

THE HARMONY

PROPHETIC CHRONOLOGY.

BY APPOLOS HALE.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY JOSHUA V. HIMES,
No. 9 Milk Street.
1846.

LECTURE I.

Time of the Advent to be Known.

"I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession; that thou keep his commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ. which in his time he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto: whom no man hath seen, nor can see; to whom be honor and power everlasting. Amen."—1 Tim. 6: 13—16.

Can this be a Christian charge?—can it be apostolic? If it is, where are the Christians? where are the apostles? Who, in this age, would dare to give or receive such a charge? Who could do so without being subjected to the imputation of "fanaticism," "heresy," "insanity?" What! the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ mentioned in an apostolic charge, and that event to take place in accordance with arrangements of time! How can these things be? Do not the reputed apostles of our day look upon everything of the kind with ineffable contempt? warn us against it as "delusion?" and laugh at it as "moonshine?" All this may be without furnishing anything new under the sun. It may be that at the

close of the gospel history, as at its beginning the truth is to be found with those who are esteemed "deceivers," "babblers," and "pestilent fellows." And why should it not be so? Are we to suppose that the devil is now to abandon the artifice he has practised with so much success since the days of the patriarchs—that of making the truth as unpopular as he can, that it may be despised for being unpopular? It is enough that the disciple be as his master. It is enough for us to know the truth, let its reputation among men be what it may.

Whatever the charge contained in the text may mean, we need not fear to believe.—That certainly is Christian, that is apostolic ground. Let us look again at the text. The manner of the Apostle implies the deeply impressive character of the truth he utters:—*I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things; who has called us and every form of existence around us into being;—and in the sight of Jesus Christ, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession—and thus set an example for all who confess his truth,—that thou keep his commandment without spot, unrebukable,—let your life be a practical exhibition of the purity and excellence of the truth you preach—and this is to be done by yourself and the faithful men to whom you are to commit the things you have heard, and the others whom they shall teach, (2 Tim. ii: 2,) until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: which in his times he shall show;—that event shall surely take place, for he is by appointment the blessed and only Potentate; the King of kings, and Lord of lords; and in that*

majesty he is to "appear," when the times for the triumph of the kings and lords of this world, and for his exaltation, shall have run out.

The propositions presented in the text, now to be considered, are these.—1st. The appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ will surely take place; and, 2d. That great event is to take place in accordance with his own arrangements of time.

1. The great event which the Apostle brings before the mind of his son, and successors, with so much solemnity, as the motive to faithfulness, and the termination of their labors, is the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ. But what are we to understand that event to be? What do the phrases mean, "the appearing of Christ," "the coming of Christ," which so often occur in the word of God? This question should be settled before we can take a step intelligently; and although the question is one of the most simple that could be presented from the word of God, there is scarcely any one on which there are so many discordant opinions among those who profess to believe his word. The meaning of these portions of inspired truth, as given in the commentaries and pulpit discourses of the day, is almost anything and everything but the one only meaning that is authorized by the word of God. They mean "the event of death"—"some remarkable event of providence, such as the destruction of Jerusalem"—"the visits and manifestations of the Spirit," we are told. (See Dr. Clarke, Preface to 2 Thess.) But for nothing of this has God given us any authority. Indeed, it is all directly opposed to his word. It is certain the apostles

could not associate death and the coming of Christ together as the same thing. When the Savior told Peter by what death he should glorify God, and Peter wished to know what John's fate was to be, Jesus saith unto him, if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple *should not die*. (John 21: 18-23.) Mark their idea of what Jesus said: *If John tarryes till Christ comes, John cannot die!* Now, if they could not suppose that the death even of an apostle might be denoted by the coming of Christ, can we give these portions such an application without being wise above what is written?

Again. When the disciples asked the question, What shall be the sign of thy coming? are we to suppose they asked for a sign of their death? or that the Savior, in answering them, meant to tell them that death could not take place in the desert, or the secret chamber? Our brethren and the world may charge us with anything else, but they must spare us from that of ascribing such nonsense and falsehood to the Great Author of all truth.

But may not these phrases sometimes apply to the destruction of Jerusalem? No. Never.—Christ was evidently speaking of that event when he said, Then if any man shall say unto you, "Lo, here is Christ, or there!" believe it not.—Matt. 24: 23. As if he had said, I shall not come *then*; if any one says that my coming takes place *then*, they will say that which is not true. Believe them not. Whom, now, shall we believe? Christ himself or those who tell us his coming

did *then* take place? Let God be true, and every man who contradicts his truth a liar.

May not these phrases then denote the visits and manifestations of the Spirit? They evidently do not in any case. Christ never could tell a falsehood, contradict himself, or speak an absurdity.—He never could tell the disciples that they should be deceived if they expected to enjoy the presence of the Spirit in the desert, or the secret chambers, for in these places it has been enjoyed, in its greatest measure, by those of whom the world was not worthy, and who were glad to find a shelter in dens and caves of the earth.—In this sense it is that he is present with two or three who meet together in his name. His disciples who loved him and kept his commandments, were to have the Spirit to abide with them forever—to dwell with them and be in them. John 14: 15-17 Besides, it is certain that the apostles enjoyed as much of the presence of the Spirit as any one in our day can honestly pretend to enjoy; and they looked to the appearing—the coming—of Christ as the crowning glory of their hope; to these also Jesus gave the promise, “If I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.—John 14: 3. Now, unless we are prepared to question the truth of this promise of Christ, the Spirit has never been absent from his disciples; and what propriety can there be in saying he will come to them, in a sense in which he is already present?

Let us not be misunderstood. We believe and rejoice in the presence of the Spirit; and that its enjoyment is absolutely indispensable to a true

preparation for the coming and kingdom of Christ; but we deny that the manifestation of the Spirit is ever spoken of as the appearing, or the coming of Christ. God is a God of order, and we cannot disregard the order of God with impunity.—We are bound to speak of things as God speaks of them. And it is precisely upon this point that the professed church of the present day has become bewildered by misinterpreting the directory of heaven so as to make one part of the truth of God the means of overthrowing and destroying another part of it. And this has given a feature to the guilt of this generation which makes it without a parrallell in that of any other generation that has lived before us. The apostles always speak of the enjoyment of the Spirit as “the earnest” of the inheritance that is to be received at the day of redemption. By receiving the spirit of adoption we become children and heirs, and henceforth wait for the adoption itself—the redemption of the body. The church of the present day has lost sight of the true relation of the received spiritual blessing of the promised redemption that is to be brought unto us at the appearing of Jesus Christ; and having lost sight of the fixed relation between these two parts of the great redeeming arrangment to each other, they can see nothing that is connected with that in its true light.—By one class the true inheritance, and the time of its possession, are lost sight of, in the earnest, just as the Jews of old lost sight of the promise which looked to the immortal state, in the typical and temporal possession of Palestine; and as they could not realize their expectations

in the temporal possession, they were continually dissatisfied, and murmuring that their "hope was lost, that they were cut off from their inheritance." Being ignorant of God's plan in the case, and going about to establish their own plan, they could not submit to that of God. They reasoned thus: "Abraham was one, and he inherited the land; but we are many, the land is given us for inheritance."—Ezek. 33:24. Whereas, according to Stephen, "God gave Abraham none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on, yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him." Acts 7:5. Just so these Christians show that they "know not the Scriptures." By misapplying a remark of Christ, which was addressed to "the Pharisees," (Luke 17:20,) and supposing it to assert that the kingdom of God is within them,—whereas the Savior meant to say that the kingdom of God, in the only form in which it then existed, or could exist till his coming in glory, was "*among*" them,—they are continually making themselves ridiculous, or abominable, by pretending to that which can never be attained in this mortal state:—that they are not under the influence of natural sympathy—that they are above the attacks of disease and death, have immortal bodies—are commissioned to destroy the wicked, &c. &c.; or, taking it for granted that the kingdom of God is indeed set up, they attempt the most fruitless and senseless efforts to make the kingdom such an one as they have light enough to see it ought to be.—These have lost sight of the true inheritance

—the kingdom in its completed state—in the earnest, the pledge of heirship to the kingdom.

Another class, entirely in doubt about any better portion hereafter, or looking for a visionary paradise in which there is as little that is inviting as could be found in that of the poet's "Poor Indian," have no sense of their need of "the Spirit," or have no use for that blessing if they have ever enjoined it, are laboring with all their might, mind, and strength for the best portion they can obtain in this present evil world. Both of these classes, which constitute nearly the whole of the professed Christian church, (we rejoice that there is a class, who, though they differ from us, are not of these two classes,) since they are alike in darkness and confusion upon the Scriptural plan of redemption, look with the most profound amazement or contempt upon those who occupy the position of the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, and are continually ascribing to them absurdities, improprieties, and extravagances, which are found in their rankest form among themselves.

It may be said of them as Stephen said of the Jews who were ready to murder him, "Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye." He showed them that their fathers had resisted the Holy Ghost by rejecting the instruments whom God had raised up to accomplish his purposes of mercy: "the patriarchs, *moved with envy*, sold Joseph into Egypt; but God was with him;—"Moses, whom they refused, saying, Who made thee a ruler and a judge? the

same did God send to be a ruler and a deliverer:”—“which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? And they have slain them which showed before of the coming of the Just One, of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers!”

As it has been heretofore so it is now. Those whom God has chosen to be the ambassadors of his truth have always been unpopular enough to excite the “envy,” to be “refused,” and persecuted by those who know not the Scriptures, nor the power or plans of God. Not that we suppose that all are right simply because they are refused by any class of men; no, no. We know where we stand. Our foundation is that of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; the foundation of our opposers is that of the persecutors and murderers of all these: they occupy the same position, in reference to those prophecies which speak of the coming of the Just One in his glory, that the Jews occupied, in reference to those which spake of his coming in his humiliation. The first of the classes before referred to, ignorant of the true relation of what they have received, and possibly now enjoy, to that which they cannot have in this state of things, grieve the Spirit of God by running counter to its dictates; the other class, as destitute of the spiritual earnest as they are ignorant both of the earnest and the inheritance to which it refers, grieve the Spirit by “despising the pleasant land”—by selling their birthright for a mess of pottage. And herein consists the unparalleled guilt of this generation.

Never has the church and the world enjoyed the outpouring of the Spirit as in our day. There is scarcely a city or village; scarcely a mansion or cottage, that has not been visited by the Spirit of God, in the awakening or conversion of those of their occupants who have arrived to years of maturity; but where is the fruit? Who now is found walking in the Spirit, living in the Spirit, as pilgrims and strangers on the earth? Who now is found of all the children of God, which have been begotten by the word of his truth, that is not so completely blinded by the worldly spirit of the sect or society into which he may have been gathered, that he feels at perfect liberty, nay, in duty bound, to deride those very truths to which that sect may be indebted for its existence? Let it not be said that it is only to the fixing of the time for the great events of prophecy to take place which has been the subject of derision by the professed people of God; they have been as much opposed to the application of the prophecies to events, according to the views of the church from its earliest ages, as to the interpretation of the times of prophecy. Indeed, it is only a hypocritical pretence to say that the interpretation of these times was the objectionable point; for which of the opposers of the Advent doctrine have not, in the same work, perhaps the same page, in which they have denounced the calculation of these times, by the Advent writers, as an unpardonable meddling with secret things, gone right on to show, as they assumed, when these periods were fulfilled in the past, or when they terminate in the future? And why should it be so much more ob-

jectionable to fix their termination "about the year 1843," than about 1866, or about 1900, or about 365,000 years in future even? This objection is a mere pretence, under which it is attempted to conceal the prevailing and deep-rooted hatred to the truth of God.

The old promise, that the everlasting kingdom of the Son of God and the saints of God is to be the kingdom and dominion and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, in a renewed state, the renewal or regeneration to be effected by the Son of God at the time of his personal return in glory, has been denied and rejected to give place to the senseless "fables," of the modern divinity makers;—the hope of the fathers, that the dead shall be quickened into life at the call of the trump of God, has given place to the speculations of unbelief, to the sublime vagaries of heathenism;—the terrors of the Lord, which are to be revealed in the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men, are explained to mean something which has befallen some past generation of sinners—the poor Jews, of the apostolic age, perhaps, or the changes which are to be effected in this earth, while under the curse, by the mighty agency of human improvement! These are some of the "fables" which are received by those who have "turned away their ears from the truth," and these are more popular than what God has spoken.

This is the whole mystery of the popular hatred to the Advent doctrine. And unless God disavows his truth, those who prefer these fables to what he has spoken, let their professions or their

position in society be what they may, must grieve the Spirit of God. And since there is no other agency appointed by which the word of God can become effectual, or the salvation of man possible, those who have caused his Spirit to leave them finally, are as certainly damned as if they were already in perdition. Who then can be surprised at the darkness, the coldness, the spiritual death that pervades the professed church of Christ at the present time? O! when I think of the priceless blessings which have been bestowed only that the Giver might be dishonored by the proud, contemptuous ingratitude of the recipients, and to add to the splendor of the wreck in the day that they shall fall, I am filled with unspeakable grief and horror at the suicidal follies of my brethren in the church of Christ, and with astonishment that God has borne with this ingratitude so long!

