DEFENCE

OF THE

STUDENTS OF PROPHECY,

IN ANSWER TO THE ATTACK OF THE

REV. DR. HAMILTON,

OF STRATHBLANE.

LONDON:

JAMES NISBET, BERNERS STREET.

MDCCCXXVIII.
A DEFENCE
OF THE
STUDENTS OF PROPHECY,
IN ANSWER TO THE
ATTACK OF DR. HAMILTON.

SIR,
The discussion of opinions seems to be the necessary process for eliciting truth. The Church at large, therefore, is indebted to you for having entered the lists against the real or supposed errors of those whom you term Millenarians. Unhappily, however, disputants have generally descended into the arena with so much of personal feeling, that they have lost sight of the subject at issue, in the eagerness of mutual attack and defence: both parties have usually laid themselves equally open, by their intemperate expressions, to the assaults of their antagonists, and both have been therefore equally successful in wounding the other. This gave occasion to the infidel Gibbon to remark, "the exquisite rancour of theological hatred:" but the observation is unfair if meant to be exclusively applicable to Theologians. Bentley has shewn, that even a various reading in Horace is sufficient to excite the bitterness of a controversialist; Payne Knight has proved that so frivolous a subject as landscape gardening could draw forth the most cutting sarcasms, though against a friend; and dry facts of
Saxon derivation could not be discussed by Horne Tooke in his *περι τεροντα* with decent civility. For myself, notwithstanding such high authorities, supported, as they are, by your example, I hope, in the following letter, to avoid every expression unbecoming the temper of a Christian, or the manners of a gentleman. Not having been appointed by the Church a Doctor to teach her children with authority, the name of the writer of this Defence can be no object to any one: and, therefore, if my Letter related to an abstract subject, irrespective of the opinions of any individual, I should not deem it necessary to avow it, although I should have no hesitation in doing so, if required from any quarter; but, since my object is to refute the opinions of a highly respectable individual, (not only because these opinions are his, but because they are believed to be also the opinions of a large portion of the church,) I shall sign a copy of this Letter to yourself, and give you free permission to make whatever use of my name you please; and thus, at the same time, I shall avoid sanctioning, by my example, that spirit of anonymous libelling which is the disgrace of the Evangelical world, and the very life-blood of what are called Religious Magazines.

In p. xiii. of your preface, you use the expression "the defence of this branch of revealed Truth;" the authenticity of any part of revealed truth has not been attacked, but an endeavour has been made to understand and explain it; the difference between us consists in this under-
standing and this explanation; but it is not fair, and scarcely honest, for either of us to charge the other even by implication with denying any branch of revealed truth; at all events the charge comes with a very ill grace from you, because, as we insist more for a literal, and you more for a figurative interpretation, it might with better colour be advanced by us.

The first three chapters of your book are occupied in transcribing detached phrases from various works on unfulfilled Prophecy, and putting them in such a juxta position, as to make the opinions of the respective writers appear contradictory. This is not a mode to which any person, desirous of investigating truth, ought to resort, because, if he is possessed of ordinary information, he must know, that by following the same course, the opinions of any writers, upon any subject, could be equally made to exhibit similar apparent inconsistencies. You must have observed how fond the dupes of infidelity are of insisting on the contradictions of divines, and of deducing thence the mad conclusion, that revelation is altogether false. But is it fair,—because, for example, Drs. Whitby and Hamilton most stoutly disagree in what both maintain to be the essential doctrines of Christianity, (justification, &c. &c.,) and are at one only in their unseemly anger and misrepresentations of their brethren, who hold that which they deem a subject merely of theological curiosity—to conclude with the sceptic, that the whole system is a dream? It would be easy to overthrow the most indisputable facts in chemistry,
or any of the applied sciences, by the same mode. You surely know that the latest discovery of the greatest philosopher of the present age is that the largest luminaries in creation, many thousand times larger than our sun give us no light at all; yet who would think of refuting astronomers by bringing forward apparent contradictions? If your object, therefore, was to refute error, the mode you have adopted is insufficient for the purpose: if your object was personal, either to exalt yourself, or to decry others, I shall leave you undisturbed in the enjoyment of the triumph which you suppose you have achieved.

Another, and by much the larger portion of your book is occupied in asking the question, "how can these things be?" and because you cannot give a satisfactory answer to the "how," you will not admit the facts as they are written in the Bible. I need not remind you, Sir, that no one can give an answer to this "how," in the most ordinary operations which are every day carried on before our eyes: "how" does the milk from the breast of the mother become solid flesh and bone when conveyed into the body of her child? "how" does warmth cause a living animal to appear within the slimy contents of an egg-shell, when without that warmth no such appearance would have taken place? "how" is every operation in food and medicine carried on? "how" do heat and moisture cause a little seed to become a large tree? and to ascend higher, "how" was old Abraham to have a child by old Sarah? "how" was a virgin to conceive? "how" is the death of
a person 1800 years ago, to save the souls of you and me? Really, Sir, this question of "how" ought not to be asked by the merest tyro in science, for I defy you to answer it upon any one subject, whether moral, natural, or theological: as you have yourself shewn at length in your "Mourner in Zion," p. 162. Yet this is the sum and substance of Whitby's argumentation against Burnett, and which you seem to have adopted without even suspecting its fallacy.

Upon this subject it gives me great pleasure to adopt the following passage from your own work above quoted: "If, in his advanced years, when a son was promised him, Abraham had thought only on his own age, and that of Sarah; or if, at the Red Sea, when assured of a passage through the deep, Moses had attended merely to the operation of second causes; they would have had reason to have hesitated, and to have cried, How can these things be? But by looking at the power of the great Promiser, what was the consequence? Every shade of doubt and apprehension was dissipated; and they felt the most perfect certainty in the accomplishment of his word. They staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but were strong in faith, giving glory to God, being fully persuaded, that what he had promised he was also able to perform.—If you will dismiss the suspicions of sense, and adopt the arguments of faith, light will spring up in darkness, and you shall soon rise superior to all your trepidation and dejection. Faith will teach you to reason on this wise, What hath God said?"
p. 149. "The prophecies are uttered, not with the caution and hesitation of one who, from his superior observation and discernment, forms merely a probable conjecture of the future; nor with that renunciation of interference and agency, which might be expected from one who, from a loftier elevation than others enjoy, commands a view of the regions to them invisible, and can therefore impart to them intimation of rising events, which would otherwise be unknown until their arrival. They are delivered with all the precision and authority of Him who has planned the mighty series of events which we witness; and who is able to foretell them, because he has put the whole in motion, and the transactions that take place are the result of his own appointment and determination."
Ibid. p. 79. "Believe the testimony he has given, and you shall find that he will do as he has said." Ibid. p. 91.

You demand a kind of proof for the interpretation of unfulfilled prophecy, not only one of which it cannot, from its very essence, be susceptible, but even a kind of proof which you yourself could not produce for the first elements of Christian doctrine; and if you are inclined to question the truth of this assertion, pray try your hand on your master, Mr. Faber, on imputed Righteousness and Predestination. You must know how Bishop Tomline has succeeded to the satisfaction of ninety-nine out of every hundred of the clergy of the churches of England and Scotland, in explaining away the doctrine of justification by faith, till it becomes in fact no justification by faith at all; and
you must know also, that you are unable to give such a demonstration of it, as you demand from us for unfulfilled prophecy: and this not from want of ability in you, but because the subject does not admit of the species of proof which you require. This being the case with a doctrine, it is infinitely more impossible to give such a demonstration of unfulfilled prophecy as an objector cannot find fault with, because future things are more objects of faith than past things, and if either could be demonstrated to the senses, they would cease to be matters of faith altogether. You talk with such confidence of certain prophecies having been fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem, and as being to have no fuller accomplishment, that one is almost tempted to deny the destruction of that city and nation at all, and put you on your proof of the fact from the Scriptures. The Bible was not written to convince sceptics, but to instruct those in whom God has implanted faith to believe its declarations. Great God! increase our faith!

As I believe that there is nothing more dangerous than this same love of asking "how can these things be?" in every branch of revealed truth; as I believe, further, that it is a suggestion of the spirit of infidelity, and that this spirit is at work in the church, and in no place more active than in Scotland, permit me affectionately and earnestly to warn you against its tendency: at the same time I fully grant that it is not right for us to admit any thing as an article of our creed, which is not declared in the Bible in the most
explicit terms. But I must observe, that it was not difficulty in ascertaining facts that produced the infidelity of the generation which saw our Lord in the flesh. The question "how," arose from an indisposition to believe God’s plain declaration: the question is asked now from precisely the same cause. The principal point to which you have applied it is to ask, "how, if all the present race of mankind be destroyed by the coming of the Lord at the commencement of the millennium, is the world to be peopled during that period?" The question may be divided into three principal parts:—1st, Is all the race of mankind to be destroyed? 2nd. Is the world to be peopled during the millennium? 3d. How is it to be effected? With respect to the first, I see it very clearly revealed, and therefore have no doubt of the fact, that the end of the times of the Gentiles, when the Jews are brought back again to their own land, will be accompanied by very heavy judgments upon all the nations which have oppressed them: the historical events also which are referred to as types illustrative of those judgments, are invariably such as produced a total, or nearly total, destruction of the parties upon whom they fell; such as Midian, Megiddo, the Deluge, Sodom, and the Red Sea: but the destruction in the types is not so complete as it is declared that it shall be, in the passages which are simply declaratory. With respect to the second part of the question, it is clearly revealed also, that there will be people on earth during the
millennium, as you yourself also hold at large, p. 69: but you have wholly omitted that which constitutes the greater part of the difficulty, which is this; namely, that it seems also to be intimated, that those who inhabit the earth during that period, will be free from hereditary sin; and I presume that you likewise think so, since otherwise your opinion that the millennium will prove a season of blessedness to the brute creation is doubly unaccountable. And if you ask me how is original sin to be got out of the world, I reply, that I will answer you, when you have told me how it got into the world. I entreat you to put yourself in the situation of a Jew before the first coming of our Lord, and suppose yourself refuting an objector who should deny the fact of his being about to come in humiliation, by putting the question "how can these things be?" how, with nothing but the Old Testament Scripture, would you have answered him? There can be no objection, of which I am aware, to Ben Ezra's idea of a change in this planet's polarity, nor to any other speculation in Sacred Physics, when not used, as it is not by Ben Ezra, but as it is by you, to contradict a fact.

You say, p. 63, "after the Bible has delivered a clear, consistent, and intelligible account of the second coming of Christ, at the close of all earthly things, &c.; nothing can be more unreasonable and ridiculous than to abandon the plain statements of Scripture," &c. After the enunciation of this truism, your reader is led to hope to be favoured with some of these "plain
statements of Scripture.” But no: a string of texts, indeed, are brought forward, which truly are very plain, and which assert nothing that Millenarians deny. You then draw an inference from these texts, which inference you labour to shew is inconsistent with the millenarian hypothesis. In so doing, you prove that you do not understand the difference between Scripture, and an inference from Scripture. We must bow to the one; the other we are at liberty to deny. This confusion in your mind has led you, in another place, p. 123, to charge the Millenarians with asserting that the final apostacy at the end of the millennium will be composed of the risen saints. In stating this, you have not intended wilfully to say what is untrue, but you conceive that an unallowed inference is equivalent to a grave assertion. “What, therefore,” you say, “Mr. Faber considers the height of absurdity, these enlightened Millenarians gravely assert to be an unquestionable fact.” After putting your own inference in the place of Scripture, you lay down three suppositions, on each of which you endeavour to prove the events expected according to the millenarian scheme cannot take place. We have one short and sufficient answer to all reasonings of that kind, which is, that we believe the events will be miraculous; i.e. they will be brought about by an interruption of the laws which now regulate the material globe, as well the immaterial beings upon it. We are not concerned to state how they will be accomplished. We study God’s word for increasing light; we put forth our conjectures.
about the *how* as conjectures, and if, after all, we are unable to discover the precise mode in which the events will be accomplished, we, nevertheless, believe what is written. “Hath He said, and shall He not do it?” Before the deluge we may easily conceive an unbeliever reasoning, as you do now, on the impossibility of that event; “we must suppose,” he might say to Noah while building the ark, “either that the flood will come suddenly, and with an immense rush of water; or else it will come calmly and gently by a gradual rising of the waters.” And pray observe, Sir, that I take the instance of an orthodox person, who did not disbelieve the coming of the deluge in *a certain sense*, only he did not happen to believe it in the way God had declared it; so that he was a sort of an orthodox unbeliever. “Now,” says he, “in either case I will prove to you that your preservation will be impossible. 1st. Let us suppose the first, and see what is likely to happen. Your great unwieldy vessel, entirely unmanageable, will be at the mercy of this immense torrent of water, and must inevitably be dashed to pieces. 2d. Let us suppose the second, and see what will be the consequence. The waters rising so gradually will give ample warning to the multitude around you of the destruction which awaits them; and can you imagine that they will allow you to keep your ark to yourself and your family? will they not break open your door, and gain admittance in such numbers as to sink the ark? or at least to render existence in it impossible? your whole
supply of food will soon be exhausted, and if you escape a watery grave you will perish from starvation. And then as to your preserving the whole race of animals, beasts, and birds, and creeping things! surely nothing can be conceived more absurd and fantastical! How are you to get them into the ark? when in, how can you maintain them? how can you discover the appropriate food for all? do not many live upon green leaves? how will your tree grow in the ark? Poor, good, pious man, surely no reverie of a lunatic was ever more baseless and visionary than thine!" The simple answer of Noah to all such reasonings about the impossibility of the events is, "Is any thing too hard for God?" This is my simple answer to you; and if you are to overthrow our scheme, it must be done, not by saying that its accomplishment is above the reason of man, nor by false inferences from Scripture, but, by shewing that the Scriptures we bring forward do not declare that which we say they do.

I betake myself now to grapple with the strong hold in which you, Dr. Bogue, and others who agree with you, endeavour to maintain yourselves, wherein you contend that when it is said, that the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea, this state of things is to be brought about solely by the gradual preaching of the Gospel; which argument you found upon the parables of the grain of mustard seed, the leaven in the measure of meal, and the vision of the stone in Daniel; and
you ask "can any man in his sober senses conclude from these passages, that the world will ultimately be brought under the authority of the Redeemer by any other process than that by which men have hitherto been delivered from the power of darkness," &c.—and, "instead of being filled with the personal glory of the Lord, we are assured that the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord," "filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord."—p. 138. 140. You have been scarcely more fair in the quotations that you have made from the sacred volume, than you have been in those which you have made from the writings of the Millenarians, for you have in both cases been entirely unmindful of the connexion in which the passages that you quote occur. In my reply to you, therefore, I am compelled to make very large extracts, that I may shew how ill you are able to understand any author by taking merely a fragment from the midst of his narrative, or argument. I know scarcely one single quotation which you have brought forward, that conveys in its own place the idea which you have quoted it to justify. In order to answer such a writer completely, each passage objected to, ought to be transcribed, and an analysis of his argument given; then the whole of the passage out of which he has dragged his shred of a text, and an analysis of the Apostles, or Prophet's argument, as the case may be, subjoined, and contrasted with the argument of the writer: but to do this would not only run to great length, but be as full of dry grammar and logic as a piece of special pleading before the twelve
judges in banco, and which no one would be at
the trouble of following; I am therefore obliged
to content myself with a few extracts only, be-
cause they must be copious, when it would be
more satisfactory to analyse the whole.

Many Prophecies contain no internal proof of the
period to which we are to look for their fulfilment,
and such information is to be obtained from other
sources. On the other hand, you must be aware
that many Prophecies do contain an internal Chron-
ology, distinctly marking the precise date at
which they are to be fulfilled: of this latter kind is
Isaiah xi. which you have instanced, and which is
as follows: “And there shall come forth a rod out
of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out
of his roots.”* “And the Spirit of the Lord shall

* The title “Branch,” is not, I believe, given to our Lord in
any passage that is applicable to his first coming; but in all the
passages in which it occurs there are some circumstances to
prove it applies to his second coming; as in Jer. xxiii. 5.
“Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto
David a righteous Branch, and a king shall reign and prosper,
and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth; in his days
Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely;” this is
exactly the opposite of what took place at his first coming, for
instead of dwelling safely, Judah, and still less Israel, have had
no safe dwelling in any country on the globe; “and this is the
name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness.
Therefore behold the days come, saith the Lord, that they shall
no more say, the Lord liveth which brought up the children of
Israel out of the land of Egypt; but the Lord liveth which
brought up, and which led, the seed of the house of Israel out
of the north country, and from all countries whither I had
driven them;” now be it known and admitted, that there are
some indefatigable spiritualizers who say that this means con-
verting Christians out of all nations; but as if to shut out this
rest upon him," &c.,—" the wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid;" &c. which passage you agree with me in taking literally, and also in applying it to the time of the millennium; and in not spiritualizing, as it is called, the wolf and the leopard into cruel men, and the lamb and kid into peaceable men; for you say, p. 69, that this passage "evidently implies that the brute creation is to be then preserved, and that the millennium is to be a period of uncommon felicity to man and beast."

Thus you admit this to be literal; that therefore we are to expect the nature of the brutes to be changed; that instead of the wolf liking to eat the kid, he will like to do no such thing; in all which I agree with you: but then you require me to believe, also, that this extraordinary change in the brutes is to be brought about by no other agency than the preaching of the Gospel by the present race of mankind. I affirm, that I do not know how it is to be brought about, because I have been unable to discover anything said on the subject in the Scriptures. The fact of the change is exactly analogous to, though the opposite of, that which took place at the time of Adam's fall; and if you know how their natures were changed at that time, then you may also know how their last refuge, the prophet adds, "and they shall dwell in their own land:" if any person can be found to maintain that the expression, Judah and Israel dwelling in their own land, means Christians going to Heaven, I shall waste neither time, breath, nor paper, in replying to him.
natures will be changed again; but I know neither the one nor the other.

