy of this Milligan work on Hebrews, from the edition issued by the Christian Board of Publications, St. Louis, and copyrighted in the Library of Congress in 1875. This, we may presume, is the original text, or a copy of the original. In giving our readers this "precious reprint," we are not saying that Milligan was on this side or that, "pre" or "post," for or against, or anything else. Let the reprint speak for itself. We do say that we are glad that this valuable book has been reprinted, and that it is being offered by the *Advocate*. Where, after all, is there a scholar or noted expositor of the "Restoration Movement" who has not recorded many thoughts that would not jibe with present-day "Restoration" journalism!

In the midst of Milligan's comments on the second chapter of Hebrews (verses 5-18), and in no wise weakened by those portions which we cannot here reproduce, we find the language which now follows. It is quoted verbatim, except that the italics are ours, to bring out the high points in Milligan's prophetic teaching.—E. L. J.

MILLIGAN ON THE EARTH'S FUTURE

He [the Apostle] insists particularly that we should give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard:

I. Because, he says, it is through the man Jesus and that system of grace of which he is author and the finisher, that *we will regain our lost dominion over the world* (vv. 5-9).

1. When man was created, God said to him, "Have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the Earth" (Gen. 1:28.)

2. But in consequence of sin, man has, in a great measure, lost this dominion (Gen. 3:15-24). Satan for a time got possession of this world (Psa. 68:18; John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; 2 Cor. 4:4; Eph. 2:2; 1 John 5:19; Rev. 12:9); and by his cunning artifice and hellish malice, he not only enslaved man, but actually turned many of the elements of the world against him. Even the worm and the insect now luxuriate on his fallen remains.

3. That this state of things is, however, only temporary, and that, according to God's purpose, *man will again have at his command the dominion of the world*, is manifest from the eighth Psalm, in which David says, "What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him? For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands;

thou hast put all things under his feet; all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the sea."

4. From this passage, then, it is quite evident that *God intends that man shall possess and hold the world as his lawful and rightful patrimony. But this, says Paul, has not yet been accomplished: "We do not yet see all things put under him."*

5. But what do we see? "We see Jesus," says he, "who was made a little lower than the angels, so that he by the grace of God might taste death for every man, crowned with glory and honor for the suffering of death." All things are put under him as our Leader and Captain. And this is therefore to us a sure pledge that *in due time the dominion of the world will be restored to man; that he will enjoy the whole habitable Earth as his home, and that he will rule over it as his rightful patrimony, even as Adam ruled over Eden before he fell.*

[Milligan then takes up this scripture portion for verse by verse comment]:

Chap. 2:5-9. *Man's lost dominion over the world to be restored through Jesus.*

In view of what is stated in the first chapter, he says, "We ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest haply we should be drifted away from them." And this, he says by implication, we should do also from the further consideration, that *God has made it the business of Christ, and not of angels, to restore to mankind their lost dominion over the world.*

the world to come, whereof we speak. — *The world to come means, not the coming age, as in Matt. 12:39, etc., but the habitable world under the reign and government of the Messiah (ch. 1:6). It is the world in which we now live; and in which, when it shall have been purified from sin, the redeemed will live forever. For man, it was at first created (Gen. 1:28-31); and to man, it still belongs by an immutable decree of Jehovah. This is manifest, as the Apostle here shows, from what is recorded in the eighth Psalm, to which in the popular style of his age, our author here elegantly refers.*

thou crownedst him with glory and honor. — The two words here rendered glory and honor are nearly synonymous in both the Hebrew and the Greek; and they are used, according to a well known Hebrew idiom, for the sake of emphasis. Together, they express royal dignity; and in this instance, they indicate the fullness of the regal power and authority which God has bestowed, not on the first or on the second Adam merely, but on the race; or rather, on the loyal portion of it. By a decree as immutable as the laws of gravitation, *God has ordained that man shall inherit the Earth and have dominion over it.*

Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. — This, with the last clause, is another instance of Hebrew parallelism. It is not, however, synonymous, but constructive parallelism, which occurs here. The Psalmist first expresses the general thought, that God has

placed man over the work of his hands. But he does not stop with this. To indicate still further the degree of man's sovereignty over the world, he adds, "Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet." The latter clause is, therefore, more expressive than the former, as it indicates the perfect and entire subjection of all things earthly to the will of man; and so the Apostle reasons in what follows.

For in that he put all things in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. — In these words, there is no reference whatever to angels, or to other worlds or systems. *It is the Earth, and of the Earth only, that the Holy Spirit here speaks.* This is obvious from what follows in the latter part of the eighth Psalm. After saying that all things are by the decree of Jehovah put under the feet of man, the Psalmist immediately adds, by way of explanation, the following specifications: "all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas." *It is to this world as it was, as it is, and especially as it will be hereafter, that both the Psalmist and the Apostle have reference.* (Here quotes Genesis 1:26-28). This is the perpetual decree of Jehovah with respect to the domain and the dominion of man. True, indeed, Satan has for a time usurped the dominion of this world; and man has by transgression forfeited all claims upon it. The crown of glory and honor has fallen from his head because of sin; and now he is exposed and assailed by a thousand obstacles in earth, air, and sea. And hence the Apostle adds:

we see not yet all things put under him. — From this, it is evident that the eighth Psalm is prophetic. The Psalmist looks rather at the decree and purpose of Jehovah touching the final allotment of this world, than to the state of things which actually existed at the time in which he wrote. He means to say, that although man's scepter is now broken, the decree of Jehovah concerning it is not broken. *His purpose is unchangeable. And hence there can be no doubt but that mankind will yet regain their lost dominion over the Earth.* How far this will be accomplished before the Earth shall have been renovated by fire (2 Pet. 3), it may be now difficult to say. *When Satan shall be bound for a thousand years (Rev. 20:1-6), and the saints of the Most High possess the Kingdom (Dan. 7:14, 18, 22), the prophecy of Isaiah (11:6-9) may be more literally fulfilled than we now anticipate.* But whatever may be true of this blissful era, so long and so often foretold by the Apostles and Prophets, it is not at all probable that man's dominion over the world will be fully restored, until the new heavens and the new Earth appear, in which righteousness will forever dwell (Rev. 21).

But we see Jesus. — The Apostle here makes a very striking contrast between "Jesus" and "man," to whom by the decree of Jehovah the world is to be subjected. "We do not yet," he says, "see all things put under man"; but in the coronation of Jesus, as Lord of all, we see

that the work is in progress; and this is, of course, to all Christians a sure pledge that in due time it will be fully consummated.

crowned with glory and honor. — The best explanation of these words may be found in the above passage from the Epistle to the Philippians. God had long before promised that Christ should be abundantly rewarded for his sufferings (Isa. 53:12). And hence we are told by Luke (Acts 1:1-11), after that he had borne the pains and agonies of the cross, and after he had risen from the dead and instructed his disciples for forty days in matters pertaining to the Kingdom of God, he was then taken up into Heaven, and in the presence of adoring millions (ch. 1:6) crowned Lord of all; "angels, and authorities, and powers being made subject unto him" (1 Pet. 3:22). This was first announced to the people, as a fact, by the Apostle Peter, on the following Pentecost (Acts 2:36); and afterward it was proclaimed to every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation under heaven. See Acts 4:10-12; 5:30-32; 10:36-42; Eph. 1:20-23; Col. 1:23, etc.

There can be no doubt, therefore, that Christ is now the anointed Sovereign of the universe; and that *he will reign over all creatures in heaven, and on Earth, and under the Earth, until he shall have restored to the saints their lost dominion over this world.*

From the given explanations, then, it is quite obvious that the main object of the Apostle in this paragraph (vv. 5-9), is to remind his Hebrew brethren, that by an irrevocable decree of Jehovah this world belongs to man; and that although it has been forfeited by sin, and its dominion usurped by Satan, *it is nevertheless God's purpose to redeem it for the benefit of his saints*; not, however, through angels, nor through the law given by angels (ch. 2:2); but through that scheme of grace, mercy, and truth of which Jesus is the Author and the Finisher. And so also this same Apostle testifies to his Roman brethren. Speaking of this very matter, he says, "For the promise that he [Abraham] should be heir of the world was not to Abraham or to his seed through the Law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they who are of the Law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect. Because the Law worketh wrath; for where there is no law, there is no transgression. Therefore it is of faith, that it may be by grace; to the end that the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the Law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the Father of us all" (Rom. 4:13-16). The promise that his posterity according to the flesh should inherit the land of Canaan, was given to Abraham and to his seed through law. But *all these legal, carnal, and temporal arrangements were but a type or shadow of the more gracious provisions of the economy of redemption through Jesus Christ; according to which it seems that Abraham and the whole family of the faithful will yet inherit the entire Earth*, after that it shall have been purified by fire, and prepared for the descent of the New Jerusalem. See Psa. 37:9-11; Matt. 5:5; 2 Pet. 3:10-13; Rev. 5:10; Rev. 21.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 11

ROTHERHAM ON HEBREWS

Following the Milligan reprint of last month (on Hebrews, Second Chapter) we present at this time another famous commentator on the same scripture portion.

J. B. Rotherham, a disciple of the British group, became well and favorably known a generation ago through his translation called "The Emphasized Bible"; his "Studies in the Psalms," "Studies in Hebrews," and other works; and his writings are often quoted, especially "New Testament Critically Emphasized." He is held in high honor and esteem as a scholar and student among disciples throughout the English-speaking world.

We quote rather fully the Rotherham comments on the ministry of angels for the sake of their own value and interest; and the reader's special attention is drawn to the notes on Hebrews 2:5: "The coming habitable earth."

While Rotherham himself resorts to much capitalizing and italicising for emphasis, we have also italicised a few additional lines to bring out at a glance the high points of the prophetic teaching.

E. L. J.

ROTHERHAM ON "THE COMING HABITABLE EARTH"

The conclusion appended to the Seven Quotations [referring to the quotations in Hebrews 1:5-14] has already been stated. It may be described as balanced — inspiring — suggestive. *Balanced*, because it gives high honor to God's heavenly messengers [angels] without making them equal with the Son. They are spirits; they are God's public ministers of state; and they are charged with a noble — useful — loving — holy mission. Still they are merely created beings, and merely servants. *Inspiring*, because this their ministry concerns us; in fact, is a ministry of service unto us. I confess that I am so far daunted against following this path, in consequence of our total experimental ignorance of any such angelic ministry as a service now in exercise, that I have severely questioned myself as to whether I could not be faithful to the teaching here laid down, and yet accept the words in a purely prospective sense: "Are they not all spirits [doing public service] who are **GOING TO BE SENT FORTH** for the sake of those who are destined to become inheritors of salvation." *That is, that when we shall be installed in that lofty position of joint-heirship with Christ and joint-rulership with him over the universe with which our final and complete salvation will invest us, — that THEN they will become our servants; waiting upon us in our attained royal estate; and, as such, be executors of our behests in holding in subjection "the coming habitable earth of which we speak."* But, though I do not regard such a prospective application of the words as altogether so visionary as probably some readers of them would deem it, yet on the whole I cannot rest in such an interpretation. It may be grammatically possible and nevertheless be wholly against the spirit and drift of this remarkable passage — especially when we recur to the obvious circumstance that the writer

refers to such angelic ministry as something familiar and undeniable, as though, for instance, based on ancient recorded incidents, the like of which had been again realized in these Apostolic times. Accepting this as a fair and final adjustment of the question as one of exegesis, I have no choice left but to take the particular word in question as bearing this meaning, namely: Which spirits *are being from time to time* sent forth for the sake and benefit of those who, like ourselves, are destined to become inheritors of salvation. And, being so persuaded as to the legitimate force of this particular passage, and deeming it unlikely that our heavenly Lord—under whose command these heavenly beings now are—has wholly withdrawn this ancient merciful ministry—I comfort myself with the conclusion that, as sometimes in ancient story, so likewise now, heavenly messengers are oftentimes near us and helping us even though we know it not.

In proportion as we can accept this solution, we cannot fail to draw a most joyful inspiration from the confidence thence arising. Of course, God himself is ever nigh; the Holy Spirit dwells within us; Christ is head over all things to his Church. But when God is pleased to rescue us from misfortune and ills of any kind, he has always the means of interposition at his command. And is it nothing that amongst those means is a numerous order of holy and heavenly beings, strong of arm and swift of wing, who delight to do the behests of our merciful and faithful High Priest now enthroned in heaven? Said we not rightly it is an inspiring thought?

Observe that one great conception governs this entire section [Heb. 2:5-18] and it is this:—*The partnership of the Son of God with the sons of men.* Observe further: That under cover of this major conception, the difficulty of death is most skilfully set forth as divinely dealt with. And now note: That these great thoughts are introduced by a proposition partly negative and partly positive in character. That proposition may be stated as follows:—*that not to messengers (or angels) but to men has God (in purpose) subjected the coming habitable earth.* This introductory proposition will doubtless prove as helpful to us as to the first readers of the Epistle. To it, therefore, let us first give such attention as may fix it in our minds as really intended by the writer; working our way backwards to the second and then to the first propositions just mentioned.

I. As already intimated, this proposition is partly negative: “Not to (heavenly) messengers (or angels) has God subjected the coming habitable earth:”—which negative, being expressly stated in the text, needs no comment at present, save as it leads us to ask, With what object is that negation made? Why does the writer *deny*, but because he wishes to affirm?

Passing on, then, to the affirmative side of our proposition—“Not to messengers BUT TO MEN has God subjected the coming habitable earth,”—it is worth while to analyze the method by which the writer conveys this affirmation; observing that he does so by (1) emphasis, (2) quotation, (3) admission, and (4) pledge.

1. By EMPHASIS. To emphasize a negative is to suggest an affirmative. "Not to me did he bequeath his estate"; well, then, to whom did he bequeath it? It appears probable that you know, and are about to tell us. So here: "Not to messengers"; well, then, to whom has he subjected the coming habitable earth? We are led to expect that the writer is about to tell us.

2. By QUOTATION. The quotation from the Eighth Psalm advances to the affirmative. It says: "Not to messengers BUT TO MEN," for notice the "but" with which that quotation is introduced; "Not to messengers hath he subjected the coming habitable earth. BUT one somewhere hath borne witness, What is man?" and then follows a pretty full extract — all about man: an extract which has no relevancy but as supplying the information for which the negative has prepared us. *It is to man, then, that God has subjected the coming habitable earth.*

3. By ADMISSION. The writer admits that we do not yet see realized this subjection to man of the coming habitable earth. But this, of itself, implies that we are to see it — it is to be!

4. By PLEDGE. But though we do not yet see the full realization of this Divine intention, yet we do see something — in Jesus — of the nature of a pledge that the whole will ultimately be brought to pass.

Putting these four suggestions together, then, as clearly revealing the intention of the writer, we conclude that, although, it is true, he does not express his affirmation in so many words, yet does he most clearly and strongly imply it. *He intends us to understand him as teaching that the coming habitable earth has, in Divine purpose, been subjected to Man as Man! The Psalm predicts it; Christ pledges it.*

The only objection to this which springs out of the actual words before us is, that the Eighth Psalm does not at first sight appear to refer to the coming habitable earth at all; but rather to the present earth, or (say) the past earth, as it was placed under man's dominion at the beginning; for, that the Eighth Psalm itself again refers to the first chapter of Genesis is undoubted. And that being so, it might have seemed more natural had the writer of the "Hebrews" said, rather "We no LONGER see it," than "We do not YET see it"; in other words, more natural, if he had referred the Psalm to a dominion lost, rather than to a dominion not yet gained. But, in truth, this difficulty is very slight; for as soon as we assume that in this, as in so many other Divine appointments, the principle holds good that "the gifts and callings of God are without repentance"; and that, therefore, the dominion once decreed must ultimately be realized — however it may for a time be lost or held in abeyance; no sooner do we assume this than the difficulty at once disappears. And, indeed, I am inclined to regard the words "held in abeyance" to be quite as applicable as the term "lost"; since I know of no positive proof that man in paradise fully entered into his regal inheritance. Moreover,

the way in which the Psalm places in parallelism "Man" and "the son of man" inclines me all the more to think of a *race destination* rather than an *individual installation*; which race distinction, indeed, is plainly hinted at by the original charge to man, to "fill the earth and (so) subdue it." Be that as it may, and conceding the dominion to have been at least seriously damaged and "lost" for a time, it is surely easy to conclude that the loss was only temporary; and that the original investiture has been authoritatively clothed with the significance of a standing prediction. *It is a dominion yet to be realized; and is to be realized in "the coming habitable earth,"* which, as we have seen, *means the earth as it is to be ordered under Messiah's reign.*

Some, perhaps, may find in the Eighth Psalm this further difficulty; namely, that even conceding the prophetic character of that composition, the dominion which it describes appears too limited to suit the grandeur of the coming reign of Yahweh over the earth. It seems to carry us no further than the dominion of man over the animal creation.

For the present it must suffice to say: That such is the manner of the ancient word, as we saw when studying the opening lines of the Epistle concerning the "many parts" and the "many ways" in which God spake in the prophets: their communications were ever more or less fragmentary. Other snatches in other parts of the prophetic writings contribute further particulars concerning Man's coming dominion; and for the present we had better perhaps acquiesce in that wider view of "the coming habitable earth" which our divinely illumined writer undoubtedly entertained.—Rotherham's *Studies in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, pages 50, 51, 60-63.

ROBERT MILLIGAN

"When Satan shall be bound for a thousand years (Rev. 20:1-6) and the saints of the Most High possess the Kingdom (Dan. 7:14, 18, 22), the prophecy of Isa. 11:6-9 may be more literally fulfilled than we now anticipate."—Comments on Heb. 2:8. All who have read Milligan know that he has written much more to the same effect. Of such dominion, Milligan points out, Jesus already crowned, is the guarantee.

WALTER SCOTT

"Israel was organized civilly before they were organized religiously; in Christianity this order is reversed. We have received the inner government first; but the time will come 'when the saints' as Daniel says, 'shall possess the government,' and all power, authority and rule be recovered to God by His Son and His saints." *Pioneer Sermons and Addresses*, p. 178. Though much more could be quoted from Scott, this is enough to show any who have not read him that he looked forward to the reign of Christ and His saints.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 12

Believing that readers of this department might profit by a better acquaintance with pioneer literature, besides our reprints on prophetic lines, we reproduce this article on Operation of the Holy Spirit. It was written by a brother J. P. Davis, of Crawfordsville, Ind., and published in *Christian Eevangelist* many years ago. This extract is then followed, on the next page, by the reprint, “Campbell on the Jews.”—E. L. J.

THE PIONEERS ON THE HOLY SPIRIT

The “Dialogue on the Holy Spirit,” by Alexander Campbell, appeared in the first edition of “Christianity Restored.” Thomas Campbell thought this dialogue did not fully present the truth of the Scriptural doctrine of the Spirit; that it gave comfort to the “Word alone” errorists, and an occasion of triumph to the enemies of reform; so, in deference to his views, it was omitted from the “Christian System,” the successor of “Christianity Restored.” Yet even in that dialogue the ground was taken that the Holy Spirit is a gift to the Christian.

Barton W. Stone was a father who came into the reformation by a different route than the Campbells, and in years and piety ranks with Thomas Campbell. On the contemplated union of his people and the Disciples he said: “Oh, my brethren, let us repent and do the first works; let us seek for more holiness, rather than trouble ourselves and others with schemes and plans of union! The love of God shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, given unto us, will more effectually unite than all the wisdom of the world combined.”

There are four other fathers of a second generation whom I could quote in the same tenor as the four preceding. They are Robert Richardson, Robert Milligan, J. S. Lamar and Isaac Errett; and we might add another—W. K. Pendleton.

The fathers were agreed on the following points: That the Holy Spirit operates on the sinner through the Word of truth only; but that he attended the Word of truth, was in it and with it, and that he might greatly assist the Word by removing hindrances or by leading the sinner to the Word of God; that the Holy Spirit as a Comforter is a gift to the Christian; that as such it is something to be sought in prayer and holiness of life. As to the baptism in the Holy Spirit, they held different opinions, but were very tolerant of one another’s opinions, and loved and honored one another, according to their own principles, that all who believed on and obeyed the Savior should be received as Christians, notwithstanding differences of opinion.

Robert Richardson was a colaborer with Alexander Campbell in the ministry of the Word, a near neighbor and friend, a professor in his college, an elder in his church, his chosen biographer, and preached at his funeral. Robert Richardson says, in the “Memoirs of Campbell”: “He did not deny that ‘influences’ of various kinds might accompany the Word, but on these he declined to enlarge.

He believed in spiritual ministries of various kinds, and that invisible beings, as he had said in his discussion with Mr. Waterman, 'by an acquaintance with our association of ideas, our modes of reasoning, our passions, our propensities, and by approaching us through these avenues, could lead us backward or forward, to the right or to the left, as their designs might require. It is more than possible; it is probable. I might advance farther and say it is certain, for it has been done.'"

CAMPBELL ON THE JEWS

The Jews in their origin, their progress, and final destiny among the nations of the earth, were designed to be a standing miracle, or an unbroken series of miracles spanning the entire arch of time, from Abraham to the resurrection of the dead.

The birth of Isaac, the burning, yet unconsumed bush, whence God addressed Moses, the plagues by which their redemption from Egyptian slavery was purchased, with their journey through the Red Sea, and the wilderness for forty years, their settlement in Canaan, and all that befell them down to their final catastrophe and dispersion among the nations, together with their preservation for eighteen hundred years since—all is evidently the special hand of God, a series of splendid miracles co-operating in one grand scheme of human redemption and deliverance.

But the end is not yet. A new series is soon to commence, and the signs of the times indicate that it is not far distant. The God of Abraham has said, "Though I make a full end of all the nations" (that afflicted Jacob) "I will never make a full end of you." Millions of the Jews, known and proved to be such, yet exist, while not a remnant of their oppressors, known as such, is found in the four quarters of the globe.

But God has not kept them these many ages for nothing. He will use them again, and yet again bless all the nations of the earth by the seed of Abraham His friend. "If the casting of them away has been the reconciling of the Gentile world, what shall the resumption of them be but life from the dead." We hear a rattling in the valley of dry bones. The Jews are intent on rebuilding their city and their temple, and in returning to their own land. We intend to notice the Jews and especially the converted Jews of this, our own day, and their efforts to convert their nation to the belief of Him, as the true and long-promised Messiah, whom their fathers repudiated and persecuted to death."—*Millennial Harbinger*, 1849, Page 87.

In the *Millennial Harbinger*, 1856, page 275, Alexander Campbell says:

The unbelieving Jews were rejected and repudiated as the visible and formal people of God; and the believing Jews and Gentiles, harmonized and united, constituted the visible earthly kingdom of Jesus the Christ. Still, the unbelieving Jews exist as a *monumental* people; and, though no longer the depositories of the Oracles of God,

they are, in their present position, the subject of special prophecy and of special promise.

But that we may be better prepared to appreciate the New Testament prophecies of this monumental people, we must sojourn for some time in the tents of ancient Israel, and still more fully expatiate on the covenanted promises to the Abrahamic race, respecting their future position, according to the covenants and transactions on record in their own Oracles, so faithfully and benevolently transmitted to us.

We must, indeed, in order to our own edification and comfort, be fully assured that what is yet future, or unfulfilled in their history, will as certainly be accomplished as that their Messiah came at the appointed time, and appeared in time, place and circumstances, in exact conformity to the predictions of their own prophets, and the symbols of their own institution.

Of the whole Jewish line of prophets in the Old Testament, no one, in fewer or more pointed words, has written concerning the then future destiny of the Jewish people, than did Hosea, in the latter end of the eighth century before the birth of the Lord Messiah. His words are: "The children of Israel shall continue many days without a king, without a prince, and without sacrifice; without an image, without an ephod, and without teraphim:" or according to the Septuagint, without a sacrifice, without an altar, without a priesthood, and without oracles. "Afterwards shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David" (the beloved) "their King, and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days." (Hos. 3:4, 5.)

This passage, though sought to be applied to the Jews in their captivity in ancient Babylon, cannot, as we judge, be sustained, and is only fully verified in their present and prospective future destiny.

[Again in a missionary address, speaking with reference to Dr. Barclay, pioneer missionary, sent from churches of Christ to Jerusalem, Alexander Campbell says:]

But, as it is a settled point with us that Jerusalem is and ought to be our first choice, we presume not to argue her special claims upon our Christian benevolence. When we speak of "the rapidly waning Crescent," of the "drying up of the Euphrates," of Jerusalem as "one of the foci of Mohammedanism," anciently "the city of the great King," and long destined to be "the joy of all the earth," "a city not forsaken," "of the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion," "the Mount Zion which God loves for his servants' sake," we do not argue these glorious and sublime indications of her destiny as though any of us doubted our premises, her influence or her destiny. Jerusalem's fall is already written, and her future rise and glory occupy a large space in the visions of the future. Toward the end of the Babylonish captivity, in the prophetic visions of that day, as presented in Ps. 102, we have some joyful indications of the rise of Jerusalem. [Quoting Ps. 102: 13-16 and 18-21.]

It is good to love Jerusalem and to seek her peace and prosperity, so sang and prayed the Jews in their songs of degrees. (See Ps. 122.)

Jerusalem, indeed, has long been given up to desolation, and it is to continue, according to Daniel, "till the consummation determined," or until the purposes of God respecting it are accomplished. Our Lord, by Luke, speaks still more plainly: "Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles, till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." This is our index to the prophecies concerning the Jewish reign. "The times of the Gentiles" yet continue. God permitted them to destroy Jerusalem, and thereby to crush its persecuting power. Its fall contributed much to the spread of the gospel throughout the world. Hence, Paul reasons: "If the casting off of the Jews" from their relation to God "became the reconciling of the world [the Gentiles], what will the resumption of them be but life from the dead?"

The fall of the Jews became the rise of the Gentiles. The Gentiles have yet their times. And "blindness," not total, but "in part," has happened to the Jews, and will continue "till the fullness of the Gentiles" be come in. Then will come the fulness of the Jews. "For the Redeemer shall come out of Zion," the city of David, "and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob."

This mystery is now revealed. It was, in the Hebrew style, *mystery*, a thing hidden or concealed. It is no longer so. The Jews, as a people, are still beloved, because of their fathers, though long punished, as was threatened; for, said Jehovah, by his prophet, "Thee, O Jerusalem, have I acknowledged" more than the Gentiles; "therefore will I punish you for all your iniquities." But the time "to favor her" is not far distant.

"For thy servants take pleasure in her ruins
And show a tender regard for her very dust."

Hence David sings:

"Then shall the Gentiles fear thy name, Jehovah, and all the kings of the earth thy glory."

With Paul, we rejoice in the prophetic drama, and therefore anticipate a glorious triumph of grace in the redemption of ancient Israel according to the flesh.

Our duty on all the premises is plain. During these times of the Gentiles, we have a dispensation of the gospel committed to us. We have, therefore, established a mission in Palestine, in the literal city of David. It is not designed merely for the Jews residing in their own hallowed metropolis or visiting it, but also for the Gentiles now sojourning in this great center of mingled attractions." ("Popular Lectures and Addresses," Pages 525-527.)

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 13

Among the many and varied lines of religious literature there is perhaps no line more readable and interesting than Biography. The story of a great and noted man (or woman)—not only what he said and what he taught, but what he was and what he did—this is something to arrest the attention of old and young alike.

This month, therefore, we divide our allotted space between biography and testimony. First, a short “pen picture” of the founder and editor of *Millennial Harbinger*, from which we quote so often to show the attitude of that great man; and then a few extracts and testimonies from other noted writers of the “Restoration Movement” on “The Jews, and Prophecy,” with an added note from Robert Milligan.—E. L. J.

THE MAN AND THE MESSAGE

Among the clans of Scotland, some of whose branches have overflowed into north Ireland, none holds higher or more honorable place than the Campbells, whose position in Scottish history has been conspicuous. Of this clan Alexander Campbell was born near Ballymena, in the County of Antrim, Ireland, Sept. 12, 1788. His father, Thomas, was a minister of the secession party of the Presbyterian church. On his mother's side he was of Huguenot blood. The family life of the Campbells was simple and beautiful, and to this no doubt the young man owed as much as to any one influence in his life. The Bible was studied continuously, certain verses having to be learned every day, and the weekly review of the whole was a part of the Sunday's duties.

In 1807 Thomas Campbell, already filled with ideas of reform by conditions prevailing in the region of his home, and deeply concerned with the divided condition of the church, came to America to improve his health and the fortunes of the family. In the following year Alexander and his mother started with the younger children for the New World to join the father, but were shipwrecked off the coast of Scotland, which untoward accident brought about the happy result of Alexander's only university experience, as it enabled him to spend several months at the University of Glasgow. Here the influence of his early life was deepened and his conscience was roused on the subject of the church's departure from the unity of the apostolic age and from the simplicity of Christ. When finally the family reached America, father and son found themselves like-minded regarding the necessity for some method of reform in the church which should bring about larger liberty and closer union of the followers of Jesus. Thomas Campbell was already brooding the historic document known as “The Declaration and Address.” In this the son, now rapidly maturing, heartily joined. The proclamation of these views wrought the gradual but certain enlistment of sentiment on the part of many who were distressed by the unhappy state of the church. Among the Presbyterians, with whom the elder Campbell was an accredited minister, there was much variance of views, which resulted in the separation of the Campbells from that fellowship. Mean-

time a closer study of the Word of God led to the conclusion that infant baptism was unscriptural, and in obedience to New Testament command and example they and their families were immersed. This was in 1812.

Meantime Alexander Campbell had begun work as a preacher and the spread of the new views resulted in the formation of the Christian Association, which was not at first intended to become a church, but out of which presently grew the Brush Run church. From this time on the growth of the movement was rapid. Alexander Campbell soon became the leader through his aggressive spirit and was recognized as a powerful speaker and writer. In 1820 he held a debate with the Rev. Mr. Walker, a Presbyterian minister, on the subject of baptism. Later Mr. Campbell debated with Archbishop Purcell of Cincinnati regarding the claims of the Roman Catholic Church; with Robert Dale Owen of New Harmony, Ind., an apostle of socialism and free thought, and with N. L. Rice at Louisville on baptism, the Holy Spirit, and human creeds.

In order to further the work of the reformers, Mr. Campbell had begun in 1823 the publication of the *Christian Baptist*, which, at the completion of a seven year period, was discontinued and followed by the *Millennial Harbinger*, which Mr. Campbell continued to publish until his death. Many other works came from his prolific pen, and in the later years of his life, which closed in 1866, he traveled many times over the country and once to Great Britain.

Mr. Campbell's great purposes were the arousal of the church to the sin of division and the removal of the cause which led to this—namely, the departure from apostolic teaching and practice, the substitution of human for divine methods of work, the organization of useless machinery in the church, and the formulation of speculative creeds which were not merely testimonies but tests of orthodoxy. The removal of these was the task of the reformers, and to this task Mr. Campbell devoted an arduous and eventful life.

As the reformation became an established force its development became the chief concern of its founder. He saw that its ministry must be educated to meet the demands of the age. With this in mind he organized Bethany College in West Virginia, the oldest of the academic foundations of the brotherhood, and never ceased by voice and pen to emphasize the necessity for growth in vision and development of mind and heart as the fittest and most essential means of accomplishing the great tasks for which the movement he inaugurated ought to stand.

The program of Alexander Campbell, like that of his father, may be summed up in the words: "the unification of the people of God through a return to the ideals of the apostolic church in doctrine, in practice, and in spirit."—*Christian Century*, Oct. 16, 1902.

THE JEWS AND PROPHECY

A GATHERING OF SCATTERED QUOTATIONS FROM NOTED MEN

"I believe the Jews are to return to their own land in peace."
—S. McCorkle, *Millennial Harbinger*, 1834, pp. 20-25. (Campbell published a mass of material from him along this line.)

"[The angel] then related their future history: . . . the return of the Jews to Palestine; their conversion to Christianity, and their agency in evangelizing the world; the commencement of the millennial reign; and the safety and security of Daniel, notwithstanding the wreck of thrones and the fall of empires.

"These are the angel's themes. These are ours. On these we propose to write a series of articles for readers of the *Millennial Harbinger*."—Robert Milligan, *Millennial Harbinger*, Jan., 1856, pp. 26-30.

"We are pleased to learn that Dr. Barclay's essays on Prophecy, in course of publication in the *Harbinger*, are read with much interest, and are exciting attention to the prophetic portions of the Bible. . . . If we are careful not to *dogmatize*, when there is so much room for honest differences of opinion, the free investigation of Old and New Testament prophecy may do much to increase our faith, and enlarge the domain of our spiritual enjoyment. We have no tolerance of idle dreams. . . . But when great workers like the senior editor of the *Harbinger*, and Dr. Barclay, undertake, as earnest, practical men, to lead us into such an acquaintance with the letter and spirit of prophecy as may confirm our faith, exalt our hopes, and quicken our energies, we cannot but feel a deep interest in their communications."—(This paragraph was initialed "I. E." We understand it to be from Isaac Errett.)

"I am much interested in Brother Barclay's investigations of the prophecies in relation to the return of the Jews to the land of their inheritance. I have no doubt of their ultimate restoration, and that Messiah will return and occupy the throne of his father David, to which all the governments of earth will submit."—B. K. Smith, in *Millennial Harbinger*, July 1861, pp. 410-412.

"His second advent, with the great events of which it is pregnant, was intended, and of right ought to be preached to the disciples, for their *perfection*."—Walter Scott, in *Millennial Harbinger*, June, 1842, p. 298.

"And finally brethren, let us, one and all, add to our faith all the graces of our holy religion, while we look for the second appearing of our Lord."—George W. Elley & J. T. Carpenter. (Bowling Green, Ky.) *Millennial Harbinger*, Oct., 1842, p. 478.

MORE FROM MILLIGAN

Recently, in this department, we offered our readers a valuable reprint from Robert Milligan, on Hebrews, second chapter, concerning "The Earth's Future." Milligan was in later years co-editor with Campbell of *Millennial Harbinger*; and afterwards he became

president of the "College of the Bible," Lexington, Ky. In the Biography of Milligan (Commentary, page 393), J. W. McGarvey says:

"When Luke undertakes to tell why Barnabas was selected from among the great spirits in the church at Jerusalem to go on an important mission to Antioch, he uses the words, 'For he was a good man and full of the Holy Spirit.' This is the high encomium which first of all springs to the lips when we speak of President Milligan."

The following extract is from page 105 of "The New Testament Commentary," Volume 9, Epistle to the Hebrews, by Robert Milligan—published by Chase and Hall, Cincinnati, 1876:

"God has provided a home for his children (Heb. 2:5, 9). 'The meek,' says Christ, 'shall inherit the earth.' For ages, the dominion of the world has been a matter of strife and contention; and ambitious men have waded through seas of blood to obtain it. But it is all in vain. They will never, except by temporary usurpation, enjoy even so much as a foot-breadth of it; For to Abraham and his seed it has all been given by an irrevocable decree of Jehovah, as their everlasting inheritance (Rom. 4:13). It matters not how humble and how destitute we may now be if we have the earnest of the Spirit (Eph. 1:14); 'then indeed are we Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise' (Gal. 3:29)."

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 14

EVERLASTING GOSPEL

By Alexander Campbell

This Gospel, which has been our motto for three years past, has never yet been preached. It was the symbol of every number, though not a word has yet been said about it. As *the gospel of our salvation* was only found in type and prophecy, in the Jewish scriptures, so the *everlasting gospel* is found, in the Christian scriptures, only on the page of prophecy. We have been, for years, developing the *ancient gospel*: a gospel proclaimed by the twelve angels of the Messiah; first in Jerusalem, then in Samaria, and then to the uttermost parts of the earth. But now we are about to speak of a *future gospel*, a gospel soon to be preached; a gospel which is to be borne on the wings of an angel in the midst of heaven, whose voice is to be heard from pole to pole, and from the rising of the sun to the place of its going down. John, in vision, first saw the angel of this gospel spread his wings, and, with a speed which left behind “the swift-winged arrows of light,” fly across the heavens; and as he flew, he heard a voice—a voice of majestic and momentous import—the meaning of which no mortal yet has fully comprehended. * * *

Let it, for the present, be noticed, that the message of the angel was never before announced; that till John saw him in vision, or till the time arrived when he made his appearance in the prospective drama of the mysterious future, the items of this gospel had not been divulged. Now, that it has not yet been preached, is as plain to us as that it was not in the days of the vision and prophecy.

Before presuming to consider the items of the everlasting gospel, we must attend to some preliminary matters; and of these, two shall suffice for the present:

I. *The Jewish Christian scriptures commence with history, and end with prophecy.* Three lessons are implied in this fact.

1. That historic and prophetic facts are both necessary to operate on the heart to produce those great moral results necessary to its becoming a temple of the Holy Spirit.

2. That as both history and prophecy are revelations, they are and must be, morally intelligible, or the moral influence of them is lost to the world.

3. That as the Jewish Scriptures, ending with prophecy, imported another dispensation; so the Christian Scriptures, ending with prophecy, intimate a new state of things on earth.

II. *The first prophecy, and the last delivered to apostate man, indicate that affliction and sore trials shall always precede triumph, exaltation, and glory.*

“IT SHALL BRUISE THY HEAD.”—The bruising of the serpent’s head was the first gospel ever preached, and the first prophecy recorded. And when his head shall have been bruised on earth, then will be an everlasting joy, because an everlasting gospel shall have been announced to the world. * * *

The Christian religion and the true church have been always oppressed. From the days of Herod the King, till the present, their lives have been sought — their property, reputation, and life have been accounted like sheep for the slaughter. There never has been a genuine follower of Jesus Christ that was not an afflicted and oppressed man, either in person, property, or character; and while the dragon's head has life in it, it will not, it cannot otherwise be. Like the Jewish church symbolic, the Christian was to be evilly treated for hundreds of years; for until now we have never had *one Christian King*, except the name has been given in derision by Satan to his Catholic Majesty of France. Christianity and Christians have all been baptized in a cloud and in a sea of troubles from the first day of their march till now; and all that is wanting for Christians to be more hated, and to be more slandered and persecuted, is more similarity to Jesus in character, and a little more power on the part of those who surround the throne of political power. No kingdom in this world has yet become the kingdom of Jesus Christ.—EDITOR, *Millennial Harbinger*, 1833, pp. 70-72.

EVERLASTING GOSPEL

(Continued)

The angel of the everlasting gospel announces the good news that the suffering days of Christians are numbered — that *the hour of judgment has come* — that the Lord is about to recompense his enemies, and to commence his reign over all the kingdoms of the world. We closed our first essay on this subject, saying that not one of the kingdoms of this world had become a Christian kingdom — no kingdom of this world has yet become a kingdom of Jesus Christ. Let us now examine this assertion with all attention.

Christians there are in many of the kingdoms of this world. In all the American states, in all the European kingdoms, in some of the Asiatic and African nations; but not one of these states, nations, or tribes, *as such*, is a kingdom of Jesus Christ: for one of the very plainest reasons in the world — not one of them is governed in person by Jesus Christ; not one of them acknowledges him as its King and administers his laws. Not one of them became a kingdom by adopting his constitution, and vowing allegiance to him as Governor in all things.

Says one well versed in the policies of nations, and in the laws of Christian ethics, and all the writings of the Christian teachers, 'No nation can be governed by the New Testament alone, nor by the principles which it inculcates; for were we to take Jesus for our King, the Romans, or some unchristian kingdom would come and destroy our country and government; for Jesus would not allow us to have a sword or cannon by which to avenge our wrongs — nay, he would have us to turn the other cheek when smitten in the face; and when compelled to go one mile, to make it two.' Grant it in all its force; and what follows? That no one kingdom can become a kingdom of Jesus Christ until all kingdoms become his; and then it follows that

the New Testament is only adapted to Christians while citizens of other kingdoms, being under the governments of those who know not God, and obey not the gospel of his Son. Hence the New Testament is only written and adapted to Christians in a suffering state — not as triumphant, not as having the reigns of government in their hands.

But a time will come (and that very soon — sooner than many can be persuaded) when “the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdoms 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* (kingdoms) shall serve and obey him.” But this not until one like the Son of man shall come on the clouds of heaven, and come to the Ancient of days, and be brought near before him; and there be given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages shall serve him.

The government of no nation is now in the hands of those who acknowledge the rights of Messiah — nay, *the best government of this world*, (our own) may be in the hands of a Turk, a Jew, or an Atheist, for aught our constitution cares. And this very government is indebted for its comparative excellency to the follies of all other governments in making a court religion, and in causing all, both small and great, to bow to the idol or creed which those in power prefer. The New Testament being only adapted to Christians in a suffering state, it never can mount the throne, nor become a court religion; and, therefore, any religion *called* Christian, which has been by law established, has been an impudent imposition or base counterfeit, and not the religion of Jesus Christ. When Christianity gains the throne, Jesus Christ will place it there himself; and whenever he sets up his throne, from that place shall go forth the law adapted to his subjects in their triumphant state.

We again repeat it, from the sermon on the Mount, to the 4th verse of the 20th chapter of Revelation, every address delivered to Christians contemplated them as suffering adversity. At different periods of the prophecy we have the anticipated triumph spoken of; we hear the echo from afar, saying, “Alleluiah! for the Lord God omnipotent reigns!” “Rejoice over her, you saints, and apostles, and prophets, for God has avenged you on her.” “The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdom of our Lord and of his anointed, and he shall reign forever and ever.” But till Jesus appears in the clouds of heaven, his cause and people can never gain the ascendant. Now is the time for fighting the good fight — the time that tries men’s souls — the time for the perseverance of saints — the time for suffering with him, that with him we may reign.

No kingdom now on earth can be regarded as a kingdom of our Lord, because *they were all founded by the sword*. * * *

This is the age of improvement in everything — but morals. Labor-saving expedients spring up like grass that grows upon the field; but is human labor lessened? Are the toils and drudgery of life diminished by it? Not in the least: for as soon as one invention

is adopted, it opens a new field for speculation, new objects of enterprise, and the ever active passions in the human breast impel the children of the flesh into everlasting toils. There can be no radical amelioration of society under the influences which now govern the world. * * *

But this state of things is not to survive the message of the angel of an everlasting gospel. He appears as a harbinger of the Millennium. He announces that the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion has arrived, and assures a sleeping world that the hour of God's judgment has come; that the fate of all the enemies of the reign of Messiah is now sealed, and that consequently a new order of things is to succeed. * * *—EDITOR, *Millennial Harbinger*, 1833, pp. 119-122.

EVERLASTING GOSPEL

(Concluded)

No kingdom of this world has yet become a kingdom of Jesus Christ. The constitution, laws, and customs of each and every kingdom of this world contemplates a state of society wholly unlike that which the constitution, laws, manners, and customs of the Christian religion would mold and fashion. * * *

Wars are the curses of nations: foreign or domestic wars have always been ruinous to those long exercised in them. But our fightings with neighboring states and nations, grievous as they are, occasionally cease; and the piping times of peace afford a breathing interval, in which we recruit our national finances: but in this long war, in this untiring rebellion against heaven's rightful sovereign, there has not been a moment's respite now for two thousand years, and this has made bankrupt our happiness and involved us in ten thousand evils which no politician has ever yet thought of. The annual expenses of this our national war against Messiah are greater than the annual revenues of the richest kingdom under heaven. * * * Thus they who would shout hosannas to the rightful sovereign, and whose joy would be complete if he were the only King, are groaning and travailing in pain, waiting for the adoption or redemption promised at the coming of the Lord.

When, then, an angel is heard announcing the everlasting good news that the hour of judgment is come, all Christian ears are attentive, and every Christian heart dilates with joy, anticipating what is to follow the dethronement of all the rivals of our Lord Messiah. He shall put down all rule, all authority, and all power opposed to the benign spirit and tendency of his reign.

The nature of this judgment is the first thing that claims our attention. * * *—EDITOR, *Millennial Harbinger*, 1833, pp. 224, 225.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 15

There came into our hands recently, as a gift from our Brother E. H. Hoover of Chattanooga, two bound volumes of *The Gospel Advocate*, 1886 and 1887. Though they are now nearly 60 years old, they are in excellent preservation; and they represent, presumably, some of the most vigorous of David Lipscomb's maturer essays—a vast amount of material that has never been reproduced in any "Question and Answer" books so far. It is likely that certain valuable reprints from these volumes will be given space in this historical department from time to time.

This month, we offer first (from *Gospel Advocate*, 1886) David Lipscomb's answer to a query as to praying for sinners, that they might believe and be saved. Following this, we offer three short paragraphs from Campbell in the *Harbingers* of 1836, 1837, 1838, on quite another subject.—E. L. J.

PRAYER FOR THE ALIEN

The Query: As our Heavenly Father would have it, all men are equally responsible. The holy Bible lies open before them with all of its perfection and power, and all are requested to read and learn, act and live. With these stubborn facts before us, how dare we hinge the salvation of any one upon the prayers of any person or people? Shall we say that by prayer God imparts any additional strength to the germinating power of the seed (word) and thus answers our prayer in the conversion of sinners? This admitted, we endorse special salvation, and ruthlessly launch out on the Arminian theory. Brethren, we have some "hair-splitting" just here; at least it seems so to the writer, and he wants some one to lay hold of the tangled threads and extricate them. I have a mind in regard to the matter, but it may be erroneous; so I want to hear from those whom I consider adequate to the task of giving a thorough exposition of the facts in the case. With due apology for encroaching on valuable space, I will close."—W. F. Robinson, Hillside, Miss.

The Answer: We do not know that we understand what the brother means by the above. We don't know what can prompt brethren to write such sentences as are found in the foregoing—for instance this: "With these stubborn facts before us, how dare we hinge the salvation of any one upon the prayers of any person or people?" He is opposing something somebody has said. Who has ever said anything akin to that? I said it was right to pray for sinners. I say it is right to drink milk, to eat meat, to eat apples, as a means of perpetuating life. Would any man understand that I said the perpetuation of life depended on any one of these things? To intimate that I said or believed such a thing would be false. A thing may be helpful to an end without the end hinging on it.

Is it a careless jumping at conclusions, because he wishes to pulverize somebody? He ought to be more careful. It is the careless misconstruing of language that causes much useless controversy. But if our brother means to argue, because God says the law of the

Lord is perfect, converting the soul, and the gospel is the power of God to salvation, therefore prayer for the sinner is wrong — he [God] says also, “all Scripture is given by inspiration, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” The Scriptures are just as profitable and as efficacious and complete to perfect Christians as to convert sinners, and prayer is needless for them, too. Hence, there is no room for prayer in our brother’s philosophy, for either saint or sinner.

Now Jesus prayed that God would forgive those who crucified Him; Stephen, those who stoned him. Paul prayed that the Israelites might be saved. He asked that God “would open to us a door of utterance, to speak the mystery of Christ, that I may make it manifest as I ought to speak.”—Col. iv, 3. “That the word of the Lord may have free course, and be glorified even is it is with you.”—II Thess. iii, 1. “And for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly to make known the mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in bonds, that therein I may speak boldly as I ought to speak.”—Eph. vi, 19. “I know this shall turn to my salvation through your prayers * * * that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but that with all boldness, as always, so also Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether by life or by death.”—Phil. i, 19. “I exhort that prayer be made for all men.”—I Tim. ii, 1.

Christ told his disciples to pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers into the vineyard. All these prayers were made, or were to be made, that sinners might be converted. The Savior and apostles had as much of the law as we have. If it is wrong, or even needless, to pray for sinners that they believe and be forgiven, Christ and Paul were fools; if they were right, the philosophy, mental or natural, that teaches it is not right to pray for sinners, nullifies the teaching of the Bible. The principle in precept and example is clearly taught, that whatever a man should labor for he should pray for. Whatever he prays for, he should labor in all legitimate ways to bring about. We doubt the acceptance of any labor that is not made in prayer to God. If it is right to labor to convert sinners, it is right to pray for their conversion. To substitute human reasoning for Divine teaching, is the presumptuous sin.

If our brother expects to have the law of God’s operations explained, he will have to go elsewhere. We know no more how He does this than how burning fuel makes heat and light. I believe He does both through His laws. I do not think He made laws and then could not do His work through them.

David Lipscomb, in *Gospel Advocate*, 1886, p. 108.

CAMPBELL’S BREAK WITH DR. THOMAS

We have previously shown (p. 9 in the pamphlet, “Faith of Our Fathers,” which see) the real ground and reason for Campbell’s break with Dr. Thomas. The following paragraph from Campbell gives

further confirmation to our statement that Thomas' "dogmatism" on the subject of "re-baptism" was the original wedge; and that the "declaration of non-fellowship" came later on account of his "having become a factionist," etc. The three paragraphs that follow indicate the progressive drift of this rift through three successive years.—E. L. J.

No person can regret more than I do the course of the unhappy discussions and dogmatisms of the *Apostolic Advocate*, from the date of the suggestion on the subject of re-baptism to the church in Baltimore down to the present time. Yet still, I cannot by any means approve the spirit of the suggestion of the author of "Plain Dealing." It is not yet evident, and I hope never shall be evident, that our Brother Thomas is a factionist. That his reasonings and writings may have that appearance, and that they may have a tendency that way, I am too sensible; but that is quite another proposition. Every schismatical writer or speaker is not a schismatic; nor is every factional author or preacher, a factionist. Every speech or motion of a treasonable tendency will not stamp the indelible character of a traitor upon its author. * * *—EDITOR, *Millennial Harbinger*, December, 1836, pp. 565- 566.

But I have now come to the business of this *Extra*. In the November number we re-published Dr. Thomas's account of a discussion which he held with a Mr. Watt on some of his opinions, and also Mr. Hunnicutt's notice of it; and then followed these notices with some remarks and a declaration of my non-fellowship with him on account of his having become a factionist and having departed, in part at least, from the faith of the New Testament. * * *

Nevertheless, while he was crying out 'Injustice!' I was mercifully laboring to save him from himself and a few mistaken partisans. Yes, while I permitted him to speak to me in a style uncourteous and unchristian without seeming to feel it, and sparing him, he and some others were representing me as unable to defend my views or to disprove his opinions, and rather through conscious imbecility evading the discussion of his new theories. * * *

More barefaced perversion of scripture and reason, more unblushing sophistry, and, when all the circumstances and relations are considered, more insolent treatment has not fallen in my way during my editorial career.

—A. C., *Millennial Harbinger Extra*, December, 1837, pp. 578-581.

DR. THOMAS — AGAIN

It is true that I have declared for myself (which every freeman and every Christian under heaven has a right to do) and for myself only, that I have no fellowship with Dr. Thomas in his present course, Christian community, my friends, and my opponents too, made both necessary and expedient.

I am no Sadducee, nor mongrel Sadducee, and I wish the world

to know that I am not. I believe in angels, spirits, and a resurrection of all the dead—the just and the unjust. That Dr. Thomas has departed from the faith in this matter I doubt not, any more than I doubt the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. And this being my conviction, I can no more commune with him, *if everything else were right*, than with the pope.—We are not of one faith; and no man, nor set of men under the broad heavens, can either cajole, hoax, or denounce me into acquiescence with such gross assumptions under the name of liberality or illiberality, liberty or no liberty of discussion. But I compel no man nor church to exclude him.—A. C., *Millennial Harbinger*, 1838, p. 186.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 16

Half of last month's space in this department was given over to a fine quotation from David Lipscomb on the subject of "Praying for the Alien Sinner." We are glad to follow up now, for this month's offering, with two or three extracts from Lipscomb on the question of "Church and Kingdom." They are reprinted, not because the editors of *Word and Work* agree with every item of the views therein set forth, but for the sake of the notable and characteristic fairness and breadth of vision with which the "grand old man" handled his subject. The final reprint, "Times of Restoration," is of particular interest.

We have not, this time, undertaken to italicise outstanding sentences; but a careful reading will show that among other things, Brother Lipscomb states (or clearly teaches) the following:

A RESUME OF LIPSCOMB'S ARTICLE

"Church" and "kingdom" do not mean the same thing, exactly. The kingdom is more extensive in its signification. The church is the kingdom of God in its "little stone" stage, coming "not with observation"; the powerful, "great mountain" stage of the kingdom will be seen "when he comes the second time."

The kingdom (which was to be spiritual, enlisting the spirit, the inner man) was established on the first Pentecost after the ascension of Jesus Christ. Before that, the kingdom had its preparatory state and "stages," and it will yet pass through successive stages of development until it ends in "the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ." In its final and perfect development, the kingdom of the earth shall become the kingdom of God and his Christ; the will of God shall be done on earth as it is in heaven, earth itself shall become heaven, and God shall dwell with his people. But these different "stages" and "phases" of the kingdom are to be viewed as the stages and developments of one harmonious and connected whole.

Heaven is to 'receive' the Savior until the "time of restoration of all things"—not *through* those times as commonly taught, but *until* those times; for those times must be "when Jesus returns again to earth." Then, when Jesus comes, all things will be restored to their original relation to God; the will of God will be done on earth; all things in the world will be restored to harmonious relations with God. And this restoration includes—so Lipscomb implies, I think—the restoration of the divine original order in the material world: seed-time and fruitful harvest; the end of briers, thorns, and thistles—yea, of sickness, death, and all the ills to which mortal flesh is heir through sin. Such are the teachings, stated and implied, in these reprints from the pen of David Lipscomb. After all, they do not differ greatly or essentially, in their main outlines and final upshoot and consequences, from the views of other pioneers that have been quoted here, nor from our own. But read now for yourself.—E. L. J.

"CHURCH AND KINGDOM"

Inquiry: "*Does the kingdom and the church mean the same thing or not? Give your reasons for thinking them the same, if so.*"

Answer: "Not exactly. The kingdom embraces the church, but is, I think, more extensive in its signification. The church embraces the disciples of Christ separated from the world by obedience to Christ. It has both a local and a general application. In its local application it refers to those in a community, separated from the world, meeting together to worship God in His appointments. In its general application, it embraces all the disciples in a country, nation, or the world, separated to the service of God. The kingdom of God embraces every thing and person in the universe over which God rules as King. The term *kingdom* is not only more extensive in its reach, but it is viewed from a different standpoint. . . .

"Adventists fail to see that there are two periods, or stages of the kingdom foretold by Daniel and confirmed by Jesus—(1) when it is represented by a little stone cut out of the mountain without hands; (2) when it became a great mountain, breaking in pieces and destroying all the kingdoms of the world. The Jews made the same mistake about Jesus. He was to manifest two apparently antagonistic characters—(1) a sacrificial lamb, led as a sheep to the slaughter, not opening his mouth; (2) a conquering hero, a King on whose shoulders the government rests. The Jews looked for him as the conquering King, and did not recognize the King in 'the lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' Jesus said, 'The kingdom of God cometh not with observation' in its beginning. When he comes the second time: 'As the lightning, when it lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall the Son of man be in his day.' (Luke 17:20, 24.) The church is as much the kingdom of God when it does not attract attention as when he comes in his power and glory." —*Queries and Answers*, by David Lipscomb, pp. 247, 251.

"THE KINGDOM OF GOD"

"The kingdom of God" means the realm subject to the rule, or reign, of God. It embraces the universe. The world was created as a part of that kingdom, subject to the rule of God. The world was intrusted to man as the under-ruler for God. Man betrayed the trust and turned the rule of earth over to the devil, the rival and enemy of God. God determined to rescue the world from the rule of the devil and to bring it back to his own rule and authority. This process of bringing it back has not yet reached its completion. Much of the work was preparatory to the re-establishment of the kingdom; and after its re-establishment, the work of bringing the world into subjection to this kingdom has been slow.

Many different steps have been taken. Some have miscarried through the unfaithfulness of the servants of God, through whom he proposed to accomplish the work. Before Christ came, the steps were preparatory to the formal re-establishment and opening of

this kingdom. This new rule, or kingdom, was to be spiritual. It was to enlist the spirit, the inner man; to be built upon the affections and purposes of the heart. Through this inner man God proposed to control and guide the fleshly, or outer, man. The first rule was addressed to the outer, or fleshly, man. It failed. The material things, even the law written in stone, pass away; that written in the heart, the spiritual man, unseen to mortal eyes, will endure forever.

The preparatory state and stages for this kingdom are given us in the Old Testament. After Adam sinned, Seth and his family, ending in Noah, were developments preparing for this kingdom. The flood swept the ungodly from the earth, and Noah and his family were commissioned to repopulate the earth. Soon they went astray; but the second cycle was run, of which Abraham was the outcome. To him the promise was made: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." The separation of Isaac and Jacob and his family, the transgression of his family, the giving of a temporary law through Moses, and the dealings of God with this family under the law of Moses, were successive steps preparing for and eventuating in the birth of Jesus, the Christ, the Son of God.

To make the victory over the devil complete, Jesus suffered himself to be bound hand and foot, to be carried down into the grave by the power of the devil; and as a prisoner in the grave, the prison house of the devil, he struggled with the devil ("him that had the power of death"), overcame him in his own prison house, burst asunder the prison bars of death, and came forth a victor over death and hell and the grave. (Heb. 2:14, 15). After Jesus had thus conquered death, He organized and opened to men the great spiritual kingdom he had been from the beginning preparing to establish. This kingdom now established will yet pass through successive stages of development until it ends in "the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ." The kingdom in its present stage is not called "the everlasting kingdom," but it will grow into it. It is the same kingdom in a lower stage of growth and development.

With this glance at the growth and development of the kingdom from the first preparatory stage until its final and perfect growth, the understanding of all these prophecies and their fulfillment seems not difficult. The blessing on the family of Abraham (Gen. 22:18); the raising up of a Prophet like Moses (Deut. 18:18-22), the Prince of the house of David that should reign on his throne forever; the establishment of "the mountain of the Lord's house in the top of the mountains" and the going forth of the law from Jerusalem, as told by Isaiah (2:14) and Micah (4:1-4); the making of the "new covenant with the house of Israel" (Jer. 31:31); the setting up of the kingdom of heaven "in the days of these kings" (Dan. 2:44); and the pouring forth of "my spirit upon all flesh" (Joel 2:28), culminating in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost after the resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ, ought to be easily understood as successive steps in the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth.

The statements concerning the beginning, development, and growth of the same kingdom, given in the New Testament, ought to be equally clear and plain. The kingdom was established and opened to men on the first Pentecost after the ascension of Jesus Christ. The Holy Spirit came to earth to give this kingdom laws and to take up his abode in these laws and to guide that kingdom in its future growth to its final and perfect development, when the kingdom of the earth shall become the kingdom of God and his Christ, when the will of God shall be done on earth as it is in heaven, and when earth itself shall become heaven and God shall dwell with his people and be their God and they shall be his people. Instead of seeing this connected and glorious growth and development of the kingdom of God through successive preparatory stages of the past and of growth for the future, we insist on disjointing it and looking upon each separate stage as a distinct kingdom, or government. If we would try to view revelation as a continued, but connected, revelation of God, and the different phases and stages of his kingdom as stages and developments of one harmonious, connected whole, it would enable us to understand these things better and to see a beauty and Godlike grandeur that without this we cannot see. — David Lipscomb, in *Gospel Advocate*, May 21, 1903.)

"TIMES OF RESTORATION"

Query: "What are the *times of restoration* and the *all things* spoken of by the prophets in Acts 3:20, 21? You can perhaps help me and others to better understanding."

Answer: Jesus had been to earth and returned to heaven. Heaven must receive him until 'the times of restoration of all things.' Then 'the times of restoration of all things' must be when Jesus returns again to earth—the restoration of all things to their original relation to God. The relation which the world originally sustained to God was broken and destroyed when man, the ruler, rebelled against God. That destruction of the world's relation to God was more far-reaching and destructive than we realize. The whole material creation shared in the evil. Briers, thistles, thorns grew in the material world, as in the spiritual. Sickness, death, mortality afflicted the material world. When man rebelled against his Maker, the under creation rebelled against man. The laws of the natural world were disordered. The germs of vegetation put forth; biting frosts or burning heat destroys them. Disorder in the laws of the material world came as the result of man's sin against his Maker. When Jesus comes again, the will of God will be done on earth as it is in heaven, and all things in the world will be restored to harmonious relations with God, the Supreme Ruler of the universe.—*Queries and Answers*, by David Lipscomb, p. 360.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 17

DAVID LIPSCOMB ON CHRISTIAN UNITY

He shows that failure in love and kindness makes sectarians of our hearers; and that many, in opposing sectarianism, themselves become sectarians. That is, by opposing that which is wrong in a bitter, partisan spirit, we only make disciple partisans, and fail to really forward Christian unity. The italics are mine.—E. L. J.

The rights and privileges God has granted to man cannot be compromised. To do this is to join in rejecting the authority of God. We may for the time being overlook and disregard the truth, but the law of God must be maintained. *It must be done in a spirit of kindness to men, loyalty to God, and devotion to truth.* It must be done in a spirit of loyalty to God and love to men, *rejoicing to encourage all truth held by others.* It cannot be done in a compromising or unkind spirit to man. The masses of disciples of this age and land have failed to make unsectarian Christians. *They fail to manifest the spirit of love to man and love to fight as partisans, not as lovers of truth. They oppose wrong in a bitter, partisan spirit.* Christians that cannot show the spirit of Christ cannot overcome for Christ. The disciples of Christ have two sets of partisans. One, in its abounding liberality, is ready to compromise any and every truth for union upon human and improper grounds, willing to become a party to unity with parties. But extreme begets extreme. In running from one extreme we so often run to the opposite. From the extreme of sacrificing truth for the sake of union, *many substitute their own narrow, imperfect, and exclusive ideas for the law of God, and demand the sacrifice of much liberty and many helpful gospel privileges to satisfy their narrow conceptions. Many become sectarians in opposing sectarians.* Everything that admits what God excludes is sectarianism. Everything that excludes what God has not excluded is sectarianism. A strong and clear faith in God, a clear-minded distinction between things indifferent and things embraced in the commands of God, is needed now to maintain truth and keep clear of the things forbidden by God. Where these extremes can be upheld and kindly presented, the world may be saved by the truth of the gospel presented by even a few. Sectarianism in its grosser form is now dying. The danger is, faith in God may die with it. *Let us maintain faith in God, loyalty to Jesus Christ, love for the truth, and kindness to all men.*—D. L., in *Gospel Advocate*, 1909, p. 46.

THE TRUTH THAT SAVES

When we have the truth, *it is easy to maintain it in a bitter, vindictive, party spirit.* That is human, and it is easy to be weak and frail human beings. It is easy, if we have the truth, to compromise away the truth of God and be popular with the people. But what right has a human being to compromise or set aside the truth of God? *The thing above all else to do is to hold the truth of God in a kind and gentle spirit* and to manifest the Spirit of God in practicing the precepts of God. This makes men sublime and Godlike

in their lives and characters, and it is the effective way to benefit and save our fellow-man. That is God's way to bless and save men. The whole life is thus made the outgrowth and fruit of a living faith in Christ Jesus. The Christian's life ought to be the outgrowth and fruit of a living faith in Christ our Lord, and should *manifest his teachings in spirit and in precept*. This is the mission of the Christian in the world. "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (1 John 1: 7.)—D. L., in *Gospel Advocate*, Jan. 21, 1909, p. 98.

LOVE OF THE BRETHREN

M. C. Kurtees

It is with something like a sigh (for the failure that followed) that we read this fine essay extolling that love without which there can be no Christian unity. But it is important to know—and for posterity to know—how much so ever any of us have failed in the practice of it, that in days of clear thinking we were agreed on the main causes of discord, and on the utter indispensability of a genuine love in order to a real and lasting unity. For truly, "God has no way of holding his simple disciples together unless they love each other!"

Then, when the paragraph on "Co-operation" is added, from the pen of the same writer (in a later issue of *The Gospel Advocate*), the ground of Christian unity is well-nigh complete.

We want the world, and coming generations too, to know that these things were said; and we want to practice these fine principles of unity ourselves, as God may give us grace to do so.—E. L. J.

The oft-repeated admonition in the New Testament that brethren in Christ should love one another might lead one to wonder why a quality so beautiful and attractive in itself, and so manifestly full of blessing for all, should need to be urged with such frequency, if it were not for what our eyes are made to see and our ears are made to hear all around us. Just now, for instance, the crimination and recrimination appearing in the religious press among brethren in some parts of the country not only furnishes a sufficient reason for the oft-repeated admonition, but it furnishes incontestable proof that many are failing to give heed to it.

The Willett controversy among brethren of the Christian Church has not been without interest on its own merits, in so far as it involves his attitude toward the Bible and the significance of his occupying a place on their Centennial programme; but the real issue seems now to be almost completely obscured by the ugly personalities lugged into the controversy. The *Christian Standard*, the *Christian Century*, and, I think, the *Christian-Evangelist*, are the three principal journals taking a hand in the melee, though I have not seen the last-named paper. In the midst of charge and counter charge, punctuated now and then with what at least appears to be bitterness and unlovely insinuation, one not only feels inclined to ask where it will all end, but to quote to the combatants Paul's appropriate words: "But if ye

bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another." (Gal. 5: 15.) Paul found it necessary to say this to the Galatians; and he said it, too, in immediate connection with his admonition that they should love one another.

Assuredly some of these brethren, in the papers named, are showing us how *not* to conduct a controversy; and I have concluded that it would be good for them and for all of us to consider, just now, the subject of love of the brethren. Let us consider some sample New Testament statements enjoining this beautiful grace; and let us hear, first of all, the Lord's own words: "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." (John 13: 35.) Here is the divine badge of distinction which we are authorized by the Lord himself to wear before the world, and by which the world is to know that we are the Lord's. This badge, conspicuously worn and honored, is vastly more to the world than all Centennial programmes or any other attempt to display numbers and power. So prominent was it among the early disciples that "the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and soul." (Acts 4: 32.) What a happy condition this was, and how beautiful for the world to behold! No wonder Paul said afterwards, "In love of the brethren be tenderly affectioned one to another; in honor preferring one another" (Rom. 12: 10), and to the Thessalonians: "But concerning love of the brethren ye have no need that one write unto you: for ye yourselves are taught of God to love one another." He then followed this with the high compliment to them. "For indeed ye do it toward all the brethren that are in Macedonia;" and finally, to show that he did not overlook the fact that they already loved one another, he added: "But we exhort you, brethren, that ye abound more and more." (1 Thess 4: 9, 10.) The writer to the Hebrews commends the same quality when he says, "God is not unrighteous to forget your work and the love which ye showed toward his name, in that ye ministered unto the saints, and still do minister." (Heb. 6: 10.) Even where it existed among brethren, in order to emphasize its importance, he wrote: "Let love of the brethren continue." (Heb. 13: 1.)

No less clear and earnest is the apostle Peter in joining with Paul on the same beautiful theme: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in your obedience to the truth unto unfeigned love of the brethren, love one another from the heart fervently." (1 Pet. 1: 22.)

Now, we are led to ask, what regard can brethren have for such an array of passages when they are engaged in unholy strife, bickerings, and acrimonious accusations one of another? Have they, for the moment, wholly forgotten that such passages exist, or can they willfully ignore them?

Let us have controversy — dignified, honorable, manly controversy — as long as error in any form shows itself to the disturbance of the peace of Zion; but let us temper it all, and always, with brotherly love, bearing in mind the gentle reminder of Abram to Lot: "For we are brethren." (Gen. 13: 8.) "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and railing, be put away from you, with all

malice: and be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ forgave you." (Eph. 4: 31, 32.)—M. C. K., in *Gospel Advocate*, 1909, p. 109.

UNION AND COOPERATION

"We conclude, therefore, that while even 'exact agreement' in all things is desirable as far as it can possibly be had, yet the point at which we draw the line between having and not having union and co-operation is not whether the proposed cooperants are agreed in everything, but whether any of them are or are not by the said union and cooperation involved in any wrong act or in any act which they believe to be wrong. If any of them are so involved, they cannot consistently enter such union and cooperation; but if they are not so involved, they can."—*Gospel Advocate*, Aug. 13, 1914.

THE IMPORTANCE OF LOVE

Here Brother Elam writes in the same strain as the foregoing. In fact he felt it so important and so needed that a series of articles appeared from his pen on this line in 1909. We can, of course, give space to excerpts only.—E. L. J.

Pride of opinion, the love of place and power, greed for gain, selfishness and envy do much toward crowding out and destroying this, the greatest of all Christian virtues—love. In the ratio that love is so often commanded, envy, jealousy, and hatred, and all the evils which spring from them, are condemned. . . .

When the whole truth had been revealed, and enough miracles performed to confirm it, there was no further need of miracles, and they ceased; but the church, in all its harmonious and beautiful spiritual proportions, remains. The props, stays, and scaffolds so necessary to the erection of a building are all removed when the building has been completed. But after all miraculous gifts have ceased, faith, hope, and love remain.

Love is an act of one's heart. He can love God and men or not as he chooses. He becomes morally and spiritually better as he controls his affections and sets them on things above, and not on things on the earth. His moral and spiritual condition depends upon the action of his own will. God can cause an irresponsible ass to speak, or wicked men to speak "with the tongues of men and of angels," but he does not force people to love him and to love men. People must choose for themselves to love God and men. So unless one loves God and men, should God cause him to speak with tongues, etc., he is nothing more than "sounding brass, or a clanging cymbal," so far as his own worth and spiritual good are concerned. All miraculous gifts, bestowed by God's arbitrary power, were, without the love of those upon whom they were bestowed, to them nothing. Then the action of one's will in purposing to serve God with reverence and awe, to control his fleshly appetites and passions, and to love men, was to him far more than the power to work miracles, and is now far more than the power of eloquence, chief seats in the synagogues, fortune and fame.—*Gospel Advocate*, 1909, p. 175, 175.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 18

A FRANK INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

It is common knowledge that, in the good providence of God, there came into our hands some time ago a certain gift of money (limited by the uncertain fortunes and fluctuating values that are common to stocks and bonds), allocated to the purposes of this department. Soon thereafter, we bought a selected club of many hundreds of names, greatly increasing the circulation of the *Word and Work* while these reprints are running.

Our assignment (along with other duties of a busy life) was to search and search again, through scores of books and countless papers that had been gathered — to find there, and to publish to the world, the teachings of the honored “restoration fathers” — on Prophecy, on Unity, on Christian Love and Toleration, and other themes that lead to better understanding and good fellowship among brethren.

Then, eighteen months ago, we began publication of these “precious reprints”; and at the first year-end, the monthly installments were gathered, improved, and offered (now free for the asking) in a compact pamphlet. These yearly pamphlets are finally to be gathered, and offered as a book, if the Lord wills.

For the most part, all strictures on our reprints, and all efforts to break the great force of the pioneer testimony, have so far been disregarded — for the reason that they have generally come from harsh and “extreme” sources — “them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine.”—Rom. 16:17. According to the flesh, we might have answered them in kind, for that is natural and easy; but we have sought to remember this, that —

“The Lord’s servant must not strive,
But be gentle towards all,
Apt to teach, forbearing,
In meekness correcting them that oppose themselves;
If peradventure God may give them repentance
Unto the knowledge of the truth.”

But now there has appeared a long article from a man that we respect and esteem; a brother in the Lord that we have long thought of as wishing to be fair — namely, Brother G. C. Brewer. (We call no names unless we can commend.) This brother seems to think we have misrepresented or twisted the general teaching of Lipscomb and Milligan — or at least that we have left false impressions of their teaching. We give therefore, first, the Brewer article (with our brief notes in italics interspersed for brevity): we follow this with the pertinent portions of our February reprint from Milligan (our brief notes again interspersed). With that, (and with a “Final Sum-up”) we leave it to our readers to judge whether or not we represented President Milligan fairly (omitting Lipscomb for the present), especially since we introduced our Milligan reprint in February with the following cautious note:

“In giving our readers this ‘precious reprint,’ we are not saying that Milligan was on this side or that, ‘pre’ or ‘post,’ for or against,

or anything else. Let the reprint speak for itself. We do say that we are glad that this valuable book has been reprinted, and that it is being offered by the *Advocate*."

BROTHER BREWER'S ARTICLE

The Word and Work has recently reprinted some things from the pen of David Lipscomb on such things as "the times of restoration" and "church and kingdom." This magazine has also more than one time in recent years quoted what Robert Milligan said about the new heaven and the new earth. If the Word and Work does not intend to convince its readers that Brothers Lipscomb and Milligan were premillennialists, its use of the writings of these two men does have that effect. People who are not thoroughly familiar with claims of premillennialists, and who, perhaps, are less familiar with the writings of Lipscomb and Milligan, might easily infer that these two men sanctioned the premillennial view that is held by at least the majority of premillennialists of the present day. Those of us who know the facts know that neither of these men endorsed premillennialism, and we know that it is unfortunate that they are made to appear in that light.

(There follows a discussion of "Premillennialists" and "Premillennialism" which is not particularly germane to the issue here, omitted for lack of space.—E.L.J.)

Fortunately, Brother Lipscomb was still living when the controversy over premillennialism arose among our brethren. Brother Lipscomb was at the old Nashville Bible School when Brother Boll preached these premillennial views there. Some of us who are still living were there at the time, and we know that Brother Lipscomb did not endorse Brother Boll's views. I myself can give personal testimony to this effect. Instead, however, of making a statement at this time, I wish here to quote what I said in a lecture delivered at David Lipscomb College on January 27, 1939. This was given in a division of the lecture called "Historical Introduction." Here is what I said:

"The only conflict that came up about the matter that did not seem to be pleasant was right here [indicating in front of rostrum in auditorium]. Brother Boll was speaking on the Jews' going back to Palestine, and Brother Lipscomb was sitting right out there. As Brother Boll told of the history of the Jews and showed that they have remained a distinct nation through all the centuries, despite the persecutions they have endured, and advanced the thought that God is with the Jews and is preserving them for some future blessing in fulfillment of his purpose in them and of his promise to them, Brother Lipscomb spoke from his seat and asked: 'Do you think the Jews are now the people of God and above the church?' Brother Boll replied: 'No, Brother Lipscomb, Christians — the church — are the people of God *par excellence*. But the natural branch is to be brought back into the root and fatness of the olive tree.'

"Boll had spoken of the necessity of studying the prophecies

and had implied that some people do not encourage the study of prophecies, so Brother Lipscomb's next remark was: 'Yes, I understand you are attacking me.' And he seemed to be agitated as he raised his palsied hand in gesture and tears were in his eyes.

"Brother Boll was moved also, and tears suffused his eyes as he replied: 'Oh, no, Brother Lipscomb, I was not attacking you. I had no thought of offending you.'

"Brother Lipscomb said: 'Well I thought you were. You know my well-known position about the Jews and the teaching of the prophecies.'

"Brother Boll said, I think, that he was not sure that he did know Brother Lipscomb's position about the teaching of the prophets. Then Brother Lipscomb alluded to some controversies he had had on these points before Boll's day. And he mentioned having read something from Boll's pen in a recent issue of the Gospel Advocate that he thought was directed at him. It had something to do with the teaching or the objection to teaching the prophecies in the Bible schools.

"Again Brother Boll disclaimed any intention to criticize Brother Lipscomb, but he asked why the prophecies were not taught in this school.

"Brother Lipscomb said that the prophecies were not taught in this school, and he gave the reason. He said: 'Our students are young and immature and do not yet know the simpler and easier parts of the Bible. I have always held that one should know the rest of God's word thoroughly before one undertakes to study the prophecies. Even then he will encounter things that he will not understand, but a general knowledge of God's word should save him from false and speculative interpretations.'

"This dialogue ended pleasantly enough, but it resulted in two things that I think it will be profitable for us to remember: (1) Bro. Boll gave up the afternoon lectures on the Jews and the prophecies relating to them. He did this out of deference to Brother Lipscomb. He did not want to appear to be attacking him. He did not speak again on that subject. In doing this he increased the respect and admiration that we all had for him, and he probably caused some to be more inclined toward his position than they would have been if they had heard all his arguments. If my memory is not at fault, John Glenn told me that he and the other teachers who were near Brother Boll's age, including Brother Pittman, Ed Sewell, H. Leo Boles, and Dr. J. S. Ward, advised Boll to abandon those lectures. (I was interested in them, and was asking why they did not continue.) (2) Brother Lipscomb also made a concession. He said that if the older and more advanced students wanted to study the prophecies he would teach the class. We clamored for the class; and when it started, all the preacher students enrolled, as did nearly all the faculty. . . ."

(He here names several students who enrolled.—E.L.J.)

Brother Milligan and Brother Lipscomb both frequently spoke of the destruction of this present world, and then of a "new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." The things that they said would take place are all* to take place in the renovated earth, not in this earth while it is under the curse and while men are living in the flesh, being born and dying, and sinning betimes. The premillennialists teach that Christ will reign on this earth over mortal men, and while sin is still here, etc.; and they make a difference between the earth in which the millennium will take place and the new order which will come after the millennium has expired. And yet they do not tell their readers that what Brother Lipscomb and Brother Milligan spoke of were things that would take place in the new heaven and the new earth.*

(But is there not to be a terrible work of destruction and a mighty "renovation" at the commencement of the Millennium? Read 2 Thess. 1:7-10; Rev. 19:11-21. And who believes that millennial peace and righteousness can ever come to earth "while it is under the curse?" The curse is largely lifted when Jesus comes — at the "redemption of our body"? Rom. 8:18-23.—E.L.J.)

That all may see that the premillennialists do claim that Christ will reign on this earth while it is still under the curse, and that they do make a distinction between the earth in which the millennium will take place and the earth that we shall have after the millennium has expired, I desire again to have recourse to the lecture above quoted. In that lecture I read, by permission, some questions I had submitted to Robert Boll and his answers to those questions. These should prove interesting to students of this issue, and especially should they help them keep the record straight in reference to the views of Lipscomb, Milligan, and others. Here are the questions and the answers: [we arrange them consecutively]

Q. "1. When Christ comes to reign on the earth — on David's throne — will that be a political or material government, such as David's was, except grander and more extensive?

A. "It will be a theocracy, extending over all 'the kingdoms of the world' (Rev. 11:15), taking over all the realm 'under heaven,' which was previously held by 'the four beasts' (Dan. 7:27); and its sovereignty is 'over the nations' (Rev. 2:26). Whether in view of this it should be described as 'political' and 'material,' you must decide. I never use either of those terms when speaking of it.

Q. "2. Will the government be supported by taxes paid by the citizens in literal, earthly coinage, such as we now use?

A. "When God headed the ancient theocratic kingdom, he demanded tithes and offerings. When Israel asked for a human king, God warned of the heavy taxation that such a king would demand. (1 Sam. 8:1-18.) Whether in the new order anything will be demanded is not perfectly clear. A typical indication may be discerned

* Does the Milligan reprint support this "all" — that all these things belong to the new heaven and earth?—J.

in 1 Kings 10:24, 25 (compare Rev. 21:24, 25), and more direct prediction in Ps. 72:10, 15; Isa. 60:6, 9, 11, 16. Nothing is anywhere said about any coinage, so far as I know.

Q. "3. Will the citizens of this kingdom be flesh-and-blood men and women, as we are now? Will there be births and deaths on the earth during that thousand years?

A. "That Israel and the nations over whom that reign extends are composed of human beings in the flesh is seen in many scriptures — e.g., Ps. 72:11-14; Jer. 30:19-21; Zech. 8:4, 5. (See contexts also.) There will be births and deaths. The lives of men, especially the righteous, will be much longer than human lifetimes run now. (Isa. 65:20-25.)

Q. "4. What sort of beings will Christ and the risen saints be during that time? If Christ becomes flesh once again, becomes an earth dweller, will he have to die again? If not, how will he pass back to a glorified spirit again?

A. "Christ is not a 'glorified spirit being,' but a resurrected and glorified *man*. Such will also his saints be. As such they have access to earth or to heaven. After his resurrection, Christ walked on the earth for forty days, not bound by physical laws, yet able at will to use them and act in accordance with them. That Christ is a glorified spirit being is the doctrine of Russell and Rutherford. The Bible teaching is that he is man now. (1 Tim. 2:5.) If he were not man, he could not sit on David's throne, now or ever; for God's oath is definite that 'of the fruit of his [David's] loins' he would set one upon his throne. (See Ps. 89:3, 4; 132:11; Acts 2:30, 31.)

Q. "5. Does it seem reasonable — or even possible — to have a temporal, material, political government composed of flesh-and-blood people and supported by 'Caesar's coinage,' and yet the ruler and his subordinate officers all *spirit beings*, who neither eat nor drink, sleep nor die, exercise nor rest, rejoice nor weep as their mortal subjects do?

A. "This question is answered to all effects by the preceding.

Q. "6. Since those nations over which Christ and his saints shall rule with a rod of iron are wicked, sinner nations, how will they be controlled — by a spiritual force or by physical force? Will there be armed police and trained soldiers to enforce the Ruler's will?

A. "The rod (scepter) of iron is the symbol of strong, unswerving rule. Only rebels and oppressors will feel the weight of that rod. (Ps. 72:4, 9; Isa. 11:3-5.) There is no indication that the King will need or use carnal forces to execute his judgments. After the great judgments of that day the remnants of the nations will subject themselves willingly to his rule. (Ps. 47:9; 72:11; 102: 22; Zech. 8:20-23.) But also note Isa. 60:12.

Q. "7. Will the gospel be preached during the millennium, and will some of these sinners become Christians? If so will these Christians live on to the end of the thousand years and then die or be changed, or will they be dying along during the reign? If they die, what words of comfort could be said to the weeping ones, seeing they could not use such Scriptures as 1 Thess. 4:13-18 and Rev. 21?

A. "There is a distinction between salvation and government. Government may have to be enforced; salvation is always by grace and voluntary. There never can be any salvation except through the gospel. During the millennium, Satan, who now blinds the minds of men (2 Cor. 4:4), is bound and imprisoned, and the knowledge of Jehovah will cover the earth as waters cover the sea. All conclusions drawn from these facts must stand as conclusions only. The word of God denies that those who died in sin will have life and opportunity in the millennium, and there is no proof that those who today reject the gospel will have opportunity then.

Q. "8. If this reign is to be entirely spiritual and in a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness and where they shall not 'hurt nor destroy,' in what sense shall the rule be with a rod of iron, and how break the nations in pieces? Are we not forced to 'spiritualize' this? Also, why should such a reign end in a thousand years? Furthermore, why should we speak of such a reign as that being *on earth* at all, seeing it will not be this present earth at all and will not be 'earthy' in nature?"

A. "We must distinguish between the new order under the 'millennium' on the one hand, and the 'new heaven' and 'new earth' which follow the passing away of the present earth and heaven, on the other. The rule of the rod of iron pertains to the former, not the latter. The latter represents the final perfect goal of Christ's work, the eternal state. (Even in regard to the millennium we would not be forced to 'spiritualize' the 'rod of iron.' There is a difference between 'spiritualizing' and recognizing a simple figure of speech.)"

These answers speak for themselves, and no effort is here made to refute any point in them. (End of Brewer's article.)

EXTRACTS FROM THE MILLIGAN REPRINT

(From "Faith of Our Fathers," Feb. 1946; italics ours.)

He [the Apostle] insists particularly that we should give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard:

Because, he says, it is through the man Jesus, and that system of grace of which he is author and the finisher, that *we will regain our lost dominion over the world* (vv. 5-9).

When man was created, God said to him, "Have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth" (Gen. 1:28).

But in consequence of sin, man has, in a great measure, lost this dominion (Gen. 3:15-24). Satan for a time got possession of this world. . . .

That this state of things is, however, only temporary, and that, according to God's purpose, *man will again have at his command the dominion of the world*, is manifest from the eighth Psalm. . . .

From this passage, then, it is quite evident that God *intends that man shall possess and hold the world as his lawful and rightful patrimony*. But this, says Paul, has not yet been accomplished. "We do not yet see all things put under him." . . .

restore to mankind their lost dominion over the world. . . . The "world to come" means, not the coming age, as in Matt. 12:39, etc., but the habitable world under the reign and government of the Messiah (Heb. 1:6). It is the world in which we now live; and in which, when it shall have been purified from sin, the redeemed will live forever. . . .*

In these words, there is no reference whatever to angels, or to other worlds or systems. *It is the Earth, and of the Earth only, that the Holy Spirit here speaks.* This is obvious from what follows in the latter part of the eighth Psalm. After saying that all things are by the decree of Jehovah put under the feet of man, the Psalmist immediately adds, by way of explanation, the following specifications: "all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas." *It is to this world as it was, as it is, and especially as it will be hereafter, that both the Psalmist and the Apostle refer.*

("The 8th Psalm," says Milligan, "is prophetic." Prophetic of what — of what era? Is it the Millennium or the new Earth? But can any one believe that Milligan meant to drag "all sheep and oxen" into that new heaven and earth! Yea, the beasts, the fowl; and especially "the fish of the sea," and all the sea monsters — since there is no sea! John expressly says: "I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth are passed away; and the sea is no more. Rev. 21:2).

Further, how could man "regain" (Milligan's constant phrase) a new world that he had never lost? Is that first earth not "passed away" before new heaven and new earth come in? — E.L.J.)

"We see not yet all things put under him." — From this, it is evident that the eighth Psalm is prophetic. The Psalmist looks rather at the decree and purpose of Jehovah touching the final allotment of this world, than to the state of things which actually existed at the time in which he wrote. He means to say, that although man's scepter is now broken, the decree of Jehovah concerning it is not broken. *His purpose is unchangeable. And hence there can be no doubt but that mankind will yet regain their lost dominion over the Earth.* How far this will be accomplished before the Earth shall have been renovated by fire (2 Peter 3), it may be now difficult to say. *When Satan shall be bound for a thousand years (Rev. 20: 1-6), and the saints of the Most High possess the Kingdom (Dan. 7: 14, 18, 22), the prophecy of Isaiah (11:6-9) may be more literally fulfilled than we now anticipate.* But whatever may be true of this blissful era, so long and so often foretold by the Apostles and Prophets, it is not at all probable that man's dominion over the world will be fully restored, until the new heavens and the new Earth appear, in which righteousness will forever dwell (Rev. 21.) [End Milligan.]

*Matthew 12:32 must be intended.—J.

FINAL SUM-UP

There are two pertinent sentences (further on in Milligan's notes on Hebrews 2) that might well have been appended to our February reprint; and in fairness to our brotherly critic, we quote:

"It seems that Abraham and the whole family of the faithful will yet inherit the entire Earth, after that it shall have been purified by fire, and prepared for the descent of the New Jerusalem . . . Into this renovated Earth nothing can ever come that is impure or unholy." We have no doubt that the author is here looking on to the final state. But whatever he may say of man's position in the final Earth (and we agree with what he says) — that can never cancel out what he *also* says concerning man's dominion in the millennial age. On the subject of dominion, he deals with *both periods*, as Harding used to do: the lesser and the greater; the partial fulfillment of the golden age, and the full realization of the final state. He makes a clear distinction (see his closing paragraph above) between the blissful era of "a thousand years" on the one hand, and "the new heavens and new earth" on the other; and he clearly indicates that the "thousand years" come in *before* the earth "shall have been renovated by fire." He calls that thousand-year period the "blissful era so long and so often foretold by the Apostles and Prophets;" and most certainly he teaches that *during that era* of Rev. 20:1-6, "the saints possess the kingdom" (Dan. 7:14, 18, 22), and the prophecy of Isaiah 11:6-9 may be quite literally fulfilled ("the wolf shall dwell with the lamb," etc.). All this comports with his comments on the 8th Psalm. Milligan might well have quoted Campbell's statement —

"The lion and the lamb, the leopard and the kid, once lived on terms of friendship, and they will do so again; a time will come when the lion shall eat straw like the ox." — *Harbinger*, 1833.

Milligan does not know, or cannot say, "*how far* this [man's dominion] will be accomplished before the Earth shall have been renovated by fire;" but he shows that Rev. 20:1-6, Dan. 7:14, 18, 22, and Isaiah 11:6-9 come in, and that these may go very far in the direction of that full and final accomplishment — by being "more literally fulfilled than we now anticipate." Still, he does not expect dominion "fully restored" until the final order.

Finally may we point out that, in expounding Hebrews 2, Milligan's point is not primarily to prove that man would have dominion over the earth *in the millennial age*, nor that he would have dominion *in the final age*; his main purpose is simply to prove, without strict separation of times and eras, *that man will have dominion!* His millennial teaching may be secondary to this purpose, but it is there just the same.

All this is written with kindest feelings, and in real gratitude to Brother Brewer — for his evident fairness in giving his readers the Boll-Lipscomb conversation, and for letting the "Questions and Answers" speak for themselves. But the pioneer testimonies on this living unity issue may not be broken, or lightly brushed aside by saying that they are *all* to take place "in the renovated earth" — if by this is meant the final state.—E.L.J.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 19

Four great and honored names are spread upon these pages in this issue: Harding, Bittle, Rotherham, Sewell; and in that order.

Among disciples of these modern times there has not arisen a greater class teacher and evangelist than the beloved James A. Harding—prince of preachers, co-founder with David Lipscomb of the Nashville Bible School (now David Lipscomb College), founder of Potter Bible College, Bowling Green, Ky., man of faith and action, and editor of *The Way*. In this article, taken from his own paper, he compresses his prophetic teaching into the space of a few brief paragraphs. (The first sermon I ever heard from his burning lips was an earnest, impassioned enlargement of this outline.) Can anyone show wherein Harding's teaching differed materially from that which, by certain heresy hunters, has been stigmatized as “unsound”? Would Harding, too, be cast out now? Or would someone still deny that he was “premillennial”?

J. A. HARDING ON THE “THOUSAND YEARS”

When the saints are caught up to meet him, Christ comes on with them to the earth. Then all the kings of the earth gather their armies together, with the beast and the false prophet, to make war against Christ and his army. The beast and the false prophet are captured and cast into the lake of fire, the first to be consigned to that awful place; then by the sword which proceeds out of his mouth Christ slays all the rest, all the wicked that are on the earth, and all the birds are filled with their flesh. Satan is then caught, chained, and cast into the abyss, which is shut and sealed. In this place he is confined for one thousand years.