To return to the argument. Although it must be held as a sacred truth, that there can be no salvation without the renewing and sustaining agency of the Holy Ghost; on the other hand, whatever we may enjoy of that blessing, it can never, in this state of things, amount to anything more than "the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession"—"the spirit of adoption;"—the inheritance itself, and the adoption itself to be enjoyed at the appearing of Jesus Christ; and the people of God can never consistently or safely suppose that they are anything else than pilgrims and strangers here, for here we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come. There only can be found the kingdom of God which is the subject of promise

to the righteous; and that is to be inherited when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all nations shall be gathered before him. To the events of that day, and to these only, are we to look for the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ."

And that this is to be literally a personal and visible appearing, if men can be so inconsiderate as to suppose there can be an appearing of Christ that is not personal and visible, is made evident by testimony that no criticism, no sophistry, no quibbling of exegetics can destroy. The testimony of the angels of God, given to the apostles at the time Christ ascended to heaven, settles that point for ever, if that were all that could be given:—
"And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven."
(Acts 1: 9—11.)

Now if these angels had only said, "This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come as ye have seen him go into heaven, it would have been sufficient to settle the question of a personal and visible return in every unperverted mind; but as if it had been foreseen that the evil spirit would attempt to pervert the word of God, as to the *manner* of the event, they say, he "shall so come in like MANNER as ye have seen him go into heaven." Words could not be

employed to express more clearly and positively the fact of a personal and visible return of our Lord. The testimony is unpervertable. The same Jesus is to come from heaven who then went into heaven. He was seen to go, and a cloud received him out of their sight. Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him. The fact, and the *manner* of the fact of the return are settled.

And in accordance with this testimony the apostles took their position, which all of their faith will also take: "Our conversation (*politēuma*, community, or city) as in heaven, from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus, who shall change our vile bodies that they may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, by the power wherewith he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." (Phil. 3: 20, 21.)

Again, the fact of the first advent is made the ground of the argument for the second advent: "But now 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 salvation." Heb. 9: 26-28. As certainly as there was a personal appearing in the first advent, so there must be at the second. God forbid, therefore, that we should ever blush on account of any saintly ridicule that may be cast upon us for "gazing up into heaven" to catch the first flash of glory that may herald the appearing of "this same Jesus," while we stand on such apostolic ground. If there is any blushing to do it belongs to another class.

Every Christian who has made a profession of

his faith, if he has done it understandingly, has made it in view of this event; For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's and of the holy angels." Luke 9: 26

The hope of the Christian can never be realized until the appearing of Christ; and it is impossible for any one to embrace fully the great lessons of the gospel without embracing this truth: "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared, teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present evil world, looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Savior Jesus Christ." Titus, 2: 11—13. By this it seems that the grace of God, which came by Jesus Christ, teaches us as clearly to look for his glorious appearing, as it does to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present evil world. Is it surprising that those who deride the former of these lessons should forget the latter?

II. The appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ is to take place in accordance with arrangements of time which are peculiarly "his." Is there, then, an appointed time for this event? No fact is more evident. "God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ." That is the day of judgment—the day of his appearing. Paul speaks of "the times and seasons" for that event just as he does of the most familiar and self-evident truth of the gospel; i. e., that Christians should love one another—

(Compare 1 Thess. 4: 9 and 5: 1.) Indeed, those very portions which are so often quoted to overthrow our position, as it is thought, imply that there is a time appointed for that event. For when we are told that no man knoweth the day or the hour of that event, it is certainly admitted that there is a day and hour for it; and when it is said, "It is not for you to know the times and seasons which the Father hath put in his own power," it must be that there are such times and seasons.

These are the times referred to in the text, in accordance with which the appearing of our Lord is to take place, which are also called "his times."—And there are two very good reasons why they are called *his* times; first on account of the bearing of the great chronological arrangements of God, as to the affairs of this world, upon the actual reign and kingdom of Christ and his saints as compared with the kingdoms and reign of his and their enemies. When the ancient kingdom of David was subverted, God declared that he would "overturn, overturn, overturn it, until he come whose right it is, and I will give it him" Ezek. 21: 27. When the Savior was on earth he foretold the fate of that kingdom as follows: "Jerusalem shall be trodden under foot of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled?" Luke 21: 24. And when these times run out, "they shall see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory." v. 27. "A cloud received him out of their sight" when he was seen to "go into heaven," in like manner he shall be seen coming again when these times of Gentile domination have expired. Until that point of time arrives, Palestine—the king-

dom of David; and the world—the kingdom of Adam, the son of God—are to be trodden under foot of usurpers, and here is the time for patience on the part of God's people, as it is of long-suffering on the part of God himself. The period of worldly exultation is the period of trial to those who are heirs of the world to come, over which Christ is to reign. The point at which these earthly kingdoms fall is the point at which Christ is to appear in his glory to reign forever and ever, and at which his people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. Antichrist had "his time" to "be revealed," (2 Thess. 2: 6,) and it is a well established fact of history that it took place accordingly. Our Lord Jesus Christ has his time to be revealed in, and it will surely take place at the time appointed. "I the Lord will hasten it in his time."

The second reason why these times are called "his times," is this.—They were given by the Spirit of Christ to the prophets. Of the salvation, which is ready to be revealed in the last time, to which those are kept by the power of God through faith, who are begotten again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. Peter tells us "the prophets inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." 1 Peter 1: 3—11. The sufferings—the death of Christ took place "according to the time," as Paul testifies, Rom. 5: 6, margin; and

the Savior himself, John 13: 1. The time for the glory to be revealed, though near at hand, is yet future, and is to take place when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, as Peter testifies, 1 Pet. 5: 1—11. What was spoken by the prophets, in the case, was, in truth, Christ speaking at one point of time, of his own sufferings at another point, and of his glory at still another point. The manner in which he has honored the first part of the plan is, as we shall see, the demonstration that he will honor that part of it which remains to be accomplished. These times, by what Peter says of their communication to the prophets are found, in their specific form, only in the prophecies of Daniel.

We have now shown by the word of God, that there is an appointed time for the appearing of Christ, and the reasons why the times involved in this appointment are called his. Another question of some importance now presents itself.—Are these times to be understood by the people of God? We shall show by the word of God that they are.—Not as to the day or hour, literally; but as in other cases, so as to enable them to take a safe position in reference to the event by which their termination is to be marked. 1. The word of God was given for the purpose of guiding his people in reference to its fulfilment. This is so apparent it would be difficult to select the statement of the fact which is most to the point. It will not be questioned.—2. The command to “take heed to the sure word of prophecy,” with the assurance that we “do well” so to do, implies that it is to be understood by those who do

take heed to it; and as there is no difference pointed out between the portion which relates to time, and that which relates to events, it is evident that every part of it is essential to make it a sufficient light to the people of God.

3 Those who disregarded the prophecies which were fulfilled at the first advent, were rebuked for not discerning that time, Luke 12: 56; and fell under the severest maledictions of heaven because they knew not the time of their visitation. Luke 20: 41—44. And those who are brought to view as the subjects of the wrath of God at the second advent, are those who reject the testimony of God upon the time of that event. They shall say "Peace and safety," as to that event, "when sudden destruction cometh upon them, and they shall not escape;" or, "since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation," and on those the days shall come as a thief. Can it be that men should be thus condemned by the Almighty, if the time of these events was not to be understood? God forbid?

4. But the same prophecies which contain these times, in their specific form, declare repeatedly that the subject of which they treat shall be understood by those who take heed to them—the wise, whom Christ explains to be those who hear his sayings and do them—"at the time of the end." Daniel 12: 11. Peter tells us it was revealed to the prophets that not to themselves they did minister, but to those who should live when the things should be fulfilled of which they spake. According to Christ himself, it is

by taking heed to what he has "told us before," that we are to avoid what "they shall say," who are false teachers and false prophets: and to know when his coming is near, even at the door, so that we may lift up our heads, knowing that our redemption draweth nigh. According to Paul, it is by giving the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, and holding fast the profession of our faith without wavering, seeing he is faithful that promised, that we are to see the day approaching; and this is to be the great motive for considering one another, to provoke (stimulate) unto love and good works, for assembling together, and to exhort, not command or denounce one another. According to Peter, it is by being "mindful of the words which was spoken before the holy prophets, and of the commandment of the Apostles of the Lord and Savior, that we are to become the right manner of persons in all holy conversation and godliness; looking for and hastening unto (*hastening the coming of*, margin) the day of God, wherein the heavens, being on fire, shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat. According to John, it is declared under oath before God, that time is to be strictly regarded in the fulfilment of the prophecies: "And the angel which I saw stand upon the sea and upon the earth, lifted up his hand to heaven, and sware by him that liveth for ever and ever, who created heaven, and the things that therein are, and the sea, and the things which are therein, that there should be time no longer: but in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God shall be finished

as he hath declared to his servant's the prophets." Rev. 10: 5—7. And that this was designed for the benefit of the people of God is evident from these words of the book of Revelations itself:—"Blessed is he that readeth and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein." Rev. 1: 3. It must be that the times of prophecy, as they are so prominent a part of it, are to be understood by those who take heed to it, as the fulfilment approaches.

Another question here occurs of the greatest importance in the present case. It is this.—Are these times *now* understood? We do not say that they are; we have never said so. We never could see, nor did we ever believe, that any man was authorized to say positively that they were understood. We *believe* they are, and are ready to give to every man the reason for believing so. 1. As these prophecies were to be understood "at the time of the end," which is shown in the book of Daniel to be a short time before the end should actually come; and as we must be near the end, if there is any truth in history, anything worthy of respect in the opinions of the worthiest men who have lived since the days of the Apostles; or any scriptural meaning to the events which have marked the age in which we live, it is fair to suppose that the time for these prophecies to be understood has come. 2. The explanation of these prophecies which we are enabled to obtain, is so fully in harmony with the received views of the church in all ages: it is so reasonable, so clear, so harmonious, we

think it must be the true one. If any scriptural objection were urged against the explanation here referred to, we should speak with less confidence; and the time has been when we were more in doubt because we supposed it was possible that such objections might be found. But the world knows there is no want of ability or disposition on the part of those who have stood forth against the prophetic interpretation under consideration, and it may be asserted without qualification that the utmost has been accomplished that was possible. And now, in all seriousness, we ask, has any one of the reputed champions of the age given an explanation of the prophecies that is more in accordance with the old standard interpreters, or better sustained by the facts of history? Has any one presented an objection against the interpretation which would not be of equal weight even if it were admitted to be true?

It has been objected that the prominent advocates of the system are "ignorant"—"base villains"—"deluded"—"insane"—"fanatics"—"disorganizers," &c., &c.; it is objected that they are "believers in annihilation"—"Unitarians"—"come-outers," &c. &c.; they have been put on a level with the "fifth-monarchy-men," "false prophets," "Ann Lee," "Mormons," &c., &c.; it is alleged that their views are fatal to the plans and improvements of the age. All this, and much more of a similar character, which has shown the ignorance of those who undertook the work of what they were about, has been put in the form of objections to the hated system; but all this might be alleged falsely, as most of it is; nay, it might all

be true, and the system might also be true. And every one must certainly see that an objection that is of no force or application, in discussing the truth or falsehood of a doctrine, is good for nothing, unless it is to show the weakness or wickedness of the one who may use it. But as if providence had determined to enclose us in a wall of adamant, since our opposers can find nothing in the word of God to use fairly against us, and are left destitute of anything worthy the name of an argument from any other source, the character of the opposition itself, which seems to be necessarily such as it is, is a mighty confirmation of the truth of the interpretation we defend. It is one of the clearest facts of prophecy that precisely such opposition would be encountered by those who should occupy the true position at the time when the prophecies should be fulfilled. The more we see therefore of what we have seen and do see, the more we are forced to believe we have the truth. However, whether we do now understand these times of prophecy accurately or not, it is certain that they will be understood by the people of God before the end shall come.

“But your own mistakes have proven your views to be erroneous, and as honest men you ought to give them up.” Pray what shall we give up? You certainly would not have us give up the hope of Christ’s appearing; would you have us, then, give up that he is to appear “in his times?” Surely you would not have us give up the word of God! Shall we give up that those times are to be understood by the people of God? This too is so evidently taught in the Bible, you

can hardly require us to give this up. Must we give up the belief that these times *are now* understood? "Yes, yes. Confess that you don't know anything about them, like honest men, and let the subject alone. Give it up!" Well, now, we are ready to submit the question to any number of candid men, whether they agree with us or not, and if they will say, after deciding a case that they will admit to be precisely similar to ours, though relating to affairs of this world, that we ought to give even this up, we will do so.