The two facts of the two changes are revealed, and I believe them: the how in neither case do I care now to stop to discuss; but certainly the most improbable mean I have ever heard of for the future change is the one you maintain, namely, by any "process" which has hitherto proceeded, from the curse of Adam to the present hour. You have a long piece of declamation, p. 140, saying, that "from the commencement to the close of the sacred canon, we have no warrant to expect a revival of religion at any time, nor its unlimited prevalence in the world at last, in any other way than that in which it has hitherto prospered, and secured its present conquests." The Bible must have been read with a very inaccurate eye for this opinion to be entertained, because in Jer. xxxi. it is written, that now people teach one another, but that a time is coming when that way "in which it has hitherto prospered," shall not be the way, for then no one shall teach his neighbour; and so obvious is this to all clear-seeing men, that not many weeks since, the Bishop of Winchester grounded an argument in favour of a charity school at Guildford, upon this very passage, observing, that whenever that future time might be, the present was, evidently, different from it, for we must now one teach the other, and therefore encourage schools. But even suppose your conclusion was to be granted as far as it goes, it leaves out one half the question, namely, the re-
demption of the brutes; (Rom. viii. 23.) this is coincident with the redemption of the body, and you have omitted the only difficulty, which is, the mode by which your Missionaries are to effect it. "Then," adds the prophet, "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea; and in that day," that is, upon your own admission in the preceding verse, during the millennium, "there shall be a rod of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people, to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious; and it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time, to recover the remnant of his people which shall be left, 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 up an ensign for the nations, and assemble the outcasts of Israel, (clearly pointing to the ten tribes,) and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth: the envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim;" expressions which cannot possibly be spiritualized, and which can mean nothing but that in the day when Christ appears as the Branch, he assembles both the ten and the two tribes under one head, even himself; an event which did not take place at the restoration from Babylon; and the places mentioned as those out of which they are to be gathered, are those into which they could not have been taken.
by Nebuchadnezzar; and the prophet finishes by giving us a specimen of the strain in which the restored Jewish church will sing *in that day*.

Thus then, Sir, we have arrived at a clear and distinct revelation that the period at which the knowledge of the Lord is to cover the earth, is coincident (since the word *synchronous* displeases you,) with the appearance of the Branch, which we have seen is not Messiah's first Advent, and is coincident with the restoration of the Jews. Let us now turn to another passage to see what the Lord has declared that he will do at the time when he shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem. For this purpose let us refer to Joel iii. "In those days, and in that time, when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, I will also gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for my people, and for my heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations, and parted my land," &c.; and the prophet goes on in the same strain, warning the heathen nations, the Gentiles, of the fate which awaits them.

God has been pleased to reveal also the chief ground of controversy which he has with us Gentiles; namely, the persecution, massacres, tortures, &c. which his people, the Jews, have endured at the hands of the Gentiles. The whole prophecy of Obadiah turns upon this point. It is part of the righteous government of God, that nothing shall put away the sin of shedding a brother's blood; he that sheds man's
blood, by man shall his blood be shed. Yes, it will be said, but this applies only to individual murderers. Refer then to Numb. xxxv. 33, where we read, that “blood, it defileth the land; and the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it.” Upon this point I entirely subscribe to your sentiments, expressed in p. 240. “At death men are rewarded individually, and have their everlasting condition decided by their personal character. But nations, as nations, have no existence in eternity; and therefore their national crimes are punished by temporal calamities; and the punishment inflicted for their sins in their corporate capacity, is represented as their judgment day; and the metaphors used to pourtray it, are derived from the proceedings of the day of final retribution.” It is therefore the national crimes of Christendom which I expect to be punished at the time of the restoration of the Jews, and if you will limit the expression, day of judgment, to Christendom, when you say that Christ will not appear till the day of judgment, then I agree with you. Of both these events I see clear signs in the world at the present moment; but on this topic I do not now enter.

I next beg your attention to Jer. xxx. and xxxi., which are plainly one connected and continuous prophecy, and which also contain an internal chronology. “Lo, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will bring again the captivity of my people Israel and Judah, and I will cause them to return to the land that I gave to their fathers, and they
shall possess it." v. 3. I have not been able to gather from your work, whether you believe or not, that the Jews will return and possess the land which God gave to their fathers; but whether this be so or not, of this I am certain, that there is no man in Great Britain who, on receiving from some powerful fellow-creature of good reputation, a promise affecting his temporal concerns, couched in precisely similar terms, would be found to doubt it. The Prophet then proceeds (v. 5, 6.) to declare that the time of their return will be one of painful struggling to the Jews, saying, "Alas, for that day is great, so that none is like it: it is even the time of Jacob's trouble, but he shall be saved out of it, for it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord of Hosts, that I will break his (the oppressor's) yoke from off thy neck, and will burst thy bonds, and strangers shall no more serve themselves of him, but they shall serve the Lord their God, and David their King, whom I will raise up unto them: therefore, fear thou not, O my servant Jacob, saith the Lord; neither be dismayed, O Israel, for lo, I will save thee from afar, and thy seed from the land of thy captivity; and Jacob shall return, and shall be in rest, and be quiet, and none shall make him afraid." (We have already arrived at three points, which clearly mark that this prophecy does not relate to the restoration from the Babylonian captivity:—1st. That both Israel and Judah are promised to return, whereas the latter only returned at that time. 2nd. That David is promised to be raised, whereas he was not
raised up to them. 3d. They who did return were not in rest, nor in quiet, nor with none to make them afraid.) "For I am with thee, saith the Lord, to save thee; though I make "a full end of all nations, whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee," &c. &c. The Prophet then declares that God's punishment of them was only for a season, (v. 18.) "thus saith the Lord, 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; and out of them shall proceed thanksgiving, and the voice of them that make merry; and I will multiply them, and they shall not be few: I will also glorify them, and they shall not be small; their children shall be as aforetime," (will any one venture so to spiritualize, as to say this also means the conversion of individuals among the Gentiles?) "and their congregations shall be established before me, and I will punish all that oppress them;" after declaring that all this is to be brought about by the whirlwind and fierce anger of the Lord, the prophet proceeds, (xxxii. 1.) "At the same time, saith the Lord, will I be the God of all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people, &c.—again, I will build thee, and thou shalt be built, O virgin of Israel; (v. 4.)—Thou shalt yet plant vines upon the mountains of Samaria; the planter shall plant, and shall eat them as common things." (Can this be spiritual too?) After a great deal more to the same purpose, he adds the following very
striking particulars, v. 24. "and there shall dwell in Judah itself, and in all the cities thereof together, husbandmen, and they that go forth with flocks." v. 29. "In those days they shall say no more, the fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the children's teeth are set on edge." This, I presume, no one will contend, has already taken place, which, however, all must do, who spiritualize the restoration of the Jews to their own land into taking Gentiles to heaven: whereas it is perfectly consistent with the removal of the curse, and consequently the savage nature of the beasts which only came in with the curse, to which I have referred in Isaiah: and also quite in harmony with what follows, v. 31. "behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt, which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord, but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people."

It is clear, therefore, from all these passages together, 1. That the Jews are to be restored as a nation to their own land. 2. That at the same time the Gentiles are to be visited with judgments. 3. That the time of the restoration of the Jews is to be a season of increased happi-
ness to the brute creation; (pardon my tautology.)

4. That a long period of time is to elapse, during which this season of happiness is to be enjoyed. 5. That Christ is to be the ruler of this restored Jewish nation.

You say, p. 270, however, that the passage is not to be taken literally, because, in your opinion, it is absurd to suppose, that the literal David is to be raised from the dead to sit upon this throne, and if this be not the case, then the David here mentioned must be a spiritual David, and since the word David is to be taken spiritually, therefore the whole passage must be interpreted spiritually also. In the first place, I observe, that I object to no spiritual application of any promise in Scripture to all who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God, and only Saviour of sinners: but I object to not receiving the literal application also: so that when you think you have refuted the Millenarians by shewing that a passage of Scripture is to be taken spiritually, you have not advanced one step in the process, because you have only proved that which is not denied. The Christian Review and Clerical Magazine says, p. 431. "We have observed, that many persons bring forward arguments in this discussion, which it is evident, upon a little consideration, prove nothing either way, as only tending to establish points common to all the different schemes of interpretation which have been proposed. Now this shews miserable want of common sense and logic, or else shameful dishonesty; either of which would afford a suffi-
cient reason for excluding a person from any right or title to be heard in a discussion which ought to be conducted with wisdom and candour, or not at all."* With respect to David, it is clearly declared the Jews "shall serve David their king whom I will raise up unto them." The same is repeated in another prophecy in xxxiii. 7: "I will cause the captivity of Judah, and the captivity of Israel to return, and will build them as at the first, v. 9. and it shall be to me a name of joy, a praise, and an honour before all nations of the earth, which shall hear all the good that I do unto them, and they shall fear and tremble for all the goodness, and for all the prosperity, that I procure unto it;" (therefore it is evident, that this restoration is not at the day of judgment, according to your definition of the day of judgment, namely, twenty-four hours, in which the world is to be annihilated, because nations are to remain on the earth, and witness the blessedness of the restored Jews.) "Thus saith the Lord, Again there shall be heard in this place, which ye" (anti-millenarians) "say, shall be desolate, without man, and without beast, even

* I cannot conclude this extract from a Journal, which is by far the most honest and uncompromising of all that are published in London, without an apology for the coarseness of its language; but since it is employed by a leading Religious Magazine, and, above all, since it is used against Mr. Cuninghame, a Millenarian, it will probably be considered every thing that is right by the Evangelical World. I have quoted it, however, for the justness of the idea conveyed; the propriety of which has made me select passages of Scripture in this letter, which it appeared to me impossible to spiritualize.
in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem, that are desolate without man and without inhabitants, and without beast; the voice of joy, and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom, and the voice of the bride:” (expressions which we also know cannot apply to the spiritual Israel, the elect, who neither marry nor are given in marriage,) “the voice of them that shall say, Praise the Lord of Hosts, for the Lord is good; for his mercy endureth for ever; and of them that shall bring the sacrifice of praise into the house of the Lord. For I will cause to return the captivity of the land as at the first, saith the Lord. Thus saith the Lord of Hosts again in this place, which is desolate, without man, and without beast, and in all the cities thereof, shall be a habitation of shepherds, causing their flocks to lie down: in the cities of the mountains, in the cities of the vale, and in the cities of the south, and in the land of Benjamin, and in the places about Jerusalem, and in the cities of Judah, shall the flocks pass under the hands of him that telleth them, saith the Lord. Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised to the house of Israel, and to the house of Judah. In those days, and at that time will I cause the Branch of Righteousness to grow up unto David, and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land: in those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely, and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, the Lord our Righteousness; for thus saith the Lord, David shall never want a man
to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel." In the chapter preceding, the prophet says, v. 37. "Behold, I will gather them out of all countries whither I have driven them in mine anger, and in my fury, and in great wrath; and I will bring them again unto this place, and I will cause them to dwell safely; and they shall be my people, and I will be their God; and I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me for ever, for the good of them, and of their children after them; and I will make an everlasting covenant with them that I will not turn away from them to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me: yea, I will rejoice over them to do them good, and I will plant them in this land assuredly with my whole heart, and with my whole soul." (I cannot read these very strong expressions, without my heart trembling for those who deny so plain a testimony. Is it said that this was fulfilled at the return from Babylon? Not so, because 1. They were not driven into all countries.—2. They had not one heart that they should fear God for ever.—3. God did not make an everlasting covenant that he would not turn away from them to do them good.) "For thus saith the Lord, like as I have brought all this great evil upon this people, so will I bring upon them all the good that I have promised them; and fields shall be bought in this land, whereof ye say, it is desolate, without man or beast; it is given into the hand of the Chaldeans; men shall buy fields for money, and subscribe evidences, and seal them,
take witnesses in the land of Benjamin, and in the places about Jerusalem, and in the cities of Judah, and in the cities of the mountains, and in the cities of the valley, and in the cities of the south, for I will cause their captivity to return, saith the Lord."

Now, Sir, I admit that the return from Babylon was the Prophet's sign, Deut. xviii. 22. and furnished the language in which to pourtray the still future return from their present captivity of body under the powers of this world, and their captivity of soul under the power of sin: I admit, also, that much is descriptive, or figurative, or emblematical, (whichever term best pleases you,) of the believer's redemption out of the kingdom of darkness, and transfer into the kingdom of God's dear Son: but I maintain that there are expressions which cannot be applied to any of these things, and are therefore, from this, their own internal, evidence, as well as from their connexion with other things avowedly yet future, still to be accomplished.

I pass over many other prophecies, and will conclude with Ezek. xxxvii. 16. "Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it for Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions; then take another stick, and write upon it, for Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for all the house of Israel his companions; and join them one to another in one stick, and they shall become one in thine hand: and when the children of thy people shall speak unto thee, saying, wilt thou not shew us what thou meanest by these? Say
unto them, thus saith the Lord God, Behold I will take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him, even with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in mine hand: and the sticks whereon thou writest shall be in thine hand before their eyes: and say unto them, thus saith the Lord God, behold I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land; and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel, and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all; neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions; but I will save them out of all their dwelling places wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them; so shall they be my people, and I will be their God: and David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one Shepherd; they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes to do them: and they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they and their children, and their children's children for ever; and my servant David shall be their Prince for ever: moreover, I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an
everlasting covenant with them: and I will place them and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore: my tabernacle also shall be with them; yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people: and the heathen shall know that I the Lord do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore." Whoever, after reading this passage, can deny that the two and ten tribes are promised to be united in one kingdom, in Judea, under one king, David; and that they are to remain so for ever, and that the Gentiles shall be witnesses of all this, and consequently not destroyed, when David is raised up for this purpose, can only deny it, not from any difficulty of understanding it, but from a stout refusal to bend to the plain declarations of God's word. It matters nothing to the point who the person is that is meant by David, whether David the son of Jesse, or the Lord Jesus himself, and your saying, that the first is impossible, or absurd, or anything else, cannot make me doubt that what God has said so plainly, he will as plainly bring to pass. I see nothing absurd in supposing, that David the son of Jesse should be raised for the purpose. And I may take this opportunity of observing, that you appear to me to labour throughout your book in a radical defect upon the nature of faith; for your main objections to all that Millenarians advance, are, that the things to be done appear to you to be absurd, and that you cannot reconcile all the events of futurity with them: your belief, therefore, is built, not
upon the veracity of the Promiser, but upon your opinion of his power to do what he has said; and this power you do not rate very high, since by always asking "how?" you will give him no credit for ability to accomplish his promise, unless, in your judgment also, it shall seem feasible.

But it appears to me more consonant with other Scriptures, to believe that it is the true David, the only Beloved one, who is the person intended. You seem to forget that the names of our blessed Lord are not arbitrary and unmeaning sounds, like John, or Thomas, or William; but that they all express some office, or character which he bears, as the Redeemer of the creation: that the name of Jesus was given to him because he was to save his people from their sins; that he is the Christ, as anointed of the Father, with the Holy Ghost. In all the above quoted prophecies, the original would equally bear this translation, "they shall serve the Lord their God, and the Beloved their King, whom I will raise up unto thee;" and so of the other passages: that this is Christ, and not the literal David, we know from the argument of the apostle, in Acts ii. 30., where he says, God had sworn that "he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne," and therefore that the resurrection of Christ was the fulfillment of this oath: but you cannot say that that alone fulfills all the terms of the prophecy, because at the resurrection of Christ, the two families were not united in one kingdom, but were, on the other hand, dispersed; nor are they in the land where their fathers dwelt; nor was the sanctuary in the midst of
them for evermore. Your argument may be summed up as follows:—

There is in the prophecies relating to the restoration of the Jews, a promise of raising up dead David to rule over them: raising up dead David I think impossible and absurd; therefore the word David must be spiritualized; therefore the flocks, and the land, and the walls, and the grapes, and the two and ten tribes being united, &c. &c., must be spiritualized also; therefore the Jews are never to be restored to their land.

My argument is this:—

There are in the prophecies relating to the restoration of the Jews, many things connected with that event, such as keeping flocks, inhabiting the land, building walls, eating grapes, two rival nations being united under one king, &c., which must be taken literally: there is one word, David, which may be interpreted spiritually, because I do not see how it will be fulfilled literally: as all the other parts are literal, I believe that what is said of David, is literal also, and that He who promises is able to bring it to pass.

Which of these two lines of argument best commends itself to common sense, I leave you to decide.

Thus, then, we are brought to see that Christ's return as the King of the Jews, as the heir to the throne of David, is at the time of their restoration, which is the beginning of the time of blessedness, and which the Gentiles are to witness: consequently, the next appearance of Christ is not for 24 hours only to burn up the world.
His next appearance is not as Jesus the bearer of sin upon his own body, and therefore the accursed one, but as David, the Beloved. When he shewed his glorified humanity to his disciples on the Mount, a voice from heaven again announced him as the Beloved, as David. At another time four disciples ask the Lord, the man with whom they were conversing, Matt. xxiv., and who had just told them that he was going away, when he was coming again. Does he answer this by telling them that they are in a great mistake? that he, the man who was talking to them, the Son of Man, was not coming; but that the Holy Spirit was coming? No such thing; but directly the reverse; for he proceeds to give them the signs by which they might surely know the coming of the Son of Man. To this passage you may make three answers; 1st, that the conversation refers only to the destruction of Jerusalem. Not so, because the Son of Man did not appear, that is, was not visible (for an invisible appearance is a blessed discovery reserved for "the blaze of literature and science" of these days) to any human being; and therefore the passage cannot relate to that event; 2dly, that it relates to his spiritual coming at the commencement of the millennium. Not so; because a spiritual coming is a coming of the Holy Spirit, who is invisible, and not a coming of the Son of Man, who is to be seen, and who in the answer to his disciples spoke of the coming of his own person; 3dly, that, if it does mean a coming of the glorified Son of Man, it refers to the end of the
millennium. Not so, because at the end of the
century you say there will be no apostates
nor ungodly people, whereas at the period of the
coming spoken of in the text, of whatever nature
that coming may be, the world is described to be
as bad as it was in the days of Noah, and the
elect only gathered out of it. Christ is "entered
into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence
of God for us—once in the end of the world hath
he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of
himself—and unto them that look for him shall he
appear the second time without sin unto salva-
tion." Heb. ix. 27. Your great authority, Mr.
Faber, who contends so earnestly for homoge-
neous interpretation, will find some difficulty in
getting over this passage. The appearance will be
of the same person the second time, who has already
appeared a first time: if his first appearance was
spiritual, so will be the second; if the first was per-
sonal, so will be the second. The angels, Acts i. 11,
declared that this same Jesus shall so come in like
manner as ye have seen him go. If it was the man
that went it is the man that shall come. He was
always the Christ, or at all events, we have it so
recorded from 1 Sam. ii. 10, downwards: after
his incarnation he was Jesus: when he appears in
glory he is David. No Jew, from the day that
Jeremiah wrote, to this hour, has ever thought
that the word David in the Prophets meant any
thing but the descendant of David, even Messiah,
and not David the son of Jesse himself. The
blind man called him the son of David: David's
own son, Solomon, was also called Jedidiah, the
Beloved of God. The promise of the perpetual kingdom was not to David for himself but to David for his son; even the rod out of the root of Jesse. Do you mean to maintain that the promise to David, the son of Jesse, that his son should sit upon his throne for ever is fulfilled, by the Son of God sitting upon God's throne? In this case, you must maintain that David means God; for if the son sitting upon David's throne signifies Christ sitting upon God's throne, you can believe nothing else: or will you contend, that the Son of David sitting upon his Father's throne, means the son of God sitting upon his own throne, and therefore not upon his father's throne? It is easy to say that the throne of David is a spiritual throne; and so far as the one word *throne* is concerned, it can neither be proved nor disproved; but when we put together into the proposition all the other things predicated of it, we cannot possibly give it any other than a literal interpretation.