During this time, this thousand years, Christ and his saints reign; but the rest of the dead live not again till the thousand years have expired. This, the resurrection of the righteous, is the first resurrection; over those who come up at this resurrection “the second death hath no power; but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years”

From all this it is evident that the last thousand years of Christ's reign will be a period of perfect rest from sin. During this period Satan will be in the abyss, chained, closed up and sealed over; the beast and false prophet will be in the hell of fire; all the rest of the wicked will be dead; and the saints will have received their spiritual bodies, having been delivered “out of the body of this death.”

These facts point clearly to this period of a thousand years as the Sabbath rest that remains for the people of God . . . this glorious thousand years with which time ends, during which all the saints of all ages will reign with Christ in perfect freedom from the guilt and all the evil effects of sin, in perfect freedom from the temptation to sin. That this millennial reign will be on the earth is clearly indicated by the fact that at the beginning of it Christ and His saints are on the earth, and so they are at the end of it. Compare Rev. 19: 11-21 with Rev. 20: 1-10. Read also 1 Cor. 15: 20-28; 1 Thess. 4: 13-18; II Thess. 2: 7-9; Matt. 24: 29-31.—*The Way*, Oct. 15, 1903.

BITTLE ON THE LORD'S RETURN

The fine article which follows is believed to be from the pen of the beloved and lamented Brother L. F. Bittle, one-time co-editor of the *Octographic Review* (now called *American Christian Review*). It is taken from *Apostolic Messenger*, Glasgow, Scotland.—E.L.J.

This is set forth very conspicuously in the New Testament, yet little is said of it by the modern pulpit or the religious press. In most cases there seems to be a timid avoidance of it as a theme distasteful to the majority of hearers and readers. This reticence in regard to a vital question may be accounted for in one or both of two ways.

First, the erroneous calculations, false predictions, and consequent fanaticism of William Miller and his associates over fifty years ago made the doctrine of the Second Advent odious or ridiculous to a large class of people. This feeling respecting it has been perpetuated, if not intensified, by the subsequent division of Mr. Miller's followers into several minor sects, each with its favorite phase of wrong belief, such as annihilation, soul-sleeping and seventh-day sabbatism, and by the offensive dogmatism which these erroneous views have engendered wherever they are proclaimed. The consequence is that if a man advocates the New Testament doctrine of the second coming of Christ, and insists on it as an article of faith, he is likely to be called an "Adventist," and to have all the absurdities of "Adventism" imputed to him. Through fear of this, many, no doubt, have been deterred from speaking or writing on the subject, or even from investigating it, when otherwise they would have frequently taken it up and developed it as a most important part of the gospel.

Secondly, there is, we fear, a large proportion of professing Christians who have no real desire to see the Lord, and who put away the thought of His actual coming in judgment as a disagreeable one, preferring to regard the scriptural predictions concerning it as figures of speech rather than as statements of an awful and impending fact. So long as they are tolerably prosperous, they wish no better heaven than this present world, and would gladly live in it forever. Spiritually they have a name to live, but they are dead. They may be in good standing as church members, but the word sown in their hearts has been choked by the cares of this age or the deceitfulness of riches, so that it brings forth no fruit worth gathering. To all such the arch-angel's voice and the trumpet's sound would be as signals of doom and eternal despair. Indeed, the Christian world is in general like the servant mentioned in Luke 12:45: He said, "My Lord delays his coming," and began to tyrannize over his fellows, and to eat and drink and be drunken.

But genuine lovers of truth and its divine Author will allow neither denominational prejudices nor the vanities of this life to keep him from hearing all that the Holy Spirit has said of the return of Him who is over all, blessed for evermore. With this Spirit dwelling in him, he will desire no delay of Christ's glorious

appearing, but will rather cry with John, "Even so, Lord Jesus, come quickly." No person who has read the New Testament through can doubt that a very prominent place is given to this subject in the teaching of Christ and His disciples, and the full salvation of His people is conditioned by it. Let those, therefore, who love His appearing study the prophecies that refer to it, and by walking in the truth, keep themselves in readiness, lest the day of the Lord come upon them as a thief in the night, and their portion be assigned with the unbeliever.

MORE FROM BROTHER BITTLE

"Evidently this resurrection and transformation (I Cor. 15: 51-52) will not include the first three classes mentioned in the parable of the sower, nor embrace the servant who hid his talent in a napkin. None of these characters will have a part in the glorification which is the first manifestation of Christ's power at his second advent. They must wait till the second resurrection and general judgment. But all Christ's redeemed are caught up into the air to be with him forever. As a reward for their faithfulness, they are made his bride and reign with him upon the throne of his glory. These being taken away from the evil to come, the people (Jews and Gentiles) left alive upon the earth, enter into the great tribulation. . . . In other words His saints, already glorified, will come with him to subjugate and judge the nations."

ROTHERHAM ON "THE KINGDOM OF GOD"

1. God's Kingdom in type; — Israel under David and Solomon.
2. God's Kingdom in prophecy; Psalm 2; 72; Isa. 60.
3. God's Kingdom in mystery.
The mystery of temporary rejection. Matt. 21: 43.
The mystery of obscuring and admixture. Matt. 13.
The mystery of unforeseen delay. Luke 19: 11-27.
4. God's Kingdom in manifestation. Rev. 11: 15.
How manifested —
 1. Christ will appear.
 2. His saints will be revealed.
 3. Opposition will be overturned.
 4. Fulness of the seasons will be accomplished.

PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS

1. We are called upon to receive the word of the Kingdom.
2. To become sons of the Kingdom.
3. To realize its inward power. Rom. 14: 16.
4. To prepare for its manifestation. Luke 19: 11-27.
5. To hasten its approach. 2 Peter 3.

—J. B. Rotherham.

It seems from the foregoing that great and honored men have taught manfully on such subjects as the above, and that acceptable to the church, before some of us were born; for the sermon-outline

reproduced above is taken from the *Polymathist* a book of suggestive sermon-outlines, designed principally for the benefit of and dedicated to, "all young ministers who are faithfully endeavoring to preach Christ and him crucified," by the compiler, N. E. Cory, April, 1876. It is a standard work, and enjoys until yet a wide circulation. Great names grace the list of contributors, and it seems the sturdy student who contributed this outline on the Kingdom of God, was not afraid of being called before any Sanhedrin on heresy charges, or being stigmatized as a teacher of speculative and divisive doctrines; nor was the compiler, nor the publisher of the *Polymathist*, afraid of leading young ministers astray by giving them such an outline to work with. And it could hardly have been denounced as a "revamp of Russellism," for Russell had not been heard from in that day. Having by accident seen this sermon-outline on page 256 of the *Polymathist*, I was gratified to see what I consider the plain scripture-teaching on the kingdom which has been so bitterly denounced, there set forth. Strange how things work around in the course of time! (Reprint from the *Word and Work*, 1918, page 361.)

E. G. SEWELL ON THE "THOUSAND YEARS"

Brother S. R. Logue, honored minister of the gospel, and student of Brother Lipscomb and Brother Harding, published the following a few years ago, over his signature. We do not have the *Advocate* of 1900, but have no reason to doubt Brother Logue's accuracy:

"Brother J. A. Harding taught that when Christ returns again he will reign in Jerusalem for a literal 1,000 years. For years I heard him teach this doctrine in the classroom and from the pulpit.

"Brother E. G. Sewell, who was co-editor with Brother Lipscomb for half a century, taught as follows on the 1,000 years' reign:

"'But there will be such a reign, and it will be glorious to them that shall be in it; and it is perfectly certain that none but the righteous will be in it. Whatever is in store for the righteous will be theirs when the time comes, whether they understand it all beforehand or not. It is also clear that this 1,000 years' reign will be before the final end of this world and before the wicked will cease to live on the earth, for there is to be an awful destruction of the wicked after the time indicated for the 1,000 years' reign. Hence, it is utterly vain to try to locate this reign, either as to time or place. It is enough for us to believe the truth of it. After the 1,000 years' reign and of the bound state of Satan, he is to be loosed for a little time, and is to go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth. So there will be nations or people all over the earth when the 1,000 years have expired.' (E. G. Sewell, in *Gospel Advocate*, April 12, 1900.) Thus Brother Sewell expressed his views of the millennium."

Additional copies of this pamphlet free for the asking. Address, The Word and Work, Publishers, 1046 Dudley Ave., Louisville 4, Ky.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 20* — First Reprint of 1947

Here with the first issue of 1947, we begin the reprint of Mc Garvey's articles on the Jews. The series was written for the **Christian Standard** during the best and ripest years of the great scholar's life. — E. L. J.

WHY ARE THE JEWS YET WITH US?

J. W. McGarvey

About three years ago Mark Twain contributed to *Harper's Monthly* a very striking article on the modern persecution of the Jews, ending with the question, "Why are the Jews yet with us?" This question he was not prepared to answer; and no man can answer it except in the light of the Scriptures.

The question was suggested by the fact which the writer mentioned, that all of the nations with which the ancient Jews had dealings, have perished long ago, while they, though the feeblest of them all, have still survived. They have not only survived, but they are as numerous as in their best days. They possess more wealth than ever before; for there are now single families of Jews who in thirty days could command more gold than Solomon brought from the mines of Ophir. They are the bankers of the Old World, and the kings are their debtors. In the New World immense blocks of wholesale houses are in their hands, in New York, in Chicago, San Francisco, and other great cities. A few of them control the live stock trade between Europe and America, deriving therefrom an immense revenue. There is no telling to what an extent their financial and commercial power may predominate in a future not far distant.

They are here, also, with social and political power greater than they exercised in their earliest history. It is currently stated that in Europe the number of eminent physicians and lawyers who are Jews is so disproportionately great as to excite much jealousy against them. Many of the leading newspapers are edited by Jews; and, although they are barred from office, they exert indirectly a large influence over public affairs. We all remember that, during a large part of the reign of Queen Victoria, a Jew was Prime Minister of Great Britain, wielding the greatest political power on earth—a power compared with which that of David or that of Solomon was insignificant, while that of Daniel, under Darius, or of Mordecai, under Ahasuerus, was greatly inferior. D'Israeli was the first Jew ever admitted to the British Parliament, and it is related that soon after his appearance on the floor of the lower house, an opponent in debate sneered at him for being a Jew. He replied: "The honorable member sneers at me because I am a Jew. I freely admit that I am a son of Abraham. My forefathers worshipped the true God in

*Two pamphlets containing the 19 preceding articles, published in 1945, '46, may be obtained in any quantity free for the asking. See note on page 132.

a gorgeous temple when the forefathers of the honorable gentleman were naked savages, roaming the forests." At another time he rose to speak, but was jeered and hissed so that he could not be heard. As he took his seat, he shouted, "The time will come when you will be glad to hear me"; and it did come, for he became the Earl of Beaconsfield, and next to the Queen, the ruler of the realm. The proudest men in the kingdom sought his favor.

The question, "Why are the Jews with us?" would have less significance if it could be answered that they were the most powerful of the ancient nations, and they survived by the subjugation of their foes. But everybody knows that they were numerically among the weakest of the nations, and that their territory was among the smallest. Not only so, but they were oppressed by other nations as no other people have ever been. For four hundred years they were under the dominion of the Egyptian, who attempted to check their increase by casting their male children into the river. But the Egyptians are gone, and the Jews are yet with us. Ten of their tribes were carried captive by the Assyrians and scattered among remote cities of Mesopotamia and Media, where, for long centuries, they were exposed to all the influences by which a scattered people lose their identity; but the Assyrians are gone, and the Jews are yet with us. Later the other two tribes were led as prisoners of war into the province of Babylon, and scattered throughout the dominion of the Chaldeans; but a remnant of them were restored to their native land on the downfall of the Chaldean Empire; and, although both they and their kindred who were not thus restored, were for ages oppressed by the Medes, Persians, and Greeks; the Medes, the Persians, and the ancient Greeks are all gone, while the Jews are yet with us.

Our question acquires its greatest emphasis when we consider the further fact that twice in their early history attempts were made by powerful kings to exterminate them, and that the most powerful empire of antiquity struck such a blow at their nationality that they have been for two thousand years without a country of their own. When the well-known decree was issued by Ahasuerus, at the instigation of the infamous Haman, fixing the thirteenth day of the twelfth month of the current year as the day on which every Jew, male and female, old and young, must be slain, all the Jews then living were within his realm, and but for the marvelous interposition of Providence, the story of which it is the part of the Book of Esther to tell, the race would have been exterminated that day. At a later period Antiochus Epiphanes, Greek king of Syria, undertook to abolish the religion of the Jews. He erected an image of Jupiter in the temple at Jerusalem, and offered swine's flesh on the altar in front of it. He made it unlawful, under penalty of death, for a Jew to circumcise his children. He established a garrison of twenty thousand soldiers in the castle adjoining the temple, and sent out detachments of these with officers and images into the towns and villages of Judea, and required the assembled populace

to offer incense to Jupiter. When one of these reached the village of Modin, where lived a venerable priest, named Mattathias with his family of six stalwart sons, the officer called on him as the oldest and most respected citizen, to set his townsmen an example of being the first to offer the incense, and thus to save the lives of others who might refuse. He answered: "If all the nations that are in the house of the king's dominion hearken unto him to fall away each one from the worship of his fathers, yet will I and my sons and my brethren walk in the covenant of our fathers. Heaven forbid that we should forsake the law and the ordinances. We will not hearken to the king's words, to go aside from our religion, on the right hand, or on the left." (1 Mac. 2:19-22.) A cowardly Jew, uninfluenced by the noble words, then stepped forward to offer the incense, when the soul of Mattathias was so stirred that he drew his sword and rushed upon him and cut him down. His five sons followed. They slew the officer in command, tore down the altar, destroyed the image of Jupiter, and then fled to the rocks and caves of the wilderness. Thus was begun a war for religious freedom which has no superior in the annals of the world for deeds of daring and for the repeated defeat of great armies by a handful of heroes. As the conflict deepened, Antiochus, not content with the destruction of the Jewish religion, resolved upon the extermination of the whole people; and sent army after army supposed sufficient for the purpose, only to have them routed and scattered like chaff before the wind. His boastful title, "Antiochus Epiphanes" (the i. lustrous), was changed into "Antiochus Epimenes" (the mad-man). He and his people have passed away, but the Jews are yet with us. . . .

Moses predicted the condition in which thousands of them have languished during the period of their present dispersion:

"Jehovah shall scatter thee among all peoples, from the one end of the earth even to the other end of the earth; and there shalt thou serve other gods which thou hast not known, thou nor thy fathers, even wood and stone. And among these nations thou shalt find no ease, and there shall be no rest for the sole of thy foot: but Jehovah shall give thee a trembling heart, and failing eyes, and pining of soul; and thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear night and day, and shalt have none assurance of thy life: in the morning thou shalt say, Would God it were even! and at even thou shalt say, would it were morning! for the fear of thy heart which thou shalt fear, and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see." (Deut. 28:64-67.)

These facts and considerations do not inform us as to the why of Israel's preservation, but they do most unmistakably show that this preservation is one of the marvels of God's providence over the nations. If we could live to see the end of it all, we might be able by the light of the final outcome to determine what was God's design from the beginning; but as this is impossible, we must have recourse to the prophetic word of God, which often declares the end from the beginning. This we will endeavor to do for some weeks to come.—(*Christian Standard*, 1903, p. 588.)

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 21

WHY ARE THE JEWS YET WITH US?—II.

J. W. McGarvey

Abraham was a childless man at seventy-five, with a barren wife of sixty-five, when God called him away from his kindred, and native land and said to him: "I will make of thee a great nation; and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and be thou a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee, and him that curseth thee I will curse; and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed" (Gen. 12:1-3). This is the most remarkable promise ever addressed to a mortal man. It bears within itself unmistakable proof of its divine origin; for the specifications are such as no human being could ever have conceived with respect to another. The modern rationalistic conceit that it originated with the hypothetical "J" of the eighth century before Christ, or that he found it floating around among the oral traditions of his tribes, is proof only that he who thinks so is incapable of appreciating it. It accounts for the great race that has sprung from the loins of Abraham, for the divine curse which has visited and destroyed all the mighty nations of antiquity that cursed Israel; and for the fact that the richest spiritual blessings which have ever descended upon the families of the earth have all been received through the seed of Abraham. All the prophets, all the apostles, Christ himself, and the most noted heroes of the early faith, whether male or female, were the seed of Abraham, and the Bible has come to us through their instrumentality. Well might Paul exclaim with national exultation,

"My kinsmen according to the flesh, who are Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as respects the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever" (Rom. 9:1-5).

Having given Abraham this wondrous revelation, God led him into the land of Canaan, into which many strong tribes had already migrated, and had taken up the best parts of it, and he said to him, "Unto thy seed will I give this land." This promise was repeated some years later while Abraham was suffering from a horrible nightmare, but with the additional provision that his offspring should be strangers in a land not their own, but should serve another people four hundred years, after which he would bring them out and they should possess this land, and should hold it as an everlasting possession. Never before or since has such a deed to real estate been made in which possession was not guaranteed until the lapse of four hundred years. We vainly close our deeds with the words, "To have and to hold unto the party of the second part, his heirs and assigns forever;" but no man knows that even in

four hundred years a single heir of his body shall be alive.

Many centuries later, after Israel had become a great nation, and had long possessed the land promised to their fathers, Jehovah agreed that on account of their accumulated sins they should be banished and scattered among all the nations of the earth; but by the mouth of the same prophet who pronounced this doom, he said:

"Fear thou not, O Jacob my servant; neither be dismayed, O Israel: for lo, I will save thee from afar, and thy seed from the land of their captivity; and Jacob shall return, and shall be quiet and at ease, and none shall make him afraid. For I am with thee, saith Jehovah, to save thee: for I will make a full end of all the nations whither I have scattered thee, but I will not make a full end of thee; but I will correct thee with judgment, and will in no wise leave thee unpunished" (Jer. 30:10, 11).

The same promise by the mouth of the same prophet, is repeated with tremendous emphasis in the following lines:

"Thus saith Jehovah, who giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and the stars for a light by night, who stirreth up the sea, and the waves thereof roar; Jehovah of hosts is his name: if these ordinances depart from before me, saith Jehovah, then the seed of Israel shall also cease from being a nation before me forever" (31:35, 36).

These utterances were and are a guarantee that so long as the sun and moon, the stars, and the sea endure, no matter what be the fate of other nations, "the Jews shall yet be with us." Let it be observed, also, that these pledges of Jehovah are made not in favor of Judah alone, whose captivity was yet in the near future when Jeremiah prophesied, but also of Israel, who had already been carried away by the Assyrians, and of "Jacob," which term included all the twelve tribes.

But Israel is not destined to merely exist till the end of time. They are to be gathered together in the land God gave them as an everlasting possession. Hear Jeremiah again:

"Behold the days come, saith Jehovah, that it shall no more be said, as Jehovah liveth, who brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but, as Jehovah liveth, who brought up the children of Israel out of the land of the north, and from all the countries whither he had driven them: and I will bring them again into the land which I gave unto their fathers. Behold, I will send for many fishers, saith Jehovah, and they shall fish them; and afterwards I will send for many hunters, and they shall hunt them from every mountain, and from every hill, and out of the holes of the rocks."

This has never yet been done; for the small remnant who returned under the decree of Cyrus and Artaxerxes were but a handful of the generation then living, and there has been no general migration of Israel back to Canaan.

Isaiah, in terms and style of his own, makes the same prediction. He has been speaking of the shoot that should come out of the

stock of Jesse, and the branch out of his roots (11:1-10), one of the clearest of all the predictions respecting the Messiah, and he adds:

"And it shall come to pass in that day, that Jehovah shall set his hand a second time to recover the remnant of his people which shall remain, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. And he shall set an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth. The envy of Ephraim also shall depart, and they that vex Judah shall be cut off. Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim" (vs. 11-13). . . .

As this matter of the final restoration of the twelve tribes to their own land is not understood by many, and is grossly misunderstood by some, I think it proper to prolong this part of my argument by adding some unambiguous passages from other prophets. Amos, the earliest of the writing prophets, closes the dark picture which he draws of Israel's future with exulting words. He fixes the time of the events which he is about to predict by saying:

"In that day I will raise up of the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old, that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and all the nations that were called by my name, saith Jehovah that doeth this" (9:11, 12).

This refers undoubtedly, to the reign of Christ, in which the throne of David is restored. Then follows as belonging to the same period:

"Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that the plowman shall overtake the reaper [the harvest being so great that the reaper cannot cut it down before the plowing for the next crop must set in]; and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed [that is, the grape harvest will be so enormous that fall sowing shall set in before the grapes are all pressed]; and the mountains shall drop sweet wine, and the hills shall melt. And I will bring again the captivity of my people Israel, and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof; they shall also make gardens, and eat the fruit of them. And I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be plucked up out of their land which I have given them, saith Jehovah thy God" (13-15).

All this is yet in the future, and it is to occur under the reign of the risen and glorified Son of David.

Again, in Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones, in which Israel in exile is represented by the bones, but the bones are made to take flesh and to rise up a great army, the scene closes with the utterance of the following unambiguous oracle: (McGarvey then quotes Ezek. 37:21-28, which see).

—*Christian Standard*, 1903, p. 660.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 22

WHY ARE THE JEWS YET WITH US?—III

J. W. McGarvey

I have given three controlling and all-sufficient reasons why the Jewish race has been so marvelously preserved:

1. Because of the promise which God made to their father Abraham, that he would make of them a great nation, and bless those that bless them and curse those that cursed them;

2. Because God promised through Jeremiah the prophet, that “though I will make a full end of all the nations whither I have driven thee; yet will I not make a full end of thee.”

3. Because he promised Israel, before their exile and after it, that he would yet gather them together into their own land, and plant them in it so that they should never again be rooted out of it.

Having made these promises, God's word was pledged to all that we have thus far seen in the preservation of this wonderful people. In all these promises, except the last, which is not yet realized, there is an unmistakable demonstration of the predictive power of the prophets of Israel. No man can look these facts squarely in the face and deny that there was a miraculous foresight imparted to the men who predicted them. It is time, therefore, that the skeptical and half skeptical critics who deny the reality of predictive prophecy should lay their hands upon their mouths, and walk back and sit down. Furthermore, the fulfillment of the predictions of these prophets which have already been realized, make it absolutely certain that those predictions whose time for fulfillment has not yet arrived, will as certainly be fulfilled as time rolls on. It may appear to many an incredible thing that the land given to Abraham and his seed as an everlasting possession shall yet be restored to its real owners, who have been deprived of it for two thousand years, and are now scattered throughout all the civilized, and many uncivilized, nations of the earth. But God's hand is not shortened, and when he shall have sent out the many fishers to fish for them, and many hunters to hunt for them, of whom he speaks through Jeremiah, the world will know something about the methods by which his grand purpose concerning them is to be accomplished. It would be most unreasonable, in view of what he has done, to doubt the fulfillment of that which he has promised to do, or to be puzzled as to the means by which he shall accomplish it.

But Israel is not to be restored again to her own land as an unbelieving people. She is not to come back to Jerusalem to rebuild the temple, and renew the sacrifices which cannot take away sin. Not a syllable is uttered in all these predictions respecting anything of that kind, but it is said alike by Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, that Israel and Judah are to live again in their own land under the

reign of David their king, and as David had long been dead before either of these prophets spoke, this cannot mean David in person. Moreover, no son of David has reigned in Jerusalem since the fall of that city under Nebuchadnezzar. But Christ, the Son of David, when he ascended on high, sat down on David's throne, and he is undoubtedly the David whom God promised to raise up to reign over his people. Consequently the three prophets whom I have just cited, in predicting the restoration of Israel to their native land, contemplate them as being in subjection to David in the person of David's greater Son, and, therefore, as believers in Christ.

We should have to go no further, then, than the Old Testament prophets to know that restored Israel will be Christian Israel. But the same fact is plainly predicted by Christ and by the apostle Paul. Christ, in his lamentation over Jerusalem, said, "Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." (Matt. 23:39). But no unbelieving city could welcome the return of Christ in these words. It is implied that when Christ comes again, Jerusalem will say, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of Jehovah," and this necessarily implies that it will be occupied by a believing or a Christian population. Again, in predicting the fall of Jerusalem, Jesus said, "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled" (Luke 21:24). This latter clause implies that the time for the Gentiles to tread Jerusalem under foot will come to an end, after which it will be no longer trodden under foot; that is, oppressed by a foreign foe. After that, it must be a Jewish city and a free city. These two predictions of our Savior, although not as specific on the main point as those of the Old Testament prophets, are, by implication, equally unambiguous.

The apostle says:

"For I would not, brethren, have you ignorant of this mystery, lest ye be wise in your own conceits, that a hardening in part hath befallen Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and so all Israel shall be saved: even as it is written,

"There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer;
He shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob:
And this is my covenant unto them,
When I take away their sins." (Rom. 11:25-27.)

Here Paul reveals to his readers a secret, and that secret is that when the fulness of the Gentiles shall be come in, all Israel shall be saved. By the coming of the fulness of the Gentiles, he doubtless means the entrance of the great mass of the Gentile nations into the church, and this is to be followed by the salvation of all Israel — of course, not all Israel of preceding ages, but all Israel of that and subsequent ages. These declarations of Christ and the inspired apostles are sufficient to establish the conviction in all believing minds that Israel will yet be a Christian people.

It is probable that this final consummation appears less cred-

ible to the most of men than the restoration of the twelve tribes to their own land, and much questioning may be raised as to the practicability of bringing it about; but if we had lived in a past age, when the whole of Europe was sunk in the darkness of heathenism, and some prophet had dared to predict the final Christianization of all those nations, as many doubts could have been raised as to the practicability of it as can now be raised concerning the conversion of Israel. It is a work for God to accomplish, and his ways are all past finding out until the deed is done.

When Israel shall have been restored to the land of promise, and the people shall all become believers in their own Messiah and all the nations of the earth shall have been blessed through the seed of Abraham, they will be the most grateful and happy people on the face of the globe. An intelligent Hebrew, well informed as to the history of his own ancestors running back in an unbroken line to the first man, shall be able to say that the career of his own people is like one mountain ridge running back unbroken to the beginning of time, while that of other nations shall appear but the side ridges and foot-hills that characterize the vicissitudes of human life. This period may be in the far distant future, for all we know, though movements now on foot among the Jews, such as the recent Zion movement, whose aim is to bring about the re-occupation of the Promised Land, may mean in the hands of God to bring about the final result much sooner than the world can believe. And when this final consummation shall be realized, the world will see in it, as in all the preceding epochs of Hebrew History, a continual demonstration of the overruling power of Jehovah, and of the unerring foresight of his ancient prophets. And if, at that time, there shall be left in the world any of the people now called Germans, French, British, Americans, the question may no longer be, Why are the Jews yet with us? but, Why are we yet with the Jews?—*Christian Standard*, 1903 (p. 696).

The new covenant promised through Jeremiah is spoken of in the eighth chapter of Hebrews as being already in force when that Epistle was written. It was a covenant with Israel and Judah made effective on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. It is not said either in Jeremiah or in Hebrews that the Gentiles would receive the benefits of this covenant, but we learn from other Scriptures that they were received into the same covenant relation with God, beginning in the house of Cornelius. It is a covenant, then, with Israel and Judah, and at the same time a covenant with the Gentile world. It is true that only a part of either Israel or Judah, or of the Gentiles have thus far embraced the blessings of that covenant, but the closing words of it indicate, I think, that all Israel and all Judah will accept them, for it is said:

“And they shall not teach every man his fellow-citizen,
And every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord;
For all shall know me,
From the least to the greatest of them.
For I will be merciful to their iniquities,
And their sins will I remember no more.”

(Heb. 8:11, 12.)

Now, it is possible that these universal expressions include only those who are in the covenant, but I think that the more natural interpretation is that they include all Israel, and imply that at the consummation of the covenant, all Israel shall know the Lord, and that He will be merciful to their iniquities and remember their sins no more.

I think it is true, that if Palestine were today opened to the Jews of America, very few of them would choose to go thither, for here they are a comparatively rich and prosperous people, with all the rights and privileges accorded to other citizens, and on the first opening of Palestine to them there will be no pecuniary inducements to draw them thither. When Palestine was opened to the Jews of the whole world by Cyrus, only about fifty thousand of them seized the opportunity of returning in the caravan of Zerubbabel, and only about fourteen hundred afterwards under the leadership of Ezra. This was doubtless because Palestine was then a desolate region, as it is now, offering very few inducements for a return to it except the love of country and the love of God. Consequently, the vast majority of the Jews who had long been settled in heathen lands, who had been greatly favored by the Babylonian and Persian emperors, were content to remain where they were. But this is not the case with the great majority of Jews under the tyrannical governments of Europe at the present time. Their souls leap at the thought of freedom in their native land; and when once the resources of that country, which are marvelous in the extreme, should begin to be developed, pecuniary interests of the most alluring kind would draw Jews from every section of the world. That country lacks nothing now of being equal in natural resources to our own boastful California, with the single exception of fuel. But petroleum has now become the fuel of treeless lands, and I see by an article from a recent explorer of the eastern shore of the Dead Sea, that, as he passed along, the water on that side was covered with oil. This is proof that deposits of petroleum exist there, and as sure as they exist they will yet be developed, and probably be developed in such quantities as to supply all the fuel that may be needed for domestic and mechanical purposes. The hand of the Lord is not shortened that he should fail of the fulfillment of His purposes in any particular. (*Christian Standard*, 1903, p. 796.)

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 23

VOICE OF THE CHURCH

Before me lies a book, now nearly a hundred years old, entitled, “The Voice of The Church”. It is by D. T. Taylor, with Introduction by H. L. Hastings. It contains unanswerable evidence that, with few exceptions (almost none until Whitby’s day), the bright particular stars of Christian history have been strictly “premillennial”; that is, they looked for the golden age of prophecy, but not before the Second Coming. Whether Ante-Nicene or Post-Nicene fathers; whether “Reformation” or “Restoration” teachers; the shining lights of Christian leadership have looked beyond the Lord’s return for those millennial glories that are to follow. From this remarkable book, now rare and almost unobtainable, we shall quote certain portions in the months that are to come.

For the present issue, we offer the book’s gripping “Introduction,” written by H. L. Hastings, whose name was once — during his lifetime and long thereafter — almost a household word among religious people. — E. L. J.

HASTINGS’ INTRODUCTION

This work will fill a void in literature that many have been conscious of. It has often been *stated* that the present popular doctrine of the conversion of the world was of recent origin, but here it is *proved*, and proved beyond the possibility of successful contradiction. This is the Voice of the Church; not the voice of the Author or Editor, not the voice of a few obscure and despised Millenarians — not the voice of unwise and over-excited fanatics, but “*the Voice of the CHURCH*,” — the church for many centuries. It is not the voice of an age or a generation only, but it is the voice of those who caught the words of inspiration from apostolic lips, and of those who have followed in their footsteps, running with patience the race that was set before them, and saying, one by one, as their course was finished, “I have kept the faith.”

The writer feels that no apology is due to the church at this time for breaking in upon her easy slumbers with this volume. The *voice* may be strange, but it is the voice of the *church*. The voice may be stern and rugged, but it is the voice of the *church*. The voice may seem like the voice of those that mock, but it is the voice of the *church*. Men may be displeased with this strange voice, men that quote the fathers, and call themselves the followers of Luther or Calvin, may wave the hand and say, “begone,” but still the church claims a hearing. She must be heard, and in this volume the church of martyrs and saints, the light of the world for seventeen hundred years utters its solemn protest against the modern doctrine of the world’s conversion, the modern cry of peace and safety. We need not argue or expatiate upon this fact. The pages of this book contain the voice of the church of the first born, whose names are written in heaven. Were they all

mistaken for seventeen hundred years? Was it reserved for Daniel Whitby to correct the faith of those who listened to apostolic teachings, and who followed in their teachers' footsteps? Has that which was an unknown doctrine or a condemned heresy in the true church for seventeen hundred years come at last to be the true faith of the gospel? And shall we, the successors of those who have steeled themselves against earth's flatteries and earth's frowns for eighteen hundred years, with the solemn watch-word, "the coming of the Lord draweth nigh," now fold our arms in lazy lock and say in our hearts or with our lips, the Lord delayeth his coming? How are we certain that the judgment is hundreds of years distant from us, when for ages past the church has considered it near to *them*? Have we a new revelation? Has God sent forth men to declare that all things do and will "continue as they were" for ages yet to come? Has he not rather proclaimed that the hour of his judgment is at hand? Has he not said, behold I come as a thief, and that too, in connection with events that are now passing before our eyes? And has he not said, blessed is he that watcheth? Shall we then cease to watch? If the early disciples were bidden to watch because they knew neither the day nor the hour of the coming of the Son of man, have we learned that that day and hour are so far distant that we may be excused from the watchers' anxiety?

And what are the present prospects of a church that has set out in all confidence to convert the world? How may those now putting on the harness boast of greater expected success than is warranted by the experience of those who have put it off after having fought the good fight? The prophets could not convert the world; are *we* mightier than they? The Apostles could not convert the world; are *we* stronger than *they*? The Church for eighteen hundred years could not convert the world, can *we* do it? They have preached the gospel of Christ, so can we. They have gone to earth's remotest bounds, so can we. They have saved "some," so can we. They have finished their course with joy, and the ministry they have received to testify of the gospel of the grace of God; we can do the same. Can we reasonably hope to do more? "It would take to all eternity to bring the Millennium at the rate that modern revivals progress," said the venerable Dr. Lyman Beecher, before a ministerial convention, held close by old Plymouth Rock. And what hope is there that they will progress more rapidly? Is it in the word of God? Glad would we be to find it there. Sadly we read that "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived."

Has God a mightier Saviour — a more powerful spirit? Has he another Gospel which will save the world? Where is it? Is there any way to the kingdom other than that which leads through much tribulation? Is there another way to the crown besides the way of crosses? Can we reign with him unless we first suffer in his cause?

No doubt the world might be converted if they desired to know the Lord. And so, had all who heard received with gladness the word of God, the world might have been converted within twenty years of

the day of pentecost. If each Christian had brought one single soul to God with each successive year, the calm splendors of the Millennial era might have shone upon the declining years of the Apostles of Jesus Christ. But instead of this, ages of darkness came on. The world did not repent, but the church apostatized. If the gospel were to convert the world, we should have seen tokens of it ere this. But where are such omens to be found? Shall we look at Judson, who labored ten long years before one sinner yielded to the claims of the gospel? Shall we look to the dense darkness of the heathen world? Shall we look at the formalism of the professed church? Shall we look at the wide extension of infidelity? Shall we look at the abounding of iniquity and the waxing cold of love? Shall we look at a world where eighteen hundred years of toil and tears has not brought one-twentieth part of mankind even to a profession of true Christianity; and where not more than one-fifth claim for themselves the dubious title of Christian nations? Shall we look over a world in which we can not find one nation of Christians, nor one tribe of Christians, nor one city of Christians, nor one town of Christians, nor one village of Christians, nor one hamlet of Christians, save here and there where a questionable faith has led a few, with hypocrites even then in their midst, to withdraw themselves from the world and cherish the untried virtues of secluded life? Surely, after eighteen hundred years of experiment with that system which was to convert the world, men might point to some country, to some province, to some nation, and say, behold the commencement of a converted world.

But will not the gospel then prove a failure? That depends upon what is to be expected of it. If the gospel was to effect the eternal salvation of all mankind, then failing to accomplish that work is a failure of the gospel. If the gospel was to convert the world, then if it is not done it will prove a failure. But if the gospel was preached "*to take out of the Gentiles a people for His name,*" then it is not a failure. If it was given that God might in infinite mercy and love "*save some,*" then it is not a failure. If it was given that every repentant sinner might have eternal life, and that every good soldier might receive a crown of glory, then it is not a failure. If it was given that an innumerable company might be redeemed *out of every nation and kindred and tongue under heaven*, then it is not a failure. If it was given that the vales and hills of paradise restored might teem with a holy throng who shall be "*equal to the angels, and be the children of God, being the children of the resurrection,*" then it is not a failure. If it was given that the elect might be brought into one great family of holy ones, then it is not a failure. And was not this its object, rather than the exaltation of a worldly church to the splendors of earthly prosperity, while beneath the theatre of her easy triumph there slumbers the ashes of prophets and the dust of the apostles? Are they to hold jubilee a thousand years, while the martyrs' unceasing cry, "*how long, oh Lord,*" goes up to God? Are they to have their songs of triumph, while the whole creation groaneth for deliverance, and while that longed-

for day of the redemption of our body is postponed? Nay, verily, the hope of the one body is one hope. The hope of the church stops not at death, it sweeps beyond earth's scenes of tempest and of storm, and reposes in the calm beamings of that sun of righteousness which shall glow above the bosom of paradise regained.

Thus teaches the word of the Lord. Thus responds the universal church. There are, I know, with regard to the details, differences of opinion. But this only strengthens the argument. It shows that the churches were not led by blind reverence for the traditions of their fathers. But on the leading features they all agree. Wide apart as the poles in their theological opinions, they all agree in one point, that the coming of Jesus and the scenes of judgment must precede the rest of the church of God. They all agree that the church shall never reign till she reign complete in the presence of her Lord. They all agree that earth is not her rest until renewed by the power of God. And they agree that the world will not be converted, but that the Judge of quick and dead must come upon a race not ready for the harvest of glory, but ripe for the sickle of wrath. And is not this the voice of the prophets and apostles? If we read that God will comfort all that mourn in Zion, is it not at "the day of vengeance of our God?" If Christ is to have the heathen for his inheritance, will he not "break them with a rod of iron and dash them in pieces as a potter's vessel?" If the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ, is it not when "nations are angry and God's wrath is come." If the new covenant be made with men, is it not beyond preaching and teaching, when they shall not any more *teach* his neighbor or his brother, know ye the Lord, for all shall know him from the *least* even unto the greatest? If Jerusalem is to be comforted by the blessing of God, will he not make her an *eternal* excellency? If God create new heavens and a new earth, shall not God's saints "be glad and rejoice *forever* in that which he creates?" If the "righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their father," will not the tares be first gathered in bundles and cast into "the furnace of fire?" So of the whole Scripture. The old earth must be dissolved ere the new one can appear — Satan must be dethroned ere Christ can reign, and death must be swallowed up in victory ere the saints can sing the victor's song.

Towards those scenes we hasten. The coming of the Lord draweth nigh. The rest is before us, and the toil is very brief. But alas for the world. Woe to an earth that will not repent. The Deluge and the Dead Sea tell us what God has done. The Scriptures tell us what he will do. The Sword shall not always sleep in the scabbard — even now it is about to be unsheathed. Watchman, set the trumpet to thy lips! Sound in the ears of the world the dread alarm — "*But if the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; if the sword come and take away any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood WILL I WILL REQUIRE IT AT THE WATCHMAN'S HANDS!*"

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 24

The following statements concerning the famous "church fathers," and quotations from them on the subject of the Reign of Christ are taken from D. T. Taylor's book, "The Voice of the Church." H. L. Hastings' Introduction to this great historical work was published last month.

THE EARLY CHURCH, FROM HERMAS TO ORIGEN

The early church was eminently pre-millennial in her cherished expectations of the Lord's advent. His coming and kingdom was her constant hope, and she deemed it, says Massillon, "one step in apostasy not to sigh after his return." And this faith and hope, with her, was practical: even Gibbon admitting it to be "an opinion which may deserve respect, from its usefulness and antiquity." With her, too, Millenarianism was connected with all that is orthodox. On this point Mosheim is somewhat unfair. He places Chiliasm among the heresies of Cerinthus, in the first century, and yet affirms it had "met with no opposition till the third." The infidel saw and rebuked this unfairness. Says Gibbon, this "learned divine is not altogether candid on this occasion."

We have introduced Hermas into this catalogue, who, while he may be apocryphal, is still antique. Like Paul, he writes of a "world to come." Clement, too, advocates a future kingdom at the Redeemer's advent. Of Barnabas, we observe in the language of Professor Bush: "the genuineness of this epistle is disputed, but as far as the present argument is concerned, it is immaterial who the real author was. There is sufficient testimony that it is the production of a very early period of the Christian church." Ignatius says nothing of the millennium. His hope lay in the better resurrection. So also Polycarp, who was a strenuous advocate of the personal advent of Christ. Papias' testimony is both interesting and credible. Of Justin Martyr, the following testimony is borne by Semisch: "Justin dwells with deep emotion on this hope. It was in his esteem a sacred fire, at which he kindled afresh his Christian faith and practice. That this hope in its pure millenarian character and extent might possibly be vain, never entered his thoughts. He believed that it was supported by scripture. He expressly appealed to the New Testament Apocalypse, and such passages in the Old Testament as Isaiah 65:17, in evidence of the personal reign of Christ in Jerusalem. From the Apocalypse, and Isaiah 65:22, in connection with Genesis 2:17; 5:5, and Psalm 90:4, he deduced the millennial period. How could he doubt it?"

And Irenaeus — how explicit and weighty his testimony. In the language of Edward Winthrop, we ask, "Is it credible that that excellent and pious father, with the advantage of being instructed by Polycarp, who was himself instructed by St. John, did not know what the beloved disciple held, as to the fact, whether the second coming of Christ would usher in the millennium, or be delayed to its close? We think not." Still, it is said by Post-millennialists, that the Hebrew

church believed the same, and that the early Christians drew their Chiliasm from this source. "It is, therefore," writes Bishop Russell, "a Rabbinic fable." "No mistake," replies David N. Lord, "could be greater. Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Lactantius expressly found their doctrines of the millennium on the twentieth chapter of the Apocalypse, and the prophecies of Isaiah 65, Zech. 14, and other passages of the Old Testament, that are alleged by millenarians as foreshowing the reign of Christ and the saints on the earth. Not a hint is uttered by them that they were led to their belief in that reign by Jewish interpretations, or traditions; or that they drew their notions of it in any manner from the opinions that were entertained by the Jews of the reign of the Messiah." Such are the men to whose authority and writings we are about to refer. The opponents of premillennialism cannot quote them without being condemned. "Jerome never mentions Justin Martyr," says Mede, "being afraid of the antiquity and authority of the man." In the midst of these early Christians we love to linger, while as yet the dark cloud of apostasy had not come over the path of the church.

CLEMENT, A. D. 96.

The third Bishop of Rome, and "fellow laborer" of Paul, whose name is "in the book of Life." Phil. 4:3. Says Eusebius, "Of this Clement there is one epistle extant, acknowledged as genuine, of considerable length, and of great merit. This we know to have been read for common benefit, in most of the churches, both in former times, and in our own."*

Nor does he deny the genuineness and authenticity of the second Epistle, though he does not speak of it so approvingly.

Clement wrote about A. D. 95. In his first Epistle, he says, "Let us be followers of those who went about in goat skins and sheep skins, preaching the coming of Christ. Such were the Prophets." Again, alluding to some who scoff at the apparent delay of the advent, he says: "You see how in a little while the fruit of the trees comes to maturity. Of a truth, yet a little while and His will shall be accomplished suddenly, the Holy Scripture itself bearing witness that He shall quickly come and not tarry; and the Lord shall suddenly come to his temple, even the Holy One whom ye look for." In his second Epistle he says, "If therefore we shall do what is just in the sight of God, we shall enter into his kingdom, and shall receive the promises, which neither eye hath seen, nor ear heard, nor have entered into the heart of man. Wherefore let us every hour expect the kingdom of God in love and righteousness, because we know not the day of God's appearing." He uses the phoenix to demonstrate the possibility of the resurrection. †

Dr. Duffield says, "there is not in Clement's writings the most

*Eusebius, B. iii. ch. xvi.

† See His. Epistles, pp. 21, 30, 357.

remote hint of a millennium of religious prosperity before the coming of Christ." Roman Catholics count him a saint. Clement of Alexandria calls him "an Apostle," which Jerome qualifies by styling him "an Apostolic man." If a companion of Paul, how valuable his testimony — he plainly putting the kingdom at the coming of Christ. Clement was martyred A. D. 100, by being drowned in the sea, under the reign of the Emperor Trajan.

BARNABAS, A. D. 71.

He was the companion of St. Paul. He was a Levite, and was born on the Island of Cyprus. He was brought up with Paul at the feet of Gamaliel, and is declared by Clement to have been one of the seventy sent out by the Savior. He first introduced Paul to the other Apostles (Acts 9:27.) "He was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and faith." An Epistle is extant bearing his name, in which the writer speaks as though he were Barnabas the Apostle. It was read in the churches at an early period, and was cited by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and others, the latter styling it, "The Catholic Epistle of Barnabas." Jerome and Eusebius pronounce it Apocryphal. Vossius, Dapuis, Dr. Mill, Dr. Cave, Dr. Burnet, Dr. S. Clarke, Archbp. Wake, Bishop Fell, Whiston, and many others esteemed it genuine.

Barnabas recognizes the Abrahamic covenant as surviving and superseding the Mosaic, and as yet to be perfected by Christ, who is the covenant pledge of its fulfillment. He uses the style of Peter in speaking of the Advent, and says, "The day of the Lord is at hand, in which all things shall be destroyed, together with the wicked one. The Lord is near and his reward is with him." On the creation-week he says, "Consider, my children, what this signifies, he finished them in six days. The meaning of it is this: that in six thousand years the Lord God will bring all things to an end. For with him one day is as a thousand years; as himself testifieth, saying, Behold, this day shall be as a thousand years. Therefore, children, in six days (i. e. 6000 years) shall all things be accomplished. And what is that he saith, 'and he rested the seventh day;' he meaneth this, that when his Son shall come and abolish the wicked one, and judge the ungodly; and shall change the sun, and moon and stars; then He shall gloriously rest on that seventh day," (i. e. millennium). He taught the "restitution," or "renewing of all things," and said that we should "call to our remembrance day and night the future judgment." *

Mr. Brooks and Dr. Duffield esteem this extract as of good authority, and the Fathers who call his Epistle apocryphal do not deny that Barnabas wrote it. If this be so, and if he was the associate of the apostle Paul, was not the latter very likely to have been a pre-millennialist? and is not this testimony overwhelming? Barnabas is supposed to have been martyred about A. D. 75, by being stoned to death by the Jews.

* Apostolic Fathers, p. 186.

IGNATIUS, A. D. 100

He was Bishop of Antioch. Of his parentage and birth, nothing is known. Greek and Syriac writers affirm that he was the little child the Saviour took in his arms and sat in the midst of his disciples, as a model of innocency and humiliation. Chrysostom, Mosheim, Chalmers, Fox, and others, affirm that he was the disciple and familiar friend of the apostles, and was educated and nursed up by them. He wrote about A. D. 100. Dr. Elliot highly commends him, and says his seven Epistles are almost universally acknowledged to be genuine.

To the Ephesians, Ignatius expresses his faith thus: "The last times are come upon us; let us therefore be very reverent and fear the longsuffering of God, that it be not to us condemnation." He also bids them "stop their ears" when one shall speak contrary to the evangelical record of Jesus Christ. To Polycarp he wrote: "Be every day better than another; consider the times, and expect Him who is above all time, eternal, invisible, though for our sakes made visible." To the Smyrnians he says, that Peter and the other disciples did actually prove, by the sense of touch, the real presence and resurrection of Christ, "being thus assured of his personal resurrection, and consequently their own at his coming, for this cause they despised death and were found to be above it. . . ."

Not one word of a temporal millennium or spiritual reign, but instead the advent of the Redeemer and resurrection of the body, appears to have been his blessed hope. And if, as Eusebius says, he succeeded Peter at Antioch, they were doubtless of the same faith.

POLYCARP, A. D. 108.

This eminent man was born, it is supposed, in Smyrna. Spanheim says, he was ordained Bishop over the church in that city by John; and Usher and others affirm that John in the Apocalypse addresses him as the "angel of the church of Smyrna." He was the disciple and familiar friend of John the Revelator, and contemporary with Ignatius, Papias, and Irenaeus. Eusebius bears the highest testimony concerning him, and makes him a pattern of orthodoxy. His epistle is both authentic and genuine.

Polycarp taught in this epistle that God had raised up our Lord Jesus from the dead, and that he will come to judge the world and raise the saints, and that if we walk worthy of him we shall reign together with Him. He alludes to the other life, or world to come, and asks, Who of you are ignorant of the judgment of God? "Every one," he adds, "that confesses not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is Anti-Christ; and he who doth not acknowledge his martyrdom on the cross is of the devil; and whosoever shall pervert the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts, and shall say that there is neither resurrection nor judgment to come, that man is the first-born of Satan. *

Polycarp taught no spiritual reign, but otherwise. Dr. Burnet

* Apostolic Fathers, p. 56.

pronounces him a decided millenarian, and Irenaeus hints the same. He must have received the doctrine from St. John. Duffield, Brooks, and Ward quote him as confirming the millenarian views. Who has not read of the sainted Polycarp? He was burned at the stake about A. D. 167. His tormentors urging him to blaspheme Christ, he thus nobly answered: "Four score and six years have I served Him, and he never did me any harm; how then can I blaspheme my King, and my Saviour?" When further urged, his answer was, "I am a Christian." Being threatened with wild beasts, he cried, "Bring them forth!" †

†Eusebius Eccl. Hist., B, iv, chap, 15.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 25

We continue to quote the famous “church fathers” this month, from the book, “Voice of the Church,” by D. T. Taylor: Papias, Justin Martyr, and Irenaeus.

PAPIAS, A. D. 116.

He was Bishop of Hierapolis, where he was probably born. Eusebius and Jerome, both anti-millenarians, pronounce him to have been the disciple and friend of John the Revelator. Irenaeus testifies he was one of John’s auditors, and being a staunch millenarian, he doubtless obtained his views from John. He was also the intimate friend and companion of Polycarp, who was, as we have seen, another of John’s disciples. He taught the millennium in all the churches. His writings, consisting of five books, entitled “A narrative of the sayings of our Lord,” are not extant, but they come to us through Eusebius. He seems to have been a personal acquaintance of the apostles. He drew his Chiliasm from the Apocalypse, and Irenaeus intimates that he claimed the sanction of John for it. Eusebius denies him talent for interpreting the prophecies, because he interpreted them literally, but on other points speaks of him as being “eloquent and learned in the Scriptures.”

Papias in his preface, says that “He did not follow various opinions, but had the apostles for his authors; and that he considered what Andrew, what Peter said, what Phillip, what Thomas, and other disciples of the Lord; as also what Aristion, and John the senior, disciples of the Lord, what they spoke; and that he did not profit so much by reading books as by the living voice of those persons which resounded from them.” Jerome, who did not believe in the millennium, gives this account of Papias. Eusebius thus records the words of Papias. “Nor will you be sorry that, together with our interpretations, I commit to writing those things which I have formerly learned from the elders, and committed to memory. For I never (as many do), have followed those who abound in words, but rather those who taught the truth; not those who taught certain new and unaccustomed precepts, but those who remembered the commands of our Lord, handed down in parables, and proceeding from truth itself, i. e. the Lord. If I met with any one who had been conversant with the elders, from him I diligently enquired what were the sayings of the elders . . . The elders who had seen St. John, the disciple of our Lord, taught concerning those times (the millennium), and said, ‘The days shall come when the vine shall bring forth abundantly, . . . and all other fruits, . . . and all animals shall become peaceful and harmonious, one to the other, being perfectly obedient to man. But these things are credible only to those who have faith.’ Then Judas, the betrayer, not believing, and asking how such fertility should be brought about, our Lord said, ‘They shall see who come to those times.’ And of these very times Isaiah prophesying said, ‘The wolf and the lamb shall dwell together.’” * This is recorded by Papias as a dis-

* Eusebius Hist., B. iii., chap. 39.

course of our Lord, handed down by John the Evangelist. Eusebius himself thus speaks of Papias: "Other things also, the same writer has set forth, as having come down to him by unwritten tradition, some new parables and discourses of the Saviour. Among these, he says, that there will be a certain thousand years after the resurrection of the dead, when the kingdom of Christ will be established visibly on this earth." Daniel Whitby [who propagated the modern post-millennial theory – J] admits that Papias taught "It shall be a reign of Christ bodily on earth;" and Eusebius affirms that "most of the ecclesiastical writers" believed with Papias. Such are the admissions made by the opponents of pre-millennialism. Such their testimony concerning the faith of the Apostolic Fathers.

Dr. Elliot says that "Papias' millenary doctrine was founded in part on the Apocalyptic Book, as well as on the many other Scriptures well agreeing therewith, both in the Old and New Testaments." Dr. Burton admits that Papias' "proximity to the apostolical times, if not his personal acquaintance with some of the apostles, would put him in possession of many facts;" and the learned Greswell observes that "Papias' honesty has never been impeached, and his antiquity makes his testimony to the millennium so much the more valuable."

JUSTIN MARTYR, A. D. 150

He was a learned writer of Greek origin, born at Neapolis or Sichem, in the province of Samaria, in Palestine, A. D. 89; some say later. He was converted to Christianity A. D. 132-3, and flourished as a writer A. D. 140-160. He was in part contemporary with Polycarp, Papias and Irenaeus. Eusebius says his works stood in high credit among the early Christians. His "Dialogue with Trypho," the Jew, is considered authentic and genuine. Justin was a real convert to Chiliasm, of a pure character, and looked for no millennium in this world. He speaks of those as "destitute of just reason who did not understand that which is clear from all the Scriptures, that two comings of Christ are announced." He argued that the millennium would be beyond the resurrection, and in the restitution of all things, quoting Isaiah 65, and others of the Prophets as proof, especially these verses, "Behold I create new heavens and a new earth, etc." When questioned by Trypho in regard to this faith, he answered, "I am not such a wretch, Trypho, as to say one thing and mean another. I have before confessed to thee that I, and many others, are of their opinion (the millennial reign) so that we hold it to be thoroughly proved that it will come to pass. But I have also signified unto thee on the other hand that many, even those of that race of Christians who follow not godly and pure doctrine – do not acknowledge it. But I and whatsoever Christians are orthodox in all things, do know that there will be a resurrection of the flesh, and a thousand years in the city of Jerusalem, built, adorned, and enlarged according to the Prophets." The foregoing is according to the original of Justin's printed copies. The reader is referred to Brooks and Duffield for the argument in

relation to Justin's writings having been interpolated by Romish writers. Justin thus continues; "For thus hath Isaiah spoken of this thousand years: 'For there will be a new heaven,' etc. He then quotes Isaiah 65, making the "tree" of verse 22 the tree of life, and adds: "We believe a thousand years to be figuratively expressed [that is, prefigured by the tree — ELJ]. For as it was said to Adam, 'In the day that he should eat of the tree he should surely die.' Gen. 2:17. So we know that he did not live a thousand years. We believe, also, that this expression, 'The day of the Lord is a thousand years,' Ps. 90:4, and II Peter 3:8, relates to this. Moreover a certain man among us whose name is John, being one of the twelve Apostles of Christ, in that revelation which was shown to him, prophesied that those who believe in Christ should live a thousand years in Jerusalem; and after that there would be a general, and in a word, an universal resurrection of every individual person, when all should arise together with an everlasting state and a future judgment." And in proof that he looked for no carnal millennium, but a pure state, he immediately quotes the Saviour's prediction in Luke 20:35-36. Justin taught that the Abrahamic promise of land would be fulfilled at the resurrection, in the renovated or new earth. He also says: "We may conjecture from many places in Scripture that those are in the right who say six thousand years is the time fixed for the duration of the present frame of the world." *

Milner highly lauds the character of Justin, and Semisch, a German writer, remarks, that "Chiliasm constituted in the second century so decidedly an article of faith, that Justin held it up as a criterion of perfect orthodoxy," and Dr. Burnet calls Justin "a witness beyond all exception." Dr. Cave, though seemingly opposed to his faith, admits that "Justin expressly asserts that after the resurrection of the dead is over, our Saviour, with all the holy patriarchs and prophets, the saints and martyrs should visibly reign a thousand years," and also adds that Justin and Irenaeus held the millennium in "an innocent and harmless sense." Dr. Elliot calls him "a man to whose learning and piety testimony has been borne by nearly all the succeeding Fathers." Dr. Adam Clark declares that "he abounds in sound, solid sense, the produce of an acute and well cultivated mind." Let the reader weigh well the testimony of Justin in favor of the pre-millennial advent. Further comment is unnecessary. He was crowned with martyrdom at Rome, A. D. 163 or 165, by being beheaded. †

IRENÆUS, A. D. 178

Irenaeus was Bishop of Lyons. He was born, it is supposed, at Smyrna, not far from the beginning of the second century, and flourished as a writer about A. D. 178. Basil styles him "one near the apostles." He was pupil to and trained up under the tutorage of Papias and Poly-

* See his Dialogue with Trypho.

† Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History.

carp, both of whom were disciples of John the Revelator. The words and memory of Polycarp were deeply graven upon his mind, and by him preserved fresh and lively to his dying day. We give his language on this point both for its interest and to confirm his testimony. Writing to Florinus he says: "When I was very young, I saw you in the lower Asia with Polycarp. I can remember circumstances of that time better than those which have happened more recently; for the things which we learn in childhood grow up with the soul and unite themselves to it; insomuch that I can tell the place in which the blessed Polycarp sat and taught, and his going out and coming in, the manner of his life, the form of his person, and the discourses he made to the people; and how he related his conversation with John, and others who had seen the Lord; and how he related their sayings, and the things which he heard of them concerning the Lord, both concerning his miracles and doctrine, as he had received them from the eye-witnesses of the Lord of Life; all of which Polycarp related agreeable to the Scriptures." For learning, steadfastness and zeal, he was among the most renowned of the early Fathers. Milner highly commends him, and calls him a man of exquisite judgment. His works now extant, and which Mosheim calls a "splendid monument of antiquity," are five books on the Heresies of his times. He says that certain heretical opinions had arisen, proceeding from ignorance of the arrangements of God, and the mystery of the resurrection and kingdom of the just; and it therefore became needful to speak of them. Then he proceeds: "For it is fitting that the just, rising at the appearing of God, should in the renewed state receive the promise of the inheritance which God covenanted to the fathers, and should reign in it. * * It is but just that in it they should receive the fruits of their suffering, so that where for the love of God they suffered death, there they should be brought to life again, and where they endured bondage, there also they should reign. For God is rich in all things, and all things are of him; and therefore, I say, it is becoming, that the creature being restored to its original beauty, should without any impediment or drawback be subject to the righteous." Quoting Rom. 8:19, 22, in proof, he continues — "The promise likewise of God, which he made to Abraham, decidedly confirms this, for he says, — 'Lift up now thine eyes.' " Quoting further, Gen. 13:14-17, he adds; "For Abraham received no inheritance in it, not even a foot-breadth, but always was a stranger and a sojourner in it. And when Sarah, his wife, died, and the children of Heth offered to *give* him a piece of land for a burial place, he would not accept it, but *purchased* it for four hundred pieces of silver, from Ephron, the son of Zohar, the Hittite; staying himself on the promise of God, and being unwilling to seem to accept from man what God had promised to give him, saying to him, 'To thy seed will I give this land, etc.' Thus therefore as God promised to him the inheritance of the earth, and he received it not during the whole time he lived in it, it is necessary that he should receive it, together with his seed, that is, with such of them as fear God, and believe in him, in

the resurrection of the just." He then shows that Christ and the church are the true seed, and partakers of the promises, and concludes the chapter by saying: "Thus, therefore, those who are of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham, and the same are the children of Abraham. For God repeatedly promised the inheritance of the land to Abraham and his seed; and as neither Abraham nor his seed — that is, not those who are justified — have enjoyed any inheritance in it, they will undoubtedly receive it at the resurrection of the just. For true and unchangeable is God; wherefore also he said, 'Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.'" He supports his statements by numerous quotations from the Old Testament, reference to which we give that the student of prophecy may know what was the method of applying and expounding the prophetic Scriptures in times so near to the apostles. We give his texts in his own order: Isa. 26:19. Ez. 37:12-14 and 38:15, 16. Jer. 23:7, 8. Isa. 30:25, 26 and 58:14. Luke 12:37-40. Rev. 20:6. Isa. 6:11. Dan. 7:27. Jer. 31:10-14. Isa. 31:9; 32:1; and 54:11-14, also Isa. 65:18-25.

Irenaeus gives a famous hyperbolic tradition concerning the marvellous fertility of the earth in its renewed state, referring it to the kingdom or millennial era, and says it was related by those clergy — Papias and Polycarp — who saw St. John, the disciple of Christ, and heard from him what our Lord had taught concerning those times "which," observes Burnet, "goes to the fountain head." He relates it as from John, and John from our Lord. Irenaeus, like Justin, calls those "heretics" who expected the saints' glorification to follow immediately after death, and before their resurrection. He also made the Roman kingdom to be the fourth described in Dan. 7; and on the duration of the world, he says, "In as many days as this world was made, in so many thousand years it is perfected; for if the day of the Lord be as it were a thousand years, and in six days those things that are made were finished, it is manifest that the perfecting of those things in the six thousandth year, when Anti-Christ having reigned 1260 years * * then the Lord shall come from heaven in the clouds, with the glory of his Father, casting him and them that obey him, into a lake of fire; but bringing to the just the times of the kingdom, that is, the rest, or Sabbath, the seventh day sanctified, and fulfilling to Abraham the promise of the inheritance." He thus identifies the millennium with the Kingdom of God, placing both at the end of the sixth chiliad. *

Thus have we quoted this great man at length, but we trust not without profit. Chillingworth says that Irenaeus made the doctrine of Chiliasm apostolic tradition. Eusebius and Jerome both affirm that he believed in the thousand years reign of Christ on earth according to the *letter* of the Revelation of John; and Whitby allows that he taught "Christ will be everywhere seen," his proof being Matthew 26:29, and adding, "this cannot be done by him while he remains in

* Irenaeus *Adversus Haereses*, Lib. v. cap. 35. pp. 452-464.

the celestial regions." Irenaeus sealed his testimony with his blood by being *beheaded* under the reign of Severus, about A. D. 203-5. †

How copious and scriptural is the testimony and voice of Irenaeus! And will not the *beheaded* ones live pre-millennially? The Seer of Patmos answers "I saw them live and reign a thousand years!"

† "Irenaeus (Har. 5, 111), like Papias, founded his belief in it [the millennial teaching] on the words of those who had been taught by the apostles themselves." — New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, article, Millennium.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 26

INTRODUCTION TO JULY REPRINTS

From many places, and from even unexpected sources, comes the heartening word that the work of this department has had more than a little to do with the better spirit now appearing, and the unity-mindedness now spreading, among the brethren generally. We are assured that the example of the pioneer fathers as set forth in these “precious reprints” — their love and their unity in the midst of much difference and diversity — that this example is surely telling, directly and indirectly, among those who read these reprints. (And those who read are very many, beyond the circle of the regular subscribers to this magazine.) The *attitude* of these pioneers has convinced many that differences in the understanding of prophecy can be tolerated without serious consequences among disciples who love each other; and the *teaching* of these pioneers has convinced many that at least there may be “another side” to certain questions — something overlooked in the cocksure dogmas of the day.

It must indeed be a hard and wearisome task, to keep rolling the heavy barrel of abuse up over the endless hill with never a moment's relaxation or rest — lest those behind it be crushed by its own awful weight! And it is not strange that some are seeing the childish folly and futility of it. That may be depressing to those who go about, like Saul of Tarsus, “yet breathing threatening and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord.” But the lovers of peace and concord are much encouraged as they see this changing attitude on the part of numerous influential brethren. With many of them, the bitterness is gone; and what is a war when the bitterness is gone! It is no more a war at all, but a precious opportunity and occasion for the exercise of the lovely grace of lowliness, without which there can be no unity (Eph. 4:1-3). Soon, let us hope and pray, the fear of man will be gone from among us, and together we shall be rewarded in the larger opportunity to serve. God will open wider doors, and call the humble and the spiritual into broader fields of usefulness; but the bitter and the unrelenting will be left to lonely solitariness — except they repent. Thus it has been before, and this is the history of all such schisms and proscription movements.

It is not that we want to take any credit to ourselves. It is only that we are heartened and grateful if our humble labors here, in this great literature of the pioneers, and among the churches otherwise, has contributed ever so little to this blessed change, and to the true peace of the people of God.

There is so little at the most, humanly, that any one can do, against the workings of unconscious bitterness and envy. After all, it is the “unity of the Spirit” that we seek; and is that not a work of God? Most of all, therefore, we can pray. May we but be fitted for our little part, whatever that may be; and may we but be worthy in His worthiness, though all unworthy of ourselves. — E. L. J.

We continue the telling testimony of the "church fathers," from D. T. Taylor's book (long out of print) "Voices of The Church." In Taylor's arrangement, we find the necessary Introductions and connecting notes already well prepared. The "voices" this month are famed among all who know church history: Hippolytus, Melito, Tertullian.

PRAYER OF THE MARTYRS

I he learned Dodwell writes ("Dissertations"); "Primitive Christians believed that the first resurrection of their bodies would take place in the kingdom of the millennium; and as they considered that resurrection to be peculiar to the just, so they conceived the martyrs would enjoy the principal share of its glory. . . . It is evident that the martyrs' hope lay in the first resurrection of Rev. 20:6. Ignatius craving death that he might "rise free," . . . Cyprian attesting that those who suffered expected a prior resurrection and "a more prominent place in God's kingdom," and to crown all, Tertullian affirming that the martyr's express prayer was that he "might have a part in the first resurrection."

HIPPOLYTUS, A. D. 220

He was Bishop of Porto. He flourished, according to Dr. Cave and Lardner, about A. D. 220. Photius says he was in early life a disciple of Irenaeus, and eulogizes his style as being clear, grave, and concise. Jerome and Andreas say he wrote a treatise on the Revelation, but if so, it has perished. His treatise now extant, on Antichrist, bears every mark of genuineness. So remarks Elliott, from whom we give an abstract. Hippolytus was evidently a pre-millennialist. He declared, none of the mysteries of the future, foreshown by the prophets, will be concealed from God's servants. He gives a full exposition of Daniel's prophecies of the four kingdoms, which, with all the other fathers, he pronounces to be Babylon, Persia, Macedon, and Rome, then existing. "And what then," he adds, "remains for accomplishment but the division of the iron image into its ten toes — the growing out of the fourth Beast's head of its ten horns?" And though Rome should fall, and Antichrist arise out of the ten horns or kingdoms, he being the two horned lamb-like beast, and "being a man of resource would heal and restore it, so that it shall revive again through the laws established by him;" . . . Antichrist, he says, would reign his predicted time, greatly persecuting the saints, whose only hope will be in Christ crucified, and that then and thereupon would take place Christ's coming, personal, in glory (for, as Elliott observes, "no other coming ever entered the minds of the early Christians"); Antichrist be destroyed by its brightness; the first resurrection of the saints follow; the just take the kingdom prepared for them (Matt. 25) and shine forth as the sun; the judgment of the conflagration being meanwhile executed on the wicked.*

No millennium until Christ comes, this is the voice of Hippolytus.

* Elliott's *Horae Apoc.*, vol. iv.

MELITO, A. D. 177

He was Bishop of Sardis. He was born in Asia, and was contemporary with Justin Martyr. He was bishop of one of the apocalyptic churches, and was so eloquent and deeply pious that Tertullian affirms, "he was by most Christians considered a prophet," and Polycrates says of him, "he was in all things governed by the Holy Ghost." * He made extracts from the scriptures respecting the Messianic prophecies, and wrote a treatise on the Apocalypse, and also made out a complete list of the canonical books of the Old Testament, but his works are not now extant. He was a Chiliast. In regard to his views of that period, he probably followed Papias, Jerome and Gennadius both affirming that he was a declared millenarian. And even Neander admits that Polycarp, Papias, Irenaeus, and Melito, "endeavored to maintain the pure and simple apostolic doctrine, and defend it against corruption." The time and manner of his death is unknown, but he lies buried at Sardis, waiting with his "name in the book of life" for the first resurrection, at the coming of our Lord. †

TERTULLIAN, A. D. 200

He was born at Carthage, in Africa, about A. D. 160, and flourished as a writer, A. D. 199-220. Jerome reckons him among the first Latin millenarians, and Vincentius as the "Prince of those writers." Prof. Stuart calls him "a truly eloquent writer of extensive information." Mosheim says of him, "which were the greater, his excellencies or defects, it were difficult to say." Neander says of him, "This great Father united great gifts with great faults." Milner speaks harshly of him, but allows him to have been "an orator and a scholar." Spanheim calls him "one of the first of the Fathers," and Cyprian thought much of Tertullian, and never passed a day without reading some portion of his works, thus showing his high estimation of them. Dr. Elliott commends him, and on Tertullian's view of the Apocalypse, says, that with one or two exceptions, "there is but little in it on which we might not join hands in concord with the venerable and sagacious expositor." He also says that Tertullian's view of the New Jerusalem was, that it was of heavenly fabric, and would descend from heaven to be the abode of resurrection saints during the millennium, etc., which he said would come from heaven on the destruction of Antichrist. He was a rough writer, but he was a Christian, and his testimony in regard to the faith of the church in his day is plain and interesting. He says, "We confess that a kingdom is promised us on earth, before that in heaven, but in another state — namely — after the resurrection; for it will be one thousand years in a city of divine workmanship, viz., Jerusalem brought down from heaven; and this city Ezekiel knew, and the Apostle John saw, etc. This is the city provided of God to receive the saints in the resurrection, wherein to refresh them

* Euseb., B. v., ch. 24.

† Cave's *Lives of the Fathers*, p. 337.

with an abundance of all spiritual good things, in recompense for those which in the world we have either despised or lost. For it is both just and worthy of God, that his servants should there triumph and rejoice, where they have been afflicted for His name's sake. This is the manner of the heavenly kingdom." He was a decided premillennialist, and affirms it was customary for Christians in his times, "to pray that they might have part in the first resurrection." In regard to the triumphs of truth in this world, he refers to their persecutions and thus eloquently writes: "Truth wonders not at her own condition. She knows that she is a sojourner upon earth; that she must find enemies among strangers; that her origin, her home, her hopes, her dignities, are placed in heaven." * Tertullian died about A. D. 245, where or how it is not known.

WOULD HE WERE BOUND

In *The Truth* magazine for June, a man and his wife, unknown to us (Carrol by name), write a few simple but telling words on the subject, "Is Satan Bound Now?" They may, or may not command the eloquence of Apollos; but, like Priscilla and Aquila, they do have the truth! With truth to stand on, even a weak man may be strong, without the truth, the strongest are but weak. It is a wonderful advantage to be on the side of *what God says!* But here is their brief argument:

"We do not know Brother M— personally and have no right to discredit his sincerity, but many of us are guilty of a subconscious desire to have a thing a certain way scripturally and set out to prove it so. Brother M— states that Satan is now bound and that his work is carried on by his co-workers. He refers to Rev. 20 to prove the binding. Two difficulties are encountered here. First, that if Satan is now bound, according to the scriptures, he is doing a better job than when he was footloose; for 'evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived.' Second, according to Brother M— and the Bible, Satan was to be bound for a thousand years; but if he was bound at the Cross he has been in chains over nineteen hundred years. Now, we reason that Satan was bound to keep him from deceiving; but he is still deceiving though he is bound, and his deception while bound is worse than while loose, though he was bound to keep him from deceiving. What a travesty this sort of reasoning is against the truth of the Holy Scriptures. . . The time of his binding is established as being many years after the Cross, for disciples had been made, had been beheaded, had died, and were those that share in the first resurrection. This could not, by any stretch of the imagination, be made retroactive to the Cross.

Romans 16:20: 'The God of peace will soon crush Satan under your feet.' At the time Paul wrote this, which was many years after

* Tertullian against Marcion, Lib. iii., p. 680.

the Cross, Satan was yet to be crushed. It was yet in the future.

Heb. 2:14 states that the Devil has the power of death; the last enemy to be destroyed is death. Death as yet has not been destroyed. It is yet a future promise.

First Peter 5:8: 'Be sober, be watchful. Your adversary the Devil, prowls around like a roaring lion, seeking someone to devour.' It does not seem possible that one could squeeze from this scripture that Satan is bound and helpless."

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 27

It should hardly be necessary to reiterate (what has been said a thousand times, more or less) that in these reprints, the word "pre-millennial" is used in its true and simple sense only, meaning "before the millennium." If we are "pre-millennialists" it is only in the same way that we are "immersionists": We accept the New Testament teaching of immersion as contradistinguished from sprinkling and pouring; and we accept the New Testament teaching that the second coming of Christ is pre-millennial ("before the millennium," Rev. 19, 20) as contradistinguished from the post-millennial view. Thus, we are "premillennial," but we are not pre-millennialists in the sense of having espoused any special creed on that line, written or unwritten, or any set theory or system of prophetic teaching.

Once again, we quote from "Voice of the Church." Let the reader mark especially that the heretic Cerinthus, so far from having fathered the pure pre-millennial teaching, was stoutly opposed by those who held the pure view.—E.L.J.

Flavil Hall offers this additional note concerning Cerinthus:

"A prominent editor says that Cerinthus was the first to introduce the doctrine into Christianity, which is entirely misleading. There never was a cardinal truth that was not counterfeited by somebody, and Cerinthus was a heretical counterfeiter, as shown by Brother Boll in Word and Work, November issue, 1937. Doctrines are attributed to Cerinthus that were heretical, and along with these a perverted idea of the millennium from that held by faithful brethren now; but this perversion is mainly concealed, and the impression is made that as was Cerinthus, so are pre-M brethren mainly, now! Cerinthus' followers admitted a part of Matthew's Gospel, but rejected the rest, and held in abhorrence the epistles of St. Paul. How outrageous the comparison!"

CONCERNING MONTANUS, CERINTHUS, AND CAIUS

Munscher, a German theologian, and no friend to the Millenarians, makes the following statement: "How widely the doctrine of millenarianism prevailed in the first centuries of Christianity appears from this, that it was universally received by almost all teachers; and even some heretics agreed with them," referring we presume to the Montanists. . . . It is yet to be proved by unprejudiced witnesses that the Montanists were real heretics. And if they were, Montanism but hung itself upon Chiliasm, as more subsequently Munzerism hung itself upon Protestantism. Anti-millenarianism, on the other hand, has been all along the associate and ally of heresy. The heretics were the opponets of Millenarianism. The Gnostics could not tolerate it. The unsound and mystical Origenists opposed it. The whole Alexandrian School with the Arian Dionysius took weapons against it. The Alogi hated it. Platonism and heathen philosophy set itself with zeal to overthrow it. Socinius, of later date, attacked it, and Rome has ever been its enemy. "The Millenarian Fathers," says the London Journal of Prophecy, "were the great upholders of

orthodoxy. They fought the battle with the Gnostics, and most vigorously condemned and confuted Cerinthianism; that very Cerinthianism which they have been not seldom identified with, but which they ably opposed. Millenarianism and orthodoxy went hand in hand; Millenarianism and heresy were resolute and irreconcilable foes."

Mosheim [great church historian] admits that "the first open opposer of Chiliasm that he met with was Caius, a teacher of Rome, toward the end of the second century. On this ground he denied that the Apocalypse was written by John, and ascribed it rather to Cerinthus. But he effected very little." Dr. Burnet says that Caius called the visions of John, "monstrous stories." He ascribed a gross sensualism to the Millennium of the Revelation, which John never taught. Prof. Stuart says "the ground of his opposition is merely and only his antipathy to Chiliasm," and he also remarks that "his judgment has very little claim to our respect or consideration. The fact that he palmed a carnal Millennium upon the Apocalypse is enough to show how little he understood the book, and indeed how little he had studied it."

Here we have the character of that opposition which, still in embryo, began to develop itself against the Millennium. What was its character?

CYPRIAN, A. D. 120

He was Bishop of Carthage, which was his birth-place. In early life he was a heathen teacher of rhetoric, but afterward became a zealous Christian, and flourished as a writer, A. D. 220-250. Lactantius says of him, "Cyprian alone was the chief and famous writer;" and Erasmus declares that he spoke the purest Latin of any of the Latin Fathers. Mosheim calls him "a prelate of eminent merit;" and both Milner and Neander highly laud his character. He was a sincere admirer of Tertullian and professed to be his disciple, calling him "Master." Mede regarded him as a decided believer in the Millennium. Cyprian said to his Christian brethren, "Christ is coming to avenge our sufferings;" and Mr. Ward remarks of him that "he appeared to have been waiting for the coming of the Lord to overthrow Antichrist and to give his saints the kingdom."

Cyprian writes as follows: "It were a self-contradictory and incompatible thing for us, who pray that the kingdom of God may quickly come, to be looking for long life here below. * * Let us ever in anxiety and cautiousness be awaiting the sudden advent of the Lord, for as those things which were foretold are come to pass, so those things will follow which are yet promised; the Lord himself giving assurance and saying, 'When you see all these things come to pass, know that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand.' Dearest brethren, the kingdom of God has begun to be nigh at hand; reward of life, joy, eternal salvation, perpetual happiness, and in possession of Paradise, lately lost, are already coming nigh while the world passes away." * He certainly

* Oxford Translation of Cyprian, pp. 149, 217.

looked for no Millennial kingdom before the advent of Christ. When his sentence of death was read to him, he said, "I heartily thank Almighty God." He was led to the block, A. D. 258, amid the weeping and lamentations of the people who loved him, and who cried, "Let us also be beheaded with him." Reader, are you with the pious Cyprian, awaiting "the sudden advent of the Lord?"

METHODIUS, A. D. 260

He was first Bishop of Olympus, and afterwards of Tyre. This Christian writer flourished about A. D. 260-290, and is allowed by Neander to have been a Chiliast.* He was the firm opponent of Origen, and charged that fanciful interpreter with heresy. His work is not known to be extant, but the following passage from it is quoted by Proclus in Epiphanius. He says: "It is to be expected that, at the conflagration, the creation shall suffer a vehement commotion, as if it were about to die: whereby it shall be renovated, and not perish: to the end that we, then also renovated, may dwell in the renewed world free from sorrow. Thus it is said in Psalm 104: 'Thou wilt send forth thy Spirit, and they shall be created, and thou wilt *renew* the face of the earth.' For seeing that after this world there shall be an earth, of necessity there must be inhabitants; and these shall die no more, but be as angels, irreversibly in an incorruptible state, doing all most excellent things."† He was evidently a Pre-millennialist, and Whitby, at antipodes with his sentiments, allows that "Methodius held to a *pure* Millennium — free from every thing sensual." He was crowned with martyrdom under the reign of Decius, A. D. 312.

NEPOS, A. D. 250

Prof. Stuart says that Nepos was a strong Millenarian, and Corcion joined him. "Nepos wrote a book against Allegorists, and in defence of his Millenarian views; in which he everywhere appeals to the Apocalypse in support of them." Says Mr. Brooks, "He wrote a book entitled 'The Reprehensions of Allegorizers,' which was specially directed against those who now began to explain the Millennium figuratively." . . . Nepos' views have been denominated sensual, but like many others of the Millenary Fathers, he has probably been misrepresented and misunderstood. That he was a Pre-millennialist is most certain, even Whitby allowing that Nepos taught "after this (first) resurrection the Kingdom of Christ was to be upon earth a thousand years, and the saints were to reign with him."

Such was the Scriptural faith of Nepos. But the reader can perceive by this testimony the sad departure from the faith of the earlier Christians, and the exhibition of that blighting spiritualism which had begun imperceptibly to creep into the church of God through the influence of Origen.

*Neander's Ch. Hist., vol. i. p. 451 452.

†Epiphanius Her. 74.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 28

The book from which we quote again this month has long been out of print, and is already very rare — Taylor’s “Voice of The Church.” Its excerpts from famous historians and scholars may be considered accurate, since the sources are almost always cited. It seems fair to assume that students, even of the coming generations, when such books become still rarer, may find these pages useful for research.

The pre-millennial Coming of Christ was the well-nigh universal hope and teaching of the early church during the first three centuries — the purest days of Christianity (See Harnak article in Encyclopedia Britannica). Even those who seek to oppose this stubborn fact with historical testimony cannot do so without revealing, inadvertently or otherwise, that the statement is true. For instance, an esteemed brother (in another journal), attacking the Millenary testimony of Papias, quotes from “Wadlington’s History”:

“The first distinguished opponent of this doctrine was Origen, who attacked it with great earnestness and ingenuity, and seems, in spite of some opposition, to have thrown it into general discredit.” Now, that is an historical quotation from the opposition — that Origen was the first distinguished opponent, and that it was he who threw the teaching into general discredit!

But who was this ingenuous Origen who accomplished so great a feat? He was, on several lines, the prime heretic of the early church! * Imagine then, that well-meaning brethren should have to lean on Origen and such-like broken reeds for primitive support! And this good brother’s reference is not the first in print, by implication honoring this erratic teacher as champion of those who would “spiritualize,” evaporate, figurate, and explain away *what God has plainly said* in the prophets, and what God has said in plain, indicative, declarative sentences, *without symbol*, and with only the simplest figures of speech, in the inspired language of Revelation 20:1-6.

But, that all may know the character of the first opposition to the teaching, we print the following sum-up concerning Origen. — E. L. J.

ORIGEN, A. D. 250

“For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; — and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.” — II Tim. 4:3, 4.

Up to this period, we meet with no writer of reputed soundness in the faith, or of distinction in the church, who opposed the doctrine of Christ’s millennial reign. The most that can be said of some of them is, that they do not mention the doctrine in their writings; but at the same time, all that do refer to it adopt the Pre-millennial view, and do not even appear to dream of any other . . . We have traced

*Brother Flavil Hall contributes this note: “Origen was responsible above all others for establishing infant baptism, and the teaching that infants were born in sin, so that without baptism they could not be saved. He also taught universal salvation (Hastings Encyclopedia).”

it through the early church back to the inspired apostles, and forward to times of apostasy. And for the first time in the whole history of Chiliasm, it now began to be strenuously opposed. Would that we could speak well of the soundness of its opposers. But we cannot; truth forbids it.

Origen had his birth at Alexandria, A. D. 185. He was unquestionably a man of great talents, an indefatigable student, and the well known champion of Anti-millenarianism. But what shall we say of him? He was certainly a strange professor of Christianity. He circulated two books on magic attributed to Jannes and Jambres, representing those two prime magicians of the court of Pharaoh as inspired prophets. He taught that magic was a true and lawful science. From his master Ammonius, he learned the art of communicating with the demons. "He went so far," says Hagenbach, "that contrary to general opinion, he did not even take from Satan all hope of future pardon." * Dr. Clarke [Adam Clarke] says that according to his plan of interpretation, "The sacred writings may be obliged to say *anything*, everything, or *nothing*, according to the *fancy*, peculiar *creed*, or *caprice* of the interpreter." †

Glassius says that "it was from the allegorical system of Origen that Porphyry, his pupil, drew the strength of his arguments, as well as the point of his ridicule against Christianity." Origen taught that "the Scriptures were of little use, if we understand them as they are written;" that "words in many parts of the Bible convey no meaning at all;" that "the Scriptures are full of mysteries, and have a three-fold sense, viz., a literal, a moral, and a mystical, and that the literal sense was worthless." He also taught the pre-existence of human souls previous to the creation, and perhaps from eternity; their condemnation to animate mortal bodies in order to expiate faults committed in their pre-existent state; a spiritual or etherial resurrection of the body; the universal restoration of the damned, after a limited punishment, to a state of probation, etc., etc. The Universalists have usually claimed Origen as one of their faith. He brought in a torrent of allegory on the church which, according to Mosheim, Duffield, and other good authority, evidently laid the foundation for the rise of the Papal hierarchy, the monks being his enthusiastic admirers. Church historians speak of Origen as follows:

Spanheim says: "He fell into several doctrinal errors, which afterward supplied fuel for the flames of discord, and produced deplorable effects in the church." ‡

Mosheim observes: "After all the encomiums we have given to Origen — it is not without deep concern we are obliged to add that he also, by an unhappy method of interpretation, opened a secure retreat for all sorts of errors, which a wild and irregular imagination could

* Hagenbach's History of Doctrines, vol. 1, p. 147.

† Sacred Literature, p. 153.

‡ Spanheim's Hist., p. 219.

bring forth." He then alludes to Origen's system of interpretation, and calls it "wild, fanciful, chimerical, mystical, licentious." He says again, on the doctrine of the Millennium: "Now its credit began to decline, principally through the influence and authority of Origen, who opposed it with the greatest warmth, because it was incompatible with some of his favorite sentiments." *

Milner declares: "No man, not altogether unsound and hypocritical, ever injured the church of Christ more than Origen did. From the fanciful mode of allegory introduced by him, uncontrolled by Scriptures . . . A thick mist for ages pervaded the Christian world, supported by his absurd allegorical mode." . . . It was not till the days of Luther and Melancthon that this evil was fairly and successfully opposed." †

Saurin says: "He was famous for the extent of his genius, and at the same time for the extravagance of it; admired on the one hand for attacking and refuting the errors of the enemies of religion, and blamed on the other for injuring the very religion that he defended, by mixing with it errors monstrous in their kind, and almost infinite in their number." . . . "In spite of all his Greek and Hebrew, he was a sorry philosopher, and a very bad divine. The church has condemned his doctrine in the gross. All his philosophy was taken from the ideas of Plato." ‡

Dr. A. Clarke [Adam Clarke] justly observes, that "every friend of rational piety and genuine Christianity must lament that a man of so much learning and unaffected godliness should have been led to countenance, much less to recommend, a plan of interpreting the Divine Oracles in many respects the most futile, absurd, and dangerous that can possibly be conceived." § No orthodox Bible student will for a moment admit the soundness of his system of Biblical interpretation. The great Martin Luther wrote, "Origen is to be avoided."

But, the Emperor patronized him, and finally Origen and his fellows prepared the way of Mystery, Babylon. Well may the London Quarterly Journal of Prophecy ask, "Are we to call Origen a Christian?" At least his opposition to Chiliasm should by the church be accounted as nothing, and those who mention his name in such connection get to themselves no honor.

We are aware that Origen died a martyr, but his principles of Scripture interpretation we deplore and condemn. "Origen, Augustine, and Jerome," observes the critical author of the Theological and Literary Journal, "do not deny that the prediction of the restoration of the Israelites, the rebuilding of Jerusalem, the first resurrection, and the reign of the Messiah, teach, if taken in their literal sense, what the Chiliasts ascribe to them. They admit it; but they maintain that

* Eccl. Hist., vol. 1 pp. 181, 186.

† Milner's Ch. Hist., vol. 1, p. 435.

‡ Sermon 40, vol. 1, pp. 335, 337.

§ Sacred Literature, p. 150.

that is not their true sense." How could they do otherwise, we ask, when Origen had "laid down the broad principle," writes President Porter, "that the scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written!"

ORIGEN'S ADMISSIONS

Origen was an Anti-millenarian, but still we do not give him to the modern Post-millennialists. He allows a first and second resurrection . . . To admit two resurrections is to admit a cardinal point in Millenarian doctrine. It is but just to say of Origen that, unlike Caius, he received the Apocalypse as genuine and canonical. In being an Anti-millenarian, he seems simply to have laid aside the Millennium as being the seventh thousand years, and expected an eternal age to commence at the coming of the Lord. Had he been a literalist he would not have done so, for he admits that "they who deny the millennium are they who interpret the sayings of the prophets by a trope [figure]; but they who assert it are styled disciples of the letter of scripture only."

Says Mr. Brooks, "The majority of Christians did nevertheless continue some time after Origen to maintain the Millenarian view."

DIONYSIUS, A. D. 250

Dionysius was Bishop of Alexandria. He was a disciple of Origen, and of course an Anti-millenarian. He opposed Nepos, his contemporary, and won over Coracion to his faith; but in his opposition he questioned the canonical authority of the Apocalypse, and denied it was written by John the apostle: "From which," says Brooks, "a fair inference may be drawn that he found himself hard pressed by passages in that book;" and Dr. Duffield has shown that he only received the book at all from mere motives of policy. Prof. Stuart intimates that his object in denying that John wrote it was to take away from the Montanists their apostolic authority for the Millennial doctrine; and says, "It may well be doubted, I think, whether he would have thought of assailing the Apocalypse if he had never heard of Nepos' book;" and Dr. Elliott declares that "It was in the act of writing against Millenarians that he pronounced judgment against it." Here again we have the character of the opposition, and it amounts to this: that if the Revelation is to be received as canonical, the primitive doctrine of the Millennium is of God.

VICTORINUS, A. D. 280-290

He was the Bishop of Pettaw, and the author of an Apocalyptic Commentary, which is mentioned by Jerome, who speaks of it as one of Millenarian views. From Dr. Elliott, who has published an abstract of the same, we give the following items on the points under consideration. Victorinus made the twenty-four elders mean the twelve patriarchs and twelve apostles seated on the thrones of judgment; the voices and thunderings from the throne he made notices of Christ's threats and of his coming to judgment. He speaks of the last times,

and mingled with the continuous persecution of the saints, alludes to wars, pestilences, and famines which would precede Christ's coming. The earthquake of the sixth seal meant the last one, and the silence of the seventh seal he made to be the eternal rest. He contended that chronological order was not followed in the Apocalypse, but the Holy Spirit, when He came to the end, returns often, and repeats. He, with all the Fathers, who had not as yet adopted the year-day theory, made Antichrist's time three years and a half, and taught that he was at hand. The first beast meant Rome; the ten horns ten kings that would rise, three of whom would be plucked up by Antichrist; the woman was the city of Rome. The rider on the white horse was Christ, who will come and take the kingdom, a kingdom extending from the river to the world's end ["ends of the earth," Ps. 73:8] — the greater part of the earth being cleansed introductory to it; and, finally, the last judgment and the eternity of the kingdom, the millennium itself not ending it." *

Victorinus was martyred during the persecution by Dioclesian, being faithful unto death, and evidently expecting a part in the first resurrection.