It is well known that on board of all our well-regulated ships, there are three at least who are expected to keep what is called the ship's reckoning—the captain, mate and second mate. Suppose now that one of our ships is bound from Boston to Liverpool. The distance is laid down to be 3000 miles. The distance sailed each day is entered upon the reckoning of the captain, mates, and second mate. At length the captain finds that according to his reckoning they are 2975 miles from Boston, and that twenty-five miles farther will bring them to Liverpool. He makes known the result, and commands the ship to be put in order to enter the port. They sail on the distance that remains, according to the captain's reckoning, but see nothing of Liverpool. In this time, however, it is found that the reckoning of the mate differs from that of the captain's 25 miles, and that of the second mate 50 miles; so that they are not so near the end of the voyage by 25 or 50 miles according to their reckoning, as according to that of the captain. What, now, should be done? Shall they give up the voyage and return to Boston? Shall they give up that

there is any Liverpool? Shall they give up that they know anything about the distance to Liverpool? No, no, brethren. If you had any interest in that ship's cargo, it would not be well for those officers to meet you in Boston, if they had given up the voyage under such circumstances.—You would say, It was all right to put the ship in order to go into port according to the captain's reckoning; and now try the mate's reckoning, and if that proves incorrect, try the second mate's; if the true reckoning is kept at all, they must have it. Keep the ship as she goes: don't start a tack nor sheet; keep the ship for Liverpool! If this is righteous judgment, we cannot give up the expectation that the voyage is to end, and our hopes to be realized, somewhere within a different reckoning of the distance sailed, since the voyage begun is laid down in the unfailing chart.

In the following lectures we shall show the source of our well-known mistake, the ground of a different chronology of events, and the reasons why we expect the realization of our hopes according to this chronology.

LECTURE II.

THE fulfilment of the time appointed for the SUFFERINGS of Christ, designed to guide the people of God in reference to the time of his APPEARING IN GLORY.

Therefore understand the matter and consider the vision. Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city to seal up the vision.—Dan. ix. 23, 24.

IT is the object of this lecture to show that the 70 weeks of Dan. 9th are related to the vision of the previous chapter, in such a manner, as that their fulfilment was designed to guide the people of God in reference to the fulfilment of that vision; and that what we know of the fulfilment of the seventy weeks, enables us to point out the time for the fulfilment of the vision.

1. The first portion of the text to be explained is the phrase, "to seal, or to seal up," which points out the relation of the seventy weeks to the vision mentioned in the text. This phrase, which occurs so frequently in the Bible, has two significations; first, a thing is said to be sealed when it is made secret; as the contents of the book that was sealed with seven seals were unknown till the seals were loosed or broken. The things which the seven thunders uttered were to be sealed up, that they might remain a secret. Secondly.—A thing is said to be sealed when it is made sure; as in the case of a covenant, bond

or deed. The sealing of it adds the last assurance that the contents shall be kept inviolate; that its obligations shall be faithfully performed. The "sure covenant" made by the Jews who returned from Babylon, in the days of Nehemiah, was sealed. (Neh. 9: 38; 10: 1. See also Jer. 32: 6—44.) The king of Persia said, "the writing which is written in the king's name, and sealed with the king's ring, may no man reverse." Est. 8: 8 So, also, the apostle: "The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal." 2 Tim. 2: 19. With these significations of the words all are perfectly familiar. We seal our letters to make their contents secret; we seal our deeds, wills, and bonds, to make their provisions legally binding and sure. The sense in which the words are to be understood in the text, we shall show in another place.

II. The second point to be settled, in explaining the text, is to show what vision it is which the seventy weeks are said to seal. And it should be understood that this involves one of the great questions which constitute the main pillars in our system of interpretation, so far as the prophetic times are concerned. If the connection between the 70 weeks of Daniel 9th, and the 2300 days of Daniel 8th, does not exist, the whole system is shaken to its foundation; if it does exist, as we suppose, the system must stand. We therefore call particular attention—we care not how critical, if it be candid—to the reasons for believing that such a connection exists.

First. In the very nature of the case, it must be that the vision, which the 70 weeks are said

to seal, is something beyond the 70 weeks themselves. . No man in his senses would say that the seal which he adds to a letter to make their contents sure, seals itself. The documents are separate and entire without the seal, which is added for the purposes specified; that sealing act fixing the relation between the seal and the thing sealed, and necessarily supposing that there can be nothing sealed without something beyond the seal to which it is made an appendage. As the 70 weeks are the appendage—the seal—to something else called the vision, that vision must, in the nature of the case, be something different from the 70 weeks, even if the 70 weeks could with any propriety be called a vision. . We may understand the terms “to seal,” therefore, in either of the significations given before, and it is equally clear that the vision sealed is something different from the 70 weeks, by which it is sealed.

Second. The vision of which the 70 weeks are the appendage, must be some vision which precedes them, unless God departs, in this case, from the natural and only proper order which he observes in all other cases. Whenever a dream, vision, or parable is to be given, which needs an addition in way of explanation, the addition always follows. It was so in the case of Pharaoh's dream, as interpreted by Joseph; in the case of Nathan's parabolic reproof of David: it is so in the vision of Nebuchadnezzar, and in that of Daniel, as recorded in the second and seventh chapters of his book; it is so in the vision of the eighth, so far as the explanation is given; it is so in all other cases. Now, unless God departs in this case from the order observed in all other

cases—a departure which would be unnatural and absurd—the 70 weeks are—they must be—the appendage of some previous vision, which they are said to seal.

Third. The vision, which the 70 weeks are said to seal, must be the vision of the eighth chapter of Daniel, for it is as certain that the 70 weeks are comprehended in that vision and in no other, both chronologically and historically, as that Massachusetts is comprehended geographically in the United States, or Boston in Massachusetts. Where does the vision in its historical application begin? During the supremacy of the Medes and Persians, denoted by the “ram which had two horns.” (8: 3, 20.) Where do the 70 weeks begin? With “the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem.”—9: 25. Now it is a well known historical fact, that no such commandment was ever issued but during the supremacy of the Medes and Persians. But there is an evident intimation in the symbolic imagery of the vision, that it was to commence at that period in the history of the Medo-Persian kingdom when it was at the highest point of political prosperity: “I saw the ram pushing westward, and northward, and southward; so that no beast might stand before him, neither was there any that could deliver out of his hand; but he did according to his will, and became great.”

At what period in the history of the Medes and Persians, did their condition answer to this description—when, in spite of all other nations, they did according to their will? At the time they conquered the Babylonians, their “whole kingdom” consisted of “a hundred and twenty”-principali-

ties. **DAN. 6: 1.** At a later period in their history, there were an hundred and twentyseven provinces. **Est. 1: 1; 8: 9.** According to Prideaux, Dr. Clarke and others, (see Dr. C's Preface to Esther,) the Ahasuerus, king of Persia, spoken of in Esther, was the same as the Artaxerxes of Ezra; and as that is the latest period of the kingdom, to which the statement of the book of Esther can refer, so it is the latest point at which the historical application of the vision can begin; for we are assured by the most authentic secular historians, that "the first symptoms of decline in the kingdom of Persia appeared in the days of Artaxerxes Longimanus.*" It is also a well-known fact, that the only decrees issued in favor of the Jews, with which the 70 weeks can begin, were issued during the reign, and in the name of that king.

So far we are guided by the testimony of undoubted history to the supremacy of the same kingdom, and to the reign of the same king, both for the beginning of the events brought to view in the vision, and the beginning of the 70 weeks. It was evidently through the influence of "the queen," (see Neh. 2: 6,) that this king granted such remarkable favors to the Jews. And when we are told that the marriage-feast of Esther, at which the king "made a release under the provinces, and gave gifts according to the state of the king," (Est. 3: 18,) was "in the seventh year of his reign;" (v: 16,) and that the first decree issued by him in favor of "Jerusalem," was issued "in the seventh year of the king," (Ezra 7: 8,) it must appear that the "year" in the reign of

* Encyclopaedia Amer.—Art. Persia.

the king of Persia, at which the 70 weeks begin, is shown to be at the very point where the kingdom has attained the condition with which the vision begins to be fulfilled; and that the feast which celebrates the attainment of the political zenith brings about the occasion which originates the decree. The year of the reign of the king, according to the Nabonassarean Era, used among the Persians, began in December, which would embrace "the tenth month, the month tebeth," in which Esther's marriage was held and in which was the "release made to the provinces;" and this would afford just about time enough for Ezra to prepare to go up to Jerusalem in the following spring, "in the first month" of the Jewish year, "in the seventh year of the king." It must be seen, therefore, that the prophecy of the 70 weeks is comprehended in the vision: if we take the most general view of the two portions, this must be admitted: and the more particular and specific the inquiry becomes, the more strikingly and clearly the facts of history direct us to a single point—even the year—for their commencement.

Fourth. But when we come to examine the internal evidence of connection as indicated by the bearing of the vision of the eighth, and the communications of the ninth of Daniel, upon the great subject of interest to the prophet; by the circumstances on his part which opened the way for these communications; by the evident mistake under which he labored, as inferred from the avowed purpose of the second visit of Gabriel; and by the manner in which he enters upon the work of his mission, the particular points of con-

nection becomes so apparent and distinct, and at the same time so natural, that we are forced to admit the connection between the two chapters, here maintained, or to leave the matter in that suspicious obscurity which is claimed for it, and abundantly proved to exist, (in the writers if not in the prophecy,) by those, who, since they are incapable of seeing it to be their reproach, do not hesitate to make it an occasion of magnifying their superior modesty. (1.) The great subject of interest to the prophet was the condition of "the sanctuary and the host" during the time of the vision, and the change to take place at its termination. All the symbolic imagery and events of the vision had passed before the mind of the prophet; but it was not till the question was asked which showed that the sanctuary and the host were "to be trodden under foot" during that vision, that any thing was said to Daniel.—The answer was addressed to him: "And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." (8: 13, 14.) This vision was seen "in the third year of the reign of king Belshāzzar;" the communications of the ninth chapter were made "in the first year of Darius, who was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans"—the former the last king of Babylon, the latter, in connection with Cyrus, the conqueror of Babylon. According to Usher and Prideaux, Belshazzar reigned seventeen years, which would make the vision precede the seventy weeks about fifteen years; according to Lightfoot, he reigned three years; and according to Scaliger, Dr. Hales, and the Canon of Ptolemy, he reigned five years, which makes the vision

precede the seventy weeks but about two years at the farthest, (See Townsend's Notes.)

The condition of the sanctuary is also a prominent item in the communication of the ninth chapter. The painful fact made known in the eighth is re-asserted, though more in detail: although the commandment should go forth "to restore and build Jerusalem," it should "be built in troublous times;" "the city and sanctuary" should be destroyed, after the Messiah was cut off, and remain "desolate even till the consummation.

(2.) Daniel tells us that Gabriel came to him, at the time the communications of the ninth chapter were announced, while he "was speaking in prayer."—9: 20, 21. The subject of his prayer was the condition and deliverance of the sanctuary: "O Lord, according to all thy righteousness, I beseech thee, let thine anger and thy fury be turned away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain: because for our sins and for the iniquities of our fathers, Jerusalem and thy people are become a reproach to all that are about us. Now, therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant, and his supplications, and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord's sake. O my God, incline thine ear, and hear; open thine eyes and behold our desolations, and the city which is called by thy name: for we do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousness, but for thy great mercies. O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive, O Lord, hearken and do; defer not, for thine own sake, O my God: for thy city and thy people are called by thy name." Dan. 9: 16—19.

The circumstances which led him to offer this

prayer, he makes known to us: "I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem. And I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplication, with fastings, and sackcloth, and ashes: and I prayed," &c.. 9: 2-4. While thus praying, Gabriel is commanded "to fly swiftly" "to show" him, as he was greatly beloved," and suddenly alights at his side. 9: 21-23. And the manner in which Gabriel proceeded, shows, very plainly, the mistake under which the prophet labored: "He touched me, and informed me, and talked with me, and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding." 9: 21, 22. By re-asserting the afflicting truth of the vision, upon the condition of the sanctuary as before stated, it is evident that Daniel supposed that the change in its condition which was predicted to take place at the end of the 2300 days, the period given as the duration of the vision, was to be realized at the end of the "seventy years" of Jeremiah. That the prophet was mistaken on some important point in the case, must be inferred from the mission of Gabriel "to show" him—to "give him skill and understanding." If he came for that special purpose it is evident that Daniel did not fully understand, as it was necessary he should, "the matter" in which he was so deeply interested. That he was not mistaken about the fulfilment of the word of the Lord to Jeremiah is evident, because Daniel says he "understood" that; and it is a fact of history that that event was about to be fulfilled. That the mistake arose from

connecting the vision with the prophecy of Jeremiah, in its termination, is also evident from the manner in which Gabriel calls the attention of Daniel to the means of correcting his error: "therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision." How could he "understand the matter" by considering the vision, unless his error consisted in the misapprehension of the vision? And if the misapprehension was of the nature we have supposed, nothing more was necessary to correct it than to consider the vision; for he must see by so doing that the events of the vision had not then taken place. As if the angel had said, Has Persia been conquered by Grecia? Has Grecia been divided to the four winds? Has that exceeding great horn come out of one of them, and waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land? Consider the vision! Instead of its termination with the seventy years,—Gabriel proceeds to show the prophet,—seventy sevens (weeks) of years of the vision are allotted for thy people, to fill up the measure of their iniquities by the rejection of the Messiah; the destruction of the city and sanctuary follows: and the desolation continues during the long period that remains, even to the consummation. Viewing this as the mistake of the prophet, the re-calling his attention to the vision, together with the repeating of its most painful fact, is seen at once to be the most natural and effectual mode of correcting it. Any other view makes a large part of what is said by the angel without meaning.