Is the promise to the Virgin Mary, that her child, the man Jesus, should sit upon his father's David's throne, fulfilled by his going into heaven to sit upon a throne on which his father David never did sit?

You say that you "have abundant reason to maintain that the prophecy of Malachi refers to no other events than those which followed the first advent of Christ:" that the proofs of this are, that he is said to come suddenly to his temple, therefore it must be while there is a temple to come to, which there will not be at the second advent; and also that our Lord assured us, that John the Baptist was Elias who was for to come, p. 224, 225.
The Millenarians state some other accompaniments of the great and terrible day of the Lord, which, as they contend, shew that the passage cannot be limited to the first advent exclusively. You answer this, by affirming that it does apply to no other event than the first advent, and you support this assertion by producing nothing but what they admit to belong to the first. Here, therefore, as usual, you shirk the question. Now, Sir, I will shew you what it was you were bound to prove, in order to make good your case: you have coupled very properly the third and fourth chapters together; but there is some equivocation in saying that "the writings of Malachi were primarily directed to the Jews." Did any body ever assert that a Jewish prophet, writing in the Jewish language, to the Jewish nation, did not primarily direct his prophecies to that people? but what do you mean by putting in the word primarily in the first sentence of your paragraph, and then saying that the prophecy of Malachi refers to no other events, &c. in the second? The Millenarians assert too that the book of Malachi refers primarily to the Jews; but as they knew the meaning of the word primarily, they have been somewhat more consistent than to deny that which had a first, to have a second also. Notwithstanding your word primarily, your argument goes all along to deny the secondary application, and to maintain that this prophecy relates to no other events than the first Advent. For this purpose, then, you were bound to shew that at Christ's first coming it was fulfilled, "he shall purify the sons of Levi,
and purge them as gold and silver," (whereas, on the contrary, he abolished them altogether,) "that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness: then shall the offerings of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord as in the days of old, and as in former years—for I am the Lord, I change not, therefore the sons of Jacob are not consumed," and "I will rebuke the devourer for your sakes," (at the first advent the devourer was sent against them,)—"and all nations shall call you blessed; for ye shall be a delightsome land, saith the Lord of Hosts," (but, on the contrary, all nations have called them cursed, and the land is barren;) nor did Elias, that is, John the Baptist, turn the heart of the fathers to the children, so that God should not smite the land with the curse of division any more. You were bound, I say, to shew all these things fulfilled at the first Advent, before you were entitled to draw your conclusion that the prophecy of Malachi related to no other event.

Another grand cheval de battaille with you is in pages 240, 241, where you maintain that the expression, the day of the Lord, means the temporal destruction only of the several nations, in denouncing the judgments of which it is used: in support of which position, you bring forward two verses from Isaiah xxii. and that is all. But is this all that is said of the Day in which the Lord destroys Babylon? You treat the Bible as if it were a collection of books by different independent writers, whose histories agree in certain particulars, and each of whose works you consider.
separate and detached from the other. In this way you can never understand the Bible upon any one subject; this is the way that Bishop Tomline, and John Wesley, and Fletcher, (Scripture Scales,) set James against Paul, and in this way you array Isaiah against Malachi, and consider what is said by the former concerning Babylon as having no necessary connection with what is said on the same subject by Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and St. John. But, Sir, surely you must admit that the Bible has but one author, even God; that the names of Isaiah, Jeremiah, &c. are, like the numbers of chapters and verses, very convenient divisions for the sake of reference, but that the names of these divisions are of no more real consequence than if they had been called Whitequill, Greyquill, Goosequill, Crowquill, &c. that is, by the name of the instrument by which the letters were inscribed, for, in fact, the writers were nothing but parts of the machinery by which the Holy Spirit caused his mind to be expressed to us. In order, therefore, to get all the information which God has been pleased to give of his dealings towards Babylon, you must not take two verses in Isaiah only, but combine all that is said on that subject throughout the sacred volume; and you will then find a great many things foretold, with reference to it, to take place in the day of the Lord which never have taken place, and, consequently, you will be obliged to extend the term beyond the time when Cyrus and his Medes burst open the gates of brass of the glory of the Chaldeans. Similar observations apply to Egypt, Tyre, &c.
You are perfectly right in the following passage, p. 228, "Almost every thing in the sacred volume relating to the incarnation of Christ, and his mediatorial undertaking; to his dominion over creation, and his sovereignty over his church; to the work of grace in the hearts of believers, and the glory laid up for them in heaven; the types, promises, and prophecies, respecting the religious privileges and spiritual enjoyments of believers, have been dragged into the Millenarian service." I have no hesitation in declaring my firm belief that the grand end of God in creation is the manifestation of Himself; that the manifestation of his love is in the union with Himself of a portion of the fallen race of Adam; that His Son, one with Himself and one with man, perfect God and perfect man, is to be exhibited on this globe, a portion of the matter of which has been taken into union with him, as Lord of all the universe; and that the creation of the world; the formation of man out of its dust; the fall; the incarnation of Christ; his mediatorial undertaking; his dominion over creation hitherto; his sovereignty over his church; the resurrection of his body; the work of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of believers; are only steps in this great process, (declared in all the histories, types, promises, and prophecies, from the first verse in Genesis down to the last in the Revelations,) preparatory to that grand exhibition of fallen manhood united with the second Person of the Trinity, as the lord and head of the whole creation. It is this, Sir, which gives the
subject its importance in my eyes, and in those of many others: you seem to think it is an affair of texts, and quibblings about παρουσία, and επίφανεια, είπα, and επίστα. Nay, if I were a Doctor of Divinity, I should be ashamed of any article of my creed, be it the mode of justification, sanctification, election, original sin, or any other, and would abandon at once, as untenable, that I did not perceive in like manner pervading the whole Bible: whereas I see such hot contentsions for the three witnesses in St. John, and the Greek articles in the other Epistles, as if the revelation of the great truth of a Plurality of Persons in the Godhead was suspended upon the accuracy of an ignorant copyist, or a small verbal critic. If, as the mighty master of the Art of Poetry says, it is necessary "to know the poet from the man of rhymes," so is it far more necessary to distinguish between the theologian and the man of texts. Any doctrine in divinity which can be held as an episode, so that our scheme would do equally well without it, is, in fact, not held at all. In this you, and the other opponents of the Millenarians, shew a radical misconception of the nature and object of Revelation; but this point has been lately so admirably discussed by Mr. Erskine, in his Essay on the Freeness of the Gospel, that I forbear to touch upon it further. Give me leave, however, to remark, that for a censor, you are not quite sufficiently accurate in p. 229, and some other places, where you speak of a personal and spiritual coming. The coming of Christ in person, means the coming of him
who is God and Man; but Man as well as God: a spiritual coming, is the coming of the Holy Ghost. If I were desirous of contention, I could shew here some little confusion in the offices of the Persons of the Godhead: I feel confident that with a Doctor of Divinity in the Church of Scotland that cannot be, and therefore I should regret making him an offender for a word, or dwelling upon what can only be an inadvertence. But, Sir, there are two or three other points also on which you are not very clear: you have not well defined what you mean by heaven: you say, Christ and believers being in heaven, cannot ever wish to come again on earth: Indeed! then where is heaven? is it, as Dr. Chalmers says some seem to imagine, a place up in the sky, very cold and rather damp? Heaven, you will say, is where God is; but is he not everywhere? "Whither shall I go from Thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from Thy presence? if I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there." Ps. cxxxix. Do you suppose that a devil, or unconverted man, could be happy in heaven? does not the difference reside in the creature, and not in God, nor in the place? Neither have you defined what you mean by Christ's Throne: you seem to think that he is now on his throne. Indeed! I thought he was set down by the side of his Father, on his Father's throne, waiting till the time was arrived when he should come to sit upon his own: whereas you seem to make a confusion between the throne of the God-man, and the
throne of the Father. Again, Christ is always present with his church, in your heart and mine, by his Spirit; but He is not there bodily: his coming to his church, therefore, cannot be a coming in his Spirit, that is a coming of the Holy Spirit, because he is always so present. His coming must be something which is not now; therefore a bodily coming. I use the expression *bodily*, rather than *in person*, to obviate a quibble that might be raised upon the latter term out of some good old Divines.

You allude, p. 175, to Stephen’s seeing Christ standing at the right hand of God, to prove that heaven is a place, and not a condition. Pray, then, how many millions of miles do you suppose Stephen to have seen at that time? Can you not comprehend that the presence of the Lord, and the absence of sin and death, would at once convert this earth into a Paradise? even to our eyes it presents many beauties, which shew forth the goodness of God to sinful men: how do you know that to the redeemed it may not present itself unspeakably glorious and perfect the moment death closes their eyes, and the distorting medium of sin no longer vitiates their perceptions? 2 Kings vi. 17. I sent your book to a friend of mine, who, however, by no means agrees with me in all my views of this subject, but who possesses a very clear head, and is an excellent scholar, and he writes to me as follows: "Dr. H. does not seem to be aware that the condition of the body may be so changed by the removal of sin as to give a new face to all things, and to render it sus-
ceptible of only pleasing impressions, as before the fall. He is very ready to spiritualize texts but he takes every thing else as he finds it. The moment sin is driven from the earth, sorrow must follow it. Paradise then would be restored without any of those physical difficulties which Dr. H. seems to dread. It is evident that the whole subject is above him; some of his points are well put; but he appears to be a man whose learning is mechanical, and, therefore, as the subject is not taught in the schools, he cannot enter into it. It would indeed be strange to me to suppose that God having created this earth for his own glory, should not ultimately wrest it from the hands of Satan, but leave to the Evil Spirit the triumph of having defeated his intention. Upon this earth Satan has taken his station, and from this earth he must be ejected. When that is done, Paradise necessarily returns, and for that the earnest expectation of the creature is waiting. The coming of the Lord will be like a refiner's fire, or like a flash of lightning that purifies the air by displacing that which taints it. Ben Ezra's notion of altering the position of the earth is not at all necessary in my apprehension. The expulsion of Satan includes every thing. How does Dr. H. know that the coming of the Lord may not act at once upon this atmosphere of sin, and purify all things, like that great change which is produced in the physical world when a chemical precipitation takes place? We cannot reason upon subjects like these. Why then be angry, and use harsh expressions?
Why? but because the truth is yet to come out, namely, that some of you Millenarians have talked of an intellectual, half-infidel Scotch Church.” Ah, Sir! is this it? are we to say hinc illæ lacrymae? if so, I can assure you, you are unjust, for I will take upon myself to answer for all whom you have attacked, that, until your book appeared, no one ever even so much as dreamed of including you in that portion.

There is one inference to be drawn from the language of Scripture, which appears to me quite decisive as to the period of the second Advent, namely, whether it is at the commencement or at the close of the millennium, which is this; if the period of blessedness to the church, and to the whole creation, had preceded the Second Coming of Christ, that period of blessedness would have been held up as the object of the church’s hope and desire, and not the second Advent; but as the second Advent is so held up, and not the period of blessedness, I infer that Christ’s second appearance is at its commencement, and not at is close. As to a millennium, which you, Sir, and the party who take the Christian Observer for its Bible, and the other parties who take the other magazines for their oracles, talk of, that is, a millennium without the society of the Lord Jesus Christ, I can only express upon it my profoundest surprise. To hear the Evangelicals talk, in their speeches, one would suppose that love to the brethren and love to the Lord, had never appeared on the earth till now:
of the former I shall say nothing, but of the latter I will say, that so entirely do I differ from them in their views of happiness, that a millennium without the presence of my Lord would be no period of blessedness to me at all. A millennium without Christ, is a body without a soul, a sphere without its sun.

Indeed, Sir, I believe, in your better moments, that you have yourself but little idea of a state of blessedness without the presence of the Lord; for I read with delight, in your Mourner in Zion, "In his (Christ's) presence is fulness of joy; at his right hand are pleasures for evermore, p. 13. If your soul is overcome with the glories of his person, &c., this is a proof that you have passed from death unto life, and that you are born from above, and made the heirs of his everlasting kingdom. This love to his person, and this admiration of his character, prove that God hath shined into your hearts to give the light of the knowledge of his glory, in the face of Jesus Christ." p. 365.

In some places you are railing at Millenarians, without seeming to be aware that you are holding in contempt names as celebrated in theology and in powers of close mathematical demonstration as that of Dr. Hamilton himself. We read, in p. 250, your comment upon Luke xxi. 24., where you observe, "to look at the words of our Lord, and then say—that this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled, signifies merely till some of them be accomplished, discovers no ordinary degree of critical hardihood." Then, Sir, why have you not attacked
Bishop Horsley and Mr. Mede for this extraordinary degree of critical hardihood? or, at least, why have you not furnished us with one single passage to shew that "\(\varepsilon\omega\zeta\ \alpha\nu\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\ \gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\tau\alpha\iota\) can mean "put an end to;" for that is your interpretation of the word "fulfilled?" the Bishop would have been an antagonist worthy of your powers, while the Millenarians, men of consummate self-confidence, poor intellects, little moral worth, entertaining opinions repugnant to the whole letter and spirit of the Word of God, which cannot be entertained by any man who knows the meaning of his Bible, p. 228, lunatics, with ineffable and matchless silliness, absurdity and impiety, bitterness and vehemence, affording a lamentable proof that there is no delusion too gross for the human mind to digest, p. 327, were hardly of sufficient importance to attract your regard.

You are very angry, also, with the Millenarians, for referring to types: if they had addressed all their works to you, they would have been injudicious to have brought types forward, inasmuch as they could thereby prove nothing: but, Sir, there are hundreds of persons in this land, and many among the poorest and most destitute of the Lord's people, to whom the glorious hope of his appearing has long been their only joy: and, notwithstanding your censures, I am still unconvinced that it was wrong to open and expound the Scriptures, and shew that the promises of glorified humanity being exhibited upon this, the theatre of its suffering, has been depicted in typical things, persons, and histories in all
ages. Types are not for those who yet stand in need of milk, but for those who can bear food upon which their sense may be exercised, and their souls strengthened: not for the Scribes and Rulers in the Sanhedrim, who sit in Moses' seat, but for the poor in spirit, who take the Bible as it is written. So little am I disposed to found arguments on types, that I am scrupulous about grounding any, even on the Parables; but as you have done so, I will name one which is utterly unintelligible, upon any view whatever, but that of the servants of Christ, being appointed by him to share in his reign upon this earth, I mean the Parable of the talents, in which the number of cities, over which the servants rule, is proportionate to the employment of the talents with which they have been entrusted. Oh, Sir! God has entrusted you with many talents: do not use them, I beseech you, do not, in decrying that kingdom of which you may one day share the throne.

