THE

# WORLD REPRIEVED:

## A CRITICAL EXAMINATION

## OF WILLIAM MILLER'S THEORY,

THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST AND THE DESTRUCTION OF THE WORLD WILL TAKE PLACE, ABOUT A. D. 1843.

BY

REV. KITTRIDGE HAVEN.

The words of a book that is sealed:—Read this, I pray thee:—I cannot, for it is sealed. Isaiah xxix: 11.

Go thy way, Daniel; for the words are closed up, and sealed till the time of the end. Daniel xii: 9.

WOODSTOCK, VT:
HASKELL & PALMER.

1839.

## WILLIAM MILLER.

It may be proper to say a word, in relation to the [redacted] individual, who has passed sentence of condemnation and immediate destruction against 'heaven and earth,'—the 'throne' and 'footstool' of God, (Matt. 5: 34, 35,) and, in behalf of which, we send forth this *public reprieve*.

'Elder Miller,' is a resident of Hampton, N. Y. He was a Lieut. in the last war. For some ten years, he was a sheriff, and politician; and though he accumulated a handsome fortune, yet, he could not, as a *politician*, gain that preferment and renown to which he aspired. He was a *deist*, as he seems proud to acknowledge, till some 20 years ago; when he came out a Calvinist Baptist. After his change of sentiment, he devoted his time to the study of *prophecies*, and history, and soon came to the conclusion that the destruction of heaven and earth, and all things therein, was near at hand. Mr. M. began to discourse upon his new theory, some more than ten years ago. He has extended his labors into various parts of New York, Lower Canada and Vermont. Though extremely illiterate, Mr. M. is generally fluent and engaging. We regret to say, that many clergymen, who reject his peculiar views, countenance him for the purpose of preparing the way for *protracted meetings*.

Having repeated his lectures, with a world of anecdotes interspersed, hundreds of times, Mr. M. has got them so familiar, that he excites the fears of the timid, to a high degree. Some, who had none to spare, are frightened out of what sense and reason they had. But thank God, generally, the flurry is soon over. Mr. M. is not so influenced by his doctrine, but that *he holds on upon every dollar and cent*, as closely as any one else. Why so, if he *really believes* his own theory? Why not expend his thousands in giving wings to such soul-saving truths? Why hug his wealth, which can be of no use to any body, and let millions 'perish for lack of knowledge?' Why suffer his book to be sold at such an enormous profit? If he believes his doctrine, he stands condemned by his own acts; for he loves his paltry pelf, more than the souls of men.

R. S.

# PREFACE.

FEW persons have patience to read a long introduction, to a short pamphlet; but, in this case, it is necessary, in order to understand what follows.

1. Mr. Miller's views are before the public, in three different forms. They were published in a pamphlet of 64 pages, in 1833; in a bound book of 223 pages, 1836; and now appear in a volume of 278 pages, 1838. Both in *form*, *size*, and *language*, the work has undergone great alterations. The *sentiment*, however, is the same. Hence, we may as well make extracts from one form as another. The references cannot well be made to each form, because the words are frequently so different.—Let it be observed then, that, with the exception of the first article, the *references to pages*, relate to the *pamphlet* of 1833, and the *book* of 1836. If there are others, the *'late edition'* of 1838, will be named. This is the best we could do. Indeed, we confidently rely on Rev. K. Haven, for the accuracy of his *references* to the *pamphlet* form. As the reader has Mr. M's own words, it matters not from which book they are taken. The *prophetic numbers* are the same in each.

2. Having written *Part First*, the editor perceived that it would be necessary to travel over the same ground with his highly esteemed friend and brother, who, in the 8th vol. of the Uni. Watchman *reviewed* Mr. M's work. Believing, therefore, that the Reviewer was justly entitled to the praise of having exposed the errors of the Lecturer, in regard to the *prophetic numbers*, etc. it was deemed a just compliment to him, to reprint his examination, for the good of the public; the writer of this, *not being rewarded for his labors, save in the consciousness of having done his duty.*—By this means, too, we show that Mr. M's system was seasonably refuted. He has devoted about 20 years to the subject, and as might be expected, has gathered many historic facts, and many fictions, from various sources. By a careful examination, we discover nothing which is valuable, but what we have seen in works of learned commentators. There is less *originality*, except in the manner in which things are jumbled together, than many suppose. Even the application of the pouring out of the *sixth* vial, (Rev. 16: 12 etc.) to the French revolution, and the reign of Bonaparte, is an *old story*, newly told. We have heard it, hundreds of times, improper as it is. I have 'REV. ETHAN SMITH'S *Key to the Rev-*

*elations,'* now before me, in which he assumes 'the responsibility' of being the *originator* of that strange notion. And yet, Dr. A. Clarke, who had every means of judging correctly in regard to the operations of Napoleon, or the French empire, declares the application of those prophecies to Bonaparte, wholly erroneous.