(3.) The mistake of Daniel, while it opens the way for the prophecy of the 70 weeks, furnishes

the occasion for Gabriel to complete the work he was commanded to do at the previous visit, that is, to make Daniel understand the vision, 8 : 16. And in doing this the great points of connection between the vision of the eighth, and the prophecy of the ninth chapters are made so apparent and distinct that it is a matter of surprise, when once understood, that they should have been so long unnoticed. First, they begin and end together. The beginning of each portion we have already pointed out:—the vision reaches to “the last end of the indignation,” (8 : 19.) when the fourth great form of worldly power “is broken without hand;” (8 : 25.) the prophecy of the ninth reaches “to the consummation.”—9 : 27.

Second. The seventy weeks are cut off from the longer period which reaches to the last end of the indignation, for the express purpose of sealing the vision, of which the longer period is the duration. The vision sealed is the vision Gabriel calls Daniel to consider; the vision about which Daniel was mistaken; and the vision in which Gabriel was seen by Daniel before. 8 : 15, 16. The old Geneva translation reads the clause in 9 : 21, “*The man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision.*” Dr. Hales translates it, “*The foregoing vision.*”

Third. By stating the event with which the seventy weeks were to begin, the point at which the vision was to begin was also stated; for as the seventy weeks were cut off from the period of the vision they must begin together, and as they begin together, the point at which one begins must be the point at which the other begins also.—That point is thus stated: “Know, therefore, and understand,

that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks." The statement of this fact, as the going forth of the commandment was an event yet future to the prophet, settled the question that the vision could not have run out, since the point at which it was to *begin* was yet future; and it also gave Daniel to understand an important point which he was not made to understand by Gabriel, at the time the vision was given, viz., where the vision was to begin.

This view of the connection of the two portions under consideration it is impossible to overthrow, because no other view can be adopted without supposing that Gabriel never did what he was plainly commanded to do, "*Make this man to understand the vision!*" (8:16.) As Daniel evidently did not understand it before the announcements of the ninth chapter were made to him, if that second visit of Gabriel was not for this purpose, it is not upon record that he ever obeyed that command.

The first intimation, to our knowledge, that the connection of these portions was perceived by interpreters, is found in the works of Mede.—See Dr. Hales' *New Analysis*, vol. 2, p. 566.

The earliest definite statement of this connection, which has fallen under our observation, is found in the works of Sir Isaac Newton. In speaking "of the prophecy of the seventy weeks," in their relation to the previous visions of Daniel, he says:—
"The prophecy of the *Son of Man* coming in the clouds of heaven relates to the second coming of Christ; that of the *Prince of the host* relates to his

first coming: and this prophecy of the Messiah, in explaining them, relates to both comings, and assigns the times thereof."—Newton on Daniel and the Apocalypse, p. 128. Lond. 1733.

It was published for the first time in the form in which it has of late been understood, making the longer period end in 1843, by Hans Wood, Esq., of R ssmead, Ireland, in 1787; and afterwards republished by Dr. Hales, with some additions, in 1799, 1803, and 1809. (New Anal. vol.2 pp. 564, 565, 1358) It has since been adopted, or regarded with favor, by many of the ablest writers in Europe. It is believed to be the only true scriptural explanation of these portions by thousands of the most sincere, devoted and intelligent Christians in our land, however they may have had all manner of evil said of them; no man has ever opposed this view without confessing, at the same time, both his ignorance of the word of God, and of the views of those whom he attempted to put to shame; and as certainly as this is the true view of "the matter," the deliverance of the one class and the overthrow of the other class, is now at the door!

III. Let us now endeavor to ascertain in what sense the 70 weeks were to seal the foregoing vision. We have seen that the phrase "to seal," or "to seal up," is used in the sense of making secret, and in the sense of making sure.—In what sense is it to be understood in this case? As the 70 weeks are admitted to be the plainest portion of the whole prophecy, it can hardly be supposed that they were designed to make the vision and prophecy a secret, for one can hardly conceive how that could be possible. Again. It is distinctly stated at the close of

the prophecy (12: 4, 9), that "the book"—"the words"—evidently comprehending the whole of the prophecy of Daniel, were "closed up and sealed till the time of the end," which is also shown to mean a short period before the end should actually come. (11: 40.) And the apostle, by mentioning circumstances which are distinctly found only in the case of Daniel, tells us it was revealed to him, that he ministered the truth for a future age of the church. (Comp. 1 Pet. 1: 10-12, and Dan. 12: 5-13) Although Daniel was made to understand that the vision was not to be fulfilled in his day; it is evident that all the parts of the prophecy were to remain a secret till about the time of its fulfilment: and so the Savior pointed out to the disciples the bearing of the ninth chapter upon the fate of Jerusalem, by telling them that when they saw the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place, to know that the desolation thereof was nigh. It cannot therefore be supposed that the 70 weeks were designed to make that a secret, which was so constructed in its nature, as to remain "closed up" until events should take place which, on comparing them with the prophecy, should afford such an increase of knowledge upon it, as would enable the wise—those who hear the word of God and do it—to understand more fully its bearing upon the final catastrophe of the prophetic drama—the end itself.

It is, then, only in the sense of making it certain and sure, that the seventy weeks are to be understood to seal the vision. By the exact fulfilment of that portion which was cut off from the great comprehensive view, to be marked by events of the

most deeply interesting and memorable character to the church and the world, the demonstration was to be given of the faithfulness of God in the fulfilment of the remaining portion, at the time appointed. The 70 weeks were "cut off"* from the whole period of the vision, the 2300 days, for this special purpose; and while their fulfilment was to

* A Hebrew scholar, of high reputation, makes the following remarks upon the word which is translated "determined," in our version.—"The verb *chathak* (in the Niphal form, passive, *nechtak*,) is found *only* in Daniel 9:24. Not another instance of its use can be traced in the entire Hebrew Testament. As Chaldaic and Rabbinical usage must give us the true sense of the word; if we are guided by these, it has the *single* signification of CUTTING, CUTTING OFF. In the Chaldeo-Rabbinic Dictionary of Stockius, the word '*chathak*' is thus defined:—

"'Scidit, abscidit, conscidit, inscidit, excidit'—*To cut, to cut away, to cut in pieces, to cut or engrave, to cut off.*

"Mercerus, in his '*Thesaurus*,' furnishes a specimen of Rabbinical usage in the phrase *chashikah shel-basar*—'a piece of flesh,' or 'a cut of flesh.' He translates the word as it occurs in Dan. 9:24, by '*præcisa est*'—*WAS CUT OFF.*

"In the literal version of Arias Montanus, it is translated '*decisa est*,'—*WAS CUT OFF*; in the marginal reading, which is grammatically correct, it is rendered by the plural, '*decisæ sunt*'—*were cut off.*

"In the Latin version of Junius and Tremellius, *nechtak* is rendered '*decisæ sunt*'—*were cut off.*

"Again, in Theodotion's Greek version of Daniel, (which is the version used in the Vatican copy of the Septuagint as being the most faithful,) it is rendered by *sunetmethesan*, '*were cut off*,' and in the Venetian copy by *tetmentai*, '*have been cut.*' The idea

be the assurance of the faithfulness of God, their fulfilment as weeks of years, shows that the period from which they were to be cut off is also to be understood to express in days the number of years to be filled up by the events of the vision; which, indeed, the vision itself sufficiently proves, inas-

of cutting off is pursued in the Vulgate; where the phrase is 'abbreviatae sunt,' have been shortened.

"Thus *Chaldaic and Rabbinical authority, and that of the earliest versions, the Septuagint and Vulgate, give the SINGLE SIGNIFICATION OF CUTTING OFF TO THIS VERB.*

"Hengstenberg, who enters into a critical examination of the original text, says,—'But the very use of the word, which does not elsewhere occur, while others, much more frequently used, were at hand, if Daniel had wished to express the idea of determination, and of which he has elsewhere, and even in this portion, availed himself; seems to argue, that the word stands from regard to its original meaning, and represents the seventy weeks in contrast with a determination of time (*en platei*) as a period cut off from subsequent duration, and accurately limited.'—*Christology of the Old Test. v. 2, p. 301. Washington, 1839.*"

Sir Isaac Newton reads it, "Seventy weeks are cut out upon thy people."—On which he gives this note in the margin: "Cut upon. A phrase in *Hebrew* taken from the practice of numbering by cutting notches."—*Newton on Daniel, p. 129.*

Sir I. Newton is followed by Benjamin Ben Mordecai in his Apology. *Letters 2, 3, 4, pp. 162-166. London. 1773.*

Thomas' Translation of the Bible reads it, "Seventy weeks are set apart." *Phil. 1808.*

How much the original word here used puzzled the early fathers, may be seen in the "Six-fold commentary on Daniel," pp. 284, 285. 1608.

much as the supremacy of the shortest dynasty comprehended in the vision—that of Alexander—occupied more than 2300 literal days.

Was that portion, the 70 weeks, so fulfilled? and have we the means of pointing out the time of its fulfilment, so that we may also point out the time for the fulfilment of that portion of the vision which remains, and which extends to the end, the last end of the indignation? That the 70 weeks received an exact fulfilment, we hardly need to say a word to prove. No fact has been made more evident, so far as we are able to ascertain the date of the events in Persian and Roman history, which are connected with the beginning and end of this period; no fact of the fulfilment of prophecy has been more generally admitted. The terms in which the argument afforded by its fulfilment is spoken of, by our old defenders of the Christian faith, are these: "It is the corner stone of Christianity;" "it is the unanswerable argument;" and in every contest of Christianity with Judaism, the former has had only to point to that prophecy, to the facts of the gospel history, and the history of the Jews, to put to silence her inveterate and malicious adversary.

The fact of an exact chronological fulfilment is evidently pointed out by our Lord himself, and also by the apostles: when "the Messiah" entered upon his public ministry, he cited us to "the time" of that event, as pointed out in this prophecy by these words, "The time is fulfilled." Mark 1: 15. As he passed along through his life of suffering to "the hour" when he was to be "cut off," on several occasions when the restless malice of his enemies had plotted his death, the reason given why

he does not permit them "to kill him," as they did in the end, is this, "the hour is not yet come"—"my time is not yet." But when his earthly mission was about to end in his violent death, we are informed of it in these words: "Now before the feast of the passover, when Jesus knew that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the father" (John 13 1,) he goes "forth to the garden;" the priestly mob "cometh thither, with lanterns, and torches, and weapens;" no resistance is permitted; he tells them he is the one they seek, and they lead him as the lamb to the slaughter. Paul also, in speaking of his death, tells us that "in due time (margin *according to the time*) Christ died." Rom. 5:6. And Peter informs us that the Spirit of Christ in the prophets signified to them that there was a time to be known for the "sufferings of Christ," as well as for his glory. 1 Pet. 1:10, 11.

The fact of an exact fulfilment of the time given for the sufferings of Christ, being thus established, the only difficulty that has arisen is found in fixing with precision the date of the decree with which the 70 weeks begin, and of the facts of history connected with its fulfilment.—The extremes of difference upon the date of the decree of Artaxerxes with which the 70 weeks begin, are B. C. 457—453. The extremes of difference in the date of the public announcement of "the Messiah"—the only event clearly designated to mark the fulfilment of the time, and the only event clearly connected with chronological facts in the gospel history—are from A. D 25—29.

It is well known that in our former calculation

the earliest dates in each case for which there was any good authority was adopted—the dates inserted in the margin of the English polyglot Bible. And these dates we are bound before God and men to regard as the true dates, unless their incorrectness were pointed out by some competent hand, or it should be shown by the passing of the time.