LACTANTIUS, A. D. 300

Lactantius was born about A. D. 250, and flourished as a writer A. D. 310. He was tutor to Constantine's heir, and the purity of his Latinity gained for him the title of "the Christian Cicero." Mosheim styles him "the most eloquent of the Latin Fathers." . . . Stuart allows him to have been "a zealous Chiliast." Jerome, the Antimillenarian, charges him with the error of the Manichees, but Dr. Lardner, in his "Credibility of the Gospel History," has satisfactorily vindicated him from this charge. Says Dr. Lardner: "It is well known that Lactantius expected a terrestrial reign of Christ for a thousand years before the general judgment. Jerome ridiculed his millenary notions, and took the same freedom with Irenaeus, Tertullian, and other Christians who held the same sentiment." † Lactantius taught a mixed Millennium, as do many now, but Dr. Duffield and Mr. Brooks have vindicated him from the charge of sensualism preferred against him by Jerome. He asserted two resurrections according to the Revelation, and speaks at large upon the Millennial period, which he denominates "the thousand years of the heavenly empire, when righteousness shall reign on earth. . . . When the Son of God shall have destroyed injustice, and shall have restored the just to life, he shall be conversant among men a thousand years, and shall rule with a most righteous government. At the same time the Prince of Devils shall be bound with chains, and shall be in custody for a thousand years of the heavenly kingdom, lest he should attempt anything evil against the people of God. When the thousand years of the kingdom, that is, seven thou-

* Horae Apoc., vol. 4.

† Lardner's Credibility, vol. 3, pp. 316, 319, 520.

sand years, shall draw toward a conclusion, Satan shall be loosed again; and then shall be that second and public resurrection of us all, wherein the unjust shall be raised," * Having enlarged on this topic, he thus concludes: "This is the doctrine of the holy prophets which we Christians follow, this is our wisdom." Whitby allows that Lactantius taught "this Millennium belongs to all the just which ever were from the beginning of the world." Lactantius died at Treves about A. D. 325.

* Lactantius Div. Inst., Book 7, ch. 24.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 29

This month, we publish some of the most remarkable and interesting testimonies that have so far been offered in these pages (from “Voice of The Church”). They show clearly the Millennial faith and teaching of the early Christians; and that the change-over to the figurative, “spiritualizing” modern method of prophetic interpretation which is now popular (and by some set forth as the only “sound doctrine”) — they show clearly that this change-over came only as the church and its ancient faith gave over to corruption and incipient Catholicism. We begin with some very important statements (from the historical viewpoint) of the famous *Council of Nice*; and we follow this with a paragraph concerning Jerome, the great adversary of the Millenarians, who led directly into the Roman church. How strangely like the methods and spirit of a few modern anti-millenarian leaders is the description (from many sources) of Jerome! Last of all, we reprint a portion of the paragraph on Augustine, who, though not of the millenarian view, states plainly that such a view could be tolerated, if held in a pure and spiritual form. — E. L. J.

COUNCIL OF NICE, A. D. 325 *

This first general Church Council was called by Constantine the Great (who was present) and was, according to Eusebius, composed of 250 Bishops; Socrates says 318. Mosheim affirms we know very little about their acts and doings. It assumed authority over the conscience, expelled Arius, and framed what is called the Nicene Creed, which Gelasius Cyzicenus has given in his history of this Council. “We quote from these acts,” says Dr. Duffield, “because it furnishes, incidentally, some valuable testimony as to what continued to be at that period the method of interpretation most prevalent.”

On the resurrection state, the Council says: “We expect new heavens and a new earth, according to the Holy Scriptures, at the appearing of the great God, and our Saviour, Jesus Christ. And then, as Daniel says, ‘the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom,’ and there shall be a pure earth, holy, a ‘land of the living and not of the dead,’ which David foreseeing by the eye of faith, ‘I believe to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living’ — the land of the meek and humble. Christ says, ‘Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth,’ and the prophet says, ‘the feet of the meek and humble shall tread upon it.’” *

Says Mr. Brooks: “The majority of the churches must, at the period of this Council, have still held to the primitive method of interpretation.”

Mede remarks: “Judge by this (notwithstanding fifty years’ opposition) how powerful the Chiliastic party yet was at the time of this Council. By some of whom, if this formula were not framed and composed, yet was it thus moderated as you see, that both parties might

* History Act. Council of Nice, by Gelasius

accept it as being delivered in the terms and language of Scripture." *

The London Quarterly Journal of Prophecy says: "It is obvious that nearly a century after the days of Origen and Dionysius, Chiliastic doctrine was still truly the creed of the church, or at least of the greater part of it. In this Council it stands before us, not only dissociated from heresy, but opposed to it; nay, not only opposed to heresy, but united to what was sound and holy."

And Dr. Burnet writes as follows: "The Millennial kingdom of Christ was the general doctrine of the primitive church from the times of the Apostles to the Council of Nice, *inclusively*. According to the opinion of these Fathers, there will be a kingdom of Christ upon earth, and moreover in the new heavens and new earth." † Such is the testimony of the Nicene Fathers. Still the Millennial truth which received their sanction was crushed to death at last under the iron heel of Antichrist. But it died hard!

JEROME, A. D. 380

Jerome was born in Dalmatia, A. D. 330. Died A. D. 420. He was a learned and voluminous writer, but was a bitter Anti-millenarian, and decidedly a monk and a Roman Catholic. The Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge informs us that he founded a convent at Bethlehem, and through his exhortations many fashionable ladies there and at Rome became nuns. Mosheim affirms that he, with the corrupt principle of the two monstrous errors of the age, namely, "It is an act of virtue to deceive and lie, when by that means the interests of the church may be promoted; second, Errors in religion, when maintained and adhered to after proper admonition, are punishable with civil penalties and corporeal torture"; and in everything, while he applauds his labor and genius, he [Mosheim] gives Jerome a miserable character. The London Quarterly Journal of Prophecy says of this century: "Jerome, in whose works the seeds of most every Popish error may be found, led the opposition against the Millennium." And the learned Elliott has shown that Jerome virtually advocated saint and martyr worship, veneration of relics, the well-nigh infallibility of the Bishop of Rome, practiced penance, etc., etc. Such were the principles of Jerome; and with regard to the form of his opposition, as Dr. Duffield justly observes, "He teems with abuse and ridicule in relation to the Millennium; and by his general character for fierceness, acrimony, and ribaldry, toward all who differ from him, he has forfeited all claims upon our respect." All Millennial historians represent him as harsh and unfair. Brooks calls him "a vehement adversary of the doctrine." H. D. Ward, "an unmerciful scoffer, not always regarding fairness." Mede, "a most unequal relator of the opinions of his adversaries"; and the Journal of Prophecy calls him one of the most resolute enemies of the doctrine that ever wrote." Dr. Burnet styles him, "a rough and rugged saint, and an unfair adver-

* Mede's Works, p. 813

† Burnet, Vol. 2, p. 184. Mosheim, chap. 5

sary, that usually ran down with heat and violence what stood in his way," and that "he always represents the Millenary doctrine after a Judaical rather than a Christian manner." He held the Origenistic system and, says Elliott, he taught that "the Apocalypse was all to be spiritually understood, because otherwise Judaic fables would have to be acquiesced in; such as the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and the renewal in its temple of carnal ceremonies:" a false conclusion obvious to every Bible student. But perhaps the Millennium was made carnal by its advocates, thus giving some occasion for Jerome's laughter; and the more we presume did he wish to oppose it, it being now unpopular, and he being secretary to Pope Damasus (who used every means to suppress it), and desiring like many now to keep in with public opinion. Said Luther, "Jerome is to be avoided!"

And now we call the reader's attention to Jerome's admission, where he is constrained to allow the truth, and by which we may learn that if the Chiliasts of A. D. 400 were really in the minority, they were still a great multitude in spite of opposition. On Jer. 19:10, he says, that "he durst not condemn the (Millennial) doctrine, because many ecclesiastical persons and martyrs affirm the same." And again, speaking of the Millenarian Apollinarius, he remarks: "An author whom not only the men of his own sect, but most of our people likewise, follow on this point (Chiliasm), so that it is not difficult to prove what a multitude of persons will be offended with me."

So much for Jerome. We have been particular that the reader may know through whose opposition the Millennium fell. Rev. Henry Morris, a Post-millennialist, in his work entitled "Modern Chiliasm Refuted," truly says, "Jerome and other writers of this period were *great scoffers* at the doctrine, and the consequence was that it fell into disrepute, and entirely dwindled away, so that we hear scarcely no more of it until the tenth and a portion of the eleventh century, the Reformation, and the present time." *

But this admission of Mr. Morris' every close thinker will at once see is prejudicial, nay, even fatal to Post-millennialism! It allows that Rome banished the true Millennium, and more even than this!

AUGUSTINE, A. D. 390

Augustine was Bishop of Hippo. Born A. D. 358, and died in 434. He was contemporary with Jerome, and is acknowledged to have been a great and justly celebrated divine. Though not thoroughly free from the superstitions of his times, yet with regard to the doctrines of free grace in Christ, as Dr. Cumming says, "Augustine was a brilliant exception; and continued evangelical," and Milner also states that "the light from his writings glimmered through many ages, down even to the Reformation," Gibbon hinting that Rome had a secret repugnance to them on this account. He was once a Chiliast,

* See Jerome's Comment on Jeremiah 19:10. De Instit. Cap. 15. Horae. Apoc., vol. 4. Lond. Quar. Jour. Proph., No. 7. Mede's Works, p. 602. Ward's Hist. Mill., p. 21. Mosheim, vol. 1, p. 116.

but abandoned that view through the influence and misrepresentations of his enemies, particularly Eusebius, as Mr. Brooks argues. He then developed what is usually called the Augustinian view of the Millennium, which afterwards became very prevalent, and which constitutes a new era in its history. On the first view he expresses himself: "Those who have supposed from these words, Rev. 20:6, that there shall be a first corporeal resurrection, have been moved among other things chiefly by the number of the thousand years; as if there ought to be among the saints a sabbatism, as it were a holy vacation, after their six thousand years of trouble; which opinion would indeed be tolerable if it should be believed that spiritual delights should redound to the saints in that Sabbath, by the presence of the Lord, for we also were ourselves formerly of that opinion." Augustine's objection does not militate against *us*, for we hold to a pure Millennium of spiritual delights by the personal presence of the Lord, and his admission is that such an one can be tolerated. The abuse of Millennial truth evidently caused him to reject it as of carnal tendency.

LUTHER ON "THE LITERAL SENSE"

"That which I have so often insisted on elsewhere, I here once more repeat, viz.: that the Christian should direct his first efforts toward understanding the *literal sense* (as it is called) of Scripture, which alone is the substance of faith and of Christian theology. * * The allegorical sense is commonly uncertain and by no means safe to build our faith upon: for it usually depends on human opinion and conjecture only, on which if a man lean, he will find it no better than the Egyptian reed. Therefore Origen, Jerome, and similar of the fathers are to be avoided with the whole of that Alexandrian school which, according to Eusebius and Jerome, formerly abounded in this species of interpretation. For later writers unhappily following their too much praised and prevailing example, it has come to pass that men make just what they please of the Scriptures, until some accommodate the word of God to the most extravagant absurdities; and, as Jerome complains of his own times, they extract a sense from Scripture repugnant to its meaning: of which offence, however, Jerome himself was also guilty." (Annotations on Deut., ch. 1, p. 55)

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 30

TEACHING OF THE EARLY CHURCH

The teaching of early Christianity as set forth by the early "Fathers" (Barnabas, Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Cyprian, Tertullian, down to Lactantius who was preceptor to the son of the Roman emperor Constantine) was that the glorious, world-wide "Kingdom," (by which was meant the millennial reign on the earth of Christ) would be inaugurated at Christ's return. Not until the worldly favor following Constantine's conversion had corrupted the faith, and state and church had become allied, and not until the professed bride became the harlot, was this hope and doctrine given up. Pope says (Comp. of Theol., Vol. 3, p. 396): "With the accession of the empire, under Constantine, to Christianity the main inducement to cherish such a hope of a speedy visible return of a victorious Redeemer passed away. Augustine and other teachers introduced an interpretation of the First Resurrection and the Millennial Reign which referred both to the present estate of Christianity; and this has been in subsequent times the prevalent Catholic interpretation." This most noteworthy fact stands supported, so far as our knowledge goes, by all standard church historians.

EDWARD GIBBON, INFIDEL HISTORIAN

"The ancient and popular doctrine of the Millennium is intimately connected with the second coming of Christ . . . and that Christ with the triumphant band of saints and the elect who had escaped death or who had been miraculously revived would reign upon earth until the time appointed for the last and general resurrection . . . The assurance of such a millennium was carefully inculcated by a succession of fathers from Justin Martyr and Irenaeus who conversed with the immediate disciples of the apostles down to Lactantius who was a preceptor to the son of Constantine. It appears to have been the reigning sentiment of orthodox believers." — Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of Rome*

HENRY ALFORD, FAMOUS COMMENTATOR

Alford, one of the ablest and most learned commentators, emphatically protests against the common abuse of this Scripture. Here are his words on this text (Rev. 20:4-6).

"I cannot consent to distort its words [the words of this passage, Rev. 20:4-6] from their plain sense and chronological place in the prophecy, on account of any considerations of difficulty, or any risk of abuses which the doctrine of the millennium may bring with it. Those who lived next to the Apostles and the whole church for 300 years, understood them in the plain, literal sense: and it is a strange sight in these days to see expositors who are among the first in reverence of antiquity, complacently casting aside the most cogent instance of unanimity which primitive antiquity presents."

"As regards the text itself, no legitimate treatment of it will extort

what is known as the spiritual interpretation now in fashion. If, in a passage where two resurrections are mentioned, where certain souls lived at the first, and the rest of the dead lived only at the end of a specified period after the first — if in such a passage the first resurrection may be understood to mean spiritual rising with Christ, while the second means literal rising from the grave; — then there is an end of all significance in language, and Scripture is wiped out as a definite testimony to anything. If the first resurrection is spiritual, then so is the second, which I suppose none will be hardy enough to maintain; but if the second is literal, then so is the first, which in common with the whole primitive Church and many of the best modern expositors, I do maintain and receive as an article of faith and hope."

ORIGIN OF THE POST-MILLENNIAL THEORY

The eighteenth century is distinguished by a new theory of what is technically called the millennium — that of Whitby. Following in the footsteps of Augustine, and the mystical principles of interpretation of the Origen School, he opposed the reign of Christ on earth, and gave to the passages bearing on that subject a mystical sense. And yet, Dr. Whitby admits that it "was believed and taught by the early church," and that all "the best Christians for 250 years," regarded it "as a tradition apostolical." Dr. Whitby himself calls his theory of the millennium "A New Hypothesis."

Daniel Whitby, D. D., was born in 1638. He says: "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 part of Protestants, and yet it passed among the best of Christians for two hundred and fifty years, for a tradition apostolical; and as such was delivered by many Fathers of the second and third century, who spake of it as the tradition of our Lord and His apostles, and of all the ancients that 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 who were exactly orthodox." He says it was received in the eastern parts of the church by Papias in Phrygia, Justin in Palestine, Irenaeus in Gaul, Nepos in Egypt, . . . "but also in the West and South, by Tertullian in Africa, Cyprian and Victorinus in Germany, Lactantius in Italy, and Severus, and by the first Nicene Council." "These men taught this doctrine, not as doctors only, but as witnesses of the tradition which they had received from Christ and his apostles, and which was taught them by the Elders, the disciples of Christ. . . They pretend to ground it upon numerous and manifest testimonies, both of the Old and New Testaments, and speak of them as texts which would admit no other meaning." — (End Whitby)

"The above,," says the London Journal of Prophecy, "comes to us with the weight of an irresistible testimony."

This is the testimony of Dr. Whitby himself, *Whitby's Treatise on Tradition*. (See *Voice of the Church*, p. 228.)

Well may Bishop Henshaw say: "The fact is, that the commonly received opinion of a spiritual millennium, consisting in a universal triumph of the gospel and conversion of all nations for a thousand years before the coming of Christ, is a novel doctrine unknown to the Church for the space of sixteen hundred years. So far as we have been able to investigate its history, it was first advanced by the Rev. Dr. Whitby . . . and has been received without careful investigation by the majority of divines in the present day. But we may safely challenge its advocates to produce one distinguished writer in its favor who lived before the commencement of the eighteenth century. If antiquity is to be considered as any test of truth, the advocates of the pre-millennial advent and personal reign of Christ with his saints upon earth need have no fears of the result of a comparison of authorities with the supporters of the opposite theory." *

It seems fitting to append Flavil Hall's comment on the fair and unfair use of "the fathers," at the close of this number:

"These early Fathers are never considered unorthodox when brethren are in debates with Paidobaptists on baptism, and with Seventh-Day Adventists on the Sabbath and Lord's day! See the Harding-Wilkinson, Harding-Moody, Brents-Ditzler, and other debates, on those subjects. The quotations from the Fathers on baptism by T. W. Brents in *Gospel Plan of Salvation*, and by J. W. Shepherd in *Handbook on Baptism* have been sweet morsels in their debates with denominational representatives. The quotations as to the millennium are from the same Fathers and they are no clearer on baptism than on the millennium. Yea, and Alexander Campbell, in the debate with Owen, quoted copiously from those same Fathers. But now, the anti-millenarian editors seem desperately eager to destroy all reliance upon them on the subject of prophecy. They adroitly pass over the quotations from Irenaeus, Tertullian, Papias, and Justin Martyr, which leave no grounds for quibbling; also the testimony of history from Gibbon, Mosheim, and Neander, concerning the pre-M view of the church in the first centuries of this era."

* Henshaw on the Second Advent, p. 115

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 31

In the 1947 series of "precious reprints," now closing for this current year, we have quoted rather copiously from those famous Christians of the early days — most of them martyrs for their faith — and now generally known as "the fathers." We have distinctly traced that "Blessed Hope," and the millennial teaching, back to the days of the apostles, yea, to the very lips of the apostles — those men who spake as they were moved upon by the Holy Spirit. To quote words taken from the *London Journal of Prophecy*—"By the testimonies of men, many of whom are unfriendly to our doctrine, we have established this point: that during the first two centuries and a half 'Pre-millennialism,' or Chiliasm as it was then called, was the faith of the church."

And with Mosheim, the celebrated church historian, we may safely say that the millennial teaching — "that Christ was to come and reign a thousand years among men, before the entire and final dissolution of the world" — we may say, without fear of contradiction by any student of history, that the millennial teaching had *met with no opposition* before the third century.

Such quotations could be multiplied. We will abridge a few others. — E.L.J.

Bishop Russell, Professor of Eccl. History of the Scottish Episcopal Church, writing on the Millennium, says: "So far as we view the question in reference to the sure and certain hope entertained by the Christian world, that the Redeemer would appear on earth, and exercise authority during a thousand years, there is good ground for the assertion of Mede, Dodwell, Burnet and other writers on the same side, that down to the beginning of the fourth century, the belief was universal and undisputed."

John Wm. Augustus Neander, born 1789. A distinguished German Protestant Theologian, of Jewish origin, Professor of the University at Berlin, famous church historian, writing of the early church: "They believed that the struggle of the Christian church with the heathen state would continue on, until the victory should be conceded to it, through the immediate interposition of God, and through the return of Christ . . . This was the idea of a Millennial reign, which the Messiah should establish on earth at the close of the whole career of the world, during which all the saints of all ages were to live together in holy communion with each other . . . In the midst of persecution it was an attractive thought for the Christians to look to a period when their church, purified and perfected, should be triumphant even on earth, the theatre of their present sufferings. In the manner in which this notion was conceived by many, there was nothing unchristian in it. They imagined the happiness of this period in a spiritual manner, and one that corresponded well with the real nature of Christianity; for they conceived under that notion only the general dominion of God's will, the undisturbed and blessed union

and intercourse of the whole communion of saints, and the restoration of harmony between man as sanctified, and all nature as refined and ennobled." *

From *The American Encyclopaedia* we give the following extracts. "Chiliasm, or the expectation of a blessed Millennium, became a universal belief among the Christians of the first centuries, which was strengthened by the prophecies contained in Revelation of the times which were to precede and indicate the happy times of the Millennium . . .

"This faith the Christian teachers of the first centuries were unanimous in adopting and promulgating. * * * When Christianity became the predominant religion of the Roman Empire, it lost its interest for the multitude; victory, liberty, and security, which the Millennium was expected to bring, being now actually enjoyed." †

Giessler says of the first centuries: "Millenarianism became the general belief of the time." Dr. Kitto remarks that "The Millennial doctrine may be regarded as generally prevalent in the second century." Bishop Newton says, "The doctrine of the Millennium was generally believed in the three first and purest ages." Mede, "This was the opinion of the whole orthodox Christian church in the age immediately following St. John." Maitland says of the first two centuries: "As far as I know, no one, except such as were notoriously out of the pale of the church, had impugned the doctrine of the Millennium, as held by Justin, or taught any doctrine contrary to it." Bishop Russell admits that "The Apostles clung to the expectation of the Millennium during their whole lives." Whitby, on the Pre-millennial views of the early church, says: "They held that this (first) resurrection was not confined to the martyrs only, but that all the just were then to rise and reign with Christ." Jeremy Taylor admits that "The doctrine of the Millennium was in the best ages no heresy, but true catholic [universal] doctrine Stuart affirms that Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, etc., regarded the descriptions of the thousand years' reign on earth, of the first resurrection of the dead, and of the New Jerusalem, as designed to be literally interpreted in order to elicit the true meaning of the Apocalypse." Milner on the Pre-millenarian faith of the early church, says: "This fact is not disputed."

"The most striking point in the eschatology of the Anti-Nicene age (i.e. before the council of Nice, A. D. 325) is the prominent Chiliasm or Millenarianism, that is, the belief of a visible reign of Christ in glory on earth for a thousand years before the general resurrection and judgment." — *Schaff Church History*. Vol. 2, p. 614.

* Neander's Church History, vol. 1 pp. 403, 404.

† Encyclopaedia Amer., Art. Millennium.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

Series 1948

Being the rare and precious reprints from the pioneer preachers
and reformers, expositors and editors, as well as
the late martyrs, and the noted brethren
of our contemporary age

*“We have the word of prophecy made more sure; whereunto ye
do well that ye take heed, as unto a lamp shining in a dark place.”*

—2 Peter 1:19.

EDITED BY E. L. JORGENSEN

Free for distribution in any quantity upon request

Order from

The Word and Work, Publishers

1046 Dudley Avenue

LOUISVILLE 4, KENTUCKY

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 32 — First Reprint of 1948

E. L. J.

We begin the 1948 series of "precious reprints" with this powerful resume and expose of what incipient Romanism did in the green tree, and what Romanism still does in the dry, to the Apocalypse, and to the great truths of Prophecy. The first paragraph will be a sweet morsel to all who stand in the "good old paths," speaking "where the Bible speaks." Let all who profess to love the "ancient landmarks" and the primitive gospel take heed to read the entire installment. — E. L. J.

FROM AUGUSTINE TO LUTHER

In reviewing the testimony of the early church on the question of Chiliasm, it is of course admitted that they mixed errors with the doctrine. We remember that "the mystery of iniquity" worked in Paul's day, and we have read his solemn prediction in his farewell charge given to the church at Ephesus. An English writer has well observed, "I do not appeal to the writings of the early Christians as authority; so far from it, I regard their writings as the history of truth perverted; so that while on the one hand I should be surprised to find any truth taught by the apostles unnoticed in the Fathers, I should be almost equally surprised to find it taught Scripturally and unincumbered by human additions, so early did the apostasy begin to work." Above antiquity, tradition or human opinion, in the words of Burnet, "we should always require a higher witness, viz: the Bible." This is the first. But we highly esteem the faith of that church whose characteristics, says Milner, were "to believe, to love, and to suffer." "Whatever is first," says Tertullian, "is true; whatever is later is adulterate." And Faber has truly said: "If a doctrine totally unknown to the primitive church . . . springs up in a subsequent age, let that age be the fifth century, or let it be the tenth century, or let it be the sixteenth century, such doctrine stands on its very front, impressed with the brand of mere human invention." Such, we argue, is Post-millennialism, and such also Anti-millennialism.

Having now arrived in our history of Millenarianism at the commencement of the fifth century, when the great apostasy had begun, and this Apocalyptic truth was deemed a heresy and accounted unpopular, we here purpose giving, through the combined testimony of many voices, a brief but fuller account of its decline. Paganism was fallen, but the Papacy was hastening to its birth, and even in its embryo was hung all over with idolatry. From Gibbon, Neander and Mosheim, we learn that in the fourth century monks, monasteries, convents, penance, church councils, with church control of conscience, excommunication, the perfume of flowers, the smoke of incense, wax tapers in the churches at noon day, prostrate crowds at the altar drunk with fanaticism or wine, imprinting devout kisses on the walls and supplicating the concealed blood, bones, or ashes of the saints, idolatrous frequenting of martyrs' tombs, pictures and images of tutelar

saints, veneration of bones and relics, gorgeous robes, tiaras, croises, pomp, splendor and mysticism, were seen everywhere, and were the order of the day; and says Mosheim: "The new species of philosophy imprudently adopted by Origen and many other Christians, was extremely prejudicial to the cause of the gospel, and to the beautiful simplicity of its celestial doctrines;" and Gibbon writes that "If in the beginning of the fifth century Tertullian or Lactantius had been suddenly raised from the dead to assist at the festival of some popular saint or martyr, they would have gazed with astonishment and indignation at the profane spectacle which had succeeded to the pure and spiritual worship of a Christian congregation." Martyr worship was very common, and Eunapius the Pagan, A. D. 396, exclaimed, "These are the gods that the earth now-a-days brings forth, these the intercessors with the gods — men called martyrs: before whose bones and skulls, pickled and salted, the monks kneel and lay prostrate, covered with filth and dust." The mystery of iniquity worked like leaven, and to use the words of Coleridge, "The Pastors of the Church had gradually changed the life and light of the gospel into the very superstitions they were commissioned to disperse; and thus they paganized Christianity in order to christen Paganism." Dr. Cumming remarks that "The great multitude consisted of embryo papists, and what we call Puseyism in the nineteenth century was the predominating religion of the fourth." Milner says that "while there was much outward religion the true doctrines of justification were scarcely seen." All of this Dr. Duffield does not hesitate to affirm was the genuine offspring of the allegorical system and Platonic philosophy of Origen, who made the church on earth the mystic kingdom of heaven. "Vigilantius," says Elliott, "remained true, and was the Protestant of his times," but Jerome, remarks Dr. Cumming, "became utterly corrupted," and Augustine, as Elliott has shown, scarcely escaped the universal contagion. Such was the character of the times, and need we wonder that the true Millennium was laid aside, and with it the Apocalypse that taught it? "Rome," says Burnet, "always had an evil eye on the Millennium!" Truly spoken! Says Newman, the Roman Catholic writer: "Whereas at first certain texts were inconsistently confined to the letter, and a Millennium was in consequence expected, the very course of events, as time went on, interpreted the prophecies about the church more truly," etc., i. e. in a mystical or anagogical manner.

Continuing our quotations on this point, we give the testimony of Bishop Russell, of Scotland, a strong Anti-millenarian, who writes as follows: "It is worthy of remark, that so long as the prophecies regarding the Millennium were interpreted literally, the Apocalypse was received as an inspired production, and as the work of the apostle John; but no sooner did theologians find themselves compelled to view its annunciations through the medium of allegory and metaphorical description than they ventured to call in question its heavenly origin, its genuineness, and its authority. Dionysius, the great supporter of the allegorical school, gives a decided opinion against the authenticity

of the Revelation." Joseph Mede truly says of the Anti-millenarians of the fourth century, "They denied the Apocalypse to be Scripture, nor was it re-admitted till they thought they had found some commodious interpretation of the thousand years." Dr. Cumming observes, "Some divines of the fourth century rejected the Apocalypse, on the ground that it contained, as they alleged, prophecies of what they erroneously belived to be a carnal Millennium; just in the same way as some persons still argue that the Bible cannot be God's word, because it contains truths that cross their prejudices." Dr. Elliott testifies that from the Constantinian revolution in the eastern empire, with but few exceptions, we find the Apocalypse "passed over in silence by the great Greek Fathers of the remainder of the fourth century;" and he also shows that nearly all who rejected it were evidently under prejudices against, and misconceptions of the Apocalyptic doctrine of a Millennium. The pointed testimony of Prof. Stuart is as follows: "In the end of the fourth century, to guard against Chiliasm, quite a number doubted the genuineness of the Apocalypse — did not receive it as canonical, and carefully abstained from appealing to it; but after this period we find only here and there a solitary voice raised against it, until at length the reception became all but universal. When the question of Chiliasm had ceased to excite any special interest in the churches . . . all opposition to the Apocalypse either ceased or became inactive and indifferent." Gibbon, too, adds his testimony to this remarkable fact, and says: "In the Council of Laodicea, A. D. 360, the Apocalypse was tacitly excluded from the sacred canon, by the same churches of Asia to which it was addressed; and we may learn from the complaint of Sulpicius Severus that their sentence had been ratified by the greater number of Christians of his time." And to sum up this array of evidence with regard to the Millennium, as held by the church up to this period, together with its rejection, as also that of the Apocalypse, we give the following striking and truthful language of Horatius Bonar. On Revelation 20th chapter, he writes:

"In the first centuries great stress was laid upon this passage. It was considered the stronghold of Chiliasm — so strong and decided was its testimony deemed, that the Anti-chiliasts deemed their only escape from it was the total denial of the Apocalypse. Chiliasm, and the Apocalypse, were deemed inseparable. They could only get rid of the former, by rejecting the latter. They never thought it possible to deny that the Apocalypse taught Chiliasm. This was not disputed; and hence those who disliked Chiliasm could not tolerate the Apocalypse. It was not till the church had learned to Platonize, or had taken lessons in the school of Origen, that they could condemn Chiliasm without disputing the inspiration of the Revelation."

Such is the voice of History, with regard to the doctrine of the Millennium, and its subsequent depression. We have been sufficiently copious, so that the intelligent and candid reader might know both the character of its advocates and opponents — its firm adherents, and its ultimate destroyers. Orthodoxy had sided with it, but hetero-

doxy waged war against it. The true church believed in it, but the apostate church crushed it. If this be true, ought not the church of Christ in the present century to unanimously maintain Chiliasm? We think so. Rome, with those in her employ, rose up against it. Brooks affirms that the works of Papias and Nepos, and Mede, and those of Victorinus and Sulpicius, containing Millenarian views, were authoritatively suppressed by Pope Damasus. The extraordinary admission of Gibbon is that, "as long as for wise purposes this *error* was permitted to subsist in the church, it was productive of the most salutary effects on the faith and practice of Christians, who lived in the awful expectation of that moment when the globe itself, and all the various races of mankind, should tremble at the appearance of their divine Judge;" but now the great Antichrist was at hand, and the way must be prepared for him to reign, and be worshipped. That which Chillingworth, Lardner, Taylor, Russell and others affirm to have been orthodox in the first centuries began to be deemed heretical. The Council of Rome under Pope Damasus, in A. D. 373, formally denounced Chiliasm; and so effectual was the condemnation that Baronius, a Roman Catholic historian of the sixteenth century, observes that "the heresy, however loquacious before, was silenced then, and since that time has hardly been heard of." And of the fifth century he writes, "Moreover the figments of the Millenaries being now rejected everywhere, and derided by the learned with hisses and laughter, and being also put under the ban, were entirely extirpated!"

Says Bush — "through the dreary tract of the ages of darkness, scarcely a vestige of Millenarian sentiment is to be traced!"

Thus have we seen that through the rejection of the Apocalypse by Caius, Dionysius, and finally the church in general; through the Platonism and allegorizing of Origen and his numerous followers; through the misrepresentations of Eusebius; through the scoffing of the monk Jerome; through the hatred and opposition of a great church of embryotic Papists; through the denunciations of church councils; through the comminations and bitterness of Popes; through the laughter and hisses of Popish doctors; through the influence of an onward-creeping and awful apostasy; through, perhaps, the abuse of Millenarian truths by their advocates; and, finally, through the presentation and final reception of a new and erroneous Millennial theory more suited to the times, the Apocalyptic doctrine of the Millennium, as held by the primitive church, wasted away, and ultimately well nigh died — died, not at the hands of orthodox Christians, but at the hand of men noted for their unsoundness in the faith — died at the hands of the infant harlot, Rome! And, alas! how much truth died with it — how much error lived when it died! But it did not die utterly for

"Truth crushed to earth shall rise again,
The eternal years of God are hers!"

— From *Voice of the Church*.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 33

INTRODUCTION TO FEBRUARY INSTALLMENT

The earliest “Reformers” of the 16th century may not have recovered themselves entirely from Romish traditions and notions about the end of time. This is more or less true of Martin Luther and Philip Melancthon of Germany, John Calvin of France, Ulrich Zwingli of Switzerland, and John Knox of Scotland. But none of them were “Post-Millennialists” — not one! They all repudiated the allegorizing, spiritualizing mode of interpretation introduced in early times by Origen, and revived much later than their own day by Whitby. They all held firmly to the main point in “that blessed hope” — that the Coming of Christ was ever imminent, and they stirred their followers mightily with the preaching of it. Not one of them looked for any millennium or “golden age” on earth before the second advent, but all alike repudiated such an expectation. They prayed for and earnestly desired His coming, and they hoped that it was very near.

Yet, even then, the fuller light was breaking concerning the Second Coming and the glories that should follow. With the spread of Bibles in the vernacular — Luther's in Germany and Tyndale's in England — there arose devoted men, free men, men who loved not their lives even unto death, who dared to preach “the whole counsel of God,” regardless of tradition. From some of these we quote this month: Tyndale, Latimer, Cranmer — martyrs all; and also from Knox and “the illustrious Mede.” — E. L. J.

WILLIAM TYNDALE, A. D. 1530

Tyndale, the celebrated English reformer, was born in the fifteenth century, educated at Oxford and Cambridge, and is claimed as a Baptist in sentiment. He was connected with the Wickliffites, imbibed the doctrines of Luther, and in 1532, translated into English, and printed the first English edition of the Bible. The following is his principle of interpreting the sacred Scriptures:

“No man dare abide by the literal sense of the text, but under a protestation, if it shall please the Pope. Thou shalt understand, therefore, that the Scripture hath but one sense, and that is the literal sense; and that literal sense is the root and ground of all, and the anchor that never faileth, whereunto if thou cleave, thou canst never err nor go out of the way. . . . The greatest cause of which captivity and decay of faith, and this blindness wherein we are now, sprang first from allegories; for Origen and the doctors expounded one text twenty different ways, as children make descant upon plain song. Yea, they are come into such blindness that they not only say the literal sense profiteth not, but also that it is hurtful and killeth the soul.” *

HUGH LATIMER, A. D. 1535

Latimer was born in Leicestershire, Eng., 1470. In early life he was a Papist, but embracing Protestantism at the age of fifty-three,

* Works, vol. 1, p. 307

he became a zealous champion of the Reformation. In 1535, Henry VIII made him Bishop of Worcester, but this office he soon after resigned, refusing the mitre. He had the courage to write a letter to King Henry against a proclamation just published, forbidding the use of the Bible in English, in which he told that monarch, "the day is at hand when you shall give account of your office, and the blood which hath been shed by your sword." *

Having spoken in his third Sermon on the Lord's Prayer of a future Parliament, different from the parliaments of this world: "A parliament in which Christ shall bear the rule and not men; and which the righteous pray for when they say, 'Thy kingdom come,' because they know that therein reformation of all things shall be had," he says: "Let us therefore have a desire that this day may come quickly: let us hasten God forward; let us cry unto him day and night, 'Most merciful Father, thy kingdom come.'"

After saying that the saints in that day "shall be taken up to meet Christ in the air, and so shall come down with him again," he adds, "That man or that woman that saith these words, 'Thy kingdom come,' with a faithful heart, no doubt desireth in very deed that God will come to judgment, and amend all things in this world, and put down Satan, that old Serpent, under our feet." †

THOMAS CRANMER

In Catechism of Edward VI, 1550 (according to "Burnet's History," Vol. III, p. 4)

Question: "How is that petition, Thy kingdom come, to be understood?"

Answer: "We ask that his kingdom may come, because that as yet we see not all things subject to Christ: we see not yet how the stone is cut out of the mountain without human help, which breaks into pieces and reduces to nothing the image described by Daniel: or how the only rock, which is Christ, doth possess and obtain the empire of the whole world, given him of the Father. As yet Antichrist is not slain; whence it is that we desire and pray that at length it may come to pass and be fulfilled; and that Christ alone may reign with his saints, according to the divine promises; and that he may live and have dominion in the world, according to the decrees of the holy Gospel, and not according to the tradition and laws of men, and the wills of the tyrants of this world."

Question: "The sacred Scriptures call the end of the world the consummation and perfection of the mystery of Christ, and the renovation of all things, for thus the Apostle (Peter) speaks in his second epistle, chapter 3, 'We expect,' etc. Now, by what means or circumstances those things shall be brought to pass, I desire to know of thee?"

Answer: "I will declare, as well as I can, the same Apostle attesting. The heaven, in the manner of a stormy tempest, shall pass away, and the elements estuating, shall be dissolved, and the earth,

* Christian Index, p. 137

† Sermon for the Second Sunday in Advent

and the works therein shall be burnt. As if the Apostle should say, the world, like as we see in the refining of gold, shall be wholly purged with fire, and shall be brought to its utmost perfection; man, imitating, shall likewise be freed from corruption and change. And so for man's sake for whose use the great world was created, being at length renovated, it shall put on a face that shall be far more pleasant and beautiful."

KNOX, A. D. 1550

John Knox, the great champion of the Scottish Reformation and founder of the Presbyterian Church, was born at East Lothian, 1505. He was eloquent, influential and intrepid, and so mighty with God that Queen Mary said she feared his prayers more than an army of twenty thousand men. On the doctrine of the earth's renovation Knox writes, "to reform the face of the whole earth, which never was, nor yet shall be till that righteous King and Judge appear for the restoration of all things." Acts 3:21. In his letter to the faithful in London, dated 1554, he, on the Redeemer's advent, asks, "Has not the Lord Jesus, in despite of Satan's malice, carried up our flesh into heaven? [I Timothy 2:5.] And shall he not return? We know that He shall return and that with expedition."

MEDE, A. D. 1720

The Pre-Millennial doctrine rose to much eminence in the 17th century. First and highest on the list stands the illustrious Mede, whom David Brown, of Scotland, styles "The Prince of Millenarians." Twiss and Usher sit as pupils at his feet, and Baxter modestly says, "I cannot confute him." Bunyan, "the Prince of dreamers," also sides with him in the personal reign.

Joseph Mede, B. D., styled "the illustrious Mede," was born in Essex, England, 1586. His "Clavis Apocalypticae" is well known to prophetic students, and all his biographers concur in pronouncing him "a pious and profoundly learned man," and add that "in every part of his works the talents of a sound and learned divine are eminently conspicuous."

I Thessalonians 4:14-18. Paraphrasing verse 17 thus, "After this, our gathering together unto Christ at his coming, we shall from henceforth never lose his presence, but always enjoy it," etc. He argues that the redeemed will reign neither in heaven, nor in the air, but "on the earth," — Revelation 5:10. He then gives the cause of this "rapture of the saints on high." "The saints' being translated into the air, is to do honor to their Lord and King at his return, and . . . that they may be preserved during the conflagration of the earth, and the works thereof; that as Noah and his family were preserved from the deluge by being lifted up above the waters in the ark, so should the saints at the conflagration be lifted up in the clouds unto their ark, Christ, to be preserved there from the deluge of fire, wherein the wicked shall be consumed." *

* Mede's Works, Book IV, p. 776

"The rising of the martyrs is that which is called 'the first resurrection,' being as it seems a prerogative to their sufferings above the rest of the dead, who as they suffered with Christ in the time of his patience, so should they be glorified with Him in the reign of his victory before the universal resurrection of all. 'Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection, for on such the second death hath no power;' namely, because they are not in *via* but in *patria*, being a prerogative, as I understand it, of the first sort of reigners only, and not of the second. Thus I yet admit the first resurrection to be corporeal, as well as the second, though I confess I have much striven against it, and if the text would admit another sense less free of paradox, I had yet rather listen unto it, but I find it not. However, to grant a particular resurrection before the general is against no article of faith, for the gospel tells us, Matthew 27:52-53, that at our Saviour's resurrection, 'The graves were opened and many bodies of the saints which slept, arose and came out of their graves, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many.' Neither was the number of them a small number, if we may credit the Fathers, or the most ancient records of Christian tradition. For of this was that famous saying, 'That Christ descended alone, but ascended with a multitude.'"

He says again, "When at first I perceived the Millennium to be a state of the church consequent to the times of the beast, I was averse from the proper acceptation of that resurrection, taking it for a rising of the church from a dead estate; yet afterward, more seriously considering and weighing all things, I found no ground or footing for any sense but the literal. (His biographer says: 'He tried all ways imaginable to place the Millennium elsewhere than after the literal first resurrection, and, if it were possible, to begin it at the reign of Constantine. But after all his striving, he was forced to yield,' etc.) For first, I cannot be persuaded to forsake the proper and usual importment of Scripture language, where neither the insinuation of the text itself, nor manifest tokens of allegory, nor the necessity and nature of the things spoken of (which will bear no other sense) do warrant it. For to do so were to lose all footing of divine testimony, and instead of Scripture, to believe mine own imagination. Now the 20th of the Apocalypse, of all the narrations of that book, seems to be the most plain and simple, most free from allegory and the involution of prophetic figures; only here and there sprinkled with such metaphors as the use of speech makes equivalent to vulgar [common] expressions, or the former narrations in that book had made to be as words personal or proper names are in the plainest histories; as 'old serpent,' 'beast,' etc. How can a man, then, in so plain and simple a narration, take a passage of so plain and ordinarily expressed words (as those about the first resurrection are) in any other sense than the usual and literal? *

Usher (of the famous "Chronology") said of Mede's Comment on the Apocalypse, "I cannot sufficiently commend it."

* Works, Book IV, p. 770

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 34.

This month the beautiful testimony of some of the great “Christian Poets” is offered to our readers.

JOHN MILTON, A. D. 1660

John Milton, “The Christian Homer,” the renowned author of *Paradise Lost*, was born in London, 1608. His genius, creative imagination, mental sublimity, and power exhibited in the production of this great work is the admiration of all. An Arian Baptist in sentiment, he entered fully into the doctrine of the second advent, taught the final recreation of the earth and the near coming and personal reign of the Lord Jesus. In prayer for England, he thus addresses the Deity: “When thou, the eternal, and shortly expected King, shall open the clouds, to judge the several kingdoms of the world, and shalt put an end to all earthly tyrannies, proclaiming thy universal and mild monarchy through heaven and earth, etc.” On the personal reign, he justly remarks — “That this reign will be on earth is evident from many passages.” Quoting *Psa.* 2:8, 9; *Rev.* 2:25-27; *Psa.* 110:5, 6; *Isa.* 9:6, 7; *Dan.* 7:22-27; *Luke* 1:32, 33; *Math.* 19:28, and *Luke* 22:29, 30, in order, as proof-texts, on the last one he adds, that, “The judgment here spoken of will not be confined to a single day, but will extend through a great space of time; the word being used to denote not so much a judicial enquiry, properly so called, as an exercise of dominion; in which sense Gideon, Jephthah, and others judged Israel,” referring the reader then to *Rev.* 5:10, 11, 15, and 20:1-7. *

Such is the clear and “precious” pre-millennial “faith” of Milton — whose doctrines in the seventeenth century made Europe tremble, and who quoted the Scriptures as though he believed they literally meant as they spoke. What do his millions of admirers, of the spiritualizing and post-millennial school, think of him? He died 1674.

CHARLES WESLEY, A. D. 1770

Charles Wesley, A. M., was born at Epworth, 1708, and was educated at Westminster and Christ Church, England. One of the early Methodists, he was decidedly talented and pious, and is the author of hymns, poems, and sermons.

On *Job* 19:25, he says that —

“Jesus shall reappear below,
Stand in that dreadful day unknown,
And fix on earth his dreadful throne.”

On *Isa.* 2:17, he sings of Jesus’ coming, and of his being seated in full glorious power on his Millennial throne.

On *Isa.* 49:23, he represents Christ as saying that his people are expecting him to come and reign on the earth.

On *Isa.* 59:19, he sings of the time when Christ shall be the universal King on his Millennial throne.

On *Isa.* 60:13, Christ will descend to his footstool, and fill the world with peace unknown, and with endless joy.

* *Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, vol. 2, ch. 33.

The new earth of Isa. 65, like his brother John, he seems to interpret literally, and joyfully exclaims: "We long to see thy throne appear: bid the new creation rise; bring us back our Paradise, and create the universe fair beyond its first estate."

On Ezek. 37:24, he prays that "God would place Christ our heavenly David on his (Christ's) terrestrial throne;" and on verse 25, sings —

"Trusting in the literal Word,
We look for Christ on earth again;
Come, our everlasting Lord,
With all thy saints to reign."

On Dan., 2nd chapter, Wesley says:

"Lord, as taught by thee, we pray
That sin and death may end:
In the great Millennial day
With all thy saints descend."

On Dan., chapter 12, he sings of "the Redeemer's descending from the skies, and beginning on earth his glorious reign with his ancients."

On Zech. 14, he prays that Christ "would hasten to erect his throne below, in that last great divine monarchy."

On Mal. 4, he sings of Elijah's coming first to prepare the way of the Lord, and then, to Christ —

"When the seventh trumpet's sound
Proclaims the grand Sabbatic year,
Come thyself with glory crown'd,
And reign triumphant here."

Finally the Millennial poet thus sings:

"Mightier joys ordained to know
When thou comest to reign below;
We shall at thy side sit down,
Partners of thy great white throne;
Kings a thousand years with thee —
Kings to all eternity!" *

AUGUSTUS TOPLADY, A. D. 1770

(Author of the hymn "Rock of Ages")

Augustus M. Toplady was born in Surrey, England, in 1740. He says: "I am one of those old fashioned people who believe the doctrine of the Millennium, and that there will be two distinct resurrections of the dead: first of the just, and second of the unjust; which last resurrection of the reprobate will not commence till a thousand years after the resurrection of the elect. In this glorious interval of a thousand years, Christ, I apprehend, will reign in person over the kingdom of the just; and that during this dispensation, different degrees of glory will obtain, and every man shall receive his own reward according to his labor. 1 Cor. 3:8." †

* C. Wesley's Hymns, published 1762.

† Toplady's Works and Sermons, Vol. 3, p. 470.

WILLIAM COWPER, A. D. 1789

William Cowper, England's "Christian Poet" of imperishable fame, was born in 1731. He was obviously pre-millennial, and in his "Task" he has sung in glorious numbers of the signs of the times, the world's age, the advent, the restitution, the New Jerusalem and of all those "scenes surpassing fable," but just before us. He says:

"The groans of nature in this nether world,
Which heaven has heard for ages, have an end,
Foretold by prophets, and by poets sung
Whose fire was kindled at the prophet's lamp,
The time of rest, the promised Sabbath comes.
Six thousand years of sorrow have well nigh
Fulfilled their tardy and disastrous course
Over a sinful world; and what remains
Of this tempestuous state of human things,
Is merely as the working of a sea
Before a calm that rocks itself to rest;
For He whose ear the winds are, and the clouds
The dust that waits upon his sultry march,
When sin hath moved him and his wrath is hot,
Shall visit earth in mercy; shall descend,
Propitious, in his chariot paved with love;
And what his storms have blasted and defaced
For man's revolt, **shall with a smile repair.**
* * * * *

Behold the measure of the promise filled;
See, Salem built, the labor of a God!
Bright as a sun the sacred city shines;
All kingdoms and all princes of the earth
Flock to that light; the glory of all lands
Flows into her; unbounded is her joy,
And endless her increase. * * * * *

Come, then, and added to thy many crowns,
Receive yet one, the crown of all the earth,
Thou who alone art worthy! It was thine
By ancient covenant 'ere nature's birth;
And thou hast made it thine by purchase since
And over-paid its value with thy blood.
* * * * *

Thy saints proclaim thee King; and thy delay
Gives courage to their foes, who, could they see
The dawn of thy **last advent**, long desired,
Would flee for safety to the falling rocks." *

The reader is referred to the whole extract, found in Book sixth. Cowper, after a life of suffering, died in 1800.

ALEXANDER POPE, A. D. 1740

Alexander Pope, the celebrated English poet, was born in London, 1688, and died in 1744. He is the author of the "Essay on Man," also, "The Messiah." In the latter, after describing the wonderful birth of Jesus, he speaks of his being "the promised Father of the future age," describing his reign as follows:

"No more shall nation against nation rise,
Nor ardent warriors meet with hateful eyes,

* Cowper's Task, B 2 and 6.

Nor fields with gleaming steel be cover'd o'er,
 The brazen trumpets kindle rage no more;
 But useless lances into scythes shall bend,
 And the broad falchion in a plowshare end.
 Then palaces shall rise; the joyful son
 Shall finish what his short-liv'd sire begun;
 Their vines a shadow to their race shall yield,
 And the same hand that sow'd shall reap the field.
 The swain in barren deserts with surprise
 Sees lilies spring, and sudden verdure rise;
 And starts, amidst the thirsty wilds, to hear
 New falls of water murmuring in his ear.
 On rifted rocks, the dragon's late abodes,
 The green reed trembles, and the bulrush nods.
 Waste sandy valleys, once perplex'd with thorn,
 The spiry fir and shapely box adorn:
 To leafless shrubs the flowery palms succeed,
 And odorous myrtle to the noisome weed.
 The lambs with wolves shall graze the verdant mead,
 And boys in flowery bands the tiger lead;
 The steer and lion at one crib shall meet,
 And harmless serpents lick the pilgrim's feet.
 The smiling infant in his hand shall take
 The crested basilisk and speckled snake,
 Pleas'd, the green lustre of the scales survey,
 And with their forkv tongue shall innocently play.
 Rise, crown'd with light, imperial Salem, rise!
 Exalt thy towery head, and lift thy eyes!

The reader is referred to Pope's entire work, "The Messiah."

REGINALD HEBER, A. D. 1880

(Author of the hymn "Holy, Holy, Holy")

Reginald Heber, Bishop of Calcutta, was born in England in 1783. He was a poet and divine of much piety and eminence, and evidently a Millenarian. From his spirited poem, "Palestine," which gained the prize for him at Oxford, we extract as follows:

"And who is He! the vast, the awful form, (Rev. 10:1-2)
 Girt with the whirlwind, sandal'd with the storm?
 A western cloud around his limbs is spread,
 His crown a rainbow, and a sun his head.
 To highest heaven he lifts his kingly hand,
 And treads at once the ocean and the land;
 And hark! his voice amidst the thunder's roar,
 His dreadful voice, that time shall be no more!
 Lo! cherub hands the golden courts prepare,
 Lo! thrones are set, and every saint is there; (Rev. 20:5-6)
 Earth's utmost bounds confess their awful sway,
 The mountains worship, and the isles obey:
 Nor sun, nor moon they need — nor day — nor night: —
 God is their temple and the Lamb their light; (Rev. 21:22)
 And shall not Israel's sons exulting come,
 Hail the glad beam and claim their ancient home?
 On David's throne shall David's offspring reign,
 And the dry bones be warm with life again. (Ezek. 37)
 Hark! white rob'd crowds their deep hosannahs raise,
 And the hoarse flood repeats the sound of praise;
 Ten thousand harps attune the mystic song,
 Ten thousand thousand saints the strain prolong!
 "Worthy the Lamb! omnipotent to save,
 "Who died, who lives triumphant o'er the grave."

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 35.

INTRODUCTION

Three illustrious sons of the seventeenth century are quoted in the pages immediately following — the first, a famous allegorist; the second, a brilliant scientist; the third, a learned and noted commentator: John Bunyan, Sir Isaac Newton, Matthew Henry. Add their deathless names, dear reader, to the long list already quoted in our pages in support of the personal, visible, pre-millennial, and “imminent” (always-to-be-looked-for) coming of our Lord Jesus Christ! — J.

JOHN BUNYAN, A. D. 1660

John Bunyan was born 1628, in Bedfordshire, England, and died in 1688. He is the widely known and ingenious author of “Pilgrim’s Progress,” “The Holy War,” and other noted works, and is universally acknowledged to have been one of the most original and interesting writers of the seventeenth century. His name was attached to the Baptist Confession of Faith presented to King Charles, and he evidently believed in the personal reign of Christ “on the throne of his Father David, on Mount Zion, in Jerusalem, for ever.”

On Zech. 14:4, “His feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives,” arguing against the spiritualizers of God’s Word, he says: “This is the day of His second coming,” and he then asks, “Where is the Mount of Olives? Not within thee! But that which is without Jerusalem, before it, on the east side.” * A pointed and summary argument truly.

On the Millennium, Bunyan writes as follows: “God’s blessing the Sabbath day, and resting on it from all his works, was a type of that glorious rest that saints shall have when the six days of this world are fully ended. This the Apostle asserts in the fourth chapter to the Hebrews, ‘there remaineth a rest (or the keeping of a Sabbath) to the people of God,’ which Sabbath, as I conceive, will be the seventh thousand of years which are to follow immediately after the earth has stood six thousand years first. For as God was six days in the works of creation, and rested on the seventh, so in six thousand years he will perfect his works and providences that concern this world — as also he will finish the travail and toil of his saints, with the burden of the beasts, and the curse of the ground, and bring all into rest for a thousand years. A day with the Lord is a thousand years; wherefore this blessed and desirable time is also called a day, a great day, that great and notable day of the Lord (Isa. 2; Joel 2:31; Rev. 16:14) which shall end in the eternal judgment of the world. God hath held this forth by several other shadows, such as the Sabbath of weeks, the Sabbath of years, and the great Jubilee.” †

“None ever saw this world as it was in its first creation but Adam and his wife, neither will any see it until the manifestation of the chil-

* Works, vol. 5, p. 486.

† Works, vol. 6, p. 301.

dren of God; that is, until the redemption or resurrection of the saints. But then it shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. . . . In the seventh thousand years of the world will be 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." *

SIR ISAAC NEWTON, A. D. 1700

Sir Isaac Newton, "the greatest of philosophers," was born 1642, in Lincolnshire, England. He was the first discoverer of the laws of gravitation, and his name, connected with all sciences, is renowned throughout the world. "He gave," says Dr. Duffield, "his powerful mind two whole years to the study of the prophecies, and has avowed his belief in the pre-millennial coming of Christ."

On Daniel 12:4, 10 Newton writes: "The time is not yet come for the understanding the old prophets (which he that would understand must begin with the Apocalypse), because the main revolution predicted in them is not yet come to pass. In the days of the voice of the seventh angel the mystery of God shall be finished. . . . Among the interpreters of the last age there is scarce one of note who hath not made some discovery worth knowing; whence I seem to gather that God is about opening these mysteries." †

Sir Isaac used to say that "about the time of the end, in all probability, a body of men will be raised up who will turn their attention to the prophecies, and insist upon their literal interpretation in the midst of much clamor and opposition." "How exactly," says Wm. Thorp, "has this observation of that sagacious man been verified."

MATTHEW HENRY, A. D. 1700

Matthew Henry was born in Flintshire, England, 1663. He was a pious Dissenter, and deservedly eminent as a commentator of the Scriptures, Wm. Romaine declaring, "There is no comment upon the Bible, either ancient or modern, in all respects equal to Mr. Henry's." We give copious extracts.

On the resurrection of Rev. 20:4, he says: "This may be taken either literally or figuratively." Still, throughout his Commentary he advances sentiments utterly at war with modern Post-millennialism.

On Luke 12:45, 46: "Our looking at Christ's second coming as a thing at a distance is the cause of all those irregularities which render the thought of it terrible to us."

On watching: "To watch implies not only to believe that our Lord will come, but to desire that he would come, to be often thinking of his coming, and always looking for it as sure and near, and the time of it uncertain. To watch for Christ's coming is to maintain that gracious temper and disposition of mind which we would be willing that our Lord, when He comes, should find us in. To watch is to be

* Works, vol. 6, p. 329.

† Observations on the Prophecies.

aware of the first notices of his approach, that we may immediately attend his motions and address ourselves to the duty of meeting him."

On 2d Peter, 3d chap., of the final fire, he says: "It is yet to come, and will surely come, though we know not when nor upon what particular age or generation of men; and therefore we are not, we cannot be sure that it may not happen in our own times."

On John 18:19: "It is meet that disciples should be warned of the haste and end of time, and apprised as much as may be of the prophetic periods of time."

On Romans 8:18-25, Henry makes "the creature" to mean "the whole frame of nature, especially that of this lower world; the whole creation, the compages of inanimate and sensible creatures;" the vanity and bondage and corruption is the curse to which the whole creation is subject, now "hastening to a total dissolution by fire."

He says, "The creature, that is now thus burdened, shall, at the time of the restitution of all things, be delivered from this bondage into the glorious liberty of the children of God. They shall no more be subject to vanity and corruption, and the other fruits of the curse; but, on the contrary, this lower world shall be renewed, when there will be new heavens and a new earth, 2d Peter 3:13; Rev. 21:1; and there shall be a glory conferred upon all the creatures which shall be (in the proportion of their natures), as suitable and as great an advancement as the glory of the children of God shall be to them. The fire at the last day shall be a refining, not a destroying, annihilating fire. Compare with this Ps. 96:10-13; Ps. 98:7-9, Let the heavens rejoice, etc."

On verse 19: "At the second coming of Christ there will be a manifestation of the children of God. Now, the saints are God's hidden ones; the wheat seems lost in a heap of chaff; but then they shall be manifested. And this redemption of the creature is reserved till then; for as it was with man and for man that they fell under the curse, so with and for man shall they be delivered. All the curse and filth that now adheres to the creature shall be done away then, *when those that have suffered with Christ upon earth shall reign with him upon earth.* [Italics ours. E. L. J.] This the whole creation looks and longs for."

"Verse 23: We groan within or among ourselves. It is the unanimous vote, the joint desire of the whole church; all agree in this. Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly. The groaning notes a very earnest and importunate desire, the soul pained with the delay."

2 Peter 3: "That time which men think to be the most improper and unlikely, and therefore are most secure, will be the time of the Lord's coming. Let us then beware how we in our thoughts and imaginings put that day far away from us; let us rather suppose it to be so much nearer in reality, by how much further off it is in the opinion of the ungodly world."

"The first coming of our Lord Jesus Christ was what the people of God earnestly waited and looked for; that coming was for the

consolation of Israel. How much more should they wait with expectation and earnestness for his second coming, which will be the day of their complete redemption, and of his most glorious manifestation?"

"They (the wicked) will still attack us till the end of time; till our Lord is come they will not themselves believe that he will come; nay, they will laugh at the very mention of his second coming, and do what in them lies to put all out of countenance who seriously believe and wait for it."

On Luke 18:8: "Now when he comes, will he find faith in the earth? The question implies a strong negative; no, he shall not, he himself forcees it. . . In general he will find but few good people, few that are really and truly good; many that have the form and fashion of godliness, but few that have faith. Even to the end of time there will be occasion for the same complaint; the world will grow no better, no, not when it is drawing towards its period. Bad it is, and bad it will be, and worst of all just before Christ's coming; the last times will be the most perilous. In particular he will find few that have faith concerning his coming. It intimates that he will delay his coming so long that wicked people will begin to defy it."

On Matt. 25: "As Christians, we profess not only to believe and look for, but love and long for, the appearing of Christ, and to act in our whole conversation with regard to it. The second coming of Christ is the center in which all the lines of our religion meet, and to which the whole of the divine life hath a constant reference and tendency."

"The Bridegroom tarried, that is, he did not come as soon as they expected. But though Christ tarry past *our* time, he will not tarry past the due time."

On Dan. 12:10: Matthew Henry, though looking for an extensive proclamation of the gospel, looked not for its universal reception, but says: "As long as the world stands there will still be in it such a mixture as now we see there is of good and bad. We long to see all wheat and no tares in God's field; all corn and no chaff in God's floor; but it will not be till the time of ingathering, till the winnowing-day comes; both must grow together until the harvest."

On Rev. 22:20: "This is Christ's farewell to his church, and the church's hearty echo to Christ's promise. Come, Lord Jesus! thus beats the pulse of the church, thus breathes that gracious spirit which actuates and informs the mystical body of Christ, and we should never be satisfied till we find such a spirit breathing in us, and causing us to look for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ. What comes from heaven in a promise should be sent back to heaven in a prayer. Come, Lord Jesus, put an end to this state of sin, and sorrow, and temptation, and gather thy people out of this present evil world!"

So writes the pious Matthew Henry in a commentary . . . of which Dr. Adam Clarke affirms, "It is always orthodox!" Henry died in 1714.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 36.

For this installment, we depart from the usual historical reprint, and offer instead a new, fresh article from the pen of Stanford Chambers. The writer is known as a careful, thoughtful teacher, a man of sound and balanced judgment, and a man far removed from sectarian bias and prejudice. We ask our readers to mark well the argument — which should have been more fully stressed long ago — that if any prophetic teaching has caused trouble and discord, it is precisely the noisy, dogmatic, unscriptural, and hurtful speculations of the "post-millennial" preachers that have done so. — E. L. J.

A MODIFIED MILLENNIUM

We easily recall when even men of post-millennial views applied the term millennium to a future time, when the kingdom of the world "under the whole heaven" would be the kingdom of Christ and of "the saints of the Most High." They commonly described that age in Bible language. Without disagreement it was to be a time of universal [non ending] peace, a time when righteousness should prevail, when oppression should cease, when "the knowledge of the Lord should cover the earth as waters cover the sea." His kingdom should extend "from the River to the ends of the earth." They with others were accustomed to refer to such a time as "the Golden Age."

An issue arose with the teaching that such an age is to come during the time of Christ's absence; that the millennium comes as a result of the preaching of the gospel and its universal acceptance; that the coming of Christ is post-millennial; hence the term post-millennialism. This doctrine demands, of course, a converted world and everything else the prophets foretell that is to constitute the millennium. Such teaching has caused controversy because of its variance with the waiting and expectant attitude to which the Lord and His inspired teachers exhort the people of God. How could they be "as men waiting for their Lord" if they knew He could not come for a thousand years? Post-millennialism has put preparation for death in the place of "that blessed hope" of our Lord's return, a thing which, to the saints, is surer than death. "We all shall not sleep," says Paul, but His coming is a certainty. The admonitions of the New Testament are written with His coming in view rather than with death in view, and this is neither incidental nor accidental. We must grant that divine wisdom is back of it.

That there are thousands of spiritually-minded people, earnest Bible students, who do not subscribe to the post-millennial doctrine is well known. When Christianity was young such a doctrine had no propagandist, no voice. Men like Barnabas, Clement, Papias, Justin Martyr, Ignatius, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Polycarp, and many others — men who laid down their lives for the faith — expected and taught (as their writings show) that the glorious age foretold in the word of God would be ushered in and administered by the Lord Himself. Irenaeus and others show this to have been the hope of the whole church in that early day.

Following the days of the men just mentioned came the Papacy. As it began to take form and to take over, the post-millennial doctrine began to take root. As the professing church appeared to gain enormously and rapidly, men in ever-increasing numbers concluded that the world was being converted, and that the kingdoms of earth were becoming the kingdom of Christ. The "Golden Age" was being ushered in, the Millennium had dawned. The Papacy's false millennium had indeed dawned, and thus the coming of Christ was proved to be post-millennial! But even those who have but little Bible knowledge see instead a striking resemblance to John's vision, the scarlet woman riding the scarlet beast, the false church in control of the beastly state.

The Papacy and its regime are far removed from the government of Christ. Denominationalized Protestantism with its creedism, and its drift into modernism and atheistic apostasy, is also far removed. The "Golden Age" is not yet. Our "Atomic Age," which affords civilization the power and equipment to destroy itself, is not the "Golden Age" by God's seers foretold. At the present rate of true conversion it would be millenniums before the Millennium could, by man's endeavor, be brought in. The spiritual birth rate trails far behind the natural birth rate, and every year sees it trailing farther behind. The post-millennial position is untenable.

Down toward the end of the Papacy's false millennium, there rose up men as reformers, leading the people back to the Bible. From the Reformation times and even until now there have been men, outstanding on the pages of church history, who found no warrant for the hope of the millennium in the time of Christ's absence, but who believed and taught as did those men of early days, that the great day of peace is dependent on the presence of the Prince of peace. Truly a Roll of Honor it is, which holds such names as Wyclif, Tyndale, Luther, Knox, Alford, Whitefield, Wesley, Bunyan, Muller, Spurgeon, Toplady, Bonar, Pierson, Edersheim, Gordon, Moody, and many also of our own generation and kind. These, though like the Master, "not wishing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance," and therefore exceedingly zealous in missionary work, nevertheless have failed to find any Scriptural ground for expecting a converted world at the coming of our Lord, or before that time. Instead, they find such teaching as the following:

"When the Son of man cometh will he find the faith on the earth?"
(Luke 18:8)

"As it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be in the days of the Son of man." (Luke 17:26)

"As it came to pass in the days of Lot." (verse 28)

In the Savior's panoramic view of the times ahead, as given in Matthew, chapters 24 and 25, there is not to be found any hint of a period of time before His coming in which peace ensues and righteousness prevails. The parallel passages, Mark 13 and Luke 21, likewise leave no space for such a time. Instead it is "wars and rumors of

wars," kingdom against kingdom, nation against nation, family against family; famines, pestilences, earthquakes, evils and series of evils, reaching a climax at last in such a time of trouble and tribulation as never was nor ever will be again. Next comes the Son of man on the clouds of heaven, "immediately." (Matthew 24:29, ff.) Nineteen centuries of history verify the panorama our Savior gives down to now; and that "immediately" clause will prove just as dependable in its time.

"Evil men and impostors shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." (II Timothy 3:13)

"Because iniquity shall abound the love of the many shall wax cold." (Matthew 24:12) No improvement is to be seen.

"Be patient therefore, brethren, until the coming of the Lord," says James. In exhorting the oppressed, he says, "establish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord is at hand" (James 5:7, 8). The brethren are not promised that the oppression will cease; the coming of the Lord will be their relief therefrom. Let them be patient till He comes.

"Let your forbearance (moderation) be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand" (Philippians 4:6).

"Whom the heavens must receive until the times of restoration" spoken of by the prophets, says Peter (Acts 3:21). He does not say until after the times of restoration. Post-millennialism does.

"Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled" (Luke 21:24). "The times of the Gentiles" and "the times of restoration" are certainly not contemporaneous; they do not run side by side. The former will end and the latter will begin. The times of restoration are yet future, and must be future as long as the holy city over which Jesus wept those bitter tears is "trodden down of the Gentiles." The restoration waits for the great Restorer.

"A hardening in part hath befallen Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." (Romans 11:25, ff.) "There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer; he shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob . . ." "For yet a very little while, He that cometh shall not tarry" (Hebrews 10:37). Post-millennialism says, No, He will not come until after the Millennium; that is, until all things have been restored, or put in order. No inspired writer so teaches.

But again, it is at the time of the seventh trumpet that "the kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ" (Revelation 11:15). Not even the first of the seven trumpets has yet sounded. The trumpets are embraced in the seventh seal, which has not been opened. And no one will likely claim that even the sixth seal has been opened. Revelation 11:15 is therefore future. The glorious and universal reign of Christ lies not behind us, but ahead. The Papists won the debate in their day, but they did not win the kingdom. It must be "given to the saints of the Most High" (Daniel 7:22). "Fear not little flock; it is the Father's good pleasure

to give you the kingdom." That takes place when "the ancient of days" comes, according to Daniel, when "judgment is given to the saints." It is the event of Matthew 16:27; of 24:30; it is the event of Jude 14, 15. (And see I Corinthians 6:2; Matthew 25:31.)

Paul declares that it is to be at the appearing of the Lord Jesus that "He shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords" (I Timothy 6:15). See Revelation 19:11 ff.

"This present evil world" (margin, "age") is the Holy Spirit's designation for this dispensation (Galatians 1:4), which is "according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the powers of the air, of the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience" (Ephesians 2:2). But the millennium is at that time when "the prince of the powers of the air" will be confined in the bottomless pit.

The course of this world in "this present evil age" presents a number of misplacements; and these misplacements will continue as long as Satan is "the prince of the powers of the air." He belongs in the pit. The bride of Christ belongs with her Husband. He has not yet presented her to Himself (Ephesians 5:27). Jerusalem belongs to the seed of Abraham, the true Israel; it does not belong under the foot of the Gentiles. Our Lord has not come into His inheritance of "the nations" as promised Him in the Second Psalm. Truth does not belong "on the scaffold," with wrong upon the throne. The coming King and Lord of lords will restore all things, will set things right, each in the place where it belongs. It is not in the power of men to do it.

It is not only in "this present evil age" (man's day, I Corinthians 4:3, margin), but "in the age to come" also, that He is to be "far above all rule and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named." (Ephesians 1:21; Hebrews 6:3) This He is yet to be in completeness, in fulness and without a rival — but not separate from His bride, the Lamb's wife, His glorified church.

But why should we go on multiplying passages, as though God must say it over and over again to make it so? We are not setting forth things theoretical. These are utterances of inspiration. Post-millennialism is but a theory, and its propagandists have to subject all these and many other words of Holy Writ to special treatment, which thing they do with the aid of the best exegetical art they can procure. By "spiritualizing" many Scriptures, and unspiritualizing those who oppose their theory, they make a show of perfect soundness and loyalty. They are orthodox, and all others are heterodox. "We speak where the Scriptures speak, and are silent where the Scriptures are silent," so say they. But does that make it so!

Attention is attracted by a shift of methods pursued in defense of this theory, that the Millennium is to come first, that is, before Christ comes. The interpretation is being propagated that the Millennium is now — this present gospel dispensation. Now is the glorious age by prophets seen, and seeing which they became poetical, ecstatic,

By an adopted and adjusted method of "speaking where the Bible speaks," inspired utterances are trimmed down to fit the theory. The theory must be true though every prophet a hyperbolist. The theory predetermines their interpretation. Thus the time of peace foretold repeatedly, time and again, is now. It is modified peace. The time foretold when oppression should cease, and justice and righteousness should prevail is now — a modified righteousness, a modified justice. The reign of Christ foretold is now — a modified reign. The reign of His saints is now — likewise a modified reign. The glorious things to which the Prophets devoted so much space have their fulfillment now — a modified fulfillment. The Millennium is now — a modified Millennium. The Millennium involves a bound Satan; thus that spirit "that now worketh in the sons of disobedience" is bound now — in a modified sense. "The prince of the powers of the air" is bound now — figuratively. But what about the loosing of Satan for the "little season"? If the binding is figurative can the loosing be literal? And what about the lake of fire which ends the chapter for Satan and the lost? Is theirs a figurative doom? A modified doom? What about the Book of life and the Holy City? That figurative trick has been made to cover a multitude of Bible truths. Its logical conclusion goes a bit too far!

Post-millennialism is a tree that bears much evil fruit. Consider these results:

It neutralizes the admonitions and warnings of the Lord Jesus concerning His second coming, His instructions to "Watch," to "Be ready," to be "as men looking for their lord to return."

It is responsible for substituting preparation for death for "that blessed hope" of His personal return.

It lends encouragement to the mockers who say, "Where is the promise of his coming?"

Like the mockers, they are saying, "There have always been fanatics, pessimists, alarmists, and the like. We pay no attention to that. 'All things continue as they were.' " etc., etc. Were there then no inspired predictions? Or has time really proved them false?

Under the guise of orthodoxy versus herterodoxy it ostracises brethren in Christ, thus partitioning the family of God, dismembering the body of Christ.

It resorts to a perversion of the Scriptures, such as get in the way of the theory. Many of its adherents are not conscious of this, as in the case of all erroneous teaching, but it is true nevertheless.

It is a "plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted." It will be rooted up. It is not of heaven, but of men. It was conceived in the spirit that produced the Papacy. It pampers the ambition and pride of man, encouraging the fleshly mind these many centuries in the vain hope of doing that which is impossible without the Lord, of establishing peace in the absence of the rejected Prince.

We would appeal, if possible, to those who are committed to "the Bible and the Bible alone," seeking to "speak where the Scriptures

speak," to do just that; to take such a plea seriously, not feignedly; to do it at any cost to themselves, lest we be of the number who "say and do not." In His absence our Lord must have servants over His household to "render them their food in due season." The household needs food. The Lord supplies the food. The faithful servant does not provide; he only distributes. "Blessed is that servant whom his Lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing. Verily I say unto you that he will set him over all that he hath" (Matthew 24:46, 47). Count the cost if you will, and added into that cost will be the suffering of ill treatment at the hands of the unfaithful servant who says "in his heart, My lord tarrieth"; for that decidedly affects his conduct toward his fellow-servant who strives faithfully to please his master, and to minister "food in due season" to his master's household. But when you count the cost of faithfulness, fail not to note the cost to that servant who beat (and browbeat) his fellow-servants, being intoxicated with the old wine, the mixed wine of this evil age.

"The mystery of iniquity," already working in Paul's day (II Thessalonians 2:7), has never ceased to work. The whole lump is becoming quite thoroughly leavened. The Babel spirit animates the vaster portion of religious activity today. The Papacy, plus denominational creedism and modernism, plus cultism lodging in the branches of Christendom, minus those whom "the Lord knoweth" to be His, are fast adding up to the great "Mystery Babylon" of Revelation. In that Babylon are many misplaced persons who should hear His voice, "Come forth, my people out of her, that ye have no fellowship with her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues" (Revelation 18:4). It is not possible for those who dwell in Babylon to be "as men looking for their Lord to return." They are drunken with the spirit of the age, they secularize their religion, they compete and commercialize, they "play politics," they are conformed and conforming, they love the plains of Sodom more than the heights of Abraham; they, like Babylon, whose spirit they have imbibed, are of the earth, earthy, having lost or never having confessed their pilgrimage. "Be not ye like unto them," my beloved brethren. Better than success here, even religious success, would it be to say, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord . . . shall give to me in that day, and not to me only, but to all them that have loved his appearing."

H. L. Mencken, former editor of *Mercury*, has long been regarded in America as a cynical non-religionist. Has he had a change of heart? The following is a recent sentence from his pen:

"All I desire to point out is that the New Testament offers a precise and elaborate specification for the events preceding the inevitable end of the world and that a fair reading of them must lead any rational man to conclude that these events are now upon us."

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 37.

Few there are among the religiously well-read who are unacquainted with the works of Richard Baxter. Known among the post-Reformation writers for his gentle and earnest devotional writings, he has exercised an influence for good throughout the English-speaking world. His personal longing for the Lord's return, expressed in the reprint that follows, has the ring of all sincerity.

Following the Baxter article, we reprint portions of an early Baptist “Confession of Faith” that was filed with King Charles II of England in 1660.—E.L.J.

RICHARD BAXTER, A.D. 1670

Richard Baxter was born in Shropshire, England, 1615. He was minister at Kidderminster, and also chaplain in the army . . . His works are universally admired, and no eulogy upon him is here required. Expecting the personal return of Jesus, he thus sweetly and calmly writes:

“Would it not rejoice your hearts if you were sure to live to see the coming of the Lord, and to see his glorious appearing and his retinue? If you were not to die, but to be caught up thus to meet the Lord, would you be averse to this? Would it not be the greatest joy that you could desire? For my own part, I must confess to you that death, as death, appeareth to me as an enemy, and my nature doth abhor and fear it. But the thoughts of the coming of the Lord are most sweet and joyful to me, so that if I were but sure that I should live to see it, and that the trumpet should sound, and the dead should rise, and the Lord appear before the period of my age, it would be the joyfulest tidings to me in the world. O that I might see his kingdom come!”

“It is the work of faith and the character of his saints to love his appearing and to look for that blessed hope: ‘The Spirit and the Bride say come; even so come, Lord Jesus, come quickly.’ This is the voice of faith, and hope, and love. But I find not that his servants are thus characterized by their desire to die. It is the presence of their Lord that they desire, but it is death that they abhor; and therefore, though they cannot submit to death, it is the coming of the Lord that they love and long for. If death be the last enemy to be destroyed at the resurrection, we may learn how earnestly believers should long and pray for the second coming of Christ, when this full and final conquest shall be made. There is something in death that is penal even to believers; but in the coming of Christ and their resurrection there is nothing but glorifying grace.” *

“Though I have not skill enough in the exposition of hard prophecies to make a particular determination about the thousand-year reign of Christ on earth before the final judgment, yet, I may say that I cannot confute what such learned men as Mr. Mede, Dr. Twiss, and others (after the old Fathers) have hereof asserted . . . But I believe there will be a new heaven and earth on which will dwell righteousness.” †

* Works, vol. 17, 500, 555.

† Works, vol. 2, p. 513.

"This is the day that all believers should long, and hope, and wait for, as being the accomplishment of all the work of their redemption, and all the desires and endeavors of their souls. . . . Hasten, O Lord, this blessed day! Stay not till faith have left the earth; and infidelity, and impiety, and tyranny have conquered the rest of thine inheritance! Stay not till selfish, uncharitable pride hath vanquished love and self-denial, and planted its colonies of heresy, cruelty, and confusion in thy dominion, and earth and hell be turned into one! Stay not till the eyes of thy servants fail, and their hearts and hopes do faint and languish with looking and waiting for their salvation! But if the day be not at hand, O keep up faith, and hope, and love, till the sun of perfect love arise, and time hath prepared us for eternity and grace for glory."*

BAPTIST CONFESSION OF FAITH

Baptist Confession of Faith is dated 1660. This confession was presented to Charles II in the above year, in the city of London, and was signed by forty-one elders, deacons, and brethren, and approved by more than 20,000 others; "for which," say they, "we are not only resolved to suffer persecution to the loss of our goods, but also life itself, rather than decline from the same." We give one or two extracts exhibiting its Millenarian character:

Art. 22. "We believe that the Lord Jesus who showed himself alive after his passion, by many infallible proofs (Acts 1:3), which was taken up into heaven (Luke 24:51), shall so come in like manner as he was seen to go into heaven (Acts 1:9-11): 'And when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, we also shall appear with him in glory.'—Col. 3:4. 'For the kingdom is his, and he is the governor among the nations' (Psa. 22:28) and 'king over all the earth' (Zech. 14:9), 'and we shall reign with him on the earth.'—Rev. 5:10. The kingdoms of this world (which men so mightily strive after here to enjoy) shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ.—Rev. 11:15. 'For all is yours' (ye that overcome this world), 'for ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's.'—1 Cor. 3:22, 23. 'For unto the saints shall be given the kingdom, and the greatness of the kingdom, under the whole heaven.'—Dan. 7:27. Though, alas! now many men be scarce content that the saints should have so much as a being among them, but when Christ shall appear, then shall be their day, then shall be given unto them power over the nations, to rule them with a rod of iron.—Rev. 2:26, 27. Then shall they receive a crown of life, which no man shall take from them, nor they by any means turned or overturned from; for the oppressor shall be broken in pieces (Psa. 72:4) and their vain rejoicings be turned into mourning and lamentations, as it is written, Job 20:5-7."

"We believe that there will be an order in the resurrection: Christ is the first fruits, and then next, or after, they that are Christ's at his coming; then, or afterward, cometh the end. Concerning the

* Baxter's Works, vol. 4, p. 164.

kingdom and reign of our Lord Jesus Christ, as we do believe that he is now in heaven at his Father's right hand, so we do believe that at the time appointed of the Father he shall come again in power and great glory; and that at or after his coming the second time, he will not only raise the dead, and judge and restore the world, but will also take to himself his kingdom, and will, according to the Scriptures, reign on the throne of his father David on Mount Zion in Jerusalem forever."*

"We believe that the kingdom of our Lord will be an universal kingdom, and that in this kingdom the Lord Jesus Christ himself will be alone, visible, supreme Lord and King of the whole earth.

"We believe that as this kingdom will be universal, so it will be also an everlasting kingdom that shall have no end, nor cannot be shaken; in which kingdom the saints and faithful in Christ Jesus shall receive the end of their faith, even the salvation of their souls. Where the Lord is they shall be also.

"We believe that the New Jerusalem that shall come down out of heaven, when the tabernacle of God shall be with them and he will dwell among them, will be the metropolitan city of this Kingdom, and will be the glorious place of residence of both Christ and his saints for ever, and will be so situated as that the kingly palace will be on Mount Zion, the holy hill of David, where his throne was."†

THE POWER OF THAT BLESSED HOPE

(We clip the following beautiful article from the writings of Horatius Bonar.—E.L.J.)

A Great Incentive

Do I paralyze effort when I say, "Work while it is day, for the night cometh when no man can work?" Nay, do I not thus stimulate zeal, and toil, and prayer, and love to the uttermost? Do I lull men asleep when I say, "The coming of the Lord draweth nigh?"—or do I flatter into flesh-pleasing the great or the noble, or the beautiful of the earth, when I tell them that—

"the tide of pomp,

That beats upon the high shore of this world,"

is ebbing fast? Do I tempt the sinner to postpone his conversion, because I speak of the "wrath to come" as so very nigh? Or do I with less serious haste beseech men to be reconciled to God, because I add that the time of reconciliation, the acceptable year of the Lord, is fast running to a close? Do I cherish idleness instead of diligence, softness of spirit instead of hardness, heedlessness about redeeming time, instead of eagerness to gather up its fragments, when I announce that—"The day goeth away, and the shadows of evening are stretching out?"

Do I soothe the Bride into a deeper sleep when I say, "Behold the Bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him?" Do I tempt the minister or the missionary into indolent security, when I declare that

*Crosby's History of the Baptists, vol. 2, Appendix 85.

†Ibid, vol. 2, App. 85. Irvings Dialogues on Proph., vol. 2, p. 269.

"the Judge standeth before the door," and that ere long the time of working and preaching and inviting will be over? Do I persuade the soldier of the risen Jesus to ungird his weapons because I tell him that his feet are already on the battle field, and bid him listen to the loud roar afar that forewarns of the deadly onset? Do I preach Christ crucified the less because I preach also Christ coming to reign? or do I the less proclaim that "here we have no continuing city," because I can point so clearly to that which is to come, the "city which hath foundations, whose builder and whose maker is God?" Or do I make saints feel the less that they are strangers here because I set forth to them the "new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness?" Do I undervalue the cross because I magnify the throne? In holding up to view the crown of glory, do I deprecate the crown of thorns? Do I enfeeble my proclamation of immediate and free forgiveness to sinners, through the sin-bearer, because I enforce it with the announcement that the coming of the Lord draweth nigh? Do I foster error, or heresy, or lax walking, or any departure from the faith, when I warn men that the perilous times of the last days are setting in, when Satan will "cast abroad the rage of his wrath?"

I do not know how it may be with others, but I feel that when I can say the coming of the Lord draweth nigh, I have got a weapon in my hand of no common edge and temper. To be able to announce "the Lord will come" is much; but to be able to say without the reservation of an interval "He is at hand," is greatly more. I can go to the struggling saint against whom the battle seems to go hardly, and say, "Faint not; the Lord is at hand, and he will bruise Satan under your feet shortly." To the saint wearied with a vexing world, fretted with its vanities, and troubled with the thickening darkness of its midnight, I can say, "Be of good cheer, the Lord is at hand; but a little while and that world shall cease to vex; sooner than you think the morn will break; yea, before it is broken we shall be caught up and meet morning ere it is yet spread upon the mountains." To the suffering saint I can say, "Weep not, the Lord is at hand; the torn heart shall be bound up, and the bitterness of bereavement forgotten in the joy of union forever." To the flagging saint, heavy and slothful in his walk, I can say, "Up, for the Lord is at hand; work while it is day; look at a dying world, all unready for its Judge; cast off your selfishness and love of ease." To the covetous saint I can say, "The Lord is coming—it is no time for hoarding now—heap not up treasure for the last days.—*Horatius Bonar*."

"It is very true that Millenarians do not all agree with regard to the nature and character of the Millennial age; but, as an English writer properly said, 'they differ as the small clocks in a town may differ from the town clock, not by the hour, but by the minute and second.' Whatever be the views of the future reign of the Messiah, all agree, to a man, in believing that Christ will come in person, not at the end, but at the commencement of the Millennium."

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 38.

DIVISIONS AND OCCASIONS OF STUMBLING CAUSE, COURSE, AND CURE

E. L. J.

At this mid-year of 1948, as we are about to turn for our materials from the earlier "church fathers" to our own honored "Restoration Pioneers," we pause, so to speak, for a "station announcement." It seemed good to state once again our aims and purposes in this series of "precious reprints," now running in the fourth consecutive year. But then, as I was giving all diligence to state those aims and purposes, I was constrained to write a full installment, dealing with opinions, divisions, discipline; truth, forbearance, and the unity of the Spirit — all in connection with the text of Romans 16:17:

"Mark them which are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned; and turn away from them." (Common version, "avoid them.")

This department of the *Word and Work* (last four pages regularly) is dedicated to the task of retrieving for posterity and for the present generation, from the limbo of lost and neglected religious literature, the great and worthwhile sayings of "the fathers" and the pioneers — especially on the lines of Unity and Prophecy.

The further purpose is to bring about a better fellowship by means of a better understanding. Hundreds of extra copies of this magazine (sometimes thousands) are sent out each month, independently financed by funds from this department — in order that many brethren may benefit by these great writings, and that disciples everywhere may reach that better unity by means of a wider, fairer outlook, historically and doctrinally, on the things that are of current interest and discussion among us. Such are the aims and purposes that are ever before our minds. And the evidence of such a trend — toward unity in the midst of our diversity — is now abundant and cumulative. For this, let God be thanked.

BUILDING BROKEN WALLS: THE OPPOSITION

It is not strange, of course, that our purposes should be criticised (we are not above the need of criticism offered in the Christian spirit), nor that our efforts to rebuild these broken holy walls should be opposed — by those who plainly do not want unity in our present diversity; those who first started and have kept alive the myth — that figment of the imagination — that our differences on Prophecy are too great for fellowship; those in fact who offer fellowship only on the doubtful ground of their own published and oft-repeated opinions and theories. That there are differences, we admit, but that they are too great for Christian love and toleration, we humbly deny. At least, they are not so *from us toward them*; we see no reason therefore why they should be so from them toward us. They differ

no more from us than we differ from them; and our errors, whatever they are, could hardly be more odious and unscriptural in their eyes than theirs are in ours. Yet we plead for fellowship, reciprocal and sincere; and we try to do our best to practice it.

UNITY NEEDED NOW

Furthermore, we plead for unity *now*, that unity which is of the Spirit; yes, even now, before we have time to attain to perfect intellectual agreement, desirable as such agreement may be. We plead for that unity which proceeds by and from those peaceable qualities that Paul lays down as the means to it: meekness, lowliness, long-suffering, forbearance, and love, which is the bond of perfectness (Eph. 4:1-3; Col. 3:14). This is the unity of *the Spirit*, and the fruit of the Spirit; and it has often been realized in the midst of much diversity, both of doctrine and of judgment; whereas it has often been absent even where intellectual agreement prevailed. Moreover, this is the only unity that leaves men unenslaved and free — free to grow in grace and knowledge, and to go on with God. It stands in sharpest contradistinction to that uncertain, unstable, legalistic unity that is hammered out by the hardest, and that is maintained only by the threat of excommunication held over the heads of any who dare to differ from its leaders.

It has been said of our civil liberty that eternal vigilance is the price of it. But how much more is constant vigilance the price of religious liberty! Beware! Stand fast! Be not entangled in any yoke of bondage! There is no outside sectarianism so insidious, so enslaving, and so likely to be hidden from our own eyes, as that incipient sectarianism which rises up from within. By such influences men who think they are free disciples are no more free than slaves; and many who boast of being undenominational Christians are as creed-bound as the sects which they denounce.

WHEN TRUTH CAUSES TROUBLE

For, if the teachings of any earnest Bible student in our midst, set forth humbly by him *as truth*, and believed by him to be indeed the Word of God (whether it be what God said in so many words by inspired men, or what must necessarily follow, as he sees it, from the gathering of the scattered scripture-testimony, "here a little, there a little") — I say, if what some such man sets forth *as scripture truth* may be summarily set aside by another, *because he thinks it is opinion* and denounces it as such, then our creed is fixed, our bounds of knowledge are set, and Christian growth is ended! And again, if what good and studious men have taught as truth (and often *vital truth*) — if such teachings may be suppressed by the simple cry that it will "cause trouble," then our faith is man-controlled more surely than any OPA could ever control our war-time regimen. Such a system leaves us just as free in Christ as slaves, and the church of Christ no better than a poor, sectarian little Rome. For it would be easily possible always to prove that any teaching whatsoever

"causes trouble," if there were those ready and willing to see to it that it does! And how can we be sure after all that truth, vital needed truth, will never cause trouble? Our great Teacher, though He is the Prince of Peace, has said: "I came not to send peace but a sword" (Matt. 10:34); and another has told us, by the Spirit, that the wisdom that is from above is *first pure*, then peaceable (Jas. 3:17).

"MARKING" AND "AVOIDING"

If any word herein may seem to be accusative or direct, let it be remembered that that word applies only to whom it may justly apply. If there are misguided men today who have caused **divisions** and occasions of stumbling contrary to the doctrines which the churches addressed by Paul had learned — those doctrines of lowliness and meekness, longsuffering and forbearance, without which the unity of the Spirit is utterly impossible — then those men must indeed be marked and avoided, in solemn obedience to the Word of God (Rom. 16:17). But let us understand first what it is to "mark" a man, and how it may be done to the greatest good, and without contributing more to discord than to peace. This is a serious thing to all concerned.