3. Mr. M. does not *prove* his theory by the Scriptures. He makes *assertions* in regard to certain passages, and then attempts to *prove his assertions*, by an appeal to *history*, with which *very few* are at all acquainted. Not *one* of a thousand who hear him or read his book, *knows*, or has the means of knowing, whether he is right or wrong, in those assertions. Hence, if the multitude believe, it is on the strength of his *ipse dixit.* Now, does any person of common sense admit that our immortal destiny is suspended on such conditions? Must we believe the *mere assertions* of Mr. Miller, or be damned forever? Must we believe without one 'thus saith the Lord,' that 'the day of grace is to close,' and 'the door of mercy to be shut,' forever, during the current year? Rash pretension! Reader, how many, think you, of the inhabitants now on the earth, will so much as hear of 'William Miller Esq.' or of his new theory, before the close of the present year? How many can possibly be benefited by this *new revelation*? And are *hundreds of millions* of our race to be eternally debarred from the means of salvation, for the *monstrous crime of not having had an opportunity of hearing the truth*, in relation to this subject!

4. It should be considered that this world-destroying and panic-producing business, is no new affair. The game has been played in the church, as often as credulity and superstition would permit. The belief of the *personal second* coming of the Son of man, and the destruction of the *literal* earth, at the close of the 10th century, shook all Christendom Multitudes disposed of their property, and started for Palestine, to witness the *awful descent* of their Lord; for, ignorant as they were, they did not suppose he could *come, personally,* the *second* time, where he never was before! *Lord Napier*, also, produced a tremendous effect, by fixing the death of the world, at the close of the 17th century. And, frequently since that day, especially about the time of the last war with Great Britian, and during the 'cold season' of 1816, the *awful omens* of the world's destruction, have been numerous and frightful! Many a false prophet has lived to witness the deleterious influence of his own delusions upon the holy cause of religion, and suffer age-lasting shame and contempt. Those delusions have vanished, and so will Mr. Miller's, in regard to the destruction of the heavens and earth, in 1843. What will then be the emotions of himself, and his deluded followers, time must determine.

R. STREETER.

Woodstock, 16th Feb. 1839.

# EXAMINATION OF LECTURES.

## PART FIRST.

[An expose of Mr. Miller's views of the 24th Chapter of Matthew, together with some explanatory remarks on sundry parts of it.]

In presenting an examination of the singular work (in various forms) before us, it seems proper that we come directly to the points at issue. Almost every thing must be passed over, which does not bear directly upon the question, whether the world is to end in 1843, and whether Mr. Miller's views of the prophetic visions and numbers, in the book of Daniel, and the Revelations, are correct? For, if they are not correct, then, his theory falls to the ground. The writer of these remarks, heard Mr. M. deliver, in one discourse, in this place, the *substance* of the first two lectures in the books, together with many illustrations, which were too puerile to be named here.

But, there is only *one point*, in those two lectures, which demands particular attention, and that is, Mr. Miller's distortion of the 24th chapter of Matthew. We are satisfied, however, that few intelligent readers are liable to be deceived by such an irregular compound, as our author presents, as the contents of that well connected and consistent chapter. Reader, look at the following remark, and be astonished!

"They, (the disciples,) might *not have intended* to ask more than *one* question, yet, they did ask *three*, and Christ answered them accordingly;" &c. Here, we have it more than intimated, that notwithstanding some of the disciples of Christ, followed him to the Mount of Olives, on purpose to inquire of him concerning his declaration, "*There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down,*" having reference, as all admit, to the destruction of Jerusalem, yet, they were so confused, that instead of asking one question, as they intended, they asked three; and instead of confining their inquiries to the *subject of their soli-*

*titude*, they went off in a *tangent*, and inquired concerning things that had no connection therewith! Yes, and that the blessed Jesus, instead of answering them in reference to what they *intended*, and wished to know, barely touched upon that point, and bestowed most of his labors upon topics foreign to the intent and spirit of their inquiries! Really, there are but few men, who are not treading in the hot embers of fanaticism, who would take so much liberty, in a case like this.