Suppose, now, that when Mr. Miller published his views of the prophecies, he had spoken in this manner: "Here are the times, at the end of which Christ is to appear and the judgment to take place; here are the events with which these times begin; and here are the dates for these events, given by good and competent men, as the world all admit: I believe Christ will come at the end of these times; I believe they begin with the events named; but in the dates given we can place no confidence—they may be correct and they may not; we should have nothing to do with them." Who could have respected his consistency, or believed in his sincerity if he had pursued such a course? Who would not have felt that he had defamed the memory of the worthy men who fixed these dates? We were bound to receive these as the true dates; to profess our faith accordingly to the world; and we should thank God that we are enabled to take a position in harmony with that profession. It is the best pledge that he will be with us when the event does come.

There is data, however, of an entirely different character from that on which we have relied, though it harmonizes with it in the main: it is derived from the word and works of God, i. e. from

the connection of the facts of the gospel history with facts of astronomy.

It is well known that the practical astronomer can calculate the time of an eclipse, whether past or future, with the utmost precision, so that if any event in the past has been connected with an eclipse, the circumstances of which will enable an astronomer to calculate the time at which it occurred, the date of that event may be determined with equal precision. And though we may be dependent upon the testimony of historians for the knowledge of an eclipse, it must be seen at once, that on such a fact they would be the least likely to prevaricate; and a falsehood in the case of an eclipse could be as easily detected almost as if we had been living at the time the event may be said to have occurred. It may, for instance, be proved to be an impossibility that the supernatural darkness, at the time of the crucifixion, could have been occasioned by an eclipse. So, also, in the case of the celebrated eclipse of Thales; different dates have been supposed by historians, as the time of that eclipse, ranging from B. C. 607, to B. C. 585. But it has been settled by Maher, Costard, and Stukely, that it could have been no other than the solar eclipse of B. C. 603. (Dr. Hales' Chron. B. I. pp. 12, 182, 184.

Have we then, any facts of this kind—any eclipses—to enable us to determine the date of any of the events on which the calculation of the prophetic periods depend? I think it will be seen that the date of the fulfilment of the 2300 days and the seventy weeks, of Daniel eighth and ninth, may be determined by such facts. It must be seen that we

only have to fix the date of any one of the events, which marks the fulfilment of any one of the divisions of the longer period, in order to settle the date of the fulfilment of any other division, and of course of the end itself.

Sixty-nine weeks of the 70 were to extend "unto the Messiah the Prince." This must apply to the time when his Messiahship should be publicly made known and duly authenticated. His public manifestation as the Messiah, took place at his baptism: for he was not known as the Messiah, to the people generally (Luke 3:15); or even by John the Baptist, his natural cousin, as men count relationship, until his baptism. John came especially for the purpose of preparing the Jewish nation to receive him; he was to point him out to them; and it was by the miraculous descent and appearance of the Holy Ghost that the Messiahship of Jesus was to be attested to John, and this took place at the baptism. These facts are fully stated by the evangelists: John 1:19—34; Luke 3:21, 22.

The public manifestation of the Messiah at his baptism marked the termination of the 69th week, and the beginning of the 70th. It is the date of this event, within a certain boundary, that we are able to determine by the facts of astronomy. Luke testifies (3:1—3, 21, 23) that the ministry of John the Baptist began "in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar;" and that the baptism of Christ, by John, took place when he was "about thirty years of age."

And here it shall be shown, that our "mistake," about which so much is said, originated in a false criticism upon this testimony of St. Luke.

Some of the commentators and chronologists, in order to establish the chronology of the gospel history by the doubtful catalogues of the Greek Olympiads and Roman consulships, make this testimony of Luke refer to the *associate* reign of Tiberius with Augustus, which commenced a few years before the death of the latter. But there certainly is no authority for this in the original, as Hegstenberg and others have already shown; and it was so obviously the design of Luke to give the chronological clue to the ministry of John, and the baptism of Christ, that if he had meant the associated reign of Tiberius, he must have expressed himself in language that could not be misunderstood. He gives "the year of the reign," or government of the emperor, the name of the governor, the tetrachs of the different parts of Palestine, and the high priests; and the same word is used in the original to express the character of the official relation of Pontius Pilate to Judea, that is used to express that of Tiberius to the state with which he was connected; the same that is used to express that of Cyrenius to Syria, Luke 2:2: there is, therefore, no more reason to suppose an associated relation to the office is intended in one case than in the other. We therefore receive the testimony of Luke in its plain and obvious meaning; and refer it to the sole reign of Tiberius. As to the Olympic and Consular Tables extant, as they are made up of shreds and patches, the original records or inscriptions being lost, no reliance can be placed upon the date of an event connected with them, as to a definite year, which is abundantly evident from the discordant tables of different chronologists.

The commencement "of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar" is determined by an eclipse of the moon to have been in August, A. D. 14. The circumstances of the case were these.—At the death of Augustus Cæsar, the predecessor of Tiberius, a part of the imperial army, called the Pannonian Legions, refused to acknowledge the authority of the latter, and were in a state of revolt from the time they heard of the death of Augustus, till the eclipse, which was the means of quelling the sedition. (See Jarvis' *Int. to Hist. of the Church*, p. 251.)

Here, then, the place where the eclipse was seen is stated; and the month and day on which Augustus died being known, as the mutiny and eclipse followed that event immediately, the time of the year in which it must have happened is easily determined. The only eclipse marked in the astronomical tables, as the one here referred to, took place Sept. 26th, A. D. 14. (See *Fer. Astron. Dr. Hales' Chron. &c. &c.*)

Another and still more remarkable eclipse enables us also to fix the true date of the reign of Tiberius: it is the "great eclipse" of the sun which took place at the time of the battle of Actium. A few days before the battle in which Antony and Cæsar fought for the supremacy of the world, and while the armies were marshalled on the plains of Actium, the sun set in an eclipse;* (probably the most remarkable that ever occurred) so that there can be no difficulty in ascertaining when it took place. By this eclipse it is known that the battle of Actium was fought Sept. 2, B. C. 31. As Cæ-

* Ferguson's *Astron.* vol. 1, pp. 213, 214. Brewster's Ed. 1821.

sar was triumphant, the battle of Actium was made one of the epochs from which his reign was computed. He reigned *within a few days of forty-four years after the battle*. And forty-four full years, beginning Sept. 2, B. C. 31, extend to Sept. 2, A. D. 14. The death of Augustus Cæsar took place Aug. 19, A. D. 14. (Memoirs of the Court of Augustus, vol. 3, p. 550. Lon. 1763. Gillie's Hist. of the World, vol. 3, p. 474, 475.)

By this data, then, the sole reign of Tiberius must have begun August 19th, A. D. 14. His fifteenth year must have extended from August A. D. 28, to August 29, and some time during that year, "the word of God came unto John the son of Zecharias in the wilderness, and he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." The baptism of Christ must have taken place, therefore, after August 19th, A. D. 28, and thus we have the *earliest* boundary fixed for the period in which the last week of the 70 began.

The other boundary is marked by the connection of the birth of Christ with the death of Herod, which is also designated by an eclipse. Matthew informs us, (2 : 1, 13—20,) that "Jesus was born in Bethlehem, of Judea, in the days of Herod the king;" that "the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream, saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and flee into the land of Egypt, and be thou there until I bring thee word: for Herod will seek the young child to destroy him;" that "when he arose, he took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt, and was there until the death of Herod;" that "when Herod saw

that he was mocked of the wise men, he was exceeding wroth, and sent forth and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and all the coasts thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had diligently inquired of the wise men ;" that "when Herod was dead, an angel of the Lord appeared in a dream to Joseph in Egypt, saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and go into the land of Israel for they are dead which sought the young child's life.

Now it is well known that Josephus, who gives the details of the history of Herod's life and reign, states that some of the transactions in his last sickness were marked by an eclipse of the moon." And there are no other eclipses but those of two years, concerning which there can be any dispute as to that referred to by Josephus. One of these took place March 11th, B. C. 4; the others, January 8th, and December 28th, B. C. 1,—the one in January a "total" eclipse. Between these there was none visible in Judea, nor was there a total eclipse for more than two years after.*

* Strauchius, in speaking of the eclipse of B. C. 4, says, "Another such eclipse happened a year before the vulgar epocha of Christ."—Brev. Chron. pp. 351, 352, Lon. 1704. Mr. D. Young, of N. J., gives the following more detailed "astronomical calculation" for the period in question: "The visible eclipses of the moon at Jerusalem, from Julian Period 4710 to J. P. 4716 inclusive, with the vulgar year of the Christian Era.

J. P.	C. E.	
4710	B. C. 4	March 11, visible.
4711	" 3	No eclipse of the moon this year.
4712	" 2	None visible.

But if the eclipse which marked the death of Herod took place B. C. 4, and Christ had been born at the very time of the eclipse, he must have been full thirty in A. D. 27, March 11th, more than a year before the 15th of Tiberius began; the last week of the seventy must have begun in that year, and ended A. D. 34, and of course the whole period must have ended in 1844. Time has proved that that cannot be the eclipse of which Josephus speaks.

But the eclipse which determines the date of the battle of Actium, enables us also to determine the latest possible date for the death of Herod. Josephus tells us that Herod reigned thirty-seven years from the time he was made king at Rome; and that the battle of Actium took place in "the seventh year of his reign."* Supposing a half of his sev-

J. P.	B. B.	
4713	" 1	January 2, visible and total.
4713	" 1	Dec 28, partly visible.
4714	A.D. 1	None visible.
4715	" 2	November 3, visible.
4716	" 3	May 3, visible and total.

* Jos. Ant. Book 17 chap. 8, sec. 1; Wars, B. 1, c. 33, s. 8; Ant. B. 15, c. 5, ss. 1, 2; c. 6, s. 1; Wars, B. 19, c. 9, ss. 1, 3; c. 20, s. 1. The translator of Josephus, in a note on the statement of his author, says: "This *seventh* year of the reign of Herod, and all the other years of his reign, in Josephus, are dated from the death of Antigonus, or at the soonest, from the conquest of Antigonus, and the taking of Jerusalem a few months before, and never from his first obtaining the kingdom at Rome, above three years before." All this would be true if we must adopt the supposition of Whiston, that the eclipse of B. C. 4 marked the death of Herod. However, this would

enth year to have passed at the time of the battle,— which is the most that can be supposed, as it was “after a most dangerous winter voyage, with the hazard of his life, and loss of his baggage, he arrived early in the spring” at Rome;* and tarried there “only seven days,”† at the time he was made king,—there would remain thirty and a half years of the thirty-seven after the battle of Actium. That took place Sept. 2, B. C. 31. Thirty years beginning at that date would extend to Sept. 2, B. C. 1. The remaining half year would extend to March of the next year, A. D. 1. The eclipse that marked the death of Herod, could not, therefore, be earlier or later than B. C. 1. As there were two eclipses in that year, one in January, the other in December; and as we wish to obtain the *latest* boundary for the period, in which the date of the baptism of Christ could fall, we will suppose the last eclipse of that year to be the one mentioned by Josephus, which marked the death of Herod.

By referring to the above testimony of Matthew, it will be seen that two important facts are settled.

1. That Herod was living when Christ was born.
2. That the hasty flight into Egypt to elude the malice of Herod, and the return to the land of Israel after his death, were while the Savior was a “young child;” and therefore Herod could

carry the seventh year after his being made king, and also the year of his death, some three years earlier, and as we wish to ascertain the latest possible date for the death of Herod, we place the battle of Actium in the seventh year after his being made king at Rome.

* *Mémoire of the Court of Augustus*, vol. 2, p. 394.

† Josephus, *Ant. B.* 14, chap. 14, s. 5.

not have lived a great while after the birth of Christ.

And now, to put the matter in the worst light possible, if Christ had been born at the time of this last eclipse, and had been full thirty at the time of his baptism, he could not have been baptized later than December, A.D. 30. We are therefore brought, by this most decisive view of the question, to a period of about two years and four months, within which Christ must have been baptized, and the last week of the seventy begun; and according to this view, the *latest* point to which the seventy weeks could extend is December, A.D. 37; and the latest point to which the whole period could extend is December, 1847—a point not two years in the future. The whole period which extends to

the end is	-	-	2300 years.
From this deduct 69 weeks, or			483 "

And there remain	-	-	1817 "
------------------	---	---	--------

As this remaining part of the whole period, beginning with the last weeks of the 70, at the baptism of Christ, must have begun between August, A.D. 28, and December, A.D. 30, so it must end between August, A.D. 1845, and December, 1847.