You are likewise displeased at our having alluded to the Fathers: here, Sir, you are unjust: the facts of the case are thus: those scandalous publications, the London Magazines, (works which, mostly conducted by ministers of God's word, are much more read in our large towns, than the Bible itself, so that many of the professors of religion in the present day, know little of God's truth, but what is contained in the Magazine they read,) attacked the opinions of Christ's personal reign upon earth as being novel: to shew the ignorance of the reviewers, the Millenarians proved
that the same point was held by the Fathers: their reference to the Fathers therefore was justifiable, and was complete for the purpose for which it was made, namely, to disprove the fact of novelty. Then you turn round, and say, yes, but the Fathers held something more than the modern Millenarians, and you taunt us with not loading our pages with extracts from Papias and Nepos, Irenæus and Lactantius, authors which the poor occupants of a Manse cannot afford to keep, p. vii. and therefore could not verify, so that, after all, these learned quotations could have produced no other effect than that of making all the auld wives in Strathblane, and elsewhere, wonder and stare. You remind me, Sir, of an Irishman, who wrote an account of the last days of Mr. Fox, in which he found fault with Dr. Baillie, and Sir H. Halford, for giving his patron digitalis, which he declared caused his friend's death. The doctors in their defence said, that they had never administered one single dose of this medicine to Mr. Fox, for his disorder did not require it: upon which the accuser, nothing abashed, turned round upon them, and said, "and why did you not give digitalis?" You say, "if they had simply affirmed that their creed was ancient, or at least, that there has been an ancient expectation of a supernatural millennium, they would have asserted a notorious and indubitable fact," p. 291. Notorious and indubitable as is the fact to you, Sir, it is a fact that was not known to the London Editors of Magazines, but doubted, and denied. These Magazines are quite as contradictory to each
other in their opinions as any persons can be, but they, like Herod and Pilate, join in making common cause against the unfortunate Millenarians; for instance, we read in the Christian Review, p. 430, "we expect that this blessed time (the millennium) will be preceded by a period of darkness and fearful judgments, especially upon the antichristian nations, and apostate churches," (how complacently the writer thinks the Churches of England and Scotland can say to the Church of Rome, "stand by I am holier than thou!") What if these two should be the first to come down?) "and this to a much larger extent, and of more tremendous nature, than is generally supposed by those who are looking forward, merely to the fall of antichrist, i.e. the Romish Church, as introductory to that period of joy and peace." But in the Christian Observer we read, p. 399, "a question has of late been much agitated, in connexion with this millennial reign of Christ, whether personal or not, namely, whether the latter day glory shall be ushered in with judgments or with mercy: the advocates of the former opinions, view Christendom as verging to its downfall—We differ widely in opinion from this dejecting sentiment—we look not for a new dispensation, a fifth monarchy, but for the consummation of the present dispensation, the dispensation of the Gospel in the glory of the Messiah, and the extension of his kingdom upon earth, in the merciful arrangement of his providence, under the powerful manifestation of his Holy Spirit." I do not pretend
to understand the conclusion of this sentence, but so much for the agreement of two Church of England and Evangelical Reviews. A few days since I heard a sermon from an Evangelical Clergyman, and good divine too upon other points, who contended that the first resurrection means conversion; that this is the millennium; that the Jews going to their own land, means Christians being converted and taken to heaven; that we are now priests and kings reigning over our enemies, that is, our lusts; and that modern Millenarianism, viewed in the abstract, involves the rejection of Messiah. What could the Millenarians, who heard him, do, but smile at the mistaken zeal with which a worthy man could traduce opinions of which he knows no more than he does of Chinese. You, Sir, tell us, that the modern version of the error is not so bad as the ancient; but as against the ancient view no charge so heavy as this has been made, the harmony between all you, its opponents, is quite delightful. I am surprised, that in your quotations from the Fathers, you should have merely mentioned their chronological succession without also alluding to the prevailing opinions of the respective times, which so much modified their sentiments upon this point. You must know, that the hope of a Redeemer of this habitable world has been the hope of the church from the days of Adam to those of Christ: you must know that it was the hope of the early disciples and Christians, who could with difficulty be brought to believe, (not that their
hope was fallacious, for neither did our Lord, nor any of the apostles say so, but) that a long period of war and desolation was to intervene, before its arrival; you must know, that when the church was taken up by the Emperor Constantine, then for the first time did her sons begin to hold the Apocalypse in disrepute, for they could not conceive that the dear Power which had just begun to succour her, could ever become her bitterest scourge, the Beast, False Prophet, and Dragon of St. John: hence they began to spiritualize; and why? because men take their view to the Apocalypse, and not from it. Ben Ezra has shewn that the Papists, assuming Rome to be the only true church, can never believe that she is Babylon. The Evangelicals in Britain, assuming that their Bible and Missionary Societies are going to convert the world, can never believe that the churches of England and Scotland, and this Pharisaic and Infidel nation, will, because she has been most highly honoured, be the first to feel the weighty hand of the Lord's vengeance. The hope of a Redeemer, not merely of the souls of the elect, but of the habitable globe, has never been lost sight of by the church: God has always had his witnesses to this truth, although at particular times, (such for instance, as during the raging of the early heresies respecting the person of our Lord, and during the popish heresy of justification by works, at the reformation,) other points so wholly engrossed the attention of the most eminent men, that little allusion to this subject is to be found in their writings. But when can
you shew that the deniers of a Redeemer of the habitable globe came in? Never, but with the papacy, who spiritualized to some purpose, and put that crown of Melchizedek, the union of Prophet, Priest, and King, which shall yet be worn by Christ on earth, upon the head of their Pope, even that literal tiara, or triple crown, which marks upon his forehead, not only his three kingdoms, or horns, but his three usurpations of Christ's titles also. You speak of those who spiritualize, as it is called, the plainest passages of the Old Testament, as if they were the Orthodox in every age. Surely, Sir, you must know, as a person well versed in Ecclesiastical History, that the spiritualizers are the Papists, that the system began with them, and is the main prop of their delusion to this very hour. You forget that the making of Christ King, during this dispensation, instead of Priest only, was the first step towards making the Pope his vicegerent: that the ruling with a rod of iron, was therefore taken into his Holiness's hands, and the Inquisition seemed to be its legitimate consequence. I wonder when, upon your system, it is that Christ is to rule the nations with a rod of iron, since you reject both the letter, and the Pope's version of the spirit, yet without favouring us with an interpretation of your own. But that I may not be thought wilfully to deprive you of the advantage of any authorities for spiritualizing, I beg to add to the number Socinus, who, in his treatise on this subject, says, speaking of Rev. xx., that the kingdom of Christ upon earth
cannot be proved from that passage, because the whole must be considered allegorically; but he owns that if he should be asked what is the spiritual interpretation of it, he is not ashamed to confess his ignorance of it. An example of honesty much to be followed by all spiritualizers.

Since you do not seem to be well informed in the history of prophecy, the following short sketch may assist you. During the first three centuries, the majority of Christians interpreted literally the prophecies relating to the reign of Christ with his saints on this renovated earth, as the Jews and Apostles had done before them, and as we read in the Fathers to whom you have referred. When Constantine took the Christian church under his protection, the Christians were delighted, and straining the Apocalypse to coincide with this one fact, they construed the millennium into meaning a state of the church during the present dispensation, dated its commencement from the reign of that Emperor, and interpreted the greater part of the remainder of the book of the Pagan Empire, which had now become converted. At length Mahomet, with his Saracens and Turks, broke forth, and the whole Christian body recognized in them the fulfilment of the prophecies of the Apocalyptic locusts; and what deserves particular notice, looked forward to the effusion of the sixth vial, as the symbol of their being again driven out of Christendom. The millennium having been spiritualized from the time of Constantine, the popes were not slack in spiritualizing every other part of the prophecies, and
made themselves Christ's vicars to rule and to judge the world, together with all powers, potentates, and dominions in it; which authority, indeed, was formally consigned to them by the acts of many Emperors in the days of Justinian, Phocas, Hildebrand, Otho, &c. Although several individuals testified against the Bishop of Rome as Antichrist, yet nothing decisive took place till the Reformation, when it pleased the Lord to open the eyes of his servants to see that Popery was the system which He had foretold, as the apostacy forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats; as the scarlet whore, and mother of all abominations; against which it was their duty to protest, by coming out of, and separating from, it. Hence it was perceived that many events had been foretold as to intervene between the first coming of Christ and the millennium; that the Jews were right in interpreting Edom of Rome; and that a complete system of spiritualizing would not hold good universally. The next important step was taken by Mede, who shewed the Apocalypse to be a series of symbolical visions, arranged according to a particular plan; and that, therefore, it was idle to attempt to explain single texts and verses, which might easily be made to agree with any historical event or person, until the structure of the book was laid down by its own internal evidence, without any reference to interpretation at all. The opinion of Mede has been adopted by all competent expositors of the book from that time, some of whom have corro-
borated or otherwise improved upon it, until, finally, Mr. Frere, taking advantage of, and concentrating all the previous light, has carried the lesson he learned from Mede to the utmost possible extent, and left little more to be desired, as far as the structure only is concerned. Not much advance, however, was made in interpretation from the Reformation, till the French Revolution. As soon as that event broke out, Bishops Porteus and Horsley, and many others, immediately applied to the scenes then taking place in France, the signs in the sun, moon; and stars, of Mat. xxiv., which former writers had shown to be symbolical. Mr. Cuminghame and others brought forward the edict of Justinian, as the point from whence the prophetic number of 1260 was to be dated, terminating at the time of the French Revolution; Mr. Faber shewed one of the little horns of Daniel to be the Mahometan, as Bishop Newton had before shewn the other to be the Papal power; and a cloud of witnesses bore testimony to the events which at that time took place in Europe, being the fulfilment of the prediction expressed by the pouring out of the five first Apocalyptic vials. The Students of Prophecy looked for a corroboration, or refutation of this, their opinion, to the breaking out, or otherwise, of a Turkish war, as soon as Europe should be restored to a state of peace, agreeably to the universal opinion of the church, at the period of the rise of the Mahometans, that the sixth vial would produce the downfall of that power. Whether recent events have tended to confirm or shake their opinions, judge ye.
I would be very far from disputing, that you are, Sir, a very learned Theologian, and that we are all in the nineteenth century, "surrounded with the blaze of literature and science;" and although it might be granted, that you stand upon an intellectual Pisgah, such as was never before vouchsafed to mortal man, I hardly think you are entitled to look down upon, as such mere pigmies, all others who have ever been found capable of "swallowing the nonsense and jargon of Millenarianism, and actually of avowing before the church and the world their belief of such pure and unmingled absurdity, p. 328; because amongst these wholesale swallowers, I have arranged now before me, Dr. Gill's Body of Divinity, Toplady, Mede, Glass; Hartley, (a writer whom Dr. Jackson, the late Dean of Christchurch, used to say, was worthy of a place in every library on the same shelf with Bacon,) Sir I. Newton, Bishop Newton, &c. But instead of giving my own opinion of their excellence, I will subjoin that of one who differs from them; but who has, nevertheless, the sense and the candour to acknowledge their merits. "There has been no age of the church in which the millennium was not admitted by individual divines of the first eminence."—Encycl. Brit. I subjoin also the testimony of Bishop Bull. "Fuere quidem in prima apostolorum successione etiam ex Catholicis plerique (in quibus fuit is, quem modo laudavi, Justinus) qui regnum quoddam Christi in terris per mille annos expectarunt; verum korum sententia, ut erronea fortasse fuerit, a Cerinthiana tamen haeresi toto caelo distabat."

You assume that there is greater light on Theological subjects in the 19th century than in former times: this I deny; but as you do not enter into any proofs of your position, neither shall I of the contrary. Your friend Dr. Chalmers, however, would tell you if you read his sermon on “the Respect due to Antiquity,” that there are some things which do not admit of improvement, as poetry, morals, &c. whilst those which do are principally such as relate to mechanical science, and are confined, with very few exceptions, to the laws, properties, and forms of matter. One of the things, the knowledge of which must necessarily be progressive, is the interpretation of prophecy; I say necessarily, because, in proportion as some parts become accomplished, light is thrown, not only upon them, but upon all other parts likewise. Yet you bring forward the claim
of superior light in the present day, in order to
deride the idea of our being better able to under-
stand the Prophetic Scriptures now than at any
former period: so that the special instance in
Theology, to which you intend your remark to
apply, is exactly that wherein it is alone impos-
sible, ex necessitate rei, to be correct. You must
admit upon reflection, that your observation was
singularly infelicitous. I deny, however, that
the Church, judging by the published sermons
of her ministers, is as well versed in any other
branches of Theology, as she has been in all for-
mer periods, from the days of the Nonconformists
upwards. I deny that justification by faith is
preached in the very great majority of the Evan-
gelical pulpits, as clearly as it was by Owen,
Hooker, Luther, &c. &c. I deny that the sepa-
rate offices, persons, and operations of the Trinity
in the salvation of every particular individual;
that the two natures of Christ; that his humanity;
that the eternity of the separation between the
elect and non-elect; that the nature of Christ's
church, or the nature of the Apostacy from it;
that the personality and agency of Satan; and
many other topics which might be mentioned,
are preached as clearly, and consequently that
the people are as well versed in them, as they
have been in former times. Whereas, on the
other hand I affirm, that more truth is to be found
in popery, buried under the rubbish with which
it has been smothered, than in Evangelicalism;
that the popish notion of the opus operatum in
Baptism and the Supper, is nearer the truth than
that these sacraments are mere signs, as held by all the Dissenters, and by most of the Church of England Evangelicals; that marriage being a sacrament, is nearer the truth than that it is a mere civil contract, equally valid by a blacksmith, as by a minister of Christ's church, as it has come at last to be held in Scotland: that the Popish practice of praying from a liturgy (I say not in an unknown tongue) without preaching, is nearer being a proper ceremonial for God's house, than making it a mere preaching house without prayer, as it is generally considered now: that the Popish discipline and interference of the priest in all the private concerns of every family is nearer the truth than the total absence of discipline, whether public or private, which now universally prevails; and that the intolerance of the papists is nearer the truth than the liberality so much boasted of by the Evangelicals, and by yourself amongst that number. (p. 33.) All which theses I am prepared to maintain: though not in this letter, since their discussion would lead us away from the subject at present in hand.

The same inaptitude to quote an authority correctly which I have been compelled to shew in the cases of the writings of the Millenarians and of the Scriptures, attends you also in your reference to the Fathers and to the Primitive Church. You assert that "these principles never obtained a place in any creed, confession of faith, or formulary of doctrine of the primitive church. If any assert the contrary, let them produce the document in which these principles
are contained.” Very good, Sir, and since you do call upon us to produce our witnesses in court, should they expose you, the fault is not at our door. The last clause in the Nicene Creed is, “I believe in the life of the world to come.” O yes, you will rejoin, but that means, in a new planet. This notion of a new planet you might indeed defy us to shew in the primitive church; but what the Nicene Fathers meant will best appear from their own words. The first Council of Nice, held A.D. 325, set forth certain models or forms of doctrine for the use of the clergy, containing such topics as were judged needful for them to insist on, chiefly in their discourses to the people, among which they declare, “we look for new heavens and a new earth according to the Sacred Scriptures, wherein shall be gloriously manifested the kingdom of the Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; and then, as Daniel prophesies, the saints of the Most High shall possess the kingdom; and the earth shall be a pure and holy habitation, the land of the living and not of the dead; on the foresight of which, with the eye of faith, David cries out exultingly; I believe verily to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living; the land of the meek and humble; for blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth; and as the Prophet saith, the feet of the meek and humble shall tread upon it.”

The Church of England is in the use of St. Chrysostom’s prayer to this day, in which
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we say, "Grant us in this world knowledge of thy truth, and in the world to come life everlasting:" and most assuredly the good Father never thought of going into another planet to find this life.

King Edward VIth's Catechism, expounding the Lord's Prayer, directs as follows.

"Scholar.—In the second part, we require that his kingdom come, for we see not all things in subjection to Christ, (Ps. cx. 1, 2; 1 Cor. xv. 25—27; Eph. i. 22; Heb. ii. 8;) We see not the stone hewed off from the moutayne without work of man; which also bruised and brought to nought the image which Daniel descryeth, (ii. 34—41.) that the only rock, Christ, may obtayne and possess the dominion of the whole world, granted hym of his father. (Dan. vii. 13—27; 1 Cor. x. 4; Matt. xvi. 18.) Antichrist is not yet slayn. (Dan. vii. 10; 2 Thess. ii. 8—10; Rev. xix. 20.) For thys cause do we long for and praye that it may at length come to pass, and that Christ may reign with his saintes according to God's promises. (Rev. xx. 4.) that he may lyve and lorde in the world, according to the decrees of the Holy Gospel, (Phil. ii. 11; Rom. xiv. 8, 9; Rev. xix. 6.) not after the tradition and laws of men, nor pleasure of worldly tyrant.

"Master.—God graunt that Hys kingdome may come and that speedily."

And again, speaking of the new heavens and new earth, when shall be "as it is called in scripture, the consummation or perfecting of the
kingdom and mystery of Christ, and the renovation of all things; for it seems agreeable to reason, that there should be a time when this world shall be released from that state of corruption and changeableness to which it is now subjected through sin—and as gold is purified by the fire, so this world shall be defecated, and reduced to its primitive perfection by the same means: and in like manner will man be also freed from his present state of mutability and corruption. Thus will this world wear a far more beautiful and delectable form in its renovation for the sake of man, for whose use it was first created.”

Thus much for your appeal to creeds, confessions of faith, and formularies of doctrine of the Primitive Church!

Now for the Fathers. You say, “so far from being acknowledged as sound, the principles of millenarianism were opposed and rejected by the most eminent Fathers of the Church. With the exception of Barnabas, the person who assumes the name of Clement, Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Nepos, Apollinarius, Lactantius, and Tertullian; they were rejected by almost every Father of the Church; and openly opposed by Dionysius, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Gennadius, Jerome, and Augustin.” That is to say the principles of millenarianism were opposed and rejected by the most eminent Fathers of the Church, with the exception of all those except two of the first three centuries. (This is like the exceptions of the House of Assembly in Jamaica to the Slave Evidence
Law: which enacts that the evidence of Slaves is to be received, except in every possible case where it can be advantageous to them to have it received.) And they were openly opposed by the Fathers of the following centuries: so that to make out your case, your meaning of primitive must be, remote from the earliest times; for exactly in proportion as the times were primitive, so in proportion did the principles of Millenarianism abound.

Every writer whose works are extant, up to the time of Justin Martyr, who died in 167, held the Millenarian views. Mede says, p. 771, "This was the opinion of the whole Orthodox Church in the age immediately following the death of St. John, when yet Polycarp, and many of the Apostle's disciples were living, as Justin Martyr expressly affirmeth—a testimony absolute, without all comparison, to persuade such as rely upon authority and antiquity. It is to be admired that an opinion, once so generally received in the church, should ever have been cried down and buried. But those times which extinguished this, brought other alterations into the church besides this." Up to this time the church in her creed was pure, but it is in this very time, and in the writings of Justin himself, that Milner says "we may mark the beginning of the decay of the first spiritual effusion among the Gentiles, through false wisdom." To this hour it is this false wisdom prevailing in the church which is most opposed to these primitive views; the German Commentator on Hartley, says, "I consider it
as a just and valid objection against the expectation of such great changes that we cannot possibly conceive when, how, or by what means, they can be effected.” iii. 682: and, as you tell us, in old times they could not get rid of the Millenarian views without denying the Apocalypse, this worthy Gentleman proceeds to maintain that the objections of the infidels Semler and Michaelis to it have never been answered. All primitive doctrine fell off from the time of Justin, so that at that period Milner says, “even the knowledge of the Doctrine of the Election of Grace departed from the church.” You quote Augustine unfairly in two ways: first, he died in 430, therefore not till above two centuries and a half after the primitive faith had, on the testimony of Milner, decayed: secondly, you make him say that “none but carnal men can believe such things,” as if the “such things” referred to the Millennium, whereas they refer to the additions made to it; and without those additions he says he would not have much objection to it. Quae opinio esset utcumque tolerabilis si aliique deliciae spirituales in illo sabbato ad futurum sanctis per Dominum praesentiam credentur. Which opinion might have been borne if any spiritual delights were believed to be coming to the saints in that Sabbath through the presence of Christ. Thus Augustine says the opinion might be borne, if it had a certain condition annexed: this condition is annexed by us; therefore it may be borne. Nam etiam nos hoc opinati fuimus aliquando. Sed cum eos qui tunc resurrexerunt, dicant immoderatissimis carnalibus epulis vacaturos, in
quibus cibus sit tans ac potus, ut non solum nllum modestiam teneant, sed modum queque ipsius credulitatis excedant, nullo modo ista possunt nisi a carnalibus credi. To all this we subscribe; and say it is carnal and abominable to make the enjoyments of the elect during the millennium to consist in eating and drinking: but it would be very foolish in us, as it was not wise in Augustine, to deny a plain declaration of Scripture because carnal men had obscured it; since, for the same reason, we should be obliged to reject all the doctrines of grace, because carnal men had turned these too into lasciviousness. I think, Sir, if you had ever read the works of Augustine, you would have hesitated in bringing him forward. What think you of such passages as these? Nunc divini judicii ultimum diem dicimus, id est, novissimum tempus.—Certe animae victrices gloriosissimorum martyrum, omnibus doloribus ac laboribus superatis atque finitis postea quam mortalia membra posuerunt, cum Christo utique regnaverunt, et regnant donec finiantur milie anni, ut postea receptis etiam corporibus jam immortali-bus regnant.—Dum mille annis ligatus est diabolus, sancti regnant cum Christo etiam ipsis milie annis eisdem sine dubio, et eodem modo intelligendis, id est, isto jam tempore prioris ejus adventis.