Shamefully indeed have the unity doctrines of the Roman letter been trampled under foot, particularly chapter fourteen! There the teaching is that even the erring and the weak in faith are to be "received," borne with, and fellowshipped, rather than "judged" and "set at nought" (vs. 1, 4, 13, 19). That was the "doctrine" which the Roman brethren had learned, at least a part of it; and what "doctrine" could Paul have had in mind more naturally, *when writing on "divisions" and "stumbling"* (16:17) than his own unity teachings as unfolded in chapter 14 (although, through others, the teaching had preceded his own epistle to Rome)? It is clear therefore that Paul in the much-quoted "marking" passage (Rom. 16:17) is condemning those who preach and practice the doctrine of dividing when the apostolic doctrine is against dividing; those who go up and down the land egging on the disciples (often the untaught masses) to divide and separate — where before they were at peace and saw no need to separate. The pioneer disciples would never have thought of separation over the issues that are now current. It is a new, artificial condition created by divisive men, and it must be overcome. Such men, says Paul, must be "marked" and turned away from.

GIVE GOD A CHANCE

But this "marking" and "avoiding" is more a passive than an active duty: leave these blind guides alone. There is always the danger that we ourselves "may suffer through the strain," and do some wrong, in setting others where they may belong. It is a temptation to try to cure with sudden surgery what only time and God can heal. In days long gone we ourselves had not learned too well that serious lesson. Time and experience have shown that God himself cuts off those who would cut off their brethren — though first

He grants them time and opportunity to repent. Over and over again we have seen it come to pass — that those who (for envy or other hidden cause) have sought to brand their brethren have soon been marked and laid upon the shelf themselves. Perhaps we have no need (though it can not be wrong) to mark and point out those factionists by name; it comes to the same in the end; for eventually the rank and file of the church's humble, honest membership will come to see "how it is," and *who* it is; and from that time on they will simply "avoid" the factionist (Titus 3:10). They take mental note of him; they do not call him; they do not go to hear his harangues, once his purpose is established; they do not forward his divisive work in any way. And yet they "count him not as an enemy but admonish him as a brother." (2 Tim. 3:15.) And always, they keep a crystal clear distinction between the erroneous prophetic teaching of the factionist on the one hand (I speak not of heresy in fundamental doctrines), and his factious, divisive, and unchristian spirit and attitude on the other hand. If they must "mark" and "avoid" some men, it is on the second ground and never on the first. It is not because those men hold or teach some secondary doctrinal error, but because they are guilty of the prime sin of causing needless division in the Body of Christ. From such we are *commanded* to "turn away"; we have no choice.

WHAT WE CAN SURELY DO

Meanwhile, we can wait, and pray, and inculcate as far as possible the true New Testament unity teaching. To be sure, much harm, much pain and sorrow, will occur — while God still waits to be gracious. But while He waits, to vindicate or convict, let us on our part "follow after peace with all men, and the holiness with-out which no man shall see the Lord" (Heb. 12:14); let us "follow after righteousness, faith, love, peace, *with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart*" (2 Tim. 2:22); and if it be possible, let us be at peace with all men, "as much as in us lieth"; that is, as far as we on our part are concerned and responsible, let none surpass us in the peace-making business; for such are the sons of God (Matt. 5:9).

WILFORD HALL AND THE SECOND ADVENT

The author of the following poem was a noted and honored Restoration writer among the disciples of three generations ago:

Our Saviour once more upon earth shall appear,
In person as literal as when he was here;
The clouds are his chariot, and glory his throne,
Whilst myriads of angels his majesty own.

The kingdom shall come, and the graves shall give way,
And the saints be redeem'd from their prison of clay;
For the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall come forth,
From the east, from the west, from the south, from the north.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 39.

Once again, before beginning an orderly series of doctrinal reprints from the “Restoration Fathers,” it seems good to give over one or two installments for the clearing of certain letters from men now gone that have long been crying for the light. Odds and ends they are, a sort of “potpourri” on unity but valuable in the cause of Christian fellowship.

The materials gathered by Brother Janes, now being winnowed and edited for this department, consist of fifteen immense, home-made volumes, a total of 4000 pages. These pages are full letter-head size, single-space typewritten, or printed clippings pasted in, except that a few very important letters are preserved in the original longhand, such as Tant’s and Armstrong’s. Besides these “home-made” books there are many loose-leaf papers and scores of printed volumes, including a complete and beautiful set of Campbell’s *Millennial Harbinger*, 41 volumes, covering 41 years, 26,785 pages; and of course the *Christian Baptist* which for seven years preceded it.

Already, most of this material has been given a “once-over,” either by the present writer or by his secretary; and to this date ten of the fifteen special Janes-made volumes have been carefully read, marked, indexed, and culled, by this editor. The work calls for a tedious labor of verification, as well as for much original confirmatory research on our own part—in order that the ultimate book toward which we are driving may be the most complete and accurate account of its kind in the world. It should be a power for good, especially in the hands of ministers and young preachers, for generations to come. It is definitely designed to forward Christian unity; and we believe that it will greatly advance the plea, so often made and so little practiced, to preach “the whole counsel of God.”

It seems unbelievable that Brother Janes had been able to examine 700 books along this line of teaching, as his notes and “Lists of Books Examined” show that he had. He possessed the means (from his own personal, inherited estate), and he took the time, to visit the great theological libraries of America—those of the “Restoration Movement” particularly. He extracted what was most germane, and paid for stenographic help to put it into working shape for future sifting.

A bit odd he was, in some respects; aggressive, urgent, persistent, sometimes to a fault; but always honest, true, and purposeful. It may well be that God was pleased to raise up such a soul for reaching out, for laying up, and for gathering in—of money and materials for this work; but that in His strange providence He over-ruled that other eyes should winnow the materials, and other hearts should judge their value for our changed and changing times. It is for this task that we are constantly standing in the need of prayer.

But now we yield the page to other pens than ours—pens that have written well, but write no more.—E. L. J.

THESE, BEING DEAD, STILL SPEAK

E. A. ELAM TO R. H. BOLL

(Italics ours—E. L. J.)

"I had another conversation with Brother F. W. Smith today. *He accepts your statement and withdraws the charge of falsifying as far as he is concerned.* . . Frankly, in my judgment you have covered the ground, and Brother Smith says upon that he withdraws the charge of falsifying." (From letter of Elam to Boll, October 12, 1925.)

"I feel that I have done all I can—that is, all in my power to do. I am glad to say, too, that *you have done the same so far as the settlement of personal differences are concerned—more could not be expected or asked of you on this point.* As to the 'doctrinal differences' or 'differences of opinion,' *I have hoped that we might get these on a working basis of Christian forbearance and love.* I have worked and prayed for this and done my best; but this important matter will have to be left with each one to decide for himself in the light of the truth and in view of the judgment." (From letter of Elam to Boll, Dec. 8, 1925; both letters were published later in *Christian Leader*.)

F. B. SRYGLEY

(From articles published shortly before his death.)

"Many of us see our imperfections without being told of them or being abused for them. What most of us need is mercy and forgiveness. If Christ had no more mercy than some of us have we would all be lost, though we might boast of how sound we are in the faith . . .

"I am afraid that those of us who made the fight [against the millennial teaching] early in the beginning of it had too much personality in the fight."

TWO LETTERS FROM J. D. TANT

His "Position" on Unity

"I hold the same position Boll and H. Leo Boles held in their debate—that these items [the prophecy differences] should not cause us to disfellowship each other."

"I have baptized 3,000 to 5,000, and wonder how many of them will be saved. In the long, long ago, I held a meeting *under law* at ———, Ky., and stated the last night I would never hold another meeting like it. In that meeting was [four men are named] and others who had been my personal friends, yet I was not permitted to call on a single one of them to lead in prayer." (Written to D. C. J. in longhand; Oct. 2, 1938; Feb. 21, 1939.)

Brother Janes' Reply to Tant

"I think you are right—that the questions involved should not be allowed to alienate brethren; and *we* freely fellowship those of the other side as we have opportunity, and have opened the way for a number of them to come into our midst and preach. The ill-feeling

that has been stirred up in certain quarters by a small and noisy minority is far worse than the teaching, I think, even if the teaching should be mistaken."

The Boles "Position"

Here, following, is Brother H. Leo Boles' paragraph at close of the Boles-Boll debate in the *Gospel Advocate*. This is the "position" to which Brother Tant referred in the first extract from him above. If Brother Boles renounced that attitude later, or assumed one that was less pacific, he did so without the least new cause, or change of course or teaching whatsoever on the part of his respondent. Here are H. Leo's good closing words in the Debate (Unfulfilled Prophecy, p. 411).

"I reciprocate the fraternal expression and high regard which Brother Boll has for me. I have had many discussions and many kinds of opponents, but I have never had a more courteous and brotherly opponent than Brother R. H. Boll. My high regard for him has been increased because of the discussion. I believe him to be sincere, pious, and a cultured, Christian gentleman. I entertain the kindest personal feelings toward him. We differ, as the reader knows; but our differences and a discussion of them do not keep me from esteeming him very highly as a brother in Christ Jesus."

S. R. LOGUE

He quotes a strong appeal from "one of our most beloved brethren" which we believe to be J. N. Armstrong, 1939:

"We cannot break fellowship with our premillennial brethren because:

1. "Since the beginning of the restoration movement the steady and unwavering practice of those striving to restore the New Testament Church has been to bear with one another in honest differences as they have struggled toward their goal.

"All have been recognized as brethren, have been highly esteemed as Christians, so long as they held the common faith in Christ. The lamented F. D. Srygley expressed this practice in these fitting words:

"The whole sum and substance of Christianity may thus be reduced to faith in Christ and obedience to His commandments. Beyond this men should not be restricted in opinions or circumscribed in investigations. When we believe in Christ and obey his commandments, we are Christians. Having done this, if we differ, we should differ as Christians, as brethren in the Lord and not make our differences denominational barriers which interdict Christian love, destroy brotherly fellowship, prevent successful cooperation, and promote party strife and ugly contentions."

2. "The second reason is that we hold too much in common with these premillennial brethren. We and they hold the common faith. We all believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. No true unity will be possible between persons who are not wholeheartedly at one upon this central truth, in which is the essence of Chris-

tianity. For a Christian is first of all and above all committed to Jesus Christ, his Lord and Savior.

"The premillennial brethren hold this in common with us all. They believe with us that the Bible is the inspired word of God, and that it is the all-sufficient rule of faith and practice.

"They believe that Jesus was born miraculously of the virgin Mary; that he was crucified, buried, raised, and crowned King of Kings and Lord of Lords. They believe he now reigns with all authority in heaven and in earth; that he began this reign on the first Pentecost after his resurrection from the dead. They also believe that he must continue to reign until he shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power; and that he will then deliver up the kingdom to the Father and he himself become subject to the Father. This, again, is the common faith.

"Those brethren believe with us that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation and that men must obey that gospel to be saved. No other group of brethren in this country has been more faithful in its effort to give the pure gospel to the whole world in these twenty years than they.

"The proof of the pudding is in the eating, and by their fruits ye shall know them. No churches in the world today are more faithful to the New Testament pattern in their work and worship than the host of churches in which these brethren have ministered these twenty odd years. How could we disfellowship these brethren and those New Testament churches without being divisive, without causing division contrary to the doctrine of Christ, and without becoming sinners before God?

3. "We cannot disfellowship the premillennial brethren because we are already bearing with brethren who hold as grievous errors as these brethren hold—errors even more grievous than theirs.

"We have not forgotten the bitter conflict in this great brotherhood over the rebaptism question about forty years ago. After the smoke of that battle cleared away and we viewed the ruins, we discovered that nothing had been settled by the fight, but that the two groups were still with us. Today they get along together as brethren.

4. "In denying fellowship to brethren who hold the common faith we would go contrary to the approved practice of the New Testament churches, churches directed by the inspired apostles and prophets.

"There was in the church at Rome two parties, groups. One had learned the truth about keeping days and the other group had not. Strife had sprung up in the church between the two groups and they were judging and setting one another at naught.

"Paul exhorted them to cease this ugly treatment of one another, telling them to be fully persuaded each in his own mind about the matter. They were all God's servants and He was receiving them and was able to cause them to stand. (Read Rom. 14.) But no fellowship was broken."

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 40.

(More interesting letters and extracts from our files and scrap-books.—E. L. J.)

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S RULE

In *Firm Foundation*, January 17, 1939, Brother Armstrong said the following:

"My critics, who know anything about me, have never questioned my position. What some do not like about me is that I do not join them in their condemnation of all premillennial brethren. I think those in the church who are true to the conditions of salvation are worthy of our fellowship. This is my rule: What the Lord has made a condition of salvation I will make a test of fellowship. There is no congregation in the world in which all of its members see matters of opinion alike. We need to 'forbear one another in love, giving diligence to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace' (Eph. 4:3), 'Until we all attain unto the unity of the faith' (Eph. 4:13)."

C. B. CLIFTON

One-time Editor of "Christian Tribune"

"We can and should discuss such matters [prophecy] in the spirit of Christ and as brethren, without the use of abuse or invective. . . . I see no reason why we should not love and trust one another as brethren even though we may not see everything just exactly alike."—Detroit, Dec. 18, 1940.

O. P. SPIEGEL'S LETTER

He remembers Lipscomb, Sewell, F. D. Srygley, and Dr. Brents

"This I know, that Brother David Lipscomb, E. G. Sewell, F. D. Srygley, and our ministers too numerous to mention, regarded old Dr. T. W. Brents as one of our greatest preachers, and his Gospel Plan of Salvation as one of the deepest and best books of a generation.

"Well, now, in that book [in his volume of "Gospel Sermons," rather] he has a sermon on the Millennium. I revamped that sermon and preached it all over the United States, Canada, and Old Mexico—in every State but four—and no one ever did come tearing me to pieces because I was a 'premillennialist.'"—Jan. 4, 1936.

GEORGE W. KNEPPER'S LETTER

Make Room for Crisis

"Evolution and Modernism go hand in hand. Both are an 'unfolding.' Neither makes room for 'crises,' and that is where they fail. Life is not a mere unfolding. It goes from crisis to crisis.

"The early volumes of Millennial Harbinger are full of prophecy. The very name is prophetic, 'Millennial.' Campbell's motto at its head was Rev. 14:6. I can only account for the silence of our people on the Second Coming, and on the Life in the Spirit, by the fact that 'Millerism' was running wild here in Ohio. Dates were set and extravagant language and actions were attributed to the Spirit.

Now, our folks were sane and hardheaded folks, and doubtless began softening their emphasis on these doctrines so as not to be identified with such distorted notions."—Geo. W. Knepper.

ONE EDITOR'S SAD MISTATEMENT

He Was Rebuked by a Trusting Friend

"I feel that the only safe thing for any of us to do is to let the book of Revelation entirely alone . . .

"I sometimes wish that some Bible House would get up a Bible or a New Testament and leave the Book of Revelation off. We don't need it at all. Why should we waste time on such uncertain and unnecessary matters? . . . By confining ourselves to what is written, and limiting ourselves to what God has spoken, I know we are on infallibly safe ground. . . .

"Read Revelation if you want to, just for diversion, but don't try to read it with the thought you can ever understand it. The book of Revelation is to the Christian what the prophecies of old were to the Jews—still future; and we will never understand that book until we stand in the new Jerusalem where all mysteries will be made plain."—*Christian Leader*, 1933.

No weaker words of warning ever fell from the lips of a Christian, or from the pen of a disciple publisher, than those above; yet, that utterance was only a little more flagrant than many others in that day. There were others who might have said the same if they had been as honest or as blunt as he. It was but the final fruit and upshoot of the effort then raging to discount, if not to destroy, the last book of the Bible. Others were more cautious or more cunning, but what they said was enough to discourage any real study of that blessed book. And all in order—think of it—to break the simple, grammatical sense of chapter 20!

The editor quoted above is gone now, and we can only wish to think that he said what he said in ignorance of its awful import, not really knowing what he did. This was afterward rebuked by a writer in the *Gospel Advocate*, and a weak apology followed on July 11, 1933, in reply to that protest; but there was no retraction.

It is well that we should set by the side of this sorry human warning the divine blessing of Rev. 1:3. Let it be memorized early in life, to guard against a like mistake:

"Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of the prophecy, and keep the things that are written therein."

Yes, the "old serpent" hates the book of Revelation in general, and chapter 20 in particular. And no wonder! For in that chapter he comes to the evil end of his bad career. It suits him well when Christian publishers can be led (or misled) to hint that the Revelation is not among the "things written," nor any part of that which "God has spoken."—E. L. J.

DAVID LIPSCOMB

Teach All Testimonies and Motives

It does not follow by any means that, because it is not necessary to understand all testimonies and motives in order to render the obedience acceptable, it is not necessary for those who understand it to teach all. To understand the evidence and know the motives is to strengthen the faith and increase the zeal; but it is not necessary that the faith should be perfect or the zeal at its highest possible pitch in order to begin the service. As we learn more and more, it should be presented because some persons will be moved by one class and others by another. Hence, if only one class of testimony or motives is presented, some honest heart will fail to be reached by testimonies or motives that would move it. It is the duty of the preacher or teacher to teach the whole will of God, because a full knowledge would be helpful to all.—David Lipscomb, *Salvation from Sin*, p. 231.

ONE CAUSE OF COLDNESS

Writing in the *New York Independent* in 1850, Dr. Gill testifies that the churches then had a name to live and were dead. And there was a cause for this coldness. Whitby had lived and written, and his "New Hypothesis," by which the Second Advent is necessarily postponed a thousand years, had stifled the warning note, 'Behold I come quickly;' That "belief in the speedy advent of the Savior and habitual contemplation of the last things, which adds weight and impressiveness to the ordinary preaching of the gospel, giving it earnestness, fervor and solemnity not often attained," was now getting unpopular; and, as in the fourth century, truth measurably dimmed before wide-spread error, and with the decay of the pre-millennial hope, spiritual life, too, died away.

Still, the early divines of New England did not endorse the Whittyan view of Christ's reign on earth. "The sentiments we oppose," observes Spalding, "did not generally prevail, especially among the common people, till the present century. Even as late as the great earthquake, 1755, many Christians were looking, not for the modern Millennium, but for the coming of Christ. No doctrine can be more indisputably proved to have been the doctrine of the primitive church than those we call Millenarian; and, beyond all dispute, the same were favorite doctrines with the Fathers of New England.

FROM W. HUME McHENRY

The Change to Adventism

McHenry, a student of David Lipscomb College in earlier days, a southern man by birth, education and experience, was in Louisville over one weekend before going to India in 1914. The change to Adventism came after they had some contact with Adventists, or their literature, or both, in India about 1919. McHenry says that Brother Boll's teaching did not contribute to the change that he and

S. O. Martin made, and that he differs radically from Boll. Here is his letter, written from Dallas, Texas, June 6, 1932:

"No there is absolutely nothing in the teaching of Bro. Boll or any college that contributed to our becoming Adventists. Unless he has changed his teaching on the Millennium, there is nothing in common with him and the Adventists on the subject, even though the ——— might think so. Boll's teachings here will not stand the searchlight of God's word."

S. O. Martin came from south of Louisville, somewhere near Bowling Green; attended school down there; spent some time at Lexington, Ky., and a short time in Louisville. But Brother McHenry embraced Adventism before he did, and later Martin yielded.

MISSIONS AND THE MILLENNIAL HOPE

Letter from the Secretary of China Inland Mission

(March 21, 1936)

"In our Mission of nearly 1400 missionaries we do not know of one worker who is not pre-millennial. Indeed this truth was one of the great incentives that led our founder, J. Hudson Taylor, to found the Mission, and he has ranked high in the missionary world. So far as we are aware, every one of the founders and leaders, as well as most if not all the workers in the faith missions that send workers to the various mission fields of the world, are pre-millennial. To say that this faith 'cuts the nerve of missionary endeavor' is entirely incorrect and there is abundant proof that it is incorrect."—Chas. H. Judd.

"RUSSELLISM" AND THE BIBLE

(A paragraph left by Brother Janes)

Any system of religion from which an enlightened man or woman could be led away by the Bible alone can not possibly be true. Let me here introduce a remarkable statement from Mr. Russell's own paper.

"Not only do we see that people can not see the divine plan by studying the Bible by itself, but we see also that if any one lays the 'Scripture Studies' aside, even after he has used them, after he has read them for ten years—if he then lays them aside and ignores them, and goes to the Bible alone, though he has understood his Bible for ten years, our experience shows that within two years he goes into darkness."—*Watch Tower*.

Mr. Russell himself declares that experience shows that a man who has understood the Bible goes into darkness within two years when he ignores Russell's books and reads the Bible alone, and this too after the man has understood his Bible for ten years? That is to say, what Russell regards as the truth, the light (his own system, Russellism), is such that a man would not continue in it two full years if he were to lay aside the Russell books and go to the fountain of religious teaching which the infinite God, by the pens of inspired men, has given!

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 41.

QUOTING AND “MISQUOTING” CAMPBELL

Years ago, before I knew that the “positions” of venerable and noted men count for nothing in the settlement of *doctrinal* differences, I asked an older brother about Campbell’s “position” on a certain subject. His reply was somewhat surprising: “Campbell was on both sides of almost every question.” Brother H. Leo Boles once wrote: “The Alex. Campbell of 1823 was arrayed against the Alex. Campbell of 1849.” And there is some ground for both of these statements.

The explanation is, of course, that his massive mind was able to grasp, measurably, both sides of the infinite truth; but still more that Campbell was always a student, learning, growing, expanding. On certain primary matters of the gospel, he was hardly the same in 1823 and 1849, as Brother Boles pointed out; and certainly he was not the same in 1830, or even in 1841, that he became by 1860—in prophetic and millennial teaching. Being a student, his mind never fossilized. His constant growth in grace and knowledge is illustrated in the year-dated extracts given below. We offer these extracts, not only for what they may be worth as teaching (like all human comments), but chiefly to show the great man’s *interest* and *fairness*, as well as the *brotherly attitude* of the men of that day.

But we have at times throughout the years had the charge laid to us of having “misquoted” Campbell. We should like to make it clear to all men that we have never had any occasion to misquote Campbell, nor could we have the slightest possible interest in doing such a thing. We are not trying in these reprints to prove any doctrine by quoting or misquoting any man. What any uninspired man, Campbell or any other, may have said can never establish a doctrine. If we have quoted Campbell it was merely to show that he taught such things as some now so bitterly condemn and cast out their brethren for. Also we have referred to, quoted, or printed whole articles from, such men as Walter Scott, James T. Challen, Moses E. Lard, H. T. Anderson, J. C. Barclay, Dr. T. W. Brents, Daniel Sommer, J. W. McGarvey, J. A. Harding—things concerning the kingdom, the Millennium, the Second Coming, the Restoration of Israel, etc., for which some brethren (had they lived then and dared) would have disfellowshipped those great brethren on the charge of teaching “Pre-millennialism.” But in those days such sectarian methods were not encouraged in the church of Christ; and it seems that all brethren then freely taught what they found in God’s word, no man forbidding, and esteemed it as their inalienable right in Christ to do so.

Almost from the beginning of his *Harbinger*, the famous reformer showed the greatest fairness toward the “pre-millennial” writers of his day; I think a careful check would show that he gave them *more* space than others; certainly so, if one adds in those

writings from his own pen that *today* would be classified (and probably ridiculed) as "pre-millennial." It was in 1833 that S. M. McCorkle offered to the *Harbinger* readers his long series of "Premillennial" articles on the "Second Coming," which Campbell introduced with this gracious note under the title, "The Prophecies." (page 49):

"The attentive reader will have discovered before today, with what caution we have spoken on the prophecies and millennial matters. Among the causes of this the following is chief: We felt some misgivings in the most popular theories of interpretation; and, although prepossessed in favor of that system which flattered us with the expectation that the moral machinery about to operate, and which was operating upon the world, would usher in the glorious day, supported by the vials of God's wrath on an apostate church, we were involuntarily almost borne forward into another, and entirely different system of interpretation. Between these conflicting winds we thought it presumptuous to weigh anchor and launch upon the mighty deep. For the last five or six years we have been waiting for fair winds and a serene sky, and cannot yet say that the prospects are such as to authorize us to tempt the vast abyss. But here comes a bold adventurer who is determined to make the voyage at all hazards. As he seems destined for the same port, we shall help him to put to sea; and as he appears to sail the same stars, if he can brave the mighty dangers and get safe to land, we shall hail him as the most fortunate of modern adventurers.

Figures apart, we shall give this brother a fair hearing; for he deserves it! This we say, not because we may agree in the main propositions of his essay; but because he speaks like a *man*, and because the subject deserves more profound attention than any other, except it be the personal remission of sins. We may add a note occasionally, but he shall be permitted to tell his own story in his own way."

CAMPBELL'S GROWTH ILLUSTRATED CHRONOLOGICALLY

1830

"Some of the friends of the restoration of the ancient order of things are introducing matters entirely extraneous in their pleadings for this cause. To what purpose is it to preach their views of a millennium, or of civil government, when contending for the faith formerly delivered to the saints? In making much ado about millennial matters, do they not see that their opponents will identify their views of a millennium with their ancient gospel and ancient order of things? And if there should be a discrepancy or a peculiarity in their views of the latter-day glory, will not their opponents connect the most important items of reform with said discrepancy or peculiarity, and thus endeavor to consign them together to one and the same fate? Remember Paul's resolution in Corinth, 'I determined,' says he, 'to make known nothing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified—declaring to you the testimony of God.' Other topics at other times, but this was enough for that time and people. The ancient gospel and order of things, with the matters necessarily connected therewith, are sufficient to engross all the energies of the ablest proclaimers in the field."

That was 1830, in the first Volume of the *Millennial Harbinger*. From this statement, one might be amazed to see the wealth of material that later issued from his pen on *both* millennial and civil government subjects! But let us follow on to see what was the maturer teaching of this growing student:

1833

"But a time will come (and that very soon—sooner than many can be persuaded) when 'the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of

the kingdoms 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 (kingdoms) shall serve and obey him.' But this not until one like the Son of Man shall come on the clouds of heaven, and come to the Ancient of Days, and be brought near before him; and there be given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, and all people, nations, and languages shall serve him. . . .

"When Christianity gains the throne Jesus Christ will place it there himself; and wherever he sets up his throne, from that place shall go forth the law adapted to his subjects in their triumphant state. . . .

"Till Jesus appears in the clouds of heaven, his cause and people can never gain the ascendant. . . . Now is the time for fighting the good fight—the time that tries men's souls—the time for the perseverance of saints—the time for suffering with him, that with him we may reign.

"No kingdom now on earth can be regarded as a kingdom of our Lord, because they were all founded by the sword. Ambitious aspirants, political demagogues, successful warriors, triumphant military chieftains laid the foundation of them all. . . .

"But this state of things is not to survive the message of the angel of an everlasting gospel. He appears as a harbinger of the Millennium. He announces that the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion has arrived, and assures a sleeping world that the hour of God's judgment has come; that the fate of all the enemies of the reign of Messiah is now sealed, and that consequently a new order of things is to succeed."

1842

"Can anyone believe that the following predictions have yet been accomplished? Isa. 50:16-21; 60; 62; 63; 65:17-25; 66:10-24. Also Jer. 30:1-3, 17-24; 31; 32:36-42; 33:1-26. Ezek. 36 and 37. . . . Can anyone say that these prophecies are now fulfilled? And if not can anyone show how they are to be fulfilled after the end of the world? **Dan. 2: 40:44; 7:7-14, 23-27.** Compare these with John's Apocalypse, chapter 16:12-22, with chapters 17, 18, 19, and especially chapter 20:1-10. **Surely no one will affirm that all these things have yet come to pass."**

Campbell thought these might be fulfilled without the actual presence of the Christ, but he certainly did not believe they had already been fulfilled!

1849

"The revolutions, changes, and transformations of 1848, are such as to command us to break silence on subjects we have never before presumed to intermeddle with. We must note the attributes of European society, in order that we may better understand our own times, our country, and the prophecies."

"These [international political conditions] are more than 'the signs of the times.' These are the times themselves. **Now is the time for the students of prophecy to keep their vigils, to trim their lamps and watch!"**

1854

"The subject of the Millennium is one of growing importance and of thrilling interest to the Christian community. **We have had it often before our minds, and are glad to see that it is eliciting more attention than formerly, both in our country and in the Old World.**

"As preparatory to these questions, there are certain preliminary matters, which seem to command the attention of the student of prophecy, such as:

1. The restoration of Israel to their own land.
2. The rise and fall of Babylon the great.
3. The one thousand two hundred and sixty days.
4. The coming of the Lord.
5. The first resurrection.
6. The thousand-years' reign of the saints.
7. The descent of the New Jerusalem.

8. The scenes following.

"These are to be our themes, the Lord willing, so soon as our readers are increased to ten thousand. We have had this subject often before our mind, and more recently has it become more engrossing. **We design to give to this great theme much attention, and to spare no pains to assist our readers in the investigation of the prophetic oracles;** for the time has come 'when many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.' We are evidently approaching a new crisis in the ecclesiastical and political affairs of the world. . . .

We have been, and still are, hearing both sides and collecting documents in aid and furtherance of such an object. **It will unquestionably soon be, if it is not already, one of the most engrossing topics of our generation.**"—(Page 354.)

1855

"Besides, the compass and grandeur of that sublime subject [millennium] demand a concentration of mind paramount to any other topic now in our horizon. **We are glad to see a continually increasing interest in that theme,** and the means of understanding the subject are increasing.

"The subject of the Millennium . . . is annually growing in importance, and **we feel constrained to contribute our labors to that subject, now annually growing in its claims, and by the signs of the times demanding our special interest and attention.**"

1856

"The coming events of apocalyptic vision are pressing upon our attention, and have strong claims upon our grave consideration. **Whatever is taught in the Oracles of God respecting present or future condition of the Christian profession, demands our most grave and serious consideration.** The signs of the times are ominous, and coming events cast their shadows before them, indicating to us the necessity of preparing for them. But for this purpose it is indispensable that **we understand our own times, and their position on the chart of prophetic developments.**"

"We are deeply penetrated with the idea that Christianity [by which evidently he means the present order of things] being a new dispensation of the Holy Spirit to Jew and Gentile under Christ, a dispensation not of the letter, but of the Spirit, must continue until the 'fullness of the Gentiles' be consummated. But this clearly intimates that it is not to be forever, or to the final consummation of the drama of Christianity. **That the redeemer shall come out of Zion and turn away 'ungodliness,'—impiety, the fuel of unbelief—'from Jacob'—is an express oracle indicative of some special and glorious interposition of the Lord Jesus—which may usher in what we usually call 'the personal reign of Christ'—the subjection of all nations to him.**" Campbell then adds:

"Of the moral certainty of such an interposition we should not dogmatically affirm in advance of a most cautious and prayerful investigation of both the Jewish and Christian oracles"; and he refers to the series of articles on prophecy from Professor Milligan as expressing views which he, Campbell, himself had "warmly cherished," and that "for many years". [Which indeed, as regards the destiny of Israel, we too most heartily cherish.—J.]

1860

"The signs of the times are surely portentous, and all meditative spirits cannot but long to look into the deep significance of the long unfulfilled but yet sure word of prophecy, to see if they give us any fore-shadowings of that which is soon to come. The cry comes up from the waiters, watchers, 'Watchman, what of the night?' and who is able to read the mysterious pointings upon the dial-face? We feel that the Providence of God is moving fearfully among the nations, and stand in awe before the mighty portents which rise up year after year, so threateningly, in the pathway of his wrath. . . . **Let us search diligently, what manner of times are coming upon us.**"

(Emphasis ours.)

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 42.

THE SCRIPTURAL ORDER OF END-TIME EVENTS

(An original article; not a reprint)

E. L. J.

The space of time between the Second Coming and "the end," in the Greek of 1 Cor. 15:23, 24, was called to the attention of the brotherhood (for the first time, so far as I know) by the present writer — in the *Word and Work* several years ago. The precise point of teaching in those verses is *order*, the order in the resurrections (Christ's and the believer's) and "the end." Those verses in their context read:

"For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive. But each in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; then they that are Christ's, at his coming. Then cometh the end when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be abolished is death."

No claim has ever been made that Paul in that passage sets the *length* of that space (John does that; Rev. 20:5), but only that there *is* such a space, and that "the end" is *not immediately* when Christ comes, nor can it be. In fact, it is implied in verses 25, 26 that there is a vast work and program laid out for the Christ between "his coming" and "the end" — a program of final victory over death and every other enemy.

From the outset—within the first week or two—this exegesis was vigorously attacked in other journals; and often through the years the brethren who could on no account allow a space of time between the Coming and the End have sought to do away with the force of the Greek words (yea, even the English) in this inspired text. They seemed to feel, or fear, that perhaps we "had something" there (to use the current parlance). Indeed, those scripture texts that come in so often for special attack and opposition (such as Acts 2:38, Rom. 6:1-5, Rev. 20:1-6) usually "have something" that might tend to spoil some pet theory or "position"!

The last effort that I have seen is by a brother, unknown to me, in *Firm Foundation*, though now over a year ago. And as this brother writes in good spirit, with some ability, and in reasonable fairness, we shall try to pay courteous attention to his remarks.

First of all, this brother's argument is a doctrinal argument, not a linguistic or exegetical one at all. In fact, he admits all we have ever claimed for the text: that the Greek word translated "then" (*eita*) is not the word (*tote*) used in Mt. 25:31, which can mean "immediately"; but that the Greek of 1 Cor. 15:23, 24 (*eita-epeita*) represents sequence and order (as when one says, "first, second, third"; or "first, next, last"); but though he admits the sequence, he thinks that two minutes, two hours, or two days, might suffice to satisfy the requirements of the text. We shall consider that.

Incidentally, our brother records also that Brother Armstrong was "disturbed" and "considerably concerned" over the "possible length of time" which he thought might be included in the English word "then", when it comes from *eita*. Well, Brother Armstrong was a very careful student and teacher of Greek — was he not? Perhaps his concern was not entirely groundless! Others too have been disturbed and bothered, so says our brother's article; perhaps there is a cause. We want to examine the four cases of this use of the word *eita* that are cited by Thayer (Greek-English Lexicon, p. 188). They are Mark 4:28; 1 Cor. 15:5-7; 1 Cor. 15:24; 1 Tim. 2:13.

It is not that the word *eita* of itself contains any necessary time element; but it does stand for an order and a sequence, as when we say — first, second, third, the context determining the length and the space of time between the events named. Now if, in a statement of chronology or eschatology, as this is — a passage in which the precise subject under consideration is *order* ("each in his own order") — I say, if in such a statement of three items the second and third items transpire *together*, at the same time, then there can be no third item. If "the end" synchronizes with "His Coming", or virtually so, then Paul should have run the second and third occurrences together, thus:

"Christ, the first-fruits;
then they that are Christ's at his coming
and the end."

But instead of this, Paul makes a *third* occurrence of "the end," thus:

"Christ, the first-fruits;
then they that are Christ's at his coming.
Then cometh the end."

In other words, there are, as to occurrence in time, *three* things. This requires a reasonable space between the first and second (there have already been 1900 years); and it requires also a reasonable space between the second and third (Is not this what John marks off as 1000 years?).

Fortunately, the same chapter (and of course the same writer) provides us with a perfect parallel, both in the Greek and the English, as to the use of *eita* ("then") in the New Testament, and by the apostle Paul:

"He appeared to Cephas;
then to the twelve;
then he appeared to above five hundred brethren at once . . . ;
then he appeared to James;
then to all the apostles." (1 Cor. 15:5-7).

With each "then", there was a reasonable space — reasonable with respect to the nature of the subject in hand. The Savior's post-resurrection days on earth were few; therefore a day or a week is a considerable space with respect to His appearances. But the days of this entire dispensation are many; therefore a thousand years, two

thousand years, are fitting intervals to be marked off by those great, outstanding events in the outline of time that Paul lays out in 1 Cor. 15:23, 24. In the absence of some inspired revelation to the contrary (our brother mistakenly thinks he has found it) it would be logical to expect some interval between the second and third events that would reasonably comport with the interval between the first and second event. Though Paul did not know how long that interval was to be, it has turned out to be at least 1900 years; and the Holy Spirit was choosing words that would be fitting in any case.

Before we examine the other cases, it may be well to present the exact meaning of the Greek word in question, as defined by Thayer and by Strong:

THAYER:

eita: adverb of time, "then"; "next", "after that" . . . As in classic Greek, it stands in enumerations, to mark a sequence depending either on temporal succession, as Mark 4:28 — 1 Cor. 15:5-7 — 1 Cor. 15:24 — 1 Tim. 2:13, etc.

STRONG:

..eita-eita: "a particle of succession (in time or logical enumeration), then, moreover; — after that, afterward, furthermore, then."
epeita-epeita: "thereafter: — after that, afterward, then."

With these definitions of the word, and Paul's own parallel use in the same chapter now before our minds, we look briefly at the New Testament use of this particle in the other cases cited by the great and scholarly Thayer:

MARK 4:28

"The earth beareth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, then the full grain in the ear."

In this text, the word translated "then" (both times) is *eita*; and just as in those verses quoted above about the appearances, and in the verses under consideration about the Coming and "the end", the word stands for order and sequence. But again there is a suitable space of time between the blade, the ear, and the full grain in the ear; spaces that reasonably comport with one another in the nature of the case. Without these intervals and stages, would the speaker have been justified in using *eita* . . . *eita* ("then . . . then")?

1 TIMOTHY 2:13

"For Adam was first formed, then (*eita*) Eve."

Here again, as in the three other cases, the particle *eita* ("then") stands for order and sequence; but here again it has a temporal significance as well as an order of priority, though priority is the main purpose in this particular text.

Summing up these cases or examples: In each the word *eita* ("then") represents order and sequence; or, we may say, "stages". In each — unless 1 Cor. 15:23, 24 is the exception — it divides the events enumerated by a space that comports reasonably with the other spaces mentioned. In view of this N. T. use of the word, one wonders if Paul, by the Spirit, would thus divide a space of 1900 years on the one side and "two minutes" or even "two hours or two days")

on the other! Would he have divided such a relatively brief space at all?

But now our brother makes a very curious argument! In fairness to him we quote the gist of it (would gladly quote it all except for limited space); and following this, our brief reply.

But someone may still say, it is a fact that "afterwards," [A. V.] in reference to our resurrection following the Lord's, has allowed nearly two millenniums, and as "then" is from the same word "eita," it is not possible that the "end" of the kingdom on earth can follow immediately after his coming. We'd have to admit this, were there any time meaning in the word "eita" from which these words come, unless we had a direct statement to the contrary elsewhere. But since time, either short or long, is not in the word "eita" and since we do have a direct revelation from the Lord himself to the contrary of the assumption, and that revelation is on record in the New Testament, we have the most positive and easily understood proof that the "end" will come immediately following the resurrection of the dead. . . .

There are two words in the Greek language used to cover time, sequence and immediacy. One is "eita" (sometimes epeita) which we have already considered, and refers only to sequence of happenings, regardless of near or remote followings. The other word is "tote" (pronounced tota) and has real time element in it. It means, at that time, at once, then, immediately, etc. "Then" in this definition is the weakest of all, because as we use it, "then" may mean at once or it may mean a long time afterward, or it may mean a mere consequence, but always following

Our Lord said, "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; **then** he shall render to every man according to his deeds." (See Matt. 16:22-27.) Now look at that word and clause, "then he shall render." This word "then" is from "tote," the Greek word that means not only following, but "at that time," "immediately," etc. Now we have a complete removal of all cause for concern as to how long the "then" may be in 1 Cor. 15:23, 24. Jesus said the judgment will immediately follow the other happenings at his coming. We are not concerned whether the Lord be able to pass judgment in two minutes, or two hours or two days, after his return. It is so close in order that he used the word that means at once, at that time, immediately. This in no wise contradicts the "then" ("afterwards"), that Paul used, but is in perfect harmony with the fact that one follows the other. Remember, immediate sequence is not in "then" when it comes from "eita," but it is in the same word "then" when it comes from "tote."

Unless final judgment comes a millennium before the "end" of the kingdom on earth, then the Lord surrenders that rule immediately after the resurrection, which takes place immediately after his return. We do not see how anyone could be concerned over the elasticity of "eita" when the fixed, definite, immediate "tote" makes impossible any human length of time in 1 Cor. 15:24, "then (eita) comes the end." This is not relying on "interpretation." . . . the Lord described what will happen when he comes again. The judgment will be held then, and the surrender of the kingdom, its end, must take place at that time, "tote." It cannot happen a millennium after the judgment!

OUR BRIEF REPLY

Our brother, inadvertently of course, has himself suggested the right reply to his judgment argument, based on *tote* in Matt. 16:27, "then he shall render." He says: "Unless final judgment comes a millennium before the 'end' of the kingdom on earth, then the Lord surrenders that rule immediately after the resurrection, which takes place immediately after his return."

"Unless" — yes; "unless judgment" — yes; "unless the judgment of Matt. 16:27" — yes; but not "*final* judgment"! Here is a doctrinal argument, not linguistic. Here is "interpretation" indeed, and here is quite a slip in reasoning: our brother *assumes* that Matt. 16:27 ("then he shall render") is the *final* judgment; he *calls* it that! What then if the event of Matt. 16:27 *does* actually come "a millennium before the end"! If that event cannot be *proved* to be the "final," end-time judgment of Rev. 20:11-15, then the *tote* argument of 16:27 falls to the ground. And there is nothing left of it, except our brother's concession that *there is room* in 1 Cor. 15:24 for *any amount of time* between the coming and the end.

What if the following scriptures all describe the same awful event as Matt. 16:27, or the same series of events, and that they are indeed all to transpire "then" (*tote*), quickly, upon the glorious appearing of Christ upon the earth? And that thus they do actually come "a millennium before the end"?

Matt. 25:31-46: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory . . . then shall he sit on the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all the nations: and he shall separate them," etc. etc. Is this not a scene of some grand assize among the nations then living on the earth? Are "all the nations," including those likened to "goats," caught up to meet the Lord in the air along with the saved, there to be judged, and then cast out? No, this is surely a scene of *nations living on the earth* when Jesus comes; nothing at all is said of the dead in this passage. The righteous dead have indeed been raised — they that are "Christ's at his coming"; but "the rest of the dead lived not until the thousand years should be finished."

2 Thess. 1:7-10: "Vengeance to them that know not God . . . who shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction . . . when he shall come to be glorified in his saints". May not this well be a fuller description of the events of Matt. 16:27 and Matt. 25:31-46?

And now an expanded and more prolix statement of the same awful judgment upon the wicked at the coming of the Faithful and True, the King of kings and Lord of lords:

Rev. 19:11-21: this is the familiar description of the awful carnage when, at his glorious coming, the "Word of God" shall smite the nations? Do we not see here "the fateful lightning of his terrible swift sword," as the angry Son (Ps. 2:12) treads the winepress of the fierceness of the wrath of God? But *we know* — it is crystal clear in the inspired word (Rev. 19 and 20)—*we know* that this terrible scene is at the Second Coming (verse 11), and that it positively *precedes* the thousand years. And we know just as surely, and by the same inspired word, that the "final judgment" before the Great White Throne is "*after* the thousand years are finished." This time note appears three times in chapter 20; verses 3, 5, and 7. How then can we be so certain that Matt. 16:27 is the "final judgment"?

Finally: Why — if the "end" of 1 Cor. 15:24 follows "immedi-

ately" upon the Lord's coming — why then did Paul, by the Spirit, choose the word "*eita*" — which, as our brother freely concedes, makes room — to say the least of it — for a space of "two minutes, two hours, or two days," or even "a million years"? Why did the Holy Spirit choose "*eita*", when, if there be no space of time, "*tote*", or better still "*eutheos*" (which really means immediately) would have wrapped the whole matter up in a single word!

A fine example of the regular N. T. word for "immediately" (*eutheos*), where there is no delay on the one hand, and *eita* (or *epeita*) where there has been delay, is found in Paul's choice of words in Gal. 1:16 and 1:18:

"straightway (*eutheos*) I conferred not with flesh and blood";

"then (*epeita*) after three years I went up to Jerusalem."

The first statement is immediate action; perhaps not even *tote* was strong enough; therefore *eutheos*; but the second statement is delayed action, "after three years." Here he uses the same word (*eita* or *epeita*) as in 1 Cor. 15:23, 24, where evidently there is delayed action.

Having referred to Thayer, it seems fitting to quote that scholar's comment on the Greek word for "age" (*aion*), as found, with different modifying words, in the New Testament:

"Most of the N. T. writers distinguish *this age* — (the time before the appointed return or truly Messianic advent of Christ, the period of instability, weakness, impiety, wickedness, calamity, misery) — and *the future age* — (the age after the return of Christ in majesty, the period of the consummate establishment of the divine kingdom and all its blessing."

Thayer then cites, under "*the future age*," Matt. 12:32 and Eph. 1:21: "not only in this world (age) but also in *that which is to come*." To his trained, linguistic mind, the future age of Eph. 1:21 is the age "after the return of Christ in majesty," etc. Until that appointed return, from the meaning of the Greek which he knew so well, there is to be expected only "instability, weakness, impiety, wickedness, calamity, misery".

Yes, my beloved brethren, there is yet a golden age to come for this poor earth — when she shall have been washed of her filth through the mighty cleansing judgments of God. And there is space for it abundant, both in the Greek and the English of 1 Cor. 15:23, 24! May God haste the day!

Concluding words: The writer of the article here reviewed is Brother L. P. Francis, *Firm Foundation*, April 1, 1947. It has been a pleasure to examine an article as courteous as his; and the main point and purpose in this review, as in all our writings, is this: that we should all love one another, and that we should bear one with another — so that in full fellowship and perfect freedom we may press on to know the whole truth, and to grow in grace and knowledge of our blessed Lord.—E. L. J.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 43 — First Article of 1949

E. L. J.

This month, instead of a reprint, and as the first article for 1949, we offer an original article by the able editor of *Word and Work*. From the beginning of his preaching and his editorial work, Brother Boll has labored earnestly and consistently for free, unsectarian Christianity as opposed to denominationalism, and as opposed to the incipient sectarianism that springs up unawares, even from within. He has stood for the simple New Testament church—no man's party and no man's sect (least of all, for one of his own!); for the church of God, which is the house of God, the pillar and ground of the truth. His tracts, “The Church I found,” and “Why not Be Just A Christian?” have been universally adjudged the very best for circulation on this line, and have been read with high approval by many thousands, if not by millions.

A SECTARIAN FELLOWSHIP

R. H. B.

In a report to a certain church-journal a brother preacher enumerates several congregations of the “Church of Christ” in his city which (according to his mind and his view of the church, as he represents it in this report) are guaranteed as sound and loyal. But he adds sadly that there are also some “other congregations whose leaders love the premillennial teaching more than they love the fellowship of other brethren.” So, in other words, the requirement for fellowship with him and those sound congregations is that those “other congregations,” or their leaders, give up their love of the “premillennial teaching.”

By what authority do those churches impose such a condition of fellowship on those “other brethren” and those other congregations? It is a strange case of blindness, surely, that keeps them from seeing that they have set up a human authoritative creed to which all must subscribe who would want to have fellowship with them. This is, of course, the old sectarian principle against which the Church of Christ has battled so earnestly in times past. And while claiming to stand for the true church of Christ these brethren have fallen into the evil way of sectarian creedism, and in effect, whatever their claims may be, have joined the ranks of denominationalism. It might be suggested that in taking the confession of a candidate for baptism they put the question thus: “Do you believe with all your heart that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and that the premillennial teaching is wrong?” Why not? If they have already put “the creed in the deed,” and have made it a condition of fellowship—then it would only be fair and honest to put it into the original confession also, so that their converts may know from the first

where they stand and what is required of them by their ecclesiastical superiors.

A "TRUE" CREED

Of course those brethren are convinced and persuaded that their anti-millennial creed is in accord with the Bible. All creed-makers think that of their creeds, and they all feel that those who are not willing to subscribe to their "true" creed are not "sound" and are unworthy of their fellowship. But a simple Christian who knows what it is to stand on the ground of simple, nonsectarian, New Testament Christianity would not want to belong to such creed-bound bodies, even though they agreed with them in those doctrinal positions. For a Christian who knows his freedom in the Lord could hardly afford to work and worship under such human domination and limitation. The barrier of fellowship in this case is not so much a matter of doctrine, as of *principle*, deep and far-reaching—a principle that separates between the church of the Lord and the sectarian organizations of Christendom.

"PREMILLENNIAL" CHURCHES

It may be that the brother preacher who deplores those congregations and their leaders—who "love premillennial teaching more than fellowship with their brethren," who are not willing to purchase fellowship at the price of giving up their "premillennial" convictions in favor of the "anti-premillennial" creed which those brethren have set up—it may be that he thinks that those congregations disfellowshipped by him are "premillennial churches." If so I would like to correct the misunderstanding. Those churches are not "premillennial" churches in the sense in which the church he preaches for is "anti-premillennial." They are composed of free Christians. None of them are ever asked how they stand on this or that point of prophetic teaching. The children of God are personally responsible to God, and no man may have lordship over their faith. (2 Cor. 1:24.) They have a right to examine the scripture for themselves, they think, and accept any of it and all of it, and that quite regardless of any man's permitting or forbidding. They have set up no creed as a condition of fellowship, as their sectarian-minded, anti-premillennial brethren have done. They are free to search the scriptures and to prove all things and hold fast that which is good. So long as they acknowledge that authority, no other is to be imposed upon them. Their "leaders" would really be unable to say how many of their congregation were or were not "pre-millennial." All of them are willing to accept all the statements of God's word as they are able to discern, and as more and more by prayerful study they may be able to apprehend them; for the motto of simple Christians is always, "We are not right—the Bible is right." Those who would prevent their brethren in the exercise of such right and freedom are the real sectaries, and upon them the charge of faction and division must rest.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 44

Preparatory to a clear and strong article by Barton W. Stone in favor of “the premillennial view” of Christ’s Coming (as James Challen calls it), we offer these gracious encomiums upon the famous author’s life and character. They are taken chiefly from Elder John Rogers’ preface to “The Biography of Elder Barton Stone.” We follow these with a portion of the Stone biography, really an autobiography, as it was written by himself. Stone died on November 9, 1844, when he was short of 72 years old. The Biography was not published until 1853. Our older readers know well the fame and honor of Stone’s name, as a reformer along with the Campbells; and our younger readers will profit by being told.

“The writer believes that Barton W. Stone, the much abused and persecuted Barton W. Stone, was one of the greatest and most consistent Reformers that has appeared in any age since the apostacy.”—John Rogers.

“It is seldom we are called upon to record the death of one so much beloved, so highly gifted or so eminently pious.”—*Christian Message*, Vol. 14, No. 7.

“Our much admired and beloved Elder . . . this venerated and venerable editor.”—Alexander Campbell.

“That time-worn and honored saint . . . Elder Barton W. Stone. . . he fell covered with glory, yea, he triumphed in death.”—Dr. David Morton, his physician.

“Our beloved father Stone has gone to heaven. . . he was truly one of the excellent of earth. I doubt whether there was a purer, better man than Elder B. W. Stone. . . Those who are now pleading for the union of Christians upon the Bible alone are as much indebted to Elder Stone, if not more so, than to any other man.”—T. M. Allen.

“Take it all in all, his like, we fear, we shall not shortly see again. . . Farewell, excellent spirit, till we meet in the spirit land! Farewell, philanthropist, and benefactor of thy race!”—Aylette Rains (“whose praise is in all the churches.”)

“We feel that his place cannot be filled. . . He fought long and hard, and died with his sword in his hand.”—Love H. Jameson.

“I have differed with him on some points, but while I have a spark of true religion, I cannot be separated in heart from as good a man as Barton W. Stone.”—David Purviance.

“He had frequent paroxysms, caused by the acuteness of the pain (in his “last moments”); and while suffering the most, he would talk fluently on some passage of scripture. He would give the Greek of any passage, and its correct translation. Singing soothed him into calmness, and he awaited the call of the Lord. He remained calm and composed to the very last moment, in the perfect exercise of his mind, and left the strongest testimony a mortal man could give of

the complete victory he had won over death.”—John A. Gano, funeral address, Cane Ridge meeting house, June 22, 1845.

“He was greatly misunderstood and misrepresented by his former brethren and others, and even down to the present day these stale slanders of Father Stone are circulated and believed by many. . . . He was emphatically a teacher, a fine scholar, a clear-headed and logical reasoner, a sound Bible critic.”—Elder James Mathes, preface to “Works of Barton W. Stone.”

“Barton W. Stone became one of the leading figures in the Restoration Movement. Churches were established throughout Kentucky, Tennessee, and Ohio.”—Luther G. Roberts, *Gospel Broadcast*, Sept 25, 1941.

BIOGRAPHY OF BARTON W. STONE

(Written by Himself, with Additions and Reflections by Elder John Rogers)

CHAPTER X

Since the union of the Baptist association, as stated in the last chapter, nothing worthy of particular note occurred till the period when Alexander Campbell, of Virginia, appeared, and caused a great excitement on the subject of religion in Kentucky and other states. “Some said, He is a good man; but others said, nay: for he deceiveth the people.” When he came into Kentucky, I heard him often in public and in private. I was pleased with his manner and matter. I saw no distinctive feature between the doctrine he preached and that which we had preached for many years, except on baptism for remission of sins. Even this I had once received and taught, as before stated, but had strangely let it go from my mind, till Brother Campbell revived it afresh. I thought then that he was not sufficiently explicit on the influences of the Spirit, which led many honest Christians to think he denied them. Had he been as explicit then, as since, many honest souls would have been still with us, and would have greatly aided the good cause. In a few things I dissented from him, but was agreed to disagree.

I will not say there are no faults in Brother Campbell; but that there are fewer, perhaps, in him than any man I know on earth; and over these few my love would throw a veil, and hide them from view for ever. I am constrained, and willingly constrained, to acknowledge him the greatest promoter of this reformation of any man living. The Lord reward him!

In the year 1826, I commenced a periodical called the *Christian Messenger*. I had a good patronage, and labored hard to make the work useful and acceptable. After continuing the work for six years, brother John T. Johnson became united as co-editor, in which relation we continued harmoniously for two years, when the editorial connexion was dissolved by my removal to Illinois. The work I still continued, with short intervals, to the present year, 1843.

Just before brother Johnson and myself united as co-editors of the *Christian Messenger*, Alexander Campbell, of Virginia, had

caused a great excitement in Kentucky, as well as in other states, on the subject of religion. He had received a complete education in Scotland, and became a preacher in the strictest sect of Presbyterians. In early life he had immigrated into America, and under conviction that the immersion of believers only was baptism, he joined the Baptists. Not contented to be circumscribed in their system of religion, by close application of the Bible he became convinced that he had received many doctrines unauthorized by Scripture, and contrary to them, and therefore relinquished them for those more scriptural. He boldly determined to take the Bible alone for his standard of faith and practice, to the exclusion of all other books as authoritative. He argued that the Bible presented sufficient evidence of its truth to sinners to enable them to believe it, and sufficient motives to induce them to obey it—that until they believed and obeyed the gospel, in vain they expected salvation, pardon and the Holy Spirit; that now is the accepted time, and now is the day of salvation.

These truths we had proclaimed and reiterated through the length and breadth of the land, from the press and from the pulpit, many years before A. Campbell and his associates came upon the stage as aids of the good cause. Their aid gave a new impetus to the Reformation which was in progress, especially among the Baptists in Kentucky; and the doctrine spread and greatly increased in the West. The only distinguishing doctrine between us and them was, that they preached baptism for the remission of sins to believing penitents. This doctrine had not generally obtained amongst us, though some few had received it, and practised accordingly. They insisted also upon weekly communion, which we had neglected. It was believed by many, and feared by us, that they were not sufficiently explicit on the influences of the Spirit. Many unguarded things were spoken and written by them on this subject, calculated to excite the suspicions and fears of the people, that no other influence was needed than that in the written word; therefore to pray to God for help was vain. The same thing had been objected to us long before, and with plausibility too; for we also had been unguarded in our expressions. In private conversation with these brethren our fears were removed, for our views were one.

Among others of the Baptists, who received and zealously advocated the teaching of A. Campbell, was John T. Johnson, than whom there is not a better man. We lived together in Georgetown, and labored and worshipped together. We plainly saw that we were on the same foundation, in the same spirit, and preached the same gospel. We agreed to unite our energies to effect a union between our different societies. This was easily effected in Kentucky; and in order to confirm this union, we became co-editors of the *Christian Messenger*. This union, I have no doubt, would have been as easily effected in other States as in Kentucky, had there not been a few ignorant, headstrong bigots on both sides, who were more influenced to retain and augment their party, than to save the world by uniting

according to the prayer of Jesus. Some irresponsible zealots among the Reformers, so called, would publicly and zealously contend against sinners praying, or that professors should pray for them; they spurned the idea that preachers should pray that God would assist them in declaring his truth to the people; they rejected from Christianity all who were not baptized for the remission of sins, and who did not observe the weekly communion, and many other doctrines they preached. The old "Christians," who were unacquainted with the preachers of information amongst us, would naturally conclude these to be the doctrines of us all; and they rose up in opposition to us all, representing our religion as a spiritless, prayerless religion, and dangerous to the souls of men. They ran to the opposite extreme in Ohio, and in the Eastern States. I blame not the Christians for opposing such doctrines; but I do blame the more intelligent among them, that they did not labor to allay those prejudices of the people by teaching them the truth, and not to cherish them, as many of them did in their periodicals, and public preaching. Nor were they only blameable; some of the Reformers are equally worthy of blame, by rejecting the name *Christian*, as a family name, because the old Christians had taken it before them. At this, posterity will wonder, when they know that the sentiment was published in one of our most popular periodicals, and by one in the highest standing among us.

It is not wonderful that the prejudices of the old Christian church should be against us, and that they should so unkindly upbraid me especially, and my brethren in Kentucky, for uniting with the Reformers. But what else could we do, the Bible being our directory? Should we command them to leave the foundation on which we stood—the Bible alone—when they had come upon the same? By what authority could we command? Or should we have left this foundation to them, and have built another? Or should we have remained, and fought with them for the sole possession? They held the name *Christian* as sacred as we did; they were equally averse from making opinions the test of fellowship; and equally solicitous for the salvation of souls. This union, irrespective of reproach, I view as the noblest act of my life.

In the fall of 1834 I moved my family to Jacksonville, Illinois. Here I found two churches: a Christian and Reformers' church. They worshipped in separate places. I refused to unite with either until they united together, and labored to effect it. It was effected. I never suffered myself to be so blinded by prejudice in favor of, or against any, that I could not see their excellencies or defects. I have seen wrongs in the Reformers, and in the old Christians; and in candor have protested against them. This has exposed me to the darts of both sides. I have patiently suffered from both, but the day is at hand when all errors shall be disclosed, and the righteous justified from every false imputation.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 45

BARTON STONE ON THE MILLENNIUM

INTRODUCTORY

Barton W. Stone's *Christian Messenger* was published monthly: first, for seven or eight years (beginning 1826) from Georgetown, Ky., and then for nine or ten years, from Jacksonville, Ill., where Stone had located in 1843. The numbers we have seen were of 32 pages, size about 4 x 7; subscription price \$1 per year, cash; \$1.25 on six months' time. One name was offered free with a club of eight; postage was to be paid by the subscriber: "1½¢ under 100 miles; 2½¢ over 100 miles." In order to confirm the union which had been effected between the friends of Barton Stone ("Old Christians") and the friends of Alexander Campbell (variously called "Disciples," "Reformers," or "Christians"), John T. Johnson, of the latter group, became joint editor of the *Messenger* in 1833. Stone and Johnson had already become co-elders of the united Church of Christ in Georgetown, Ky., where they lived and labored together. At the end of their first year as co-editors, they published the joint statement which we reproduce, following. Beyond this, we reproduce Stone's essay on the Millennium.

JOINT STATEMENT

"With this number we close the seventh volume of the *Christian Messenger*. * * * We have endeavored to prune off excrescences from the truth of heaven, and to present it untinted with human wisdom, and unmixed with vain speculations. * * * We who have taken the word of God alone for our rule of faith and practice are the only people that dare to speak fearlessly. We have no name to lose—(already it is cast out as evil). We have no salaries at stake—this might be a temptation to be silent."—B. W. Stone, J. T. Johnson, Editors, *Christian Messenger*, Dec., 1833.

STONE'S "PREMILLENNIAL VIEW"

Millennium is a Latin word and signifies a thousand years. The period is spoken of in Rev. 20. Commentators are not agreed whether these are common or prophetic years. If they are prophetic years, (which are reckoned a year for a day, Ezekiel 5, 6), the millennium will measure 365,000 years. This is probable because John in Revelation makes all his calculations according to this measure.

About the commencement of this period, or just before its commencement, Babylon, the great whore, is judged and destroyed. Rev. 19:1-8.

The spurious church of Christ is called Babylon because of its pride and confusion, and is called the great whore because it has forsaken the true husband, Christ, and followed after other lovers. She is not owned as the Lamb's wife, as in the 7th verse.

About the commencement of this glorious period, the true church of Christ, or the Lamb's wife, is seen prepared for the marriage,

or marriage supper of the Lamb. Happy they who are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb. None but the saints of God have this privilege. Rev. 12:7, 9.

Immediately after, at the very commencement of this period, the King of Kings comes in his glory, and smites all the wicked nations of the earth, and treads them in wrath, as grapes are trodden in a winepress, and sweeps them all in death. Rev. 19:11, 21.

At the same time, the old Serpent, the Devil or Satan, is bound for a thousand years, during which time he has not one subject alive on earth. Rev. 20:1-3.

At the commencement of the thousand years, the martyrs who were beheaded or slain for the testimony of Jesus and for the word of God, shall rise from the dead; also the saints who had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands, shall rise, live and reign with Christ 1,000 years. This is the first resurrection. Rev. 20:5, 6. Commentators generally, if not universally, limit this privilege to the martyrs only, and think that these only shall rise from the dead at the commencement of the millennium, and reign with Christ during that period; yet the text by no means limits it to them. The Apostle Paul, speaking of the resurrection, marks the particular order of it. 1 Cor. 15:23: "But every man (is made alive) in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." (1 Thess. 4:15, 18.) We are plainly taught that at the coming of Christ the saints that shall be alive on the earth shall fly up to meet the Lord in the air, they having been changed from mortality to immortality in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the sound of the last trump. But they shall not enjoy this privilege till the dead saints shall first rise from mortality to immortality, and then shall they all be caught up together to meet the Lord. The Lord shall descend with the trump of God; the trump shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. In all these passages of scripture, not a word is said of the resurrection of the wicked.

In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are equal to the angels. The idea of an increase of men by ordinary generation, is certainly incorrect and untrue. . . .

Some have thought that Christ would not come and reign in person on earth: that his coming and reign on earth are entirely spiritual. *How then differs his reign in the millennium from his present reign?* His first coming was in person. So shall his second be. His first coming was to save his people from their sins: his second is to save them from death and *hades*, and not from sin. His first coming was not to judge the world, but to save the world; his second coming is not to save but to judge the world. In his first coming he abode but a few years on earth; in his second he will abide 1,000 and will not leave the world till he has adjudicated on it, and assigned to each one his eternal portion in heaven or hell. For

at the end of the 1,000 years, Satan is loosed and the wicked are raised from the dead—this is the 2nd resurrection. Satan is permitted to collect his old armies composed of all the wicked now raised from death, and to deceive them once more with the hope of conquering the armies of Jesus. As soon as they are collected together, the judgment is set on each of them and they are condemned to suffer the vengeance of eternal fire.

One objection is offered to these views, which is that the dead, saint and sinner, are to be raised in the same hour.

"The hour is coming when all that are in their graves shall come forth; they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation." In a few verses above the Lord said, "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." John 5:28, 29. In this last verse the dead spoken of are such as are dead in sin—such shall hear his voice, and if they hear and believe they shall live the life of faith in the Son of God. This the context shows to be the truth. The hour of hearing the voice of Jesus in the gospel has continued 1,800 years. It yet continues. If then this hour measures 1,800 years, why not the hour spoken of in John v. 28 continue 1,000 years? These are humbly submitted to the public.—(From *Christian Messenger*, Georgetown, Kentucky, October, 1833, Pages 314-316.)

Wm. Caldwell, of Tupper's Plains, Ohio (who thought the book of Revelation was written before the fall of Jerusalem) wrote a 5-page criticism of Stone, and Stone printed it. Caldwell either misunderstood or misinterpreted Stone, to which the latter replied:

"Had I communicated some of the ideas you have suggested, I should be astonished myself. In fact, I never thought of some of them. His second coming will be in his proper person. This is the testimony of the two glorified angels to the apostles while they were gazing at the ascending immortal Jesus." * * *

"The second resurrection is of the wicked, which shall take place after the 1,000 years are finished."

"I cannot believe that in the millennial period the human family will increase; for, said our Lord, 'In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.' Matt. 22:30. Angels do not procreate their species." (But does anyone believe or teach that there will be procreation among angels or resurrected saints?—ELJ.)

At one point Caldwell had argued that if Christ were to come at the beginning of the millennium, heaven would be without Him for a thousand years. To this, Stone replied that heaven was once without Him for 33 years! The exchange was carried on in fine spirit, nor did the one call the other "heretic" or "speculator," as the following quotations show:

Caldwell: "Now then, while I dissent from your opinion respecting the second coming of Christ, let not our love be cooled to

each other; the best of men have differed on this subject."

Stone: "From my views on the millennium you dissent, and have in plain and brotherly style stated your objections, and requested my attention to them. This I will cheerfully give you in the same style. . . ."

"The second coming of Christ is at the commencement of his millennial reign on earth. Here on earth he will reign till the 1,000 years be finished; nor will he cease to reign on earth till he has raised from death the wicked, and judged them according to their works. As to the people living in a national capacity, planting, building, marrying, etc., we believe this shall be the fact at the coming of the Lord to reign on earth with his saints a thousand years. . . ."

"Difficulties, it is acknowledged, attach to the doctrine of the millennium, and such that we may not be able to solve. But shall we, therefore, conclude that nothing can be certainly known respecting it? . . ."

"How frequently people, from preconceived opinions, reject the plainest truth because it contradicts their traditional notions. . . . Let us diligently examine the subjects by the book."—B. W. Stone, in *Christian Messenger*, December, 1833, Pages 365-367.

Apparently, Stone too, in his day, was charged with disbelief in Christ's present kingdom! In answering one, Shehane, he has this to say:

"Mr. S. [Shehane] takes much pains to prove that which I believe as firmly as he does himself, viz: that Christ has a kingdom on earth. Had he none previous to the day of Pentecost? Christ said to the Jews: 'The kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.'"

"Now, according to prophecy, according to the promise of the Lord Almighty, and the unconquerable expectation of the Jews: Jerusalem by the sons of Abraham is to be *again*, 'safely inhabited.' See Zech. 14."—Barton W. Stone, in *Christian Messenger*, Jacksonville, Ill., Feb., 1835. Pages 31-37.

STONE'S NEW TESTAMENT POSITION

"But say some, 'Campbellism we will oppose.' In this we wish you success. But beware lest you are either beating the air, not understanding what it is; or lest you oppose the truth of God, because brother Campbell has advocated it. There is danger, and therefore you ought to be cautious. But says another, 'I am determined to oppose Stone's Arianism and Socinianism with all my might.' Amen. But be sure you fight not an image made by yourself or by others, and call it Stone's doctrine. And beware lest in your opposition you lift your arm against the truth of God and do a great injury to yourself. Campbell and Stone are but fallible men and therefore should not be followed farther than they follow Christ. Our opinions we wish no man to receive as truth, nor do we desire to impose them on any as tests of Christian fellowship."—B. W. Stone, in *Christian Messenger*, Georgetown, Ky., Sept., 1832.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 46

We continue this month with further reprints from the real pioneer of the "Restoration Movement," Barton W. Stone:

THE FUTURE RESTORATION OF ISRAEL

Barton W. Stone

This doctrine has never been disputed till a few years past, and then it was set aside by some to suit their theory of the second advent of Messiah and destruction of the world in 1843. Since then the minds of many are confused, and their faith shaken. I must still view it as one of the signs of the Lord's coming, and if this be confirmed by revelation it will settle the faith of all Christians and effectually preclude all doubt.

My first argument shall be taken from Romans 11th chapter. The restoration there spoken of is certainly posterior to that of their captivity in Babylon.

Paul seems to have foreseen the introduction of this doctrine, and is therefore very particular in defining whom he meant by Israel. In the 9th chapter of Romans he says, they are not all Israel who are of Israel, or children of Jacob. Neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children; but in Isaac shall thy seed be called—not in Ishmael or any other of his families. In Romans 9:4, 5 a particular description is given.

Second, their fall. Rom. 11:1: Hath God cast away his people? By no means. . . . God determined to make their fall a blessing to the world, for through their fall salvation came to the Gentiles. . . . If then the smaller part of the Jews is such a great blessing to the world, how much more their fulness, i. e. the fullness of the Jews, when *all* shall know the Lord and receive the Messiah? How much more abundantly shall the world be blessed by the fulness or whole of them, than by the small part?

In verse 16 the same sentiment is expressed. For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead? Thus, combining the two verses, we will read them in this manner: If the *lump* or casting away of the Jews be the riches or reconciling of the world; and if the smaller part of the nation who believed in Jesus was such an unspeakable blessing to the Gentiles, what shall the receiving of the whole nation of the Jews be, but life from the dead to the Gentile world?

In verse 17 the apostle describes the future character of the whole Jewish nation, when they shall be received, called by him the "lump." "For if the first fruit be holy, the lump is also holy; and if the root *be* holy, so *are* the branches." Here is evidently a mistake in all the translations I have ever seen of this verse, and has rendered it less understood than any text in the Bible, and has completely broken the chain of the apostle's discourse. Common readers by reading the text will see the words *is* and *are* are supplements of the transla-

tors, not in the original. Those verbs, too, they know to be in the present tense, than which nothing could be farther from the apostle's reasoning. These words should be supplied in the future tense. Thus, read the verse with the foregoing connection: "For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead? For if the first fruits were holy, so *shall be* the branches." Now the first fruits of the gospel were Jews—the *eetteema*, or small part of them. They were eminently holy: so shall be the lump, the whole nation, the whole fulness, the *pleroma* of them. The root of the Christian church was composed of Jews that believed and obeyed the gospel: and they were confessedly a holy people; so *shall be* the branches—the branches that had been cut off by unbelief. This I verily believe to be the truth. . . . I wish them [the learned] to inquire whether *eetteema* and *pleroma* be not correlative terms, translated *the lesser part* and the fulness or whole. I view this an irrefragable argument in confirmation of the Jews' restoration, the whole of them, and their future holiness.

Verse 26. [quoted in King James, also 33]. By the fall of the Jews the Gentiles are saved; and by the mercy of the Gentiles the Jews will be saved. It is all of God.

One more argument I will use . . . 2 Cor. 3:15, 16: "But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it (they, the Jews) shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away." This appears decisive that Paul believed in the return of the Jews in the latter days."—*Christian Messenger*, July, 1844, pages 83-87.

THE APOSTASY

Again, writing on "The Apostasy" (which he considered already for long time in progress), Stone says:

"The apostasy and the man of sin, spoken of by Paul, are exciting topics of the day. The man of sin, the viceregent of Christ, has usurped his throne too long. The king himself will soon come and take possession of his kingdom, and drive off the usurpers from their unlawful seats, and reign himself alone over the house of God for ever. Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly. Amen."—*Christian Messenger*, Sept. 1843, pp. 138-140.

ON CHURCH GOVERNMENT

It has been said that Barton Stone was the earliest "Restorer," long ante-dating Campbell's work in America. The following on "Church Government" is dated 1814.

"While they (Luther, Calvin and others) stood thus on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone, they grew up into a holy temple in the Lord, and promised fair to ameliorate the condition of an unhappy world.

"But how soon these prophets blasted! Reformers, just emerging from the chaos of Popery, began to read the Bible for themselves. So long habituated to the error of human glosses it would have

been almost a miracle for them to have thought alike on every point. The fact was, they differed in things of little note; but yet lived together in peace and brotherly love. On account of these small differences the papists charged them with want of uniformity among themselves. To avoid the reproach, and remedy the supposed evil, they undertook the unhappy and vain project of making the people think alike. For this purpose forms and creeds were again introduced; which, so far from answering the contemplated design, broke and divided the Christians into opposing sects. Divisions and sub-divisions have since been multiplied—they still increase and will increase till the cause be removed and the original ground be retaken by the church of God. The law-making business for the church we have disclaimed as an unwarranted intrusion upon the prerogative of Jesus Christ."—An address to the Christian Churches in Kentucky, Tenn., and Ohio, by Barton W. Stone, 1814.

* * *

THE COMING OF THE LORD

Alexander Campbell

The extract that follows contains the first two pages, entire, of an article by Campbell written during the Miller stir of 1841. Succeeding pages of the article present some thoughts that to us seem out of harmony with the prophetic word; but that Campbell expected the Lord Jesus to come actually back to earth again, to "set foot" on this globe—a Bible teaching that is often denied and sometimes even ridiculed in our day—of this there can be no doubt at all. He reasons first the probability of it, and then he states the certainty of it. Evidently, the belief that our Lord will actually set foot on earth again is not of itself heresy—unless such men as Campbell were heretics!—E. L. J.

Of all future events, that of *the coming of the Lord* in power and glory, is the most soul-subduing, enrapturing, and transcendent. In one sentence, it is "*the blessed hope.*" The church has been praying for it, and the whole creation groaning and travailing in pain for it for almost two thousand years. "Behold he cometh in the clouds of heaven, and every eye shall see him. They also that pierced him, and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." Then will "heaven's eternal arches ring" with shoutings of glory, and honor, and blessing, and praise, while his enemies will be confounded with terror and clothed with shame.

But when shall this most joyful hope be consummated in vision! When shall the Lord come! Whether shall it be before the triumphs of Christianity over Paganism, Mahometanism, Papalism, and Atheism, usually called the Millennium, or after this moral victory? This is the great question now in debate. My method of deciding it embraces in its philosophy as a primary evidence the events that are clearly and incontrovertibly declared to be concomitant with, or attendant upon his coming. These decided, and the question is, in my opinion, settled on the clearest and safest foundation. To discover and substantiate these is the burden of the present essay. Of necessity, therefore, this essay must consist mainly of testimony from which we may argue again.

The points to which I solicit attention are four:—

- 1st. The *probability* of the personal return . . . to this earth.
- 2d. The *certainly* of it.
- 3d. The *manner* of it.
- 4th. The *events* then to be expected.

The probability of his return is argued from two facts:— 1st. *It is the place of his nativity.* “And thou Bethlehem of Judah are not the least of the cantons of Israel; for out of thee shall he come—or *in thee shall he be born*, who shall become Governor of my people Israel.” The *Word* that was in the beginning with God, that was God, “by whom all things were made,” became human flesh in the city of David, and was born of a daughter of Eve, in Asia, 1836 years ago. It is human to love the place of one’s nativity. And especially is it pleasant for one who has been raised to great honor and authority, and who has been long unknown to the place where first he saw the light of heaven, to revisit the scenes of his childhood, and re-survey the humble horizon which once bounded his views of the universe, and in which he first learned to know himself. No wonder, then, should our Lord delight to stand at “the latter day upon this earth,” not far from the Mount of Olives, whence to heaven his earthly friends and relatives saw him triumphantly ascend.

But there is a second fact that adds much to the probability of his return: *He has much property in this earth.* All things in it, on it, and connected with it, are his. . . . Where one has much property he has much thought and much attachment. Our Lord has much property here. The earth, the sea, the air—the kingdoms, animal, vegetable, mineral, are his. The Devil will not for ever usurp the territory of Christ’s present kingdom; nor retain the field, the theatre of war, where he and our Messiah in single combat fought the first battle, when first Satan felt the sharp two-edged sword that proceeded out of his mouth. He will take the field and drive the usurper down to eternal ruin. The earth is, moreover, dear to the Lord; because the ashes of all his saints, a few only excepted, are in it. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, David, etc., have their sepulchres with us to this day. From such considerations and facts we infer the probability of his return. But to the 2d point, the *certainly* of his return:—

1st. The types under the law indicate his return. The Jewish High Priest entered the most holy place once a year. He presented his sacrifice there before Him that dwells between the cherubim. Meantime, the people anxiously expected his return after he had for them made an offering and prepared a place. He ultimately returned to the door of the tabernacle and blessed them that looked for his return. So says Paul: Christ was once offered to bear the sin of many, and to them that look for him (as the Jews looked for the return of the High Priest) shall he appear the second time, without a sin-offering, to salvation, having made his offering within the veil.—*Millennial Harbinger*, 1841, page 1.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 47

The Songs of Our Fathers

E. L. J.

"All hail the power of Jesus' name!
Let angels prostrate fall.
Bring forth the royal diadem,
And crown Him Lord of all!"

Strange and unpredictable are the fortunes and vicissitudes of a great hymn—especially when it falls in the path of blind, and unreasoning religious prejudice. For a century, more or less, the hymn, "All Hail the Power," has been accepted throughout the Christian world and sung as the grandest of all our opening hymns—except it be "Come, Thou Almighty King." One would have said that such a hymn could never lose its place and power.

Yet, in these late days, one hears strange tales of great hymns now blacklisted; of blackboard lists of "songs unfit to sing" that include "All Hail the Power"! Why is this? Has something happened—something new in our time and generation? Could it be some extreme religious bias? Or have our hymnology and hymnists just run down at the heel? Our search reveals no criticism of this hymn until the present generation. On the contrary, it was generally used among the brethren, and widely published in their books, until our day.

It is said by those who ought to know that Nashville Bible School (now David Lipscomb College), in the days of Lipscomb and Harding—and even until recent years—was wont to open school each autumn with the singing of this grand paean of praise. Did those good brethren, then, not know an unscriptural song when they saw it? And were the songbook editors of that era all perfectly blind to heresy appearing in the well-known hymns—such men as E. G. Sewell, T. B. Larimore, J. C. McQuiddy, A. B. Lipscomb, C. M. Pullias, S. P. Pittman, D. Austen Sommer, G. H. P. Showalter, S. H. Hall, John T. Smith, E. G. Rockliff, F. L. Rowe, Chas. H. Roberson; yea, and David Lipscomb, J. W. Shepherd, and others who were responsible for the Christian literature of those days? Were these men totally unqualified to detect an unscriptural song when they heard it and sang it repeatedly over a period of a generation or two? One cannot but wonder about it, and ask, Why this strange change?

In this strange situation, it may not be amiss, therefore, that this department of "Faith of Our Fathers" should include at least one article on the songs our fathers sang; for those songs reflect their faith, and they touch also on certain questions that are current in our own day.

How is it that, according to the scriptures (Heb. 6:6), it is still possible to crown Him in the heart as Lord of all? Though God

has indeed crowned the Son long since with glory and honor, giving Him all authority in heaven and on earth, and with that name that is above every name; and though He sits in universal power upon the Father's throne (Rev. 3:21)—are there not still millions in the world who have never owned His Lordship yet? And are there not professed believers also who still crucify the Lord afresh by their apostasy? If then we may in all propriety exhort the sinner in our invitation songs to "come to Jesus," and to "surrender all," why is it that we may not exhort him as well to crown Christ Jesus in his heart, and to confess, with Thomas, that He is to him both "Lord and God"? Such, at least, was the faith of our immediate "fathers" in the gospel.

"Our Lord is now rejected, And by the world disowned;
By the many still neglected, And by the few enthroned."

Before me as I write, drawn from our collection of three hundred different titles, are most of the songbooks issued for the simple churches of Christ for the last 60 years. It was a simple matter to draw from these at least 15 songbooks published for these churches that contained this grand old hymn, without textual change whatsoever. Checking first the Nashville songbooks, I find that from 1889 or earlier to 1923 or later, the principal hymnals published by the Gospel Advocate brethren carried "All Hail the Power," without any change of text, sometimes in prominent positions and with two or three alternative tunes. These books include "Christian Hymns," "Words of Truth," "The Voice of Praise," "Seventy-Seven Sweet Songs," "Praise Him," "Choice Gospel Hymns," and others. Passing by the Fillmore "Hymn and Tune Book" of 1882, (though it was widely used in the simple churches, and contained "All Hail the Power") we begin our list with the Gospel Advocate's old original—

1. *Christian Hymns*. It was edited by E. G. Sewell, and published by the Gospel Advocate Company in 1889. What song is in the Number 1 position, the opening hymn of the collection? It is none other than this same "All Hail the Power," without any alteration of the text whatsoever. In the Preface to this volume the publishers say: "The songs the people sing must in a good degree reflect the teaching of the Lord's word, so that they may not at any time sing sentiments that are not in agreement with the revealed truth." And then on the next page they begin the book with "All Hail the power"!

2. *Words of Truth*, edited by E. G. Sewell; published by the Gospel Advocate Company in 1892. In the Preface the publishers say: "It has been our aim to teach nothing that would teach error . . . and give to the public only such songs as are scriptural in sentiment." But No. 194 is "All Hail the Power," text unchanged.

3. *The Voice of Praise*, by Leonard Daugherty; published by the Gospel Advocate Company in 1895; No. 19, "All Hail the Power," 5 verses, text unchanged.

4. *Seventy-Seven Sweet Songs*, edited by T. B. Larimore and

Wm. J. Kirkpatrick; published by McQuiddy Printing Company, 1906. No. 78—first song of the "Familiar Hymns" department—is "All Hail the Power," text unchanged.

5. *Praise Him*, edited by Wm. J. Kirkpatrick and A. B. Lipscomb; published by McQuiddy Printing Company, 1914. In the Preface the publishers say: "These [the unscriptural] we have endeavored to eliminate from *Praise Him*. But three times in this book (to three different tunes) we find "All Hail the Power"!

6. *Choice Gospel Hymns*, edited by T. B. Mosley, C. M. Pullias, S. P. Pittman; published by Gospel Advocate Company, 1923. In the Preface the publishers say: "The book abounds in the standard old hymns, suitable for all occasions of Christian worship." But "All Hail the Power" appears twice, two tunes, No. 189 and 190.

7. *Gospel Melodies*, edited by J. H. D. Thompson (Rogers, Ark.), 1895; No. 242: "All Hail the Power," text unchanged.

8. *Hymns for Churches of Christ*, by Publishing Committee of Churches of Christ, Birmingham, Eng., 1913. No. 175: "All Hail the Power," text unchanged.

9. *Wonderful Story in Song*, by Fred A. Fillmore; 1917, Copyright and distributed by F. L. Rowe. No. 364: "All Hail the Power," text unchanged.

10. *Selected Revival Songs*, by John T. Smith, C. F. Witty, E. G. Rockliff, published by F. L. Rowe, 1917. No. 102: "All Hail the Power," text unchanged.

11. *Cross and Resurrection*, by S. H. and Flavil Hall, 1927. Published by F. L. Rowe. No. 245: "All Hail the Power," text unchanged.

12. *Tipton Home Gospel Songs*, No. 2, by J. W. Dennis et al., 1927, No. 118: "All Hail the Power," text unchanged.

13. *Hymnal*: a book of hymns (supplementary to a book of 400 numbers they were then using at A. C. C.; they now use "Great Songs"); compiled by Leonard Burford about 1942; words approved by Charles H. Roberson, Head of Bible, Abilene Christian College. Published by A. C. C. No. 418: "All Hail the Power," text unchanged.

14. *Protracted Meeting Songbook*, by D. Austen Sommer. No. 15: "All Hail the Power," text unchanged.

15. *Our Leader*, by Thos. S. Cobb and G. H. P. Showalter, 1941. Published by Firm Foundation, Austin, Texas. Opening cover page, "All Hail the Power," text unchanged.

These, then, were some of the books our fathers used. And was there a hymn among them all more often used, and more blessed of God in the using, than "All Hail the Power," set to the grand tune, "Coronation"

"That in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."—Phil. 2:10, 11.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 48

Writing in regard to “the misrepresentations and exaggerations of a few “bigoted partisans,” and after characterizing anathemas against him as “a tissue of falsehood,” and exposing, by irrefragable documents, the immoral character of Mr. Winter, one of its chief prompters, Alexander Campbell asks the following questions. How very much up to date the line which we have italicised sounds!—J.

“Who is making divisions and schisms? Who is rending the peace of the churches? Who are creating factions, swellings and tumults? *We who are willing to bear and forbear or they who are anathematizing and attempting to excommunicate?* Let the umpires decide the question. For my own part, I am morally certain they who oppose us are unable to meet us on the Bible; they are unable to meet us before the public; and this I say, not as respects their talents, acquirements or general abilities, but as respects their systems. Thousands are convinced of this, and they might as well bark at the moon as to oppose us by bulls and anathemas. If there be a division, gentlemen, you will make it, not I; and the more you oppose us with the weight of your censure, like the palm tree we will grow faster. I am for peace, for union, for harmony, for co-operation with all good men. But I fear not you; if you will fling fire-brands, arrows and discords into the army of the faith, you will repent it, not we. You will lose influence, not we. We covet no persecution, but we disregard it. We fear nothing but error, and should you proceed to make divisions, you will find that they will reach much farther than you are aware, and that the time is past when an anathema from an association will produce any other effect than contempt from some and a smile from others.”—Memoirs of Alexander Campbell. pp. 323, 324.

I have read where Alexander Campbell said that when he undertook to answer or decide a Bible question he never allowed anything he had ever written or said to occur to mind so as to influence his decision. He simply wrote or said each time what he thought right. True, he was charged with being inconsistent with himself. He may have been, but few have been more nearly consistent with the truth.—G. H. P. Showalter, editorial in “Firm Foundation,” Dec. 9, 1941.

“Unless what we learn of prophecy, of the Lord’s coming, of the age to come, as well as any other truth, makes us more humble, more obedient, more loving and Christlike, we have indeed learned in vain.”—R. H. Boll

BRITANNICA ON CHRIST’S REIGN ON EARTH

Lest someone should think the Biblical teaching on the “Millennium” as given in the 20th chapter of Revelation and throughout the Prophets is a “modern conception” we subjoin here an ex-

tract from the coldly impartial *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Eleventh Edition; Article "Millennium."

Britannica Notes on The Primitive Belief

"Faith in the nearness of Christ's Second Advent, and in the establishment of his reign of glory on the earth, was undoubtedly a strong point in the primitive Christian Church. In the anticipations of the future prevalent among the early Christians (A. D. 50-150) it is necessary to distinguish a fixed and a fluctuating element. The former includes (1) the notion that the last terrible battle with the enemies of God was pending; (2) the faith in the speedy return of Christ; (3) the conviction that Christ will judge all men, and (4) will set up a kingdom of glory on earth. To the latter belong views of the Anti-christ of the heathen world-power, of the place, extent, and duration of the earthly kingdom of Christ, etc. . . . But even here certain positions were agreed on in large sections of Christendom. Amongst these was the expectation that the future kingdom of Christ on earth should have a fixed duration—according to the most prevalent opinion, a duration of one thousand years. From this fact the whole ancient Christian eschatology was known in later times as "Chiliasm"—a name not strictly accurate, since the doctrine of the millennium was only one feature in its scheme of the future.

" . . . Justin (*Dial.* 80) speaks of Chiliasm as a necessary part of complete orthodoxy, although he knows Christians who do not accept it. That a philosopher, like Justin, with a bias towards an Hellenic construction of the Christian religion, should nevertheless have accepted its chiliastic element is the strongest proof that these enthusiastic expectations were inseparably bound up with the Christian faith down to the middle of the 2nd century. . . .

"After the middle of the 2nd century these expectations were gradually thrust in the background. They could never have died out, however, had not circumstances altered, and a new mental attitude taken up. The spirit of philosophical and theological speculation and of ethical reflection which spread through the churches did not know what to make of the future.

GIBBON'S TESTIMONY

Gibbon, never accused of sympathy with such teaching, says: "The ancient and popular doctrine of the Millennium was carefully inculcated by a succession of Fathers from Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, who conversed with the immediate disciples of the apostles, down to Lactantius, who was the preceptor of the son of Constantine. It appears to have been the prevailing sentiment of orthodox believers." . . . "As long as this error was permitted to subsist in the church, it was productive of the most salutary effects on the faith and practice of Christians."

The historians, Mosheim, Neander, all others of note, are unanimous in stating that the church of the earliest centuries was pre-

millennial. All show that changes came with the rise of the papacy. The Church of Rome has consistently opposed the teaching from the beginning until now. This is a significant fact.—Stanford Chambers.

JOHN T. HINDS, ON "THIS GENERATION"

A querist in Kentucky asks for the meaning of Mark 13:30. The part of the verse meant reads as follows: "This generation shall not pass away, until all these things be accomplished." The verse is a part of Jesus' answer to the questions of the apostles respecting the destruction of Jerusalem and his coming.

If the term "generation" is to be taken in its ordinary sense of lifetime, it would have to apply to the Lord's coming in judgment on the Jews in the destruction of their city. This does not agree very well with the words, "all these things," which by a reasonable construction includes his entire answer. The Greek word has a variety of meanings, one of which is "race." That is the meaning that gives the easiest solution to the problem. It was a prediction that the Jews as a race, or people, would not cease until all the things mentioned had been accomplished. They are still with us and no prospects of their extinction.—John T. Hinds, in *Gospel Advocate*, April 14, 1932.