	1817		1817
Added to A.D.	28	Added to A.D.	30
	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>		<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>
Extend to	1845	Extend to	1847

But all the time the birth of Christ preceded the eclipse, and all the time that Christ was short of 30 at his baptism, must bring the termination of the 70 weeks, and of the whole period so much earlier. If Christ was baptized any time in A.D. 29, the

whole period must terminate in 1846. And the most natural view we can take of all the facts stated by the evangelists, make it very probable that the termination falls more than a year before the latest point here referred to. The decree of Herod by which he intended to secure the Savior as his victim, was framed according to the time which he had diligently inquired of the wise men what time the star appeared,—and as the decree provided for the slaughter of all the children in the coasts of Bethlehem, “*from two years old and under,*” since Herod must have been living at the time he “sent forth” the decree, it is reasonable to suppose that Christ was born not less than *one year*, nor more than “*two,*” before the issuing of the decree. But if Christ was born only one year before the eclipse, and was less than thirty at his baptism, the end must come more than a year before December, 1847. And when we remember that the eclipse of January, as it was a “total” eclipse, is quite as likely to be the one which marked the death of Herod, the end is crowded so much the nearer. It hardly seems possible that it can pass beyond 1846. Indeed, we have already passed so far into the period, within the limits of which the end must fall, according to the data here given, we should not put off the end a single hour.

With this termination of the 70 weeks, and of course of the longer period of which they are a part, agrees the opinion of one of the most profound Biblical critics of the age, Hengstenberg. Without any reference to the question in which we are so deeply interested, but to vindicate the faithfulness of God against the objections and cavils of neologists,

in reference to the fulfillment of the 70 weeks, he uses this very proper though strong language:—
 “The prophecy itself bears all the marks of chronological definiteness. The commencement and termination are not fluctuating, but designated by strictly limited events. The whole period of 70 weeks is not only divided into three parts of 7, 62, and 1 week, but also this latter into two halves.—
How could this happen, if no regard was paid to half a hundred years, more or less? God himself would have given occasion to doubt his word, if a prophecy, bearing all the marks of chronological definiteness, were proved by the fulfilment to be indefinite.”—(*Christology*, vol. 2, p. 380, Wash. 1839.) He dates the commencement of the 70 weeks “in the *third month* of the civil year,” a part of our November and December, “455 before Christ.”—*Ib.* p. 387, 389, 394.) This would bring us to the same point in the year 1846 for the termination of the 2300 years.

That the apostles regarded the fulfilment of the prophecies which referred to the first advent, as a pledge of the fulfilment of those which refer to his second advent; and the fulfilment of the time, according to which he was to suffer, an “assurance” that the time, according to which he is to appear in glory, will be as strictly fulfilled, we think must appear very evident from a few citations. The arguments from the fulfilment of the first advent prophecies to enjoin or encourage faith in the second advent prophecies, abound in the New Testament. A few specimens may be found in the following places: Acts 3:12-26; 10: 34-43; 13; 23-47; 1 Cor. 15: 1-11; 2 Tim. 1: 8-12; Titus 2: 11-15;

3:4—8. Some of the portions which refer directly to the time of "the sufferings of Christ," and the time of "his appearing in glory" may be considered more at length: "But those things which God before had showed by the mouth of his prophets, that Christ should suffer he hath so fulfilled.—" "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: whom the heaven must receive, until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the word began." Acts 3:18—21.

As God had showed by his prophets the time for Christ to suffer, to which Peter himself testifies, in another place, which we shall presently consider, this must have been a prominent feature in the fulfilment which he here affirms to have taken place. And it is the exact fulfilment of the things which God had showed to his prophets, as to the sufferings of Christ, which is made the ground of the Apostle's earnest exhortation to repent and be converted, that they might share in the blessings to be enjoyed when he shall send Jesus Christ,—when the times of refreshing—the times of restitution of all things should come, of which God had also spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began. Now as we are told immediately that "the priests, and the captain of the temple, and the sarducees," were grieved that the people were taught through Jesus the resurrection from the dead, in this case, it must be that the refreshing and restitution comprehended "the resurrection;" and when

“the times” for this shall come, He who “so fulfilled” his word in the past “shall send Jesus Christ:” the times, therefore, refer to the second advent; and the faithfulness of God in the fulfilled promise, as to the time, is the pledge for that which is unfulfilled, when the time for it shall come.

Again, Paul views the raising of Christ from the dead, as a “given assurance,” on the part of God, that “he has appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by” him. Acts 17:31. How could that event become an assurance of such an appointment, unless both events, the resurrection of Christ, and the judgment, were embraced in the times before appointed, (v.26.) which God “hath determined,” and the fulfilment of one event, at the appointed time, were considered the proof that the other would also be fulfilled when the appointed time for it should arrive?

But the other testimony of Peter, before alluded to, is still more clear and direct. It was the stated purpose of the apostle, as he tells us, to prove that it was “the true grace of God” in which “the strangers” stood, to whom he wrote. Compare 1 Peter 1: 1, and 5: 12. He points out therefore, *first*, their position: “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time. Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season (if need be) ye are in heaviness through

manifold temptations: that the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise, and honor, and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ: whom having not seen, ye love: in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable, and full of glory: receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls."—1 Pet. 1: 3—9.

Secondly, he shows that their position was marked by the prophets, as that of the subjects of "the grace" of which they spake: "of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which is in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, and not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you, with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, which things the angels desire to look into." vs. 10—12. What is here said of these prophets, though their words are not quoted, is found to exist distinctly in no other case but that of Daniel, therefore he must be particularly referred to by the Apostle:—(1.) Their being made acquainted with the fact that they ministered to a future age of the Church, in what they spake, is particularly striking in the case of Daniel. 8: 26, 27; 12: 4, 9, 10. (2.) The anxiety and interest of "the angels" in "the things" spoken, so remarkably prominent in the prophecy of Daniel, (see

Dan. 7th, to 12th,) is not thus brought to view any where else. (3.) To these prophets it was "signified by the spirit of Christ which was in them," that some mysterious "manner of time" was to be observed "in the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow," "when it testified beforehand" of these things.—This is found only in the prophecy of Daniel. 7:13, 14; 8:25; 9:25, 26; 12:1-7, 11-13. And lest any one should insist that "the glory" had already been realized, (for it is considered no fanaticism to declare all these prophecies of a state of glory to be fulfilled, if by so doing "Millerism" can be destroyed,) Peter tells us it was future in his day, and to be realized "when the Chief Shepherd shall appear." 1 Pet. 5 1-11.

Third. Having pointed out their position, and having showed that it was sustained by the word of God, he proceeds to exhort them as follows: "Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ. . . . And if ye call on the Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man's work, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear: forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: who verily was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you, who by him do believe in God, that raised him up from

the dead, and gave him glory; that your faith and hope might be in God." 1 Pet. 1:13, 17-21.

Here it is, now, that the apostle declares, that the special design of the *manifestation* of Christ in these last times—and he uses the same word that John the Baptist uses, when he says, "that he should be made *manifest* to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water," (John 1:31)—was "for them who by him do believe in God," that their "faith," "which is to be found unto praise, and honor, and glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ;" and their "hope," which looks "to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, ready to be revealed in the last *time*, might be in God." The grace already received was the ground on which he exhorts them "to hope unto the end, for the grace that is to be brought unto us at the appearing of Jesus Christ." And since it was the exact fulfilment of the time signified to the prophets by the Spirit of Christ, for his manifestation to suffer, which was designed to establish the faith and hope which look to his appearing in glory; his appearing in glory must also take place at the time signified by his Spirit to the same prophets for its accomplishment. The 2300 years, which express the time during which the sanctuary and the host—the church and her inheritance—are to be trodden under foot, is the time for the glorious appearing; and the fulfilment of the 70 weeks, gives us the assurance that this period is about to be accomplished. That the glorious appearing is then to take place is asserted by "the man clothed in linen," with the oath of God; for referring to the time given for the political dispersion "of the holy people," he de-

clares that when God shall have accomplished that prediction, the exaltation of Michael, who is Christ, the resurrection of the righteous and their glorification shall take place. Dan. 12:1-7. And again, "when the Lord buildeth up Zion he shall appear in his glory."

Here, then, is the result of "the unanswerable argument," in its bearing upon the termination of the vision. To me it appears as clear and certain that Our Blessed Lord will appear in his glory, before we reach the latest boundary here pointed out for the termination of the 2300 years, as that the 69 weeks terminated at the public manifestation of Christ to Israel, as the Messiah, which took place at his baptism.

Reader, are you prepared for this fulfilment? If not, unless you can show that this portion of the word of God means something different which is more worthy of confidence, what have you to sustain you in that day? By the word of God you and I must stand or fall for eternity! I believe this is what it teaches; if I am in error, I will thank any man to point it out, though as every attempted explanation which differed materially from this has been confessedly deficient, so that this is the more strongly commended as the truth; let me therefore entreat you to lose no time in the work of preparation. Take the position which will prove safe under the worst that may come, "for behold, the Judge standeth at the door!"

LECTURE III.

Harmonious Termination of the Prophetic Periods.

“ And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days. Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days.

But go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days.”—**Dan. 12: 11—13.**

Those who are acquainted with the earlier termination of the prophetic periods, according to the calculation of Mr. Miller, and others, will remember that the remarkable harmony in their termination was considered a strong confirmation of the correctness of the calculation. And now, whenever a different calculation, or a later termination, of any one of them is proposed, the question at once arises, “What do you do with the other periods?” The most important of the prophetic periods, excepting the 2300 days—the latest termination of which has already been given—are now to be considered. In doing this, we may explain, first, the promise given personally to the prophet, in the text; and, secondly, endeavor to ascertain when that promise is to be fulfilled.

I. The promise to Daniel is to be explained. The nature of this promise is indicated by the more general statement of the time for its fulfilment—"the end." "Go thou thy way *till the end be*;" which implies that the promise could not be realized "till the end." Now we know that throughout this prophecy, and, indeed, throughout the Bible, unless some special arrangement in the context is referred to, *the end* is the common phrase by which the termination of the present state of things is designated. Dan. 6:26; 7:26; 8:17, 19; 12:4, 6-9. And we know very well what is to be the lot, the portion, the inheritance, of the saints of God when the end comes.—This prophecy has made that all plain: "But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion to consume and to destroy it unto the end. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him."—Dan. 7:26, 27. Comp vs. 17, 18, 21, 22.

Again: the nature of the promise is indicated by stating the condition of the prophet until it should be realized.—"Thou shalt rest." And this must mean, that Daniel should be in the state of the righteous dead, their state from the time of their death till the resurrection of the just. For although "there is a rest," a keeping of sabbath, "that remains for the people of God," as this is to come after our probationary state is finished, and therefore we must "labor to enter into it;" and as that spoken of in the case of Daniel is to continue till that sabbath begins, it must denote the rest of the departed saints.

In the same manner Isaiah speaks of the righteous who are taken away, who go in peace: "they shall rest in their beds." 57: 1, 2. And so it is said to them that were slain for the word of God, whose souls were under the altar, when they cried, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" "*rest yet* for a little season," which implies that they were already in that state of rest. Now, as it was said to Daniel, "Thou shalt rest and stand in thy lot at the end of the days," this promise cannot be fulfilled till the grave gives up the dead who die in the Lord. The promise refers, therefore, necessarily to the immortal inheritance—the everlasting kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ.

This is made more evident, thirdly, by the terms of the promise itself. Literally it reads, "Thou shalt rest, and stand up for (i. e. to receive) thy lot at the end of the days. It does not express the idea of actual possession, like a man standing up in his field or dwelling, but that of taking a position to receive a possession. And that can never be done by any child of God in this state of things. It never has been, it never can be, that they shall receive an inheritance here; "For here we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come." Heb. 13:14. There is but one character for the people of God to sustain, or that they ever have sustained, with His approbation: it is that of "strangers and pilgrims on the earth."—Wherever they may have been, or may now be "on the earth," this is their true character. They may, like Abraham, be "blessed in all things" as to this world; like Moses, be heirs to all the treasures of Egypt; or,

like David, sit upon the throne itself; but, like Abraham, they will have "none inheritance" here, though the promise on which their faith lays hold may assure them they are "after" to receive even this "for inheritance," and so they will look for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God; like Moses, they will have such respect to the recompense of reward, that they will esteem the reproach of Christ and affliction with the people of God, even if they should be hated slaves, more desirable than the pleasures of sin, and greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt; or, like David, they will exclaim, when they look to the kingdom of their Father, "O that I had the wings of a dove, that I might fly away and be at rest!" On the other hand, they may be as poor as Lazarus at the rich man's gate, and as much afflicted, but as they feel sure that they are, in due time, to reign with Christ for ever and ever, to exchange their place among the dogs to become equal to the angels, to leave their crumbs and eat bread in the kingdom of God, they will endure as seeing the invisible, and glory in their tribulations. Be it as it may with the people of God, their portion, their inheritance, is not here: they cannot receive it till the Great Heir, with whom they are joint heirs, sits in the throne of his glory, and all nations are gathered before him, and he shall say to the righteous, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

This view of the promise identifies Daniel with the subjects of the promise, in the previous verses of this chapter,—those who are to rise out of the

dust of the earth to everlasting life, those who are to shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars for ever and ever. This accounts also for the question proposed by Daniel in verse eighth, when, after hearing the promise of the resurrection and glorification of the righteous, with other events, and the statement of the time when they were to be finished, he says, "O my Lord, what shall be the end of these wonders?" The answer, so far it is contained in the text, shows that he wished to know, like the martyrs under the altar, when his hopes were to be realized? And here it may be worthy of remark, that the several periods which refer directly to the end, are connected in their termination with different events: that in the eighth chapter with the cleansing of the sanctuary; that in the seventh verse of this twelfth chapter, though it refers to that of the eighth, to the deliverance of the righteous—all that are found written in the book; and this period now under consideration, to the rewarding of the prophet himself. That these periods end together is evident, from the fact that he whose right it is to reign is to take the throne of his father David, and restore again the kingdom to Israel, when the sanctuary is cleansed, or justified, i. e. no longer trodden under foot; and then all the heirs are to be gathered together unto him, being changed into his image, that they may "enter the kingdom of God."