But one thing must in candor be conceded, and that is,—if Mr. M. has given a correct view of the subject, both the inquirers and the Saviour were as confused as his language would seem to imply. We have reason to rejoice, however, that it can be shown to the satisfaction of every candid reader, that the disciples did not wander in their questions from the real object of their solicitude, viz: to ascertain *when* the things should take place, spoken of in Matt. 24: 2, and *what signs* precede the fulfillment of those words. In order to make the subject plain, and put it beyond fair disputation, we must compare the accounts, severally given by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, in relation to the interview between Jesus and his disciples, concerning the destruction of the temple. It will be seen that there is a variation of language, or words, even in relation to the prophecy itself; but all will admit that each one means to report the same fact. Thus, Matthew says, Chapter 24: 1, 2, "And Jesus went out—from the temple, and his disciples came to him, for to show him the buildings of the temple. And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? Verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." But the evangelist Mark, in narrating the same general facts, Chapter 13: 1, 2, uses these words, viz: "And, as he (Jesus) went out of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him, Master, see what manner of stones and what buildings are here. And Jesus answering, said unto him, Seest thou these great buildings? there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." Now here is a variation of language from Matthew's report. And yet, does any christian doubt its meaning the same thing, essentially? None. Let us proceed then. St. Luke says, Chapter 21: 5, 6, "And as some spake of the temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones and gifts, he (Jesus) said, As for these things which ye behold, the days will come, in the

which there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down."

Now let it be remarked, that the three Evangelists above named, in continuation of the report of the same interview, proceed to relate the question or questions which immediately followed the above declaration, concerning the destruction of the temple. And certainly every candid reader will allow that, notwithstanding there may be some variation of phraseology, in stating the questions, as there is in the statement of the subject to which the questions allude, still, the meaning must be essentially the same, or there is a contradiction among the divine witnesses. But, since there was but one main topic under consideration, there can be no doubt that the inquiry was one and the same.

Well, that no one Evangelist may seem to have the preference, by being always first named, I will inquire of St. Mark, to ascertain what he understood the disciples to say in relation to the destruction of the temple, as foretold in Chapter 13: 2? What say you, St. Mark? Answer, (verses 3 and 4) "And as he [Jesus] sat upon the Mount of Olives, over against the temple, Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, asked him privately, Tell us *when* shall these things be? and what shall be the *sign* when all these things shall be fulfilled." Very well; that is a fair answer to our question, and enables us to perceive that, at least four of the apostolic disciples, were not confused, but proposed their inquiry with special reference to the subject of their solicitude, just as nature itself would dictate. We find, then, that they inquired for the *time* when the prophecy would be fulfilled, and the *sign* portending the event. So far, all is clear.

Well, now let us inquire of St. Luke, how this matter was reported to him by those who were eye witnesses of the facts? His answer is (Chapter 21: 7,) "And they asked him, saying, Master, but *when* shall these things be? and what *sign* shall there be *when* these things shall come to pass? This witness, too, is perfectly clear and definite, and gives us to understand "what was most surely believed," in regard to these things at the time when he wrote. And, if we credit his testimony, (and he could be liable to no mistake, "having had perfect understanding of all things from the first," Luke, 1: 2, 3,) then it follows, that the disciples inquired, definitely, for the *time*, and *sign*, of the destruction of the temple. These two adequate witnesses, Mark and Luke,

make a similar report. And let me ask, does any believing christian entertain a doubt, but that Matthew's testimony will agree entirely in point of facts with that of his fellow witnesses? Certainly not. And, although, as in stating some other parts of the interview, he may employ different terms, yet, they will mean the same things as those stated by Mark and Luke. Let us then, hear the report which Matthew gives of the inquiries made by the disciples. He says, (Chapter 24: 3,) "And as he [Jesus] sat upon the Mount of Olives, his disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us *when* shall these things be? and what shall be the *sign* of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" literally, the *conclusion* of the age.

Now the reader cannot fail to perceive, at a glance, that in order to make this testimony agree with the clear and express declarations of the other two witnesses, the question, "What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world," or the *conclusion of the age*, must be synonymous with the account which reads "What shall be the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled?' Nothing short of this can render the several reports harmonious, or save the latter witness from the charge of having made a report of the *very same conversation* between Jesus and his disciples, contradictory to, and irreconcilable with the report given by the other two.