The fact is, that though the Millenarians did not appeal to the Fathers as authority, but only as to the fact of antiquity, you have endeavoured to raise a cry against these doctrines on the ground of authority, and you have failed. But here also, as usual, you are radically wrong in the nature of
the evidence for which it is fair to refer to them; since, unless they have handled professedly the points we maintain, their evidence is not admissible. Now almost all which they have written on the subject is against the errors which were superadded to the millenarian doctrines, and which we agree with them in censuring. Your reference, therefore, is no more to the real purpose in hand, than if any one intending to write against justification by faith, were to write against Antinomianism; and because you differed with him, and defended the former, it by no means follows that you should not agree with his observations on the latter. So that your reference to the Fathers is very wide of the mark for which you appeal to them, and is a shirking of the real point at issue. Unless, therefore, you confine yourself to those extracts which treat of the points which we hold, they have nothing to do with the matter; and if they had, we never cited them as authority, nor would bend to them, if you could make them state what you wish. It was exactly in this way that the Papists appealed to the Fathers in the doctrine of justification at the time of the Reformation, and passages from their writings, particularly those of Augustine, were brought forward on both sides of the controversy: and Milner confesses, that "the precise and accurate nature of the doctrine itself seems not to have been understood by this holy man." In the Apocryphal controversy, the Apocryphists appealed to the Fathers, because they frequently quoted the Apocryphal writings, as if they were
the Word of God; but the reference was unfair, because that was not a point to which their attention had been especially directed. No camp is assailed at all points at one time, and the nature of the defence adopted against one attack can be no precedent against another attack from an opposite quarter. Satan's first aim at the Church Militant was through the Roman persecution: his next through the various ramifications of the Nestorian and Arian heresies; then he advanced under the form of Pelagianism and Popery. In all these he was successively foiled by the Martyrs, Fathers, and Reformers; he is now advancing against the inspiration of the sacred volume, which is the real root of the Apocryphal heresy; and against all the tangible and substantial hopes by which the church has been fed ever since the days of Eve, under the specious pretexts of a zeal for the diffusion of the Word of God, and a horror of all carnal and earthly desires.

Thus Sir, in direct contradiction to your assertion, we find that a millennium, as we hold it, was the general belief of the first ages of the Church. The doctrine was maintained even up to the first council of Nice, after which time, with every other truly apostolic doctrine, it waxed fainter and fainter, till obscured in the gross darkness of the middle ages. But when the light of true religion dawned on the English Church, it too was received with other primitive doctrines, and was embodied in his catechism by Edward VI. It sank not till the evening of the Apostolic Church, and it re-appeared in the
morning of the Reformed Church: the intervening period of darkness and of spiritualizing.

"Cowls, hoods, and habits, relics, beads, indulgences, dispensers, pardons, bulls"

we abandon to you; make what you can of the boon.

You indeed say, p. 276—281, that this world, that is, this planet, is to be annihilated, and a new planet created, and that the life promised is to take place in that new planet: we say, it is to take place in this: you say, that we are to go from this planet into our state of blessedness; we maintain, that our state of blessedness will come here to us: and I maintain this, notwithstanding the coarse and indecent attack of the Edinburgh Theological Magazine, which you so much admire, and extol, upon Mr. Cunningham's very temperate and well-written Summary. You, as well as the writer in the Theological Magazine, may find useful matter in reflecting upon the change which has already been effected by the power of the Holy Ghost in forming the beautiful and organized body of man, out of unorganized matter: and that the now risen and glorified body of the Lord Jesus, which he shewed on Tabor, is a further act of the power of the Holy Ghost; for that body is, however different, still the same, and atom for atom as it came from the virgin: all our bodies are to be like his, and will be at one and the same time both our old and our new bodies. What changed flesh may be, no one can tell; but we have a
kind of sample of it in the change which has already taken place from dust to our present bodies: a parallel change the material earth shall undergo; and if we would learn theology from our senses, what is the growth of vegetables but the continued transmutation of unorganized into organized matter? and what is the growth of our animal bodies but the continued transmutation of dead into living being? Are the precious stones and splendid wonders of the mineral creation to have no object, but to adorn the persons of our wives and daughters, and to ornament the cabinets of the curious? but I forgot; Rev. xxi. 20, and Is. liv. 11, are spiritual too I suppose.

You say, p. 276, "There can be no doubt that the world to come, of which St. Paul speaks, is identical with the new heavens and the new earth of St. Peter and the Apocalypse. But the question is, are their new heavens and their new earth, the earth in its restored state? is it customary to give the name of new to what is only restored? Is an old friend restored from abroad, a new friend? Are old goods restored by the house-breaker, new goods? Is the old earth restored to its original and primitive state, a new earth? If this is the case, it would have been more german to the purpose, to have called it the old, or ancient earth; but new it certainly never would have been named." Peter mentions three heavens and three earths; 1st, the heaven of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water; 2dly, the heavens and earth which are now; 3dly,
the new heavens and the new earth. We are agreed, I presume, as to the meaning of the second; but by whatever law of logic, whether in Barbara, or Celarent, you will undertake to prove that the third means a new planet after the second is annihilated, you will be bound to admit, that the first is an old planet, which was annihilated before the second was created. There are two confusions in the above extract; 1st, by your insertion of the word only; "only restored;" 2dly, by your simile of an old friend restored from abroad. Nobody says, that the new earth means this earth only restored. A man going abroad, and returning home again in the same state in which he went, is not analogous to the case in point. If you adhered to the illustration of the Scriptures, you would get out of this difficulty. Is the risen body of the child of God a new body, or his old body? though it is his old body, do not the Scriptures call it new? was not the Lord's body, which he shewed on Tabor, the specimen of what the redeemed bodies of his saints will be? and such as Daniel and John saw in their visions? And you may learn this even from the heathen philosophers, and ask them, whether the body of the butterfly is a new body of that insect, or the old body of the worm?

You say, p. 278, that the new heavens and new earth of Peter must mean another planet, which shall be formed after there is no place found for the present planet; "they," the apostles, "have told us, as distinctly as language can express it, that the future habitation of the redeemed is to be
a new, that is, another heaven and another earth with which the present earth and heaven have no connection, and of which they form no part.” But in p. 283, you say, “the Bible recognizes no world nor age to come to Christians, but the one where they shall enjoy eternal life. Till that is ended, the redeemed will not trouble themselves with seeking other worlds, or ages to come. In page 279, you suppose a Millenarian to ask, “if by the world to come, the Apostle does not mean the renovated earth, what does he mean?” and the answer you give is, “he means heaven; that better country, which was promised to Abraham, and his spiritual seed.” In p. 172, you tell us, that “from the earliest ages a belief was inculcated in another world, as the abode of the faithful;” and at p. 173, “as we proceed in examining the sacred pages, the proof multiplies, and the conclusion becomes irresistible, that “heaven is the everlasting residence of the redeemed.” Thus then, by placing together several passages in juxta position, we have arrived at your notion of heaven, namely, that it is an earth: but as you agree with us so far, I am entirely at a loss to discover why, in two distinct portions of your book, you should employ nearly thirty pages in railing, “in good set terms,” at Millenarians for their grovelling; “low,” “base,” “earthly” “notions,” of looking to this earth as the dwelling-place of the redeemed. Why is the term earthliness to be applied to those who look to one earth, more than to you who look for another earth? Whatever you believe of that earth we believe of this; describe
it as unlike all we at present see as you please, we will not object to any thing you say on that score; but you have not explained to us why the redeemed will not "trouble themselves" with
seeking this earth in its renovated state, although they will "trouble themselves" to seek your earth which is yet to be created. At p. 175, you say, "Heaven is our inheritance and home—if Christ is in heaven his people shall likewise be there; for where he is, there shall they also be. But in heaven he is." Then in order to get into your new earth, which is not yet created, not is to be so until this earth is burned up, He must come out of heaven, and all his people likewise, who are now with him there. But in the preceding extracts you say that the new earth is heaven; clearly not the heaven in which Christ and his people now are; therefore you teach us there are two heavens. The Mussulmen Doctors only make seven.

You are evidently in a puzzle here. In the Foreign Universities, the Students distinguish those lessons of their Professors, which are not very lucid, into two kinds, Galimatia simple, and Galimatia double. The first is, where the teacher himself understands his subject well, but has not the faculty of rendering himself intelligible to others. The second is, where neither teacher nor hearer understand one syllable of the matter. Under which of these two species your notions rank of a heaven which is, and is not, and yet is to be, and yet is the same, it would not be civil in me to decide; nor am I, at present, going to
attempt to help you out of the mire, further than
to beg of you to read Mede upon the ἐπιστολή; a
writer with whom, though you quote him, you are
plainly but little acquainted; and also to recom-
mend you not to try to interpret obscure expres-
sions in the New Testament, which are borrowed
from the Old, without reference to the Prophet
from whence they are taken.

You are very positive upon five points; 1st.
That the earth shall be filled with the knowledge
of the Lord during the millennium; 2. That this
is to be effected exclusively by the same process
by which the Gospel has hitherto been promul-
gated; 3. That the saints do not rise till the
end of this period; 4. That Christ does not come
till the end of the same; 5. That when Christ
does come he will only stay twenty-four hours,
and burn up this whole planet. Let us see then
how this notion of a judgment, (which belongs
rather to the Minos, and Rhadamanthus judgment
of Homer and Virgil, from whence I verily be-
lieve the church has taken it, than to the scrip-
tural description, or definition of judgment,) agrees
with a few passages of Scripture. "The Spirit
itself beareth witness with our spirits that we are
the children of God; and if children, then heirs;
heirs of God, and joint heirs of Christ; if so be
that we suffer with him, that we may be also
glorified together. For I reckon that the suffer-
ings of this present time are not worthy to be
compared with the glory which shall be revealed
in us: for the earnest expectation of the creature
waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God,"
(what! is it very earnestly expecting to be burned up, annihilated, and made cease to be?!) “for the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason (or on account) of him who hath subjected it, in hope that the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, (most vain hope, for it is to get no deliverance, according to Dr. Hamilton, but by being burned up;) “into the glorious liberty of the children of God: for we know that every creature groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now; and not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.” Rom. viii. 16—23. Here the time of the redemption of the body of those who are partakers of the Holy Spirit, and are the sons of God, is looked forward to by the whole creation with longing anxiety, expecting that then it will be delivered at that time from the bondage of corruption; whereas, on the contrary, Dr. Hamilton assures us that the creation is in a great mistake, for that at the time of the resurrection of the bodies of the sons of God, the corruption of the creation is at its highest pitch, and vanishes into thin air, and like the baseless fabric of a vision, leaves not a wreck behind.

Christ’s appearing and the setting up of his kingdom is at one and the same time, 2 Tim. iv. 1; we also shall reign with him, 2 Tim. iii. 12. What are we to reign over? Not over heaven, for God reigns there, and the holy angels are His servants,
and His will is done perfectly. Not over the earth, for you tell us that it is to be annihilated as soon as Christ appears, so that God's will is never to be done in it as long as it exists; since the devil's will has been done in it hitherto from the time of Adam; and as soon as Christ and the saints come into this earth in their glorified state, the earth is immediately burned up. Perhaps, Sir, you would have the kindness to favour us with your idea of the reason why it was ever created; for upon your scheme it savours strongly of having been a work of supererogation which might have been well dispensed with.

Our Lord promises the Apostles, that in the regeneration they shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel; and informs us, further, that it is in this regeneration that the Son of Man sits upon the throne of his glory; yet as you say the day of judgment lasts but twenty-four hours, it does not appear that the privilege granted to the Apostles is of much importance. It seems to me, that you have invariably annexed to the word judgment, the single idea of passing sentence. Pray, is not the King of England always sitting in judgment in his courts? or do you conceive that he never exercises that branch of his royal office, but at the moment when he signs a warrant for execution? You will please to observe, also, that the appearance of the Son of Man on his throne is at the regeneration, and not at the destruction. The word judgment very often in Scripture means rule, government,
...dominion, &c., and I believe more often than carrying sentence into execution, to which idea alone you confine it. See Ps. xxxiii. 5; lxxii. 2; xcix. 4; Is. xxxii. 16, and many other places. The Lord's day is put in contradistinction to Man's day in 1 Cor. iii. 4, &c., where the latter term evidently includes all the period between the time when the Apostle was writing, and the time of the Lord's coming. If Man's day has lasted a long and indefinite period, why may not the Lord's day? You have, indeed, at p. 152, said, that it is "no matter whether this day shall last twelve hours, twelve years, or twelve centuries;" but as if you were aware that so far from its being "no matter," it is, in fact, all the matter, upon this point, you have invariably argued upon its being twelve or twenty-four hours at most. You have also given a learned extract, to shew that τοτὲ means "identity of time:" if those acts be "identical in time," between which "twelve centuries" may intervene, you concede all that the most unreasonable Millenarian can require. It is fortunate that none of the works you have criticised, were printed on the opposite shores of St. George's Channel, or I doubt not you would have been right merry with the hapless author upon the identity of time which runs over twelve centuries: an identity which would prove our most gracious Sovereign George IV. contemporary with no less a personage than Justinian himself.

You ask, with that air of conscious triumph which anticipates but one answer, whether the
Millenarians believe that "the Most High literally walked in a tent, and in a tabernacle, and walked with all the children of Israel from the Exodus:" and you interpret (and assume that the Millenarians do, because you consider it impossible that any persons should do otherwise,) the passages which so describe the Lord; "as denoting no more than the spiritual presence of God with his people, and guidance and protection which he afforded them," p. 269. I wish you had informed us whom you mean by the Most High? Do you mean the whole Godhead? Do you mean the Father? or do you mean the Christ? or do you mean the Holy Ghost?

Ac ne forte putas, me, quae facere ipsa recusam
Cum recte tractant alii, laudare maligne,

I will take the liberty of informing you, who I believe, did literally walk in a tent, and in a tabernacle, with the children of Israel in the wilderness. The Christ of God: in whom Moses believed; and for whom he was reproached, Heb. xi. 26; whom the Israelites tempted, 1 Cor. x. 9; and who appeared, that is, was visible to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, and Joshua. This brings me to another point, which you do not seem well to have considered, which is, that one essential difference between the Old and New Testament dispensations consists in the former being visible, and the latter invisible. Now, Sir, this may furnish you with the key for the right understanding of the nature of that dispensation which shall take place when the
Jewish nation is restored to God's favour, and when also the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the whole earth, including, consequently, the Gentiles likewise; namely, that it will be a dispensation both visible and invisible at the same time. For let me add, if you will go deeper into the matter still, and take, no Millenarian, but, Mr. Dugald Stewart as your guide, I doubt not but you will arrive in time at the conviction of this fact, that no created thing can have any apprehension of the Creator but by means of other created things: do not object to this as being metaphysical, for if you will have nothing to do with metaphysics, neither can you meddle with the higher branches of theology. "No man can see God," is not a more obvious matter of revelation than of sound philosophy.

I have ventured, in the course of these remarks, to place some of the inconsistencies of your own scheme before you, and yet I cannot bear to call it your scheme, because I would fain hope that it is rather a floating idea which has crept in, as most of our ideas do, without our being able to ascertain their origin, become adopted without examination, and retain their place in our creed, from an apprehension, that if they are dislodged, no better can be found to supply their place. Such is the case with the greater part of all men's ideas upon every subject; and very few persons are at the trouble of analyzing the ground of their opinion upon any one, whether religious or political. Dr. Chalmers has shewn how the ministers of religion are overwhelmed with secular matters;
this being the case, it is the greater pity that any of them should meddle with writing journals, or managing committees, instead of giving themselves wholly to meditation and prayer. The consequence is, that the clergy are behind their congregations in the knowledge of God's ways, that is, in the knowledge of God himself. If a minister be employed in laborious every-day duties, from the time of his ordination, it is not possible that he should have the time necessary for so much meditation, prayer, and study, as is requisite to advance him from being a babe in Christ to the full stature of his model. The great men upon whose works the church is now supported, were removed by God from active business, and many of them, in the retirement of a dungeon, attained to that knowledge which they never could have acquired if they had lived in this bustling, working, Martha-like age. The picture you yourself draw in your preface, shews that some ministers of the Church of Scotland are not in a condition to employ themselves in that patient study, and above all, in that meditation which is indispensable to great advance in theological science. It is truly gratifying, however, to remember, that the volumes of Drs. Chalmers and Gordon have burst through the gloom, which you describe so pathetically, as overhanging a Scottish manse. "Oppressed with a charge of five, ten, or 20,000 souls, how is a clergyman, in such a situation, who wishes to fulfil his duty to God and man, to prepare works for the press? At a distance from public libraries, how are we on-
such occasions to procure the books which it is necessary to consult? One third of my brethren, and some of these too endowed with the finest talents, and distinguished by the highest literary and theological attainments, to the disgrace of this age and country, are condemned to starvings of £150. per annum:” (Dear Sir, this is very sad, but it is not the fault of the Millenarians, although the bile which these things have occasioned in your bodily economy has overflowed in abuse of them. You remind me of what a friend of mine said of the battle of Navarino, “it is a capital fight, but they knocked down the wrong man!”) “after defraying the expenses inseparably connected with their station, how are they both to secure food for their families, and purchase the publications requisite for the liberal and effectual prosecution of their studies? Even supposing these difficulties surmounted, how are they to obtain command of leisure and retirement? The minister of the smallest parish has many indispensable duties to perform, which consume a large portion of his time,” &c. &c. Now, Sir, all this would furnish a very sufficient justification of those ministers for not being able to instruct any person who had come to them for information out of the Scriptures respecting the Millennium: they might reply, “We heard nothing of the matter when we were at the College; we learned, indeed, the five Calvinistic points, and we know a great many texts on which to support them, but for all the above stated reasons, we have had no time to read or study ever since, and therefore we are no wiser now than when we left the
College." To this answer no one could have fairly objected. But this is by no means your case; and after giving very sufficient reasons why they should know nothing of the question, you proceed to dogmatize upon it, although you have said in your preface, "few of my brethren could have been more unqualified for the undertaking;" and your answer is, "because, prophecy and the millennium have attracted less of my attention than the other parts of revelation;" because, I never found myself called on to make them the subject of particular investigation, therefore, I tell you, the theory of the Millenarians is utterly groundless and untenable, and the writers on it labour under a deplorable lack of theological knowledge, and an universal ignorance of the elements of biblical interpretation," p. vi. However you, Sir, may deride those who grieve over the state of things in the Church of Scotland, p. 281. I for one am not ashamed to confess, notwithstanding, that it is a state of things highly to be deplored; that it is the duty of laymen to make the ministry of their respective pastors, and of the church at large, a subject of reiterated prayer; and save them all possible labour, instead of laying greater burdens, such as "serving tables," &c. upon them. It is by the prayer and meditation of the clergy alone that the church can be healthily fed.