II. When is that promise to be fulfilled? "At the end of the days." What days? "The thousand three hundred and five and thirty days." When do these end? In 1335 days, or years, "from the time that the daily [sacrifice] shall be

taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up." Now if it can be shown what these things are, called "the daily," and "the abomination that maketh desolate;" and when the event in their history here pointed out took place, it may also be shown when these days end. What, then, are "the daily," and "the abomination that maketh desolate?" They are mentioned in the eleventh chapter of this prophecy, which gives the prophetic history of the great forms of this world's iniquity and of the people of God, down to the period of their deliverance: "And arms shall stand on his part, (i. e. of the king of the north, v. 29,) and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily [sacrifice] and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate," v. 31. Here the things are spoken of, and also the event in their history which is made the starting point in the fulfilment of the periods given in the text—the 1290 and 1335 days.

The same things are also brought to view in the vision of the eighth chapter, as giving character to all the great organizations that tread the sanctuary and the host under foot during that vision.—Of the third power, whose history is given in that vision as a horn which waxed exceeding great, and can apply to no other power but Rome, it is said, "By him the daily was taken away," v. 11; "and an host was given him against the daily," v. 12; which is the same idea as that of chap. 11: 31, already quoted. And the character they give to the whole vision is thus brought to view: "How long the vision, the daily, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trod-

den under foot?" We omit the supplied words in quoting, and the reader will see that the word "sacrifice," in each case, is supplied by the translators. It evidently obscures the sense. (See A, Appendix.)

Let us now inquire what two things, one of which existed in the days of the prophet—"the daily"—have instigated and given character to the great powers of this world which have oppressed and persecuted the church—"the host"—of God? But one answer can be given to this question, either from the word of God, or from history.—They are Paganism and Popery. Paganism began the work; (Lev. 26: 33, 38; Deut. 28: 36.) it was Paganism that cast Daniel into the den of lions, and his brethren into the fiery furnace; and its active and murderous hostility to the people of God was continued until it was forced to give place to its great moral successor—Popery. The same view of the relation of Paganism and Popery to the church is given by Paul, in terms about the application of which there is scarcely room to mistake. He speaks directly of "the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."—the day of Christ; and it is his purpose to correct the "troubled mind" of the Thessalonians, who supposed that day was (*eneste ken, immediately*) at hand. And here, it is worthy of remark, we have the only argument ever given by an apostle with a design to prove that the Lord might not come at any time, so that if this argument is no longer of force in the case, none can be given with the authority of the apostle against his coming at this present time. Of what force, then, are the unauthorized assertions of our adversaries, but to prove that event to be near?

The apostle shows that there was to come "a falling away first," and that the man of sin must be revealed, the son of perdition, "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." It appears Paul had made this a subject of conversation. He says: "Remember ye not, that when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth (or hindereth) that he might be revealed in his time." No other "time" is given for the revelation of this man of sin but in the prophecy of Daniel. The Apostle goes on: "For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth (or hindereth) will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming."—2 Thess. 2: 1-8.

It is said to be a historical fact, (see Dr. Clarke on Thess.) that the apostolic church understood the pagan Roman empire to be meant as that which hindered the revelation of the son of perdition; and that they actually prayed for its continuance, cruel as it was in persecuting them, because they knew it was to be followed by a still more bloody and cruel enemy. And it is still more certain that this "Man of Sin," of whom Paul speaks, has been applied to Popery, "constantly for more than twelve hundred years, by the church of God."—(*Gaussen.*)

The same view is also given by the Revelator.—The great red dragon who makes war in his wrath

against "the remnant, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ," is pagan Rome. Rev. 12: To the beast who continues the "war," the dragon gives "his power, and his seat, and great authority." Rev. 13: 2-8. The seat of the dragon's power was the city of Rome. No other power, that agrees with the description of that beast, has claimed that city as its seat, since the fall of the Roman empire, but the Papacy. Here is the united testimony of three great prophets, Daniel, Paul, and John. The established application of the testimony of Paul and John fixes that of Daniel. If any farther proof is wanting, it is found in the unanimous voice of history, secular and ecclesiastical; papal, protestant, and infidel. And none is so clear as the papal, because the more strenuously they defend their blasphemous assumptions, the more fully do they show that the prophecy applies to them.

The daily, or existing, abomination of the days of Daniel and Paul being thus shown to be Paganism; and the abomination that maketh desolate being Popery, the question arises, To what event in their history does the prophecy refer, as the point at which these periods begin? It is to the declining of one and the rising of the other as the desolator of the people of God: "They (the arms) shall take away: the pagan enemy, "and place the" papal;—the pagan "will hinder" the revelation of popery, until paganism "be taken out of the way, and then shall" popery "be revealed," to oppose and exalt itself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped.

Let us now inquire, Has this change taken place? and if it has, whether we can ascertain by what

agents, and at what time it was effected? That the blasphemies and murderous cruelties of the Papacy have succeeded to those of Paganism, is as evident as that the sun shines. That this change was to take place after the division of the Roman empire, is evident from the fact, that "the great red dragon," the symbol of pagan Rome, had "ten horns," the same number as the papal beast, which denote the ten kings or kingdoms into which the empire was divided. The fall of the empire is dated A.D. 476; and that it fell by pagan conquerors is known to all the world. The event for which we are inquiring must therefore be found at a later point of time than this.

Now if we can ascertain when the abominations of the Papacy, that combination of all abominations, were known to exist; and when its work of desolation was fairly begun, we can also point out the latest point of time for the event referred to in the text. That the Papacy had become noted for all that is abominable and wicked as early as the sixth century, though its abominations were more fully matured after that time, is the united testimony of all history. Dupin, a "Catholic" historian, testified that as early as A.D. 503 the pope, Symmachus, excommunicated the emperor Anastasius; and in defending himself assumed that "*his dignity was higher than that of the emperor.*" (His. Eccles. Writers, vol. 1, p. 527.) Mosheim, in speaking of the grand feature of papal arrogance, the claim of the pope to divinity, says, "How greatly the ideas of many had advanced respecting the powers of the Bishop of Rome cannot be better shown than by the example of Ennodius, the insane flatterer of

Symmachus, who, among other extravagant expressions, said, "*The Pontiff judges in the place of God.*" (Vol. 1, p. 389.) "The worship of the Virgin Mary was ordained by a general council in 528."—*E. King*. Monasteries for women were established as early as 507; the order of Benedictines was established in 518; pillar saints were in high reputation; penances were enjoined; heathen festivals were incorporated into the Christian service; the mass and other superstitions were substituted for the devotions of pure Christian worship; the obligations of celibacy were imposed upon the clergy; purgatory was preached by Gregory; the use of holy water and other popish superstitions became very general about the same time. (See Ruter's Church History, cen. 6, chap. 2.

It is also well known that between the beginning and middle of the sixth century, the agents of the pope had slaughtered those Christians who would not acknowledge his supremacy by hundreds of thousands.

By this general testimony of history we are brought within a century of the event referred to in the text, as the point at which these periods begin. Can we get at that event with sufficient precision to ascertain by what agents it was effected. What is the testimony of the pope himself? Among the so called "Christian Majesties" of Europe, there is one to whom the pope applies the titles, "*Most Christian Majesty!*" and "*Eldest Son of the Church!*" It is the king of France. Now the Pope does not confer such titles without a cause; and "the church" could have no sons before her "eldest son" was born. The origin of these titles

will throw much light upon the question before us. Mosheim speaks of their origin as follows:—"It is said, that the conversion of Clovis gave rise to the custom of addressing the French monarch with the titles of *Most Christian Majesty*, and *Eldest Son of the Church*, for the kings of the other barbarous nations which occupied the Roman provinces, were still addicted to idolatry, or involved in the errors of Arianism."—Vol. 1, p. 315.

The history of Clovis is briefly this, as attested by papal, protestant, and infidel historians. In 493 Clovis was a pagan "conqueror, whose arms were everywhere victorious;" his conversion took place in 496; he fought the battles of "the Catholic faction" till 508; he devoted himself to the founding of churches and monasteries till the year of his death, A.D. 511. (See Gifford's *His. of France*, pp. 32-39. Howel's *Int. to Gen. Hist.* vol. 3, pp. 342-347. Baroni, Tom. 6. Venetiis. Du Pin, Gibbon, Mosheim, Hallam.)

That popery was not in the ascendancy at the time of the conversion of Clovis, is sufficiently evident from the testimony of Gifford, who speaks of him while yet a pagan, as "a young prince whose arms were everywhere victorious." Gibbon testifies to the same effect: "On the memorable day when Clovis ascended from the baptismal font, he alone in the Christian world deserved the name and prerogatives of a Catholic king. The Emperor Anastasius entertained some dangerous errors concerning the nature of the Divine incarnation—and the barbarians of Italy, Africa, Spain, and Gaul were involved in the Arian heresy. The eldest, or rather the only son of the church, was acknow-

ledged by the clergy as their lawful Sovereign or Glorious Deliverer, and the *arms* of Clovis were strenuously supported by the zeal and favor of the Catholic faction."—M.'s Gib. vol. 2, p. 412.

Could anything be more striking than this testimony of the skeptical Gibbon upon the fulfilment of the prophecy: "*Arms shall place the abomination that maketh desolate?*"—Dan. 11:31. Baronius, the standard papal historian, in giving the details of these wars of Clovis, speaks of him as a model for the encouragement of princes, and ascribes the expenditures and toils of the war to his piety, and his success to the favor of God. (Tom. 6, p. 696) According to Gifford, Gibbon and most other historians, Clovis "received the title and insignia of patrician and consul," at the hands of the ambassadors of Anastasius, emperor of the East," at the city of Tours, on his return from his last expedition, in 508. The consular office conferred on him supreme magisterial authority in Western Rome; and Hallam admits that "the connection between Clovis and the empire, and the emblems of Roman magistracy which he bore, reconciled the conquered to their new masters." (Mid. Ages, p.18.)

The investment of Clovis with the powers of the consular office, has an important connection with the placing, or setting up, of popery in West-

* "The Roman Consuls were heads both of the senate and people, Generals of the Republic, Guardians and Executors of the laws, and protectors of the privileges of the several orders of the state.—Memoirs of the Court of Augustus, vol. 1. pp. 58, 177. Lon. 1763.

ern Rome; for in the council which he held at Orleans just before his death, the using of heathen temples for the papal worship, and the manner of treating pagans and heretics, then in office, were some of the most important questions settled by its authority. Its enactments of course would be considered as law to the extent of his jurisdiction. Mezary informs us that this council was held "in July, A.D. 511;" and that it was "the first ecclesiastical council celebrated under a *French* king." (Hist. of France, p. 19.) Gifford tells us it consisted of "thirty three bishops;" * that it was assembled by the order of Clovis, and that "he fixed on the topics of discussion." This, he says, "was the last remarkable event in the life of Clovis." He died in November of 511. (Mezary, p. 17.)

The author of the *Decline and Fall of Rome* states the fact, that the successors of Clovis inflicted "one hundred lashes on the peasants who refused to destroy their idols." (M.'s Gib. vol. 2, p. 406.)

From all these facts it must be evident, that the scale preponderated in favor of popery by the agency of Clovis. So far as paganism was concerned, popery had no serious dangers to encounter after his triumphs; and whenever it had a battle to fight with some fresh horde of barbarians from the north, as in the case of the Lombards, it fought to defend, not to *obtain* its position. Its future battles

* The letter of the bishops assembled at this council, addressed to Clovis, begins as follows:—"Domino suo Catholicæ Ecclesiæ filio Clodoveo gloriosissimo Regi. Omnes sacerdotes, quos ad Concilium venire jussistis, quia tanta ad Catholicæ religionis cultum gloriosæ fidei cura vos excitat," &c. Bar. Tome 6, p. 698.

were with rebellious emperors and kings, or with other Christians, whom the Church of Rome has always considered "heretics." Somewhere in the career of Clovis, it would seem, then, the event referred to in the text must be found.