And to show that we are not singular in this view of the subject, and do not "strain a point" for the sake of favoring any system of doctrine, let us attend to a few remarks by the candid and learned Bishop Newton. Speaking of the questions, "Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the *sign* of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" he says, "These are only different expressions, to denote the same period with the destruction of Jerusalem; for when they (the disciples) conceived would be the destruction of Jerusalem, they conceived would be 'the coming of Christ,' and when they conceived would be 'the coming of Christ,' then they conceived would be 'the end of the world,' or rather (as it should be rendered,) *the conclusion of the age.* 'The end of the world,' or conclusion of the age, is the same period as the destruction of Jerusalem; for there being two ages, (as they were called) among the Jews, the one under the law, and the other under the Messiah; when the city and temple were destroyed, and the Jewish polity in church

and state was dissolved, the *former* age must of course be concluded, and the age of the Messiah commenced."—"The coming of Christ is also the same with the destruction of Jerusalem, as may appear from several passages of the Gospels, and particularly from these two passages. 'There are some standing here,' says our blessed Lord, Matt. 16: 2 8, who shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom,' that is evidently, there are some standing here who shall live, till the destruction of Jerusalem, to the coming of Christ in judgment upon the Jews." (He then refers to John, 21: 22.) And let it be remarked, that that coming of Christ, was to be, "In the Glory of the Father, with the angels, *(messengers)* to reward every man according to his works;" that is, every one who was to participate in the all-momentous event.

The reader will perceive then, that with all the precision and force of demonstration itself, we come to the conclusion, that the disciples proposed their questions with special reference to "the coming of Christ" at the destruction of Jerusalem; and Mr. Miller himself concedes, (Lectures, p. 13,) "that if he did come at the destruction of Jerusalem, it must have been his *second coming.*" It follows of course, then, and by unavoidable inference, that unless the Lord Jesus answered questions which were not proposed to him, he described the signs of his coming at the destruction of Jerusalem, and the time of that remarkable event; and nothing foreign to those points. To say, the disciples asked certain questions, and that Jesus, under pretence of answering those questions, digressed immeasurably upon other subjects,—which must have been the case, if he went on to describe the destruction of the material universe,—is to treat his name with irreverence, and his word with contempt.

And now, candid reader, that you may see we are right, in maintaining that the questions of the disciples, as given by the three Evangelists, though in somewhat different language, mean precisely the same thing, you have only to compare the answer to the questions, as reported by the same persons; beginning, Matt. 24: 3, Mark 13: 4, Luke 21: 8. There is, as conceded by the most learned and candid expositors of all denominations, every reason to believe that the answer was given to substantially the same questions. Their language does not vary in the several reports, more than the language of the same Evangelists generally does, when pro-

fessing to report the substance of any other discourse or conversation. But, what I would wish to have particularly remarked is, that when Jesus, to the astonishment of his disciples, spake of the overthrow of Jerusalem, it was perfectly natural for them to inquire, first, in regard to the time of the event, and then, the signs which would precede it, as the time of the event, would of course, be uppermost in their minds. And, in giving the answer, it would be just as natural to follow the order of events, and mention the signs first, and then the event of which they were preludes. If there was any danger of being deceived in regard to the things inquired after, it would be perfectly natural, to precede the whole, with a word of caution and warning. Well, reader, if you will be at the trouble of examining the three Evangelists, before named, you will perceive that each, regarding the questions as the same, proceeds to report the answer, in the very order which nature would dictate. Each one represents the Saviour as beginning his answer in the same way. For brevity's sake, we will quote from Matthew, and offer some remarks. Matt. 24: 4—7, (which compare with Mark 13: 5—8, and Luke 21: 8—10.)

"And Jesus answered, (the disciples) and said unto them, take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ, and shall deceive many. And ye, (the disciples to whom he was speaking,) shall hear of wars, and rumors of wars: see that ye be not troubled; for all these things must come to pass, but the end (of the world or age) is not yet. For nation shall rise," &c.

And, as shown by Newton, Lightfoot, Clarke, and many others, these declarations were literally fulfilled in the subsequent events of the age. Mr. Miller attempts to evade this, by saying, (p. 11,) "there were no wars of *any note*, till the destruction of Jerusalem." It would seem then that he is the *Solomon* of the world, and that wisdom must die with him! But Jesus did not say, "wars of any note," or that the wars would be *noted* by historians, or that the disciples would witness them. "Ye shall *hear* of wars, and (hear) rumors of wars," &c. It is not unfrequently true, that the reports and rumors of wars, vastly exceed the facts of the case. We have rumors about wars which never take place. Mr. Miller ought to understand this, for some of his lectures abound with "rumors of wars," which, my life for it, will not be realized, as he predicts. But, if Josephus is right,

Anti. B. XVIII, C. 9, and War, B. II, C. 10, then Mr. M. is wrong. Were there not rumors of war, when the Jews refused to comply with the orders of *Caligula*, to have his statue set up in the temple? And were they not so apprehensive of war with the Romans, as to neglect the cultivation of their lands?