I truly rejoice that you have made the attack you have. Whether it will tend much to exalt or to lower your own personal reputation, is a point with which I have no concern. It has shewn,
however, all that a combination of piety, talent in composition, and sufficient learning on other subjects can effect: moreover, the attack has been made, not by a skulking anonymous libeller in a magazine, but by a person of deserved reputation, and of authority in the church. And what is the result? In no one instance has the _forte_ of your antagonist's position been assailed; nothing has been attempted but an affair of outposts; a mere skirmishing of texts. It is seen that opposition to the leading views of the Millenarians cannot be supported but by rending fragments of verses from their context, without any reference to the line of argument in which they occur; by denying that land means land; throne of David means throne of David; by asserting that appearing means what is invisible; that coming means going; that reigning means ruling over nothing; and that the new earth means no renovated earth at all, but another planet altogether; and by considering as absurd, the literal fulfilment of all the promises of God of which we cannot see the mode of accomplishment.

Your attack, Sir, has been beneficial to me, and I am bound as an individual especially to thank you for it, because it has caused me to re-examine the ground of my hope; and I assure you, that if I had discovered reason to believe that hope unfounded, I should have had the same pleasure in acknowledging my obligations to you, for having convinced me of error, that I now have in expressing them for having been the means of establishing me in the truth. If I at all regret your publication,
it is lest you should unhappily be more tenacious of opinions after they have been expressed in print, than you would have been if they had remained concealed within your breast; for I cannot but hope that a Christian minister, who I doubt not daily acknowledges his ignorance upon his knees, and entreats the Father of Light to send him His Holy Spirit as his teacher of all truth, will sooner or later be led to perceive that the opinions expressed in your attack, are held upon untenable grounds. I find that I go along with you in all the elements of divine truth, but that you see no useful purpose for this visible creation, and therefore, as your faith goes no further than your sight, you conclude it is to be burned up. We are in the situation of two workmen who are employed in preparing some beautiful edifice, to one of whom the architect has vouchsafed a glimpse of the whole plan as it is ultimately to be exhibited complete: the other is so pleased with the beauty of the parts, that he is always quarrelling with his fellow-workman, for thinking little of their present work, either its sorrows or its joys, in comparison with the wonders of the whole, on which he is daily meditating; this other will not believe that there is any ultimate use for the portion on which he is always working, and therefore concludes that as soon as he has finished it, it is to be destroyed; he will not ask the great Author of the plan, who has employed him, to let him see it; he says that would be presumption; and that it is more humble to be content with his enjoyment of the
single part on which he is engaged. It is doubtful whether this humility is not rather idleness, or indifference to the honour of his master: but be that as it may, it is clear that his companion, who has caught, however dimly, a view of the whole, can never go over to the opinion of the other, although the other may come over to him. This then is the whole; to manifest God as the ALONE I AM, the alone pure and unchangeable One: the only means by which that manifestation could be made, was by manifesting the impurity and mutability of all other beings: for God can only manifest himself, by manifesting the opposite in all other phases and modes of being. This, Sir, is the key to the development of all the individual and collective sin of the human race, of which the Bible is the record: hence the permitted falls of Cain, Lot, David, Manasseh, Jezebel, Judas, Peter, and Mary: hence the permitted idolatries of the heathen, the apostasies of Israel, the corruption of Judah, these last repeated in the Greek and Popish churches respectively, and as its climax, the infidelity of the present times; which last has arrived to such a pitch, that no class of society, whether in the church or out of it, is without the sphere of its influence; so that we may say of it, as Bishop Beveridge does of the bondage of Satan, that those are most under it who most deny its power. To know and enjoy God is the end of the being of the elect; but to be enjoyed, he must first be known. To know God, is not to have an abstract metaphysical idea of a spirit, and a First Cause;
but to know the God who has done all things which ever have been done upon this globe and in our own persons, with the view of shewing us that there is no depth of sin into which each of us is not liable to fall every instant, unless we are prevented and upheld by the Almighty Spirit dwelling in us and uniting us to the very Godhead itself. This globe is, and is yet to be, the scene of it all; for the matter of it is, by the incarnation of the Son, united also to very Deity; why else did the incarnation take place on this earth, but because it was the place where we were to receive the benefit?

I have avoided as much as possible appeals to verbal criticisms, and to Lexicons, because, as Payne Knight says, "they are only the remembrancer of the scholar, while they are the oracle of the dunce." But before I conclude, permit me to beg you to re-examine a few points on this head also. You say, that souls cannot signify persons but by a metaphor, p. 204. Do pray, dear Sir, turn to Acts xxvii. 37. As to soul, ψυχή, being a metaphor for a person, it is no more a metaphor in any sense than William Hamilton is a metaphor for the minister of Strathblane. Again, you talk of resurrection being a figure for conversion. What in the world do you mean? The former expresses the state of a person similar to a former state of that person, between which two states a fall, descent, or declension has taken place: the latter means the turning of a person from going one way, to going another way: resurrection means the
third state of a body which shall have existed in two previous states, the third being similar to the first. Conversion expresses a different direction of a body in the same state. How can a word expressing the former idea be a figure for the latter idea? You might as well talk about blue being a figure for red. Perhaps you will quote Eph. i. 20, and ii. 6, to show that ἐγερας is applied to the literal resurrection of the individual Jesus, the head of the body; and συνηγερης to the resurrection of his members, though they were in the flesh at the time. Could you with any propriety make use of two different terms to express the same act in two different parts of the same body? Do you believe the union between Jesus and his members to be a figure, or a fact? Did you ever meditate on Christ as a Constitution, a State, a new Creation, of which he who died on Calvary was the head? Do you consider that believers are translated into that state in this life, or not till they are dead? Again you mention, p. 323, "Christ's mediatorial kingdom." I fear here is another confusion, a king is one thing, and a mediator is another thing: it is a pity you did not vouchsafe us a text as a reference to this term. I grant, that it is a term in common use in "that annual deluge of trash which issues from the press under the name of practical sermons;" but I never yet could discover its meaning. Again, you contend that the world, and earth, in the original are synonymous, p. 156. Did you never attend to the distinction between γη, οἰκεμενη, κοσμος, and αἰων? does not the first
mean the planet, the earth, land, or country? Does not the second mean a place of habitation? Or if you choose to derive it as the learned author of Palaioromaica does, making it a corruption of dominium, does it not convey what is still the same idea, an empire? Does not the last mean, the outside ornamented part of this planet? And may not both these latter be altered as Sodom, and as at the deluge, without the planet vanishing into thin air? Does not the last refer exclusively to time? And is it not properly an age or dispensation? May we not have a new άιων, or a new οἰκεμενή, or a new κόσμος, or even a new γῆ, while the planet remains precisely such as it is? Perhaps you will gain some light from Matt. xiii. 38, 39: the field is the κόσμος, but the harvest is at the συντελεία τος άιωνος. You might plough the γῆ, or the κόσμος, but to plough the άιων would be rather difficult: yet you will maintain the terms are synonymous! I am not going to solve these queries, but I throw them out for your meditation.

Another striking instance of the inaccuracy with which you quote the Scriptures, occurs in p. 59, where you blame Mr. Irving for preaching upon any thing but “Jesus Christ and him crucified;” which you assert Paul says was all he would preach about. In the first place, Paul says no such thing; and in the second place, if he did say so, as it is notorious he did preach about many other things beside the crucifixion, you were bound to account for this contradiction between his al-
leged assertion and his practice. But, in point of fact, he says nothing of the sort. In order to serve the purpose, for which you have brought the half verse forward, the antithesis should lay between Christ crucified, and Christ glorified; between his humiliation and his exaltation. But the contrast lays between different modes, not subjects of preaching; whether the Apostle should preach with enticing words of man's wisdom, with all the flowers of rhetoric, and learning of Gamaliel, or whether he should confine himself to plain and simple speaking.

Neither is it only in this your attack upon the Millenarians, that you display the same inadvertence in quoting the Scriptures: for in your "Mourners in Zion" you quote 1 Cor. xv., that there is one glory of the sun, and another of the stars, &c. to prove that there are differences of degrees of glory in heaven. I do not deny that there will be that difference for which you contend, but I peremptorily deny that 1 Cor. xv. contains a syllable upon the subject. It appears that some foolish person had denied the fact of the renovation of our dead bodies, by asking the question, "how are the dead raised up? with what bodies do they come?" to whom the Apostle replies, "thou fool," has not every thing that body which God sees fit to give it, adapted to the situation in which it is to move? which he illustrates by shewing that the living plant has not the same body as the dead seed; and that the
bodies of fowls and fishes differed from the bodies of beasts; and one planet from another planet. But, in order to justify your quotation, the Apostle should have said, there were different degrees of glory in the same fishes, in the same planets, in the same sun, and in the same stars, not that all these differed from each other. Yes, but you will reply, "the Apostle mentions the word glory, and that one star differeth from another in glory." Very true, but he does not say there are different glories in the same star. Your reasoning is like that whereby the Welshman proved, that Wales and Greece were the same place, namely, because there is a river in Monmouth, and a river in Macedon, and there are salmons in both. The Apostle says "differeth in glory," and you say "differeth in glory:" but he applies it to two different bodies, in different places and situations, while you apply his remark to two bodies in the same place and situation.

Instances of this kind might be multiplied from your writings, to any extent. I have felt myself imperatively called upon to shew, that in the new trade which you have taken up of being a critic, the frame of your mind is too inaccurate to enable you to pursue it to any good purpose. I beseech you, therefore, to confine yourself to a safer walk; do not study any thing which does not please you, but refrain from breaking out against those who do. I have abstained from remarking upon perpetual instances of misrepresentation
of the opinions of the Millenarians, because I am unwilling to believe them wilful, and can only therefore regret that you should have attempted to criticise what you do not understand.

It is in order to be enabled to distinguish genuine truth from the darkness and error with which Satan, through the instrumentality of weak or wicked men, is ever obscuring it, that accuracy of statement in theology is desirable for all, but absolutely indispensable for those who undertake the office of critic. A pious heart may indeed be joined to a very muddled head; while the converse is equally true, and much more alarming in these intellectual days, namely, that a correct and orthodox creed may consist with unsanctified affections. A Christian, who is well instructed, is sometimes seduced into being uncharitable towards a weaker brother, and refuses to acknowledge as such, one who does not see all truth so accurately as himself, while he who is condemned is, perhaps, the more spiritually minded of the two. I trust that those who see the doctrine of the second advent of our Lord at the commencement of the millennium, as clearly revealed in the written Word as the Trinity, justification by faith, election, predestination, and the other essentials of Christianity, will not be tempted to deny the right hand of fellowship to those who reject their views; but it is curious, and awfully instructive, to see this doctrine assailed by the very same arguments with which
professed infidels oppose the fundamentals of revelation.

I fear, too, the masters under whose tutelage you have placed yourself, are not of the happiest selection. Mr. Faber, whom you consider "the ablest modern interpreter of prophecy," p. 114, has just published three long volumes to unsay a principal part of what he has been teaching the church all his life. This may be a proof of candour; but it is rather an unusual proof of ability, or of judgment. A sample of this ability and judgment is as follows: In the Acts we read of Christ, whom the heaven must receive until the times of the restitution (or accomplishment if Mr. F. will) of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy Prophets; from which he starts with the following specimen of logic. "If heaven must receive and retain Christ until the full accomplishment of all the things which God hath spoken by the Prophets, since the world began down to the time when the Apostle uttered the passage now under consideration; then, assuredly, the second Advent of Christ cannot take place until after the complete expiration of the millennial period of blessedness. 2. For Daniel, and Isaiah, and Joel, and Zechariah, all foretell the occurrence of such a period, as immediately following the conversion of Judah, and the synchronical overthrow of the great Roman Confederacy. 3. But, according to St. Peter, heaven must retain Christ until the accomplishment of all the prophecies which had
been delivered anterior to the time when he made such a declaration. 4. Therefore heaven must retain Christ until all the ancient prophecies respecting the millennial period of blessedness upon earth, shall have received their full accomplishment; and, consequently, the literal second Advent of Christ cannot occur until after the close of the same predicted millennial period of blessedness."

We have besides in this passage, p. 163, an useless display of knowledge of the Greek accidence, to prove, what nobody denies, that the relative which, ὃς, agrees with the noun, things, and not with the noun, restitution. But these men of words perpetually lose sight of ideas, and forget that the only use of their nouns and relatives is in order to convey them. The idea conveyed in both is precisely the same. Mr. Faber says, that Mede would make Peter say concerning which, whereas the apostle says only which. This, however, is not the case, for Peter does not say a, but ὃς, of which, or concerning which. Mr. Faber should know that though it is possible to speak words, events, or things, can only be spoken of. Take it according to Mr. Faber's version, and still the ideas remain as they were: the prophets have spoken of things; what have they said about the things? that they are to be restored; which is precisely the same as if the passage said, the prophets had spoken of the restitution. Mr. Faber has, probably, some misgivings upon this point, and therefore he gives a violent rendering to the word ἀποκαταστάσις, and says,
that instead of being translated "restitution," it ought to be rendered "accomplishment;" having now got hold of a word with a double sense, he resorts to the old expedient of sophists, and uses it in one sense in one part of his proposition, and in another sense in another part, and thus entraps the unwary.

The whole page may be put into this syllogism.

Heaven must retain Christ, till all things spoken of by the Prophets are accomplished.

The millennium is spoken of by the prophets. 

*Ergo,* Heaven must retain Christ till the millennium is accomplished.

The major contains two fallacies, 1st. The only sense in which the word *accomplished* will serve his argument, is that of "come to an end." Let us see, then, another syllogism, equally true with this, which Mr. Faber must likewise be bound to admit.

Heaven must retain Christ till all things spoken of by the Prophets are come to an end.

Futurity is spoken of by the Prophets.

*Ergo,* Heaven must retain Christ till futurity is come to an end.

Again,

Heaven must retain Christ till all things spoken of by the Prophets are come to an end.

The earth being burned up is spoken of by the Prophets.

*Ergo,* Heaven must retain Christ till the earth having been burnt up is come to an end.

Which is to say, that the second coming of Christ is to a place which has ceased to exist.
The second fallacy is in the application of the term *all things*. The subject matter of which the apostle is speaking, is the Lord Jesus: the *all things*, therefore, spoken of by the Prophets, are the *all things* relating to him, and not to other persons or subjects: if amongst the things spoken, and relating to him, the time of his return be found, as it unquestionably is, then the sentence is exceedingly simple and plain, being that, "God shall send again Jesus, although he is now gone to heaven, at the time foretold by the Prophets;" so that even if we grant to Mr. Faber the word *accomplished*, instead of *restitution*, he is just as far off as ever from proving his point.

My proposition is, Christ is to come at the period spoken of by the prophets. The period spoken of is that of the restoration of the Jews and judgment on the Gentiles. Therefore, Christ is to come at the period when that restoration and that judgment takes place. I know Mr. Faber denies the minor; but that point I have already discussed: and since many things spoken of as to be accomplished by all the Prophets, have already come to an end, it is obvious, not only from this fact, but from every principle of common sense, that the accomplishment of each particular *one* thing, out of the *all* things, must depend upon what is said of the particular thing; itself. Any event occurring at a predicted period, is the accomplishment or bringing to an end of that prediction.

The Prophecies relating to the return of the Jews are accomplished when that event comes
to pass. The prophecies relating to the destruction of this earth are accomplished when that event comes to pass. The prophecies relating to the second coming of the Lord are accomplished when that event comes to pass. The time, or order of succession of these several events must be collected from the prophecies relating to each, separately; but to attempt to prove the period of accomplishment of one event, by reference to the prophecies relating to another, is extremely absurd.

The apostle was a plain simple man, who confines himself to one point at a time. The point before him was the Lord: the people were gazing at the apostle, who had just performed a miracle, in great astonishment; and the apostle directs this wonder from himself to Him, by whose power he had effected it; at the mention of the man whom they had just put to death as a criminal, their wonder would be still further excited, and probably the indignation of some also: this man, he says, whom you have put to death, is gone to heaven; but not for ever, but only until an appointed time, which has been spoken of by all the prophets. He refers to the prophecies relating to the point in hand; not to prophecies either not relating to it at all, or which related to it only in a secondary manner.

But I have not done with Mr. Faber. Having disposed of his logic, I now take up his Greek; ἀποκαταστάσις does not mean accomplishment in any other sense than that of re-establishment, restitution, or setting up again in a former...
state. This is the only place in the New Testament in which the noun occurs, but its *thema ἀποκαθιστήμω* occurs in several places, and always means to restore. Matt. xii. 13; xvii. 11; Mark iii. 5; viii. 25; ix. 12; Luke vi. 10; Acts i. 6; Heb. xiii. 19. The noun occurs nowhere that I know in the lxx., but the verb is frequently found; almost always in the sense of restoring to a former state, and never in the sense of bringing to destruction: so that the double testimony combined is as strong as the nature of the case can afford. As for example, Hos. ii. 3. I will place her in the *state in which she was in the day of her birth.* Jer. xlvii. 6, it is used to express the idea of a sword being restored to its scabbard. Mal. iv. 6, it is used for the reconciliation of parents and children. But I go further still, and defy "that learned Theban" to find a passage in any classic, for ἀποκαταστάσις, signifying the accomplishment or fulfilment of an event predicted. He refers to a Lexicon, Hesychius, where he finds as a synonym for it, τελείωσις: his argument, therefore, is, that because ἀποκαταστάσις is used in some places in the sense of τελείωσις, and because τελείωσις means perfection, therefore ἀποκαταστάσις may signify perfection here; but if Mr. Faber would remember Payne Knight's observation, he would not take a lexicon for an oracle; and then he would find that it is only used in the sense of perfection, or bringing to an end, in such a case as that of a planet returning to the place in its orbit from whence it had set out; so that his own solitary authority is com-
pletely against him, and the authority of another lexicon is more to the point, which explains it, by διαφθοράς. Rerum compositio, in melioremque statum reductio. I am sorry to find in Mr. Faber such an instance of perversion, both of the argument and of the original Greek of the Scriptures; for he is usually above such subterfuges, and always writes like a scholar and a gentleman. He laboured the point so much, because he doubtless felt how much his system turned upon it; and I have gone more at length into a defence of the authorized version of this passage, than I should have done in a letter addressed to you, and not to him, in the hopes of somewhat counteracting the influence which the authority of his name might have against the text, as left us by the translators of our Bible. I regret that you have not adopted other of his views connected with this subject, in which he is far more sound, and more worthy of being taken as a model, than in the instance which, with your wonted infelicity, you have selected. If the only result of his learning was to torture a poor Greek word out of all its senses, in order to support an hypothesis, I should be tempted to say with Bernard de St. Pierre, Je me felicite de n'avoir jamais lu le Vocatif.