In our former calculation, we supposed the setting up of the Papacy was effected by the success of his arms, and as he fought the last battle of his "religious wars" in 508, that was made the date at which the periods now under consideration were supposed to begin. In the present calculation, however, we refer to the latest date possible; and as the establishing of popery by law seems more like the event specified in the prophecy—that of *placing, or setting it up*; and as it could not take place later than 511, if it took place in the lifetime of Clovis, we begin the 1290 and 1335 days or years at that point.

	1335	years
Added to A.D.	511	

Extend to	1846
-----------	------

We have already seen that the earliest and latest boundaries for the period in which the 2300 years must terminate, according to the data used, are Aug. of 1845, and Dec. of 1847; and that the most natural view we can take of all the facts stated by the evangelists, brings the termination at least one year earlier than that latest point. It must be seen, therefore, that the harmony in the termination of these two periods is as exact as in our former calculation.

Let us now consider the other period—the 1290 days, or years. The first question usually asked in reference to that period is this. With what event

does it terminate? No event is stated in the text ; but as it evidently relates to "the abomination that maketh desolate"—Popery, we must apply it to some noted period in its history. The text says : "From the time that the daily shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, (margin, *to set up the abomination that maketh desolate,*) shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days." By referring to other parts of this prophecy, as well as other prophecies, we find that two grand epochs mark the early and latter history of the Papacy. In its early history it was, *first*, to take the place of Paganism. *Second*, The saints were to be given into its hand. In its decline, it was, *first*, to have its dominion taken away. *Second*, To be destroyed by the brightness of Christ's coming. The 1290 and 1335 days, or years, begin at the point where the Papacy takes the place of Paganism ; but as Popery is to be "destroyed at the end," where the 1335 days also terminate, the 1290 must terminate at the taking away of its dominion. Has that event taken place? Yes. That is as evident as that Popery exists. The whole Papal communion are sighing over the loss of its former authority and power ; promising that if they can but enjoy their "liberty"—(liberty to lord it over the world as they please,) they "will regain everything ;" and because they cannot have their "liberty," they raise the cry of persecution. They ought to thank heaven and earth that they have not long since been exterminated ; but they must do their work, and their day of visitation is at hand.

The ancient Papal dominion has been taken

away.—When was it done? That act is fresh in the recollection of thousands now living? It was done by the arms of the same nation that set it up in the place of Paganism, and by one whose will, like that of Clovis, was law in Western Rome, Napoleon. The act of Napoleon, by which the Pope was divested of his ancient prerogatives, is spoken of by Sir Walter Scott in these terms:—

“This important treaty was managed by Joseph Bonaparte, who, with three colleagues, held conferences for that purpose, with the plenipotentiaries of the Pope. The ratifications were exchanged on the 18th of September, 1801; and when they were published, it was singular to behold how submissive the once proud See of Rome lay prostrate before the power of Bonaparte, and how absolutely he must have dictated all the the terms of the treaty. *Every article innovated on some of those rights and claims which the church of Rome had for ages asserted as the unalienable privileges of her infallible head.*” “Such was the celebrated compact, by which Pius VII. surrendered to a soldier; whose name was five or six years before unheard of in Europe, *those high claims to supremacy in spiritual affairs, which his predecessors had maintained for so many ages against the whole potentates of Europe.* A puritan might have said of the power seated on the Seven Hills—‘*Babylon is fallen, it is fallen, that great city!*’ The more rigid Catholics were of the same opinion. The Concordat, they alleged, showed rather the abasement of the Roman hierarchy than the re-erection of the Gallic Church.” Life of Napoleon, vol. 1, p. 502. Philadelphia. 1827. (See also Rotteck’s History of the World,

vol. 4, p. 148. Thiers' Consulate and Empire, pp 326—339.)

"This important treaty" was *signed* at Paris, by Joseph Bonaparte and "the plenipotentiaries of the Pope," as Thiers tells us, in "July, 1801," just 1290 years after the Council of Orleans was held by Clovis. Its *ratification* at Rome took place in September of the same year.

	1290
Added to	511
	—
Extend to	1801

{Here also the harmony is very exact.

In our former calculation, it will be remembered, this taking away of the dominion of popery was supposed to have been effected, at the *conquest* of Rome by the French, in 1798, as these periods also were supposed to commence with the *conquests* of Clovis in 508. But we now take the latest date to which we can reasonably refer for their termination, as we have done for their commencement. And if the pope was ever humbled by Napoleon; if he has ever been divested of those high claims to supremacy in spiritual affairs, which his predecessors had maintained for ages against the whole potentates of Europe, it was done by the voluntary, though constrained, ratification of the Concordat in 1801.

* I would state on the authority of a worthy brother—A. Flavel—of New Jersey, not having access to the works of Luther, that "Luther dates these 1290 days at the time Clovis obtained the consular power." It is well known to our friends that according to Luther's calculation, their end will come in 1846.

And here it should be remarked, that in the restoration effected by the "Holy Alliance" in 1815, the supremacy of the Pope was not recognised; but it was distinctly rejected, as the following statement of "the principle of all the conduct of the allied," by Rotteck, shows: "They—the allied—guarantee an indissoluble fraternity and mutual assistance in all cases, and acknowledge *all of the Christian name as one nation united under the only supreme sovereign JESUS CHRIST!*" "Of this," he says, "the history of the world offers no example."—Vol. 4. pp. 255–6. It is also well known, that the provisions of the Concordat have been the basis of some of the most important negotiations between the nations of Europe and the Pope, down to the present time.

There is also one other period intimately connected with those now under consideration, though not brought to view in the text, on which a few remarks should be made.—It is the period of "a time times and half a time" or 1260 days, or years—during which "the saints" were to "be given into the hand" of popery, as predicted in the seventh of Daniel. The giving the saints into the hands of popery must, in the nature of the case, follow its triumph over paganism in Western Rome; and that the period, during which they were to be in this subjection, has expired, is as evident as that the Pope has "surrendered" his "high claims to supremacy" over them. The 1260 days, or years, must have ended with the 1290 in 1801. With what event then did they begin?

To give a clear idea of the course of events in the early history of popery, that we may see the

development of its true character, and by what agencies it attained the position assigned to it in the prophecies, we call attention to a few well attested facts.—The conversion of Clovis, as we have seen, turned the triumphant arms of the West in favor of popery. This was immediately followed by the excommunication of Anastasius, Emperor of the East. And there is very good evidence to believe, what has been asserted of Clovis, that he formed a conspiracy with the “Catholic” bishops for the overthrow of all the Arian kingdoms within the limits of the fallen empire. Mezary says of his wars, “they were waged under the specious pretence of religion;” and ascribes to him the vilest character for treachery and cruelty.—(Hist. of France p. 16.) Du Pin, a papal historian, in his account of a visit of Avitus, bishop of Vienna, to Gondebald king of Burgundy, for the purpose of holding a conference with that king and to convert him to “the faith,” says, “Gondebald, perceiving them, came to meet them, and spoke reproachfully of the king of the French, Clovis.” The amount of the *reproach* was a remark of the king to this effect, “If your religion is so much better than ours, why does Clovis continue to make war on me without any provocation?” “The bishop answered him, That *the way to make peace was to agree about the faith.*”—(Hist. of Eccles. writers, Vol. 1. p. 530. Dublin 1722.) To the same effect is the testimony of Baronius, before stated; and Gibbon gives us *these words of Clovis*, as an expression of his motives in entering upon the Gothic war:

“It grieves me to see the Arians still possess

the fairest portion of Gaul. Let us march against them with the aid of God, and having vanquished the heretics, we will possess and divide their fertile provinces."—M's Gibbon, vol. 2, p. 416.

The success of this "conspiracy," in placing popery in the ascendancy in Western Rome, we have already seen. By the strength thus secured to the "Catholic faction" in the West the same faction were placed in a position to commence open hostilities in the capital of the Eastern Empire, Constantinople. In 508 the whirlwind of fanaticism swept in fire and blood through the streets of the city. Gibbon thus speaks of this first outbreak of the abomination that maketh desolate in that quarter: "The streets were instantly crowded with innumerable swarms of men, women and children; the legions of monks in regular array, marched and shouted, and fought at their head. 'Christians! this is the day of martyrdom; let us not desert our spiritual father; anathema to the Manichean tyrant! he is unworthy to reign.' Such was the Catholic cry; and the galleys of Anastasius lay upon their oars before the palace, till the (Catholic) patriarch had pardoned his penitent, (the Emperor) and hushed the waves of the troubled multitude. . . Day and night they were incessantly busied either in singing hymns to the honor of their God, or in pillaging and murdering the servants of their prince. The head of his favorite monk was borne aloft on a spear; and the fire-brands which had been darted against heretical structures, diffused the undistinguishing flames over the most orthodox buildings. The

statues of the Emperor were broken, and his person was concealed in a suburb, till at the end of three days he dared to implore the mercy of his subjects. And they accepted the blood of two unpopular ministers, whom their master without hesitation condemned to the lions.—Ib. vol. 3, p 262.

This exhibition of the Man of Sin was followed, in 514, by a still more important "rebellion" in the east, in which Vitalian, whom Gibbon styles "the Champion of the Catholic faith," depopulated Thrace, and exterminated *sixty-five thousand of his fellow-Christians*. Du Pin says, in speaking of this movement of Vitalian, "The Emperor was forced to make peace with him upon condition that a council should be called *to regulate the affairs of the church, by the advice of the Bishop of Rome.* This obliged the Emperor to write to Hormisdas, successor of Symmachus, to pray him that he would be mediator for pacifying these commotions, and that he would labor **TO RESTORE THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.**" In this manner was accomplished what the historian calls, "the triumph of Roman pertinacity."

These illustrations of the character of Romanism, during the reign of Anastasius, had their desired effect upon his nephew and successor, Justinian, who ascended the throne of the Eastern Empire in 528, though he had controlled its decisions to a great extent, for some time before. Justinian did even more, as an ally of the Pope, than Clovis had done. In the first great transaction of his reign—the revision of the laws of the Empire, which produced the celebrated Justin-

ian Code"—"the supremacy of the pontificate" was declared to belong to "the elder Rome;" and the 131st of the Novellæ," on the ecclesiastical titles and privileges, chapter II, reads:—*"We therefore decree, that the most holy Pope of the elder Rome is the first of all the priesthood."* Justinian was a most furious persecutor. By a single edict designed to "unite all men in one faith," the whole band of mercenary papists were let loose to plunder and murder those who did not "in the space of three months, embrace the *Catholic faith.*" The "heretics" of different religions, who were slaughtered by his orders, must be estimated by hundreds of thousands.—And this was only the introduction of a scene of carnage which has been continued and sustained, in the Christian world, by the authority of the "seat of the beast" for more than twelve hundred years.

The laws of Justinian, in behalf of Popery, were followed by the appropriation of his choicest armies for the destruction of its enemies. In our former calculation it was supposed that the 1260 years began with the conquest of Rome by the armies of Justinian, in 538, and that they terminated with its conquest by the French in 1798.—Is there any later event, in the series of events which marked the rise of popery which would more properly constitute the giving of the saints into the hands of the Pope? There is but one form of power, recognised at Rome, which could be supposed to stand in the way of the legal or actual supremacy of the Pope at the time the city was conquered in 538,—that was the consular

power. And Gibbon testifies that in "541," *thirty years* after the death of Clovis, "the succession of consuls finally ceased, in the thirteenth year of Justinian, whose despotic temper might be gratified by the silent extinction of a title which admonished the Romans of their ancient freedom." (M's Gib. vol. 3. p. 55.) So that there was never afterwards any power resident at Rome acknowledged as supreme, excepting that of the Pope, till after its conquest by the French in 1798. 1260 years, the period during which the saints were to be subject to the Papacy, beginning in 541, extend to 1801. 1290 years, beginning in 511, terminate at the same point, and 1801 is the latest date that can be assigned for the humiliation of the Pope by Napoleon."

Then the "Justinian Code," as far as the Pope was concerned, was to give place to "the Code Napoleon." And accordingly, 1846 is the latest point to which the 1335 days, or years, can extend, when Daniel shall stand up to receive his lot in the everlasting inheritance. "Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days:" thou shalt stand up to receive thy lot, thy portion, thy immortal inheritance, at the end of the days. Amen.

(APPENDIX.)

(A) *Note on page 74.*—A difficulty has been supposed to arise from applying "the daily" of Daniel to Paganism and "the abomination that maketh desolate" to Popery, since it is well known that Christ speaks of "the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet," as the sign which was to indicate "the desolation of Jerusalem to be nigh."

It is evident that Christ referred to that abomination of which Daniel spoke as the instrument of doing that work "of vengeance" upon the Jews, and that is found only in Dan. 9:27.

Paganism or Popery might either of them, however, be called "the abomination that maketh desolate," when one was spoken of by itself, though, when spoken of in connection, the *then present* desolation might more properly and clearly be called the daily, to distinguish it from that form of the desolation which was to take its place, and of course was yet future.

For a more detailed explanation of these particulars, see "Second Advent Manual," and "Review of Pond."