Mr. M. throws a mist before the eyes of his readers, by pretending that the saying, "but the *end* is not yet," means, "the end" does not succeed the *war* in which Jerusalem was destroyed! Whereas, the only grammatical construction of verse 6, is, that "the end," of which the disciples inquired, would not take place when they were *hearing* of wars, and rumors of wars. And, Jesus assigns the reason, verse 7, "For (because) nation shall rise up against nation," &c.

Another perversion of facts, is seen on page eleven, in which Mr. M. pretends, that, although the christians were saved from the destruction which came upon Jerusalem, yet, it would not verify the words of Christ; since they had the promise of being "saved from all the troubles which Christ had been speaking of." No assertion could be more groundless. If we had not descovered Mr. M's entire ignorance of the rules of grammar, from hearing him speak, we could not excuse such a gross misrepresentation of our Saviour's words. The two next verses, 9 & 10, show that such was not his meaning; for, he speaks of afflictions and various troubles which would beset them, and be experienced by some of them; for we may presume that *many* were present, though but *few* asked the questions. If the reader will turn to Acts 4: 3, 6, and 7: 59 and on, and 12: 2, 4, he will see, in part, how the above was verified. And verse 13, (of Matt. 24,) shows that those who endured to the *end*, (of the Mosaic age) should be *saved* from the common calamity, coming upon that nation; and that was actually the case; for not a christian perished on that awful occasion.

But the reader wishes to know, in what sense "the gospel was preached in all the world," previous to the destruction of Jerusalem? Well, turn to Luke, 2: 1, 2, and you will perceive that "all the world" "went up to be taxed," which meant no more than the people of the Roman empire. And, in Col. 1: 6, 23, and Romans 10: 18, we are told that the gospel was *then* preached, to the full extent of the above declaration. Of course, "the end," of which Jesus was speaking, was soon to come,—was "at hand." St. Paul

confirms this, by saying, "They are written for *our* admonition, on whom the *ends* of the world *are* come." (I Cor. 10: 11.) And St. Peter, in his day, said, "the *end* of all things *is at hand*." (I Peter, 4: 7.)

Then, verse 15, speaking to the same disciples, Jesus says, "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth let him understand:) Then (verse 16,) let them which be in Judea, flee to the mountains, &c. Now this, with the corresponding passage in Mark 13: 14, is the only instance in which he mentioned the name of Daniel; and proves to a demonstration, that "the abomination spoken of by Daniel," Chap. 9: 27, was seen in the Roman army, with its ensigns and images, besieging Jerusalem, and making it desolate. Or, as St. Luke expresses it, (Chap. 21: 20, 21,) "When *ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies*, then *know* the *desolation* thereof is *nigh*. Then let them which are in Judea," &c. The notion, therefore, that those words of Daniel, and the Saviour, are yet to be fulfilled, is too ridiculous to be seriously refuted.—But, our limits compel us to pass on to

Verse 29. "*Immediately after the tribulation, &c.* The word *immediately* shows that our Lord was speaking of no *distant* event; but of the destruction of Jerusalem. The Jewish *heaven* must perish, and the *sun* and *moon* of its glory be darkened. The *sun* is the religion of the church; the *moon*, the government of the state, and the *stars*, the judges and doctors of both. (See Isai. 13: 10, Ezek. 32: 7, 8.) And Mr. Miller understands similar language, Dan. 8: 10, as meaning "the destroying Jerusalem." And, on Rev. 6: 12, 14, he says, the *heaven being rolled together as a scroll*, must "mean the laws and government of *France*." By the *sun*, he understands *kings*, by the *moon*, the *queen*; and by *stars*, inferior officers, &c. (p p. 178, 179.) Hence, his friends cannot object to the above views of Newton, Lightfoot and Clarke.

He not only calls the heaven, "laws and government," but frequently makes "the earth" to mean the *Roman government*; sometimes, *German princes;* and "the four winds of heaven," he says, "mean opposing elements, war and contention." (p. 180.)