A writer in the Edinburgh Theological Magazine, in the extract which you have given from it in p. 234, shews also that he does not understand the first elements of interpretation of symbolic prophecies: he says, "the Son of Man came to the Ancient of days, or was brought near before
The only question here is, where has the Ancient of days his abode? Where do the Scriptures uniformly represent him as fixing his throne? If it be on earth, then the coming of the Son of Man was a descent, according to Mr. Cunningham; if it be in heaven, then the coming of the Son of Man was an ascent, according to the interpreters, Maclaurin and Scott. Instead of the only question being, where do other Scriptures represent the Ancient of days fixing his throne, it is a question wholly irrelevant to the point at issue. The true question is, where is the scene of the whole vision? but this I do not mean to answer. The writer seems not to know that, under every view, his as well as ours, it is one of the most difficult passages in Scripture, of which to give a consistent explanation. We should like to hear who he thinks is the Father of the age to come, in Isaiah ix. 6. Does he not know that Brenius thinks, that by “one like the Son of Man” is not meant Christ, but his glorious kingdom in the latter day? See Notes on Dan. in loco: and de regno glorioso.

So much for another writer whom you have taken for your own guide, and whom you would have us also consider as an oracle upon these subjects. This small verbal critic in theology, as well as every other of the same mould, is just what his brethren the note-makers are in poetry, a very Martinus Scriblerus on the Bible; and as these latter are utterly incapable of appreciating, and never seem to enter into, or consider as of
the smallest consequence; the subject-matter of their author; but merely make use of the most splendid passages of Euripides or Virgil, as materials on which to display their own knowledge of manuscripts and digammata; in like manner, the quibblers on texts hold the scope of the prophet or Apostle, in the truth that he is unfolding, as quite irrelevant to the interpretation of a word which they think to develop by a reference exclusively to a Suidas, or Etymologicum Magnum. But, it must be remembered, that in proportion as the style and subject of any author approaches the sublime, so in proportion does it set all canons of criticism at defiance; and so does it find a continually diminishing number of persons who can appreciate or even comprehend its beauties. We all know how little Dr. Johnson could enter into the merits of Milton and Gray; for it requires to possess something of a kindred spirit, to be alive to the delicacies of an abrupt and highly impassioned composition. Hence there are a thousand admiring of Homer and Tasso, for one who enjoys Pindar and Dante; and since the compositions of the Hebrew poets are more analogous to the latter than to the former, they are by far the most difficult portions of the sacred volume from which to expound, or prove doctrines to others; whilst, at the same time, their treasures having been once unlocked by the key which other parts of the Sacred Record afford, they are the most animating strains in which the renewed soul can indulge. Lowth and Horsley are almost the only
systematic writers upon Hebrew poetry who seem fully to have felt the force of its beauty; although many striking remarks are to be met with in the Fathers, which have been repeated by subsequent commentators, such as Vitringa. One of its beauties, and also of its peculiarities, consists in a play upon words, Paronomasias, of which Lowth gives many instances in Micah; and in consequence of the inability arising out of this beauty to translate Isaiah xxix. 1, 2, except by a paraphrase, which our translators have most properly always avoided, that passage in our Bibles is nearly unintelligible. Of Hosea, Horsley says, "he writes in short, detached, disjointed sentences; not wrought up into periods, in which the connexion of one clause with another, and the dialectic relations, are made manifest to the reader by an artificial collocation, and by those connexive particles that make one discourse of parts which otherwise appear as a string of independent propositions, which is left to the reader's discernment to unite. His transitions from reproof to persuasion, from threatening to promise, from terror to hope, and the contrary, are rapid and unexpected. His similes are brief, accumulated, and often introduced without the particle of similitude. Yet these are not the vices, but the perfections of the Prophet's style; for to these circumstances it owes that eagerness, and fiery animation, which are the characteristic excellence of his writings, and are so peculiarly suited to his subject:" and what is his subject? “The
final conversion to God of his own nation, to a condition of the greatest national prosperity, and of high pre-eminence among the nations of the earth, under the immediate protection of the Messiah, in the latter ages of the world. He touches upon the final overthrow of the Anti-Christian army in Palestine, by the immediate interposition of Jehovah. We have nothing in him descriptive of the events between the two advents of our Lord." Such is the account which Horsley gives of the subjects of Hosea's predictions. Thus, another great beauty of the Hebrew prophets, but, at the same time, one which causes their greatest obscurity, is, that they almost invariably blend the humiliation and the glory of the Messiah, so that, as Bishop Horsley observes, they pass over altogether the period between the two advents, that is, the period to which the New Testament relates; being that of the Gentile dispensation, and the fourth monarchy of Daniel. The last twenty-six chapters of Isaiah are in an almost uninterrupted strain of animated exhortation to the house of Jacob, to be comforted by the assurance of ultimate blessings; during the whole of which, there are very few passages which necessarily relate to the previous humiliation of its deliverer, either directly or indirectly; perhaps not more than the following five; xl. 3, xlii. 1—7, lii. 14, liii., lxi. 1. We may, indeed, give to many other bits of sentences a spiritual application to ourselves; and these, from their poetic beauty, have always been
great favourites with the church, and particularly with the poor; but neither the poor nor the learned have been able to give a consistent explanation of the contexts in which they occur, without reference to a future glorious exaltation of Messiah upon the throne of David in the rebuilt Jerusalem. The writings of the prophets are the Io Pæan of those who have overcome in the fight of faith: the object of these strains is not to furnish texts for debate, but to supply words that burn, and thoughts that breathe to the soul enraptured by the contemplation of the glories yet to be revealed, in the unhesitating confidence, that what her God has promised, He is also able to perform; and it shall be unto every one according to his faith.

Your extreme satisfaction at the solution of your difficulties by Mr. Faber, and by the Edinburgh Theological Magazine, is like that of a worthy person, who, reading in a newspaper, that the Russians had crossed the Danube, which river disembogued itself into the Black Sea, turned round to his companion in a stage coach, and requested to be informed the meaning of that word about the river. "The ablest and most judicious interpreter" in the coach replied, "disembogued, Sir? disembogued? why Sir, suppose I was to disembogue you, or you were to disembogue me." "I thank you, Sir," rejoined the simple and easily satisfied enquirer, "it is a rare thing to be a scholar." Surely the millennium of authors is arrived, when they find readers so ready to be convinced.
When I see these *ura* and *etrua* men of texts foiled at their own game of quibbling, I am constantly reminded of an anecdote told of an old sensible nobleman at a coronation. The master of the ceremonies, whose business consists in determining such important matters as the due length of silk robes, and breadths of gold lace, and also the proper order for the Peers and Peeresses to stand in, had learned his trade so ill, that upon that occasion he was giving a great deal of unnecessary trouble, in ordering them, first to one place, then to another; *ura* making them sit; *etrua* making them stand, to the great annoyance of all, and particularly of the old nobleman above mentioned; who, at length unable to endure any longer with patience the irritating ignorance of his tormentor, exclaimed, "thou silly fellow, thou dost not understand thine own silly business.

Every sincere student of God's Word will be willing to give up any interpretation of a passage when he sees ground for doing so, and therefore the only way to convince others of error, is to propose a better meaning, and not merely to rail at those who are, at all events, performing a duty in endeavouring to ascertain the mind of God, as revealed in his word, whether they succeed, or whether they conduct their enquiry wisely, or otherwise. By the study of the yet unfulfilled prophecies we have arrived at a particular view of the time in which we live, the signs of which; we
think, we clearly see. What you require of us is, not to abandon our view, and our signs, for some other view, and some other signs, but for none at all. But, suppose after reading your book, some one of us had been shaken in his opinion respecting the millennium, and the judgments and signs of the times, where was he to seek for better instruction? one Evangelical preacher, of great eminence in London, will tell him the millennium has been begun long ago; the Christian Observer will tell him it is coming without judgments; the Christian Guardian will tell him it is coming with very severe judgments; you will tell him that you are so occupied that you are unable to consider the subject; but you will all four agree in abusing the unfortunate Millenarians; upon this point, indeed the harmony of the Evangelical world is complete, and its love eminently conspicuous. We admit all your spiritual views, but we will not be limited to them, because we should then, as you do, leave one half of the Bible absolutely unintelligible: we take it therefore literally also, and thus the whole is so plain, that he who runs may read. What then should we gain by adopting your view? Nothing that we have not now. What should we lose? Half the Bible; and the key-stone of the whole arch which has been erecting from the fall of Adam: the meaning of all the mighty acts of God which have been transacted on the theatre of this planet.

You will readily admit, that from the days of
Eve to those of our Lord, the universal expectation of the saints was, that a man should come to set up his rule in this earth: you will admit further, that in every age, from the birth of our Lord to the present hour, some individuals have been found who have kept up a continual witness of the same belief. I will admit, on the other hand, that this expectation has been disbelieved by all heathen; by all Turks; by all Sceptics; by most Papists; and by most of the modern Evangelical world; and by Whitby, and all those learned commentators who are ignorant of justification by faith, and the other rudiments of Christian doctrine. Now let us try another truth: you will admit that the unconditional gift of eternal life, through the blood of Messiah was the universal faith of the saints from the days of Abel to the establishment of the Christian dispensation, and that faith is ours at the present day. On the other hand, this faith is despised by all heathen; by all Turks; by all Sceptics; by all Papists; and by the majority of the Protestants throughout Europe, not excepting the clergy of England and Scotland. I do not infer from the parallel fates of these two points of Christian verity, that therefore the belief in the Deliverer of this world must be the truth of God, but when I add to this, that all but the very elect are to be deceived, and that every expression intimates that at the time of our Lord's coming very few shall be expecting, or wishing for him, I at least have
a right to say that I see a **prima facie case in its favour**.

There is no such thing as standing still in religion. The grand object of it is the knowledge of God, in order to the enjoyment of Him. **The knowledge of ourselves is only valuable as leading to a knowledge of Him.** "Grant us in this world knowledge of thy truth, and in the world to come life everlasting." Unless God is limited in his nature, and in his operations, which it is absurd to suppose, the knowledge of the creature, like an asymptote, must be continually approaching, without ever reaching the goal. I do not know, Sir, whether you are a farmer or not; if you are, you will be aware that it is a great object with a shepherd to keep his lambs always growing; if they are ever stinted in their growth, they never recover it through their lives, and never fat so kindly as other sheep. Lambs, in this state, are said to be "sticky;" and I much fear, that Christians are now somewhat in the state of sticky lambs; they are not growing: the aged Christians seem very little wiser, but often much more worldly than the merest babes in grace.

No one will venture to deny that many foolish things have been, and will be written, upon the subject of unfulfilled prophecy; but it will be quite time enough to give up the study of it on that account, when you shall have pointed out one single other subject to which the same charge would not apply, and you may safely leave to each author the privilege of exposing
himself ad libitum. There is a clear and distinct command given and often repeated to the disciple of Jesus, which is, to watch for the signs of his coming: this command can only be obeyed by studying the things which are revealed as to precede or to accompany his approach. You indirectly assert, that you have studied unfulfilled prophecy, and that from this you have learned that the millennium has not begun; that the Jews are to be restored before it does begin; (I hope I do not mistake you here;) that during its continuance, a great increase of blessedness is to attend the brute creation; that, (since you are silent concerning them, it is fair to conclude this to be your opinion), this millennium is not to be ushered in by judgments on Christendom; and that Christ does not come till the end of that happy period. You therefore admit, by the fact of your sanctioning the study of prophecy, as you do by venturing to pronounce decided opinions upon its fulfilment, that it is the duty of the Christian to do so. I will go further than you, Sir, and express how far the student has a right to expect the blessing of God upon these his labours; and that is, in being enabled to see the precise character of the times in which he lives; to be enabled to give an answer, satisfactorily to himself at least, if not to others; to the question, "Watchman, what of the night?" but I do not think he has any right to expect to be informed of the minutiae attending that advent, and still less those belonging to that dispensation which is to take place subsequent to it,
Here is the point at which the wise man will stop; but at which you intimate, p. 107, he would be wise not to stop; short of this, however, he ought not to stop: and to this I would apply some appropriate sentences written by yourself.

"Lukewarm and worldly professors are very soon and very easily satisfied with the attainments they make. A slight degree of religious knowledge, the discharge of a few outward and formal duties, and the possession of a few superficial and short-lived joys, are perfectly sufficient to fill and gratify all the desires of their mean and grovelling minds. The case, however, is widely different with the Christian, when freed from the darkness and entanglements of security and sloth, and rendered fully alive to the importance and grandeur of things heavenly and eternal. Nothing less than a thorough knowledge of the whole will of God, nothing less than entire deliverance from the body of sin and death, nothing less than close and uninterrupted communion with the Lord, can then fill and satisfy the boundless and divine ambition of his holy and heaven-born soul. As the racer strains every nerve in proportion as he reaches the goal, the believer exerts every faculty and power in proportion as he advances in his course, and becomes more and more covetous of spiritual improvement the nearer that he approaches the summit of Christian perfection. The higher that he rises in the divine life, and the more rich and delightful acquisitions he obtains, divine objects acquire a more lovely and attractive energy, and his sen-
timents and views become more exalted and refined. He entertains more lowly ideas of the worth of his past attainments, and feels a more intense desire to reach the height of Christian excellence, and lay hold on all the immense and blessed privileges and enjoyments which are every where opening before him, and rising around him:" p. 258. M. in Zion.

Your present work is not confined to the subject of the millennium, and to the examination of the Scriptures by which our views are supported, but you have brought forward the opinions of some of the writers, both upon politics and upon the London University, in order, by creating a prejudice against them on the latter points, to decry what they say on the millennium also. As far as your conduct is personal I shall leave it without notice. As far as it is a mode of attacking the doctrine of the millennium, it betrays conscious weakness, and a necessity for resorting to every weapon, however unjustifiable, by which it may be assailed. As far as the way in which you have brought forward the case of the London University is concerned, it denotes the same indistinctness of perception of things entirely dissimilar, which I have had such ample occasion of pointing out, and which is, perhaps, the chief cause of your opposition to what we perceive the Scriptures declare upon the subject of the kingdom of Messiah. One of the writers on the fulfilment of prophecy had called the London University an Infidel Establishment; and you ask whether the writer "will charge the House of Commons
with infidelity, because at the close of every twelfth or twentieth speech, one of their number is not uniformly required to deliver a sermon?" p. 33. It appears to me, Sir, that a man who can see no difference between a place for Public, National, Education, and a House for Political Debate, neither can see any difference between the moon and a cream cheese; both are round, and both are white. But so completely different are my organs of vision constituted, that although I can see a resemblance between the moon and the cheese, I positively can see no one point in common between an University and the House of Commons. An University is a place in which all branches of knowledge are taught, and therefore called Universitas Scientiarum. The House of Commons is a place in which no branch of knowledge is taught. An University is a place in which the majority is inferior in age, learning, and power to the minority, who keep the majority in subordination, and in which no debate or discussion whatever of the orders is allowed. The House of Commons is a place in which all are on an equality, and in which not one act can be performed but after division, and assent of the majority given. I might go on much further; but I must now come to the charge brought against the University, and your defence of it by a comparison with the House of Commons. The charge is, that calling itself an University, and thereby assuming the title of a place in which all branches of knowledge are taught, it makes one exception; and that
exception is Religion, or, in other words, the
duty of man to God and to his fellows, founded
upon the law of God. Whatever other persons
may do, I for one am ready to maintain that
every institution, be it what it may, which is
established upon the basis of the exclusion of
Religion, is an Infidel Institution; it matters
not whether the institution be that of the go-

government of a nation, of a private family, or of
an University. It is a miserable subterfuge to
say that a Canal Company or Agricultural So-
ciety is an Infidel Company or Society, if these
too do not mix religion with their secular, single;
and distinct vocation. The Bible says nothing
about Canal Companies, or Agricultural Socie-
ties; but it does prescribe the mode in which
youth shall be trained, namely, in the nurture
and admonition of the Lord; and a system
founded on the intentional neglect of, and dis-
obedience to, that command, is an infidel sys-
tem, or rather a system of premeditated and
obstinate rebellion against God. In like man-
ner the Bible prescribes the duties of nations;
in the classes of magistrate or subject; and of
families, through every grade of husband, wife,
child, master, servant, &c. The London Univer-
sity is founded upon the principle of setting aside
that law of God as its basis and rule; and the first
that ever was so established in a Christian land.
America, as a nation, is founded upon the same
basis, and is the only nation in the world with-
out a God. America has no national God. Christi-
ans living on its soil do not make it a
Christian nation, any more than Turks living in
England make the English nation Mahomedan. Turkey, Ava, China, and the Hottentots are not so far removed from the truth in this matter as America, and the London University; the great image before which our Liberals, Dissenters, and Evangelicals command us to fall down and worship. But now for your defence of this Infidel University by a comparison with the House of Commons. This latter would not have been necessarily infidel, even if all reference to religion had been excluded from it; but most unfortunately for your comparison, every one of its acts commences by such reference; every one of its sittings opens every day by the Prayers of the National Church; every member upon taking his seat is obliged to come under certain obligations, to which he binds himself by an attestation to his faith in Divine Revelation; and, until the Liberals succeeded this year in repealing the Law, every member was obliged to bring a testimonial of his being a consistent and orthodox member of the church of Christ. In all these essentials it differs from the London University, so that the true definition of your simile must be like that of the foolish lexicographer, of lucus, a non lucendo, simile, from having no resemblance. But, Sir, whether I be right or wrong concerning the University, what has this to do with the "Scriptural Doctrine of the Second Advent of Christ," which alone you professed to be discussing? You know it has nothing whatever to do with it. The writer to whom you allude had referred to it as one of the signs of the times; you do not refer to the sub-
ject in order to shew either that it was no sign,
or that he had improperly cited it, but you in-
troduce it solely because you believe the Lon-
don University to be popular, and because you
think an attack upon it by the writers on the
millennium, will tend to prejudice them as in-
dividuals with the bulk of your readers. Your
having introduced the subject, therefore, in the
way in which you have, affords a strong pro-
sumption that you have had some secret mis-
givings that your cause could not be defended
by more manly weapons. "'Tis hard to kick
against the pricks."