"THOSE KINGS"

"I know that the traditional theory claims that Daniel [2:44] had reference to the Cæsar kings, where he says "In the days of those kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, nor shall the sovereignty thereof be left to another people; but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever";

But let it be borne in mind that when Christ was upon earth there was but one king, Cæsar.—*Christian Leader*, Nov. 13, 1900 (author unknown).

HOMILETIC PARAGRAPHS

46 years ago, R. H. Boll wrote these true words of warning, in commenting on Acts 20:

The saddest point perhaps is that from among themselves, of their own number, the traducers should come. The generation of Judas is not dead yet. The danger to the church comes from within. He does not mean this in the first place of those who by honest mistake are propagating error; but of those heady, ambitious characters who, to have pre-eminence and leadership, speak perverse things among the disciples; the "smart," overbearing, "rule or ruin" spirits that are found in most communities. And also it happens that for the love of money, or the fear of man, or some such weakness, able men, beloved and esteemed among the church, become instruments of creating ungodly divisions and occasion the destruction of souls. It is then that we must learn how to pluck out the

right eye and cast it from us, when it causes us to stumble. Sometimes it seems quite as hard to deal with such men as to cut off a member of one's body. Yet it stands written: "Mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned; and turn away from them." And if we love men more than Christ and his cause, "we cannot be his disciples."—*The Way*, October 15, 1903, page 931.

C. H. ROBERSON'S HISTORICAL TESTIMONY

Though the good brother who wrote the following paragraph may have changed his views, or renounced his former interpretations on certain prophetic scriptures—we hear that he has—such a change cannot weaken his own **historical testimony** on the subject, which we now quote from this scholar:

"The distinguishing characteristic of the millenarian theory is the remarkable series of waxings and wanings it has had at different periods. It seems that during the early centuries it obtained a prevalence that was so general that it may be quite properly mentioned as catholic [that is, universal].

After the lapse of the first three centuries, a gradual change of opinion was wrought as pertains to the theory. This change was brought about by the combined influence of secular prosperity, and by the activities of Origen, Augustine, and Jerome against it.—C. H. Roberson, in *Firm Foundation*, April 7, 1942.

IRENÆUS ON THE ANTI-CHRIST

Ireneus, Second Century (180 A. D.), refers to 2 Thess. 2: "He (*Antichrist*) shall come . . . not as a righteous king, neither in lawful submission to God, but in impiety, unrighteousness and lawlessness. . . . He shall put down idols so as to persuade men that he is God. He shall exalt himself as the only object of worship. . . Concerning him, the apostle in his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, speaks."—Irenæus, "*Against Heresies*," V. 25, 1.

DAVID LIPSCOMB ON 1 THESSALONIANS 1:10

"To expect the coming of his Son from heaven, whither he ascended after God had raised him from the dead. The coming of the Son of God to reward his servants, and to execute wrath upon his enemies, is an item of faith kept more constantly before the disciples by the apostles and inspired teachers than by the teachers of the present day. When taught now it is too often so featured as to make a party or divisive body to the neglect of other truths. It should be taught in connection with other vital truths as a fundamental Bible teaching. The expectation of the return of the Lord to execute justice and judgment ought to be kept before the people. The apostle connects the raising of Jesus from the dead with the deliverance of the Christians from the wrath to come."—From an unpublished commentary on 1 Thessalonians, sent in by J. W. Shepherd.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 49

Because it is due the memory of this princely man, and for their own value and merit, we offer our readers these extracts from the writings of G. Dallas Smith. Lovingly remembered by all who knew him, he passed away in his mental and spiritual prime some years ago. But first, this brief sketch of the author's life, from the pen of John R. Williams of Hornbeak, Tenn., Feb. 21, 1919. Following this, extracts concerning Bible Study, the Millennium, and Prophecy.

A SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR'S LIFE

"G. Dallas Smith taught school and preached six years; for the past eighteen years he has preached regularly, giving his whole time to the study of the Bible and the work of preaching the gospel. . . . in Tennessee, Kentucky, Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama. . . . He preached 3 years at Weatherford, Texas; 2 years at Fayetteville, Tennessee; 6 years at Murfreesboro, Tennessee; preached also at Cleburne, Texas. Author of 'Outlines of Bible Study,' also tracts on prayer and on Instrumental Music; 2 years, editor of "Christian Messenger"; gave it up because it took too much of his time.

Brother Smith is careful, painstaking, and perfectly loyal to God's Word in all his teaching. It was my good fortune to hear him through a series of sermons at Hornbeak, Tennessee, my home congregation, some years ago, and I consider that series of sermons among the best I ever heard."

CONCERNING BIBLE STUDY

"In our study we must let the Bible speak fully and freely on every subject; for we must remember that while every passage tells the truth, it takes every passage of scripture on any particular subject to reveal all the truth on that subject."

CONCERNING THE MILLENNIUM

"A score of years ago, or more, Charles T. Russell, of Millennial Dawn fame, announced that in the year 1914 the millennium would be ushered in, with all its attendant blessings—including an opportunity to those who had not at least had a fair chance to be saved. . . . Well, what happened in 1914? Was there anything to suggest that the millennium was dawning? Did the dead begin to rise? Did Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and others come back to this old earth to serve as models for mankind? Has there been any indication that men from then on would live a hundred years, and possibly some a thousand years? Have any of these things come to pass? Has there been anything to suggest that the time of the millennium is here—a time when the whole earth is to be filled with the glory of the Lord, and peace, like a river, should flow on for ever?"—G. Dallas Smith, "Lectures on the Bible, and What Is Man?", pp. 26, 65; F. L. Rowe, Publisher, Cincinnati.

SHALL WE INTERPRET THE SCRIPTURES?
BUT SHALL WE INTERPRET THE PROPHECIES, TOO?

G. Dallas Smith

Among the first sermons I ever tried to preach was one upon the subject of "Setting up the Kingdom." I took as a text Dan. 2:44. "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom" etc. In connection with this I also used Isaiah 2:1-3 and Micah 4:1, 2. And with these and many other texts I proved, to my own satisfaction at least, that the Kingdom was set up on the first Pentecost after the ascension of Christ, in the City of Jerusalem. And I am still convinced that I preached the truth on that subject. But it required a bit of interpretation on my part to be able to reach my conclusion. For, of course, none of the texts I used (or any other text, for that matter) says the Kingdom was set up on the Day of Pentecost, or in the City of Jerusalem, either. How, then, did I make out my case? Why, I just interpreted the Scriptures, of course. And this is just what every other preacher among us does. And most of us interpret it in the same way; for as a matter of fact, most of us learned how to interpret these scriptures from older brethren, who set the example for us. And shall we also attempt to interpret the book of Revelation? Well, I think I do not know a preacher-brother among us who does not try his hand on this book sometimes. Take, for instance, Rev. 20:6. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power." And what is this "first resurrection"? Does any preacher or writer pretend to know what it is? Why, to be sure, many of them know. Ever since I can remember, preachers and writers have been explaining the first resurrection for us. True, they do not all agree as to what it is, but this just serves to show that their explanations are only human interpretations. If the Bible told us, in so many words, just what this first resurrection is, then all would give the same answer, or explanation concerning it. But since the Bible does not, in so many words at least, tell us what the first resurrection is, then we are left to interpret it for ourselves. And I know of no preacher among us who is too conscientious to make the attempt.

But really, nobody objects seriously to your interpreting the Scriptures, provided you interpret only such scriptures as we all are accustomed to interpret; and provided, second, that you do not introduce any new interpretations. Because all *new* interpretations are likely to be "human interpretations," and maybe human speculations, to boot! Well, I confess that in most cases I learned my interpretations from older preachers, and in the majority of these cases I have found them to be correct, as far as I know. But notwithstanding this, I am conscientiously opposed to accepting an interpretation just because some brother who is considered authority says it is that way. And I am just as much opposed to rejecting an interpretation just because a different brother suggests it. To be sure,

every text that needs explanation should be explained or interpreted in the light of every other text on the same subject, and in harmony with the whole trend of the Scriptures. And this should be the rule of interpretation, rather than following any man or set of men.

In conclusion, let no one misunderstand me. I do not believe in teaching speculative theories. But I doubt if I ever heard a preacher in my life who was absolutely free from speculating. This does not justify it, of course. But I suggest that we preachers, before we condemn others too severely for preaching speculations, just "sweep about our own doors." I seldom, if ever, hear a man preach with whom I can agree in all that he teaches. But I am not disposed to accuse every brother who disagrees with me of teaching speculations; for perhaps he could, with equal justice, "return the compliment."

"I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherein ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."—Eph. 4:1-3.—Article in *Gospel Herald*, Jan. 25, 1917.

OUR SIMPLE, SCRIPTURAL, NON-PARTISAN POSITION

In regard to the controversies that have been raised concerning the second coming of Christ, the thousand years' reign, the return of the Jews to Jerusalem, and the future manifestation of the kingdom, I wish to make a pointed and clear statement of my position.

I do not count myself wiser or better than others. No one is infallible. Only God's word is infallible. My purpose in all my teaching is to point men to the word of God, and to let them see and decide for themselves. I do not bind my teaching on prophecy on anyone as necessary to fellowship, nor do I even attempt to do so. I do not wish others to bind their teaching on me. I have never made it a test of fellowship and have never caused division over it and never shall. I simply present what I believe the Bible teaches. It is every brother's privilege to test it by God's word and to accept or reject it according to his findings. But I claim the right to teach my convictions, though I recognize that wisdom should be exercised in all teaching.

I desire also to state clearly my position on some of the questions at issue. I believe that the church of Christ (which is the manifestation of the kingdom of God on earth in the present dispensation) was established on the first Pentecost after Christ's resurrection; that this kingdom or church exists now: that Jesus is King now, crowned with honor and glory, enthroned on the right hand of the Father. I teach the Great Commission and encourage the practice of it, and that it applies to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews. I denounce the theories of Adventism and Russellism. I believe the Bible is a sufficient guide to men in all matters of faith and practice, and I agree with the long-established teaching of Christians in all funda-

mentals and points of obedience and congregational practices, and in everything that should affect our fellowship.

We could wish to make sure only of one thing:—that the readers of some of our religious journals shall not get the impression that we are “the other party” to the dispute some antagonistic scribes are carrying on. The Word and Work does not represent some party opposite to that represented by those papers. It represents no party at all. We claim no sectarian standard or slogan. For a man to be Christ’s and to subscribe himself to the word of God is sufficient in our estimate. Concerning the matters of prophetic controversy, we do not ask him to get on or off any fence, nor to stand on either side of any. We do not ask any man what he does or does not believe about the prophetic teachings which are held by some and assailed by others. We do not demand “expressions” on, or agreement with, any prescribed articles of faith of ours on the subject in order to fellowship, as the manner of some is, nor have we ever withdrawn fellowship from any for holding different views on prophecy (all assertions of editors, scribes, etc., to the contrary notwithstanding). As for ourselves, we propose to believe and teach whatever we find God’s word to say, and to be simply Christians; and on that ground by the help of the Lord we shall stand, to the satisfaction of all who love the Lord and are content to stand simply on His word. —Editorials by R. H. Boll, in *Word & Work*, May and November, 1935.

ARE THESE MEN SPECULATORS?

(Quotations gathered years ago by Stanford Chambers)

A. Campbell: “No kingdom of this world has yet become a kingdom of Christ. . . . But till Jesus appears in the clouds . . . his cause and his people can never gain the ascendancy. . . . He appears as harbinger of the Millennium.”—*Mil. Har.*, 1833.

Moses E. Lard: “At his coming the holy dead will be raised, the righteous living changed, and the Millennium will have set in.”—Commentary, Rom. 11:15.

T. W. Brents: “If this does not express a literal reign with Christ for a thousand years, we know not what assemblage of words would be capable of expressing the thought.”—Rev. 20:4-6.

J. A. Hardings: “Jesus plainly shows that the faithful are to be made rulers.” (On parable of the pounds.) He adds that this is at “the time of His second coming.”

L. F. Bittle: “This appearance of Jesus” (Matt. 24:9-50) “we identify with that of Rev. 19:11-21. His saints, already glorified with him, will come to subjugate the nations.”

Daniel Sommer: “What may we say to those who declare that Christ will not come again till at the close of the Millennium age? We may say ‘Ye do greatly err.’” etc.—Questions and Answers.

Robert Milligan: “Palestine will certainly again be restored to Israel for an everlasting possession.”—*Millennial Harbinger*, 1856.

J. W. McGarvey: “When Israel shall have been restored to the

land of promise, and the people shall all become believers in their own Messiah . . . they will be the most grateful people on the face of the earth."—*Christian Standard*, 1903.

A. Campbell: "God has not kept them [the Jews] these many years for nothing. He will use them again."—*Millennial Harbinger*, 1849.

CAMPBELL'S EMPHASIS AND TOLERANCE

(Concerning Differences with Barton W. Stone.)

"For my own part, I can, and do make allowance for early and long established habits of thinking and speaking on all religious questions; and therefore, regarding brother Stone as confiding in the sacrifice and death of Christ as indispensable to salvation, although by no means acquiescing in some of his views and interpretation of the meaning and designs of the Messiah's death, I can bear with a difference of opinion on a subject so vital, which many would regard as an insuperable obstacle to Christian communion.

Men may and do hold the Head, Christ, and his death and mediation as indispensable to salvation, who nevertheless have very inadequate conceptions of some of the aspects of these transcendent subjects. And as we are not saved by the strength and comprehension of our views, but through obeying from the heart the apostolic mould of doctrine, more stress ought to be laid upon moral excellence than upon abstract orthodoxy; especially when all the great facts and documents of Christianity are cordially believed and cherished. Our bond of union is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one body, one Spirit, one hope, one God and Father of all. And as many as walk by this rule, peace be on them and mercy, and upon the whole Israel of God!—A. C."—*Millennial Harbinger*, 1841.

Dr. John T. Duffield, one time professor of Mathematics at Princeton, quotes Mosheim; "The prevailing opinion that Christ was to come and reign a thousand years among men, before the final dissolution of the world, had met *with no opposition previous to the time of Origen.*"

Gieseler: "In all the works of this period (the first 2 centuries) Millenarianism is so prominent that we cannot hesitate to consider it as universal."

Luther, on John 10:16: "Some say that before the latter day the whole world shall become Christians. This is a falsehood forged by Satan, that he might darken sound doctrine. Beware of the delusion."

PIONEER EVANGELISTS

As biographical reading is always interesting, it would seem apropos, in connection with the Restoration reprints to offer the following notes concerning other great and good men of that day. These notes are taken from a recent article in *Christian Standard* by James Matthew Alley.—J.

MANY GREAT EVANGELISTS

Who was the greatest evangelist of the period of Restoration history? There are probably as many opinions as there are students of the history of that period. And certainly we are not going to be so conceited as to tell you that we know the answer, because we do not, and neither does any other living mortal. Evangelists are but human personalities through which the gospel is preached. To one man, Walter Scott would be the greatest of all; to another, Barton Warren Stone; to still another, John T. Johnson. As men and preachers they were without peers. So were the other hundred or more evangelists who worked with them. Some had greater talents in some respects than others. Campbell's supreme talent was in debate. Scott's supreme talent was in exalting Christ and telling men how to become Christians. Barton W. Stone's supreme talent was his loving heart and his great emphasis upon the spiritual life. John T. Johnson's supreme talent seemed to be his spreading optimism and enthusiasm for the things of Christ everywhere he went.

Our most outstanding proclaimers of the gospel in the past considered themselves evangelists. They were proud of this office. They discharged the duties that the New Testament ascribes to it to the utmost of their capabilities.

Alexander Campbell was a great man. The word "evangelist" comes from a Greek verb meaning to *proclaim good news*. God bless the memory of this good man to our hearts, and fasten the historical truth to our hearts that "to proclaim good news" is exactly what he did from his twenty-second year until the close of his long life. His last sermon, from the first chapter of Ephesians, was preached only a few days before his homegoing.

John T. Johnson was a princely man, an aristocrat lawyer, a member of Congress, and the brother of Richard Johnson, vice-president of the United States. He could have become famous as a statesman, or by taking advantage of his opportunities to become a wealthy man. He did neither. He turned his back on all of these temptations and became an itinerant evangelist in the Restoration movement. He had an appealing personality. He loved people and people loved him. His biographer, John Rogers, has this to say about him: "Doubtless we had among us many men who were his superiors in erudition, in a knowledge of the rules of logic, the art of reasoning, but who was equal to him in the unspeakably important art of touching all the springs of action in the human soul, and setting his hearers to work?"

Rogers further says of him: "He was eminently (not to say pre-eminently) fitted to be a leader, a great captain of the evangelical hosts. His brethren so regarded him, and therefore wherever he went despondency gave way to hope, fear to courage, apathy and coldness to interest and zeal, indolence to industry, unbelief to faith—a faith that worked by love and broke down opposition."

SOME THINGS STILL FUTURE

From J. W. Monser's famous and widely read book, "Types and Metaphors of the Bible," we clip the following excellent paragraph:

There are portions of the New Testament that point to events still future in the Messiah's kingdom; and in respect to these, also, the typical arrangements of former times are capable of rendering good service. Such a one is the character of the latter part of Christ's reign over the earth. It was the Divine appointment concerning Christ that he should sit upon the throne of David to order and establish it. In the higher sphere of God's administration, and for the world at large, he was to do what had been done through David in the lower, and on the limited territory of an earthly kingdom. The history of the one, therefore, may justly be regarded as the shadow of the other. But it is still only the earlier part of the history of David's kingdom which has found its counterpart in the events of the Gospel times. The shepherd of Israel has been anointed king over the heritage of the Lord, and the impious efforts of his adversaries to disannul the appointments have entirely miscarried. The formidable train of evils which obstructed his way to the throne of government, and which were directed with the profoundest cunning and malice by him, who, on account of sin, had been permitted to become the prince of this world, have been all met and overcome—with no other effect than to render manifest the Son's unquestioned right to hold the sceptre of universal empire over the affairs of men. Now, therefore, he reigns in the midst of his enemies; but he must also reign till these enemies themselves are put down—till the inheritance has been redeemed from all evil, and universal peace, order, and blessing have been established. Is not this also what the subsequent history of the earthly kingdom fully warrants us to expect? It was long after David's appointment to the throne before his divine right to reign was generally acknowledged, and still longer before the overthrow of the last combination of adversaries and the termination of the last train of evils admitted of the kingdom entering on its ultimate stage of settled peace and glory.—By J. W. Monser, *Types and Metaphors of the Bible*," pp. 36-38.

* * *

"The premillennial view of the second advent of Christ was held by all the 'Fathers' in the first two centuries"—so writes James Challen, famous preacher and writer of the Restoration Movement, Bedford, Indiana, in the book *Western Preacher*, Vol. I, pp. 170-184. A full and wonderful article from his pen will be reproduced in this department in the very near future—probably after Walter Scott.—E. L. J.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

(Introduction to the 1950 Series.)

E. L. J.

Of making books there is, and there will be, no end—until that day when men shall learn there is but one.

Slowly, but surely—if God wills—we too are driving toward a book. The page you now are reading is a page in that book, and this entire article is a chapter in that volume. Its contributors—a galaxy of stars in the Christian firmament, a great Hall of Faith, a veritable roll call of the worthies: from the "fathers" and martyrs of the post-apostolic age to the great "reformers" of three and four hundred years ago; from the reformers to the great "restorationists" of a hundred years or so ago; yea, down to contemporary writers and preachers who are still striving for the faith of the gospel, still laboring to restore original Christianity—many of them also truly great, as time will tell.

Most purposeful books have some particular subject to be discussed, some proposition to be proved, some problem to be solved, some question to be answered; and so have we. Our primary question is this: *When Will Christ Come?* We ask it not concerning the day or the hour, the month or the year; for we deal not in date-setting at all. Our inquiry is simply, *When Will Christ Come* with reference to the Golden Age of Prophecy? May we scripturally and hopefully "watch and wait" for our Savior? May we reasonably "look and long" for Him? May we scripturally "love His appearing," while "earnestly desiring" and praying for that day? May we live our lives in the burning, cleansing light of our Lord's return, and serve our God in the stimulating, motivating power of "that blessed hope" after the manner of life among the early Christians? Or must we cancel out that hope with the false doctrine of a thousand years of waiting and of dying, if not a million! And must good men be charged with heresy for rejecting this deadening error, this over-dose of sleeping pills, this "time-enough-yet" doctrine, this unfaithful servant song, "My lord delayeth his coming"?

For, vitally connected with our primary question, *When will Christ Come?*, is the problem of fellowship and Christian unity. If this difference is not too great for fellowship on the part of those who hold "the premillennial view" (to use James Challen's convenient, concise phrase in its simple Dictionary meaning), then why not on the part of those who hold the "post-millennial view"? If Christian love and tolerance can bridge the gap from us to them, then why not from them to us? Or is it, after all, the lack of love among us much more than any lack of uniformity in thinking? And if we, on our part have failed in this, may God forgive; and may we all live to see the folly of seeking peace by fighting for it, and of offering fellowship to those only who bow to our opinions!

It is to this end that we quote these men of old, the spiritual giants who were in the earth in those days; not to prove or disprove anything upon their word or by their prestige. But we quote them

first, because what noted men have written other men will read. Their attention will thus be drawn to *what God has said*; and this no man may well ignore. Second, we quote them as the unanswerable proof of our proposition, *That cooperation is possible* among those who espouse the great fundamentals, if there be among them a genuine love. The pioneers were not entirely agreed on this very question, When Will Christ Come? But they were wonderfully united nevertheless in the bonds of Christian love. This is the true unity, and there is no other. That we may all find grace and help, example and encouragement, to follow after it, and to attain to it—that is to be the grand and final purpose of this book.

For this noble program we make no apology, except for our mistakes and frailty in executing it; nor yet for the will of our Brother Janes, which provided the cost of it. Those who were in haste to warn against that will—might they not well have waited to see the form and outline of the program, as we have prayed daily for wisdom to execute that will faithfully, and in harmony with that greater Will of Him whose we are and Whom we serve? Need we be ashamed to print, or afraid to read, what has been written on these lines (on Prophecy and Unity) by these and other honored men: A. Campbell, W. K. Pendleton, Robert Richardson, John F. Rowe, Wm. Ruble, J. T. Barclay, Barton Stone, Robert Milligan, J. B. Rotherham, David Lipscomb (on "Times of Restitution" and on "Christian Unity"); E. A. Elam (on "Christian Love"); J. N. Armstrong, J. W. McGarvey, G. Dallas Smith—not to mention again the "fathers" and the martyrs, the reformers and the church historians.

Or need we make apology for these who have been laid out to be heard in more prolix manner within the next two years: Walter Scott, James Challen, Jacob Creath, Moses Lard, Dr. Brents, J. A. Harding, Daniel Sommer?—others also in the years to follow.

The current year is well begun with a timely reprint from Robert Richardson on Opinions. We offer then the first of three articles from James Challen; Elder in the church at Lexington, Ky.; consecrated Christian minister; coworker with A. Campbell; contributor to D. D. Burnet's "Christian Preacher," 1836; author of the article, "Reconciliation" which appears in "Living Pulpit," 1868.

ROBERT RICHARDSON ON "OPINIONS"

No. 50—First Reprint of 1950

In the year 1836, Campbell invited the brilliant and spiritual physician, Robert Richardson, to become associated with him as co-editor on the *Millennial Harbinger*, then in its seventh year. Through its pages, Dr. Richardson became known as one of the ablest and best of the Reformation writers, highly respected and greatly beloved. He preached A. Campbell's funeral sermon thirty years later, and wrote the well-known "Memoirs."

In the following extract, taken from the *Harbinger Abridged*, the great reformer discusses interestingly, scripturally, and most in-

telligently a subject that is often in our day discussed ignorantly and most unreasonably. That subject is (in connection with "untaught questions"), The Place and Treatment of Opinions. Here are sane words, not only on the evil of exalting opinion to the plane of faith (which we all ought studiously to avoid, but which is done daily by many who are strangely blind to their own opinionism); but also and especially to the schismatic dangers connected with any attempt to suppress Truth (or what men hold as truth) by opposing it as opinion. For it has come to be a common conceit in some quarters that Truth can be best suppressed by the quick and simple expedient of *calling* it "opinion," or "speculation," or "a theory," or some other hated name!

Of special value herein also is Richardson's rule for distinguishing truth from error, or rather faith from opinion: "whether or not it be found in Scripture."

In order to present the main thoughts of the extract quickly to the reader's eye, we have italicised certain sentences entire.—E. L. J.

THE RICHARDSON ARTICLE

"Follow peace with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart. But foolish and untaught questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strife."—II Tim. 2:23.

In reference to one of the principal objects of the present Reformation, there are no injunctions in Scripture more pertinent or important than those just quoted from II Timothy. Nor are there any which possess a more obvious propriety in the view of sound reason and experience. It was the primary purpose of this religious movement to effect a union of the pious of all parties; or, in the words of the Apostle, to establish "peace with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart"; and, as an indispensable condition of the establishment and maintenance of Christian union, it was in the very beginning adopted as a fundamental principle that all should "avoid foolish and untaught questions," it being clearly perceived that these were the occasion, in almost every instance, of the existing religious strifes and divisions.

This principle was not designed as a prohibition of legitimate religious inquiry, nor was it intended to deprive any one of the liberty of forming or even expressing his opinion on any religious subject. It would, indeed have been futile to have denied to men the exercise of their reason, or even of their imagination, in reference to the things of religion. Men will reason upon the subjects presented to the understanding; they will frame conceits; they will construct for themselves such theories as seem to them best fitted to explain the facts which they believe, and no scheme can be devised by which men will ever be compelled to coincide perfectly in their trains of thought, or in the conclusions to which they tend.

It is the attempt to establish such uniformity of opinion, that is, in fact, the principal cause of partyism. The religious teacher who propounds a specious and ingenious theory will find many who are willing to give a general assent to his views. It is rare, indeed,

that there is perfect agreement, but there is, at least, a central point of influence created, around which individuals conglomerate, at different distances, and with varying adhesive force, until there is formed a distinct and independent swarm, which will have no communion with those who follow a different leader. *The attempt is made to quash all free investigation, to repress all rivalry; to protect the community from the intrusion of strangers and to build up the interests of a separate party.*

All works well for a time, and peaceful laborers occupy the harmonious and prosperous colony. But in the midst of this apparent quiet, secret influences are at work, and separate interests are established; and when it is perhaps least expected, when the day is calm and the sky serene, a new leader issues forth to lead away disciples after him. The opinion of no single individual can afford intellectual space enough to accommodate all the world, or even any considerable portion of it, and *the attempt to confine men's thoughts serves only to provoke resistance and create division.*

To concede, on the other hand, an unrestricted liberty of opinion is to preserve peace, by simply avoiding the cause or occasion of dispute. It is to remove every apology for schism, by conceding universal toleration. It is to obviate all necessity for revolt, by granting freedom. And all this without any extreme. For as to *opinion* in the proper sense of the word, and as it is constantly used in this reformatory effort, there can be neither bigotry nor latitudinarianism. An opinion is, at least, a mere intellectual conception. It is not a fact. It is not a truth. It can not be legitimately a matter of faith. It is something that is incapable of verification, something that is merely plausible; and, though it may sometimes be probable, it is always apocryphal. It is this just view of the position which religious opinions occupy which at once relieves us from all difficulty in regard to them, and delivers us from their thralldom by divesting them of their usurped authority. It is this which restores to us Truth as our rightful sovereign, who rules by an unalienable divine right—the only *theological* Melchizedek—King of righteousness and of peace. It is in showing an unswerving fealty to the truth, and in avoiding “foolish and untaught questions,” that we can alone “follow peace with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart.” Now, the word of God is the truth; and the “foolish and untaught questions” constitute the staple of men's opinions.

In order to determine, then, whether or not a proposition is a legitimate subject of discussion or of belief, it is only necessary to ascertain whether or not it be found in Scripture. If it can be found there, it can be produced without difficulty, and will be at once accepted as conclusively proved. If it can not be produced as expressed or distinctly implied, in the terms of Scripture, it is at once evident it is not a matter of revelation, and consequently, not a matter of faith, but that it belongs to the chapter of untaught questions which occupy so large a place in all the editions of Popular Theology.—*Millennial Harbinger Abridged*, Volume II, Page 47.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 51

We offer this time an article, beautiful and scriptural, from the able pen of James Challen, highly honored preacher and writer among the "pioneers" of Restoration days. Manifestly, this student had reverently traversed again and again that most neglected field of Holy Scripture, the prophets of both Old and New Testaments, those men who spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit. Rich indeed are his gleanings; and richer still as the essay moves upon its way, this month and next, and the next.

"THE KINGDOM"

By James Challen

It is not without design that the kingdom of God is so often spoken of in the New Testament as "The kingdom of the heavens" (Gr.). We have often observed a deep meaning in words and expressions used by the Messiah and his apostles, which the more careless reader has overlooked. In nothing is our folly more manifest than the attempt to explain away or to ignore the sayings of Christ or to accommodate them to some theory of our own. The Jewish nation missed the Messiah and rejected him when he came by adopting this fatal mistake; are we not liable to fall into the same error in regard to the second appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ? They spiritualized the prophets when they spoke "of the suffering of the Christ"; and we are doing the same, when they and the apostles speak "of the *glories* that shall follow." The danger to us will be greater than to them, inasmuch as we fail to be warned by their example or instructed by the additional light we have on the subject.

We have done well on the restoration of the ancient faith; shall we not leave our work but half complete if we neglect the hope? The past, as it looks to the present salvation, is secure for all coming time; but the future, as it anticipates the eternal salvation at "the appearing and the kingdom" of our Redeemer, is not so clear. We need but apply the principles of interpretation to the latter that we have done to the former, and the results will be glorious.

The field of prophetic scripture is to many unexplored. We should seek to enter into it. It is a part of Immanuel's ground and rich with all that is precious and good. It is the Eden of Scripture—a garden which the Lord has blessed. It is a large part of those divine oracles "given by inspiration of God," and "profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness."

It is no easy thing to divorce our minds from prejudice or free ourselves from the traditions of the fathers. We may encounter as much opposition in reference to the prophecies which look to the future, as we have met in reference to the plain teachings of the Messiah with respect to the gospel, or "the present truth." But we are bold and courageous and Canaan is before us. . . .

The pre-millennial view of the second advent of Christ was held by all the "Fathers" in the first two centuries of the church, as all must admit. Those who lived nearest the apostles and were contemporary with them held to it. This is something in its favor.

When the church became secularized by its connection with the empire, it gradually diminished its hold upon the doctrine, and favored the idea of progress and Christian civilization as all-sufficient to fulfill the hopes of the prophets, and to realize their grand prospective delineation in regard to the ultimate triumphs of the truth over error, and light over darkness, and good over evil. Origen, by his system of allegorical interpretation, mingled with the philosophy of the Greeks, threw endless confusion upon this, and all other subjects found in the scriptures of truth. Then came, for one thousand years, the dark ages in which nothing shone but the gilded temples, the glittering crowns and jeweled tiaras of the papacy. Rome and its priesthood; its shrines and its altars; its feast days and fasts; its ritual and offerings; its wealth and its kingdom, were the only millennium the church then needed or desired. It was the Eden of the sensualist, the paradise of the serpent, the kingdom of the clergy—the empire of Satan!

A few of the faithful still lived in the mountains; in caves and in dens; or in unbroken forests; or hid themselves in the catacombs beneath the imperial city. They retained the ancient faith, and hope; but they were persecuted and slain. But there was light in their dwellings. They lived in Goshen—all beyond them was Egypt and Babylon.

After the Reformation by Luther, the scriptures were taken out of the cloisters in which they had been buried, and the "one hope" again gladdened the heart of Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, and others. The same destiny for the church, which gave such a mighty impulse to the faith and hope of the "Fathers" and the first Christians appeared anew. But in process of time the union of church and state—never fully recovered in Europe—deadened the religious sense of the people and prepared the way for a system more in accordance with the pride and ambition and hopes which everywhere prevailed.

Dr. Whitby, of the church of England, a man of transcendent genius and learning, is the author of the modern theory of a Spiritual Millennium. It was gradually accepted and has been sustained by popular vote until this day. He acknowledged that it was not the ancient faith; and he gave it as an innovation upon the established theories of the purest days of the church. . . . The world, according to this theory, was to be converted by the rapid increase of light, by the gospel and these accessories, and finally reconciled and redeemed; the golden age of prophets and apostles would be restored and the earth be filled with the glory of the Lord. What with the new impulse given to the world by the recovery of the lost arts; by the revival of learning; by a more Christian civilization; by a knowledge of the exact sciences; by a cultivated taste; by a sounder philosophy, by railroads and steam power; by the printing press and the telegraph; an universal peace—Paradise—would be restored, and heaven come down as before the eating of the fatal apple!

We were all captivated by this grand thought in regard to the future. We supposed that by this time our fondest hopes would have been realized, and that the work would be done. But "where

is the wisdom of the Scribe? where the disputer of this age?" "Has not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" The sects stand just where they did—only in a worse condition. They see and feel the necessity of union, but dare not sacrifice denominationalism to obtain it. They still cowardly compromise the truth or withhold it for the sake of party. Destructive substitutes, resting on tradition, on inferences and customs, have displaced the positive institutions of heaven. Human authority has legislated out of the kingdom the laws and ordinances of the Christ; and human creeds have superseded the divine. Each party aspires after the preeminence, and hopes for a millennium by absorbing all the rest. Ecclesiasticism is exalted above the church of Christ, and numbers have claimed as their special right the prestige of "orthodoxy." The rights of conscience have been trampled under foot by the usurpations of the assembly and the synod, the associations and the conferences. The apostasy is as huge as ever. Rome still stands impregnable. The Church of England is still the church of Henry the Eighth. The Presbyterian, the Baptist, and the Methodist Churches are as far apart as ever, and not half as pious as they were a hundred years ago. Paganism holds on as in the past. Mohammedanism is still alive. "Darkness covers the earth, and gross darkness the minds of the people."

According to this theory, judging from the past, a spiritual millennium never will come. It would take a million years for any one sect to swallow up the rest, even if it had all the learning, wealth, and influence which the world could furnish; and what would be the result? The goal could be as far removed from us as it now is. The theory must be wrong, or there can be no "last days," and no hope for the "restitution of all things." . . .

But enough has been said on this subject to prepare the way for the introduction of our theme—"The Kingdom of the Heavens."

In every single case, so far as we have examined the Gospel of Matthew, the plural form of "the heavens" is used in connection with the kingdom. Consult the following in the Greek: Matt. 3:2; 10:7; 5:3; 10:19; 18:3; 8:21; 16:19. There may be exceptions, but this is the rule.

We can not suppose that this formula happened by accident, or was made without design, or that our Savior would have used these words unless for some definite purpose; nor can we suppose that the "Spirit of Wisdom and Revelation," who brought all things to the remembrance of the apostles as taught by the Savior, would have employed this phraseology unless it had a value which could not otherwise be expressed. Matthew wrote his testimony for the benefit of the Jews, and he is the one who most frequently uses these words, "The Kingdom of the Heavens." Mark, Luke and John usually speak of "the kingdom," or "the kingdom of God." The reason why Matthew employs this term may be, that as he wrote for the benefit of his own countrymen, who were familiar with the writings of the prophets, they would be better able to understand its meaning and feel its importance. Examples illustrating it are abundant:

"Give ear, O ye heavens, and I will speak." (Deut. 32:1.) "Behold the heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee." (1 Kings 8:27.) "Our trespass is grown up into the heavens." (Ex. 9:6.) "Thy mercy, O Lord, is in the heavens." (Ps. 55:26.) The law, the prophets, and the Psalms speak of "the heavens" as the abode of God and of angels. It was, then, in perfect harmony with this, that the word in the plural form is used by the Savior in reference to the throne and kingdom he came to introduce.

The kingdom of God had its origin not in heaven, but in the heaven of heavens. It came from the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, on which the Messiah now sits, and where the "heavens do rule." It has no lower origin than this, and can have no higher. Our Savior said that His kingdom was not of this earth; and it has no sympathy with the atmospheric heavens over which the prince of the power of the air presides, and which shall be destroyed by fire. It is emphatically from above—"above all heavens," into which our Prince has entered.

We know but little of these ancient heavens, their extent and glory, or the thrones and principalities therein; their division, ranks, and orders; but whatever they may be, however vast and extensive their dominion, they constitute but one kingdom, one empire—"the kingdom of the heavens." It may be illimitable, and beyond all conception glorious and sublime. Jehovah is its King. He is called so, not because He has borrowed it from the language of earth, but as having lent it to those who bear office among men. Human government is but the shadow of the divine, and its official dignitaries but images of what is real and personal in the heavens. "The kingdom of the Heavens" is not a figurative expression, but most literal. It symbolizes the only empire that shall stand forever. It can not be shaken—never shall be moved. "The kingdom of God," as established in the earth under the reign of the Messiah, is only a part of the celestial and the heavenly. . . .

"What if earth

Be but the shadow of heaven, and things therein

Each to other like, more than on earth is thought."

As a reward to the messiah for His sufferings and death, "The heavens received Him," and will retain Him until He shall come in the clouds to earth again. The kingdom of the heavens was transferred to Him by the Father, and he is now the ruling sovereign of the universe. He will one day be proclaimed as "King of kings and Lord of lords." Every knee shall bow to Him, and every tongue confess that He is Lord to the glory of God the Father. The whole intelligent universe and all worlds have been put under His dominion and control. He is the Head of all principalities and powers. The Son of Mary, the Son of God, is the heir of all things. This is the grandest thought in the whole compass of divine revelation. It is the most enrapturing, soul-cheering, soul-ennobling conception ever made known to man. . . .—James Challen, quoted by Mathes in the book, *Western Preacher*, Bedford, Ind., 1865; pp. 170-184, Vol. 1.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 52

"THE KINGDOM OF THE HEAVENS"

By James Challen

How little do we understand the "new birth" if we think its meaning exhausted by entering into the church, even in its highest sense, and especially so when entering into *a* church! The penitent believer in his immersion does not so properly enter into the church at Rome, in Ephesus, or Colosse, as he enters into "the kingdom of the heavens." He becomes incorporated with a living, most vital, and as far as our conceptions reach, a universal empire, part of which is now on the earth and visible to our senses, part in the unseen—and part in the heaven of heavens.

In making converts let us remember that we are adding new subjects to the kingdom; filling up the complement of the saved; naturalizing men and women as "citizens of the heavens." Let us turn away our eyes from the party divisions of the earth and fill up the number of the redeemed. And we who belong to the great family, let us live worthy of our high calling and the glorious destiny that awaits us, if we be found faithful to our covenant relations.

This kingdom is called "the kingdom of the heavens," not only on account of its origin and nature, but because its King and his subordinates, the dignitaries of state, are in the heavens; and although his government extends to and is exercised over men upon the earth, yet is not of the earth. "My kingdom," said Jesus, "is not of this world." It has a higher origin and destiny than any other kingdom. All others are to be broken to pieces, but this shall stand for ever. All others occupy but a small portion of the earth, but his is universal.

At present, the king is not seen; he is to us invisible. Even the great princes of his empire and the "spirits of the just" are not yet made manifest; they are not known to the world. But the day is coming when he shall appear in his beauty, accompanied by his saintly retinue. The spirits of the just, clothed with the robes of immortality, with bodies spiritual and incorruptible, shall stand revealed to the eyes of men. The angels will then "come forth"—now hidden—and sever the wicked from among the just. They do their blessed ministrations now unseen, but then they will be revealed and fully recognized. As a portion of the kingdom celestial and unfailing, they take the deepest interest in everything connected with our redemption. They sympathize with us in our afflictions. They minister to us in our misfortunes. They defend us in the midst of our perils. They fight our battles and disarm our adversaries. And as many of our enemies are unseen and potent, they meet them in secret and baffle them in their plots and schemes for our destruction. Mighty powers are arrayed both for and against us; but error is always weak, evil is unable to cope with good, or darkness with light. These elder sons of light have had a large experience, and are richly

endowed; and they exercise a tender care and watchful vigilance over the minor children of God's great family. They are with us in sickness and carry us to paradise at death, and will be present at the resurrection to escort us to our everlasting home. In the intricate movements of the wheels of providence, they play a mighty part, and the destiny of individuals and families, of churches and nations, are under their agency and control.

A glorious future is reserved for the faithful followers of Christ. If they suffer with him here they shall be glorified hereafter. The rewards of the conqueror are not to be found upon the field but after the war has ended. "The kingdom and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the saints of the people of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, which shall not pass away and whose dominion shall never end." Those who shall be found worthy to share in the first resurrection will become kings and priests unto God, and shall reign with Christ a thousand years over redeemed humanity upon the earth. Those who shall escape the desolating flood of fire at the coming of the Lord shall be their subjects and will receive their princely and priestly ministrations. There still will be found on earth men in the flesh, as families and political organizations, but they will be subjected to the rule and authority of the only potentate—the King of kings and his subordinate rulers. "All nations, kindreds, tongues, and peoples" shall own his sovereign sway and acknowledge his powerful scepter.

The apostles, as a reward for following Jesus in the days of his flesh, and as the chosen and faithful ambassadors of his reign in the day of tribulation and suffering, shall sit nearest his throne in Jerusalem, and shall have due honors conferred upon them. "Verily, I say to you, that, in the restoration, when the Son of man shall sit on his glorious throne, you also who have followed me shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." This day has not yet come. The Saviour sits on his Father's throne, and the twelve hold no regal scepters, but the day is at hand when it shall be fully accomplished. Israel in the flesh is still beloved for the father's sake — Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. They shall return to their own home land and they will inherit it. They will be converted there and not before. They will see the King in his beauty and shall say, "This is our God, we have waited for him." "Blessed is he that comes in the name of the Lord!" shall be heard from the lips of the outcasts and the preserved in Zion. They will become the center of that mighty realm over which the Messiah shall reign, and Jerusalem be the capital of his kingdom on the earth. "All nations shall flow into it, and many people shall go and say, come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us of his ways and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares and

their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Isa. 2:1-4; comp. Ps. 72; Isa. 27:12, 13; Jer. 31:6-8; Ps. 46; Hos. 2:18.

This passage [Isa. 2] may have had a partial fulfillment on the day of Pentecost, but its full complement is reserved for a brighter day than ever yet has dawned upon our sin-ruined earth. "Many people" have never gone up to learn the ways of the Lord. Jesus, as yet, has never assumed the office of judge among the nations. No nation, not even the most Christianized, has ceased to learn the art of war. England and America have made it their special study, and are the most perfect adepts in it on earth. Their spears have not been converted into pruning-hooks nor their swords into plow-shares. It is easy to spiritualize all this away, and accommodate it to our low conceptions of God's infinite and glorious designs; but the word of God is a tried word, and his promises shall never fail.

There is not a Christian nation on the earth. There are Christians among the nations, and the influence of Christian principles is felt in society and over human government and wherever the gospel is known. There is scarcely a shire, a neighborhood, or county in the most favored portions of our globe that has been brought fully under the authority of Christ. Many of these glorious predictions concerning "the latter days" we have given to the sects and parties which have ruined Christendom. We have robbed Israel in the flesh to enrich the church in her present suffering state; and the gorgeous sunrise of millennial glory we have cast over the decayed and waning fortunes of apostate institutions and corrupt forms of the Christian religion. This accommodating spirit has disposed of nearly everything of value in the prophetic scriptures and has tyrannized over the faith and hope of the church for ages. We should displace it by the application of sounder principles of interpretation and the hidden treasures of the scriptures of truth will be disclosed to our wondering and admiring eyes.

Let us be faithful to our acknowledged principles of interpretation as applied to the gospel of Christ and the ordinances of the Christian institution, and permit the prophecies to speak out in their own fearless and robust manner, whether in literal or figurate forms of speech. We should receive with reverence their oracular communications, whether our reason or philosophy approve them or not. They may dash to pieces our most cherished theories in regard to unfulfilled prophecy. They may render useless many excerpts, skeletons, and preparations for the pulpit. They will undermine our beautiful theories in regard to human progress, and the gradual conversion of the world by modern appliances; but they will open a field of inquiry wide as the heavens and glorious beyond all conception. It will enable us to understand more fully the relations we stand in to the age in which we live, and the duties involved, and to the more glorious age which lies before us at "the appearing and kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ."

There is a suffering and a triumphant form and condition of the

kingdom of God. The first allies itself to the despised Nazarene—the man of sorrows—the lowly Redeemer of our race. Its great symbol is the cross, outside the gates of Jerusalem. There it stands, and stained with his blood—the blood of the King of Martyrs—the blood of the atonement! It rises up before us as the accepted token of trial and suffering to all who would enter into the kingdom. It reminds us of Bethlehem and of Nazareth, of weariness and want; of painfulness and privation. It speaks to us of insult and outrage, of reproach and persecution. The dew that rests upon it is the dew of tears; the air that surrounds it is full of sighs and groans coming from Gethsemane, and from the Sanhedrim and Pilate's bar; the wail of ages of suffering and sorrow mingle with them and swell the deep diapason from the tongues of martyrs and confessors—the partakers of Christ's sufferings. The faith of all ages is fixed upon it, and every disciple is "crucified with Christ." But if there is a suffering, there is also a triumphant condition of "the kingdom of the heavens." This allies itself to the crown and the King in his glory, and appeals to our hope. The ages which are past have anticipated it. Abraham saw the grand capitol of this kingdom, and walked humbly before God in hope of entering into it. The prophets leaped over the suffering state of the kingdom, to catch the inspiration of its crowning glories. Enoch, the seventh from Adam, overlooked all that lay between him and "the day of the Lord," and saw him "coming with his holy myriads"; and the Saviour in his transfiguration gave to Peter, James, and John a faint idea of its transcendent glory; and the last of the Apostles saw it approach with its descending King, and said: "Come quickly." The Bride, the Lamb's wife, has been waiting for the day, impatient for his return. She has felt her loneliness and poverty, more like a widow in mourning, than as his empress queen. But "The kingdom and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven" shall be hers, when Jesus our Lord shall come.

"Wherefore, we receiving a kingdom that can not be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear: For our God is a consuming fire."—James Challen, in the Mathes book, *The Western Preacher*, Bedford, Indiana, 1865; pp. 170-184, Vol. 1.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 53

"THE TIMES OF THE GENTILES"

By James Challen

"The times and the seasons" are in the hands of the Father, and are wholly at his disposal. They represent great eras, long periods, and the complexion of events which occur under them. "The times" refer to periods in the history of the world; "the seasons" to the character of those periods. Just as a year is a "time," and spring, summer, autumn and winter the seasons. Now, both the times and the seasons are under the direction and control of God.

It is of the very essence of Atheism that Jehovah has divorced himself from the world he has created, and takes no care and feels no interest in the affairs of man. In no case is this seen either in the Old Testament or the New. The earth has He given to the children of men. The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof. In all the events connected with Israel and their enemies, God is spoken of as a jealous God, watching over his friends to do them good, and strong to punish those who are his enemies and theirs. His eyes are on the ways of men. "For the eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the *whole earth*, to show himself strong in the behalf of them whose heart is perfect toward him." (II Chr. 16:9.)

Kings, rulers, magistrates and nations are specially under his government. He disposes them as he wills. When they answer his purposes, they prosper, and when they fail to do this he puts them down. He raises up one and destroys another. He sends armies from abroad, or incites them from within, to reform, or to utterly subdue or destroy. His own people, Israel, for a long time had their own kings, but when they refused to obey him in accordance with the will of God, he dethroned them and made them subject to their enemies: and when this failed, he utterly removed them from their own land, and put them under the government of a foreign power, until he had rooted out the last vestige of idolatry from them. Thus God said to Israel, "The Lord shall make thee the head, and not the tail; and thou shalt be above only, and shalt not be beneath; *if thou hearken unto the commandments of the Lord*. But it shall come to pass, *if thou wilt not hearken*, the Lord shall bring thee and thy king which thou shalt set over thee, unto a nation which neither thou nor thy fathers have known; because thou servest not the Lord, *therefore shalt thou serve thine enemies*." (Deut. 28:13, 15, 36, 47.)

In the year of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon besieged Jerusalem, took part of the vessels of the Lord, and the Lord gave Jehoiakim, king of Judah, into his hand. After this he took the people away from their own land, after he had slain their young men with the sword. *God gave them all into his hand*, to fulfill the word of the Lord. (II Chron. 36:11-21.) Here we have a striking fulfillment of the prophecy of Moses, which we quoted from Deuteronomy.

To show how intimately God stands connected with human government, and the authority he exercises over it, he says to Nebu-

chadnezzar, "Thou, O king, art a king of kings, *for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom.*" And again, "I have made the earth, and have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto me."

In the present life, God is the Governor of the nations, and also the Judge. He raises them up, tries and punishes them for their iniquities, or absolutely destroys them. We have no inspired historian now to show in what way God exercises his influence over the destiny of States and kingdoms, but it is no less true now as of old, that he does it; and we have but to read the past in the light of Scripture to see his hand still at work in arranging, disposing, punishing, and controlling the affairs of men in their social and political relations to each other, and to him. God is still known by the judgments which he executes. His hand is seen in effecting changes which baffle the wisdom of senators, and stain the pride of governors and kings.

Since the days of Nebuchadnezzar until now, the chosen people of God, Israel, have been in subjection to the authority of the Gentiles. They were divested by him of their nationality as a free and independent people, and have never recovered it to this day. Through the four successive universal monarchies they passed, under Gentile domination, being transferred from one to another. The last one—the Roman—broke them to pieces, destroyed their State and nation, burned their city, slew them with the sword, and sent them captive among all nations. In the last divisions of the Iron Empire, into ten petty kingdoms, they have been for the most part under their domination and dependencies, until this day, and will continue in their depressed condition until the times of the Gentiles shall be over. As certainly as the Nile, rising in the Mountains of the Moon, runs its course until it empties its waters into the sea, so the nation of Israel, from the days of Jacob to the present hour, has pursued its course, under the eye and by the direction of an unseen but Almighty hand. It is still his nation, as much so as any portion of that noble river is the Nile. And although frequently punished, and still in the dispersion, Israel is beloved for the sake of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Of the covenant God made with them he is mindful, and the promises of their future glory shall be fulfilled. Jerusalem will be trodden down of the Gentiles, *until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.*

Blindness, in part, is happened to Israel, *until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in.* (Rom. 11:25.) Gentile domination has lasted nearly two thousand five hundred years, and during all this time the Jews have been in a depressed condition. They have survived all that the rage and malice of their enemies could inflict upon them. A miracle, the greatest ever known—contrary to the ordinary miracles, which are momentary, or of short duration—Israel in the *fiery furnace* has been kept for unbroken centuries, and it is probable their number at this time is as great as in the days of Solomon. Judea is still desolate, and they are in exile. In their dispersion, they are still separate and distinct from all people. As long as Jerusalem is trodden under foot, they are to be wanderers away from the home of their fathers. An obstinate unbelief still characterizes the nation,

and will, until the times of the Gentiles are over. They still retain the features of their fathers, so that you can distinguish them as Jews wherever you find them. Had they continued in their own land, this would not have been so wonderful, or had they in their dispersion lived in some other country, alone; but the dwellers in all lands, the dispersed among all nations, and yet bearing, even in their features, the national characteristics, is a miracle of wonder among all people! They assimilate with none; everywhere the same, they live under any form of government, adopt the language and customs of the country in which they live, and yet, after the lapse of so many centuries, they bear the original features of their nation.

Their unbelief is as marked as their nationality. With the Scriptures of the prophets in their hands, and their history engraven on the memories of the past, they still reject the Messiah. Daniel's 70 weeks have expired; Bethlehem of Judah is in ruins; the second Temple, destroyed; Jerusalem, the capital of their kingdom, overthrown, and they in the dispersion for eighteen centuries; and yet, holding on to the Scriptures of the prophets in their blindness, bearing as they do their living testimony to the truth of the Christian system, and against their infidelity! No history of any nation can be compared with this. Contrary to the uniform experience of all others, they hold on their way, through all the changes of States and kingdoms, and their own changes—a distinct and separate people.

God has great things in store for Judah and Israel. They will yet play a wonderful part in the scenes opening before us. They have not been preserved down to the present time for nought. *"These dry bones shall live."*

When Jesus for the last time, in their temple and city, addressed them; when he took his farewell of the nation, after that scathing rebuke he ministered to the Scribes and Pharisees; and when expecting on their part a still higher culmination of threatening and wrath, he stood, and suddenly overwhelmed with grief, uttered these impassioned words: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee! how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth *till ye say*, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." (Matt. 23:37-39.)

This wail of grief has come down the ages, and still burdens the air. It is the last note of sorrow over the unbelief of the nation, in the way of teaching, that fell from the lips of Jesus. On the cross he did not forget them. *"Father, forgive them, they know not what they do!"*

When they next see Jesus, they will look on him whom they have pierced, and will mourn and be in bitterness, as for an only son that serveth him. Then, and not until then, will they say, *"Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!"*

—*Millennial Harbinger*, 1862, pp. 202-205.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 54

For this month's offering, we have selected this unusually clear and forceful article fresh from the pen of Brother Boll.

"MARK THEM AND AVOID THEM"

R. H. Boll

"Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned: and turn away from them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Christ, but their own belly; and by their smooth and fair speech they beguile the hearts of the innocent." (Rom. 16:17, 18.)

This passage of God's word has of late times been much used by some to justify a course of disfellowshipping and ostracising of brethren whom they charge with teaching "premillennialism." The injunction of the apostle here given is good and necessary, and it means what it says; and if those who by their anti-millenarian brethren are called "premillennialists" come under the head of the kind named in the text, it is simple obedience to "mark them" and "turn away from them." This point, however, should be carefully examined, lest (as has happened many times in the history of the church) a good word of God should be used to cover up a grievous wrong. Thus, for example, the Jews, demanding the death of Jesus, said to Pilate, "We have a law, and according to that law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God" (John 19:7). In this they were perfectly right, and in full accord with God's word as given in the scripture; for if Jesus was an impostor, claiming to be the Son of God, he, according to the Law, deserved to die. But was He an impostor? Was His claim false? That question should before everything else have been carefully gone into, and all the evidence faithfully weighed; and not until He were found guilty should the condemnation of the Law have been invoked against this Man. But that was the very thing His enemies were far from willing to do. The fact was, they hated Him without a cause and were only anxious to be rid of Him; and they saw in this word of the Law a convenient pretext for carrying out their evil purpose.

This is mentioned merely to show how perfectly easy it is to use this kind of injunction to justify an evil design; how easily such a command could be made a weapon of self-interested sectarianism and ecclesiastical tyranny. At any time a group of religious leaders, so minded, could appeal to Rom. 16:17, 18 as an excuse to cast out their brethren for any difference whatever. Therefore, in making application of this passage of scripture, it is paramount first of all to ascertain whether the accused are really such persons as should be marked and avoided. Much is at stake. When men sin against their brethren they sin against Christ. In casting out a faithful brother, we cast out Christ. When we draw a line against a faithful child of God, we draw the line against ourselves. Here is a matter that should be carefully looked into.

Granting, say, that "premillennial" views of prophecy run con-

trary to the views of certain brethren—even a majority of them—this alone would not constitute ground for applying the commandment of Rom. 16:17, 18. Nor even if they feel convinced that the “pre-millennial” belief is erroneous, could they therefore invoke the anathema of Rom. 16:17, 18 on that ground? For, if such a principle were adopted, it would open the door to refusal of fellowship to any who differed with us in any matter. The logical end of such a principle would, of course, be the multiplication of parties and would finally eventuate to put every man in a church to himself. The question then first of all to be considered should be whether those whom we would mark and avoid are such as Paul speaks of in Rom. 16:17, 18. The question therefore is this:

1. Did these brethren who are to be marked teach doctrines contrary to the faith of the gospel?

2. Did they by their teaching cause divisions and occasions of stumbling among their brethren?

3. Are they workers for selfish interest and material advantage?

If in the case of the “premillennial” brethren these questions demand an affirmative answer, then it were right that they should be marked and avoided. But if they are not guilty, the guilt of those who mark and avoid them is great, and to be accounted for at the judgment-seat of Christ.

In defense of the brethren against whom, on the ground of “pre-millennial” teaching, the line is being drawn by other brethren (for these brethren whom they call “premillennialists” have never in any instance drawn any line on doctrinal grounds against their “anti-millennarian” brethren)—I would say, in defense of these “marked” and ostracised ones—

I first of all deny the charge that they have “caused divisions and occasions of stumbling contrary to the doctrine” of God’s word. For:

(1) They believe and teach the same fundamental doctrine which their opposing brethren also profess: they believe in the same God, the same Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, the same unadulterated gospel, the same New Testament church, the same authoritative and inerrant word of God, the Bible, by which all is to be tested. They follow the same simple practice in worship and in the service of God. They hold in common with all the saints that there is “one body” and “one Spirit,” one hope of our calling, one faith, one Lord, one baptism, one God and Father of all. So we all profess to believe and teach and so we do.

(2) These brethren who are to be “marked” have never caused any divisions, anywhere, at any time, over disagreement of the prophetic teaching of the Bible. [They do not believe that such divisions are right or necessary.] That divisions have occurred I would not deny; but in no case have they been caused by the brethren who have been stigmatized as “premillennialists”—but only and always by agitators for the anti-millennial brethren, who demand submission to their views. The procedure followed by those dividers is such as

could cause division over any difference great or small.

Here may I quote an excerpt from the writings of a dear friend and brother:

UNITY NEEDED NOW

"Furthermore, we plead for unity **now**, that unity which is of the Spirit; yes, even now, before we have time to attain to perfect intellectual agreement, desirable as such agreement may be. We plead for that unity which proceeds by and from those peaceable qualities that Paul lays down as the means to it: meekness, lowliness, long-suffering, forbearance, and love, which is the bond of perfectness (Eph. 4:1-3; Col. 3:14). This is the unity of **the Spirit**, and the fruit of the Spirit; and it has often been realized in the midst of much diversity, both of doctrine and of judgment; whereas it has often been absent even where intellectual agreement prevailed. Moreover, this is the only unity that leaves men unenslaved and free — free to grow in grace and knowledge, and to go on with God. It stands in sharpest contradistinction to that uncertain, unstable, legalistic unity that is hammered out only by the hardest, and that is maintained only by the threat of excommunication held over the heads of any who dare to differ from the leaders.

It has been said of our civil liberty that eternal vigilance is the price of it. But how much more is constant vigilance the price of religious liberty! Beware! Stand fast! Be not entangled in any yoke of bondage! There is no outside sectarianism so insidious, so enslaving, and so likely to be hidden from our own eyes, as that incipient sectarianism which rises up within. By such influences men who think they are free disciples, and who boast of being undenominational Christians, are as creed-bound as the sects which they denounce.

WHEN TRUTH CAUSES TROUBLE

For, if the teachings of any earnest Bible student in our midst, set forth humbly by him **as truth**, and believed by him to be indeed the Word of God (whether it be what God said in so many words by inspired men, or what must necessarily follow, as he sees it, from the gathering of the scattered scripture-testimony, "here a little, there a little") — I say, if what some such man sets forth **as scripture truth** may be summarily set aside by another, **because he thinks it is opinion** and denounces it as such, then our creed is fixed, our bounds of knowledge are set, and Christian growth is ended! And again, if what good and studious men have taught as truth (and often **vital truth**) — if such teachings may be suppressed by the simple cry that they will "cause trouble," then our faith is man-controlled more surely than any OPA could ever control our war-time regimen. Such a system leaves us just as free in Christ as slaves, and the church of Christ no better than a poor, sectarian little Rome. For it would be easily possible always to prove that any teaching whatsoever "causes trouble," if there were those ready and willing to see to it that it does! And how can we be sure after all that truth, vital needed truth, will never cause trouble? Our great Teacher, though He is the Prince of Peace, has said: "I came not to send peace but a sword" (Matt. 10:34); and another has told us, by the Spirit, that the wisdom that is from above is **first pure**, then peaceable (Jas. 3:17).

"MARKING" AND "AVOIDING"

If any word herein may seem to be accusative or direct, let it be remembered that that word applies only to whom it may justly apply. If there are misguided men today who have caused divisions and occasions of stumbling contrary to the doctrines which the churches addressed by Paul had learned — those doctrines of lowliness and meekness, long-suffering and forbearance, without which the unity of the Spirit is utterly impossible — then those men must indeed be marked and avoided, in solemn obedience to the Word of God (Rom. 16:17). But let us understand first what it is to "mark" a man, and how it may be done

to the greatest good, and without contributing more to discord than to peace. This is a serious thing to all concerned.

Shamefully indeed have the unity doctrines of the Roman letter been trampled under foot, particularly chapter fourteen! There the teaching is, that even the erring and the weak in faith are to be "received," and borne with, and fellowshipped, rather than "judged" and "set at nought" (vs. 1, 4, 13, 19). That is the "doctrine" which the Roman brethren had learned, at least a part of it; and what "doctrine" could Paul have had in mind more naturally, **when writing on "divisions" and "stumbling"** (16:17) than his own unity teachings as unfolded in chapter 14 (although, through others, the teaching had preceded his own epistle to Rome)? It seems clear therefore that Paul, in the much-quoted "marking" passage (Rom. 16:17) is also condemning those who preach and practice the doctrine of dividing, when the true apostolic doctrine is **against** dividing; those who go up and down the land **egging on** the disciples (often the untaught masses) to divide and separate — where before they were at peace and saw no need to separate. The pioneer disciples would never have thought of separation over the issues that are now current. It is a new, artificial condition created by divisive men; and **such** men, says Paul, must be "marked" and turned away from. *

(3) These brethren who are designated as "premillennial" are not such as serve their own belly instead of the Lord Jesus Christ. All motives for earthly gain, for positions, for remunerations and emoluments, for prestige and popularity in the brotherhood, are on the other side. No princely salaries are received by even the ablest of those "marked" brethren. If a man would go in to "serve the belly" he would certainly not take up with a maligned and persecuted class like those who are marked as "premillennialists." The worldly advantage lies all on the other side; and to those who in such a case sign up the "creed" of the dominating powers of the brotherhood, the doors of opportunity are open—for "doing more good" (as they would think) and incidentally for getting on in the world! In saying this I am not judging any man's motives: I only say that if one were looking for a way to further his own interests—to "serve the belly" as Paul puts it—he would not seek it among the "premillennialists."

Finally, may it be said that the brethren who by way of reproach are called "premillennialists"—so far as I know them and can speak for them—are committed to no "ism," nor are they beholden to any man's doctrine. They stand for God's word simply, nothing but that, but *all* of that. And in all things their position is summed up in the slogan, "*We are not right, but the Bible is right.*"

So, those who are minded to consider, let them decide as in the sight of God whether or not such brethren are to be marked and turned away from. And as they decide conscientiously, before the Lord, so let them do.

* The quotation is from a tract by E. L. J., "Cause, Course and Cure of Division," free for the asking.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 55

Twenty-five or thirty years ago Brother C. M. Neal wrote his very clear and excellent tract, “The Lord’s Supper And The Thousand Years,” in which he drew a parallel between the testimony, scriptural and historical, concerning the two doctrines mentioned in the caption. This parallel has never been refuted, nor can it be. The exact form of the questions discussed was this:

“Did the early Christians observe weekly communion? And did they look for a Thousand-year Reign of Christ on the earth?”

The writer of the tract answers both of these questions in the affirmative. He then proceeds to present as proof on the first question, the scripture evidence and the historical testimony offered by a prominent disciple editor who believes and preaches the first, but denies and controverts the second of these two propositions! The scripture proof is from these five passages: Acts 2:42; 20:7; 1 Cor. 11:20-24; 16:1, 2; Heb. 10:25. Following these, said editor states very positively that “all antiquity concurs in saying that for the first three centuries all the churches broke bread once a week.” He then gives the well known quotation from Justin Martyr; also quotations from Pliny, Tertullian, and others of “profane history,” as well as good and pertinent quotations from Calvin, Wesley, and other reformers who advocated weekly communion.

Proceeding along the same lines on the second question, the tract undertakes to show, by scriptures and historical testimony far more copious than our brother-editor produced on the first, “That the early Christians believed in an age or dispensation to follow this present age, called “The Thousand Years”; that this is “susceptible of every proof, and is beyond the possibility of a reasonable doubt.” It is this part of the tract which we here reproduce:

PROOF FROM SCRIPTURE

First, let the reader take the Bible. Read Revelation 19:11-21. Here you will note one of the clearest delineations of Christ’s second coming. Here the “Faithful and True” one (Rev. 3:14), The Crowned One, “King of kings, and Lord of lords” (1 Tim. 6:16), whose Name is “The Word of God” (Jno. 1:1, 14), comes forth to “judge and make war.” (“The wicked one”—“the beast” is slain by “the breath of his mouth” and brought “to nought by the manifestation of his coming.” (2 Thess. 2:3-9). No Bible student need mistake who this is or when it is. This is Christ at His second coming.

Now, as the second step, Read Revelation 20:11-15. Here you have the last resurrection and the last judgment. The white throne appears; the dead, “the great and the small” are raised and judged. The place of the dead is destroyed and the earth and heaven destroyed. No one can mistake that this is the last judgment and the last resurrection and the destruction of the earth. (2 Pet. 3:6, 7). After this we see the “new heaven and a new earth,” and death is “no more.” (Rev. 21:1-7.)

Now, as the third step, Read Revelation 20:1-10. You will note that this section fills the gap between steps one and two of your former studies. Step No. 1 showed Christ's second coming; step No. 2 showed the last resurrection and last judgment and the destruction of the earth. Step No. 3 which lies between—that is, after Christ's coming and before the last resurrection—is the thousand-year period. In this section (Rev. 20:1-10) "the thousand years" is mentioned six times. As a period it lies between the second coming of Christ and the last resurrection. The Holy Spirit placed it there. The Spirit places "the first resurrection" before the thousand years (verses 5, 6) and "the last resurrection" after the thousand years (verses 7:15). After speaking of "the first resurrection" as embracing the "blessed and holy" the Holy Spirit says, "the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years should be finished." Here you have a thousand years, preceded by a resurrection of the just and holy and followed by the last resurrection. During this time Satan is bound and the saints reign with Christ. The second coming of Christ marks the close of our present age at which time the church—sleeping and living—are caught up to Christ. (Matt. 28:18-20; 1 Cor. 15:50-59; 1 Thess. 4:13-18). After the second coming of Christ (Rev. 19:11-21) comes the thousand years (Rev. 20:1-10), and after the thousand years comes the last resurrection and judgment. (Rev. 20:11-15.) Thus saith the Scriptures.

Now, as a fourth step, let the reader turn to 1 Cor. 15:20-28. Read this carefully. Note (1) All the dead will be raised (ver. 22). (2) The dead will be raised in different orders—bands, ranks, or companies (verses 23-27). (3) These different companies are plainly set forth: (a) Christ the firstfruits; also Matt. 27:53, 54 denotes other saints at the same time. (b) The second company, "they that are Christ's at his coming." (c) The rest of the dead marks the end, and this occurs after the second coming of Christ, and after the last enemy is destroyed. Between the raising of those "that are Christ's at his coming" (v. 23) and the destruction of the last enemy (v. 26) lies the reign of Christ in the subjugation of all enemies (verses 24, 25). The last of all enemies destroyed is death, and this comes, the Holy Spirit says, after the thousand years and after the reign of Christ (Rev. 20:5, 7-15). Thus 1 Corinthians 15 fully agrees with Revelation 20.

As a fifth step, let the reader turn to Luke 20:34-36. Here we have the words of our Master. He speaks of "this age" and "that age" (R. V. margin). In Luke 18, Jesus uses the terms "this time, and in the age to come." (Luke 18:30, R. V., margin). In Matthew, He says "in this age nor in that which is to come" (Matt. 12:32). In the word by Paul we are told that Christ's authority is above every name "in this age" and "in that which is to come" (Eph. 1:21, R. V. margin). That "this age" and "that age" from Paul and Jesus could not mean any other than our present age and one to follow is very evident. Now go back to Luke 20:34-36. Note that only the "worthy"

attain unto "that age"; that such an age is after the resurrection of the worthy and that such are "equal unto the angels": they are "the sons of God," and cannot "die any more." They have been raised "from the dead." The rest of the dead being unworthy are not raised and have no part in "the age to come." This fully agrees with Revelation 20 and 1 Corinthians 15. Here is an "age to come" after Christ comes and after the resurrection of the worthy and before the resurrection of the unworthy. This age to come is said to be of "a thousand years" in duration.

As a sixth step turn to Acts 3:18-24. Here you will observe a period of which Moses and Samuel and "all the prophets" have spoken. This period is called "the times of restoration." These times come after Christ comes. Christ is now in the heavens. They receive him "until the times of restoration of all things, whereof God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets that have been from of old." This period, which comes after Christ comes, is said by the Holy Spirit to be "a thousand years" in duration.

As a seventh step take your Bible in hand, and learn still more of such a time. The devil will be bound (Rev. 20:1-3); Christ and the saints will reign. (Rev. 20:4-6; Dan. 7:18, 22, 27.) The nations will not learn war any more. (Ps. 72:7-10; Isa. 2:2-4; Mic. 2:1-5). The animals shall be at peace with one another (Isa. 11:6-9) and the glory of the Lord shall fill the earth (Hab. 2:14).

Summing up, the proof will show that an age after this, called "the age to come," of one thousand years' duration, is plainly and abundantly taught by John and Paul and Peter and Christ and "all the prophets." The length of it cannot be misunderstood; the place in God's plan cannot be misunderstood; the nature of the times cannot be misunderstood if we are willing to accept God's word as it reads. The scriptures teach and the early Christians believed in an age to follow this one called "the thousand years."

PROOF FROM EARLY SECULAR HISTORY

POLYCARP. Born A. D. 69 and martyred A. D. 167: "If we obey Christ and please him in this present age, we shall receive the age to come. He will raise us from the dead and we shall live and reign with him. The saints shall judge the world."

PAPIAS, who died in A. D. 165, says "There will be a millennium after the resurrection from the dead, when the personal reign of Christ will be established on the earth."

JUSTIN MARTYR, born A. D. 89 and martyred A. D. 163, says: "I, and whatsoever Christians are orthodox in all things, do know that there will be a resurrection of the flesh, and a thousand years' reign in the city of Jerusalem, built, adorned and enlarged according to the prophets."

TERTULLIAN, born A. D. 160, died A. D. 240: "We profess that a kingdom is promised us on earth, before that in heaven, but in another state, namely, after the resurrection; for it will be one thousand

years in a city of divine workmanship, namely Jerusalem brought down from heaven; and this city Ezekiel knew and John saw."

LACTANTIUS, who wrote about A. D. 300 and died A. D. 330, says: "About the same time also the prince of devils shall be bound with chains and imprisoned during the thousand years of heavenly rule of righteousness which shall reign in the world."

Here are five witnesses, during the two centuries following the inspired men, who speak plainly. The testimony of each could be enlarged. For lack of space we will not quote further but will add the names of six others during the same period whose testimony is in full accord with that given—Hermas, Clement, Irenaeus, Commodianus and Hippolytus.

To the foregoing testimony we wish to add the testimony of accredited Historians regarding this early age of the church on the point in question.

SCHAEFF says: "The most striking point in the eschatology of the Ante-Nicene age is the prominent Chiliasm, or Millenarianism, that is, the belief of a visible reign of Christ in glory on earth with the risen saints for a thousand years before the general resurrection and judgment. . . . It was a widely current opinion of distinguished teachers, such as Barnabas, Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Methodius and Lactantius."

GIBBON says: "The ancient and popular doctrine of the Millennium . . . was carefully inculcated by a succession of Fathers from Justin Martyr and Irenaeus who conversed with the immediate disciples of the Apostles, down to Lactantius who was the preceptor of the son of Constantine. . . . It appears to have been the reigning sentiment of all orthodox believers."

MOSHEIM says: "The prevailing opinion that Christ was to come and reign a thousand years among men before the final dissolution of the world had met with no opposition until the time of Origen." (This was about 250 A. D.)

Space forbids a longer list of quotations but we wish to add a list of brethren of the restoration movement who have written plainly in favor of the doctrine of the thousand years as herein set forth: J. T. Barclay, Moses E. Lard, James A. Harding, Daniel Sommer, T. W. Brents and J. B. Rotherham. [Many others might be added, J.]

Thus, by Scripture testimony, by earlier and later uninspired testimony, by Church Historians and by the Religious leaders and reformers, we have set forth the testimony that the early Christians believed in an age to come called The Thousand Years. The testimony is authoritative, clear, abundant and convincing. If one accepts the proof adduced in support of the first contention as being sufficient, surely the proof of the second contention will be taken as beyond the possibility of reasonable doubt.

CONCISE TESTIMONY BY ABLE MEN OF THE RESTORATION MOVEMENT

"The Millennium will commence in the precise moment in which Satan is bound and locked up in prison. . . . From that time it will stretch forward and include, in our opinion, a period of a thousand years precisely."—*Moses E. Lard*.

"This is the millennium. If it does not express a literal reign with Christ for a thousand literal years, we know not what assemblage of words would be capable of expressing the thought."—*T. W. Brents* (after quoting Rev. 20:4).

"The word millennium is composed of two Latin words which together mean—a thousand years. That God intends to introduce such a period is as plainly stated in this chapter as that He intended to bring a flood of waters on the earth is set forth in Genesis sixth chapter. Mankind will live on the earth then, even as they are now living, except they will not be tempted by the devil."—*Daniel Sommer*.

"When Satan shall be bound for a thousand years (Rev. 20:1-6) and the saints of the Most High possess the kingdom (Dan. 7:14, 18, 22) the prophecy of Isaiah (11:6-9) may be more literally fulfilled than we now anticipate. But whatever may be true of that blissful era, so long and so often foretold by the Apostles and Prophets, it is not at all probable that man's dominion over the world will be fully restored until the new heavens and the new earth appear, in which righteousness will forever dwell."—*Robert Milligan*.

"There is no aspect in which the millennial age can be regarded that is not richly suggestive of the most pleasing and profitable themes of contemplation. Satan being bound, and man brought into complete subjection to Jesus Emmanuel, the whole creation, which had hitherto groaned in travail on account of man's sin, is vocal with praise—'the times of restitution of all things' having now arrived! Who that has a heart to feel can refrain from praying and laboring for a consummation so devoutly to be wished."—*J. T. Barclay*.

(The brethren quoted just above will be quoted in fuller manner in a later issue. See also p. 205 in the series for 1949.)

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 56

We offer for this installment some scattered paragraphs from Campbell—useful, not only toward interest in Prophecy, but toward unity, tolerance, and general forbearance.

Following the Campbell paragraphs we reprint a portion of Justin Martyr's remarkable testimony on the belief of early “orthodox” Christians, together with Justin's rating in the minds of noted men, including M. C. Kurfees.

Then there is a query answered by George A. Klingman (*Christian Leader*, 1915); the famous Harnak quotation from the *Britanica*, which we have not hitherto reproduced in this department; also some other quotations of special interest. We pray that God, in His providence, may open the hearts of all who read these precious things.—J.

SOME TIMELY EXTRACTS FROM CAMPBELL

VALUE OF PROPHECY

Campbell: The effort of my opponent (Bishop Purcell) has been as much to disparage prophecy itself, as any mode of interpreting it. According to him, prophecy is no gift. On our principles, it is at least as useful and interesting as history. It is one of the kindest boons of heaven, that we are permitted sometimes to peep into the future, guided by the lamp of eternity. The whole Bible is for the most part, history and prophecy. It is almost all history, for prophecy is the history of the future. - - - I thank our Heavenly Father that he has thus from the beginning vouchsafed to his children something of the future. Indeed so abundant are his revelations, his promises, which are all prophecies, and his prophecies, which all threaten or promise, that there is scarce a single page of the whole Bible without a prophecy inscribed upon it. - - - But if prophecy be wholly unintelligible, why, I ask, should it constitute so large a portion of God's only book to man?

There are two kinds of maps in schools; one gives both the place and the name of it, the other (sometimes called a blank map,) gives the place without the name. The former represents history; the latter, prophecy. Prophecy is as correct a map of the future, as history is of the past; but it is not always quite so obvious. I have taught geography with these two sorts of maps. The pupil studied on that inscribed with the names of the places, and we examined him on the blank map. The study of fulfilled prophecy, with the history of the past, prepares us for the blank map, the outline of the future. On the blank map, we can learn the great outline of things—their relative positions, distances and magnitudes. We may sometimes err, in fixing the proper name on every place: but we cannot greatly err, in forming a useful acquaintance with the whole; especially, having a correct knowledge of what is past, or of certain portions of the past, which must ever be a key to the future. Thus we can acquire a clear and satisfactory outline of the vast expanse of future

time, although we may, sometimes, err in a date, or in the name of a particular place, person, or thing.—*Campbell-Purcell Debate*, pp. 247, 248, Edition of 1852.

HE COMMENDS A STRONG MILLENARIAN

It gives me pleasure to inform my readers that Brother Cridfield (Editor "Orthodox Preacher") is no Millerite, but one that believes in a thousand-year Millennium, at least, after the Lord comes; and that, of course, it was only as a Poet he spoke of "heavens wrapt in fire," and of the earth "melting at the breath of his ire," perhaps in the present year, or at no very remote day, etc.—A. Campbell, *Millennial Harbinger*, June 1843, p. 271.

HE THOUGHT IT "STRANGE," IF SATAN BOUND NOW!

It seems as though the first millennium after Christ, about its close, was seized with a delusion very much akin to the present Miller speculation. It was, indeed, more general than the present excitement, and embraced all orders of mind more proportionally than the present. Strange, indeed, that as the whole idea of a millennium comes from Rev. 20:1-10, any one could imagine that Satan had been bound a thousand years, even while during that time he had killed the Messiah. To us it appears equally strange how any one, well read in sacred learning could imagine that Satan has been bound for the last thousand years, and that we have had a reign of Christ of a thousand years.—A. Campbell, *Millennial Harbinger*, 1843, p. 231.

HE COMMENDS THE NEW TESTAMENT ATTITUDE

The following short article is from the first number of "*The Bible Student and Family Monitor*," published in New York by a society of Ministers and Laymen. To what denomination they belong I know not. They say some things, however, indicative of more than usual attainments in their conceptions of the present state of the Christian world in contrast with the primitive church. They seem to be amongst those who are looking for the coming of the Lord at no very distant day. Probably they may be a sort of reformed Millerites as the world of names now goes. There is, however, no prophecy in their number, but much good sense: a sample or two of which we may give.—A. C.

He then reprints the following paragraph, in the *Harbinger* of July, 1844, pp. 307-309:

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH CONTRASTED WITH THE CHURCH AT THE PRESENT DAY

"Then Christians were living in constant expectation of their Saviour's return. Now the church are satisfied to delay his coming one thousand years. - - - This is most truly the Laodicean state of the church, and Christ stands at the door, while the church are saying in their hearts, 'My Lord delayeth his coming.' We therefore who are looking for the blessed hope of the glorious appearing of the great God and our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, ought to be up and doing, that we may arouse others to be ready, with their lamps

trimmed and burning, ready to meet the Bridegroom when he cometh, like the Christians of the primitive church."

HE URGES "ALLOWANCE" FOR "OPINIONS" AND "DIFFERENT DEGREES OF KNOWLEDGE"

Luther and Calvin began a great reformation, and ever since we have been quarreling about what Luther and Calvin meant; and thus people get to hating one another on account of religious opinions. Whenever men will make the belief of Christian facts, and not an argument of abstruse opinions, or the inferential reasonings of some orthodox commentator, the bond of Christian union, divisions and all their evil concomitants, will cease; but so long as Christians demand unity of opinion, or a concurrence in the conclusions of some philosophic, or speculative mind, essential to Christian faith and Christian character, so long will the discords and the divisions abound.

Many skeptics (and Christians) mistake the dross of mere human doctrines and dogmas for the pure gold of Christianity. Men have, under the dominion of opinions, been made to love and hate one another for the argument or collisions of their opinions. But under the dominion of faith *they are taught to allow a difference in opinions*. There is but "one faith," but nowhere is it written that there is one opinion. All Christians are in reality of one faith; for all believe the gospel facts, and he that does not believe the gospel facts can not be a Christian. But the Apostle Paul positively commanded all Christians to maintain the "unity of the faith," and "receive one another" without regard to differences of opinion. There is only one faith, but many opinions, and many different degrees of knowledge; and Christianity makes allowance for these.—"*Evidences of Christianity*," pp. 295 and 373.

JUSTIN MARTYR, AND THE KURFEES COMMENT

Justin Martyr was born about A. D. 89, (some say 100) and was beheaded about 165 A. D. We give first Brother M. C. Kurfees' estimate of Justin as a historical witness, and then Justin's telling testimony on the Thousand Years. Note that Brother Kurfees estimates Justin's testimony (on Instrumental music) as "of the greatest importance that can justly be attached to the testimony of an uninspired man:"

But if Justin's testimony is that good on Music, why not on other historical lines also?—J.

JUSTIN MARTYR: Wherever Christianity has long been established, the name of this justly celebrated Church Father of Palestine, who is said to have suffered martyrdom in the year 165, is well known. He was born at the beginning of the second century, and hence his period begins where the apostolic period closed. His testimony is therefore, of the greatest importance that can justly be attached to the testimony of an uninspired man. Eusebius says (Book IV, Chap. II) that he 'was the most noted of those that flourished' in

the second century.”—M. C. Kurfrees, in *Instrumental Music in Worship*. pp. 192, 193.

JUSTIN'S TESTIMONY

“But I, and whatsoever Christians are orthodox in all things, do know that there will be a resurrection of the flesh, and a thousand years in Jerusalem, built, adorned and enlarged according to the prophets.

“A certain man among us whose name is John, being one of the twelve apostles of Christ, in that revelation which was shown to him, prophesied that those who believe in Christ should live a thousand years in Jerusalem; and after that there should be a general, and in a word, an universal resurrection of every individual person, when all shall arise together with an everlasting state and a future judgment.”—*Dialogue with Trypho*.

“Jerome never mentions Justin Martyr,” says Mede, “being afraid of the antiquity and authority of the man.”

Of Justin, the following testimony is borne by Semisch, a German writer: “Justin dwells with deep emotion on this hope. (The Lord's Return). It was in his esteem a sacred fire, at which he kindled afresh his Christian faith and practice. That this hope in its pure millenarian character and extent might possibly be vain never entered his thoughts. He believed that it was supported by scripture. He expressly appealed to the New Testament Apocalypse, and such passages in the Old Testament as Isaiah 65:17, in evidence of the personal reign of Christ in Jerusalem. From the Apocalypse, and Isaiah 65:22, in connection with Genesis 2:17, 5:5, and Psalm 90:4, he deduced the millennial period.”

Semisch further remarks that “Chiliasm constituted in the second century so decidedly an article of faith that Justin held it up as a criterion of perfect orthodoxy.”

Eusebius says that Justin's works stood in high credit among the early Christians. His “Dialogue With Trypho is accepted as authentic and genuine. He argued that the millennium would be beyond the resurrection, and in the restitution of all things, quoting Isa. 65, and other of the prophets as proof.

Adam Clark declares that Justin “abounds in sound solid sense, the product of an acute and well-cultivated mind.”

(For more from Justin, let the reader turn back to pages 105, 106, in Faith of Our Fathers,” article No. 25, in the 1947 pamphlet.—J.)

G. A. KLINGMAN'S ANSWER

(1 Cor. 6:2, 3; Rev. 2:26, 27)

Query No. 1,532.

“I wish you would give me some light on the following scriptures. I have my convictions, but would be glad to have yours: 1 Cor. 6: 2, 3: ‘Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and know ye not that we shall judge angels?’ Rev. 2:26, 27: ‘To him will I

give power over the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron.' I note that Russell and others use these and kindred scriptures in their arguments on the Millennium. Give us what light you can."

It seems clear that the saints who shall attend Jesus when he comes to execute judgment upon all shall share in the judging (see Jude 14). Since angels are also to be judged (Jude 6), we shall share in judging them. See also Rev. 3:21.

The passage in Rev. 2:26, 27, finds a parallel in Ps. 2. Victorious saints shall participate in the overthrow of all kingdoms of this world.—George A. Klingman in *Christian Leader*, April 20, 1915.

ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA AGAIN

In this justly famous work, *Encyclopedia Britannica*, under the article "Millennium," the writer, a no less distinguished scholar than Adolf Harnak, Professor of Christian History in the University of Giessen, Germany, says:

"This doctrine of Christ's second advent, and the kingdom, appears so early that it might be questioned whether it ought not to be regarded as an essential part of the Christian religion."

We offer for this department the following fair and thought-provoking argument by Brother F. L. Lemley, Minister at Trinidad, Colo.

WHO CAN FELLOWSHIP WHAT?

There should be some standard of judgment that will apply to all church division alike, by which we may determine when to sever fellowship. Some are going so far as to dis-fellowship those who fellowship those who fellowship those whom they think are in error. And furthermore, they justify such action by misapplying scriptures that apply to immoral persons and anti-Christ, applying them to godly brethren who differ with them on the interpretation of a scripture. There is no excuse for such gross misapplication. . .

The scriptures expressly teach that if a man be guilty of immorality, we cannot participate with him even in those things on which we may agree (1 Cor. 5:5). The scriptures expressly teach that if a man be anti-Christ then we cannot participate with him even in those things on which we agree (2 John 7-9). We are expressly commanded to reject a heretic (Tit. 3:10). But what kind of heretic? Paul said this one was perverted and sinful. The heretic of Romans 16:17 was a slave to his own carnal lusts and served not Christ. . . . We may withdraw from (1) the immoral, (2) those who have forsaken or erred concerning the doctrine that made them Christians, and (3) the heretic who serves not Christ but his own belly. I further affirm that there is not one scripture that can be correctly applied to justify withdrawing from brethren who differ on application of some scripture, or who are in error in doctrine of secondary nature that would not prevent them becoming Christians if held during the process of conversion. Those who build factions around such doctrines and practices are guilty of crucifying the body of Christ, and are endangering their own souls.—F. L. Lemley, in *Gospel Broadcast*.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 57

This month — 15 or 20 separate, valuable quotations. With a few connecting notes, each speaks for itself.—J.

B. W. JOHNSON ON THE “LORD’S PRAYER”

“*Thy Kingdom come*”: The Messiah’s kingdom had not yet come, but was proclaimed by the Lord at hand. It did speedily come, but in its full and in its final triumph over evil, it has not **yet come**. For this coming we may now pray, and the prayer is answered in part by each success of the gospel.”—*Peoples’ New Testament with Notes*, Vol. 1, p. 42.

JOHNSON ON “THE JEWS”

“*So all Israel shall be saved*”: After the fulness of the Gentiles has come in, the Jews, as a people, shall be saved. That is, of the Jews then living, the greater part shall be saved. The nation shall turn to the Lord. *Peoples’ New Testament with Notes*, Vol. 2, p. 57.

McGARVEY ON “JOEL”

“Not all of Joel was fulfilled at Pentecost.”—McGarvey on *Acts*.

“WHITBYISM”

Dr. Duffield of Princeton, N. J., says: “The doctrine of a Millennium *before* the advent of Christ is not to be found in any of the standards of the churches of the Reformation: by several it is expressly repudiated. It is a modern novelty, suggested but 150 years ago by Whitby, and avowedly a ‘new hypothesis.’”

IS IT NOT?

“That the Lord Jesus will personally descend from heaven and revisit this earth is neither doubted nor denied by any Christian.”—Alexander Campbell, (*Millennial Harbinger*, 1843, page 49).

DAVID LIPSCOMB ON THE RESURRECTIONS

(Italics ours. J.)

1 Cor. 15:23: *They (the dead) will not all be raised at one time*. Christ came forth as the first fruits. When Christ died on the cross, many of the graves were opened, and “many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep were raised; and coming forth out of the tombs **after his resurrection** they entered into the holy city and appeared unto many” (Matt. 27:52). Those who accept Christ, put him on, live in him, “shall rise first: then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord” (1 Thess. 4:16, 17). *The wicked shall afterward be raised*: “Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt” (Dan. 12:2). “And death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire. And if any was not found written in the book of life, he was cast into the lake of fire” (Rev. 20:14, 15).

Verse 24, "Then cometh the end": The consummation of the gospel dispensation or state of things, which will open the new and eternal period. * * * Everything that is in the world, that exercises rule, authority or power, save as it comes directly from God, and is used under his direction, to promote his rule and dominion, is an enemy of God and of his Son Jesus Christ, and must be destroyed by the rule and dominion of the Son before the kingdom and dominion of the world can be delivered up to the Father. Jesus Christ came into the world to rescue it from the evil one and to destroy everything that exerts power or authority or dominion on the earth, and to establish the kingdom of God on earth. *When that is done* every one will render homage and obedience to God."—David Lipscomb, in *Salvation From Sin*.

CAMPBELL, AND THE THOMAS "COVENANT"

In reply to some references to a covenant entered into between Dr. Thomas and myself, I have to say that there is no such document in existence, and never was. There was, indeed, a covenant entered into between John Thomas (no "D. D.", but "M. D.") and certain brethren in Virginia, touching the immutability and impropriety of teaching the mortality of the soul and the non-resurrection of infants and Pagans, certain speculations concerning the final destiny of the wicked, etc.; which covenant binds him to desist from such vain and foolish speculations in public. The alleged breach of said covenant lies between him and those brethren, and not between myself and him.—A. Campbell, *Millennial Harbinger*, 1843 p. 522.

IS IT SO "CERTAIN"?

In the *Gospel Advocate* of Feb. 9, 1950, Brother Earl West (in an interesting series on the Restoration Movement) registers this "objection" to Campbell's placement of certain prophecies. It is true that "a great man can be wrong," and Campbell could be, and was at times. But **was he here?** Brother West says:

There were times when Campbell's objections to Millerism were open to objection, to say the least. In the fall of 1842 Campbell noted that Miller had said the world would come to an end the next year. If that were true, said Campbell, how could the fact be accounted for that several prophecies had not yet been fulfilled? He quoted from Isa. 2:4: "And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks." Again, he said that Satan was to be bound for a thousand years; but how could this be if the world come to an end the next year, since there was no indication that Satan was then bound. He quoted freely from Isaiah's prophecies asserting that these had not been fulfilled. Even a great man can be wrong, and it is certain that many of the quotations to which Campbell referred pointed to the first coming of Christ, not his second coming."

And here is Campbell's fuller list of passages yet unfulfilled, as he thought, in his day.

He is arguing against the teaching of William Miller, the father of modern Adventism, and the Millerites, who were expecting the end of the world in 1844:

"Can anyone believe that the following predictions have yet been accomplished? Isa. 59:16-21; 60; 61; 62; 63; 65:17-25; 66:10-24; also Jer. 30:1-3, 17:24; 31; 32:36-42; 33:1-26; Ezek. 36, 37; also chapters 38 and 39 concerning God and Magog. Can anyone say that these prophecies have been fulfilled? And if not, can anyone show how they are to be fulfilled after the end of the world? Dan. 2:40-44; 7:7-14, 23-27. Compare these with John's Apocalypse, chapter 16:12-21, with chapters 17, 18, 19, and especially chapter 20:1-10. Surely no one will affirm that all these things have yet come to pass."—*Millennial Harbinger, Condensed*, Vol. I, pp. 95, 96.

The true mode of biblical interpretation is to follow the historico-grammatical sense. * * * Thus *Aion* grammatically means time or age; historically, a dispensation, as the Jewish or Christian. Melancthon was quite right in saying: "Scripture cannot be understood theologically, *unless* it is understood grammatically"; and Luther in saying: "The knowledge of the sense can be derived from nothing but the knowledge of the words."—*B. A. Hinsdale, "Ecclesiastical Tradition,"* p. 169.

EVEN THE "POST" WRITERS ADMIT IT

(But they brush the testimony aside as "uncritical"!)

The early church before Augustine in its popular thinking was largely apocalyptic. An early return of Jesus was expected to establish his kingdom. We have seen that the Jewish apocalyptic writings had currency in the early church, and that one New Testament author, Jude, refers to one such writing and quotes by name from another. This apocalyptic thought was generally premillennial; it was a temporary kingdom upon earth that was to be established. That this thought was uncritical is indicated by the current of the Jewish writings in the church which were interpreted in a Christian way and sometimes suffered Christian interpolation.—Harris Franklin Rall, in "*Modern Premillennialism and the Christian Hope*," The Abingdon Press.

Burton, of Oxford, in his Bampton lectures of 1829, and Bishop Russell, both anti-chiliasts, assert that the matter is beyond successful denial. The latter, in his history of the Scotch Episcopal Church (p. 84), affirms that, "Down to the beginning of the 4th century the sure and certain hope entertained by the Christian World, that the Redeemer would appear on earth, and exercise authority during a thousand years, was universal."

"Desprez, Vicar of Alvidiston in his semi-infidel praeteristic book on Daniel and John, confesses: "That the writer of the Apocalypse meant to assert a literal reign of Christ and His saints upon the earth for 1,000 years." and that this receives confirmation from the fact that the church of the first 3 centuries was essentially chiliastic (pre-millenarian)."—Desprez, on *Daniel and John*, p. 309.

Alford says: "The whole Church, for 300 years, understood Revelation 20:1-6 in a plain, literal sense; and, It is the most cogent instance of unanimity which primitive antiquity presents."

BARTON STONE ON UNIFORMITY

The attempt to make all believe alike has always been followed by the most painful results. * * * Uniformity of faith is desirable, but in the present state of things, it can hardly be expected. * * * All should believe, and do believe the Bible as divine—as the truth of God. Not a fact or a truth there stated, but all receive it, yet the various opinions formed of that fact, or truth, no man can relieve. It is impossible to force an honest, intelligent mind to believe. Coercion has divided Christians in every age; ever since the introduction of laws to enforce uniformity. The Reformers saw this and for a while protested against it. They boasted that the Bible was their religion. But the free mind soon began to form different opinions of Bible facts. For this they were reproached by the Catholics—and to remedy the supposed evil, the Reformers began to embody their opinions of Bible truth in a creed or book, and required all their members to subscribe to it. Thence division ensued, and it has continued and increased to the present time—and will continue as long as uniformity of faith is required. This evil has been seen by many of the present age. They, too, have determined to reform, and revert to the true principle of reformation, to take the Bible alone as their only rule of faith and practice. If these principles be relinquished, there will be a speedy end of reformation and union. Let us watch and pray, lest we enter into temptation.—*B. W. Stone, Editor, Christian Messenger*, Oct. 1833, pp. 302, 303.

"I have long since lost my pride of opinion. I would not knowingly hold a sentiment contrary to the truth of God for a world."—*B. W. Stone, Editor, "Christian Messenger*, July, 1833, p. 205.

"As to 'featuring' the disputed teaching—it is not my purpose to press it unduly or disproportionately, nor to make it obnoxious by undue and offensive emphasis; but only in faithfulness to the word of the Lord, as occasion may require. Also, we recognize the fact that though *the Scripture* is inspired, *our conclusions* are not; and our *conclusions* are, therefore, not to be insisted upon as though they were. Only the statements of God's word are the basis of Christian fellowship."—Quoted from R. H. B.

"When we believe in Christ and obey His commandments, we are Christians. Having done this, if we differ, we should differ as Christians—as brethren in the Lord—and not make our differences, denominational barriers which interdict Christian love, destroy brotherly fellowship, prevent successful coöperation and promote party strife and ugly contentions."—F. D. Srygley, p. 315, *Larimore and His Boys*.

A COURAGEOUS LETTER

The following letter, dated Jan. 26, 1950, was sent to the the elders of a church in the Rocky Mountain area, by Waldo Hoar, the fine minister of the church at Linton, Ind. Whether heeded or not, it is at least an example to others who are pained to see the simple churches of Christ sectarianizing themselves.—J.

"Dear Brethren in the Lord: Your letter of Nov. 30, 1949, reached me some weeks ago. I was very glad to know of the work in Belgium, and hope and pray that it may be prospered of the Lord to accomplish much in His name.

"After much thought I am writing you concerning the statement in your folder entitled 'Our Doctrinal Stand.' I want to plead with you not to carry on a work, in Belgium, Denver, or in any other place, on such a denominational basis as there stated. I believe you have no right to draw such lines against your brethren who have become obedient in the very same way in which you obeyed the Lord, and who carry on the very same worship, and who live the same lives of godliness in which you believe. I have never been able to see that we could disfellowship one another because of a difference in understanding of things the Lord will do in the future. I know faithful brethren who are on both sides of your question and who will fellowship one another and work together. I believe it should be thus in every place, at home and abroad; and that if we allow ourselves to be divided over such questions we will defeat in a large measure the purpose for which the Lord has called us. We can not afford to do it, brethren; and again I plead with you, in all kindness and brotherly love, to reconsider that 'Doctrinal Stand.'"

MORE INTERESTING LETTERS

For earlier letters from prominent preachers, see installments No. 39 and 40, in the 1948 series of "Faith of Our Fathers."—J.

FROM A. B. LIPSCOMB

(He thought our doctrinal differences could be tolerated on the basis of Christian love):

"I regret, my dear brother, that these doctrinal differences, or 'differences of opinion' continue to disturb the brotherhood; and, as Brother Elam put it, I have hoped and still hope that 'we might get these on a working basis of Christian forbearance and love.'"
—From letter to R. H. Boll, dated Jan. 30, 1935.

F. L. YOUNG

(From an article by W. W. Freeman, in the F. L. Young memorial number of **Firm Foundation**, entitled, "He Yet Speaketh"):

In an unpublished thesis of over eight hundred pages prepared for Southern Methodist University appear the name and picture of F. L. Young. The words spoken by him at the close of a lecture (Abilene Christian College Bible Lectures) in 1919 account for the distinction. These words were as follows:

"No earthly censor can dictate to a faithful gospel preacher. The overseers of the flock may suggest the best message for the occasion, but the faithful messenger gets his authority higher up. I have read a few books on religious theories that I considered speculative . . . Some of their theories I accepted, some I rejected. . . . Shall I disfellowship the good brother whose theory I rejected? . . . I have resolved never to make anything a test of fellowship that the Holy Spirit has not made a condition of salvation."—Page 134).

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 58

For this chapter we offer a condensed and clear-cut resume on the Doctrine of Christ's Return—besides the short closing paragraphs, from Boles, Hines, Kelcy, and Flavil Hall.

THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST'S RETURN

The history of the primitive Church discloses that until Origen's time, about A. D. 250, no other idea was entertained of the Lord's return than the premillennial. Evangelical denominational groups have for the most part retained this teaching. Liberalism, with its negative approach, has turned many from the path of truth. Belief in Christ's return is one of the great, positive doctrines of historical and evangelical Christianity.

Jesus introduced it with the promise, "I will come again and receive you unto myself." The Epistles clearly indicate that the apostles and disciples accepted the doctrine as a vital ingredient in the sum total of Christian belief. The fact exerted a tremendous influence upon their lives.

Dr. Albert Barnes says in his notes on John 14:2, 3 and 1 Thessalonians 4:14, "This was the firm belief of the early Christians, and this expectation with them was allowed to exert a constant influence on their hearts and lives. It led them (1) to desire to be prepared for his coming; (2) to feel that earthly affairs were of little importance; (3) to live above the world, and in the desire of the approaching of the Lord Jesus.

"This was one of the elementary doctrines of their faith, and one of the means of producing deadness to the world among them; and among the early Christians there was, perhaps, no doctrine that was more the object of firm belief, and the ground of more delightful contemplation, than that their ascended Master would return."

Dr. Hackett said: "That event was always near to the feelings and consciousness of the first believers. It was the great consummation on which the strongest desires of their souls were fixed."

Dr. Charles Hodges said: "The second advent of Christ, so clearly predicted by himself and His apostles, was the object of longing expectation to all the early Christians."

The premillennial return was taught in the eastern section of the Church by such leaders as Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Nepos, Appollinarus, Methodius . . . and in the western and southern parts by Tertullian, Cyprian, Victorinus, Lacantius, Severus, and the first Nicene Council.

Other Church Fathers entertained almost uniformly the same "blessed hope." The list includes such illustrious souls as Barnabas, Hermes, Polycarp, Clement, Ignatius, Hippolytus, and Mileto. These were all premillenarian. The only exception of the period seems to be Origen, who was inclined to give over-emphasis to allegory. Dr. Adam Clark says: "According to his plan of interpretation, the Sacred Writings may be obliged to say anything, everything, or noth-

ing, according to the fancy, peculiar creed or caprice of the interpreter." Martin Luther wrote: "Origen is to be avoided." He was pronounced unsound by the council of Constantinople.

During the "dark ages" the theological skies became clouded and the doctrine of the Second Coming was almost lost due to corruption and worldliness in the Church. But the Waldenses and Paulikians remained loyal through "dungeon, fire and sword."

Finally the Reformation dawned and the Reformers thundered their great doctrines of the Faith. They were ardent exponents of second advent teaching. Le Bas says that John Wycliffe, "the morning star of the Reformation," regarded the Redeemer's appearing as the object of the hope and constant expectation of the Church of God."

Calvin said: "It must be held as a first principle that ever since the appearing of Christ, there is nothing left to the faithful but with wakeful minds to be always ready, intent on His second advent." Bishop Latimer: "I believe the Lord may come in my day, old as I am." John Knox: "We know that he shall return and that with expedition." Martin Luther: "I ardently hope that amidst these internal dissensions on earth, Jesus Christ will hasten the day of His coming."

Church leaders of the seventeenth century like Joseph Mede, William Twisse, Archbishop James Ussher, John Milton, Jeremiah Taylor, Samuel Rutherford, John Bunyan, Matthew Henry, and a host of others proclaimed the premillennial return of Christ.

The eighteenth century included Sir Isaac Newton, Bengel, Philip Doddridge, Watts, Robert Hall, Fletcher, Toplady, Cowper, Thomas Coke, Charles Wesley, John Wesley, George Whitefield and many others. Charles Wesley, known as the "millennial poet," wrote hundreds of songs confirming the doctrine. Space is not available to even name the outstanding leaders of modern times who expounded the doctrine.—From *Defender*.

THE MEANING OF THE WORD "PREMILLENNIAL"

(Boles, Hines, Keley)

Brother H. Leo Boles, in *Gospel Advocate* of Jan. 17, 1946, said, in part:

"'Post' means those who believe that Christ will come *after* the millennium; 'pre' denotes those who believe that the second coming of Christ will be *before* this millennium."

Then, in disclaiming any opposition to the "true meaning of Revelation 20"—(how can we know "the true meaning" if we reject what it grammatically *says* in plain, indicative, declarative, non-symbolical language?)—Brother Boles said further: "The word 'premillennial,' in its literal and simple meaning, means that Christ will come before the millennium": Very well, that is simply what the writers in these pages mean by the word; that, and only that, as they have said and written a thousand times; not some set of conclusions, true, half-true, or untrue; avowed by us, or foisted on us. We mean simply what James Challen, great and honored pioneer of

the disciples, meant when he spoke of "the premillennial view." Brother H. Leo Boles, now departed, often closed his articles with the exhortation, "Brethren, let us be fair"; and no doubt he meant to be. Would to God we all might be!

Brother J. L. Hines of Dallas, though disclaiming that he was anything but "a Christian, without any other designation" (as well he might disclaim it), wrote (in *Gospel Broadcast* of Nov. 28, 1943): "A premillennialist is one who believes that Christ is coming before a thousand-years' reign of Christ with the saints on earth. A post-millennialist is one who believes that Christ is coming after a thousand-year reign, as referred to in Rev. 20."

And in *Gospel Advocate* of Jan. 17, 1946, Brother Raymond C. Kelcy makes the following fair statement:

"What is the doctrine of premillennialism? It is the teaching that there is to be a thousand-year period of universal righteousness upon this earth, and that Christ is to come to the earth before that time. Of course, there are other points involved, but this is it in brief."

Yes, we hold "the premillennial view," to use Challen's phrase, avoiding circumlocution; but if we are premillennialists it is only in the sense that we are "immersionists"—with a small "i", not a capital.

FLAVIL HALL'S "LAMENTATION"

It is a lamentation for leaders in the church to charge "gross materialism" ("equaled only by Charles T. Russell," etc.) against brethren who believe there will be a purified condition on earth, and that Christ will reign here for a long period of time. David Lipscomb wrote this as a conviction of his so clearly that it is a grievous thing to try to conceal it. He declared of Acts 3:21 that the restitution of all things "must be when he returns again to earth"; that the earth will then be restored to its primeval state and the will of God will be done on earth as in heaven (*Queries and Answers*, page 360). Lipscomb did not say how long this blessedness will continue on the earth, whereas Word and Work brethren think Rev. 20:1-6 designates the length as a thousand years. And this redeemed state of the earth for a millennium (1,000 years), as the location of Christ's universal kingdom, is precisely what is found in the old *Christian Hymns*, published until recent years by the *Gospel Advocate*, with the hymns edited by Brother E. G. Sewell, D. Lipscomb's associate on the *Advocate* for more than forty years:

"Then shall dawn the happy day,
When the bright millennial ray,
Shall the darkness drive away,
Over the sea;
When the earth, redeemed and free,
Shall Messiah's kingdom be,
And each soul shall bow the knee
Over the sea."

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 59

Two men are quoted in this number whose names were held in honor in their day. Both were frequent contributors to the religious press. Brother Poe in several papers (this article is from the **Gospel Advocate**); Brother Carter, chiefly in the **Leader-Way**. I met Brother Poe just once, in Montgomery, Ala., long ago, together with J. M. Barnes. I remember asking them, as older men: "What do you men do with James 5:14, 15?" "What do we do?" they answered; "we do exactly what it tells us there to do!" There are not many who would say that today.

Brother Poe was born in Tuscaloosa, Ala., Aug. 30, 1836. He died at Longview, Texas, Dec. 23, 1917. Of him, H. Leo. Boles said, in **Biographical Sketches** (p. 284):

"He was a good writer. He wrote much for the religious papers. * * * He did not claim to be a profound reasoner, and yet he was logical in the presentation of his subjects, both in oral and written teachings. He had a number of debates, and he was always able to meet successfully his opponents."—J.

THE EVERLASTING KINGDOM

By John T. Poe

"And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." Dan. 2:44.

From this scripture it is generally understood that the kingdom which the God of heaven was to set up refers to the establishment of the Church in the days of Caesar. I can find no well defined application of things which denote its fulfillment then, and for the following reasons I beg to dissent from the conclusions of very many wise and scholarly men who have placed the fulfillment of this Scripture at Pentecost, A. D., or thereabouts: (1) These kings (the four mentioned by Daniel) were not contemporaneous, and Daniel says, "In the days of these kings," meaning, doubtless, in the days of a plurality of kings referred to in his interpretation of the dream; (2) the kingdom which the God of heaven was to set up was to break in pieces and consume "all these kingdoms"; (3) the kingdom which the God of heaven was to set up was to fill the whole earth and assume universal rule over the world; and (4) this kingdom was to have no end, but it was to stand for ever.

Now, I respectfully submit that these four objections standing against the conclusion that the prophecy refers to the setting up of the Church in A. D. 33, there is not a man on the earth who can truthfully and properly make such an application. "In the days of these kings" indicates not one king, but a plurality of reigning kings, at the time the God of heaven should set up the everlasting kingdom.

At the commencement of the Christian era, the Roman Emperor ruled the world. Three other kings of universal empire are mentioned by Daniel, but their rule was brought down and vested in Augustus Caesar, whose empire was universal, but was the last of universal empires mentioned by Daniel. This kingdom, Daniel said,

should be as the mixture of iron and clay, especially toward its close. The legs of Nebuchadnezzar's image were of iron, indicating great strength; but as it approaches the end, the feet and toes, it was partly iron and partly clay. So the kingdom was to become weak and was to be divided into several kingdoms, a thing which actually occurred when the Roman Empire was at last divided into ten kingdoms.

Daniel says (verse 34) that the stone "smote the image upon his feet," clearly indicating that it was to smite the image in its divided state or condition. Now these kings, or their successors, still reign and are not yet scattered to the four winds and destroyed. Daniel said that the kingdom which the God of heaven would set up should "break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms." Has the church done this? Did the church smite the Roman Empire on its feet, near its close, and break it in pieces, and has it attained universal empire over all other kings and kingdoms?

I challenge the world to show one single kingdom over which the church or kingdom of God now reigns supreme. Is there one nation on the globe, one state, or one county, parish, shire, or community where Christ now reigns supreme? The kingdom which the God of heaven should set up was to fill the whole earth. Now we know this is not yet fulfilled: and if the church, after nearly two thousand years, has not yet subdued one kingdom, when shall it subdue all kingdoms?

Brother Christopher, in his "Remedial System," argues, if I understand him, that it will be done by the Gospel, but that it "will probably take myriads of ages to do it." So it will, if the present ratio of increase (?) is to be taken as a criterion.

The kingdom which the God of heaven was to set up, as in Daniel's prophecy, was to have no end but stand for ever. Now we know that the present kingdom of Christ on earth shall have an end, for Paul plainly tells us (1 Cor. 15:24) that this kingdom shall be delivered up to God. Not only so, but Christ himself, the now reigning King, shall give back to the Father his delegated authority (Matt. 18:18) and He himself become subject to the Father (1 Cor. 15:28). Thus we see this kingdom gives place to one which we constantly speak of as the "everlasting kingdom."

In view of what I have now said, I conclude that the God of heaven has not yet set up the everlasting kingdom spoken of by Daniel (2:44), but that He will do so at the second coming of Christ. The kingdom that he shall then set up will fill the whole earth; it will have destroyed all other kingdoms and will bear universal and eternal rule; it will never give place to another; and the time is at hand. We are living in the last period of the Laodicean age of the church. Christ now stands at the door and knocks. He is knocking at the door of the church by all the signs which He said would be apparent at His coming. Let the church take warning, and repent, and be ready for entrance into the everlasting kingdom which the God of heaven is now about to set up.—From *Gospel Advocate*, February 1, 1900.

ONE THOUSAND YEARS

By W. H. Carter

There has been, as I regard it, too much speculation—too much “reading between the lines,” or going beyond that which is written. (Quotes 1 Pet. 4:17; 1 Thess. 4:13-18; Rev. 20:1-6.) Now what do these scriptures teach? * * *

1. Judgment is now going on. * *
2. The blessing will be upon them who enter Christ. * * *
3. When Christ comes he will bring those who are asleep, who have died in the Lord, with him and those who are alive at his coming will be changed—this mortal will put on immortality and will be caught up to meet the Lord and to ever be with the Lord.
4. This is the first resurrection, which is a blessing to the saints, over which the second death hath no power, and is the beginning of the thousand years. They are to live and reign with Christ during the thousand years.
5. The rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years are expired. Satan shall be loosed out of his prison and shall go out to deceive the nations. * * * * *

NOW FOR THE PLAIN FACTS

1. At the beginning of the thousand years Christ will come and those who are asleep in Jesus will God bring with him. Those who are alive at this time and are in Christ will be changed and caught up with them to meet the Lord. This includes the righteous, both dead and living, and is “the first resurrection.”
2. These are to reign with Christ a thousand years, during which time the devil is chained, and bound in the bottomless pit.
3. “The rest of the dead,” those not asleep in Jesus, live not till the thousand years are completed. This then will be the second resurrection.
4. Satan will be loosed, and again work his deception among the nations. He will induce them to make war against the saints, and compass the camp of the saints about and the beloved city. Then fire will come down from God out of heaven, and devour them.
5. Then the judgment of Satan and the wicked will be rendered. They will be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone where they will be tormented day and night for ever and ever.—From *Leader Way*, Feb. 4, 1913.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 60

Space did not suffice in 1950 to present all the “Precious Reprints” that had been laid out for publication during the year. In course of the fresh and independent research which we are continually carrying on, many things too good to pass continue to come up for attention, and these are worked in as best we can, usually in their chronological order, or as “fillers” (yet not mere fillers) under the more expansive articles. Much great prophetic material, therefore, is scheduled for the coming year, from noted brethren who wielded strong millenary pens: Barclay, Lard, Brents, Harding, Sommer, and others.

We have elected to fill these last four pages of the 1950 series with Campbell extracts, gathered from scattered years and sources. We offer then, for this time (*Italics by us for quick reading*) these carefully selected—

PARAGRAPHS FROM CAMPBELL

Is this “Our Position”? Some Have “Signed Up.”

Before entering into the details of existing theories [on the Millennium], or into the documents of the Holy Record on the promised or predicted fortunes or conditions of the last dispensation of remedial grace and mercy, it may be more pertinent and edifying, in the first place, to recapitulate in a short space, our positions - - - .

We have, indeed, no assorted nor accepted, nor proposed synopsis of a creed, expressed in our own diction or in that of others; much less any human terms, phrases or positions which we have ever offered to a human being as prefatory to his baptism or to his admission into any of the churches of our community wherever located, either on the Eastern or on the Western continent. - - - *In not one of these [churches] known to me, is there acknowledged any written or printed document in form of a creed, confession, catechism or discipline, drawn up by any man, or company of men, on earth, living or dead.*—*Millennial Harbinger*. 1856, pp. 697-700.

NOT “CAUSE OF ALIENATION”—EVEN “MILLERISM”!

Our brethren of the Second Advent [referring to the “Millerites”], for many of whom I cherish a very tender affection, like other theorists, find too many proofs of their doctrine. I do not, indeed, at all feel any prejudice against these brethren because of their preparation to meet the Lord, nor because they are looking for his immediate return; nor do I call them “Millerites,” nor “Second Advent Folks,” out of any disrespect. They are designated by these names in this age of nicknames, sects, and parties. I merely so designate them to save time, because they are so called, and so call one another. They are, however, unfortunately encumbering their views by a revival of the antiquated notions usually called “destructionism”—a theory wholly inoperative of good, and prejudicial to their cause and to their influence with the community. At least so I think; but *I allow others to differ from me, as I claim the privilege of differing from others. These theories, if not dogmatically propounded for schismatical purposes, are not to become causes of alienation or of*

excommunication. On the contrary, a free and unreserved discussion of them, in a Christian spirit, if they are to be discussed at all, can do no harm.—(Writing as “Deacon Equitas”), *Millennial Harbinger*, 1848, pp. 164, 165.

HIS “CHANGE OF OPINION”

I am sensible that, on many points, I have changed my opinion, and found reason to correct what I had judged formerly to be right. *The consciousness of former mistakes proves a guard to preserve me from such presumptuous confidence in my present judgment as would preclude my giving a patient hearing to whatever may be urged from reason or Scripture, in opposition to it.* Truth has been in all my inquiries, and still is my great aim. * * * Preface to The First Edition, “*Christian Baptist*,” July 4, 1823.

MUST WE SUFFER “MENTAL SLAVERY?”

It is always more or less detrimental to the ascertainment of truth to allow our previous conclusions to assume the position of fixed and fundamental truths, to which nothing is to be at any time added either in correction or enlargement. On the contrary, we ought rather to act under the conviction that we may be wiser today than yesterday, and that whatsoever is true can suffer no hazard from a careful and candid consideration. In this manner I am accustomed to examine all questions, literary, moral or religious. . . . *It is the beginning of mental slavery and degradation, to deny a person the right to interpret the Scriptures except as others have done.*—Alexander Campbell, quoted in *Apostolic Review*.

THE TYRANT WHO COERCES BRETHREN

He that seeks to coerce brethren into his views in any way other than conviction and persuasion, is a tyrant. It matters not whether the tyranny assumes this form or that, he is a tyrant in principle and in practice.—(Speaking as “Bishop Omicron”), *Millennial Harbinger*, 1848, p. 265.

THE SUCCESSFUL EDITOR

One of three things, we may add, or perhaps all, are essential to the success of an Editor. First, that he have the means of living independently of his editorial labors. Secondly, that he has something to say which the people wish to hear. And, thirdly, that he say it in a decent, respectful, and Christian style. If, with these eminent endowments, he is not addicted to perpetual cravings for prompt and immediate relief from anticipated ruin, telling his patrons how much they owe him and how much he needs it, he will nine times in ten succeed.—*Millennial Harbinger*, March, 1848, p. 179.

THE LORD TO STAND UPON THIS EARTH

In an article published in *Millennial Harbinger*. 1841. Campbell reasons, first, on “the probability of the personal return of the

Lord to this earth." He follows this, second, with "the certainty of it"; then concerning the manner of it, and the events connected with it.

Under the head, "probability of the personal return of the Lord to this earth," Bro. Campbell says:

"It is the place of his nativity. . . . *No wonder, then, should our Lord delight to stand at 'the latter day upon the earth'* not far from the Mount of Olives, whence to Heaven his earthly friends and relatives saw him triumphantly ascend."

----- "THE LAST DAYS"

The phrase ["the Last Days"] in the Old Testament occurs only three times, and in the New Testament five times. It does not appear to be restricted specially to the conclusion of either the Jewish or Christian times. Jacob uses it when foretelling the fortunes of his twelve sons in all subsequent time. Isaiah and Micah use it in reference to the gospel age, and Peter, in quoting Joel, applies it to the conclusion of the Jewish age and the commencement of the Christian. Paul uses it in reference to the times subsequent to his own, and then it seems to include the last dispensation, or all the times from the first to the second coming of the Messiah.

The reader will please consider the following passages: Gen. 49:1; Isaiah 2:2; Micah 4:1; Acts 2:17; 2 Tim. 3:1; James 5:3; Heb. 1:2; 2 Pet. 3:3—from which he will perceive that it represents not only the last days of the Jewish state, but also the gospel age. We have the phrase "*last time*" and "*last times*" on four occasions. 1 Peter 1:5, 20; 1 John 2:18; Jude 18, confined to the times from the manifestation of Jesus to His second coming. *We live in "the perilous times of the last days"*—"the times of scoffers"—of antichrists, and not in that period of the last times when the mountain of the Lord's house is to be exalted above the hills, when all nations shall form one communion, and wars exist no more.

The last days, or times, therefore, include the whole period from the first to the second coming of the Messiah—both the good and bad times—the ordinary and extraordinary times of the gospel dispensation: I say, they include all these times, but do not always refer to the whole period, nor exclusively to that period; and therefore, must always be understood with reference to the subject before the speaker.—"*Millennial Harbinger*," 1835, p. 122.

----- "OBSERVE THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES"

Those who have read my discussion with Bishop Purcell will be struck with the similarity of the views contained in it on the seventh chapter of Daniel, with those recently expressed by the learned Professor Gaussen, of Geneva. The only difference between the Professor and myself is, whether the Man of Sin is to continue till the second coming of the Lord, or to be consumed by the bright displays of his indignation providentially administered. With the

old Millerites the day is past—with the new Millerites it is some time in the future. We look for sudden and extraordinary events, worthy of the phrase “Whom the Lord will destroy with the brightness of his coming”—events, indeed, worthy of such a representation. Let Christians closely observe the signs of the times.—*Millennial Harbinger*, 1844, pp. 394-405

MILLENNIUM FUTURE

No kingdom of this world has yet become a kingdom of Christ. * * * When Christianity gains the throne, Jesus Christ will place it there himself; and wherever he sets up his throne, from that place shall go forth the law adapted to his subjects in their triumphant state. * * * But till Jesus appears in the clouds of heaven, his cause and people can never gain the ascendancy. * * * But this state of things is not to survive the message of the angel of an everlasting gospel. He appears as a harbinger of the millennium.”—*Millennial Harbinger*, 1833, p. 119.

THE KINGDOM IN SUPERLATIVE DEGREE

But there is the superlative as well as the comparative degree. A more illustrious day is yet in prospect—a day when it shall be said, “Rejoice over her, you holy Apostles and Prophets, for God has avenged you on her!”—a day on which an angel shall proclaim, “The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord!”—a day on which it shall be sung, “The kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven is given to the people of the Most High, and all people shall serve and obey him!” This will be a day of gladness only to be surpassed by the joys of the resurrection.—From Fourth of July oration, Pittsburg, 1830.

CAMPBELL ON THE NEW BIRTH

The Christian is not born of water alone, nor of the Spirit alone; but born of water and of the spirit; and in this sense only politically, or with reference to an earthly state of kingdom.—(1855)

We need not marvel that the God of all grace, after having sent His Son into our world to become a sacrifice for us—to die for our sins, and to rise again for our justification—should have instituted faith in Him, in His death, burial and resurrection, as a means of a perfect reconciliation to himself, commanding us not only to cherish this faith in our hearts, but to exhibit it by a visible death to sin; a burial with Christ to sin, and rising again to walk a new life, expressed and symbolized by an immersion in water into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; not as a work of righteousness, but as a mere confession of our faith in what He did for us, and of our fixed purpose to walk in Him. . . .

Baptism is, therefore, no work of law, no moral duty, no moral righteousness, but a simple putting on of Christ and placing ourselves wholly in his hand and under His guidance.—*Writings of Campbell*, by W. A. Morris, p. 251.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

E. L. J.

No. 61—First Reprint of 1951

DR. BARCLAY, MILLENARIAN MISSIONARY

James T. Barclay, brilliant student and writer, who was twice the son-in-law of Alexander Campbell, was the man chosen by him, and by his brethren, to be the first missionary of the Restoration churches to Jerusalem—in fact, the first of the group to any nation in the world. In this ancient city, Barclay lived and labored, read and wrote, for a period of years.

His prolix and famous book about Jerusalem, "City of The Great King" (621 pages), was published from Philadelphia by James Challen and Sons in 1858. In this great work, Barclay describes Jerusalem under three tense-heads, "As It Was," "As It Is," and "As It Is To Be." We intend to reprint a portion of his last chapter in an early issue.

There followed his series on Israel and Prophecy in the **Millennial Harbinger** of 1861, from which our Barclay reprint for this issue is extracted. Still later, running through the year 1867 in the **Harbinger**, another series was presented, and from these articles also we hope to reprint a sample portion. The Barclay extracts will accordingly take up our space for the first quarter of the current year.

In presenting the series for 1861 to the **Harbinger** readers, Campbell published an Introduction full of high praise and commendation of the author, though he was (as the reprints will reveal) a decided and out-spoken "millenarian." The business of "marking" and dividing over this issue is manifestly a modern thing; and may God have mercy upon those who introduced the practice—and upon us all!

We offer now the Campbell introduction, and the Barclay reprint, which latter the reader may wish to compare with a former brief extract which appeared on page 23 of the 1945 F. F. pamphlet.—ELJ

Campbell's Introduction to the Barclay Article

We invite the especial attention of our readers to the series of articles on the prophetic teachings concerning the Jews, which we commence in this number, and which will be continued through the Volume of 1861. They are from the pen of our gifted Brother Barclay, missionary to Jerusalem. The subject is one of deep and abiding interest to the hopeful Christian heart, and we feel assured that it will be treated not only with much originality of illustration and freshness of thought, but also from a standing point calculated to throw around the subject a deep and exciting interest.

The signs of the times are surely portentous, and all meditative spirits cannot but long to look into the deep significance of the long unfulfilled but yet sure words of prophecy, to see if they give us any fore-shadowings of that which is soon to come. The cry comes up from the waiters, watchers, "Watchman, what of the night?" and who is able to read the mysterious pointings upon the dial-face? We feel that the Providence of God is moving fearfully among the nations, and stand in awe before the mighty portents which rise up year after year, so threateningly, in the pathway of his wrath. We have already promised to furnish our readers with the results of our own reflections on this sublime subject, and will, the Lord willing, keep it constantly before mind and heart, for their benefit. Let us search diligently, what manner of times are coming upon us."—A. C., **Millennial Harbinger**, 1860, p. 716.

WELFARE OF THE WORLD BOUND UP IN THE DESTINY OF ISRAEL

Present conditions of Israel in his Land, contrasted with their former and future condition—Their Restoration, Resumption, Nationalization and ennoblement as chief of nations.

That the children of Israel are predestined to be restored to their Fatherland is sufficiently obvious from scores of passages—far too numerous for insertion in this brief essay. Let it suffice, therefore, to cite only a few comprehensive ones—such as will best meet the objections alleged against a literal restoration: i.e., that all such passages either refer to the restoration from Babylon, or must be construed *spiritually*. In order to economize room, they are cited without note or comment, farther than that indicated by italicizing, or by an occasional bracketed remark:

- I. Ezek. 37:21-28—(Quoted).
- II. Isa. 11:11-12—(Quoted).
- III. Jer. 31:27-34 and 38-40—(Quoted).
- IV. Jer. 32:37-42—(Quoted).
- V. Jer. 33:7-9—(Quoted).
- VI. Ez. 36:11—(Quoted).
- VII. Amos 9:11-15—(Quoted).

Many passages might be quoted, showing miraculous interposition in accomplishing the closing stages of the restoration. Now, no miraculous power having been called into requisition at the first restoration (that from Babylon) all such passages must of course refer to a restoration yet future. The same may be said also of such as mention the permanent emancipation of Israel, and the subjugation of their enemies, in connection with the restoration; and of such passages also as couple their return with the advent of Christ, the millennium, or a state of sinlessness. But why multiply proof of that which is already self evident! for if a yet future restoration is not unmistakably taught in these various passages, what language could possibly be used that would convey the idea?

It is most obvious from the Scriptures that there are two phases or stages of the restoration—the one partial and initiatory, consisting of the House of Judah mainly, the other full and complete, consisting exclusively (almost) of the House of Israel; the former effected by human instrumentality, without any special act of divine interposition, the latter accompanied by tremendous display of divine power. It is of course with the former alone that we have any concern.

That Israel, thus territorially reinstated, is to be also politically reestablished and completely re-enfranchised, is sufficiently obvious from the declarations of the Lord, already cited: "I will settle **you** after your old estates, and do better unto you than at your beginning"; and "I will make them one nation in the land, upon the mountains of Israel, and one king shall be king to them all." (Ezek. 37:22). To the same effect is the prophecy of Isaiah (1:26): "I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning." But the fact is still more obviously indicated by Zechariah, in the twelfth and fourteenth chapters of his prophecy, who shows them to be regularly organized as a nation, under governors of their own, when the confederated nations invest the city. With

equal explicitness is the same fact shown by Ezekiel (chapters 38, 39) in describing the same invasion. * * *

* * * "For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea those nations shall be utterly wasted." (Isa. 60:12). —J. T. Barclay, *Millennial Harbinger*, 1861, pp. 6-14.

CONVERSION OF ISRAEL

God hath not cast off his people — All Israel destined to be saved; but not while dwelling amongst the Gentiles — Testimony of prophets and apostles — Distinct stages of the Restoration
The Jews return unregenerate.

* * * * *

This prophecy (Ezekiel 35:23-27) is alleged by many to have been fulfilled in the restoration of the Jews from Babylonia: but that this is a mistake is obvious; for it by no means relates to the *Jews*—distinctively so termed—who were the only subjects of that restoration—but to *Israel*—to Israel either as limited to the ten tribes, and contradistinguished from the *Jews*, or as comprehending the whole house of Israel and Judah, as frequently applied in the Scriptures. The first captivity of the Jews (i. e. the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, inclusive of a portion of the tribe of Levi), it will be remembered, was restricted almost entirely to Babylonia; nor were they ever literally scattered through *all* countries till the dispersion under Titus. And besides—even had it been the ten tribes instead of the two who were thus restored by Zerubbabel—most evident is it, both from sacred and profane history, that they were by no means possessed of "a new heart and a right spirit"—that they were not "cleansed from all their filthiness," nor did they "walk in God's judgments, to do them"; all of which will be the case when the restoration here spoken of shall have occurred. It is evident, therefore, from this consideration, as well as from the conclusive argument, first adduced in the "Rice Debate," based upon the true nature of "clean water," that the attempts to press this passage into the service of those who would pervert the initiatory ordinance of the kingdom of heaven, is altogether futile and absurd. * * *

If, therefore, there be any meaning in language, it is abundantly shown that it is the settled purpose of the Lord to save all Israel at some future period. And that this great and glorious conversion of Israel is consummated *mainly*, if not entirely, in the land of Israel, and not whilst they are scattered and peeled amongst the Gentiles, is sufficiently evident—though so much queried—from many entirely unambiguous passages of Scripture. It is altogether obvious from the Living Oracles that there are two distinct stages of the oncoming restoration—so distinct, indeed, both in time, circumstance and extent, that they might be termed two restorations—the one of Judah, partial and preliminary, and the other of Israel, complete and final. And it would seem that the first emigrants (almost exclusively Jews) return in an unconverted state, whilst these constituting the second

phasis (composed almost entirely of the *ten lost tribes*) would appear to contain in its ranks many who, if not fully converted, are at least deeply convicted of sin before they reach Jerusalem. It is equally obvious, also, that the one is accomplished prior to the manifestation of Christ; the other subsequently. Without a due consideration of the peculiar circumstances attending these distinct stages of the restoration, some passages of Scripture would appear quite inexplicable, if not directly contradictory; but whoever will take the pains thus rightly to divide the Word of Truth, will find no difficulty whatever in reconciling these apparently conflicting passages. And while the last stages of the restoration will be accomplished by the most astonishing manifestations of the divine interference, we have no warrant for expecting any extraordinary interposition in behalf of the earlier stages—its accomplishment being the result, alone, of ordinary motives, considerations, influences and means. But it is the first restoration alone—that of the Jews, distinctively so termed—which now claims attention: and that this class of immigrants resettle their country in an unconverted state is sufficiently obvious from a consideration of the following references:

Hosea 3:4, 5—(He quotes). Here it is distinctly stated that it is after their restoration that they seek the Lord and his goodness.
 * * * * * (He quotes Isa. 59:20, 21; Isa. 45:17, 23; 46:15; 60:20).

These are only a portion of the texts that might be adduced in proof of the fact that God's ancient people, on their first exodus from the nations, are unconverted; and so remain—the *Jews*—until a period subsequent to their return; and the *Israelites* till an advanced stage of their march Zionwards. But surely these are enough to convince any unprejudiced mind of the truth of the alleged fact.—J. T. Barclay, *Millennial Harbinger*, 1861, pp. 61-69.

BRINEY AND COLLIS

Two men, quoted below, from the second generation of "Restoration preachers," grew strong and became noted leaders on the "Christian Church" side of the Movement. Both were "post-millennial" in their earlier years, and both changed their minds upon more mature study. These men were J. B. Briney and Mark Collis. Briney is gone; Collis is still living, or was at last report, almost a hundred years old. Three years ago the Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York paid him the death-benefit amount of his own life insurance policy, explaining that he had out-lived their mortality tables. He was for years the minister of Broadway Christian church, in Lexington, Ky., and has since been known among them as "minister emeritus."

Twenty years ago J. H. McWhirter published letters from Briney and Collis in the *Illinois Christian* (issue of Sept. 15, 1931) on these lines, and they are reproduced here as the testimony of these two noted men:

J. B. Briney's Letter

"As to whether the Savior will return to earth before or after the millennium, my views have undergone a change in recent years. In my younger days, when my enthusiasm dominated my judgment, I thought the Gospel would convert the people and bring in the millennium, at the close of which the Lord would come. But experience, observation, and a more careful study of the Scriptures have convinced me that I was wrong, and that the Master will come to introduce the millennium and personally reign on earth during that period. Possibly I may have something to say in *The Standard* on the subject in the near future."

—J. B. Briney (to J. H. McWhirter, Dec. 14, 1925).

Mark Collis' Letter

"Dear Brother McWhirter: My mind, like that of Brother Briney, has undergone a change with regard to the time of our Lord's return. I believe now that it will be before the millennium. To me it looks as if the signs of that great event are very plain. I am slow to undertake the interpretation of unfulfilled prophecy, but it looks as if Zechariah 14:1-3 points forward to the coming of the Savior when all seems to be lost."—Mark Collis (to J. H. McWhirter, Dec. 26, 1926).

McGARVEY, ON THE JEWS AND THEIR LAND

There is every reason to believe that as prosperity revisits the land and it is revived from the ruin which has long brooded over it, its former inhabitants and owners will be among the first to re-people it. Natural causes, directed by the hand of Providence, may yet bring about that return of its Jewish population which seems to be demanded by many predictions in the Word of God."—*Lands of the Bible*, Edition of 1881, p. 79.

"When Israel shall have been restored to the land of promise, and the people shall all become believers in their own Messiah, and all the nations of the earth shall have been blessed through the seed of Abraham, they will be the most grateful and happy people on the face of the globe."—*Christian Standard*. (1903, page 696.)

"It is a matter of common knowledge that J. W. McGarvey was one of the ablest Bible scholars of his time."—B. C. Goodpasture, in *Gospel Advocate*, 1940, p. 556.

THE DEVIL BOUND

The Bible plainly says that he [Satan] was not bound when Paul, Peter, John and James wrote to these churches. If he was not bound then, I can see no reason for thinking he is bound now.—C. W. Sewell, *Christian Leader*, Nov. 25, 1913.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 62

As announced last month, the Barclay articles on Prophecy, Israel, and the Millennium continue in this department. At least another installment from this brilliant writer is yet to be printed—perhaps two or three more. As we read the Barclay Postscript, concerning the dearth of prophetic literature, and his earnest wish for a better supply among disciples, we rejoiced in our opportunities and thanked God for the privilege of adding “Faith of Our Fathers” to the meager list.

The present reprint is lifted from the 1867 series in *Millennial Harbinger*. In presenting this series, W. K. Pendleton, then editor of *The Harbinger*, wrote:

We are gratified to announce a new and most interesting feature in this volume. Our beloved brother J. T. Barclay will give us a series of articles on prophecy. We need not say that but few living men have had equal opportunities for studying this subject, and none have improved them better. For many years our resident missionary at Jerusalem, and ardently devoted to the study of prophecy, he brings to its discussion the rarest advantages, and will be able to give a charm to its investigation, which but few, if any men of the age, could impart.—W. K. P.

PROPHECY

Dr. J. T. Barclay

“Believest thou the Prophets?”

“The wise shall understand.”

I.

To popularize prophecy—in the hope of attracting to it that measure of attention to which the momentous interests involved so justly entitle it—is the special object of a few articles I propose writing upon the subject, in which I shall attempt to exhibit the importance and obligation of its study, refute the objections that have been so inconsiderately and injuriously urged against it, remove the prejudice thus engendered, harmonize the principles of prophetic hermeneutics, and otherwise endeavor to stimulate its study and facilitate its apprehension.

Fully assured that the fast ripening purposes of Him who is at once “his own Interpreter” and the all-wise Disposer of all events, are at least sufficiently unfolded by his gracious providence to enable us to “scan his work and make it plain,” an effort will be made, in humble reliance upon the Divine guidance and blessing, to present such a view of the matter as may suffice, however compendious, so to represent the subject as to enlist the interest and assist the investigation of any one sincerely inquiring after truth; and, if not to arouse the dormant conscience of the scoffer, at least to arrest the attention of the heedless and apathetic. Allow me to remark, however, that I am neither an alarmist nor a thaumaturgist.

For if it be true, as is most confidently believed by some of the most eminent students of prophecy, that we are already entering upon that eventful era of knowledge and power known in prophetic terminology as “the time of the end,” when the consumption decreed

shall overflow with righteousness, it is undeniably true that what was, but a few years ago, "shut up and sealed" by special prophetic embargo, may now be satisfactorily explicable—the seal of mystery being thus removed by the unerring hand of Providence—for thus it is written: "But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words and seal the book even to the time of the end; many shall run to and fro, and *knowledge shall be increased*" (Dan. 12:4); as says also another revealing angel—addressing the writer of the most obscure of all the prophecies, from the anticipated standpoint of the present day; "*Seal not the sayings of this book; for the time is at hand*" (Rev. 22:10).

Much prejudice, as well as apathy, it is well known, operates, most unfortunately, to negative the study of Prophecy in general, and especially the Apocalypse; and not only so, but it is a subject actually tabooed in many a pulpit and religious journal; and yet, most truthfully has it been observed of the Book of Revelation, (confessedly one of the most symbolical and recondite of all the prophetic oracles) that "even if one does not understand the first and most immediate history of its explanation, it is a book for all hearts and all times. It contains the essence of Christianity and of worldly history. . . . It is a book of instruction and comfort for all the churches among whom Christ walks, even when the uneducated do not understand the learned explanation of it." And truly no better sedative of unhallowed ambition, nor antidote to worldly-mindedness, could be devised than this divine catholicon for pining Zion—a balm for so large a portion of the ailments to which humanity is heir. As a lamp to the feet and a light to the path of the benighted traveler, so is this blessed volume of illumination to the pathway of the weary pilgrim wending his way amid the mazes of this wilderness world—a never failing ground of faith and hope amid all the trials of God's people in all ages—such is the sure word of prophecy whereunto we "do well to take heed, as a light that shineth in a dark place." How, then, can we declare the whole counsel of God, as ministers thoroughly furnished unto every good word and work, without assigning a suitable place to prophecy in "preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ"!

Most appropriately observes the late erudite Professor of Sacred Literature in Andover Theological Seminary, Moses Stewart, in his learned work on the Apocalypse. (and it is to a due appreciation of this sentiment, under the circumstances alluded to, that I may ascribe the ineffable joy I have derived from the study of prophecy): "All that hope or fear can do in the way of operating upon the minds of men to encourage them to persevere in a course of holy life, and to dissuade from opposition to God and the purposes of his redeeming grace, seems to be held forth by the Apocalypse. No book in all the Bible can, on the whole, and when rightly understood, be regarded as exceeding it in respect to adaptedness for making impressions of such a salutary nature. If the human mind can

be affected (and who will deny that it is most deeply affected) by hope and fear, the highest point to which the agency of these principles can be carried is attained by the writer of the Revelation. Above all, the Apocalypse when rightly understood, should be the *vade mecum* of such as go forth to publish a Savior's name amongst the heathen. Surrounded by those who are servants of the powers of darkness, discouraged perhaps by small success, and disheartened by the strength of superstition, and by zeal for bloody and foolish rites and ceremonies which pervades all around them, the faithful missionary may read with tears of joy the precious promises so often held out in the book before us—promises of the universal triumph of truth and love over all the opposition of error and malignity; and when he lights upon the soul-reviving assurances of the Savior, that 'he will surely come,' his heart may respond, like that of the Apocalyptic seer, 'Amen, even so, come Lord Jesus, come quickly.' . . . As I have said before, I say again, that I know of no book in all the scriptures which contains matter adapted to higher moral excitement than the Apocalypse."

For the same high estimate of prophecy the weight of such names as those of Sir Francis Bacon, John Locke, Sir Isaac Newton, his successor Whiston, the great Mathematician, and hosts of the wisest and best men that have ever adorned the annals of time may be appropriately adduced as corroborative testimony. And what saith He who spake as never man spake?—what is *His* estimate of the value attaching to the study of prophecy? Let it be inferred from what his great revealing apostle declares in his brief introduction to the Apocalypse: "Blessed is he that readeth and they that hear the words of this prophecy and keep those things which are written therein"; but especially from his ample endorsement of John's declaration, "These things are faithful and true; blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book." Nor should the reproof so pungently administered to two of his disciples when on a certain occasion they manifested an ignorance of prophecy, "O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken," be lost upon us.

Surely then it is permitted to us—be the adverse opinion of some of our fellow-creatures what it may—to investigate these high and holy mysteries, as saith the prophet, "If ye will inquire, inquire ye," for "those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of the Law." Assuredly then the study of prophecy is legitimate and allowable, let who will maintain the reverse; and not only allowable and proper, but commendable and important: hence its obligation! a duty, however, arising not only from its importance, but negatively from the culpableness of its neglect.

To no book whatever [as the book of Revelation] attaches so signally the stamp of a Divine origin; and hence it is affirming but

little to aver that though we may not attain to the full assurance of faith in all things, it is both profitable, and intelligible to a most encouraging extent. But, there being no "royal road" or privileged way of access to the arcana of prophecy—however much obstacles may be removed and facilities afforded—if we would intelligently understand these heavenly mysteries, we must adopt the practice of the *noble* Bereans, and search the Scriptures—the *prophetic* Scriptures, as they did daily—*diligently searching* as for hidden treasure.

The reason why so many have derived but little benefit from the study of prophecy, is, doubtless, that they have examined the subject so superficially. Let geometry be studied with as little care as many bestow upon prophecy, and the student will never pass over "pons asinorum" of Euclid's Elements. Let it be especially borne in mind, however, for our consolation and encouragement, that the blessing consequent on a due attention to prophecy is not made upon a full comprehension of its glorious mysteries; but is most graciously promised "to him that *readeth*," and keepeth (in mind, as the word simply means) those things that are written therein."

That the investigation of prophetic truth should possess no charms for the giddy worldling, the self-satisfied formalist, and even for the truly converted that are *at ease in Zion*, complacently lending a listening ear to the siren song of pleasure, is not so very strange; for

"Sounds *prophetic* are too rough to suit
Ears long accustomed to the pleasing lute."

But that any who profess, enjoy, and manifest the religion of Christ should slight the spirit of prophecy which is the testimony of Jesus, is matter of profound surprise; and still more astonishing is it that those whose characteristic, *distinctive* motto it is to "*prove all things*," should be guilty of slurring over the admonitory injunction with which this all-comprehensive precept is introduced to our notice—"Despise Not Prophecyings"—prophecyings too about "times and seasons" about which there is no need that one be ignorant.

It may wound our denominational pride a little to be told that though we profess to "*prove all things*," we "yet lack one thing" of transcendent interest, so long as we neglect the cultivation of prophecy; yet confessedly the charge is *just*, however mortifying. For most evident is it that without the parapets, copings and turrets of prophecy on the wall of our Zion now so long joined all around, and built up so high, too much are these revived walls of primeval Christianity like those of Jerusalem at a certain stage of the great Jewish Reformation. These, it will be remembered, were then reared up only half their required height, despite the superhuman efforts of that great Reformer, the pious Tirshatha of the Holy City—striking type of the great Reformation of the present age so happily accomplished by that greatest and best of all men and reformers in all post-apostolic times, whose long-cherished intention it was, as so often announced in his "Harbinger," but unavoidably post-

poned from time to time, till too late, to devote much of his remaining energies to the elaboration of these soul-engrossing themes—the contemplation of which, as his end approached, afforded his capacious soul such rapturous delight. And although the height to which we have reared the wall enables us successfully to set at defiance the united efforts of all the Sanballats, Tobias, and Gashmus of Samaria, Philistia, and Babylon; yet it must be admitted that for want of these bulwarks and towers of watchmen and seers we are unable to “view the landscape o’er” from these lofty stand-points—as it is equally our duty, our interest and our honor to rear and occupy, that we may the better see the King in his beauty and the land that is afar off.

Candor extorts the confession that as a people we seem to look too exclusively for growth in grace and establishment in the faith to the New Testament Scriptures, whereas it is most evident that the primitive saints were *jointly* “established according to the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret since the world began, and *by the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the everlasting God made known to all nations for the obedience of faith.*” Well spake good king Jehoshaphat therefore to self-reliant Israel: “Believe in the Lord your God, so shall you be established: believe his prophets, so shall ye prosper;” and to the same effect also Isaiah testifies: “If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established.” He then that would be firmly established in the faith, hope and love required in the Scriptures must make the *prophets* as well as the apostles, his bosom companions and the men of his counsel.

How my cheeks burned with the crimson of sympathizing shame when I heard, on a certain occasion, a learned D. D. remark complacently that he knew “no more about prophecy than an unborn babe!” But still more was I shocked and scandalized at the declaration of one of our brethren, unblushingly averring that he knew “no more about prophecy than a horse does!” Is it not a significant fact, strongly addressing itself to our hopes and fears, that the great Prophet and Teacher never displayed more indignation against those self-satisfied religionists of his day than when they *despised prophesyings*, and were consequently unable to “discern the signs of the times;” nor does he ever seem to have evinced more displeasure towards his disciples than when they were “Slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken.”

But—hoping to speak more directly to the point hereafter—let these few desultory remarks suffice, by way of preface, proem, and apology, in thus undertaking to advocate this important yet obscure subject in the *Millennial Harbinger*—a journal, by the way, whose very name seems to involve the necessity of discussing such themes—not only for consistency’s sake, in consonance with its significant title, but still more appropriately, in accordance with the demands of the age and the signs of the times.

P. S. Just as I had finished writing the foregoing lines, a brother came in, and asked me if I would not like to look at his "prophetic paper,"—stating that he has always been fond of prophecy; and that inasmuch as we have no such productions of our own he was compelled to patronize the works of some one or more of the sectarian denominations.

Now this reminds me that I am cognizant of many such cases. I have also occasion to know that some of these brethren evince a very strong inclination to take leave of us and cast in their lot amongst those who feel more interest in what so deeply interests them, than we do as a religious community. And I am likewise fully persuaded that there are many amongst the various religious communities around us who would gladly unite with us did we but give to prophetic subjects that attention to which, in their estimation at least, it is so justly entitled. All the greater is the shame, therefore, that we have no prophetic literature of our own, except a few occasional essays in some of our serials. I remember, however, with pleasure, that altho' we have no such systematic, standard works, nor even a single permanent volume devoted to that subject, that Prof. Milligan, some years ago wrote quite a number of short and well-digested articles on the subject—very good in the main—which, I doubt not, it would be conferring a decided benefit to the brotherhood were he to give them to us in an extended and permanent form. The brotherhood is also indebted to Bro. Lard's able pen for at least two very interesting articles on the Millennium, which would well bear publication in pamphlet form, and handsomely repay perusal. Both of these contributions, and perhaps many others of which I have no knowledge, would serve a valuable purpose, both in gratifying an already existing want and in awakening a latent and innate taste for prophetic exposition—that food of the soul for which there is naturally such a hungering and thirsting; for well has it been observed by an eminent writer, that "Besides the pleasure derived from acquired knowledge, there lurks in the mind of man, and tinged with a shade of sadness, an unsatisfied longing for something beyond the present—a striving toward regions as yet unknown and unopened. Such a sense of longing binds still faster the links which in accordance with the supreme law of our being connect the material with the ideal world, and animates the mysterious relation existing between that which the mind receives from without and that which it reflects from its own depths to the external world."—From *Millennial Harbinger*, 1867, pp. 30-36.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 63

From the brilliant restoration student and writer, Dr. J. T. Barclay, we present now, in two installments, the last chapter from his book, “City of the Great King.” This beautiful volume was printed by Lippincotts, for James Challen and Sons of Philadelphia, in 1858—eight years before Campbell, Barclay’s famous father-in-law, passed away.

JERUSALEM—AS IT IS TO BE

Jas. T. Barclay

“Glorious things are spoken of thee, O City of God!”

MILLENNIAL JERUSALEM

Mene, mene, tekel, upharsin, was the terrible verdict denounced alike against the empire of the Chaldees, its haughty monarch, and its mighty capital, “the beauty of the Chaldees’ excellency”; and upon many a splendid city of antiquity has “Ichabod” been written: but of *Jerusalem*, Jehovah says, “I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands: thy walls are continually before me: I will make thee an eternal excellency.” We accordingly find that however often doomed to utter destruction by her merciless spoilers and subverters, Phoenix-like, she has always risen from her ashes in due time. For the same Almighty Being that not only suffered these chastisements to be inflicted upon the Holy City, but declares in judgment for her sins—“I will make Jerusalem heaps and a den of dragons—Zion shall be ploughed like a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the House like the high places of the forest,” also declares in fulfillment of his inscrutable decree, “because they call thee an outcast—saying, This is Zion, whom no man seeketh after, behold, I will bring again the captivity of Jacob’s tents, and have mercy on his dwelling-places, and the city shall be builded upon her own heap, and the palace shall remain after the manner thereof”—“it shall not be plucked up nor thrown down *for ever*.”

It is strongly intimated in this comprehensive promise, that the city would not only be fully restored, but be built up according to her ancient land-marks. And that such a reëdification was literally accomplished under those great reformers and restorers, Ezra, Zerubabel, and Nehemiah, we have abundant evidence in the memoirs of the admirable Tirshatha, and the zealous Scribe. But the same Divine Being who so graciously promised its restoration, is pledged also for its enlargement beyond its ancient boundaries. And to any one at all acquainted with the history of Jerusalem and the topography of the city and its environs, the truth of this declaration will abundantly appear from the following explanatory paraphrase of the prophetic text recorded Jer. xxxi 38-40 (quoted).

And to this permanence and prosperity of the Holy City throughout the Millennium, Zechariah also abundantly testifies in the last chapter of prophecy—10th verse: “And it shall be lifted up and inhabited in her place, from Benjamin’s Gate unto the place of the First Gate, unto the Corner; and from the Tower of Hananeel unto

the King's Wine Press." The land-marks here indicated seem expressly designed to mark out the ancient capital of the Jewish kings, and purposely exclude much of Coenopolis—the large addition made by the apostate Jews under Agrippa. . . .

The adaptation of the Temple and courts described by Ezekiel to the Temple Mount at least, is attended with no special difficulty—and certainly requires no such reduction as that proposed [to change the text, substituting cubits for reeds, in some passages]. The area of Mount Moriah is abundantly adequate to the accommodation of the projected Temple and all its courts. And there is certainly no kind of objection to the enclosure of the whole city within the five hundred reeds quadrilateral, constituting the boundary between the sanctuary and the profane place—provided, at least, that it be remodeled and inhabited only by the Prince, the Priest, Levites, etc., in attendance on the Temple service.

But while the exterior enclosure of the sanctuary described by Ezekiel is so much more extended than those of the former Temples, the sacred fane itself, as well as the other corresponding structures, is but slightly larger. Their respective dimensions indeed are generally identical as far as recorded; but it must be remembered that the cubit used by "the man" in measuring Ezekiel's Temple is the "greater cubit"—being 21.648 inches in length, while the measurements of the other Temple were given in the "common cubit" of eighteen inches—shorter than the former by a hand-breadth, which is rated at nearly four inches. (Ezek. xl. 5, and xliii. 13.) And besides this discrepancy in size, there is also a considerable dissimilarity in the internal arrangements. In the former temple there were four courts—that of the Priests, that of Israel, that of the Women, and that of the Gentiles: whereas in the Ezekiel Temple there are only two mentioned—the Inner and the Outer or "Utter court." But there are many points of difference between the Ezekiel or Millennial Temple, and the old Jewish Temple in any of its former phases—all going to show a modified ritual adapted to the Millennial age.

That this Temple is not, to be erected before the final advent of the Messiah is obvious from the declaration of the Lord by Zechariah (vi. 12), "Behold the Man whose name is the Branch; and he shall grow up out of his place, and *He* shall build the Temple of the Lord." . . .

This great city—Yehovah Shammah—is a square of ten and a fourth miles on each side, inclusive of its suburbs; half a mile wide, and occupies the exact middle of this portion. . . .

If "the living waters that go out from Jerusalem," as recorded in the fourteenth chapter of the prophecy of Zechariah, be identical with the waters described by Ezekiel in the twelve first verses of the 48th chapter of this prophecy, as issuing from the Temple (and they undoubtedly are), then must the Temple be built upon its ancient foundations in the Holy City. And that the city is to be rebuilt upon its ancient site (and if not under the very meters and bounds

that described it at the period of its subversion by Nebuchadnezzar, at least as extensively), is also evident. (Jer. xxxi. 38-40, and Zech. xiv. 10.) That the "very high mountain," on the south of which the prophet saw the future city in vision, can be no other than Jebel Fureidis (that celebrated signal station in days of yore), is sufficiently obvious from a consideration of the fact that there is no other mountain in all southern Palestine to which this expression could apply with the least propriety. A circumstance strongly corroborative of this conclusion, too, is found in the fact that this mountain is situated just on the northern border of the belt of country that is to be levelled "as a plain—from Geba to Rimmon, south of Jerusalem." And for what purpose is this rugged region to be reduced to an even surface, but as a site for the vast millennial city—Jehovah Shammah!

This city of cities will cover an area of more than a hundred square miles, and will number its inhabitants by millions. It can be rendered very accessible by a short railway from Al Arish, Askalon, or perhaps still better—Gaza—reputed the very best seaport on all the coast of Syria; and the construction of a railroad to Ezion Geber, Solomon's celebrated seaport at the head of the Elanetic branch of the Red Sea, is also entirely practicable at a small cost. The commerce of the East once flowed mainly through a channel almost identical in position with the route here indicated, between the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean; and it is doubtless destined again to become the great highway of trade and travel between the East and the West. Such a city, in such a climate, in a position so advantageous in a civil, commercial, and geographical point of view, might well claim to be the mistress of the world, when Judea shall have again become inhabited by its rightful owners.—But still it is to its neighbor, a few miles to the north—the City of the Great King—the joy of the whole earth—that this supremacy is assigned in the coming age by Him who is Governor among the nations—the King of kings and Lord of lords.

We learn from the prophecy of Zechariah (xiv. 8), that at the coming of the Lord two most copious perennial streams of water shall burst forth from Jerusalem—one going forth towards the Mediterranean or "hinder sea," and the other towards the "former" or Dead Sea—developed apparently by the great earthquake. And as this earthquake that shall rend Mount Olivet asunder and produce a "very great valley" running eastward, apparently for the purpose of conveying one of the life-giving streams to the parched desert below, will probably effect other physical changes in the immediate neighborhood of Jerusalem, as well as in the depression of the land from Geba to Rimmon, it will be useless to speculate as to the course the western stream will pursue—though it would seem from the 3d chapter of Joel, 8th verse, in connection with the declaration of Ezekiel (xlvii. 1-12), that the course of the eastern river is very definitely marked out, though there is no valley in the neighborhood of Jerusalem known at the present day by the name there designated—

Shittim. Wady Anak-Nazal, however would seem to be indicated as the most natural channel, and may originally have been called Shittim.

We are not informed *where* the healing stream bifurcates—if indeed there be only *one* source of the waters—or in what part of the Temple enclosure, or of the city, the second fountain arises—if there be *two* distinct sources. Ezekiel only measures and describes *one*; but Zechariah clearly indicates the existence of two, and inasmuch as that which flows eastward arises on the east of the Holy House, that which flows westwardly probably arises west of that building. If so, it must necessarily fall into the Tyropoeon, and if left to itself, would naturally be carried down Wady en-Nair into the Dead Sea, unless it be conducted out of it eastwardly by an aqueduct, or else the earthquake divert it in the same direction either by opening a new channel or by blocking up, or elevating some portion of the present Wady en-Nair. It would be perfectly practicable, with very little labor, to conduct a stream issuing from the Temple area to the region of the future Jehovah Shammah by a short serpentine canal conformed to the requirements of the ground about the upper portions of the Tyropoeon, Mount Zion, Hinnom, etc.—situated as the ground now is. This western stream may thus readily be conducted to the great city, and thence, after irrigating a large portion of the arid region of southern Judea, enter the Mediterranean at el-*Arish*, or by any of the numerous valleys that empty into the Mediterranean. We have no positive information as to the size of *this* river; but, if it be as large as that emptying into the Dead Sea, it may be rendered very serviceable not only for irrigation of a large district of country, but for internal boat navigation. If it be true that the desert of Arabia was once an inland sea or lake, and is still depressed below the level of the sea, may it not be re-filled either from the sea or by this river? It will be recollected that while Jerusalem is 3927 feet above the Dead Sea, its elevation above the Mediterranean is only 2610 feet; and that Jehovah Shammah will be much more depressed.

The waters that issue out eastward seem to undergo no increase in passing from the altar through the surrounding buildings, nor perhaps for a farther distance of six hundred yards; but at this point, at the least, the fountain becomes a stream ankle-deep; twelve hundred yards from the sanctuary it becomes knee-deep, at a distance of eighteen hundred yards it is found to be loin-deep; and when it is last measured, at a distance of two thousand four hundred yards (more than one and a third miles) from the wall of the sanctuary (by which time it has passed through the cleft in Mount Olivet), it has become more than chin-deep—"risen waters to swim in, a river that could not be passed over." Whether the river becomes still deeper, and what is its width, we are not informed; but it is probable that it receives no further increment. Its gradual augmentation thus far, at regular intervals of one-third of a mile, seems to be due to sub-

terranean accessions received from the rent bowels of Mount Olivet *

Should this river rush immediately down this valley into the Dead Sea, it would produce a succession of rapids, cascades, and cataracts unequalled in all the world; for the distance being only about fifteen or twenty miles, and the difference of altitude nearly four thousand feet, the rate of descent could not be less than an average of two hundred feet per mile, or one foot in twenty-six— a fall of four thousand feet in twenty miles! while the entire fall in the Mississippi, throughout its whole course of two thousand miles, is only fifteen hundred and seventy-five feet! What inconceivable power for the propulsion of machinery! What teeming luxuriance must crown the banks of this fertilizing and vivifying stream, and especially if the waters be made to meander along the declivities of the once frightful barren and desolate desert! How surpassing beautiful the evergreen landscape in which this life-giving river sweetly meanders—where “grow all trees for meat whose leaf fadeth not, neither shall the fruit thereof be consumed—bringing forth new fruit according to his months—the fruit thereof for meat and the leaf thereof for medicine!” (xlv. 12.) Then indeed will “the wilderness and the solitary place be glad, and the desert rejoice and blossom as the rose!” These are the gladdening waters of which the exulting Psalmist spoke in vision—“There is a river the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God, the Holy Place of the tabernacles of the Most High.” (Ps. xlv. 4.)

We are not positively told that the waters issuing to the west will possess those wondrous properties that characterize the eastern river; but it is altogether a legitimate inference, that they will be similarly endowed. And if on the banks of this refreshing and fructifying stream, adorned with those health-imparting and life-giving trees, the Highway of Holiness shall lead from Yehovah Shammah to the Holy City and Temple, through the desert of Tekoah, thus really become “an house of prayer for all nations,” what a paradisaical avenue would conduct the millennial pilgrim up to the House of the Lord! Thus shall “the ransomed of the Lord return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads!”

* It is a little singular that on descending a few yards below the surface of the earth, amongst some riven rocks, in a valley called Wady Anak Nazal, leading up to Mount Olivet, opposite Jerusalem, one may hear the faint ripple of a subterranean stream. By-the-bye, may not this **Nazal** have some connection with the “Azal” to which the “valley of the mountains” is to extend? (See Zech. xiv. 5.) The transition from Azal to Nazal is by no means too violent for a Hebrew name to undergo in the mouth of an Arab. And besides— as the valley takes its name from an **ain** or fountain on its border, the **n** may properly belong to the **ain**, and the difficulty in distinctly separating the **n** from the **a** in pronunciation, may have led to its permanent connection; but be this as it may, it is situated due east of Jerusalem in the precise direction indicated by the prophet. The traveler going down to Jericho will pass this valley about two miles below Ain el Horth (the Apostles’ Fount), where it enters into Wady el Horth—written el Haud on some maps.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 64

JERUSALEM—AS IT IS TO BE

II.

James T. Barclay

Great as are the temporal blessings of the Millennial age, greater by far are its spiritual blessings. Satan being then bound, and the evidence of the Lord's presence ever before their eyes, who can form even the faintest conception of the blessedness and splendor of the glorious era when the whole earth shall be filled with the knowledge of "the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea!" For "wisdom and knowledge shall be the stability of thy times and the strength of salvation."

The waters of the Dead Sea would not only be "healed," but doubtless much increased in depth and extended in length: for the latter rain being also fully restored would form in concurrence with these copious waters, far more than a counterbalance to the evaporation by which this mysterious sheet of water is now restricted to its narrow limits; and being walled in by perpendicular cliffs towering to the height of one or two thousand feet on each side, while its breadth would not be much increased, its length must necessarily be greatly extended—particularly towards the south. It would seem, even from existing indications, that its length was formerly much greater than at present. And such a copious accession would doubtless cause its permanent outflow to the Red Sea—thus effectually sweeping away its bitter waters.

Very considerable geological changes will doubtless be produced by the great convulsions that accompany the subsidence and leveling of the tract of country lying between the Mediterranean and the Dead Sea, under parallels of latitude separating Jeba and Rimmon. And one highly beneficial result, amongst many remarkable consequences of the earthquake, will, no doubt, be a literal verification of a prophecy of Isaiah (xxxv. 6, 7), that has heretofore been regarded as exclusively figurative—"in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert. And the parched ground become a pool, and the thirsty land springs." How glowingly is the prosperity of the land and nation of Israel set forth by the prophets, when Judah and Israel shall have been restored and brought in complete subjection to their prince, David—the Beloved—i. e. the Prince Messiah. (Is. lx. &c.)

But the most interesting and perhaps the most marvellous circumstance attending the Millennial condition of Jerusalem, remains yet to be mentioned. We are informed by Isaiah in the 4th chapter of his prophecy, that "when the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughter of Zion, and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof by the spirit of judgment and by the spirit of burning . . . he will create upon every dwelling-place of Mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day,

and the shining of a flame of fire by night: for upon all the glory shall be a covering. And there shall be a tabernacle for a shadow in the day-time from the heat, and for a place of refuge, and for a covert from storm and from rain" (3, 6) . . . "the Lord shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee; and the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising." (lx. 1, 3.) "The sun shall be no more thy light by day: neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee; but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory: thy sun shall no more go down, neither shall thy moon withdraw itself, for the Lord shall be thine everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended: thy people also shall be all righteous, and they shall inherit the land for ever—the branch of my planting, the work of my hands that I may be glorified: a little one shall become a thousand, and a small one a strong nation: I the Lord will hasten it in his time." (lx. 19:22.) "Moreover, the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be seven-fold in the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of their wound." (xxx. 26.) "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." (xxiv. 23.) From these passages it would appear, that when the Lord shall again record his name on "his dwelling-place in Zion"—(for "this is the hill which God desireth to dwell in—yea, the Lord will dwell in it for ever"*)—there will be a revival, on a magnificent scale, of the "Glory of the Lord" as it anciently rested over the Tabernacle in the wilderness—"a pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night"—such a manifestation of Deity, perhaps, as was once seen in Eden! May it not be to this Shechinah, thus overshadowing the Holy City as a glorious luminary canopy, that the astonishing change of climate is to be ascribed? And need any more direct divine interposition be invoked in explanation of the wonderful effects wrought on the whole vegetable and animal kingdom in relation to the fertility of the soil, the domestication of destructive monsters of the forest, the transmutation of poisonous reptiles into innocent creatures, and the prosperity, happiness, and longevity of its inhabitants. . . .

*"Thus said the Lord, heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool"; We are not, therefore, to infer from these and similar passages, that Jehovah will dwell at Jerusalem in any other manner than by delegation and the symbols of his presence. Nor do the Scriptures, rightly construed, intimate that the Savior will actually **dwell** upon the earth in **propria persona**—as contended by many—or that he will ever be seen upon earth except at Jerusalem, which, however, there is every reason to believe he will occasionally and perhaps stately visit in personal manifestations to receive the homage and adoration of his earthly subjects. The Throne of God and of the Lamb—where of course is the real seat of Divine Government—is the Heavenly Jerusalem above—the abode of the redeemed, whence, as kings and priests, and the partners of his throne, they will reign with Christ **over** the earth for ever and ever.

Has not the Lord promised, in speaking of this very matter as portrayed in the 11th chapter of Isaiah, that he will make a covenant with the beasts of the field, and the fowls of heaven, and the creeping things of the ground? (Hos. ii. 18.) There is no calculating the wonderful consequences that would inevitably result from the alteration of electrical, thermal, and magnetic agencies, to say nothing of those of celestial light from the overhanging Golden City in a meteorological and climatic point of view! And who can divine the wonderful change that will be wrought not only on man, but in the brute creation also, and indeed even in the vegetable kingdom, by the life-giving stream that flows from the oracle of God! Would it be any marvel that the carnivorous beasts should not only become herbivorous by feeding upon the vegetation growing on the banks of this marvelous water, but have their entire natures changed into something like what it probably was when Adam gave them names in the garden of Eden? If the juice of the grape when fermented is capable of producing an effect so astonishing upon man—mentally, physically, and morally—is there anything unreasonable in the supposition that the water of this river and the vegetable productions on its banks—which are not only healing but life-giving—should effect such a change even in ravenous beasts and venomous reptiles? Certainly not: *“because their waters they issue out of the sanctuary”*—a fact to which the prophet directly ascribes their wonderful properties. If the properties of the nitrous oxide (or exhilarating gas) are so different from those of the atmosphere (though formed of the same elements, and differing only in their relative proportions), why should not a slight change in the waters of the sanctuary be adequate to the production of all the effects ascribed to this Millennial *“aqua vitae”*

There is no aspect in which the Millennial age can be regarded, that is not richly suggestive of the most pleasing and profitable themes of contemplation. Satan being bound, and man brought into complete subjection to Jesus Emmanuel, the whole creation, which had hitherto groaned in travail on account of man's sin, is vocal with praise—“the times of the restitution of all things” having now arrived! Who, that has a heart to feel, can refrain from praying and laboring for “a consummation so devoutly to be wished!”

TWO LETTERS

The following is a letter written last month by the editor of this department in answer to an inquirer. As a very brief summary of a question often asked, it may be of interest to others.

Re Campbell: his concept of the MM; his attitude toward brethren who were more outrightly premillennial than himself, etc.

It has been said that Alexander Campbell could be quoted on both sides of any question! There is some truth in this, due to Campbell's constant development and life-time growth. Much depends on *when* and *where* one picks up Campbell to quote him.

His mind was continually expanding.

Only once, so far as I know, did he vigorously oppose any Premillennial writer, and that was not on the Premillennial issue proper—whether our Lord will come before or after the golden age; it was on the Throne of David question, in answer to H. T. Anderson, of Kentucky. Moreover, it was during the excitement and stir over the Miller Delusion in the early forties. On the other hand, Campbell printed, from the pen of others, volumes of prophetic teaching on Millenary lines, seldom challenging it in his paper, often commending it for honest study. He associated with himself editorially several men who were outrightly Premillennial, and who taught freely, as they pleased, in *The Harbinger*. In spirit, he was far above “drawing lines” against the brethren of this persuasion, even as he gave his life to lead believers out of the sectarianism into which they had fallen in the historic churches.

While in his earlier writings he was rather “Post” (and this did influence the Restoration Movement), he wrote many things in later life that sound more “Pre” than “Post” (See my article “Campbell’s Growth”, page 172 of the 1948 series *Faith of Our Fathers*). He did not profess to know by what means (human agency or supernatural) the Millennium would be introduced, nor by what degree of human process, or by the supernatural; he freely admitted it could be both.

This much, at least, can be said definitely: he looked for the Lord’s return; he expected Him actually to “stand upon the earth” (now denied by the “Post” brethren); he expected the conversion of Israel and their return to the land (cp. Milligan, McGarvey, Barclay, et. al.). He was, in short, a very poor prototype of present-day “Anti-Millennialists” among the Disciples.—E. L. Jorgenson.

Dear Brother Jorgenson: Your quotations in recent “Faith of Our Fathers” from brethren W. H. Carter and J. A. Harding in the Word and Work are of deepest interest to me personally. Brother W. H. Carter baptized me and my sister Lula (Mrs. Paul Holloway), nearly fifty years ago now; and the dearly beloved J. A. Harding was my ideal as a preacher and teacher in Potter Bible College where I was educated in God’s Word and inspired to go out and preach the unsearchable riches of Christ. So I have not departed from the faith as taught by these grand and good men; but better still I am true to the New Testament Church of Christ as to her first establishment by Christ and His apostles.

Brother Carter was holding this meeting at the Schochoh Church in Logan County, near Adairville, Ky. So I have not departed so far from the teaching of my father in the Gospel, nor from my beloved teacher, J. A. Harding, whom I hold in the tenderest and most honored memory. I wonder, if these brethren could come back, could they preach at these places where they held such great meetings and warmed the hearts of so many sinners for Christ and salvation. I fear that they could not! I cannot remember when I did not believe in the Thousand years reign of peace with Christ on the earth.

We all need to get closer to the Lord in these perilous days and to pray for those who would separate us from their company and cast our names out as evil. May God have mercy upon them, and upon us all.

Lexington, Ky., Nov. 18, 1950

H. N. Rutherford.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 65

Requests for the free 1950 pamphlet have been unusually heavy. About 200 sets (not years, but complete sets of the six years now finished) have been called for in the past week. Many ministers are giving them to their officers. And quietly—they are making their sure contribution to the true unity. The false alarm of unavoidable division over the millennial question—like so many "wolf, wolf" cries of years gone by—is fading out in many sections, thank the Lord. That Christians can live and love and work together, regardless of their varying grasp of future things, (and many present things as well)—that they **must** do so, if they work together at all—many eyes have been opened to this great truth. And it was this, even more than "the millennial view" itself, **quod erat demonstrandum**.

MOSES LARD ON THE MILLENNIUM

A few biographical notes on Lard are taken from Earl West's interesting article printed in *Gospel Advocate*, Dec. 5, 1946. In another place the same writer speaks of Lard as "one of the greatest pioneer advocates of a return to the ancient order." And this is the unanimous verdict of his associates.

EARLY LIFE

"He was born at Shelbyville, Tenn., on October 28, 1818. but lived there only a short time. His Scotch parents migrated to Missouri in 1829. Leaven Lard, his father, tried to establish a land claim, but failed. In a few years he contracted smallpox, and died in poverty, leaving a widow and six children with no means of support. The responsibility of earning a living fell upon Moses E. Lard and a brother, so both started from home as just young men to earn a living. Upon leaving, their mother gave both of the boys a blessing and a New Testament. Many years later Lard wrote: 'To that little book and the memory of that scene my future life owes its shaping. I never neglected the one, thank heaven, or forgot the other.' . . .

"At the age of seventeen he could not write his own name. Through sheer determination he learned to write by tearing down advertisements which had been stuck up around the village, and these he used for copy. At this time Lard knew little about religion, though by nature he was inclined to be religious. The denominational preaching which he heard had sent him into atheism temporarily. One day, however, he happened to hear Jerry P. Lancaster preach, and following this sermon, Lard was immersed.

THE PREACHER

"On March 4, 1845, Lard entered Bethany College. To earn expenses, Lard was forced to devote a part of his time to manual labor. Even so, he managed to finish the four-year course in three years, and received a master of arts degree. Moreover, he graduated at the head of the class and was elected valedictorian. During the last year of his schooling he was classmate of J. W. McGarvey, who, though much younger, entered Bethany in April, 1847.

"After graduation, Lard went back to Missouri and began preach-

ing. He was extremely eloquent, and could easily hold the attention of an audience for two hours and a half. J. J. Haley says of him: 'I have heard nearly all of the supreme masters of the pulpit in the English-speaking world in the last generation and a half, and I have never heard a better preacher than Moses E. Lard.'

Brother West concludes with a quotation from J. B. Jones, a eulogy that hangs beneath a picture of Lard in the chapel hall at Freed-Hardeman College:

"He towers above all his compeers in intellectual grandeur; in his power of analysis; in his elegant and poetic diction; in his prose poems; in his clear, clean-cut, lucid statements; in his ability to open the word of God and turn its life-giving fountains in upon the thirsty soul; in that indescribable, magnetic force which bears the audience away upon the winged thoughts of the orator."

If more or greater praise were needed, it is abundantly available.

In the *Gospel Advocate* of September 5, 1929, there occurred an interesting biographical sketch of Moses E. Lard, written by Brother H. Leo Boles. In the same issue there appeared also, from Brother F. W. Smith, a highly commendatory article concerning Brother Lard, from which we take the following extracts, and in which we find also Lipscombs, Hardings, and McGarvey's high encomia of the man:

"For a long time I have regarded Moses E. Lard as one of the ablest men whose writings I have read and studied. . . . Brother Lipscomb wrote of Moses E. Lard as a preacher, describing him as follows: 'With his close and clear analysis and elucidation of his subject, and his power to touch the sympathy and stir the feelings with his tender pathos—' Brother J. W. McGarvey said to me once, 'There was but one Moses E. Lard,' thus expressing his estimate of the greatness of Lard as a teacher of God's word.

"His 'Commentary' on the book of Romans is a profound work, which has been of incalculable help to many a preacher in the study of Paul's letter to the church in Rome. Moses E. Lard could state a proposition with more clearness and reach a more definite conclusion than any one after whom I have ever read.

"Brother James A. Harding once said to me: 'Moses E. Lard could take a passage of Scripture, break it down into its several parts, analyze each part, and arrive at its full meaning, as no other man I ever heard preach.' Such testimonials as to the logical powers and profound knowledge of God's word possessed by that man of God could be many times multiplied, but enough has been given for the purpose here intended. . . ."

"The unanimity of sentiment among the disciples, not only to have a Quarterly, but that Moses E. Lard should be its editor and that it should bear his own name, shows the esteem in which he was generally held as an able teacher of God's Word, and his ability to set forth and maintain 'Primitive Christianity.'"

Brother Boles' article was also full of praise, after the tenor of this extract:

"Among preachers of the church of Christ for the last century, there has not arisen one greater than Moses E. Lard."

In preparing to give our readers "Moses Lard on the Millennium," we are well aware that he did not expect the restoration of Israel "as a nation," nor to their "former national prosperity"—

though he adds (Commentary on Romans, p. 374): "That a national restoration is possible, I shall not deny; but will it ever occur? I cannot think it till better informed." But he did expect "a general future conversion of the Jews" (in the simple gospel manner), p. 357; and he thought it would be very near the time of the Lord's coming, the "literal resurrection of the just," and the commencement of the Millennium; and, though this conversion would be by individuals, and by gospel obedience (who would deny that?), yet on all but a national scale:

"When the Jews accept Christ and devote themselves wholly to preaching the gospel, I look for the scenes of the primitive Pentecost to be re-enacted. Such an ingathering into the church I expect then to occur as has never yet taken place. Christian Israel and the Christian Gentiles will then be one. Their united energies will be turned against sin; and the result will be that their victories for Christ will have no parallel. The residue of mankind will flock into the church. This will be the "life from the dead," of the passage. But at the end of this great spiritual harvest, more naturally, it seems to me, than anywhere else, is the literal resurrection of the just to take place. Of course this is conjectural. But when all Jews and all Gentiles have entered the church that will do so, I can see no reason for postponing the end. The world will then be ripe for the coming of Christ; and at his coming the holy dead will be raised, the righteous living will be changed, and the millennium will have set in." . . .

". . . Moreover, when their unbelief is broken, and they begin to turn to Christ, they will turn in numbers and with an ease that will be astounding. It has always been difficult to Christianize Gentiles; hence the slowness of the process. But when the Jews shall break away from their darkness and obstinacy, they will rush into the kingdom like a flood. That day will have no parallel in the past."—Commentary on Romans, pp. 359, 367.

With the following words, then, quoted from Stanford Chambers in *Truth Advance* (Sept., 1947), we are ready to hear (next time) from Moses Lard on the Millennium:

"I cannot recall definitely when I first read Lard (on Romans), but there seemed nothing strange to me in such a statement as, this: "At His coming the holy dead will be raised, the righteous living will be changed, and the millennium will have set in." So had my Bible read to me. All know that *more* to the same effect could be quoted from Lard; this is enough to show that without question he was pre-millennial. Order of events: the Lord's coming, resurrection of "those that are Christ's at His coming," His ushering in of the millennium. No one *denies* Lard was pre-millennial."

"Certainly a general future conversion of the Jews does not now seem more improbable than did the general conversion of the Gentiles at the time of Christ. Marvelous may be the changes which a hundred years shall work out."—*Moses E. Lard*.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 66

It was our hope a month ago that we could exhibit here, this month, Lard's essay on *The Millennium*. But as the article of itself requires more space than our usual allotment, and as we saw the opportunity to advance the unity effort in which we labor by further introductory comments, we seized that opportunity, and postponed the essay, proper, until next time.

The reader will then have before him the strongest, most "Millennial" article so far offered in this department. It was written, not by some present-day scribe, but in 1864 by Moses E. Lard of "Restoration" power and fame. Strange to say, our brethren who have sought to do God service by opposing the millennial teaching, and by making fellowship issues over this difference, have exalted Brother Lard to the skies. They have set him on a pinnacle as the greatest, ablest preacher, the most powerful and logical reasoner, that has so far arisen within the Restoration ranks; and they have published and republished his writings in journal after journal to this very day.

It was for this reason that we took time and space last month (and now again) to lay the ground for Lard's essay, and to quote those words of highest commendation from more recent Restoration writers—to *prove again that the millennial difference was not a test of fellowship in our fathers' day*, nor was it either the cause or occasion of division among them. Those words of commendation are from men on *both sides* of the millennial question, but chiefly from the anti-millennial. Of course, we recognize that there are two sides: the plain, "grammatical," and the "highly figurative," representing, we may presume, an *honest* difference that is always with us (the more reason for patience and brotherly toleration). Last month's encomia (q. v.) were from David Lipscomb, J. A. Harding, F. W. Smith, H. Leo. Boles, and Earl West. To these may well be added the following three—from W. D. Frazee, from the editor of *Sound Doctrine*, and from the editor of *Gospel Advocate*:

"If I had the naming of three of modern date who have made tracks on the sands of time, I would mention Jacob Creath, John W. McGarvey, and Moses E. Lard. For passionate, pathetic, and logical eloquence, and for the power of concentration, I doubt if Moses E. Lard had his equal in this country. . . . Lard surpassed either [Barton Stone and A. Campbell] in passionate and pathetic appeals to the mass, and was the peer of either in logical eloquence and power of concentration."—W. D. Frazee, in *Reminiscences and Sermons*, published by the *Gospel Advocate Co.*, 1893.

"When the brethren in America were confronted with numerous obstacles, inconveniences, and trying circumstances, the church produced some of the ripest scholars that the world has known since days of the apostles. A roster of those men would present such names as A. Campbell, Moses E. Lard," etc.—Editorial by R. A. T. in *Sound*

Doctrine, quoted in *Apostolic Times*, October 1947.

"It is the consensus of opinion among those who are familiar with the literature of the brotherhood that 'Restoration' journalism reached 'high-water mark' in *Lard's Quarterly*. In the most literal sense, it was *Lard's Quarterly*. He wrote about three-fourths of its contents. Few men attain the literary excellence which characterizes the work of the inimitable Lard. . . . At the time he was editor of the *Quarterly*, the *New York Ledger*, which was publishing the star papers of Henry Ward Beecher, offered Lard five thousand dollars a year to write for its columns. He did not accept this offer.

"The *Quarterly* began with the issue of September, 1863. In all, only eighteen issues were published. Yet it would be exceedingly difficult to find so much sound teaching, ably set forth, elsewhere in so small space."—Editorial in *Gospel Advocate*, Jan. 12, 1950.

With these words before us, deserved and true, there rises up a question of very great importance to the unity effort, one that poses a dilemma: *How can brethren of our day "receive" and honor Lard while they reject and dishonor other good and able men of like faith and teaching?* The answer cannot be that Lard was not "pre-millennial" (of course, he was no sectarian "ist" of any brand); for no one denies or can deny that Lard was "premillennial," outspokenly and powerfully premillennial. The answer cannot be that Lard "held" his faith on this line to himself. He did not; he preached and printed it. (Nor did he fall into any such erroneous application of Romans 14:22. See Lard's Commentary on Romans, p. 428, where the true sense is given). If it be said that Lard did not "press" or "push" his teaching over-much, then that is well, and all of us, both pro and con, might profit from his example. If we have erred by over-emphasis, correction is in order. But *Lard did print his essay in the famous Quarterly*. He gave it the wings and range of the type-set page. It has been printed and reprinted, read and re-read. That much Lard did: what did he less than others? For it has already been said (by some) that to print is to press the teaching!