I have omitted to notice any of your quota-
tions from the Apocalypse, because since you
were so inexact in passages which were not
symbolical, it was utterly hopeless to discuss
texts out of a purely symbolical book; more
especially, as by your approbation of a quota-
tion out of the Edin. Theol. Magazine, it is
obvious that you did not consider the scene
in which the vision was laid, as entering at all
as an element in it. Thus it would have been
necessary to have occupied a great deal of time
in settling preliminaries, and arranging a com-
plete symbolical dictionary; and I have there-
fore left your inability to understand the
Apocalypse to be inferred from the inaccuracy
with which you read and interpreted easier and
more obvious parts of Scripture.

You are pleased to lay down the following
position without any reservation or limitation.
"This system cherishes secular and carnal
principles; feeds the love of superiority; and
even cherishes a spirit of fierce, unchristian and relentless warfare; annihilates all that is sublime, elevating, spiritual, and transforming in the Gospel; and brings us back to the worldly services and carnal expectations of the Jews.” p. 330. This is a harsh assertion, and the difficulty of replying to it consists in its not admitting of refutation, because it contains no attempt at proof, and to deny it in terms as strong would be to make myself guilty of the crime alleged. I am therefore inclined to consider the idea as arising from the same inaccuracy in reading the authors to whom you mean the charge to apply, that I have had occasion to shew you have used in reading the Scriptures and the Fathers. Of the works which you quote, the largest are those of Mr. Faber, 7 vols. octavo; (which I include, because, though differing from the rest in one essential point, he agrees with them in all others much more nearly than with you;) Fry, 2; Noel, 1; Frere, 2; Stewart, 2; Marsh, 1; Cuninghame, 2; Way, 2; Ben Ezra, 2. I omit above 100 volumes now on my shelf before me of authors of the same sentiments, but who are dead. But in all these 20 volumes octavo (Query, have you read them?) I defy you to produce, fairly and honestly, one sentence which merits the charge you have advanced; and I desire nothing better than to stake the credit of the tendency of the doctrine on one hand, and the credit of your veracity as an author on the other, on the decision of the first twelve men whom you shall meet in the street, for the proof of this one fact.
But, supposing it be all true: let it be granted that these writers, instead of being mild, affectionate, and Christian, are scurrilous, fierce, and unchristian; what has that to do with the doctrine itself? Luther was violent and coarse, but is the argument of the Papists, that on that account alone his Doctrine of Justification is unscriptural, therefore sound? John Knox was foul-mouthed and brutal to his beautiful, and unfortunate Sovereign, but is the Kirk of Scotland a Synagogue of Satan on that account? You may, though in the seclusion of a Scotch provincial town, have a more extensive personal acquaintance with those whose sentiments you have attacked, than I possess, who live often, and too long in the midst of "the hum and shock" of this great "Mart of Nations." I can only answer for those whom I know, and I can truly say that of these your portrait wants even the merit of a coarse caricature, for it is destitute of the smallest resemblance to any with whom I am acquainted. I have never met one individual whose mind is imbued with these truths, who is not likewise awfully impressed with a deep sense of his corresponding duty. If there be one point more than another of the divine jurisprudence which weighs with peculiar force upon my own soul, it is that of the measure of reward and punishment being proportioned with unerring exactitude to the opportunity of improvement offered: so that when I reflect on the 800,000,000 human beings which compose the population of this globe; when I think further that not half of
these ever heard of the only name given under heaven by which any can be saved; that out of those who have so heard, not half believe the joyful sound, but are immersed in Popish superstition, or proud Infidelity; that this land has been more favoured than any spot on the whole earth with the number of preachers of God's Word, and variety of form with which that word has been set forth; that it has been selected by Jehovah to be His witness against the Popish Apostacy; when I join to these reflections the remembrance of our Lord's declaration that it will be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of retribution than for Chorazin and Bethsaida; I cannot but feel my heart sink within me at the thought of how many talents Britain has to answer for. But when I go further still, and reflect how few there are, upon the most enlarged estimate that can be formed, who profess to serve the Lord; and that out of this small number how much fewer there are who expect or long for His immediate approach; if, I repeat again, if this small band should be found in the right, how great is their responsibility! how awful, amidst all the opposition of their brethren, is the charge of being the depositaries of, and witnesses to that Truth! Gratitude to God for having opened their eyes to perceive the signs of the Coming of the Son of Man; shame at having read His Holy Word so often, and perverting it, instead of receiving it simply as He has written it; love towards those who still pervert it, and anxiety that they should not
shut themselves out by unbelief from the inheritance, as the people of God did of old; these, and sundry more, but all of a kindred nature, are the sentiments with which the study of the things which, though yet unfulfilled, have been "freely given us of God," has generated in the breasts of all with whom I am acquainted. This study, too, has taught them, that in the last days shall come scoffers, saying, where is the promise of his coming? that those who say, "my Lord delayeth his coming," will smite them; that these scoffers are not to be sought for among the openly profane, for that the peril of the last days consists in these persons being those who are lovers of their own institutions, and of wealth; boasters of their charitable, and missionary exploits; lovers of expediency rather than of principle; laying false accusations; speaking against the plain letter of God's word; and yet having the form, circumstance, and profession of godliness. But when you learn, that I could furnish you with a list of several of the most celebrated Evangelical ministers in London and its vicinity, who have denounced those of their brethren from their pulpits by name, that hold these views; that the storm of violence into which they worked themselves, in doing so, was noticed, not by Millenarians, but by those of their own sentiments, as disgraceful; that there is a large and opulent body of Dissenters, which, upon finding that one of their superannuated ministers was about to publish a tract upon the millennium, informed him that if he did, the annuity he re-
ceived from them should be taken away, and he left to starving: that several clergymen, as well Dissenters as in the Church, have received personal insults, and coarse language, even in some instances amounting to cursing, from their Evangelical brethren, such as no other branch of doctrine can in these days draw forth from the openly profane; when in addition to this new information, you refer again to the pages of the Evangelical, Congregational, Eclectic, and Edinburgh Theological Magazines, and to your own book; you will indeed perceive, that this subject has elicited an acrimony, which no other has had power to do; but you will be inclined to form a different judgment of the side to which your remarks should be applied.

In order still further to divert the attention of your readers from the object which you profess to have alone in view, you have made an attempt at its close, p. 331, to brand one of your Brethren in the ministry of your own church as a heretic. I say attempt, because here again your unhappy propensity to quote wrongly has a very ludicrous effect: for though it is obvious that you mean to make the passage you bring forward the ground of your accusation, it so happens that the words you have selected are such, that he who denies them is the heretic, and not he who maintains them. In the same page you make this assertion; "if sin is necessary and unavoidable, it is no longer sinful; and men may live as they please; for if they cannot resist sin, they cannot be justly
blamed or punished for its commission." Now, Sir, I will not retort upon you the charge of heresy for this last sentence; I know that aliquando bonus dormitat Homerus; and I will only suppose, that when you arrived at the end of your tirade against the Millenarians, the lamp of your genius did not burn so brightly as it did when you commenced; but certainly it was "a noddin, nid, nid, noddin," in the Manse of Strathblane, on the day when you penned those unfortunate words; for as an ill-natured man might arraign you before the General Assembly for bordering in your denial on the error of the Monothelites, and Eutychians; so for the assertion might you be charged with poaching on the manor of the Manicheans, and Spinozists. Neither is this all: in the same slumbering page we read, "see—a letter to the Rev. E. Irving in refutation of the Doctrines of the sinfulness, mortality, and corruptibility of the Body of Jesus Christ. The argument in this letter is conducted with the clearness and cogency of a geometrical demonstration." This is too bad for comment. Squaring the circle itself would be a joke to the geometrical demonstration which should conduct a refutation of the mortality of the body of Jesus Christ.

There is one other point to which I will allude, because the church at large is reaping the benefit of the labours of the students of prophecy, at the very moment her leaders are crying them down. It is to them alone that the church is indebted for giving her that warning
of impending judgments of which many of her sons seem to be now convinced, although spurning the hand from whence they have received the boon. The following extract from the Christian Review is well worthy of your serious attention, and coming from an enemy to the Millenarians, may, perhaps, thereby secure your regard. "We shall be glad to find ourselves mistaken, but we confess that we have very serious and painful apprehensions, whether that revival of religion, with which we have been favoured since the commencement of the present century, be not in some measure on the decline. We confess that we are looking for a conflict such as the world has never yet seen—a conflict of opinions, which, in its results, must doubtless be subservient to the cause of Jesus, but which, during its progress, may be attended with events for which some of us are little prepared. We may be wrong, but we confess we think we see, in the gathering of distant clouds, indications of an approaching storm. Let us all, but especially the clergy, work while it is called to-day; remembering, that sooner than they imagine, and from a quarter where it was least expected, a night may be coming, in which, while it lasts, no man can work."—Preface.

Take this warning, Sir, and thank God for having opened the eyes of any of his servants to the contents of the prophetic Scriptures, for it is through them alone that this light has been obtained.

If by adopting the reductio ad absurdum as the
mode of most clearly shewing the unsoundness of the arguments which you have brought forward, I should have been so unfortunate as to have transferred the tone of levity, with which your reasonings have inspired me, to the sacred subject itself, of the coming glories of my Lord, it will be to me a source of the sincerest and profoundest regret. I am fully aware that with so uncandid a writer it is impossible to adopt any tone at which he will not carp and cavil. If we bring forward a single passage, we are accused of wresting the whole word of God to coincide with one solitary text; if we appeal to the whole testimony, we are accused of "dragging every thing in the sacred volume into the millenarian service." Our blessed Master complained of the same mode of dealing with the truth in his day, saying, "Whereunto shall I liken this generation? it is like unto children sitting in the markets, and calling unto their fellows, and saying, we have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented, &c. &c.; but wisdom is justified of her children." Latimer says, (eighth sermon before king Edward,) "now a-days if they cannot reprove the doctrine that is preached, then they will reprove the preacher, that he lacketh due consideration of the times, and that he is of learning sufficient, but he wanteth discretion——It rejoiceth me when my friend cometh and telleth me that they find fault with my discretion, for by likelihood, think I, the doctrine is true; for if they could find:
fault with the doctrine, they would not charge me with lack of discretion, but they would charge me with my doctrine, and not with the lack of discretion.” I have not yet met with one individual, in public or in private, who has assailed the views of unfulfilled prophecy which I have attempted to develope in this letter, and who would come to the candid examination of the Word of God; who would say that “this chapter which you interpret so and so, seems to me to mean so and so, and my reason for thinking it is thus and thus, by inference of other Scriptures.” No; it is far easier to laugh and call names. Well, God is sufficient for the maintenance of his own truth, and man cannot blot it from his book. We must be patient. We may give argument for argument, but I shall be sorry to see the cause defended in the way in which it has been attacked by you and the (Religious!) Magazines. Next to my own clear perception of the truth in the written word, there are two things that most strongly confirm my acceptance of the millenarian doctrines; (if that is to be their name.) Of these, one is that their opponents invariably meet them with invective or contempt, instead of with argument; and the other, of which I have had opportunity of knowing much, is the ready, the grateful acceptance of them by those of God’s children who live apart from this contentious world; who know little, and care less about the names of men; the retired, the sick, the sorrowful. When presented to these in the pages
of inspiration, it is accepted as a key that unlocks exhaustless treasures. They do not ask who believes or who denies it; they see that it is there; the single beam they wanted to enlighten all that was obscure and unexplained before. It opens to them a door which no man can shut; and whether or not they may choose to study the doctrine elsewhere, in the using of the Scriptures it is never afterwards forgotten or foregone. Thus must I comfort myself with believing, that while the champions of the faith are contending over a disputed truth, the hidden ones of God are gratefully enjoying it; and many a prayer, unheard of man, is going up to heaven to meet the promise of His appearing, and give it welcome.

I now, Sir, for the present, take my leave of you. I have made no attempt to vindicate any writers who have expressed themselves improperly or even unguardedly, but only to shew that you are unable to discriminate between the error and truth which they profess. This inability, on your part, is sufficiently accounted for in your preface, by your want of leisure to study the subject; and it has further appeared, by the examination of your work, that you read the Scriptures with inattention, and lend yourself too easily to the guidance of the false logic of Mr. Faber, and the verbal quibbles of the Edinburgh Theological Magazine. The cause of the modern Millenarians having laid themselves open to many of your remarks is, that they have omitted all mention of the obvious things
in any passage of Scripture which they have quoted, as matters too plain to require explanation to the merest tyro; and have betaken themselves to the real difficulties of the texts to which they have referred. In your answer, you have shewn no distinction between those points on which they have expressed themselves as feeling assured, and those on which they have only said there were various degrees of probability; and with respect to the mode by which any of the anticipated events are to be brought about, they have almost uniformly acknowledged themselves in entire ignorance.

One of the most extraordinary circumstances about your book, is, that you never once testify the smallest consciousness that your own scheme has any difficulties in it. It does not matter in the least degree to my argument, whether it has or has not, and as my object is neither to attack you, nor your scheme, but only to defend the truth, I have not taken much notice of your own incongruities; but that you may understand what I mean, take the following sample. You say, that during the millennium, the knowledge of the Lord will be universal, p. 69; you assert, that for one who has tasted that the Lord is gracious to fall away is impossible, p. 73; and yet you admit, that there is to be final apostacy at the end of the millennium, i. e. preceding the day of judgment, p. 69; pray then from whence, since falling away is impossible, do these apostates come?

The following may be considered as a sum-
mary of the opinions of the majority of the writers to whom you have referred.

1. That the Millennium is not begun.
2. That that period is ushered in,
First, by judgments on Christendom.
   a. On Protestant nations first, because most highly favoured. Query? is Tyre the type of Britain?
   b. Jews the instruments of these judgments on the last confederacy of Christendom.
Secondly, By the return of the Twelve Tribes to their own land.
Thirdly, By the coming of the God-man Christ to sit upon his throne, and
Fourthly, By the resurrection of the elect.

III. That the chronology of the present days is between the 1260 days of Daniel, and St. John, and the 1335 of the former; and that we are under the sixth vial of the Apocalypse.
   a. Supposing the 1335 commences from the same epoch as the 1260.
   b. That the types which shadow forth the present time, are, 1. The period which elapsed between the coming out of the wilderness and the crossing of Jordan; 2. The time between the proclaiming of Solomon, during David’s life, and his coronation. 3. The preaching of Elias, that is, John Baptist, who bore witness to the immediate coming of Christ, and against the Pharisees, as
well as the Sadducees, and open sinners.

v. That the signs of the times are the fulfilment of those characteristics given for that purpose in 2 Tim. iii. 1—8; the French Revolution, answering to Mat. xxiv. 29, and sixth seal, and five first vials of the Apocalypse, and the divisions of all men now, as before the first advent, into three great classes, the Indifferent; Sadducees, or moral and respectable Sceptics; and Pharisees, or religious world, with their societies.

vi. That during the millennial dispensation, the inhabitants of the renewed earth will be under a different covenant from that which the present inhabitants are under; that they will not be subject to the influence of original sin; that the brute creation will participate in the blessedness of that period.

It is not meant, however, that these points are all considered equally clear. Thus, Sir, we are watching for the signs of the coming of the Son of Man; those who did not do so at our Lord's first Advent, he called hypocrites; will he call by any less severe name, those who do not do so now? but until we believe a fact, we cannot look out for a sign of it: until the physician believes the fact of a man being sick, he never thinks of looking for symptoms. I beg you to reflect upon one point, which is this:—are not the blessings attendant upon Christ's
coming, be it when it may, promised only to those who are looking, and longing, for his appearance? Do not resolve this home question, as Cromwell did one similar, by a reference to final perseverance: men are not saved for believing doctrines, any more than for doing works; neither hunt for a retort in order to gain a victory over Millenarians; but seek the answer in the silent stillness of midnight, and in the realization of the idea of your bed being one from which you may never again rise. There is no truth believed by man, which does not contain some falsehood in it; nor any falsehood believed which has not some portion of truth at the bottom of it. Let it be our earnest prayer, that we may be daily more and more filled with the knowledge of God, who alone is Truth; so shall we gradually, though perhaps insensibly, become freed from error, and become more and more like our blessed Lord, and like each other, every day. I pray most sincerely for a continued blessing upon your ministerial labours; upon the truths of God which you declare; upon the people who hear them; and upon your own soul in the preaching of them. I pray too that God will in mercy touch the hearts of the Aristocracy of Scotland, and that the treatment by them of his ministers, which you have so much cause to lament, be no longer with justice laid to their charge. It were better for them that a millstone were tied about their necks, and that they were cast into the sea, than that they should oppress in any way his
servants, and above all the ministers of his church. Although the times of controversy have been the healthiest of the church, I shall be glad, if it please God to spare me, from being the foremost in this field; and I conclude with an extract from Sir Wm. Jones to Dr. Parr;

"Oh, my friend, remember and emulate Newton, who once entered into a philosophical contest, but soon found, he said, 'that he was parting with his peace of mind for a shadow.' Surely the contemplation of God's works and God's ways, the respectable task of making men virtuous, may employ the forty or fifty years you have to live, more serenely, more laudably, and more profitably, than the vain warfare of controversial divinity, or the dark mines and countermines of uncertain metaphysics." This is my feeling; I wish the experience of the church coincided with it. Whether in controversy or not, and whatever you may please to say of Millenarians, I, as one of our reformers said of another, will never say otherwise of you, than that you are a most useful minister, and worthy disciple of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and that I am, with undiminished respect,

Your sincerely faithful servant in the Lord,

H. D.

November 1, 1828.