What then can be the answer to this fellowship riddle, or what excuse for having none? The problem has been up before, concerning Barton Stone, Dr. Barclay, J. B. Rotherham, and many others of "the premillennial view". It will come up again, concerning Dr. Brents, Daniel Sommer, J. A. Harding, and others who held and taught "the premillennial view" in later times. What is the excuse for "receiving" these and rejecting others? Why honor the "premillennial" dead and dishonor the "premillennial" living. Has there been sin, sectarianism, and partiality here? If so, repentance is in order, before there can be righteous peace.

But an answer has been offered, a weak and worthless answer, when examined (as we shall), but on the surface better perhaps than none at all: Lard called his article "a theory"! He said he was inditing a theory, nothing more. What did he mean by this? Did he mean to discount his own reasoning in the Scriptures? (Paul "rea-

soned," Acts 19:9). Did he mean to make it all appear as a mere conjectural, human hypothesis, a "take-it-or-leave-it" effusion of his own great brain, without sincere conviction or Biblical proof? If so—if the whole were fanciful—why did he stop at one place in his essay to say (concerning the fitness of the present earth to our future bodies), "We have a fancy, it is but a fancy." By such words as "theory," "opinion," and "conclusion," clearly contrasted with "fancy," did he have in mind the current, low-grade connotation of these terms among us, or had he never heard them used, perhaps, in this derogatory way? *That* is what we wish to know. For *either* Lard wrote *as Bible truth* what he had found and gathered there, or else he is guilty of spinning out a mere millennial "theory" in the bad meaning of the term. If the former, we too may hope to be "received," since we are of like purpose, faith, and teaching with the honored Lard; if the latter, we might yet hope to be "received," by the simple expedient of calling our millennial teaching a "theory"! If not, why not? Lard was—if that is what he meant!

But there is a saying, "What proves too much proves nothing." Moreover, if this word, "theory," from the lips of Lard, excuses fellowship with him, it still helps not at all concerning Stone and Challen, Creath and Barclay, Rotherham and Ruble, Sommer and Harding, Poe and Carter, with hosts of other honored men who never called their doctrine "theory."

Or, did Lard "indite a theory" in that better, higher sense of a connected and orderly arrangement of the Scripture teaching before him? Was it a "valid induction," as we might call it—conclusions right and true from gathered Scripture testimony on the subject? If this is what he meant, then he meant nothing more or less than *that teaching method which we all employ*, which every preacher uses, continually and on every topic; no more than David Lipscomb meant when he said (as quoted by Brother Dorris in *Gospel Advocate*, May 24, 1951) "When and how may we, in this world, find the way and *the theory* to attain success?"

That Lard intended to be cautions we admit. His is the language of modest restraint and humility, as opposed to the claims of the cocksure and dogmatic. But one glance through his essay will be enough to show that he was seriously presenting the teaching of God's word, and that he considered it important and inspiring. Who is there, inditing a mere hypothesis, or some uncertain system of religion, that would say, as Lard says: "That Christ is to visit the earth one day, as literally as he left it, is what we think no Bible student can deny [but it is denied!] without, in the act, avowing a principle which, if sound, at once extinguishes the truth of Christianity." Or again, after quoting 1 Thess. 4:13-17: "This does not sound like anything else than a strictly literal detail of facts. Accordingly, I cannot look upon it in any other light. I hence conclude that Christ will literally come in person at the commence-

ment of the millennium, and literally remain here on earth during the entire thousand years."

It remains now only to take a brief look into the Webster Unabridged of our own times on the word "theory"; and then (next month) the essay proper.

"THEORY" IN THE DICTIONARY

The first definition given, before "speculation" or any other meaning, is "a contemplation." There is a note stating that in Mathematics a theory is "a body of theorems [established or provable truths] presenting a clear, rounded, and systematic view of a subject; as the theory of equations." This is in Mathematics; but is not the Bible as exact and accurate as figures? We sometimes say that figures lie; but God never. The Webster quotes from J. S. Mill: "In its most proper acceptation, *theory* means the completed result of Philosophical induction from experience." Under Synonyms, the Webster draws a clear distinction between ordinary *hypothesis* and *theory*: "In scientific usage, a hypothesis is a provisional conjecture . . . ; a theory is a hypothesis *which has undergone verification.*"

But, in our day, we have taken up the lowest definition of the word, and forced it even lower: "a principle or conclusion rendered more or less plausible by evidence in the facts and by the exactness of the reasoning."

Now, when the reader examines the famous essay, let him judge for himself in the context whether it was originally offered as a mere plausible speculation (if so, how can we honor Lard?), or whether it was offered as a "contemplation"; a body of truths "presenting a clear, rounded and systematic view" of the subject; "the completed result," may we not say, of Scriptural induction from earnest, honest Bible study; sound in conclusions "which have undergone verification" from the Word of God. And in most cases, his conclusions are simply the acceptance of *what the inspired text says*.

Let him who will brand this procedure contrary to the teaching method of apostles and prophets, of pioneer or modern preachers, and we will show it is *the unchallenged method of all*, not even the "soundest" living man excepted. Where, for example, does the Bible say that the church was established on the first post-resurrection Pentecost? It is so preached, and rightly so. It is the plain, undeniable truth. The Bible teaches it, but without exactly saying it. From the self-same chapter (Acts 2), Christ on David's throne is often valiantly preached and "proved"—so they say; yet the text does not say it, there or anywhere. And many other such-like conclusions are reached, by induction. Our methods are nothing; the truth is all that matters. Let all be tested by the Word of God.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 67

We pointed out last month that if Lard (who wrote the following essay in 1864) was merely spinning out a religious “theory” in the present-day low grade meaning of a speculative human hypothesis—then we have no right to honor him as a great and faithful teacher. On the other hand, if it was his honest purpose to present, in a humble, orderly, gathered, and connected manner, the teaching of God’s word on this subject—that and only that, without admixture of mere human opinion (as we think it was)—then he was a teacher of “the premillennial view” as certainly as any man now living; and we have no right to withhold the hand of fellowship from the living while we extend it graciously—to the dead!

But now at length the reader has the famous article before him. Let him mark carefully, especially from the lines that we have italicized, how the author constantly, earnestly draws attention only to *what God has said* on this subject.

MOSES E. LARD ON THE MILLENNIUM

(Concluded)

Of all the subjects of the New Testament, not one possesses a deeper interest for the Christian than the Millennium. . . . None will say that it has received an attention disproportionate to its importance. . . . I am anxious that the earnest attention of the brotherhood shall be turned to it. . . . There is not among us, so far as I know, a single elaborate article in print on the subject; and I have never heard a discourse on it, nor even so much as heard of one being attempted. This silence, I believe, we may well afford to break; and when once broken, I have strong hope that good will result. . . .

On one point . . . I have no theory to advance: namely, when the millennium will commence. . . . Without, then, making any effort to fix the time when the millennium is to begin, we shall now proceed to speak: 1. of the events, which, in our opinion, are immediately to precede it, 2. Of the millennium itself proper, 3. Of the events which are to follow it.

[Lard now quotes Tregelles’ translation of Rev. 19:11-21, and proceeds:]

The millennium, with its closely antecedent and closely subsequent events, were all scenes shown in vision to the Apostle John in Patmos. . . . As to the sense in which we expect to take these sections, a few words are thought necessary. The disposition, so long and so widely prevalent, to convert difficult or disagreeable Scriptures into mere figures of speech and to make them mean anything or nothing, as may happen to suit the whim of the writer, has been the source of incalculable mischief and error. . . . Neither do we mean to say that it contains no passages which are to be interpreted figuratively. . . . We simply mean to express the belief that a more literal method of interpretation than the one in general

use is both applicable to the Book of Revelation, and necessary to elicit its true meaning. . . . We shall assume that the main thread of thought is literally expressed; in other words, that it lies upon the surface in the most obvious meaning of the language used; and that it is not to be sought in some enigmatical or fancied sense thereof. . . . The sections to be treated will be construed much as we interpret the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. . . .

Against whom will Christ wage his war? . . . 'The nations of the earth' or the wicked of the human family. . . . I conclude that, in the end of the present state, Christ will make war on the entire wicked portion of the human family, *and that in the conflict they will all die.* . . . I mean ordinary or natural death. . . . Amen, 'Be it so,' is said and the work of death is complete. . . . It lasts not a day, not even an hour. This conclusion seems to be necessarily implied in the fact that the wicked all die by a word, which being instantly spoken, instantly does its work. . . .

Just before the millennium then, all the wicked die, and die instantly. . . . The whole earth now rests and praises the Lord.

The time is now come to speak of the millennium proper; and first as to the meaning of the word. The term, as many of our readers well know, is derived from the Latin, *mille*, a thousand, and *annus*, a year. It hence means a thousand years. And although it is not found in the New Testament, yet the expression "a thousand years" is, and this expression and the terms are used to denote the same thing. These thousand years, however, are not a thousand ordinary years, but a thousand glorious years to which Christians, from the earliest ages of the church, have been looking forward with the deepest solicitude. These thousand years of sinless and painless bliss, constitute the millennium. Such is the meaning of the term, and such is the period it denotes.

The millennium will commence in the precise instant in which Satan is bound and locked up in prison. The battle in which all the wicked die, will end. Immediately thereafter, Satan will be seized, and bound for a thousand years. This binding will consist in divesting him completely of all power over the human family. At the moment when he falls, the moment when his great bad power is wrested from him, at that moment the millennium will be inaugurated. From that time it will stretch forward and include, in our opinion, a period of a thousand years precisely. It will not consist of an indefinite number of years, or be merely a long time; but of a thousand years, neither more or less. Of the events which are further to characterize its commencement we shall now speak more particularly.

1. All the living saints will be changed. . . . "Behold, I show you a mystery," says Paul, "we shall not all sleep, *but we shall all be changed*, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruption must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." This is the

change which is to take place at the commencement of the millennium. It will consist in putting off these mortal bodies, and in putting on those glorious spiritual bodies which await the finally faithful. By it the Christian will be rendered perfect, as perfect as he will ever be throughout eternity. After this he will be the subject of no further change, except such as may consist of a continual increase of knowledge.

2. The sleeping saints will be raised. *Of the truth of this* all who have written and spoken on the millennium seem not satisfied; for some have taken the ground that only a part of the just will be raised. The martyrs only, they say, will be raised at the beginning of the millennium; and all the rest of the pious will remain in their graves till the end of the thousand years, and then be raised. In proof of this they cite the following passages: (Here is quoted Rev. 20:4, 5. Authorized Version.)

Had we no facts or circumstances besides those contained in this passage to shed any light on the first resurrection, then might we conclude that it will be only partial. But, even in that case, I believe the conclusion would be only probable, and that in a low degree. Now, I submit the following translation of the passage as not a whit inferior to that of Tregelles, except, possibly, in the matter of the supplement in the first clause; and some supplement is certainly necessary to enable the verse to make sense:

"And I saw thrones and they (the saints) sat upon them, and judgment was given them: and I saw the souls of those that were beheaded because of the testimony of Jesus, and because of the Word of God; and I saw those that had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received the mark upon their foreheads and on their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." According to this rendering, of those who lived and reigned with Christ the thousand years, John saw two classes marked by very different characteristics: 1. "Those who were beheaded because of the testimony of Jesus, and because of the Word of God." This class clearly includes the martyrs, but excludes all others. 2. "Those that had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received the mark upon their foreheads, and on their hands." This class just as clearly excludes the martyrs, but as certainly includes all others. Therefore, the two classes include *all the saints*, whether martyrs or not. And this, *we think to be the truth*; that is, that all who sleep in Jesus will rise at the commencement of the millennium.

But in further proof of a partial resurrection of the just, this passage is cited: "And the rest of the dead lived not until the thousand years were finished. But the "rest of the dead" here named are not part of the righteous dead. They are the wicked dead. The idea is this: All the righteous dead will be raised at the commencement of the millennium, but the rest of the dead, who are the wicked dead, will not be raised until the end thereof.

Again: when the apostle says, "The dead in Christ shall rise first," the expression, "The dead in Christ," is incapable of being made to include only the martyrs. It clearly includes all the righteous dead. And further, while the expression, "shall rise first," means that the righteous dead shall first rise, and that then immediately the righteous living shall be changed, it also implies that all who rise will rise at the same time. I hence conclude that whenever one of the dead in Christ rises, all the rest will rise at the same instant.

As further *proof of this conclusion* I quote the following: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive; but every man in his own order: Christ the first-fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at at His coming." In this passage a particular event is alluded to and called "Christ's coming." When this event happens, those that are Christ's are to rise from the dead. Now, it seems clear that the expression, "They that are Christ's" includes all who are His, and not merely a part, as the martyrs. Indeed, we feel confident that this is its meaning.

But it is most evident that others besides the martyrs are to share the honors of the millennium. Certainly those of the saints who remain alive to that time and are then changed will share them. Now, if these, who of course are not martyrs, share the honors of the millennium with the martyrs, then why not all who are not martyrs? And this would include all the pious dead. We can see but one answer to this question. To put a strong case: let us suppose two men, precisely equal in a moral point of view, and precisely equal in the estimation of our Heavenly Father. These men live on up into the last day before the commencement of the millennium. In the morning of that day one of them sickens and dies. He is no martyr; hence he sleeps on through the millennium to its end. The other lives on through the day to the moment when the millennium begins; he is then changed, and reigns with Christ a thousand years. Is there reason in, or reason for, the difference? I confess I cannot see it; hence I do not believe the difference will exist. On the contrary, I not only believe that all the saints who are alive at the coming of Christ will then be changed, but also that all who sleep, not one excepted, will then be raised and also changed. So that all the ransomed children of God shall meet, in time now coming, on the margin of the empty tomb, and there greet each other. Proud day! It makes me wild to think of it. My kin lie sleeping, sleeping in the ground. My brethren sleep there, brethren loved is life itself is loved. The forest trees stand over them, and night lies dark on their bed. The grave worm is in their flesh, and no voice of friendship is heard to cheer them in that silent world. They have been, many of them, long absent; yet how often in the restless night, when the spirit is troubled, and dreams troup through the brain, do they return. The maternal face looks on us again, sisterly voices send a strange sweet thrill through the soul, such, it may be, as the disembodied spirit alone knows truly. If such be the feeling which the

mere phantom excites, what must be the joy which the reality shall induce? But we shall not be undutiful and fret for that day, except as it is the Father's will to hasten it. * * * *

3. The actual personal and literal reappearance of the Saviour. We confidently expect this even to take place in the commencement of the millennium. *That Christ is to revisit the earth one day, as literally as he left it, is what we think no Bible student can deny without, in the act, avowing a principle, which, if sound, at once extinguishes the truth of Christianity.* * * * "For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." (1 Thess. 4:13-17.) Here the descent of the Lord is described in language as unfigurative as that in which the resurrection of the dead is described. If we take the one event literally, so also must we take the other. The whole piece of information was communicated to comfort the disciples; besides, it is upon a subject of great intricacy to them. It is hardly natural, therefore, to suppose that it has been expressed in other than in very plain language. Certain of the disciples are represented as being alive, as remaining *to the coming of the Lord*; then the dead arise, the living are changed, and all are caught up together with the Lord in the air. *This does not sound like anything else than a strictly literal detail of facts. Accordingly, I can not look upon it in any other light, I hence conclude that Christ will literally come in person at the commencement of the millennium, and literally remain here on earth during the entire thousand years.* .

Such are a few of the great events which are to mark the commencement of the millennium. We feel overwhelmed with their significance and importance. So marvellous are they, and so deeply do they involve our happiness, that we are shy to believe them. Our very fear that they may not be true increases our incredulity and causes us to distrust them. We hesitate to commit ourselves even to our own faith, lest in the end we should be made sick at heart by disappointment. Yet, *if the Word of God assert these things, then we shall not be disappointed.* Does it then teach them? This question settled, and we may wait in confidence.

It does not appear, *from the record before us*, that any change will take place in the earth itself at the commencement of the millennium. It seems that it is to remain in all respects as it is now till the end of that time. Then, and not till then, will the new heavens and the new earth appear. Here, at least, the narrative seems to locate that great change. Now this jars not a little on our feelings. We are so accustomed to associate the resurrection of the just and the new earth together, that we find it difficult to separate them. Not only so, but we have half learned to feel that the new earth is necessary to the new body, and that we can not be happy in this,

without that. The shortest thought, however, should satisfy us that this feeling is ill founded. That the new earth will be, in some way, necessary to the perfection of our happiness, we may correctly infer from the fact that God is going to provide it. We must, however, think it necessary rather on the score that he is going to provide sumptuously and even gorgeously for our happiness, then on the ground that no measure thereof can exist without it. This earth at present may not be a very desirable home, and we are not in a condition to affirm that it is. Still, where does the defect lie? Not so much in the earth surely as it is in us. When we are changed we shall the less need a change in the earth. We have a fancy, it is but a fancy, that it will then be a pretty respectable home. When our bodies cease to be what they are now, we shall not so much need the earth to be what it is now. Its heat cannot affect us injuriously then, neither its cold. These do not that we know of affect angels' bodies, if they have any, when visiting the earth. As little will they affect those spiritual bodies for which we look. From the influence of poisonous miasmas we shall be wholly free. We cannot sicken, nor otherwise suffer. With sin, with death, with the infirmities of the body, all that makes this world bitter will pass away. When such is the case, we can well afford to be content with the present earth till the time comes to change it. As long as the wicked dead lie in it, it seems not to be the purpose of the Heavenly Father to disturb it. Not until they arise will it be touched. The dust of the dead, though they be the wicked dead, must not be disquieted to provide a home even for the millennial saints. The bed of God's unransomed children is sacred in His sight. For those degenerate ashes he has a mournful regard. Their deep and awful repose he will not break till the time of the waking comes. That time will not be till the thousand years are past. Thus long, then, must those who shall be accounted worthy of a part in the first resurrection wait before they enter into the full measure of their honors. * * *

We come next to the events which are to succeed it. This will bring us to the close of all earthly scenes. * * * [Lard here speaks of the loosing of Satan, the deception of the nations, resurrection of the wicked, another battle, Satan cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, etc.] * * * It appears, then, that no change will take place in the earth at the commencement of the millennium; nor at its end, until the last great battle is fought and the judgment is ended, and the wicked cast away. * * * The notion, so very prevalent, that the Christian's future home lies away in some immeasurably distant region, is only a vulgar error. No foundation whatever exists for it. God built this earth for man and he does not intend to be defeated in his purpose. * * * The earth in its renewed form will be man's everlasting dwelling place. * * * Here amid the splendors of that grand fane shall they spend the cycles of eternity."—Opening editorial, *Lard's Quarterly*, Vol. II, pp. 1-21, Lexington, Ky., Oct. 1864.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 68

INTRODUCTORY

Among the fallacies that have marred the message and abridged the preaching of the Restoration brethren, none is more common or more deadly than this. That when we have told the sinner what he must do to be saved we have at the same time preached to him all that is “essential” to his salvation. This is a fallacy pure and simple; but a fallacy so plausible that it has been difficult to dislodge. Yet it should not require a sage to see the difference between “essential steps” and essential scriptures. The “essential steps” (a rather mechanical way of putting it after all) represent those things that a sinner must believe and do in coming into Christ; the “essential truth” sums up that body of Scripture testimony, warning and promise by which faith is produced in his heart and repentance brought about in his life. One or two simple verses are sufficient to state the former: “Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved”; “Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins.” But who will say that the preaching of *these passages only* would ever bring about faith, repentance, and confession or baptism in a single soul? For, back of saving faith lies the whole body of faith-producing testimony concerning the Savior; and back of repentance and obedience lies all the inspired, inspiring, motivating warnings and promises of the word of God.

But *how much* of the Scripture testimony must a man understand for such a saving faith? No man can answer that for each particular case. And how much must he know, and exactly which, of the warnings and promises of God (all these are prophecy) to move him to repentance and obedience? No man on earth can answer that. It is our part to set before him “the whole counsel of God,” as much as in us is; to keep on piling up the testimony and the promises that inculcate faith and repentance, never losing heart or hope of anyone. Sister T—— said, on the night of her husband’s baptism, “John has gone through twenty-four revival meetings; he has long known what to do to be saved; but this is the first time he was ever moved to come.” The preacher’s message on the night he came was an earnest delivery and appeal on the Second Coming of Christ! To Brother John (now at home with the Lord) *that* teaching was essential; for it took that to move him! How many thousands of others have been moved to obey, and nerved to persevere, by that blessed hope, or some other line of teaching on future things! We *have* to talk about the future; stop talking about the future and you stop the whole works. No wonder Paul said, “By hope were we saved.”

Summing up now, we may say with certainty: *Whatever it takes to move a man to take the essential steps is just as necessary as those steps.* We all need to know the things that move us to do the things we know we ought to do. Let us keep on expanding the future horizon for ourselves and for others. The lack of a great future pros-

pect accounts for the littleness and the dryness of many churches. Big hope, big Christian; little hope, little Christian.

But now, as the article of the month for this department, we present a fresh, new article from the facile pen of Brother R. H. Boll. It is an able discussion, utterly fair, yea, even conservative, so we think, on this question:

IS PROPHETIC TEACHING ESSENTIAL?

Perhaps no other question needs more to be answered in the controversy that has arisen over matters of prophecy than this, so often raised, "Are these things essential?" Some say they are not, and ought therefore not be taught at all if the teaching of them should cause trouble. Some base their whole opposition to the prophetic teaching on the contention that "these things are not necessary to salvation anyhow." Some, though considering the prophecies (especially the unfulfilled) as non-essential, would disfellowship brethren for teaching them, on the ground that they are introducing unnecessary things to the troubling of the churches. It seems therefore that a faithful inquiry into the question of the essentiality or non-essentiality of the prophetic teaching may help to clear our minds and promote peace and good understanding among brethren.

THE QUESTION ANSWERED

Are these prophetic teachings—the question say, concerning the coming of Christ, the kingdom and millennial reign, etc., essentials? They are not essential in the same sense as faith, repentance, and baptism. No one would claim, I think, that an understanding of the prophecies is a condition and prerequisite to entering the "Ark of Safety," of getting "into Christ."

But are those teachings essential to a continuance in Christ? Not so as to interfere with the fellowship of the saints. I should certainly fellowship my brother in Christ regardless of his view on prophetic matters. It is further to be noted that an agreement or disagreement on the prophetic teaching under present consideration would not outwardly affect any act of worship or service toward God. There is nothing in this teaching that would cause any man to omit any act of obedience, or to do anything God has commanded in a wrong or different manner, or to add any new thing to the prescribed way of obedience. It is therefore clearly not fundamental and essential in the absolute sense of the word.

IS PROPHECY UNIMPORTANT?

At this point, however, it is necessary to guard against a very natural but unwarranted conclusion. As soon as it is said that certain things are not exactly essential, we are apt to say, "Very well then, they are unimportant things and matters of indifference." But that does not follow at all. There are many things important, necessary even, and relatively indispensable, which are not absolutely es-

sential. No man would think that he could afford to do without his eyes, for example; yet we know that the eyes are not *essential to life*, nor even necessary to welfare. A ship has been known to get through without anchor; and a soldier may conceivably put up a valiant and victorious fight without helmet. But who would say that these things are therefore superfluous and indifferent?

The prophetic teachings of the word of God are not essential in the common sense of the word. But they are important, and may, in special cases be of vital moment. First of all, *Every scripture*, prophecy not excepted, is *profitable*. This much we know. It is further evident that any part of scripture, and any scriptural-theme, is fit theme for investigation and brotherly discussion that we may all learn and be edified. Nothing should be made a hobby of; and, on the other hand, nothing should be excluded for any fear of misunderstanding or abuse. Those who contend that Daniel 2:44 was fulfilled on Pentecost would hardly claim that their position is "essential," would they? Yet they manifestly place some weight on their position, and count it worthy of investigation and vigorous defense. And I would have none to keep that conviction to themselves on the ground that it pertains to a non-essential.

IS IT A JUST GROUND OF DIVISION?

The exceptionable point about all this is that a division could be occasioned among us over such things. Slender indeed must be "the tie that binds" if it can not bear the strain of differences on such a matter among brethren, and when disagreements that should cause nothing worse than a more eager and earnest investigation lead to strife and division. It is altogether a fault if such were the state of mind among brethren. And if it should become necessary to keep still on all but the most essential matters and to discuss nothing but what we are already agreed on, then we may bid farewell to all growth and advancement in the word of truth, and likewise to the freedom and the independence of creed which marks the distinction between a Christian and a sectarian. But it has not been so among us always, and I trust will not be. Brother Davil Lipscomb's position on the Christian's relation to the Civil Government, for example, is admittedly not one of the essentials. Many brethren agreed and many disagreed with this position. The matter has been freely discussed pro and con; and no harm has resulted, nor has a word been said about any "division." This is as it should be; and it was in itself a triumph of the principle of unity for which the church of Christ contends.

THE WRITER'S POSITION

In regard to the position which I have advanced on the lines of unfulfilled prophecies, my friends, perhaps even my opposers, will bear me record that I have not been dogmatic and peremptory. In my classes and elsewhere I have ever aimed at establishing correct principles of interpretation, and letting every man draw his own conclu-

sions; I have never endeavored to force my conclusions upon others, always preferring that a man should go to the word of God to work things out for himself in God's sight rather than that he should simply take over my convictions on any matter. For I claim no authority of my own; and no infallibility. In everything and in all things I am ready to say with the true and beloved Brother Larimore, "*I am not right, but the Bible is right.*" The things which I hold and present I certainly believe to be true and right; but they are not presented for blind acceptance, but to point out the teaching of God's word, and to lead to comparison and investigation, and a consequent better understanding. I subject the teaching of the brethren to such a course of treatment; and ask nothing more for what I say and teach.

HUMAN FALLIBILITY

Is is bound upon the Christian to "Preach the Word." Yet no one understands by that that the preacher is to recite scripture—merely that and nothing else, nor yet that he should merely paraphrase the scriptures; but it is his to apply scripture; to illustrate, elucidate, to reason and explain and quote, selecting from this and that context passages that bear on his theme, pointing out the import of the passage. And while on most points his teaching will be true and correct, nevertheless he will be liable now and then to mistake in his apprehension and application of the scriptures, and in the presentation of the teaching. Every true preacher is conscious of this liability; and while in no wise compromising his convictions, that very fact leads him to make much of the word of God, and to disparage any undue reliance on the teaching of men, whether his own or that of others. He will endeavor to throw every man upon his own responsibility by bringing him face to face with the word of God in the sight of God. The man who would claim inerrancy for his presentation of God's word, or who would allow himself to think that he has the whole truth, would of necessity be a sectarian, his own conception of God's truth being his creed and standard, and all avenues for growth in the Word being barred to him.

"PROVE ALL THINGS"

There is altogether too much tendency in the religious world to regard the utterances of uninspired teachers of God's word as authoritative in themselves. Now indeed every faithful preacher should endeavor to speak with authority—yet making it clear that the authority is not his, but is borrowed from God's word, and that the final appeal is to that word. As someone has said, "The message must commend the preacher, not the preacher the message." On a very common evil, that of "passive hearing," James Denney, speaking on 1 Thess. 5:21 ("prove all things, hold fast that which is good") makes the following pertinent remarks:

"This injunction forbids all passive listening to the word. Many people prefer this. They come to church, not to be taught, not to

exercise any faculty of discernment or testing at all, but to be impressed. They like to be played upon and to have their feelings moved by a tender or vehement address; it is an easy way of coming into apparent contact with good. But the apostle here counsels a different attitude: we are to put to the proof all that the preacher says. . . . He is speaking expressly to the Thessalonians who were Christian men. A heathen was no judge of Christian truth; neither is a man with a bad conscience, or who loves sin in his heart; neither is a flippant man who has never been awed by the majestic holiness and love of Jesus Christ—all these are simply out of court. But the Christian preacher who stands up in the presence of his brethren knows, and rejoices that he is in the presence of those who can put what he says to the proof. . . . Their power to prove his words is a safeguard both to them and to him. And it is necessary that they should prove them. No man is perfect, not the most devout and enthusiastic of Christians. In his most spiritual utterances something of himself will naturally mingle; there will be chaff among the wheat. . . . That is not a reason for refusing to listen; it is a reason for listening earnestly, conscientiously, and with much forbearance. There is a responsibility laid upon the Christian conscience of every congregation, and of the church at large, to put prophesyings to the proof. . . . No man with any idea of modesty, to say nothing of humility, could wish it otherwise. . . . The preacher has as much need of the word as his hearers; if there is a service which God enables him to do for them, in enlightening their minds and fortifying their wills, there is corresponding service which they can do for him. An open meeting, a liberty of prophesying . . . is one of the crying needs of the modern church."

THE CONCLUSION

Unfulfilled prophecy is important—if only because it is a part of God's word. It is important because it holds the key to much of the motive-power of the Christian life, and to intelligent co-operation with the plans of God so far as he has revealed them to us. As often as the preacher of the word refers to the hereafter, to judgment, to heaven, to hell, he makes use of unfulfilled prophecy. We could not do without it; we ought not do without it, even if we could see no practical bearing in it. It is not a question whether it is essential, but whether we shall be faithful; not whether we can be saved without it, but whether God gave it to be believed and taught; to the end that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work. The man who leaves God's word to speculate is in the wrong; and the man who would shut out the serious study and discussion of any part of God's word on any ground is in the wrong. It is a time for mutual helpfulness in patient examination and re-examination of the scriptures; not for clamor and recrimination and hasty judgment, nor for blind defending of our own conceptions of these things. And what is needed, beside the faith that exalts the word of God, is the love that makes us humble, forbearing and eager to help and bless—the love by which all men may know that we are His disciples.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 69

T. W. Brents was born in Lincoln County, Tenn., Jan. 10, 1823, and spent his last years with his daughter, Mrs. Victor Dorris at Georgetown, Ky. His well-known book, "Gospel Plan of Salvation," was published in 1874, and his later, most mature work, "Gospel Sermons," from which this reprint is taken (now out of copyright) appeared in 1891. It was published by the Gospel Advocate Company in the days of the vigorous Lipscomb and Sewell administration, and is probably still obtainable. As late as 1938, the Advocate catalog (or McQuiddy) offered the book at \$2.00, and described the sermons as "written in the author's well-known, clear, and convincing style."

The present edition of *Gospel Advocate*, Brother B. C. Goodpasture, asks a question which is itself a high commendation of the man: "was the gifted Brents less able to detect error than some are now?" (Advocate, Dec. 5, 1940, p. 1156); and Daniel Sommer, himself a powerful "reasoner," said this in *Apostolic Review* (Sept. 29, 1936): "The strongest reasoner that the Southern churches ever had in them was, probably, one T. W. Brents."

It will interest many readers to know that those few sentences from Dr. Brents that we have made to stand out by italization (besides his own italics) are those that D. H. Friend, beloved and now departed brother, had underlined. It was he who contributed the Brents books to our endeavors in this department.

Nothing is further from the author's mind and purpose than to spin out a mere human philosophical "theory" in this latter-day derogatory meaning of the word; that is perfectly clear from his own repeated statements—in his Introduction, his Conclusion, and in the text between. The effort of recent writers to try to break the force of Brents and Lard by stigmatizing their writings with a word which *these later writers themselves* have made opprobrious, and that since those great men wrote—such an effort is cheap and unworthy of Christian men. We leave the reader now to judge for himself, regretting only that space is insufficient to exhibit Brents in a single article.—J.

THE MILLENNIUM—I

Dr. T. W. Brents

DR. BRENTS' OWN INTRODUCTION

Of course no one is responsible for anything in this book but the writer, **nor does he expect any one to believe it, unless it be in harmony with what the reader conceives the Bible to teach on the subjects treated. We have written for the purpose of aiding the reader in coming to a knowledge of what is taught in the Bible.** We believe the Bible to be a revelation from God, and therefore true. It contains all we know of God or the devil—heaven or hell—angels or spirits—eternal life or eternal death. We may misconstrue its teachings, but we are willing to be taught it more perfectly. Nor have we any inclination to **figure or symbolize** it all away either. Some construe its language quite literally until it comes in conflict with their peculiar hobbies, then it must be symbolic or figurative. Unquestionably there are figures and symbols

in it, but where they occur the context will clearly show them to be such; otherwise we accept the plain literal construction **without an "if" or a "but."** Plain literal constructions cannot be set aside for no better reason than the **preservation of a theory.** If we may take such liberties as this, then there can be no certainty as to what the Bible teaches about any thing. One man will figure it to suit him; another will figure it to suit him; and so there will be no end to such figuring. Surely a theory must be **doubtful** that requires such **symbolizing** and **figuring** to support it. It occurs to us that he who is truly loyal to the Master is always willing to accept his teaching without straining it to fit theories. **We propose to form theories by the Bible, rather than to construe the Bible to fit theories already formed.** If there is any thing in this book that cannot survive this treatment, let it die; the sooner it is dead and forgotten the better. But, kind reader, if you find that what we have written is supported by the plainest teaching of Holy Writ, then let not your **prejudice** keep you from receiving it. **If it is not true,** you should reject it, but **if it is true,** you cannot afford to reject it. To this test we most cheerfully submit our work.—T. W. Brents, Lewisburg, Tenn., Aug. 1, 1891.

The revised or new version is a manifest improvement on the above [that is, the King James quotation of Rev. 20:4-6] so much so, that we propose to insert and use it as the *text* for this discourse, rather than the old version. Indeed, we treat the new version just as we do any other version, receive and adopt its *improvements*, but continue to use the old and more familiar version where it is not improved in the new.

"And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and such as worshiped not the beast, neither his image, and received not the mark upon their forehead and upon their hand; and they lived, and reigned with Christ a thousand years. The rest of the dead lived not until the thousand years should be finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; over these the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."—Rev. 20:4-6 (R. V.).

Time, the great prover of all things, has shown much of what has been written on the millennium to be false; and public sentiment has about settled down to the conviction that there is nothing clearly taught in the Bible concerning it, hence, those who propose to speak or write about it are judged and condemned without a hearing. The verdict is that it will be all speculation, and so the matter is settled in advance. We have never manufactured much reputation as a *speculator* on theological questions, and we are too old to begin that kind of work now. Hear us before passing sentence upon us.

There is surely something taught in the Bible on the subject, and it can do us no harm to study it. While it is *vastly interesting*, it is not so important as that any one's salvation depends upon a knowledge of it. A mistake concerning it, therefore, would be entirely harmless. Hence, we do not see cause for alarm, even were we to indulge a little speculation about it, so long as we make no effort to force our speculations on any one else.

We have read much of what has been written on the subject, and Bro. M. E. Lard is the only man whose writings have fallen under our notice who seemed to have a tangible theory as to *what the millennium really will be*. On this point we believe his theory is correct, but we shall write as though he had not written.

Some writers boldly deny that there is any such thing taught in the Bible as a *thousand years' reign* with Christ by any class, at any time, anywhere, in any way. With this class we propose no argument. *Our text says, as plainly as words can express any thing, that there shall be such a reign, and this ought to settle it with those who believe the Bible; and we propose no argument with those who do not believe it.* All such labor is worse than thrown away.

Others admit that there will be a thousand years' reign with Christ, but they insist it will be some sort of a figurative affair. and they figure it all away, until there is nothing left that they can describe, or that we can see. We know not how to reason with this class, for they give us nothing on which to reason.

Others think that it will consist in the breaking down of denominationalism, and the universal acceptance of the pure gospel of Christ, as taught by Mr. Campbell and his co-workers. However desirable this may be, we see no prospect of it; nor can we find satisfactory evidence on which to base a belief. Denominationalism is here, and it is here to stay. It will be here when Jesus comes, perhaps about as it is now. Some of the denominations that are here now will doubtless pass away. Some are dying, and have been struggling in the throes of death for a number of years. The handwriting is on the wall, and they must go; and he is but a poor reader of the signs of the times who does not already see this; but perhaps other parties will rise up and take their place, and thus denominations will continue so long as time endures. All the world has never accepted the pure word of God, and never will. He is dreaming who expects the millennium to come about in this way. . . .

[At this point, the author argues rather vigorously and at length, against the return of Israel to Palestine and their conversion to the Christian religion. His main argument is the bottle illustration from Jer. 19—the bottle that was broken beyond repair. But even if we concede that the bottle represents Israel *for ever* (even beyond Titus, and A. D. 70), does it necessarily mean that *God Himself*, with whom all things are possible, could not make them whole again? For that is precisely what God promises, through the same prophet, *to this same people*, in Jer. 30:12-17, that He will do: “Thy hurt is incurable . . . thou hast no healing medicine (no, *they* had none) . . . thy pain is incurable; “for *I* will restore health unto thee, and I will heal thee of thy wounds.” That answers that; and the bottle argument, still used by many, also.

While we are bound to dissent from Dr. Brents' position on the return of Israel (are they not even now a nation in their land?), his view on this line does not make him any less a clear and definite “pre-millenarian,” the reader will easily observe.—J.]

"And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called the word of God."—Rev. 19:11-13.

That this had reference to Jesus is evident from the fact that his name is called The Word of God, and the fact that he is coming as a *judge* and a *warrior*. Then Jesus will come to the earth again. But we are told that the book of Revelation is so highly symbolic that we cannot know what it means. Well, let us see if the same thing is not taught elsewhere. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God." 1 Thess. 4:16.

"When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory."—Matt. 25:31.

"And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked stedfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven."—Acts 1:9-11.

There is no symbolism in this; but a plain statement of a literal fact. These witnesses are assured that as they had seen Jesus ascend into heaven, he would in like manner come again. They saw him ascend literally—then he will as literally come as he went. Of this there can be no mistake.

"And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean." Rev. 19:14. Who were the armies of heaven that followed him? "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him." Matt. 25:31. Then the *armies of heaven that followed him were the holy angels that came with him*. See also Matt. 16:27.

We have seen that while the disciples beheld him going, or ascending up, a cloud received him out of their sight. He shall so come as they saw him go into heaven. Then he will come in the clouds. "And they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." Matt. 24:30. "And then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory." Mark 13:26. "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him." Rev. 1:7.

Then, if authority can establish any thing, the statement in the vision of John, relative to the coming of Chris. is made out. He will come; and the armies, or angels of heaven, will come with him. And he was received by, and went up in, *a cloud* and he will come in the clouds. We have these things in Revelation fully corroborated by other witnesses. Then they are true—literally true.

(To be continued)

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 70

Dr. Brents' article on 'The Millennium,' reprinted from the *Gospel Advocate's* book of 1891, "Gospel Sermons," will require three installments here, of which this is now the second. The reader should at least glance through the preceding installment, especially Brents' own Introduction, to satisfy his mind that the author is earnestly, urgently presenting the article *as the gathered teaching of the word of God*, not as some unimportant *human* theory at all. In fact, as far as the authority and basis on which Brents wrote are concerned—and Moses E. Lard too—there is no *real difference between them and us*. All that they or we can do for others is to arrest their attention by tongue and pen and draw their minds to *what God has said*. Neither they nor we could wish for greater rights; nor are the pioneers quoted here for any other purpose—unless it be, additional, to exhibit the beautiful unity of the pioneers in the midst of much diversity. Certain other writers of our day are quoting certain other pioneers (even Campbell in his earlier years) who may have been as "post" as Barton Stone and Lard and Brents were "pre:" very well: let them have this honor over us. But let them try to prove, if they can, that those pioneers fell out over these differences; until and unless they can show *that*, their case is not made out, nor is their divisive course and attitude justified.

It is not in any derogatory or unscriptural sense that Brents referred to Lard's "theory," or that he said, "We propose to form theories by the Bible, rather than to construe the Bible to fit theories already formed." All that these men wrote and all we write, must be tried and tested by the inspired word. We have no knowledge beyond or "theory," apart from that revelation.

THE MILLENNIUM—II

Dr. T. W. Brents

WHEN WILL CHRIST COME?

Many have been the calculations made on this subject. Some have set the very day for his coming. But time has shown that these calculations were wrong. The days set have passed and he has not come yet. We think we can give all the information attainable on this subject. We feel sure that we have reached the truth in the premises. Then when will he come? *We do not know any thing about it*. Not one thing. Nor do we think it at all possible for any one else to know.

[But may not the watchful Christian see something of the approaching *season* or "watch" by comparing events and signs with Scripture predictions? Even the doctor himself quotes here from Matt. 24:43 in this connection: "But know this, that if the goodman of the house had known in what watch the thief would come he would have watched."—J.]

"But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father. Take ye heed, watch and pray; for ye know not what the time is." Mark

13; 32, 33. Now why should we worry ourselves in seeking to know that which no man knew—no angel knew—that which not even the Son of God himself knew. We should so live as not to be taken by surprise when he comes: hence the admonition: "Watch therefore; for you know not what hour your Lord doth come. But know this, that if the Goodman of the house *had known in what watch* the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up. Therefore be ye also ready; for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh." Matt. 24:42-44. While we may not know *when* the Lord is coming, of one thing we may be sure—he is not coming when all the world is looking for him. "For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night; for when they shall say, Peace and safety; then sudden destruction cometh upon them." 1 Thess. 5: 2, 3. When the Lord shall come, the world will be moving on about as it is now. We see no prospect of much improvement, and we most earnestly pray that it may get no worse. The farmer will be going to his plow, the mechanic to his shop, the merchant to his counter, the accountant to his desk, the editor to his sanctum, the banker to his vaults, the doctor to his pills, the lawyer to his office, the miser to his gold. "As the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be; for in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left; two women shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken, and the other left." Matt. 24:37-41.

These scriptures show that the world will be drifting along as usual, without any visible change in the vocations of men, just as if the Lord were not coming at all. Of this there can be no doubt. That the people will all be converted to the Christian religion, there is not the slightest possibility. We have seen that Jesus is coming as a *warrior* and a *judge*. "In righteousness he doth judge and make war." On whom will he make war? Not on the righteous, surely; for in righteousness he doth judge and make war, not upon the righteous, but the wicked. He will not fight against his friends . . .

"But this is from that symbolic book." Then we will see what Paul says about it. "And to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance." Vengeance? Yes. Vengeance on whom? "On them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day." 2 Thess. 1:7-10.

While there is no intimation as to *how* the events here alluded

to will be brought about, it is clearly seen that Jesus will take vengeance on the wicked—them that refused to obey him; and this fact is made, if possible, more plain by the fact that he will be glorified in, and admired by his saints. The two classes are clearly seen in this quotation, and the contrast is well drawn. No one need be mistaken as to the parties against whom Jesus will fight this war. No plea of “symbolic language” can be made to cover them up—*them that know not God and obey not the gospel.*

WITH WHAT WILL HE FIGHT

“And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword that with it he should smite the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God.” “And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth; and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.” Rev. 19:15, 21. “This is more from that *symbolic* book.” Who can be at a loss to know that the sword which proceeded out of his mouth *was his word*? This is by no means the first use of such a style. Paul says: “And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit which is the word of God.” Eph. 6:17. This book of Revelation was the “Revelation of Jesus Christ,” which God gave unto him * * * and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John.” To the angel of the church in Pergamos he said: “Repent; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against them with the sword of my mouth.” Rev. 2:16. “We understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God.” Heb. 11:3. God spake and things were. He upholds “all things by the word of his power.” Heb. 1:3. He who spake the world into existence, and upholds all things by the word of his power, *will speak the word*, and the wicked will be slain, in a moment they will die—be dead—slain by the sword which proceedeth out of his mouth.

“And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, Come, and gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God; that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great.” Rev. 19:17, 18. “And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth; and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.” Verse 21.

This shows that the wicked who are slain will not be buried, but will be devoured by the fowls of heaven just where they chance to be when slain. Is this symbolic, or is it a literal description of what will happen? We think it must be understood literally—why not? A very similar account of what came upon the Jews at Jerusalem is given by Jeremiah, and Josephus tells us that it was literally fulfilled. Then why not this? He says: “I will cause them to fall

by the sword before their enemies, and by the hands of them that seek their lives; and their carcasses will I give to be meat for the fowls of heaven and for the beasts of the earth." Jer. 19:7. Josephus was in Jerusalem, and he says they buried the dead until there was no place to bury, and they could bury no more, and the dead were consumed by the vultures and dogs where they lay in the streets. Now, when Jeremiah made this prediction, was it not just as improbable as that the fowls should feed upon the slain at the coming of Christ? This is a very natural and plausible result, and we think it will take place just that way. Why not?

"But they are to be burned up, destroyed, judged, and sent to hell the very day that Christ comes." Let us not crowd things too close together. They are to be *destroyed*, but that does not imply *annihilation*, surely. "Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they **planted**, they **built**; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." Luke 17:28-30.

This was intended to illustrate the condition of things at the coming of Christ by the condition of things in Sodom. As the people then went on in the usual pursuits of life, thinking nothing of danger until they were destroyed, so it will be *when Jesus comes to the earth again*. The people will be going on as usual until he comes and destroys them. But what is meant by the phrase, "**destroyed** them all?" Does it mean damned in hell forever? We suppose not. What then? They were going on, thinking of no danger, until God instantly killed them—destroyed their lives. So when the Son of man comes, they will be going on until, like the Sodomites, they will be instantly destroyed. Destroyed how? In hell forever? Then there is no fitness in this wonderful Bible illustration. The Sodomites *were not thus destroyed*, but their *lives* were destroyed. They were *destroyed as living creatures*. Then the wicked will be destroyed in the same way when Jesus comes. They will be slain by the sword that will proceed out of his mouth. And *that destruction* will be *everlasting*, too. They will never live again *as they lived before*. The question of a final resurrection and judgment is not involved in *this destruction*. These will come in due time.

"I NEITHER ASK NOR EXPECT IT"

There are not a few who seem to think that if an author or an essayist does not, in every single point, acquiesce in their views of every particular text or question, that there is no excellency, or value or utility in them. We flatter ourselves that we have not many readers of that class amongst our subscribers. I know no man of any note in the world, with whom I agree in every thing; and certainly there is not one in the world that agrees with me in every thing. I neither ask nor expect it. We, therefore, contend not only for the **right**, but for the **duty** of private judgment; and with a Roman poet we affirm, "It is right," and we will add often expedient, "to learn from an enemy"; and certainly from a friend and brother with whom we may not agree in everything.—A. Campbell, *Millennial Harbinger*, 1847, page 133.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 71

We present now the third and last of the Brents reprints.

THE MILLENNIUM — III

Dr. T. W. Brents

Will there be any *righteous* living on the earth when Jesus comes? Most certainly there will. What will be done with them? Paul says: "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." 1 Cor. 15:51-53.

This shows that there will be righteous persons living on the earth when Jesus comes. We shall not all sleep, that is, all will not be dead. They will be changed—they will exchange their mortal for immortal bodies. The dead will be raised incorruptible. At the same moment when the living saints will be changed, the dead saints will be raised incorruptible; that is, *they will come forth with the same kind of body that the living will get by the change.*

"But we would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning them that fall asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as the rest, which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we that are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord, shall in no wise precede them that are fallen asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. 4:13-17. [*New Version.*]

This quotation is full, clear, and specific. We learn that there will be righteous persons living when the Lord comes, but they will not go before those who sleep in Jesus. The dead in Christ shall rise first. This is *generic*, and includes *all* the dead in him. We are now prepared to read our *text*. "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and such as worshipped not the beast, neither his image, and received not the mark upon their forehead and upon their hand; and they lived, and reigned with Christ a thousand years." *This is the millennium. If this does not express a literal reign with Christ for a literal thousand years, we know not what assemblage of words would be capable of expressing that thought.*

With the old version before them, many have concluded that this was a sort of pre-eminence, given to the martyrs, and that they are all who are included in this reign. This would exclude even

the beloved apostle John himself. Holding, as he did, the most sacred place in the affections of the Savior, he could have no share in this reign with him, because he died a natural death, and was not among the martyrs. Besides this, it seems to flatly contradict what we have already quoted from the apostle Paul, that the dead in Christ shall rise first. This is without restriction, and certainly includes *all the dead in Christ*. But the new version clears up all the fog from the passage. After giving the characteristics of the martyrs, it takes in other classes: "And such as worshipped not the beast," etc., showing that others were included. It clearly means all the righteous, living and dead, at the time Jesus Comes. It can mean no less, when construed with the other passages cited.

The dead in Christ shall rise first. "This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." None but the pure and holy have part in this resurrection; because none but the saints will come forth in it. This is corroborated by Paul to the Corinthians: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." 1 Cor. 15:22, 23.

The resurrection will be in orders or ranks. Christ has already been raised; afterward, or in the first rank, they who are his at his coming. This is in exact accord with what he said to the Thessalonians: The dead in Christ shall rise first, for they will be his at his coming.

But Satan is to be bound during this thousand years. The wicked will be all dead, the righteous clad in the habiliments of immortality, and under the protection of their Master, there will be none subject to the machinations of the devil, and hence he will be completely shorn of his power. This will be a glorious period. No wicked living—the saints all immortalized, hence, free from pain, sickness and death. No sorrowing, no tears, no sad farewells, and no temptations, consequently no sin. All will be joy, peace, and love. Not a ripple in the ocean of bliss for a thousand years. Then will be fulfilled the benediction of the Savior: "Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth." Matt. 5:5. Then the earth will belong to the meek—the saints; and it will be theirs by inheritance, but never before. They get very little of it now, and pay very dearly for that.

With this theory another curious saying of the Savior becomes plain enough. "Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left." One shall be slain, the other left alive, to be glorified and to reign with Christ a thousand years. Without this theory of the millennium the import of this Scripture is difficult to see.

THE SECOND RESURRECTION

We have seen that the dead in Christ rise first, and that this is the first resurrection in which none but the blessed and holy will have

part. "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." The phrase, *first resurrection*, clearly implies a *second resurrection*, for there cannot be a *first* without a *second*. So does the phrase, dead in Christ, imply that there are dead who are not in Christ; and the sentence, the dead in Christ shall rise first, implies that the dead out of Christ will rise afterward. How long afterward? "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished." Rev. 20:5. This clearly implies that the rest of the dead *will live again* when the thousand years shall be finished. *We see not how to resist these conclusions from the premises, or from the Scriptures quoted. They are plain statements of Holy Writ, which seem to admit of no other interpretation. It seems to us that the conclusions must be admitted, or the truth of the Scriptures denied.*

That "the rest of the dead" that lived not again until the thousand years were finished, are the *wicked* dead, is evident from at least two considerations. First, all the righteous dead were raised in the first resurrection, and hence the wicked must be *the rest* of the dead. Second, as the dead in Christ will rise first, it follows that the dead out of Christ will rise next or afterward. Then at the expiration of the thousand years, the wicked will be raised—will live again. Not as they live now, but they will have bodies indestructible as the righteous, but capable of enduring the endless punishment awaiting them according to their works. . . .

[At this point Brents devotes about five pages to a discussion of endless punishment and the nature of the resurrection body of the lost. But as these are not in question among our readers, and as space is limited, we omit this portion.—J.]

A few passages of Holy Writ supposed to contradict what we have here taught must now be noticed. . . .

"Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." John 5:28, 29.

This passage does show that there will be a resurrection, both of the just, and of the unjust; but that both classes will come forth in the same moment is assumption—nothing less. There is not an intimation in it as to the order of the resurrection. The fact is stated, the order is not. It is certainly unsafe to bring this passage (where not one word is said about the order of the resurrection) into contradiction of a number of passages in which the order is clearly and plainly stated. It were better to take up such passages as speak of the order and show, if such be the fact, that they are not correctly construed, than to seek to contradict them by remote inferences. Such a method of meeting an argument, though often resorted to, is not very satisfactory to those who think for themselves. As this is the strongest passage relied on, we need not pursue the

weaker ones, most of which have been already noticed in other connections. . . .

[From here on, Dr. Brents discusses Rev. 21, "new heaven and new earth," and launches into an earnest, evangelistic appeal to those unprepared for Christ's coming to turn before it is too late.—J.]

Why any child of God should be stricken with terror and alarm at the prospect of Christ's second coming is not easy to see. For those who have oil in their vessels, with their lamps trimmed and burning, and have on the wedding garment ready to meet the Bridegroom at his coming it should be a source of inexpressible joy. *It will take away the dread of death, for to them there will be no death.* They will be changed in a moment without death. But those who have no oil in their vessels, and have slumbered and slept, in neglect of duty, until their lamps have gone out, and have not on the wedding garment or Christian character, may well be alarmed, for it will be too late to buy oil then. Oh, my brother, wake up to a discharge of duty now. Watch and be ready—always ready; for you know not the time when the Son of man cometh. God help us all to be ready. . . .

When Jesus steps down from the mediatorial throne there will be no more pardon of sin. It will then be too late, too late.

DR. BRENTS' OWN CONCLUDING NOTE

Note:—Many persons object to every thing written or spoken on the subject of the Millennium, because the book of Revelation is so highly **symbolic** that it cannot be understood. That **much** of the book is symbolic, we most frankly admit, but that **all of it is so** we respectfully deny. Take, for example, the letters to the seven churches of Asia. That these churches did exist, wearing the names applied to them, is simply certain; and that they were literally guilty of what is charged against them in those letters will be denied by none. In the preface to the book it is said: "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of the prophecy, and keep the things that are written therein: for the time is at hand." Rev. 1:3.

How can the book be a blessing to any one who cannot understand it? If it is so symbolic that nothing in it may be understood, how can any one be expected to keep those things which are written therein? We think it likely that those who symbolize and figure it all away will not understand much of it, while grand truths sparkle on the very surface unobserved.

But to one thing we wish to call the reader's special attention: Almost every important point made in the foregoing discourse on the Millennium is corroborated by other Scriptures which have never been regarded as symbolic. We think that Peter, Paul, and Jesus himself have pretty fully supported John in Revelation on this subject. The thousand years between the first and second resurrections is the only single point now remembered that is dependent upon John's vision alone for support. Being sustained in so many points by other witnesses, is he not worthy of credit in this?

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 72

Of the strife and warrings in the early years of the present century (my boyhood years) over the “Bible School” question, I knew but little. Daniel Sommer opposed the colleges—on conscientious grounds, I now think, though some have said in print that it was for other reasons. He was a greatly mellowed man in the 1930’s when I knew him—first in the unforgettable Unity Meeting at Kansas City, which I attended as the invited song leader, and where I saw and felt the joy that swept that assembly over the reconciliation of Brother Sommer with some good brethren from whom he had been estranged; then later, when he stayed for many days in our home while he was preaching in several churches of the Louisville area. Those days were spent in writing, writing—except that he **sat sometimes** in the rocking chair, reading the Bible, meditating, and praying, often aloud. Naturally we came to respect the man, for his undeniable greatness, and his reverent praying spirit. It was direct from here that he went on his tour of the Southwest where he was everywhere received among churches and schools, in the conciliatory spirit.

The Jews of Rome called the simple, primitive Church of Christ “a sect, everywhere spoken against,” Acts 28:22, (which of course did not make the church a sect). Likewise, if the simple brethren of “the premillennial view” (Challen’s century-old phrase) be thought of in some quarters as “a sect,” and if they be ever so much and everywhere “spoken against,” it would be only because sectarian men have drawn the line themselves, to cut these brethren off, and have themselves everywhere “spoken against” them—and, for that matter against almost everybody else as well! If in such a state of lovelessness among disciples, Brother Sommer wrote a few lines in later years that seem in any degree to weaken the emphasis on his millennial teaching of 1912, it was no doubt because he knew what factionists would try to do against his beloved “Review,” by fastening upon that journal an opprobrious name which these factionists themselves had made opprobrious. Those were days of real depression, and heavy financial problems, for all religious journals. Sommer said to me, with deep concern: “We don’t like debt”; and to the honor of his family (Bessie K., Allan, Chester) I can say that though I lost hundreds of dollars in those days in unpaid songbook sales, I have never lost a penny on sales to the Review. This kind of integrity, as well as their own great contribution to “a better understanding” (in accepting publicly their full share of blame for past divisions) is more than worthy of this humble tribute.

The extract which now follows is taken from a series of articles on the book of Revelation which ran through the *Review* in 1912. This was some years before brethren of “the premillennial view” were attacked, and represents therefore the free expression of what this able writer thought would “serve the best interests” of his readers, and “save them from error” by setting “the truth before them.”—J.

DANIEL SOMMER ON REVELATION 20

(The italics are the author's own.)

At or near the beginning of the thousand years, the first resurrection will be made, and then will be fulfilled Matt. 25:31-46 (also 2 Thess. 1:6-10, with 1 Cor. 15:32, and 1 Thess. 4:15, 17). But notice that *only those of the wicked* will then be pronounced against or judged who will then be on the earth, and *will have rejected the Gospel*. This is evident by Matthew, also by Paul in the first chapter of 2nd Thessalonians. *This must be considered by all that wish to be clear in regard to the future judgments.* Many wicked persons will still be on the earth who will not have *rejected* the gospel, *because they will not have heard it.* The judgments against the heathen "signified" in Revelation eighth and ninth chapters will leave alive on the earth two-thirds of the men, not to speak of women and children. And in Bible lands, many may be considered by the Lord as not having heard the gospel. He will be the judge in regard to their condition and responsibility. Besides, the angel "signified" to John that "the end" will not come at that time—the time when Satan will be bound and the dead in Christ will be raised. The "end" will be *after the first resurrection.* See 1 Cor. 15:24-26. "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death," and death will not have **been destroyed** till "death and hell"—death and the unseen world—will have been cast into the lake of fire, and that will be **"the second death."** See Rev. 20:14. And this means that not until the earth will have *remained a thousand years without any devil to deceive mankind* will **"the end" come.** Then will be the general judgment "signified" to John by that which he wrote in Rev. 20:11-15.

Many Bible readers shrink from making all the admissions indicated in the preceding paragraph. In regard to them I state, "*If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.*" (1 Pet. 3:11.) All that will obey this command fully will not only *admit*, but *will believe and declare* all that they find in John's Vision, and all other parts of the Bible. Many seem troubled or confused over the revelation in regard to the binding of Satan. But that is as plain as Peter's declaration about the angels that sinned being delivered into "chains of darkness." The word "chain" is only a "sign" of God's power to control the angels that sinned, including the devil. And we might as well say that the "chains" that Peter wrote of referred to the gospel truth, as to say that the "chain" that John wrote of refers to such truth. . . .

But some one may be ready to say, "If you are going to contend for several resurrections and several judgments, what are you going to do with John 5:29 on these subjects?" I answer that I am going to treat John 5:29 even as I do Matt. 3:11, and John 3:5. Every concise statement needs to be explained by that which is more prolix, extended, or more amplified, than is the concise statement. Thus we explain Matt. 3:11 by Acts 2:1-4, and Rev. 20:14, 15. And we explain John 3:5 by the entire record of the conversion to Christ in

Acts, and by Titus 3:5. Why may we not explain John 5:29 after the same manner? . . .

In the foregoing paragraphs I have offered a brief outline of the last book in the Bible. I trust it will be of value to all that read the *Review*. I wish to serve their best interests and save them from error by setting the truth before them. These paragraphs, though not written *specially* for those that have recently been writing in regard to the resurrections and future judgments, yet may, possibly, be read by them with benefit. I would be rejoiced if they would all consider them aright, and become united on the truth as it is revealed.—*Apostolic Review*, Feb. 20, 1912.

From boyhood I read Daniel Sommer and heard him. His book "Questions, answers, and remarks" dates back to the beginning of our century. On Revelation we read:

"What shall we say to those who declare that Christ will not come again till at the end of the Millennial Age?"

"We may say, Ye do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. All such by implication deny that the resurrection mentioned in 1 Cor. 15:12-54 and 1 Thess. 4:13-17 means 'the first resurrection' . . . Then when John declares, in contradistinction from the righteous dead, 'But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished,' the testimony on this subject is complete. . . ."—Quoted by Stanford Chambers in *Truth Advance*.

J. A. HARDING, PRINCE OF PREACHERS

We have just now re-read an article concerning Brother Harding that is so accurate, so true and inspirational, that it must needs be passed on first, for younger readers who did not know this princely man. It is Brother Jesse P. Sewell's oration, delivered in the Harding College church auditorium on April 18, 1951, and published in both *Firm Foundation* and *Gospel Advocate*. We have regretfully shortened it (for lack of space), but we have nowhere changed the sense of this beautiful tribute. We insert it here, not only as introductory to the Harding reprint (next month), but for its own value to posterity:

SEWELL'S EULOGY

It is my assignment to speak today of James A. Harding:

He had his human weaknesses and limitations. He was deeply conscious of them, and would strongly protest being represented as perfect. He fully expected to be victorious in life, to give to humanity a worthwhile service, and to live eternally with God—not, however, on the basis of his own perfection—but through the wisdom, power, and goodness of God, made available to him by the atoning sacrifice, and through the advocacy of Jesus Christ. . . .

I wish I could fix the name of James A. Harding in the hearts of disciples of Christ throughout the generations to come as "James A. Harding, the Magnificent." He was magnificent physically; he was magnificent mentally; he was magnificent culturally; he was mag-

nificent spiritually; he was a genuinely magnificent personality. . . .

The faith of James A. Harding was noble, lofty, and sublime. He had taken nothing for granted. He had intelligently and thoroughly examined the evidence. His conclusions, thus reached, were clear, definite, and mighty in vitality. With him God was as real as his fleshly father. To him the Holy Spirit was as real as was the spirit in his own body. To him the Bible was as literally a personal message from God as were the letters from his earthly father personal messages from him. To him heaven was as real as Nashville, and as far superior in good and beauty as are the mind and soul of man superior to his aging and decaying body. . . .

In faith he was like Abraham. He was constantly going forth in obedience to the command of God, without any knowledge of whither, except that given in God's word—and that without the slightest fear as to the present or future—ever locking “for a city which hath foundations whose builder and maker is God,” and fully expecting to be constantly protected and blessed along the way.

The hope of James A. Harding was splendid, in the full meaning of the word. It radiated light and warmth and optimism and enthusiasm and courage. By this radiant hope—which lighted his countenance, gave grace and force to the very movements of his body, and music to his voice—darkened minds were led to see the light of divine truth; cold hearts were warmed with God's love; down-hearted people received a new hold on life and a new power to live; unconcerned souls were inspired with undying enthusiasm; and timid hearts were filled with unconquerable courage.

In hope he was like Paul. Those of us who were permitted the wondrous privilege of being his pupils can never forget him as he would stand before us, his magnificent personality aflame, and recite such passages as “I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day”; and, “I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.” . . .

The love of James A. Harding was a mighty spiritual passion. It was dynamic. It lived and moved. It smiled and laughed and wept. It talked, it sang, and it worked and worked. It denounced sin and exalted righteousness. It sacrificed and gave and gave and gave life itself without reservation. It taught, exhorted and plead. And, how it did preach Jesus Christ. . . .

By the power of faith, hope, and love, this magnificent specimen of physical, mental, and cultural manhood, was lifted up and transformed into a magnificent spiritual personality. His entrance into any company brought confidence, warmth, enthusiasm, joy and courage.

James A. Harding was a great husband and father, a great

preacher and debater, and a great teacher.

As a husband and father, he was generous, kind and gentle, but unyielding in his stand for what he believed to be God's will.

As a preacher he was logical, clear, and easy to understand. As a speaker, he was earnest, eloquent, and persuasive. To him, preaching the gospel was man's highest and noblest activity. He went about it with profound reverence, and proceeded always with becoming dignity. The pulpit was never desecrated by anything common or coarse when James A. Harding occupied it. By him the process of salvation was never presented as mere mechanical form. It was always a life-moving, spiritual experience—a new birth-giving entrance into a new life. By his preaching Christians were never led to determine their standing on the basis of party loyalty, or institutional support; but always on the basis of their personal faith in, and life loyalty to, Jesus Christ and his word.

As a debater, he possessed and exercised the power to lead the entire procedure, in most instances, away from the plane of a partisan fight for party victory and personal glory, into a careful, prayerful, intelligent, scholarly search for divine truth. Error was by him uncovered without hesitation and mightily exposed. Truth was first made clear and plain, and then driven into minds and hearts with vigor and power seldom seen.

As a teacher, James A. Harding was great in the thoroughness of his preparation, and the clearness of his presentation, and his unyielding demand for thorough preparation by his pupils. He would not accept careless, indifferent, slovenly work. But above all, he was great as a teacher in his deep and controlling love for his pupils, and in his continuous effort to lift them into the likeness of Jesus Christ.

In all things, James A. Harding was ever the courteous, gracious gentleman, and the deeply reverent and constantly prayerful Christian. He was a great lover of both God and man, a mighty champion of truth and right, and a strong and effective enemy of error.

"I saw a human life ablaze with God,
I felt a power divine,
As through an empty vessel of frail clay
I saw God's glory shine."

May the memory of this magnificent Christian be ever kept alive in the hearts of men in order to stronger faith, more vital hope, purer and deeper love, better living, and more efficient and effective service to humanity is my earnest wish, and fervent prayer.—(End Sewell).

AN EARLY MANIFESTO

Barton W. Stone

It was after the meeting at Cane Ridge that Stone and his colleagues published the following:

With deep concern we have viewed the divisions and party spirit among professing Christians, principally owing to the adoption of human creeds and forms of government. While we were united under the name of Presbytery, we endeavored to cultivate a

spirit of love and unity with all Christians, but found it extremely difficult to suppress the idea that we ourselves were a party separate from others. We have taken the name of Christians not because we consider ourselves more pure than others, but because we knew it was the name first given to the disciples of Jesus by divine authority. It better agreed with our spirit, which is to unite with all Christians without regard to names or distinctions. There are party names too many already in the world, without our assuming another. Partyism is distinctly opposed to the plan of heaven, which is to gather into one, or all in Christ Jesus. It is contrary to the express command of God, to the doctrine, example, and prayer of Jesus, to the repeated exhortations of His inspired apostles, and to the very spirit of Christ in all His new-born children, for they are born with heavenly love and union with the whole family of Christ. But alas! how many are corrupted from the simplicity of the gospel. Enlisted into a party, they too soon are taught to despise others and to forget the good exhortation, "Let brotherly love continue." We have neither made nor adopted any party creed, but have taken the Bible only as our standard. We have taken no party names by which to distinguish ourselves from others, but the general name Christian. We have raised no bars from our communion but what the Bible has raised before us. It is said that heretics are to be excluded from the church: granted, but by what law are they to be judged? Certainly by the Bible. Romans 16:17, "Mark them who cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned and avoid them." Among fallible mortals who know so little, the tolerant spirit ought to prevail, especially among Christians. A Christian is to be judged by his fruit. If the fruit be good, the tree is also good. If we determine a man to be good or bad by his notions or opinions, we are sure to err, as matters of fact. For how many have orthodox sentiments and wicked practices, and how many are holy in their lives, but have erroneous opinions. If to the profession of faith in Christ Jesus as the only Savior of sinners be joined a dependence on Him alone for salvation; if to this be added a holy life according to the gospel, this man thus professing and acting is a Christian in the estimation of heaven, and if God deigns to receive and commune with such, who shall reject him? What if he may have erroneous opinions; yet they do not become principles of his heart or his life so as to influence him to err in practice. A person of this character should not be excluded from the arms of charity. Yet we should not spare his errors, but in the meekness of wisdom, labor to correct them. By thus entreating him as a brother, we can have access to his heart so as to impress it with truth. This I hope, dear brethren, we shall labor to do, from a disposition to please God rather than man. In this too there is danger of erring, but it is safer to err on the side of charity. One thing I have ever observed, that in every revival of pure religion the spirit of toleration revives with it, and as religion declines, intolerance increases. Pure religion expands souls of Christians, but bigotry contracts them. —From *Reminiscences and Sermons*, by W. D. Frazee, pages 50 to 53.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

Brother Harding was the first great pulpiteer from the men of the “Restoration Movement” that I had met; and his sermon on “The Millennium” was so impressive that it could never be forgotten. It seems but yesterday we heard it.

It was in a week of meetings at Odessa, Mo., at the Christmas time in 1907; and though two elders out of three in my Nebraska home church were of “the premillennial view,” and though evangelists who held our meetings there, notably Andrew Perry, had expounded Revelation 20 (constructively, not with mere negations, as now) and had illustrated its teaching on the blackboard, yet it was Harding’s powerful sermon that sank deep into my mind and heart.

It is the glory of great souls that they can differ, and differ freely, without the loss of respect and love for one another; without breach of that unity and fellowship which is the Spirit’s most beautiful fruit. As from Aaron’s head and beard to the skirt of his garment the sweet-smelling oil ran down (Ps. 133), so the fragrance of Christian love, proceeding from Him who is the priestly Head must flow and go, yea, even to the farthestmost rim of his spiritual body, which is the church. Did our pioneer fathers understand this somewhat better than we have understood? Did they prize more highly the precious pleasantness and goodness of dwelling together in unity? Why did they not break fellowship with Harding? David Lipscomb was for years his colleague in the Nashville Bible School: was he perhaps, like E. G. Sewell, either too good a Christian or too poor a “post” or “anti” (as indeed he was), to fall upon Harding as a “speculator”? He probably differed from Harding in considerable degree. Even some millenarians will find themselves differing from Harding on the place of the 21st chapter of Revelation. Harding thought (as the first part of our reprint indicates) that that chapter would be fulfilled within the frame-work of the 20 chapter; that the holy city, New Jerusalem, would come down on earth in all its glory at or during the millennium. In this he may have been right or wrong; but that he was “premillennial”—boldly, out-spoken so—is beyond all possibility of denial or doubt. Lipscomb and Sewell must have known that he was so. To D. H. Friend and J. Edward Boyd, he said (summer of 1925): “I believe just as surely as that we are sitting here, that we shall reign on the earth with Christ a thousand years.” And the following reprint, especially the latter part, will be evidence all-conclusive. It was written as an editorial for *The Way* (later combined with *Christian Leader*) in 1903, long before his memory weakened. In the final paragraphs, he sums up his faith and teaching in a very compact manner.—E. L. J.

No. 73—First Reprint of 1952

HARDING ON SECOND COMING, REVELATION 19, 20

The time came for the enlargement of God’s family. There must be added to it a great host of “sons of God,” of beings made in the image of God, after the likeness of God, being educated, trained

and fitted to reign with Christ as members of the royal family, as children of the King. (See 1 John 3:1-3; Rev. 20:4-6; Rev. 22:3-5; Dan. 7:18, 27; Matt. 19:28, 29; Rom. 5:17.)

From these considerations it is clear that the earth is God's nursery, His training grounds, made primarily for the occupancy of His children, for their education, development and training until they shall have reached their majority, until the end of the Messianic age has come; then it is to be purified a second time by a great washing, a mighty flood, but this time in a sea of fire. Then God will take up His abode Himself with His great family upon this new, this renovated and purified earth. . . .

It is apparent that the one great, all-including purpose for which we were made, for which we exist, is to be educated, trained, developed, so as to be indeed sons of God; brothers of Christ, heirs of God, who will dwell with their Father for ever, and will reign with Him. We were made for rulers to start with (Gen. 1:27), and the faithful are to be members of the ruling family of the universe, rulers for evermore. Daniel prophesied, saying, "The saints of the Most High shall receive the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever. . . . 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 the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High: His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him" (Dan. 7:18, 21, 22, 27.) Paul indignantly asks of the Corinthians, when they were so foolish as to go to law before unbelievers, "Know ye not that *the saints shall judge the world?* and if the world is judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that *we shall judge angels?*" (1 Cor. 6:2, 3). In the parable of the talents (Matt. 25:14-30), and of the pounds (Luke 19:11-27), Jesus plainly shows that the faithful are to be made rulers. Referring to the time of His second coming, He says to the faithful, "Well done, thou good servant: because thou was found faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities;" and, to another, "Be thou over five cities;" or, as He expressed it in another place: "Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will set thee over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." Again, He says (Matt. 24:45-47), "Who then is the faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath set over his household, to give them their food in due season. Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Verily I say unto you, that he will set him over all that he hath."—From *The Way*.

"There shall be signs in sun and moon and stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, in perplexity for the roaring of the sea and the billows; men fainting for fear and for expectation of the things that are coming on the world: for the powers of the heaven shall be shaken. And they shall see the Son of man coming in a cloud

with power and great glory. But when these things begin to come to pass, look up, and lift up your heads; because your redemption draweth nigh." (Luke 21:25-28).

When Christ came the first time no man knew the day nor the hour of His coming; but devout Jews were expecting it, and many false Christs arose because of this expectation. In foretelling His second advent Jesus makes it plain that the world will not expect it, nor be prepared for it; to them He will come as a thief in the night; but it should not be so with regard to His people; He tells them plainly that they should watch, and not be surprised as by a thief; they are to read the signs of the time and be ready.

"And as were the days of Noah, so shall be the coming of the Son of man. For as in those days which were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and they knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall be the coming of the Son of man.—From *The Way*, Sept. 25, 1902.

(Italics ours)

When the saints are caught up to meet Him, *Christ comes on with them to the earth*. Then all the kings of the earth gather their armies together, with the beast and the false prophet, to make war against Christ and his army. The beast and the false prophet are captured and cast into the lake of fire, the first to be consigned to that awful place; then by the sword that proceeds out of his mouth Christ slays all the rest, all the wicked that are on the earth, and all the birds are filled with their flesh. Satan is then caught, chained, and cast into the abyss, which is shut and sealed. In this place he is confined for one thousand years.

During this time, this thousand years, Christ and his saints reign, *but the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years have expired*. This, the resurrection of the righteous, is the first resurrection; over these who come up at this resurrection "the second death hath no power; but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." . . .

From all this it is evident that the last thousand years of Christ's reign will be a period of perfect rest from sin. During this period Satan will be in the abyss, chained, closed up and sealed over; the beast and false prophet will be in the hell of fire; all the rest of the wicked will be dead; and the saints will have received their spiritual bodies having been delivered "out of the body of this death."

These facts point clearly to this period of a thousand years as the Sabbath rest that remains for the people of God. . . . this glorious thousand years *with which time ends*, during which all the saints of all ages will reign with Christ in perfect freedom from the guilt and all the evil effects of sin, in perfect freedom from the temptation to sin. That *this millennial reign will be on the earth* is clearly indicated by the fact that at the beginning of it Christ and His saints are on the earth, and so they are at the end of it. Compare Rev. 19:11-21 with Rev. 20:1-10. Read also 1 Cor. 15:20-28; 1 Thess. 4:13-18; 2 Thess. 2:7-9; Matt. 24:29-31.—From *THE WAY*, Oct. 15, 1903.

R. C. Bell's Encomium of J. A. Harding

We obtained Brother Bell's kind permission to reprint here his warmhearted lines concerning J. A. Harding, printed first in the autobiographical sketch of Bell's life that appeared by request in *Firm Foundation* Nov. 6, 1951. Thus we close the Harding reprints with Brother Bell's encomium, as we opened them with Brother Sewell's.

"At the age of eighteen years, I entered the Nashville Bible School, Nashville, Tennessee, to alternate for five years attending this institution and teaching in the rural schools of Tennessee. Under the influence of David Lipscomb and James A. Harding, I soon saw that Paul's description of some who would hold a form of doctrine, but deny its power, fit me. Especially, Brother Harding's living, magnetic contagious faith in God as a real personal friend matched the wave-length of my spirit. I slowly enough imbibed his enthusiasm for God's fatherly care of individual Christians, for Christ's brotherly sympathy and fellowship with them, and for the empowering Holy Spirit's residence in them. In other words, for Brother Harding's conception of Christianity as a "divine-human encounter," in which spiritual communion between God and man, the sweetest of human experiences, was enjoyed.

"I gradually came to realize, however, that the spiritual power of the church was contingent upon the actual personal presence and working of the triune God in and through Christians. More and more the conviction grew on me that Brother Harding's interpretation of Christianity, which was Paul's too, was needed to save the church from being merely a human organization with a formula to follow, a prayer to recite, and a dull, demagnetized program to render; with professional preachers in her pulpit mechanically saying dead words detached from the living realities of which they spoke, dealing in trite moralizings, threadbare platitudes, and heartless preaching about the heart and passion of Christ. This kind of a church instead of being the divine organism, instinct with the life and power of God, as designed by her Founder! In short, Brother Harding's interpretation was needed to save the church from changing divine dynamics to human mechanics.

"This fuller understanding of revolutionary Christian truth began to turn my "world upside down," and to open up for me a new world of worship, of work, and of values in general. Consequently, when Brother Harding started another Bible School at Bowling Green, Kentucky, to be known as Potter Bible School and asked me to become one of his teachers for the fall of 1901, I, believing that God was guiding, eagerly accepted. Thus began my half-century of teaching Bible in our Christian schools. Every member of Brother Harding's faculties was expected to teach at least one class in Bible daily."

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 74

The following address was delivered at Louisville Bible Conference on September 7, 1951. We thank the author for permission to publish this thoughtful essay in this department.

CAUSES OF DIVISION

By H. L. Olmstead

"Behold, how good and how pleasant it is
For brethren to dwell together in unity!
It is like the precious oil upon the head,
That ran down upon the beard,
Even Aaron's beard;
That came down upon the skirt of his garments;
Like the dew of Hermon,
That cometh down upon the mountains of Zion:
For there Jehovah commanded the blessing,
Even life for evermore."—Ps. 133.

This is described as a song of "Ascents"—somewhat like the modern processional, and was sung as the temple choir were taking their places to begin the service in the great congregation where the brethren of Israel had gathered to worship together the God of their fathers.

For brethren to dwell together in unity is both "good and pleasant" (Ps. 133). To dwell together in disunity and strife is evil and unpleasant and must sooner or later result in their ceasing to dwell together at all, and then we have *division*.

I am asked to point out "Causes of Division." I realize that the task is no small one and I realize better than any one else does my own limitations in handling this great subject.

It is not my aim to discuss the wide field of division and interminable strife of the religious world at large. Under some circumstances that would be practical, but for this meeting and our purpose here, it shall be my aim to confine my address to the causes of division among those who have preached the possibility and practicability of Christian Unity and yet find themselves practicing division. To do this it will first be necessary for us to state, or rather to restate, some of the principles of the religious movement in which we ourselves were reared. In its earlier history those who espoused the great cause spoke of it as *the Reformation*, because, while giving due credit to all the great Reformers preceding them—Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Knox, Wesley and others—they did not feel that the true Reformation had come until the great principles they saw fit to speak of as the Restoration Movement had been announced and accepted.

THE PRINCIPLES STATED NEGATIVELY

To fully understand the meaning of the movement we will first consider the things they opposed. First, they opposed all human creeds of every form as being provocative of division among Christians, rather than unity. By no means did they deny or oppose every

statement made in the various creeds of Christendom, but they strove to make faith in Christ—personal faith in Christ as the Son of God, and the Savior of the World—central rather than intellectual conformity to creed. Hence the one and only good Confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God" was all that was required. They labored to make the movement Christocentric rather than Credocentric.

2. They opposed all *Authoritarian groups* in the church beyond that of a local congregation of duly organized disciples of Christ. How often we find the expression in the writings of Campbell and others, "The kingdom of the clergy." Kings were not in good repute in the early days of our country—we had just had a "brush" with one of them through which we had gained our independence as a nation, so the fathers of the movement played up to the popular feeling of the time and spoke of the Authoritarian religious groups as the "kingdom of the clergy." They were the men who sought to regiment the thinking, the faith and practice of Christians by making the various creeds and imposing them upon their fellow Christians as being the final standard of faith and fellowship within the group.

THE PRINCIPLES STATED POSITIVELY

1. This movement exalted Christ and His supreme authority, not just above that of the creeds, but they demanded His complete re-enthronement, and that all other gods be torn down from the Pantheon and He alone be supreme. The creeds must go as the final and binding statements of authority in religion. The best that could be said of creeds was that they were honest human attempts to discover and state divine truth and in that sense might be helpful but, being what they were—only human attempts—they should not be made final and authoritative for faith and fellowship.

2. All this also resulted in a personal exaltation of the whole Word of God. Creeds produced group religion. These principles would produce personal faith in Christ and personal responsibility of each Christian to the Word of God, in its entirety. This, it was believed, would make for unity, for it meant the recognition of all who have active faith in Christ and a free and untrammelled study of God's word by each individual. Together they might pool their knowledge of God's word and by that which "every joint supplieth" grow into an holy temple in the Lord (Eph. 4). The original apostles and prophets who gave us the truth, together with pastors, teachers, and evangelists, would work together that "Unity of the faith unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." It would keep us from being children "tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine," and at the same time find us "longsuffering," forbearing one another in love, endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." Creedal religion makes bonds of fellowship other than faith in Christ and a willingness to adhere to His Word. Creedal religion makes somebody else's explanations the bond of fellowship.

THE CAUSE OF DIVISION—OFF-CENTER

The real cause of division among us is clear. We have failed to abide by our own espoused principles. Honesty would demand that we return to them or repudiate them. We cannot go on preaching one set of principles and practicing another. If the Church of Christ has a human creed, honesty demands that it shall be fully stated so that the public will know what kind of a group of people they are asked to be identified with. If orthodoxy among us has become "Credocentric," let us by all means announce it. If theological and philosophical contentions are replacing simple faith in the person of Jesus Christ our Lord, then we *are* a denomination pure and simple and have renounced our plea. If we are "more concerned about things that are merely incidental than about our personal confidence in Christ as Lord and Savior", then what becomes of our boasted freedom in Christ? It has come to be that what a man believes about cups, colleges, Sunday school, method of work, order of services, singing in the assembly, etc., are tests of loyalty and orthodoxy and have neutralized the intent of the whole unity movement. Around these things as center our thoughts revolve, our doctrines are stated, our creeds have formed. We have moved far off-center and find ourselves under the stress of mere things and incidentals, each group contending its particular order, method, system, position, is the only true one. Could it be that the word "Restoration" to us has come to mean more than was intended or more than should be included in a "Restoration"? In other words, are we trying to restore something that never existed? Who, for example, knows *how* the Churches "appointed the man to travel with Paul on a fund-raising campaign? How many churches were represented? (2 Cor. 8:18). When they spoke one to another in Psalms, hymns and spiritual songs," was it congregational, or one speaking at a time or was it antiphonal? What songs did they sing? Who wrote them? Did they have song books? A paid leader? Did he hold their time together by using a baton, or by some other human means? When they remembered the Lord's death, did they sit, stand, kneel or recline? Did they use one little nibble of bread, or sip of wine, or did they eat and drink at a table? When the Church at Philippi sent one and again to Paul's necessities (Phil. 4:15, 16) did they take up a special collection, take it out of the treasury, get those who wished to give to "subscribe," or how? When the collection for the saints was taken at Corinth on "the first day of the week" (1 Cor. 16:1, 2) did they pass a plate, basket, leave it at the door in a box as they did in the temple, or how? Do any of these things make any difference at all? A Methodist Bishop is quoted as saying that Alexander Campbell all but united the Protestant world and might have done so if his followers had not included so many incidentals in the "plea".

A well-known journal that takes "the post-millennial view", reprinted recently an article from 1910 by D. Lipscomb against Russell's "Millennial Dawn" theory. Very well! The brethren of "the pre-millennial view" have dealt with the error often, long ago, and very effectively. We make no apology for "Dawnism."

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 75

CAUSES OF DIVISION — II

H. L. Olmstead

KINGDOM OF THE CLERGY RETURNS

In the various religious groups there has been, as we have shown, an Authoritarian body who declare the doctrine and practice of each denomination. Against this rule of the Clergy our fathers rightfully rebelled. The Clergy was organized. There were Synods, Conferences, Councils, etc., who guard the faith of the local churches.

Today, representing the various groups among us, are the Papers and Schools. Both are mostly organizations of the preachers. Usually one man is president of the organization and his decisions are the final word. The theory, especially of the papers, is that to guard the Churches they must pass upon the orthodoxy of every preacher and missionary. It is they who must review all the acts of the local Churches in these matters of missionaries and ministers. These organizations reach everywhere. They wield great power in the movement. They make the young preachers and missionaries feel that it would be dangerous for them to have such an organization opposing them, or not to have their unqualified endorsement, so these young men either suffer in silence or subscribe to the creed of the organization. Now, to head a group or to be important in a faction, appeals to the flesh and to the fleshly mind. No doubt the pope of Rome feels that if he and the College of Cardinals did not speak, the Churches would go to pieces. So with the heads of all religious organizations. So do our papers and schools feel. If they did not speak, and sometimes actually interfere, they feel that the Churches would go to pieces with no one but Christ to head them and nothing but the Bible and their chosen servants to guide them. The difference between our "kingdom of the clergy" and that of the others is that most of theirs was authorized by the Churches, while ours are self-appointed organizations.

THE CAUSE UNDERLYING IT ALL

Among the works of the flesh we find, "enmities, strife, jealousy, wraths, factions, divisions, parties" (Gal. 5:20). If it were not for the predominance of the flesh, brethren could honestly differ and not divide. If it were not for fleshly pride we could stand to see our own religious conclusions investigated and even assailed. Were it not that we desired the preeminence, like Diotrephes (3 John 9), we would think twice before casting any one out of the Church. If we did not love power we would not constitute ourselves into religious organizations to pass upon the orthodoxy of our brethren. If preachers crucified the flesh with all the passions and lusts thereof, the passion of jealousy and envy so often seen would be non-existent.

Our hope for real unity does not lie along the path of creedal uniformity. It must come as a result of putting Christ, and not things or incidentals, in the center of our preaching and plea. There is

needed such a preaching of the full Gospel of grace, salvation, and holiness by the power of God's Spirit as is set forth in the New Testament, a preaching that stops not at merely changing men's religious views but changes *men* themselves. There was once such a forth-right ministry of the central message of the Gospel that those who embraced it were said to be "new creatures in Christ Jesus." The number of nominal Church members since Pentecost has been very many. The number who could say with Paul, "I have been crucified with Christ" has been far less. It is clear then that there can be no unity between those who are after the flesh and those who are after the Spirit. There can be no compromise there. Preaching that produces group religion and no personal religion can never produce unity, for it appeals to the flesh, rather than to the spirit.

As in the long ago, he that was born after the flesh (Ishmael) persecuted him that was born after the Spirit (Isaac), *so also it is now*. Wherefore, what saith the Scripture? cast out the handmaid and her son, for the son of the handmaid shall not inherit with the son of the free woman" (Gal. 4:29, 30). If our preaching be concerned with incidentals, with philosophical and theological contentions, these all appeal to the fleshly mind but are of no value against the indulgence of the flesh (Col. 2:23).

There is only one counteractive agent against the flesh, and that is the Holy Spirit Himself. "Ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. But if any man (be he elder, deacon, preacher, editor, college president) have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." (Rom. 8:9.)

Creedal agreement and uniformity in congregational practice, may be desirable but are not essential. The common life imparted by the Spirit of God is; else the flesh will dominate all our actions and division will be inevitable. "I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. 7:18).

THE CHALLENGE AND CALL

These things being true, in these troublous days of moral laxity, mere group religion, careless and ungodly living, loose thinking in a time of trouble, when all men's hearts are fainting for fear of the things that are coming to pass on earth, we are challenged to a ministry of the unsectarian gospel of Jesus Christ, a gospel that preaches the cross of Christ not only as the procuring cause of man's salvation, but preaches the Cross for ourselves that we may no longer live unto ourselves but unto Him who died and rose again. (2 Cor. 5:15).

The call today is for men, who, in the utter abandon of their faith, will declare the whole counsel of God.

The call is for men who are laboring to save men, *not doctrine*.

The call is for men who not only preach Christ-centered religion but who *live* it themselves.

We issue a call for men who will preach Christ and Him crucified, *not* so as to leave the impression that He is defending the theology of some group, but that he is laboring to bring men to Christ by bringing Christ to men.

The times challenge us to seek understanding and fellowship with all who know and love our Lord in sincerity and truth in every place.

We are called at whatever cost or personal sacrifice to turn away from all allegiances that are creed-centered instead of Christ-centered. We are called upon to throw off the yokes of legalism and creedalism, to wear only the yoke of Christ. "His yoke is easy and his burden is light."

What is needed today is not men who think that Jesus started something that reached its climax in the 13th Century and left believers in the bondage to papacy; nor that the climax of Christ's movement came in the 16th, 17th, or 18th Centuries. *That* left Christians in bondage to the creeds. Much less do we need men who, in their claims for chapter and verse authority for all they do in religion, resort to the legalistic hair-splitting distinctions as tests of loyalty that are now being made in a score of places. Surely the truth of God is a living and active thing. Its nature is such that it cannot be stored away in cans, fashioned after the pattern of human minds who place the stamp of finality on these human containers.

We, therefore, recommend that all who seek to be simple unsectarian Christians, those who seek fellowship in free Churches which are not controlled by preacher organizations or by clergy, (whatever the method they may employ—whether direct organization, or under the guise of religious Journals or Schools or groups and cliques of preachers) declare unceasing spiritual warfare against all such workings of the flesh. That we back up, take a new start, declaring allegiance to no group, not even our own, but only to Him who is the one divine head of the one body of Christ which is His Church.

I humbly suggest that we for ever repudiate all tests of loyalty that have been arrived at by human reason, and all attempts at Christian unity other than that which the Holy Spirit will work among those who have received God's Christ and hold His Word in holy honor. This unity will be genuine, not artificial; it will be of the Spirit and not of the flesh; it will be divine and not human; it will be of God, not of men. It will please God, build up only His house, and not a sectarian party!

CONSISTENCY

Late in 1952 a contemporary journal published a thought-provoking article on Rev. 19:17, 18, in which the author spoke of himself as "taking a post-millennial view, not a pre-millennial." We have no objection to register against that terminology. It is often used by educated men merely to avoid circumlocution, not to admit membership in some post-millennial party. But one cannot but wonder why those who take an opposite eschatological "view" should have suffered so much criticism for using the convenient term "pre-millennial", or the phrase, "the pre-millennial view."

We do not, on the ground of his terminology, charge that our brother is an "*ist*", in some sectarian sense; nor do we admit that those who "take the pre-millennial view" are "*ists*" in some sectarian sense. But if to "take the pre-millennial view" makes some men "*ists*" in a sectarian sense, then to "take the post-millennial view" would make other men "*ists*" in the same sectarian sense. If not, why not? Words to conjure with—that is all; and "much ado about nothing".—E. L. J.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 76

Over a hundred years ago (1849) there appeared in *Millennial Harbinger*, from the pen of an honored correspondent, H. T. Anderson, an article on "The Throne of David." Editor Campbell of the *Harbinger* wrote a rather sharp answer to Anderson's letter, though not to the point of breaking off fellowship with the able translator. Campbell had now gone through the Miller stir, and he was perhaps a bit "on edge" and anxious over the Hall-Army commotion. Moreover, his answer to Anderson shows that he was plainly irked by "other kindred notions," such as "state of the dead"; notions which he did not, however, impute to Anderson, and which could not be imputed now to the editor of *Word and Work* (whose article on the same subject is our chosen reprint for this issue). Even with these disturbances and allowances, Campbell's answer was out of harmony with his customary patience and toleration; and for this cause, no doubt (its severity) it has been played up in current journals among us. He did, however, exhibit his correspondent's entire article; and, though calling it "an opinion" (a word more common and less odious then than now), he spoke of his correspondent as "our much esteemed Brother Anderson of Kentucky." Still, it must have been Anderson's humility rather than any meekness shown by Campbell, that prevented a breach! After all, it takes two to make a quarrel; two—at the same time!*

In this connection, and before exhibiting our present reprint, it seems apropos to quote here Item XII from Begg's "Twelve Short Reasons," which Campbell printed in full in the *Harbinger* of 1832, and which he then introduced as "*worthy of a very candid and attentive consideration.*" Here is that paragraph:

"The first event which distinguishes the advent of our Lord, Matt. 25:31, is, that he shall **sit on the throne of his glory**. If it is not **till the advent** that he shall thus sit on the throne of his glory, it necessarily follows that he is not **now sitting on that throne**. Accordingly he himself assures us, Rev. 3:21, that the throne where he now sits is that of his Father (in heaven); and his words necessarily imply that this session on his own throne is yet a future event. If we further inquire what is the identical throne on which Messiah, the Son of Man, shall sit, we find the answer in the well known prophecy of Isaiah 9:7: 'He shall sit upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and establish it.' Confirmatory of which are also the words of Gabriel to his virgin mother, Luke 1:32: 'The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever.' Unless, then, we identify the throne of David with that of the Eternal Father, which would be blasphemy, we must acknowledge that the session of Messiah on his own throne is a distinct event, and belonging to another period." (See entire article, **Faith of our Fathers**, 1945, p. 28.)

* See further comment in the Editor's article, "Basis of Christian Fellowship", page 346, this volume.

CHRIST ON DAVID'S THRONE

R. H. Boll

About the Throne of David, an able and respected brother writing on Peter's Pentecost sermon, presents us with the following bit of reasoning:

Observe the facts of the sermon. First, the life of Christ—"Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you." Second, the death of Christ—"Ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." Third, the resurrection of Christ—"Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death." Fourth, the ascension and exaltation of Christ—"Therefore being at the right hand of God exalted." Fifth, the Kingship of Christ—"God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." And to the fact of all this David is called to witness. "Being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his [David's] throne; he seeing this before spoke of the resurrection of Christ." Thus the thirtieth verse of Acts the second chapter connects the event of Christ seated on David's throne with the event of his resurrection and not with the event of his second coming. David's throne has, therefore, been **transferred** from earth to heaven and **transformed** from temporal to spiritual. And Peter's inspiration is staked on the fact that Christ is on it.

We are pleased at the good, straightforward manner of these declarations. Simple Christians who have no theory to maintain nor creedal position to uphold care only to know what the truth is. So far as my personal preferences go I would as lief have it the way my brother puts it as any other, very much rather in fact, *if that is the truth*. If "the throne of David" means the present super-exaltation of Jesus Christ to the right hand of God and the throne of the Majesty on High to absolute, universal authority ("angels and authorities and powers being made subject to him," and seated "far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and every name that is named, etc.,"; 1 Pet. 3:22; Eph. 1:21, 22)—If *that* is what is meant by the "*throne of David*," why, of course, He is now sitting on the throne of David. For we all believe that Christ has sat down on the Father's throne, and that absolutely everything is now subject to Him, He alone excepted who did subject all things unto Him. (1 Cor. 15:27.) If *that* indeed is the throne of David we are well pleased to have it so. But that is the thing that needs to be shown. We have no personal or party interests at stake, and are entirely willing to have it as God wills and says, however that may be. But if the Word does not say that Christ is now on David's throne, then neither shall we say it, no, not even to promote "unity" or to please anybody. I give my brother who wrote the above quoted paragraph credit for the same honesty and love of the truth.

* * *

What authority then does our brother present for his bold assertions that Jesus Christ is now sitting on the throne of David and that the throne of David has been "*transferred* from earth to heaven, and *transformed* from temporal to spiritual"? Such statements

should not be made except upon a warrant of sure and sufficient scripture-teaching. Where is that teaching? We ask and seek for it in vain in our brother's article. The only ground apparently on which he bases all this assertion is that Peter said that God had raised up Christ to sit on David's throne. On that much we all agree. But that lacks something of saying that Christ is already on that throne. Here are Peter's words:

"Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ. . . ." (Acts 2:30, 31.)

On this the brother says, "Peter's inspiration is staked on the fact that Christ is on it, (i. e. on David's throne). Now perhaps he sees something more in this passage than I have been able to find. If so let him kindly show us and tell us just where inspired Peter says *Christ is on David's throne*? That Christ *had to be raised up* to sit on David's throne we all believe and know. But that He now sits on David's throne is precisely the thing Peter did *not* say. The two events are not declared to be simultaneous. The Revised Version makes that even clearer:

"Being therefore a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins he would set one upon his throne, he foreseeing this spake of the resurrection of Christ, that neither was he left unto Hades, nor did his flesh see corruption."

Peter reasons that for this cause *His flesh* was so carefully preserved from corruption, and He was raised from the tomb incorruptible, since only as to *His flesh* did the Lord Jesus have any relationship to David (Rom. 1:4) and only as to the flesh did He have any claim whatever to David's throne. And God had sworn to David that *of the fruit of his loins* (that is, an actual fleshly descendant) He would set one upon his (David's) throne. Clearly then the Christ had to be raised from the dead in order that He might occupy "the throne of His father David," and "reign over the house of Jacob for ever." (Luke 1:32.) But that He is already occupying that throne Peter does not say. We must be careful not to impute any statement to Peter which Peter never made.

Still less ground is there for the speculative conclusion drawn by our brother when he says that the throne of David has "therefore" been "transferred from earth to heaven and transformed from temporal to spiritual." This may be his opinion and that of many other good brethren; but I do not believe it is warranted by any statement of scripture. It could not be classed as even a legitimate inference, much less a *necessary* one. And though this good brother does not proscribe his brethren who differ with him—is it true that brethren among us have to confess to such doubtful ideas as these in order to be recognized as sound in the faith and worthy of fellowship? I hope not. I know of no sect in Christendom that would not accord standing and fellowship to those who would sign up their articles, and conform to their peculiar views. But the

church of Christ is not so, and, let us hope, will never come to that. Enough for us that we stand wholly committed to the word of God, all of it, and that alone, in *faith, doctrine, and practice*. That is the basis of fellowship among Christians. Even at that, because of our weakness we shall make blunders enough in all three of these departments; but standing faithfully by that true principle, and earnestly seeking the truth in love, we can grow into an ever more perfect unity and harmony. I believe that if on such themes as the Throne of David we will drop our own preconceived notions, and also forget the "representative views of the brotherhood," and address ourselves to learn what God has said, we shall ultimately arrive at both truth and agreement.

* * *

Thus far my studies of the scripture have led me to believe that the throne of David was that particular sphere of government which God established over "the house of Jacob," and which God delegated to David and his house for ever. ("The throne of the Kingdom of Jehovah *over Israel*.") By "the house of Jacob" is meant that nation which descended from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. (Jer. 33:26.) David's realm was "over Israel and over Judah from Dan even to Beersheba." (2 Sam. 3:10.) "David shall never want a man to sit upon *the throne of the house of Israel*." (Jer. 33:17.) David's throne and kingdom was that which Saul had previously had. David never had any other. The brother referred to must have understood this, and must also have felt that the extreme difference in both nature and location between David's throne and the throne which the Lord Jesus now occupies, had to be accounted for, else he would not have thought it necessary that David's throne should have to be "transferred" and even "transformed" (beyond all recognition) in order to be what he says it is now. It is certainly a fact that David never sat on such a throne as that which the Lord Jesus has now. It is equally certain that the Lord Jesus never occupied the special throne that was David's, nor exercised the authority of David's realm. So different and distinct are the two spheres that the Lord Jesus could hold His present supreme authority regardless of Davidic descent without at all infringing on David's promised rights of sovereignty in Israel. How then could it be said that Christ is now on David's throne? For the identity of a throne is not determined solely by the occupant of it, but upon the realm over which the throne is established.

* * *

As *Son of God*, Jesus holds all things in His hands (John 3:35) and He is Lord over all. As the *Son of man*, he is crowned with honor and glory and the universe is made subject to Him (Heb. 2:5-9). As the *Son of Abraham* He is Heir of the world (Rom. 4:13) and through Him is the world-wide blessing which was promised to Abraham. As the *Son of David* He is the king of Israel, and shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever (Luke 1:32), from which center His dominion shall go out unto the ends of the earth (Isa. 9:7) —From *Word and Work*, 1930.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 77

IS DAVID'S THRONE A "CARNAL" RULE?

R. H. B.

When it is contended that the Throne of David means now what it always meant — the Divinely delegated sovereignty over the nation of Israel — some will think there is something low and carnal and materialistic in such doctrine, something unworthy of our glorious Lord. The idea that Christ will "sit on a throne in Jerusalem and rule over the Jewish nation" (as some put it) easily lends itself to caricature and ridicule. It suggests "that old dirty town," and a residence palace, and a chair of state on which the Lord is supposed to sit wielding an iron rod; and presumably other premises — bed room, dining room, and general living quarters. Of course, no thoughtful, fair, and serious man would draw such a picture or charge such teachings to any one unless those teachings were avowed. There are also terms in current use about that Throne of David that exhibit similar misconceptions — such as "fleshly," "earthly," "temporal," "carnal," "political," "worldly"; some of which would be very good if we didn't read something into them that does not necessarily belong to them. If by a "worldly" throne you mean that it is *in* the world — well; but if you mean that it is *of* the world — *no!* The church also is in the world, but it is not *of* the world. If by "earthly throne" you mean a throne that is *on* the earth, and a sovereignty over the earth — yes; but if the idea is that it is *of* the earth, earthly — *no*. If by "fleshly" were meant a rule over human beings in the flesh — well; but not if anything that is *of* the flesh is meant. All those epithets can be and generally are used in a false sense, which misrepresents the Biblical idea.

It will help us if we remember that God once did rule over the nation of Israel, Himself, in a special sense. Israel was His province and domain. He was their King. It was an "earthly," "political," "temporal" throne and sovereignty. If there was nothing essentially debasing and destroying in that then, there could be nothing debasing or derogatory in it if He assumed the same or a like sovereignty over Israel again.

Then there came a time when Israel rejected God as their King and asked for a human king. God acceded to their request, but did not abdicate His right and sovereignty over them. He Himself selected the king, commissioned him, and delegated His authority over Israel to him. The king of Israel was always a sub-ruler under Jehovah, whom he must obey and consult. The first man chosen of God to serve as Israel's king was Saul. (Some have erroneously represented that Saul was *the people's* choice, not God's; the Bible shows the opposite). He was rejected for his disobedience to Jehovah, and David, the son of Jesse, was anointed by God's orders to be king. To David and David's house God granted the

sovereignty over the house of Israel in perpetuity, by oathbound covenant (2 Sam. 7; Ps. 89). Thus "the throne of David" meant the exercise of God's sovereign rule over the nation of Israel, as delegated to David and his descendants for ever. It still means just that, and nothing else. To change its meaning from that specific rule over the land and nation to a "spiritual" rule in the "hearts" of a different people of no particular land or race, is juggling terms. Let that latter rule and reign be called whatever it may — it is not that of the throne of David, nor can it be.

The throne of David belongs to the Lord Jesus Christ by right of Davidic descent and Divine choice and appointment of Him as king of David's line. It is a throne to which even He would have no personal right if He were not "of the seed of David according to the flesh." For it is that particular sphere of sovereignty which God delegated and sware for ever to David's house and dynasty — namely the rule over the nation of Israel. But (after the type of His father David) the Lord Jesus will not assume that rule till the nation wants and welcomes Him as their king. Then will God send Him (Acts 3:19-21). Then will Israel be a converted and regenerate nation — a spiritual Israel. ("Spiritual Israel" is not the church, but that contingent of the natural Israel, ultimately embracing the whole living nation, that accepts Jesus as their Prince and Savior). So shall all Israel be saved, and the receiving of them shall be as life from the dead to all the earth. (Rom. 11:15, 25, 26.)

The center and capital of that Davidic rule which is to be exercised by David's greater Son, will be Jerusalem. It is His resting place for ever (Ps. 132) and it will be *glorious* (Isa. 11:10) when the Lord shall have cleansed away its filth and blood "by the spirit of justice and by the spirit of burning." Over the whole habitation of Mount Zion shall hang a canopy of cloud, like the pillar that guided Israel through the wilderness of fire by night, and for a shade in the day time; and like the Shechina that hung over the Tabernacle, the symbol of the presence of God. (Isa. 4:4-6.) There is nothing debasing or "materialistic" in such a conception. At any rate, that is the way *God* says it is going to be. Let us hope that nobody will object! Note too that in these predictions it is always Jerusalem that once was sinful, defiled, cast off, that is restored — not the New Jerusalem in heaven, nor the church (Isa. 60:10-17).

Finally, from Jerusalem as a center God will rule, in the Person of Jesus Christ, to the ends of the earth. Thither will the nations flow for light and instruction, and there will He sit and arbitrate for them; and then there will be disarmament and peace (Isa. 2:2-4; Isa. 11). Thither, too, as in the days of Solomon (1 Kings 10:23-25), the nations will bring their willing tribute from afar (Isa. 60:5-11), and through the restored People, under Christ's benignant rule, the light of truth shall go out into all the world, and the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea (Ps. 67). We believe it will be even so, as God hath said; and that the zeal of Jehovah of hosts will perform this. Such is the Biblical conception of the Throne of David, as it is to be.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 78

To all who may be inclined to preach Baptism as a work of law or merit, we recommend the reading of this reprint from the *Harbinger*.

CAMPBELL ON JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH

The gospel is addressed to faith. All its promises of pardon, justification, sanctification, adoption and salvation are addressed to this power or capacity of our nature. But faith, being the belief of testimony, whether human or Divine, is essential to the blessings contained in that testimony—essential to the appreciation, or appropriation, or enjoyment of them. Hence ordinances are instituted and ordained—such as repentance, baptism, the Lord’s day, the Lord’s supper. There is a special grace connected in the Divine economy with every specific ordinance. But whatever be the specific ordinance, faith is indispensable to the enjoyment of each and every blessing connected with it. So that it is not the ordinance alone, or at all, but the faith developed in our active or passive obedience to it, that possesses whatever be the gift, or virtue, or power in it, or associated with it. Hence we are justified and pardoned by faith, exercised and perfected in our acquiescence in and submission to, these ordinances. The merit is not in them, but our enjoyment or reception of the grace contained in them is mercifully connected with this obedience of faith. For faith can be perfected only in obedience, or submission to these gracious institutions. No man can shew or prove his faith but by his obedience, for faith is made perfect only in and by obedience.

With Martin Luther, I regard “justification by faith, the test of a standing or a falling church”—perhaps it should have been of “a standing or a fallen church.” Grace and faith are not incompatible in any scriptural view of either. But grace and works are evidently incompatible. Grace and baptism into Christ are not incompatible, for baptism is not a work of the subject, but of the administrator. The subject is as passive in baptism as he is, or will be, in his literal burial in the earth, so far as his own work is contemplated. There can be no merit in any work not performed by the subject himself. Hence baptism is but the personal and formal confession of the faith of the subject. It is, therefore, never regarded nor denominated as a good work of the subject. All good works have our fellow men as their objects and not ourselves. They are the radiations of philanthropy. Piety itself is only gratitude to God. We can never make God our debtor. We must eternally be debtors to God. These are but the aphorisms of eternal and immutable reason.

Hence in its institution, Christian immersion is only a development of the grace of God. It is his solemn, silent assurance to the proper subject of the pardon of his sins and acceptance with God through the sacrifice of Christ, whose blood alone “cleanses from all

sin." Man alone, of all the tenants of the universe, can be pardoned. Demons, dying infidels cannot, according to the whole Bible, be saved. There is not one ray of hope for them in any Divinely inspired book or document under the broad heavens. He that believes and is immersed into Christ shall be saved; and he that does not believe in the person and mission of the Lord Jesus shall as certainly be damned, or condemned, to an everlasting destruction—an endless perdition, as that God exists and is a rewarder of every man according to his works.—Alexander Campbell, in *Millennial Harbinger*, 1857, p. 648.

NOTES ON REVELATION 20: 1-3

The following paragraph, taken from an exchange, is used here, not with intent to criticize the author of it (a truly good man), but for introductory and background purposes.

"That this [the overthrow of Satan] was done through the death of Christ is stated in the Hebrew letter: 'that through death he [Christ] might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is the devil.' What more could be done with the devil than to destroy him, or bring him to nought? Well, the inspired writer declares this was *done* through the death of Christ. It cannot be said, then, that it is something yet to be accomplished in a supposed age, in a material kingdom, following the age in which we now live. . . . From such as accept this atonement through obedience to the gospel the devil is effectively bound. He can deceive them no more—sin is his power of deception and sin has been blotted out by the blood of Christ."

QUESTIONS

1. Is it "stated in the Hebrew letter" that "*this was done*"—that is, to a finish, for those who accept the atonement? The text reads, "that through death *he might* bring to nought him that had the power of death." (Heb. 2:14.) Of course, the final triumph is "through" Christ's death. (Rev. 1:5.)
2. Has Satan then no longer the "power of death" over those who accept the atonement? Is that done to a finish, for them? If so, why do Christians die?
3. Did not Peter say (to persons who had accepted the atonement "through obedience to the gospel"), long after Christ's death, and long after Pentecost—"Be sober, be watchful: your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour"? (1 Peter 5:8.)
4. Does not the text in question (Rev. 20:1-3) plainly declare, in simple, indicative language, that it is *the nations* (not alone those who accept the atonement) that Satan shall deceive no more, "until the thousand years should be finished"?
5. If Satan is bound now, through the death of Christ, how could he ever "be loosed for a little season," after the thousand years? Will the death of Christ be abrogated for a little while?
6. Finally, what is there, after all, in the vocabulary of this text (Rev. 20:1-3) that any humble reader should fail to understand? What language is there *in this portion* (though there is much *elsewhere* in Revelation) that is so "highly metaphorical and symbolical"? The plain truth is, there are *no symbols* in Rev. 20:1-3 (except "dragon," immediately interpreted as "the devil"). There are *two*

simple figures of speech, "key" and "chain"—so simple and so fitting in this context that a child may understand. Nor is there any difference among us brethren in our understanding of these two words: the "key" is simply something suitable for locking and unlocking the abyss; the "chain" is simply something suitable for binding a great and powerful being. No one—that I know of—denies or ought to deny that these are figures; but some of us think that they are figures of *something*! None of us insist that "key" and "chain" are literal, iron implements, but some of us believe they really lock and bind what God says they lock and bind! In other words, no careful student insists on the *literal sense*; but only on the plain *grammatical sense*.

Try for yourself the following child-like test questions on this text:

"I saw an angel"—what is an angel? Is that a dark symbol or a difficult figure?

"Coming down out of heaven"—do we not know what "heaven" means?

"Having the key of the abyss and a great chain in his hand"—What is the evident meaning, in this context, of the simple figures, "key" and "chain"?

"And he laid hold on the dragon, the old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan"—Is this not clear enough? If not, why not?

"And bound him for a thousand years"—Is there anything difficult here?

Do we not know what the English phrase, "a thousand years," means? Does "bound" mean "loose"? Does "bound" mean "walking about, seeking whom he may devour"?

"And cast him into the abyss, and shut it, and sealed it over him, that he should deceive the nations no more, until the thousand years should be finished"—Is there anything too hard in this third verse? Are there any "symbols" here? Is it not written in plain, simple, indicative, declarative English, faithfully translated out of the original Greek?

Paul tells us (Eph. 2:2) that Satan is "the spirit that *now* worketh in the sons of disobedience" ("now," that is through "the course of this age"); and Peter said, long after Pentecost, that Satan was walking about, "seeking whom he may devour": is all this one and the same in meaning as to be "bound," "cast into the abyss," "shut" and "sealed" in that place, in order that "he should deceive the nations no more . . . ! If so, there is indeed an end to any significance of inspired language, and we may as well give up the search for truth!

It is all very odd and unnatural! Those who believe Rev. 20: 1-3 in its *plain and grammatical sense* are called "speculators," unsound and unworthy; but those who tell the common people that God does not mean what He grammatically says—these are the safe and sound ones in our day!

It seems to me the issues have been stated in reverse: they ask, Can they bear with us, can they tolerate us, can they fellowship us, who accept the simple, grammatical statements of the word of God? And to this some of them (not all) have answered, No. But the question might well be, Can we bear with them, can we tolerate them, can we fellowship them, who "spiritualize," and explain away what God has said? Yet to this question—unless in the case of the extremely factious—we have always answered, Yes!—E. L. J., in *Word and Work*, 1944, p. 176.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 79

PROPHECY: HERMENEUTICS AND APPLICATION

Dr. J. T. Barclay

The key which has heretofore been found so exactly to unfold the prophecies already fulfilled is that which will, and can alone, satisfactorily unlock the treasures of prophecy yet unfulfilled. And that the system thus educed is, in general, what is termed the *natural, rational, literal* or *grammatical*, as opposed to the *quib-libet quo-libet* scheme known as the "spiritual" or "spiritualizing," . . . or any one of the divers other hermeneutic nostrums and private interpretations, there cannot be the shadow of a doubt.

In proof of the exact manner in which prophecy (and especially that of a mere verbal character) has received the most complete and minute fulfillment upon the *literal* or grammatical principle in times past, we need only appeal to the faithful historic record of the rise and fall of certain cities, countries and empires, as compared with predictive announcement concerning them; and it will be observed that Providence has endorsed this principle of exposition in the most complete and satisfactory manner. Of this literal and precise fulfillment of even the minutiae of prophecy, we also have the most incontestible proof in the exact manner in which the minute account of the predictions of the prophets concerning many incidents in the life and death of the Messiah, as recorded by the Evangelists, was fulfilled. Let the following short collation in relation merely to one or two topics testify in behalf of the general principle of literal accomplishment.

PREDICTION

The Lord himself shall give you a sign: behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son; and shall call his name Immanuel.—Isa. 7:14.

And thou Bethlehem Ephratah, out of thee shall He come forth unto me that is to be ruler over Israel.—Micah 5:2

Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion, shout, O daughter of Jerusalem! behold thy King cometh unto thee. . . . lowly and sitting upon a colt, the foal of an ass.—Zech. 9:9.

And all that see me laugh me to scorn; they shoot out the lip, and laugh me to scorn, saying, he trusted in the Lord that he would deliver him; let him deliver him, seeing he delighteth in him.—Ps. 22:7, 8.

I hid my face from shame and spitting.—Isa. 50:6.

He was oppressed and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth.—Isa. 53:7.

FULFILLMENT

Then Joseph took unto himself his wife and knew her not till she had brought forth her first-born son . . . this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet. . . .—Matt. 1:22, 25.

Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea, . . . behold there came wise men . . . saying, where is he that is born king of the Jews?—Matt. 2:1, 2.

And they brought the colt to Jesus, and He sat upon him; and they that went before and they that followed cried, saying, "Hosanna! blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord."—Mk. 11:7.

And they that passed by reviled him, wagging their heads and saying, . . . "If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross. He trusted in God; let him deliver him."—Matt. 27:39.

Then did they spit in his face and buffet him.—Matt. 26:67.

And when he was accused of the Chief Priests and Elders, he answered nothing.—Matt. 27:12.

He was despised and rejected of men.—Isa. 53:3.

And I said unto them, "If ye think good, give me my price, and if not forbear." So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver.—Zech. 11:12.

And the Lord said, "cast it unto the potter."—Zech. 11:3.

They gave me gall for my meat, and in thirst they gave me vinegar to drink.—Ps. 69:21.

He was numbered with the transgressors.—Isa. 53:12.

They pierced my hands and my feet.—Ps. 22:16.

They parted my garments among them and cast lots for my vesture.—Ps. 22:18.

He keepeth his bones: not one of them is broken.—Ps. 34:20.

And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death.—Isa 53:9.

Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas. . . . crucify him.

They covenanted with Judas Iscariot for thirty pieces of silver.—Matt. 26:15.

They took counsel and bought the potter's field, to bury strangers in.—Matt. 27:7.

They gave him vinegar to drink mingled with gall.—Mark 15:27.

With him they crucified two thieves, the one on his right hand and the other on his left.—Mark 15:27.

Except I see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my hands into the print of the nails, I will not believe. Then said Jesus, reach hither thy hands and behold, and be not faithless but believing.—John 20:25-27.

Then the soldiers took his garments and made four parts—to every soldier a part, and also his coat. Now the coat was without seam, woven from the top throughout. They said therefore among themselves, let us not rend it but cast lots for it—that the Scriptures might be fulfilled.—John 19:33.

But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs. . . . that the scriptures should be fulfilled.—John 19:33.

When the even was come, there came a rich man named Joseph. . . . He went to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus; and laid it in his own new tomb.—Matt. 27: 57 - 60.

Now most evident is it from this simple exhibit that if the figurative, spiritualistic, mystical system be the true one, then Christ has not yet come! for these prophecies have not yet been in any way figuratively, but altogether literally fulfilled.

It might well be supposed that such exact and complete accomplishment of plain verbal prophecy would afford to the contemporaries of Jesus of Nazareth the most incontestible proof that he was the promised Messiah; but the scribes and the lawyers found it not at all a difficult task, by means of the same spiritualizing, figurative system of interpretation, now so generally in vogue, to mystify and misapply these predictions as to show him up as an impostor and a malefactor! Most confidently did the Jews look for a great Deliverer at the period of the first advent; but they entirely overlooked those prophecies—however numerous and explicit—declaring that they must first undergo dispersion, before he would come in his glory, and enter upon the government of his kingdom in its new phasis.

But if literal fulfillment is the prominent characteristic of prophecy heretofore fulfilled, does not the same principle dictate the rule of interpretation for prophecy of the same general character, yet unfulfilled? If the events of the Redeemer's life of humiliation were so exactly fulfilled on the principle of literal exposition, according to

the sure word of prophecy that went before, why should not those of his exaltation be just as literally and truthfully fulfilled? If he was literally born at Bethlehem, and literally ascended from Olivet, why shall he not just as literally so come to Olivet on the clouds of heaven in like manner as he went up? What reason can be logically assigned for the application of the literal principle in one case, and the mystifying, spiritualizing system in the other? Altogether evident is it indeed, from every consideration, that the only system of hermeneutics that can reliably unfold the arcana of unfulfilled prophecy is the key that has so successfully unlocked the door to prophetic revelations already accomplished—the “literal system,” as it is generally styled. *If Christ's throne be merely spiritual, as some contend, then consistency requires that the Scriptures announcing his birth, his sufferings, and his death be so construed as to make them merely spiritual and unreal too!*

Let it be conceded by the mystic spiritualizer that the Lord does actually design doing what is claimed by the more literal interpreters, for Jerusalem, Judea, and the Jews—I ask what plainer language could have been used than that by which the Holy Spirit has indicated these matters?—and surely they are not at all impossible, unreasonable, or improbable. If the various matters predicted in the concluding portion of the Book of Zechariah, as attendant upon the advent of Christ, must be spiritualized, as is maintained by so many commentators, what kind of prophecy can possibly be literal? Indeed, such spiritualization of Jehovah's language absolutely deprives him of the power of communicating anything whatever of a literal character.

Has mighty Tyre become a place for the spreading of nets?—Has Judea been desolated, Jerusalem overthrown and the Jews led captive amongst all nations? Did the Lord really mean that Jerusalem should be encompassed with a trench? and does authentic history verify the truth of these predictions? Then why may not Mount Olivet be really cloven asunder? Was it easier for Titus to surround the city with his entrenchment than it will be for Him who made all things to cleave the mountain in twain? If Moses could strike the rock in mount Horeb and cause the gushing stream to rush forth, and follow the Israelites in their devious wanderings through the desert, is it too much to believe that the Lord Jesus will smite Mount Olivet and cause the healing flood of living waters from Mount Moriah to flow through its cloven base? Did the Sechinah manifestation overhang the Tabernacle of old as a pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night, and shall not the Holy City, in the “latter day” be impended by the same cloud of glory in the form of an immense tent or canopy, as foreshown by the sure word of prophecy!

If such plain verbal prophecies be not fulfilled literally, what is the value of prophecy in proof of the inspiration of the Scriptures? If they be not literally fulfilled, well may we excuse the skeptic for stigmatizing the Bible as “an enigma, a fable, a myth!”—*Millennial Harbinger*, 1867, p. 303.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 80

(The Barclay article from "Millennial Harbinger" on Hermeneutics and Application of Prophecy is here concluded. Please refer to last month's installment before reading this).

PROPHECY: HERMENEUTICS AND APPLICATION, II

Dr. J. T. Barclay

To refute arguments addressed from prophecy by the primitive preachers of the gospel, in proof of the Messiahship of Jesus the Nazarene, on the present recognized interpretation, was indeed a task easily performed by the cabalistic scribes, pharisees and lawyers; and will serve to explain the slow progress of the gospel among them; and on just such spiritualizing principles does the infidel of the present day allege the atonement to be "a dream," and all the Christian system "a fable." And the truth is—if it must needs be confessed—that there is not a single prediction, doctrine or fact in all the range of revelation—not excepting the crucifixion itself—that may not be mystified and spiritualized into a mere nullity, by precisely the same species of interpretation and construction as that by which the Scriptures declaring the restoration of Israel and the glorious events connected with their restoration are construed by the allegorizing expositors.

But let it be constantly borne in mind that prophecy is not all of one and the same style, kind, and character. Future events are sometimes indicated by types and symbols, and sometimes by parables and visions, as well as in plain terms of ordinary verbal communication. Now if the literal principle of construction be indispensable for the interpretation of plain verbal prophecy, just as necessary is the figurative for visionary, typical, metaphorical prophecy. But each in its proper place. It is just as injurious to apply the literal system to symbolical prophecy, as the figurative to plain verbal prophecy. Hence the importance of rightly dividing the word—duly discriminating between the literal and metaphorical, so as to know what principle of hermeneutics to apply in unfolding its true meaning.

Symbolical prophecy, like that which characterizes the book of Revelation, must, of course, be figuratively understood; but ordinary verbal prophecy, like that of the concluding chapters of Zechariah—which is merely history penned in advance—must be construed as literally as common sense and consistency will allow. Nor can any system of exposition be reliable that does not recognize the typical character of some portions of prophecy and the double fulfillment of others—which, however liable to abuse, is certainly a principle of divine appointment. And that prophecies coming under this rule of construction are liable to perversion, is candidly admitted (as what oracle of Truth is not?); but what of that if heaven so ordains! Has not the Righteous Judge of all the earth a right to order as he lists! We find figurative language mixed with the literal throughout the Bible, and indeed in all books in all languages, and hence their universal liability to misconstruction. . . .

A wide distinction must always be made between direct verbal prophecy and the figurative style. And it must be borne in mind that the literal and figurative styles are often blended in the same passage. It is an egregious blunder to allege, as is sometimes done, in cavil, that the literal system of interpretation is at all averse to the true spiritual exposition and enjoyment of prophetic composition.

By such an inculcation of the "literal system of exposition," is not by any means to be understood its application to the symbolical, the typical, or the figurative, tropical prophecies, but only to the ordinary, plain, narrative styles. To interpret these literally, would be just as improper and injurious as to interpret literal prophecies figuratively, or spiritually—so called. To lay down an exact canon for the interpretation of symbolical or visionary prophecy may fairly be classed in the category of impossibilities; but yet equally true is it that the difficulties in the way of the interpreting of plain, direct, narrative predictions, are mainly of our own creation.

"Literal interpretation," as Dr. Duffield well remarks, "does not reject the tropes of speech and rhetorical embellishments of style, but interprets the meaning of the prophet always by the same rules of exegesis that would be applied to the same kind of composition." . . . "The literal interpretation," says the same accomplished expounder of prophecy, "carefully searches for the great leading theme of prophecy which gives shape, character and import to the entire system; and applying them to the rules of philosophical and Bible exegesis, the principles of grammatical interpretation and construction, determines whether they are to be interpreted literally or allegorically."

The Holy Spirit has seen fit to deliver some portions of the prophetic word in language highly symbolic, others in types, others in the adornments of figurative style; while other portions are conveyed in the plainest alphabetical style. But it is generally very easy to discover the particular style, and apply the principle of interpretation accordingly. For, in most cases, the observant reader, at all conversant with prophetic diction, intuitively perceives whether the expression is literal or figurative. And if a literal construction involves an absurdity, or in any way transgresses the dictates of common sense, or other oracles of Revelation, the figurative system of interpretation must, of course, be adopted—but only *ex necessitate rei*.

"It is a cardinal rule, however, that the literal meaning is never to be abandoned without evident reason or necessity. The sense afforded by a cautious and critical examination of the terms of the passage, and an impartial construction of the whole sense according to the known usage of the language and the writer, is the common rule of all rational interpretation"—as Dr. J. Pye Smith well remarks.

Because a portion of the prophetic record has been delivered in metaphorical language, and, of course, requires to be metaphorically construed, the mystical interpreter imagines that he triumphantly answers the literalist by requiring him in all cases to apply the literal rule of interpretation. But how absurd the requirement! When Christ says of Jehovah, "My Father is an husbandman," and of his

disciples, "Ye are the branches;"—of the loaf, "This is my body;" and of himself, "I am the true vine," "the door," "the shepherd," "a rock," etc., surely none but the blindest enthusiast, steeped in the dye-stuff of some darling error, could insist on a literal construction of the terms! That all such passages, therefore—involving as they do when literally construed, an absurdity, not to say impossibility—should be understood figuratively, of necessity, is self-evident. The strict application of the literal principle to figurative, tropical, or visionary prophecy would be almost as absurd as the ultra figurative principle to plain verbal prophecy.

It is very justly remarked by Prof. Stuart, that "it is one of the plainest and most cogent of all rules of hermeneutics that every passage of Scripture, or of any other book, is to be interpreted as bearing its plain and primary and literal sense, unless good reason can be given why it should be tropically understood."—According to Vitringa, "It is an unerring canon, and of great use, never to depart from the literal meaning of the subject mentioned in its own appropriate name, if its principle attributes square with the principles of the prophecy." Hooker holds it for a most infallible rule in expositions of Scripture, that when a literal construction will stand, the farthest from the letter is generally the worst." And Ernesti goes so far as to say, that "theologians are right when they affirm the literal sense to be the true one;" but this, of course, must be understood as implying the limitations and restrictions as above expressed. It is generally assumed that when a portion of a prophecy is construed metaphorically, *all* of it should be similarly interpreted; but for a conclusive refutation of this notion, see Ps. 22, and a great many other portions of the Scriptures, where the literal and figurative are intermixed so promiscuously.

It is a fact so obvious as scarcely to need a remark that a large portion of the prophecies relating to the times and the seasons of the ages to come are entirely insusceptible of any other than a literal interpretation, without such a violent wresting as to outrage all propriety. It was precisely by such a process of perversion as that practiced by many spiritualizing anti-millenarian scribes that the lawyers and scribes of old disallowed the claims of Jesus of Nazareth to the Messiahship. And indeed, no phraseology whatever can be made so definite and strong that the truth designed to be set forth cannot be *Spiritualized* away by the emasculating sublimations manipulated in the laboratory of the hyper-metaphoric school, whose cardinal maxims seem to be that the Author of eternal truth never means what he says.—*Millennial Harbinger*, 1867, p. 303.

RESTORATION OF THE JEWS

"I believe that the great body of learned Protestant commentators allow that we are approaching rapidly to three great leading events marked upon the page of prophecy....The third event is the restoration of the Jews to Palestine and their conversion to Christianity.

"Their preservation for so long a time, and under such accumulated and multiplied sufferings, is among the greatest prodigies the world ever saw. The bush that Moses saw on fire has been burning a long time without being consumed. May God hasten the time when He will accomplish all that He has promised to His ancient people!"

—Jacob Creath, Jr., in *Millennial Harbinger*.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 81

The following reprint from the pen of R. H. Boll is as timely today as it was in the day it was written in 1938, and it seems to "belong" with the other able reprints of this work, in defense of the undenominational Christianity for which we stand.

THE MAKING OF A SECT

That differences of views and doctrines should exist in the church of the Lord is not strange. Nor is it in itself bad. When free brethren study God's word independently it is to be expected that on one point and another they will arrive at different conclusions. Where brotherly love rules, these different views and findings, and the discussions that follow, are mutually helpful. Where motives other than love control, differences result in dissension, strife, bitterness, sectarian parties and partisan hate. The blame in such a case, however, does not rest on the differences themselves, but on the spirit and attitude of those who differ. The wrong comes in when lines are drawn, when brethren are "marked," branded, ostracised, disfellowshipped. So long as brethren in Christ confessedly stand upon the Bible as the sole and absolute authority in all matters of doctrine, and confess the Divine Sonship and supreme Lordship of Jesus Christ; so long as they are agreed on what makes a man a Christian and how to work and worship together, no differences would or could divide them, their hearts being right toward God and toward one another. It is when they begin to regard one another as being of different sorts and kinds, because of differences of views, that they become guilty of the wrong warned against in 1 Cor. 1:12.

Moreover when any such difference of views is made the occasion of division, the human authoritative creed, written or unwritten, follows inevitably. For example, the brethren who make fellowship depend on assent or acquiescence to their anti-millenarian contentions have as definite a human creed as any denomination in Christendom; and they have formed themselves into a sect as well-defined as any other sect in Christendom. This regardless of the respective merits of the questions involved, or who is doctrinally right or wrong in the matter. It is strange that brethren cannot see this, but will go on proclaiming themselves the non-sectarian, undenominational church of Christ, and as holding no human creeds nor authoritative standards of doctrine, while nevertheless ousting from their fellowship all who do not agree with them in their anti-millenarian ideas. Some perhaps have seen this point, and have tried to justify themselves by representing the brethren whom they oppose as fundamentally unsound. But this is obviously a mere pretext, gotten up to clear themselves. For both sides in said controversy acknowledge their agreement in other matters. If either side therefore disfellowships the other it means that those who thus disfellowship their brethren forfeit their own standing as undenominational, non-sectarian Christians, and should in fairness and honesty mark themselves with some distinctive title, such as, for instance, "Church of Christ, Anti-Millenarian." As for myself I would be far from dis-

fellowshipping any brother because of differences in prophetic teaching.

To be sure the immediate reply from the anti-millenarian opposers would be, "Why don't you call yourself the 'Pre-millenarian Church of Christ'? It was you, not we, that brought in the divisive doctrine. We stand where we stood before; but you have separated yourselves from us."

To this I must make the following answer, on my own behalf and on behalf of others who have been ostracised, discredited, disfellowshipped by anti-millenarian brethren:

1. We do not deserve any sectarian title, such as "Premillenarian Church," because what "pre-millenarian" teaching we hold we do not hold as a distinctive doctrine. We do not make it a test of fellowship. We would welcome among us and in our fellowship brethren who hold anti-millenarian views, and would gladly bear with their different outlook and teaching, just as we would be borne with by them. We have therefore no distinctive differences upon which to base a sectarian party, but stand upon the broad ground of New Testament Christianity only. But those who make their anti-millenarian views a creed and a test of fellowship have forsaken the ground of non-sectarian New Testament Christianity and have constituted themselves an anti-millenarian sect. In all justice they should therefore be denominated and known as such.

2. In the "pre-millennial" teaching for which those brethren have condemned us and are attempting to cast us out, there is nothing that is either new or divisive. It is not a new teaching for it was held by the professing church as a whole for the first three centuries and by multitudes of faithful Christians since. In the pioneer days of the Restoration, in the days of Campbell, Stone, Lard, and others as well as in later days, this teaching was freely taught and cherished by many noted leaders and many of the rank and file of the church. It was not divisive then, for though it was freely discussed pro and con, it caused no rift in the fellowship. It is not divisive now. For though some have risen up who evidently have never understood what the principles of undenominational New Testament Christianity are, and have made their opposition-views a test of fellowship, the fault of that lies not in the teaching against which they have raised their opposition, nor even in the fact of the opposition itself (for Christians are free to oppose what they believe to be wrong) but in the divisive sectarian spirit and course which the opposition has followed, and by which they have separated themselves from their "Premillennial" brethren and constituted themselves an anti-millenarian party and sect.

3. Finally, because the *principles* of non-sectarian New Testament Christianity, for which we whole-heartedly stand, *must be* maintained, and that the whole church be not led into a sectarian rut by those who are seeking to impose their anti-millenarian creed on it, all Christians who prize their freedom in Christ should stand up against the sectarian efforts of those leaders who would make the anti-millenarian or pre-millenarian views a test of fellowship. However important may be the intrinsic merits of the doctrines in question, the principle of free New Testament Christianity which is at

stake is of still greater importance; for upon the maintenance of that depends our existence as a religious people whose only plea is that of the nonsectarian, undenominational New Testament faith.

Too long have good brethren, in their desire to avoid "trouble," put up with their sectarian course. If the whole "church of Christ" is not to degenerate into an anti-millenarian sect, it is certainly high time that those who understand and love the righteous principles of nonsectarian faith rise up and call a halt to the insidious work which threatens to overthrow our very foundations, and to contend—not for premillenarianism or anti-millenarianism—but for that basis of brotherly unity in Christian liberty on which alone a true New Testament Christianity is possible.—*Word and Work*, 1938, p. 93.

THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST

By George Müller of Bristol

In confessions of faith, the truth that the Lord Jesus will come again may still have a place; but practically, to by far the greater number of His disciples, it has been a mere doctrinal statement that has not been enjoyed, and which has had no influence upon their lives. The Lord, however, desired it should be otherwise. He intended that His Church should look for Him; that she should watch and wait for His return. Again and again, during His personal ministry, the Lord Jesus foretold this great event; and after His ascension the apostles referred continually to it.

The second coming of the Lord Jesus means that He will return *in person*, and has no reference to the gift of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, or to His manifesting Himself in an especial manner to the believer in the way of comfort, instruction or help of any kind; nor has it reference to our death, when we, as believers, are taken to be with Him.

If, however, anyone should say, "Why lay such stress upon this; is not our going to Him when we die the same thing?" The reply is, "There is a vast difference between these two events."

(a) As *individuals* we shall at that time [death] be brought only to a state of *partial* happiness; we shall have no glorified bodies then, but we must await the hour when "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." Nor when we fall asleep do we reign with Christ and sit with Him upon His throne; because He will not then be manifestly reigning.

Blessed though it is for the child of God when he departs "to be absent from the body and present with the Lord," it will be unspeakably more blessed still to enter upon that *fulness* of glory which awaits us only at our Lord's return.

(b) Satan will not be bound until Jesus comes again, and for this reason, by the permission of God, he still has power here, both in the world and in the Church

(c) The *whole Church* will at once be introduced to full eternal happiness and glory at our blessed Lord's return. Not only as *individuals* will our cup of joy be full to overflowing, but we shall rejoice throughout eternity with *the whole company of the redeemed*.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 82

(We are pleased to give wider circulation to this excellent article from Stanford Chambers — in two installments.)

A COMPOSITE OF ERRORS

We now consider that dispensational error gaining in popularity of late with some even who profess to speak only as the Scriptures speak. viz., that this, our dispensation, is the thousand-year period of Revelation, the "Golden Age" of prophets and bards, looked and longed for by people of God through the centuries until now. This error which is in fact a *composite error* originated in the reign of the Emperor Constantine when, by his decree, persecutions ceased and Christianity became popular and finally was made the state religion. With the passing over of controls to the church dignitaries and ecclesiasticisms came a new and different interpretation of such prophecies as foretell that new order in which peace and righteousness shall universally prevail. The Church of Rome still contends for this view; and strange to say there are many Protestants not far removed from the same dispensational error, the "Dark Ages" to the contrary notwithstanding.

This interpretation became the new orthodoxy, and those protesting the same came to be listed as heretics. Yet prior to Constantine's day such interpretation is not to be found. Christianity was older than the United States of America is now before the theory began to be propagated, placing as it does an age between the promise of the Lord's return and its fulfillment. For 300 years the Lord's coming was the Church's "blessed hope." This is undisputed.

Most readers will know that the thousand-years passage involved in the interpretation in question is found in the 20th chapter of Revelation. There in a few verses are found the thousand years, six times mentioned; in connection, the arrest and imprisonment of Satan, the first resurrection, the retention of the rest of the dead, the relieving of the nations of Satan's deceivings until his thousand years' sentence is served, the enthronement and reign of those having part in said resurrection the while Satan is in the pit of the abyss.

1. No, *Satan is not bound*. Not yet, but he is himself the instigator of such propaganda, and his cause profits as Christians are thereby thrown off guard and are made captives according to his will. Peter's admonition to sober watchfulness is by this and other deceptiveness made of none effect as regards many.

"But isn't Satan now undeniably under limitations and restrictions?" Yes, thank God. But such has been the case ever since the serpent was sentenced to go on his belly and to eat the dust of the ground. (See Job 1:12; 2:6). The binding of John's foreview is not just restrictions. Read again and see. And such bindings as occurred when demons (as "the strong man's goods") were cast out are not the binding of Revelation. John had witnessed that kind of thing and had had a part in it; he had heard Jesus say, "By whom

do your sons cast them out?" Clear proof that that kind of binding had been done even before Matt. 12. But John in the Apocalypse is being shown, not well-known past historical events but "things which shall come to pass hereafter" (Rev. 4:1). Note that.

2. *Satan is not yet in his prison* (The abyss dreaded by the demons when faced by the Lord Jesus Luke 8:31). Instead Satan is "the prince of the powers of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience" (Eph. 2:2). This dispensation had been going on forty years when Paul by inspiration penned those words. When Satan goes to the abyss he will have been dethroned as "prince of the powers of the air." He is not in prison, but John sees him prior to Rev. 20 as about to cast others into prison (Rev. 2:10).

3. *Satan's deceiving of the nations has never ceased.* Never were more nations more deceived than now. Witness Communism and its globe-wide menace. Witness the sweep of Modernism over all Christendom. Note "the world rulers of this darkness" in Eph. 6:12. And the coming forth of the "man of sin" which (2 Thess. 2:9) will be "according to the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders." Note that the man of sin is in the very height of his exaltation at the moment of Jesus' appearing. See v. 8.

4. *The saints are not now enthroned, are not now reigning.* Now is the time to bear the cross, not the time to wear the crown. "Hold fast that which thou hast that no one take thy crown." It is laid up for you as was Paul's laid up for him (2 Tim. 4:8) and is to be received "in that day," not by men and women while in the flesh, neither as disembodied spirits. "If we endure, we shall also reign with him" (2 Tim. 2:2). Peter foresees crowns bestowed "when the chief Shepherd shall appear" (1 Peter 5:4).

Paul said to certain men, "Would that ye did reign, that we also might reign with you" (1 Cor. 4:8). The reigning time will not be until "that day" (2 Tim. 4:8) when the crowns that are laid up for all them that have loved "his appearing" will be given to all.

5. *The saints are not now judging as John foresees.* He sees judgment given to them only whom he sees on thrones. To those same Corinthians Paul writes, "Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come" (1 Cor. 4:5). Beware, however, of holding in contempt our Lord's decree that His saints shall judge the world, and angels even. Under divine instruction and discipline saints here may qualify for such functioning when the time does come.

6. *The first resurrection is not past, nor is it now going on.* "They that are Christ's at his coming" (1 Cor. 15:20, 23). True, "many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep arose" at the time Christ the firstfruits "arose" (See Matt. 27:52). That was a token of what is vouchsafed to the company who are to compose His great harvest proper in that day, those who will be "counted worthy to attain unto that age (margin) and the resurrection from the dead" (Luke 20:35), not the resurrection of the unjust, for that takes place without regard to worthiness. See also Phil. 3:11 and Paul's yearning to attain to that resurrection, literally the out-resurrection from among the dead. Over such, of course, the second death can have no power. Death is swallowed up in victory in this resurrection, but not

of the unjust, for the *second* death awaits them. The unjust are not in the resurrection picture of 1 Thess. 4:17, for those having part in it shall be for ever with the Lord. It is the resurrection of the Just.

7. *The resurrection John foresees is not figurative.* "Bodies are not mentioned," they say. True. But are disembodied souls or spirits resurrected? The term resurrection always involves the body. At Pentecost about 3000 souls were added. Bodies are not mentioned. However, most of us believe their bodies were involved in their baptism. Bodies are implied and do not *need* specific mention when the term baptism is used; no more so when the term resurrection is used. Resurrection pertains to that which has died; the spirit does not die.

8. *This is not the glorious age seen by prophets and bards of old.* An age of grace it is indeed, thank God, but not the age when they "beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks" to learn war no more. See Isa. 2 and Micah 4. Paul by inspiration calls it "*this present evil world*," margin, "*age*." See Gal. 1:4. This is not to depreciate the blessedness of our high calling, a calling out of the world to be a people for his name. But "the god of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving" that they should not respond to the call, and as a result "the whole world lieth in the evil one." See 1 John 5:18; 2 Cor. 4:4. Satan is "the deceiver of the whole world." (Rev. 12:9) even until now. The knowledge of the Lord does not "cover the earth as the waters cover the sea," nor do righteousness and justice prevail. We are not in the Micah 4 era, but very much in the Joel 3 era. "Truth is mighty and will prevail" yet; it will not be left for ever on the scaffold, rest assured.

9. *Jesus is not now reigning as foreseen in John's vision.* His present reigning in the hearts of His faithful who appreciate His having "all authority in heaven and on earth" is a fact in which to rejoice. He is "head over all things to the church," and His "little flock" composes His kingdom *here now*. But His family rejoices to know that He has been anointed and crowned to be "King of kings and Lord of lords," that "the kingdom of the world is" to "become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ" (Rev. 11:15), that He is to be "King over all the earth," to rule "from the River to the ends of the earth," that "all nations shall serve Him," that "they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain." Isa. 65:23. See Ps. 72 et al. They rejoice to be able to see by faith death abolished.

Nevertheless, "now we see not yet all things subjected to him" (Heb. 2:8), *a self-evident fact*, but we see *Him* already crowned, qualified, and able effectively to act in God's time and subject all things unto Himself according to the decree of the Second Psalm. "Not only in this age but in that which is to come" (Eph. 1:21 and margin) is He to be "far above all rule and authority and power and dominion." "Though it tarry, wait for it." John sees Him going forth "conquering and to conquer" (Rev. 6:12), and the finish of that is foreseen in Rev. 19:11; 20:3. After that He reigns without a rival, having indeed shown "who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords" (1 Tim. 6:15). Saints rejoice to know that the future of His kingdom will be glorious. May we by His grace have abundant entrance therein. See 2 Peter 1:11.

“FAITH OF OUR FATHERS”

No. 83

(We conclude here the Chambers article, “A Composite of Errors”)

10. *The coming of Christ is not figurative, nor incomplete.* Note that in Acts 1:11 it is to be the same Jesus just seen going into heaven, and that He is to come again “in like manner.” Can any one word a plainer statement of such an event? Again, (1 Thess. 4:17) it is “the Lord Himself” who is to descend from heaven, when the dead in Christ are to rise and the living in Christ, together with the resurrected ones, are to be caught up to meet Him and thence to be for ever with Him.

Among those who have fallen into the “composite error” we hereby refute are some who challenge that Christ will ever set foot on earth again! They suppose He is for ever done with His footstool. In Isa. 60:13 He says “I will make the place of my feet glorious.” Perhaps, in spite of the fact that as yet “the whole world lieth in the evil one” that purpose has not been repented of, but *will* be accomplished.

Let no one conclude that the catching up of the saints and their going to meet Him will in any wise preclude “the coming of our Lord Jesus with all His saints” according to 1 Thess. 3:13. Their going to meet Him precedes but does not prevent it. Enoch and Jude prophesy, “Behold the Lord came with ten thousands of his holy ones to execute judgment upon all.” . . . He can not come “with all his saints” until they are caught up to Him. But now just what would depend upon His setting His foot upon the earth, meaning the ground supposedly? He is not subject to the laws of gravitation, nor will His resurrected, glorified saints be subject to them.

11. *Nowhere do the Scriptures place the second coming of Christ after the thousand years.* Inspiration does not allow any one to insert such a period between the promise of His coming and its fulfilment. The counsel ever is, “Watch ye at every season,” that whether He shall come in the first watch of the night, or the second, or at the cock crowing or in the fourth watch He shall find us in the attitude of watching. Encouragement cannot be found for any one’s saying, “My Lord delayeth his coming.” And though, within the authority of the Father, much time has indeed elapsed, warrant is not thereby given for the scoffers’ challenge, “Where is the promise of his coming?” “For yet a very little while and he that cometh shall come and shall not tarry” (Heb. 10:37).

John is called up to heaven in Rev. 4:1 to be shown “things that shall come to pass hereafter,” that is, things to come to pass after the things of the preceding chapters. John sees the Lord Jesus taking the seven-sealed book in chapter five, and in the next He begins opening the seals. Upon the opening of the first seal he sees Him going forth “conquering and to conquer.” From this He never beats a retreat until He does indeed *conquer*. The climax is reached in chapter 19 at His coming there described and the imprisonment of Satan in the next. Then follows the thousand-years reign which is contemporary with Satan’s incarceration.

The Lord's *over-ruling*, exercised as it is at the present time, does not constitute the reign foreseen by John. He has *always* over-ruled. That fact was revealed to Nebuchadnezzar with emphasis. He over-ruled *then* as well as *now*. But John sees (Rev. 11:15) "the kingdom of the world . . . become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ." That is an assured future event. The fact of His future reign however in nowise detracts from His present reigning in the hearts of His faithful, for "he that hath this hope set on him purifieth himself."

12. *The contention that the thousand years is but a symbolic figure is unwarranted, unproved.* The "year-for-a-day" theory makes the thousand years stand for 365,000 years. If the rest of the dead live not till 365,000 years are finished, any "looking for that blessed hope" (Titus 2:13) would be psychologically impossible. Who then *could* protest the challenge, "Where is the promise of his coming?"

"The rest of the dead lived not until the thousand years should be finished." There are those who make out that the first resurrection is *regeneration*. Then the rest of the dead are not regenerated until the present dispensation is past! John saw those of the first resurrection, many of whom had died as martyrs, "And they lived," lived not to be hurt of the second death as they had been of the first. In whatever sense these "lived" the rest of the dead "lived not." Making the terms and the number out as figurative only complicates matters. Why not allow it as the Bible puts it? There is a group of religious people who declare that Jesus came in 1878, and His "secret presence" here is one of their basic tenets. How much more actual evidence really is there that this "present evil age" is the age of Christ's foretold triumph and reign? Each theory is of human invention, brought forth from a desire to avoid what *seemed* to its instigators to involve certain complications or inconsistencies in taking the Scriptures as they read.

13. *The making of these erroneous tenets of faith a test of fellowship can never be maintained as righteous or scriptural or in any way justified.* It is sinful, being divisive, disruptive of "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." There have been brethren all along, and there and now, possessed of the grace and spirit of Christ to fellowship brethren even if considered in error, not consenting to the withholding of fellowship, from one, for example, who thinks a day in prophecy means a year in literal time, or who thinks Satan is bound by the gospel chain, or who makes baptism the First Resurrection; but when he makes of the same an article of faith required of others as an evidence of soundness, and when he requires, as a condition of fellowship, that they *subscribe* to his dogma — "sign on the dotted line" or else — there division ensues — unless *all* yield to such dictatorial demands and subscribe. It should be plain to all as to *who drives the wedge*.

Many instances could be cited of Diotrephic ways of effecting individuals, leaders, teachers, preachers and even congregations of Christ to the extent of their excommunication. And how does *this* rate as to edification?

For an example, here is a congregation of long years' standing, holding to New Testament simplicity, maintaining standards of upright Christian living, making use of the ministries of many men without discriminations among those who preach Christ. It comes to pass now that that congregation is advertised as a *restored* and "true" church. What has happened? The same standards of living, the same order in worship, the same steps of primary obedience, the same terms of membership, the same plea for the Bible as the guide. What now is the difference? The discrimination as to preachers. Only those subscribing to the dogmas of the unwritten creed (but well-memorized), including with emphasis those we have herein exposed, are tolerated! Bringing the congregation under this different type of control and regime constitutes the "restoration," and it is now a "true New Testament church!"

Our Earnest Entreaty. Let the Lord have His way. The Revelation is His word. Be not afraid to let it *make its own impression*. Can you trust it that far? Let human pronouncements as to what is orthodox be "out." Allow that the purpose of Revelation is to reveal rather than to conceal. (And John was told not to seal it up). And since the first six verses of chapter 20 have been made the focal passage we urge its connected reading. Read what precedes and what follows.

With the great harlot out of the picture the fourth "Hallelujah" of chapter 19 acclaims the presence in heaven of the glorified bride, adorned and ready for Him who gave Himself for her to present her to Himself as seen in Eph. 5:27—the marriage of the Lamb. Then what a retinue follows Him (the linen-arrayed are there) descending from the opened heaven in great glory as King of kings and Lord of lords! With the breath of His mouth He slays the wicked, sets a feast for the fowls of the air, hurls to their doom the beast and the false prophet, through a mighty angel arrests and incarcerates Satan, and with His resurrected, glorified, and enthroned saints He takes over—a dispensation of whose everlasting reign is contemporary with Satan's thousand years' imprisonment. This is the same simple, natural treatment of the focal passage which *all* accord the *rest of the chapter*. We protest any method of treatment here different from that applied to the portion following.

Finally, we are not unaware that this simple, natural way of taking the passage for what it says will be given some *epithet* prejudicial to its reception. Past observation impels us to expect that. A very handy term ending with "*ism*" is made to do duty to this end, and the zealots of the "new hypothesis" (term applied to it by a chief advocate) will hardly fail to appeal to prejudice. Take heed how you read.—From *Truth Advance*.

"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS"

No. 84

THE HISTORICAL AND SCRIPTURAL BASIS OF CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP AND COOPERATION

(The editor of this work writes a Resume of fellowship material so far reprinted, and a final Appeal.)

The simple old-line "Churches of Christ," though professing autonomy, do not often act in any great way on the local level—without a nod from their trusted editors and evangelists. Deplore this as we may (it has its good side too), that is the way it is.

The deep crying need just now is a good word to the churches about fellowship—a word long overdue, *from the top*, if we may put it that way; from those (or their successors) who, near 40 years ago, led off from the New Testament ground of fellowship by Christian toleration, and from the historical unity precedents of our pioneer fathers.

It is a solemn thing—that the original brethren in that departure are now all gone, gone on to God, the righteous arbiter, beyond our feeble judging. What they did is done, no matter now about their motives. They meant, no doubt, to do God service; so did the Jews who delivered up Christ, and so did Saul who persecuted Jesus. But they were wrong. Some of them repented, or at least relented.

Brother F. B. Srygley wrote, not long before his death, concerning the attack on the "premillennial" brethren:

"I am afraid that those of us who made the fight early in the beginning of it, had too much personality in the fight."

He also said, in 1939:

"What right has any one to say that one who believes an error should stop trying to teach it? If one is in error, I have no right to ask him to cease preaching error until he learns that it is error." (*Gospel Advocate*, 3-30-39.)

Some of the originals were never more than half-hearted in the fight. We who write this were in those early conferences, and *we know that*. Brother Elam, A. B. Lipscomb, J. C. McQuiddy; and, of course, G. Dallas Smith not at all. They were concerned about reconciliation. Some were later carried along by more aggressive colleagues. (But read below, Elam and Lipscomb 10 and 20 years later). We are not impressed that their successors are wholehearted in the fight today. Since they are hardly as involved as the originals, may we not hope for some good word from them before it is too late; some nod, some brotherly sign or act of fellowship? Could they not say at least what Srygley said in 1939, or even what H. Leo Boles said in 1928? (for there has been *no adverse change* in us since then). Boles said of Brother Boll:

"We differ, as the reader knows; but our differences, and a discussion of them, do not keep me from esteeming him very highly as a brother in Christ Jesus."—(*Unfulfilled Prophecy*, p. 411.)

It is certain that nothing short of some daring word or act from the original source can reach out over our troubled "Zion" with healing in its wings. If, from that level, there might go forth a clear word, to "cease fire" and "ground arms"; to try cooperation on the

basis of brotherly love—well, the alienation connected with prophetic teaching would die shortly, and we would all become more considerate of one another and of what the churches could bear, under the general rule, "Let all things be done unto edifying." (1 Cor. 14:26.) Of this we have not the faintest shadow of a doubt, nor do we think that any informed and honest man among us, on either "side," would deny the probability of such a result. What other approach can offer so much, so soon? What other means or method can any one suggest for sudden, lasting peace? *There is no other.* It becomes, then, chiefly a question whether *we want* unity or not. We can have it, if we want it; and that without sacrifice of principle or conscience by anyone. For it does not follow that any would be restrained from teaching "truth" or opposing "error." The pioneers were not. It simply means that all that we do would be done in genuine love (1 Cor. 16:14), and by the golden rule.

To the brethren concerned, it would indeed be a step of faith; faith that their doors would remain open, notwithstanding all (and they would); faith that their journals and hymnals would continue in demand (and they would); faith that their positions and pulpits would remain secure (and they would). For God would greatly bless such a step, and there would be "great joy" throughout the land. It is vain and unrealistic, in present conditions, to look for lasting local peace, anywhere, without this change at the higher levels.

There is a small town in Southern Indiana, population only 1500, where the simple church is 120 years old, and numbers hundreds of members, all at perfect peace among themselves. It is a great and active church, with a fine, new, adequate plant, and of high repute in the community. But now, a "gospel tent" is pitched by certain evangelists to try to establish there a "true church of Christ"—on the ground, of course, that the old original is not a true church! No matter (and no wonder) that the town sees "how it is," and the effort ends in failure; the intent was the same: to confuse and divide, or at least to proselyte. Is there no restraining word to these evangelists from those who have their ears? If not, what hope is there of any peace?

But one will say, "Yes, there is another way, a better way than all this toleration: If all would come to the truth on 'Prophecy'" (by which unwittingly, they mean *their* views and conclusions) "we could have peace." (We do not believe it, for the same intolerance and lovelessness would then break out over something else; look 'round and see). But grant it for argument's sake—though it "begs the question," and assumes that the whole prophetic truth lies on their side! Yet, grant it, that when at last we all see "eye to eye" we shall be reunited. But *when? How soon* could such a thing be? For would not that method require *complete* mental uniformity, not only on Prophecy, but on *every* line of revelation? If not, what security is there in it against trouble? Desirable as such mental uniformity might be, it simply will not work among fallible men, as all scripture, history, and experience go to show. Nor do we think that any informed and honest man among us, on either "side", would deny the probability of an interminable delay by this method.

What with our early teaching and "raising", our varying inclinations and opportunities for study, our differing teachers, and our great disparity in age and in years of growth—in these conditions it is unthinkable, unrealistic, unscholarly, unscientific, and above all, unscriptural, that being agreed on the primary truths, we should demand or expect mental uniformity of one another in so vast a field as Prophecy.

It is not *this* kind of "same-mindedness" that Paul inculcates in 1 Cor. 1:10, as the context shows: "Now this I mean" (v. 12)—not mental uniformity, but an utter loyalty to the headship of Christ, rather than to Paul, Apollos, Cephas, or any other man. The thing Paul fears for Corinth is the partisan spirit of human loyalties and favoritism; not the inescapable diversity of thinking among free, creedless believers. His "same mind" of 1 Cor. 1:10 is none other than that same "same mind" of Ph. 2:2-5: "having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind; doing nothing through faction or vain-glory. Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus." That is the "mind" he inculcates in Corinthians and Philippians.

To the same effect is Paul's great Unity Statement in Ephesians, chapter 4: "I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you to walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called, with all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love; giving diligence" [meaning *thus* giving diligence, of course] "to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

One wonders how our opposing brethren can work *even with each other*, without this spirit; but if they know and have this spirit, and work together by it, *then why not with the rest of us?* We may have often failed of it; yet we can say this for the brethren of "the premillennial view", those who look for the Lord's coming before the millennium: That never, so far as we know, have they at any time, anywhere, withheld or withdrawn their fellowship from any man, preacher or "layman," simply for his "post-millennial" teaching, or for opposing what he thought was error. One much publicized case of discipline there is on record (35 years ago) on grounds of factious *acts* and divisive *deeds*: but never for opposite *teaching* on prophetic lines.

"But, in that one case, could not the church have been yet more kind and still more patient with the two excluded men?" Grant it, in all its force; and what does it prove? Only what we here are saying—that utmost love and brotherly forbearance is the only way of unity among us weak and erring mortal men.

As Unity by Toleration was the apostolic way, so it was also the way of all our great and honored pioneers. We extract the following sentences out of our own reprints from them, as they are scattered throughout this work ("Faith of Our Fathers"):

Barton Stone: "They (Luther, et al) undertook the unhappy and vain project of making the people think alike. Creeds were introduced, which broke and divided the Christians into opposing sects." (1814.)

"Christians can love one another, and dwell together in unity, and yet differ in sentiment. I hope that we shall give an example of that moderation and forbearance which the scriptures teach." (1841.)

"Among fallible mortals who know so little, the tolerant spirit ought to prevail. A Christian is to be judged by his fruit. If to the profession of faith in Christ Jesus be joined a dependence on Him alone for salvation; if to this be added a holy life, this man, thus professing and acting, is a Christian. What if he may have erroneous opinions; yet they do not become principles of his heart or his life to influence him to err in practice. A person of this character should not be excluded from the arms of charity. In every revival of pure religion the spirit of toleration revives with it, and as religion declines, intolerance increases."—(from *Reminiscences and Sermons*, pp. 50-53.)

Alexander Campbell: "The apostle Paul positively commanded all Christians to maintain the 'unity of the faith' and receive one another without regard to differences of opinion. There is only one faith, but many opinions, and many different degrees of knowledge; and Christianity makes allowance for these."—*Evidences*, pp. 295, 337.)

"I can and do make allowance for early and long established habits of thinking and speaking on all religious questions. I can bear with a difference of opinion on a subject so vital (the Atonement). We are not saved by the strength and comprehension of our views, but through obeying from the heart the apostolic mould of doctrine."—(*Harbinger*, 1841.)

"I allow others to differ from me, as I claim the privilege of differing from others. These 'theories' [even the serious Millerite Errors], if not dogmatically propounded for schismatical purposes, are not to become causes of alienation or of excommunication."—(*Harbinger*, 1848.) [Campbell even called some of Miller's notions "Destructionism." See page 249, this volume.]

"I know of no man of any note in the world with whom I agree in everything; and certainly there is not one in the world that agrees with me in everything. I neither ask nor expect it."—(*Harbinger*, 1847.)

"So long as any man declares his confidence in Jesus of Nazareth as God's Son, that He was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification, and so long as he exhibits willingness to obey Him in all things according to his knowledge, so long will I receive him as a Christian brother and treat him as such."—(Reply to Bishop Sample.)

"But if private opinions are expressed, are they not to become matters of discipline?" "By no means, unless a person expresses them for the sake of compelling others to receive them, or to exclude them from their fellowship if they do not receive them. In that case he is answerable, not for his opinions but for his practices."—(*Harbinger Abridged*, Vol. II, pp. 38, 39.)

These extracts from Campbell should be sufficient to show that, in his view, toleration of differences, yea of great differences, was not only possible, but right and necessary to fellowship, and that too on every line of teaching beyond the simplest fundamentals. His use of the word "opinions" is usually in that higher sense—the conclusions that men come to from their study of the Scriptures. We have no defense to make of "opinionism" in the current sense, of course.

In these late years, however, to break the force of Campbell's Toleration teaching and practice, and to justify their own intolerance some have tried to find refuge in the great reformer's answer to H. T. Anderson's long article (in the *Harbinger*) on the Throne of David. (1848, '49.) That answer was uncommonly severe for Campbell; but—what has been overlooked—its severity was not against the author—"our much-esteemed Brother Anderson of Kentucky"; it was plainly directed toward a younger class which Campbell denominates as "these theological adventurers," "those 'neophytes,' who had evidently irked him with "other kindred notions . . . concerning the state of the dead"—questions that are not at all disturbing us today. The word "neophyte" means a new convert, a beginner, a novice; "boy preacher," we might say today. But Anderson, who was soon to offer the world his "New Translation," and who was already called "Elder", could hardly be so described!

No, Campbell did not break fellowship with Anderson. The translator was honored often in the *Harbinger* after that, by Campbell, by Milligan, and by Pendleton, with frequent space and commendatory mention, and with reprints from his translation—yea, until Campbell's death in 1866 and until the *Harbinger's* end in 1870. (See article on p. 319).

Campbell wrote glowing commendations of numerous "premillennial" brethren, and warmhearted Introductions to their articles and long series of articles in his journal: Begg, Crihfield, McCorkle, Barclay, and others. While more "post-millennial" in his own teaching, and sometimes differing courteously from the authors, he reprinted long essays and elaborate arguments in support of "the pre-millennial view," sometimes even calling attention to their well-nigh unanswerable force, as in the case of the "Twelve Short Reasons" which we published in 1945 (See p. 28).

John F. Rowe: He published the strictly "premillennial" book, "Letters to Jews and Gentiles," by Ruble, and he praised both book and author to the skies.

Lipscomb and Sewell: They published and sold Dr. Brents' book with its strong millennial article, and they worked hand in hand with J. A. Harding and John T. Poe who were both boldly and out-spokenly "premillennial."

E. A. Elam: He said, Dec. 8, 1925, (in letter to Brother Boll)—"As to the 'doctrinal differences,' or 'differences of opinion,' I have hoped that we might get these on a working basis of Christian forbearance and love. I have worked and prayed for this, and have done my best."

A. B. Lipscomb: He wrote to Brother Boll (Jan. 30, 1925)—"I regret that these doctrinal differences, or 'differences of opinion' continue to disturb the brotherhood; and, as Brother Elam put it, I have hoped and still hope that we might get these on a working basis of Christian forbearance and love."

F. L. Young: He said at Abilene in 1919—"Shall I disfellowship the good brother whose theory I reject? I have resolved never to make anything a test of fellowship that the Holy Spirit has not made a condition of salvation."

J. D. Tant: (Letter to Janes, Oct. 2, 1833)—"I hold the same position Boll and H. Leo Boles held in their debate—that these items" (the prophecy differences) "should not cause us to disfellowship each other."

J. N. Armstrong: He said (Jan. 17, 1939)—"What some do not like about me is that I do not join them in their condemnation of all premillennial brethren. I think those in the church who are true to the conditions of salvation are worthy of our fellowship. This is my rule: What the Lord has made a condition of salvation I will make a test of fellowship. We need to forbear one another in love, giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

Finally brethren, there's not much time left. Party lines are forming fast, the Lord is coming, if death come not before. Our children have grown up in a world of war and strife: and shall they not find peace a little while in the shadow of the church? We confess to falling short of our own beliefs and standards too often and too far; but we have never gone off the old ground—the historical and scriptural basis of fellowship and cooperation. *The Restoration pioneers and early fathers never broke fellowship over these questions.* Nobody did—until the great departure in 1915. Let those who will do what they may to undo that deed and to heal the hurt. To such a step there will be good response.—in Jesus Name, Amen.—E. L. J.

MY CONTRIBUTION TOWARD UNITY

Don Carlos Janes

I will accept my personal responsibility and obligation to help answer our Lord's prayer for the unity of all who believe on Him.

I will not accept any extra-scriptural authority of any sort, nor receive any human creeds of any kind, whether oral or written, expressed or implied, but will gladly cooperate with all followers of Christ so far as they may desire and circumstances may permit, seeking always to manifest the Spirit of Christ, without whom no one belongs to Him.

I will give up anything except the Word of God, to further Christian unity.

I shall not forget that it is only by the grace of God that even friends can long abide in undisturbed unity.

I will see to it that honest differences on non-vital matters shall be no bar to fellowship.

On disputed matters, I will give very respectful consideration to the other side, and will endeavor to use discretion in case there is an occasion to deal with such matters.

I will endeavor so to conform life, character, and doctrine to the revealed will of God as to make fellowship possible to all who love our Lord Jesus supremely.

I am prepared to forgive all who have trespassed against me, even as I wish to be forgiven, and will no more allow myself to harbor malice in my soul than I will permit myself to carry deadly germs in my pockets.

I am fully persuaded that the unity enjoined in scripture teaching is not an exact intellectual agreement upon every item of Christian activity, for Christians do not all have an even start; do not all have equal opportunities; do not all apply themselves with equal diligence; nor do they all approach perfection at the same rate.

I see, therefore, that love and forbearance must be exercised for Jesus' sake and also for the desired end of a practical, working unity.

I will be mindful of my own serious imperfections, and while standing steadfastly for my conscientious convictions, I shall not be too eager to bring the whole church to my conception of the ideal state, for that would mean the adoption of some error somewhere—unless I am a perfect exponent of scripture, which no one believes.

God help us all to be more Christlike that we may be one in Him.

—From *Word and Work*, 1937, p. 223.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

American Encyclopaedia, Extracts from	132	Coming Of The Lord—Campbell	193
Armstrong's Rule	167	Composite Of Errors, Stanford Chambers	337, 340
Baptist Confession of Faith	156	Consistency—E. L. J.	318
Barclay, Millenarian Missionary	253	Council Of Nice	121
Basis of Christian Fellowship and Co- operation—E. L. J.	343	Cowper, Wm.	143
Boles' "Position"	165	Cranmer	138, 333
Brents, Dr. T. W., On the Millen- nium	291, 295, 299	Daniel 7:27—Walter Scott	48
Brittanica Encyclopedia—		David's Throne—R. H. B.	319, 322
On Christ's Reign On Earth	198	Devil Not Bound—C. W. Sewell	257
On The Primitive Belief	199	Disputed Teaching, Featuring—R. H. B.	241
On Millennium	237	Divisions and Occasions of Stumbling —E. L. J.	159
Campbell, Alexander, on:		Divisions, Cause Of—H. L. Olmstead	312, 315
Coming of the Lord	193	Dr. Thomas, Campbell breaks with, 62,	63
Commends Premillennial Book	6, 21, 25, 28	Dr. Thomas, Case of	9, 62, 239
Differences No Cause for Alienation	249	Dr. Thomas' "Covenant"	239
Everlasting Gospel	57	Early Church, Teaching Of The	128
Forbearance, Tolerance	5, 198, 206	Earth's Future—Milligan	41
Fourth of July	36	Errata	354
Independent Student	4	Featuring Disputed Teaching—R. H. B.	241
Introduction to "Twelve Short Reasons"	318	Fellowship—F. L. Young	242
Justification By Faith	325	Fellowship, A Sectarian—R. H. B.	181
Kingdom In Superlative Degree	252	Fellowship With Premillennial Brethren —J. N. Armstrong	165
Lord Will Rebuke Many People	35	Flavil Hall's "Lamentation"	245
Mental Slavery	250	Gibbon, Infidel Historian	128
Millennium Future	252	Gibbon's Testimony	128, 199, 231
"Millerism"	239	Habitable Earth, The Coming— Rotherham	45
New Birth	252	Harding, Bell's Encomium of	312
No Creed On the Millennium	249	Harding, on The Second Coming	309
Observe "Signs of the Times"	251	Harding, on "The Thousand Years"	81
Opinions	6, 36, 235, 250	Harding, J. A. Prince of Preachers— E. L. J.	305
Semi-Valedictory	11	Harding, Sewell's Eulogy of	305
The Jews	50, 206	Hebrews—Milligan	41
"The Last Days"	251	Hebrews—Rotherham	45
The Lord To Stand Upon This Earth	238, 250	Hinds, John T., On "This Generation"	200
The Successful Editor	250	Historical and Scriptural Basis of Chris- tian Fellowship, E. L. J.	343
The Thomas "Covenant"	239	Holy Spirit, Pioneers on	49
Timely Extracts from	233	Homiletic Paragraphs—R. H. B.	200
Tyrant Who Coerces	250	Introduction to the 1950 Series—E. L. J.	209
Campbell, Quoting and Misquoting, E. L. J.	171	Israel, Conversion of—Barclay	255
Campbell's Growth Illustrated	172	Israel, Destiny of—Barclay	23, 253
Cause, Course, and Cure of Divi- sions—E. L. J.	159	Israel, Future Restoration of—Stone	191
Cerinthus—Flavil Hall	115	Jerusalem As It Is To Be—Dr. Bar- clay	264, 269
Cerinthus, Montanus, and Caius— Munschar	115	Jews and Prophecy	55
Chambers' Article	37	Jews and Their Land—McGarvey	257
Change To Adentism—McHenry	169	Jews, B. W. Johnson on	238
Christ On David's Throne—R. H. B.	319	Jews, Campbell on	50
Christ's Return, Commentators on	243	Jews, Restoration of—Creath	333
Church and Kingdom—D. Lipscomb	66		
Clement	100		
Coldness, One Cause of	169		
Coming Of The Lord—McCorkle	172		

Jews, Why Are They Yet With Us? —		New Birth, The — Campbell	252
McGarvey	85, 88, 91	Newton on "The Millennium"	132
"Joel" — McGarvey on	238	Nice, Council of	124
Johnson, B. W., on the "Lord's Prayer"	238	One Thousand Years—W. H. Carter	248
Justification By Faith—Campbell	325	Opinions, Robert Richardson	210
Justin Martyr	105, 132, 230, 235	Origen	118
Kingdom of God, Rotherham	83	Origen's Admissions	121
Kingdom, The — James Challen	213, 217	Origin Of The Post-Millennial Theory	129
Kingdom, The Everlasting—John T. Poe	247	Pioneer Evangelists	206
Kitto on the Millennial Doctrine	132	"Post" Writers Admit It	240
Klingman's Answer	236	Power of "That Blessed Hope"—Bonar	157
"Lamentations"—Flavil Hall	245	Prayer for the Alien—D. Lipscomb	61
Lard, Moses E., Life and Work	273, 276	Prayer of the Martyrs	111
Lard, Moses E., On The Millennium		Preamble — E. L. J.	2
	273, 276, 280	"Premillennial", meaning of the word	
"Last Days" — Campbell	251	—Boles, Hines, Kelcy	244
Letters:		Proof from Scripture—C. M. Neal	228
Briney (J. B.) to McWhirter	257	Proof from Secular History—C. M. Neal	230
Clifton to E. L. J.	167	Prophecy — Dr. Barclay	258
Collis to McWhirter	257	Prophecy: Hermeneutics and Application—Dr. Barclay	328, 331
Elam to Boll	164	Prophecy, Literal Fulfilment of —	
E. L. J. to Inquirer	271	Begg	21, 25, 28
Hoar, Waldo to the Elders	241	Prophecies — "Daniel"	33
Janes to Tant	164	Prophetic Teaching, Is It Essential?—	
Knepper to Janes	167	R. H. B.	287
McHenry to Janes	169	Resurrections, D. Lipscomb on	238
Rutherford (H. N.) to E. L. J.	272	Restoration of Jews—Jacob Creath	333
Spiegel to Janes	167	Revelation 20, Daniel Sommer on	304
Tant to Janes	164	Revelation 20:1-3, Notes on—E. L. J.	326
Lipscomb (A. B.) to Boll	242	Roberson's Historical Testimony	201
Lipscomb, D., on Teaching All Testimonies	169	Rotherham on "Kingdom of God"	83
Lipscomb, D., on 1 Thessalonians 1:10	201	Rowe, John F., Attitude of	18
Lipscomb, on The Resurrections	238	Ruble, Wm., Attitude of	19
Logue, Quotations	84, 165	"Russellism" And The Bible—Janes	170
Lord's Prayer, B. W. Johnson on	238	Satan To Be Bound—Milligan	48
Lord's Return, L. F. Bittle	82, 83	Scott's Address—Campbell	36
Love of the Brethren—Kurfrees	70	Scriptural Order of End-Time Events—	
Love, The Importance of—E. A. Elam	72	E. L. J.	175
Luther on the Literal Sense	127, 240	Second Coming of Christ—	
Man and The Message, The	53	George Muller	336
Manifesto, An Early—Barton W. Stone	308	Sect, Making Of A — R. H. B.	334
"Mark Them and Avoid Them" —		Shall We Interpret the Prophecies?—	
R. H. Boll	224	G. Dallas Smith	203
McGarvey on the Jews	85, 88, 91, 257	"Signs Of The Times" — Campbell	251
Mede on the Millennium	139	Some Things Still Future—Monser	208
Mede on "The Orthodox Church"	132	Sommer, Daniel, On Revelation 20	304
Millennium, Barton Stone on	187	Songs of Our Fathers, E. L. J.	195
Millennium, Dr. T. W. Brents, 291, 295	299	Speculators, Are These Men	205
Millennium Future — Campbell	252	Speedy Coming of Christ—Waller	12
Millennium, Moses E. Lard	273, 280	Srygley, F. D., on Differing as Brethren	241
Milligan, Robert—Extracts from	78, 232	Srygley's Statements	6, 164
Missions And The Millennial Hope—		Stone, Barton, Encomiums on—John	
—Judd	170	Rogers	183
Mistake, One Editor's	168	Stone, Biography of	184
Modified Millennium — Stanford		Stone, "Church Government"	192
Chambers	149	Stone, Future Restoration of Israel	191
Mosheim	131, 206, 231	Stone, On The Millennium	187
My Contribution Toward Unity—		Stone, on Uniformity	241
Don Carlos Janes	348		

Stone's "Premillennial View".....	187	Unity—D. Lipscomb	69
Stone, "The Apostasy"	192	Use of "The Fathers"—Flavil Hall.....	130
Thousand Years—E. G. Sewell.....	84	Voice of the Church—Taylor 95, 99,	
Thousand Years—J. A. Harding.....	81	104, 111, 115, 118, 124, 128, 131,	
"Those Kings"—Christian Leader.....	200	133, 137, 141	145
Times of Restoration—D. Lipscomb....	68	Wesley, Charles	141
"Times of The Gentiles"—James Challen	221	Whitby on the Premillennial Early	
Truth that Saves—D. Lipscomb.....	69	Church	132
Twelve Short Reasons.....	28	"Whitbyism"	214, 238
Union and Cooperation—Kurfees.....	72	Who Can Fellowship What?—Lemley..	237
Unity—Barton W. Stone.....	27	Would He Were Bound—Carrol.....	113

INDEX OF AUTHORS

(Teaching and Testimony quoted or contributed)

Alford, Henry	128, 240	Ignatius	102
Alley, James Matthew	206	Irenaeus	106, 132, 201
Armstrong, J. N.	165, 166	Janes, Don Carlos	164, 170, 348
Augustine	126, 133	Jerome	125
Barclay, J. T.	23, 232, 253, 258, 328, 331	Johnson, B. W.	238
Barnabas	101	Jorgenson, E. L.	2, 8, 18, 65, 73, 80, 95, 115, 118, 124, 137, 159, 163, 171, 175, 195, 209, 271, 276, 286, 295, 303, 309, 318, 319, 326, 343
Baronius	136	Justin Martyr	105, 236
Baxter, Richard	155	Kelcy, Raymond C.	245
Begg, J. A.	21, 25, 28	Kitto, Dr.	132
Bell, R. C.	312	Klingman, G. A.	236
Bittle, L. F.	82, 83, 205	Knepper, George W.	167
Boles, H. Leo	165, 244	Knox, John	139, 244
Boll, R. H.	181, 198, 200, 204, 224, 241, 287, 320, 323, 334	Kurfees, M. C.	70, 72
Brents, Dr. T. W.	205, 232, 291, 295, 299	Lactantius	122, 231
Briney, J. B.	257	Lard, Moses E.	205, 232, 273, 280
Burton (of Oxford)	240	Lattimer, Hugh	137, 244
Calvin	244	Lemley, F. L.	237
Carter, W. H.	248	Lipscomb, A. B.	242
Challen, James	208, 213, 217, 221	Lipscomb, David	61, 65, 69, 169, 201, 238
Chambers, Stanford	37, 149, 200, 337, 340	Luther	127, 206, 244
Clark, Adam	120, 243	McCorkle, S.	55
Clement	100	McGarvey, J. W.	85, 88, 91, 205, 238, 257
Clifton, C. B.	167	McHenry, W. Hume	169
Collis, Mark	257	Mede, Joseph ("the illustrious Mede")	132, 135, 139
Cowper, William	143	Melito	112
Cranmer, Thomas	138	Mencken, H. L.	154
Creath, Jacob, Jr.	333	Methodius	117
Cumming, Dr.	135	Milligan, Robert	41, 48, 55, 56, 78, 205, 232
Cyprian	116	Milner	132
"Daniel"	33	Milton, John	141
Davis, J. P.	49	Monser, J. W.	208
Deprez	240	Mosheim	119, 131
Dionysius	121	Muller, George	336
Duffield, Dr. John T.	206, 238	Neal, C. M.	228
Elam, E. A.	72, 164	Neander, John Augustus	131
Elliott	135	Nepos	117
Errett, Isaac	55	Newton, Bishop	132
Francis, L. P.	180	Newton, Sir Isaac	146
Gibbon, Edward	128, 135, 136, 199	Nice, Council of	124
Giessler	132, 206	Olmstead, H. L.	116, 313
Goodpasture, B. C.	257	Origen	118, 121
Hall, Flavil	130, 245	Papias	104, 230
Hall, Wilford	162	Poe, John T.	246
Harding, J. A.	205, 309	Polycarp	102, 230
Hastings, H. L.	95	Pope, Alexander	143
Heber, Reginald	144	Rall, H. F.	240
Henry, Matthew	146	Richardson, Dr. Robert	211
Hermas	99	Roberson, C. H.	201
Hinds, John T.	200	Rogers, John	183
Hines, J. L.	245		
Hinsdale, B. A.	240		
Hippolytus	111		
Hoar, Waldo	242		
Hodges, Dr. Charles	243		

Rotherham, J. B.	83	Stuart, Prof.	132, 135
Rowe, John F.	18	Tant, J. D.	164
Ruble, William	18	Taylor, D. T.	99
Russell, Bishop	131, 132, 134	Taylor, Jeremy	132
Rutherford, H. N.	272	Tertullian	112, 132, 230
Schaff, Philip	109, 132, 231	Toplady, Augustus	142
Scott, Walter	48	Tyndale, William	137
Sewell, C. W.	257	Victorinus	121
Sewell, E. G.	84	Waller, J. C.	12
Sewell, Jesse P.	305	Wesley, Charles	141
Smith, G. Dallas	202, 203	West, Earl	239
Sommer, Daniel	205, 232, 304	Whitby, Daniel	129, 132
Spiegel, O. P.	167	Wycliffe, John	244
Srygley, F. B.	6, 164	Young, F. L.	242
Srygley, F. D.	241		
Stone, Barton W.	27, 184, 187, 191,		
241, ...	307		

ERRATA

Page 7, line 33: The M. H. editor may have intended this fact as a reason for *not* opening his pages to Begg (but cf. M. H. 1832, p. 322; or p. 21 of this volume).

Page 12: line 1 moves back three lines.

Page 39, line 41: "nst are" should be "*ist is*."

Page 63, under paragraph, "Dr. Thomas — Again," insert, as lines 4 and 5: "*nor with his views; and I would not have the public understand that we are fellow-laborers in the same cause. This my relations to the Christian community—make both necessary and expedient.*"

Page 79, line 1: Read "*God had made it the business of Christ and not of angels, to restore to mankind,*" etc.

Page 84: The Sewell quotation, now examined, is correct, but not complete. In his full context, this writer may be considered non-committal, but not anti-millennial.

Page 111, line 2: Read "*Voice*," not "Voiccs."

Page 167, line 14: For "spirit" read "*Spirit*".

Page 171, line 32: For "J. C. Barclay" read "*J. T. Barclay*."

Page 195, last two lines: Read "*It is still possible to crucify the Lord afresh, yet not possible to crown Him in the heart as Lord of all!*"

Page 197, line 14: For "Thompson," read "*Tomson*."

Page 198, line 6: "italacized" should be "*italicized*."

Page 205, line 36: Read "*Harding*," not "Hardings."

Page 272, line 6: For "during," read "*following*."

Most of the tracts and pamphlets offered often throughout this volume are still in print and available, free for the asking. This includes most years of "Faith of Our Fathers," 1945 to 1952, in the yearly pamphlet form.

The book, "Gospel Sermons," from which we extracted Dr. Brents' sermon, "The Millennium" is still offered by its publishers, *The Gospel Advocate Co.*, Nashville, Tenn., price \$3.00.

Note that the address of The Word and Work, publishers and distributors of this book, is now 2518 Portland Ave., Louisville 12, Ky.

**FAITH
OF OUR
FATHERS**

**WORD
AND
WORK**