According to Mr. M's own showing, then, "the gathering together of the elect, from one end of heaven to the other,"

*may* mean no more, than from all parts of Judea, as Bishop Pearce suggests; unless "the government of *France*" was the only one entitled to the appellation, *heaven!*

Verse 30. "*Then shall appear the sign of the Son of man, &c.*—"The plain meaning of this is," says Dr. Clarke, "that the destruction of Jerusalem will be such a remarkable instance of Divine vengeance, such a signal manifestation of Christ's power and glory, that all *the Jewish tribes* shall mourn, and many will, in consequence of this manifestation of God, be led to acknowledge Christ and his religion. By *the land*, in the text, is evidently meant here, as in several other places, the *land of Judea* and its *tribes*, either its then inhabitants, or the Jewish people wherever found."

I will simply add, with reference to the 31st verse, that Dr. Clarke understands the word *angels*, to mean *messengers* and apostles, or ministers, who should go forth as with a *great sound of a trumpet. &c.*

Then commences the reply to that part of the question, which related to the *time, when* all these things shall come to pass.

Verse 32. "*Now learn a parable of the fig-tree, &c.* That is, These signs which I have given you, (who asked questions, verse 2nd,) will be as infallible a proof of the approaching ruin of the *Jewish state*, as the budding of the trees is a proof of the coming summer.

Verse 33. "So likewise ye, (said Jesus, to *those whom he then addressed,*) when *ye* shall see all these things, know it, ("the end of the world" or age) is *near*, even at the *doors*." What! and pretend that an event which was to be "at the doors" of disciples of Christ, of that age, is still future? How absurd and groundless!

Verse 34. "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away, till all these things be fulfilled". The meaning unquestionably is, that there were persons then living, who would survive the destruction of Jerusalem. Doubtless, there were considerable numbers who witnessed the event. Jesus said, expressly, Matt. 16: 28, "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." (See Mark 8: 38 and 9: 1.) And, notwithstanding the Saviour used the phrase, "this generation," many times, and even in the next preceding chapter, (Matt. 23: 36,) yet, to sustain his far-fetched notions, Mr. M. goes back to Psalms 22: 30, which speaks of

"a generation." He calls it "the generation of righteousness." The reference would have been much better, had he named Ps. 74: 8, and Jer. 7: 29; which speak of a *rebellious generation* of *wrath*. That system must be "in the mire," whose author is driven to such subterfuges for its defence. Why did not Mr. M. inquire for the meaning of the phrase, "this generation," by an appeal to the use of it by the Saviour himself? The answer is plain,—because it would have upset his wild and visionary theory. Jesus says, Matt. 11: 16, "Whereunto shall I liken *this generation*?" Does he mean "the righteous?" Chap. 12: 41, "The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with *this generation*, and shall condemn it." 23: 36, "All the blood shed on the earth—shall be required of *this generation*." Does this mean the *generation of saints*? Nothing can be more ridiculous than to pretend that Jesus used the phrase, "this generation," in the text, in any unnatural and far-fetched sense; entirely different from the sense in which he employs it any where else.

Verses 35 and 36, need not be quoted, as they clearly set forth the *certain* and *speedy* fulfillment of our Saviour's words. There is no intimation, however, that a more precise description could be given of the 'day or *hour*,' meaning *season*, when Jerusalem would be destroyed, than what was to be learned by the parable of the fig-tree. They were certified it would be in that "generation," and when the signs were witnessed, they might "know it was near, even at the doors."

The agrument, therefore, is conclusive, that the coming of the Son of Man, which Mr. M. says, is his "second coming," (an unscriptural phrase) took place at the destruction of Jerusalem, A. D. 70; and of course, his whole frightful theory about its being *delayed* till 1843, falls to the ground. He is one who says, Our Lord delayeth his coming; and he "smites with the fist" of error. But, glory to God! great is the truth, and it shall prevail! Hallelujah! the Lord God omnipotent reigneth! let the whole earth rejoice.

NOTE.—The few preceeding *references*, agree with the *late* edition of the Lectures, 1838.

## PART SECOND.

[The four great Monarchies. Mr. Miller's views of sundry texts, shown to be erroneous. *Body* of the *beast* destroyed. Mr. M's *data* and *calculations*: copious extract from pamphlet.]

THE author commences his first chapter, (in the pamphlet form) thus: '*Showing that Daniel's prophecies teach us, when the latter day glory will commence; when the kingdoms of this world shall be broken to pieces, and carried away by the glorious kingdom of Christ; when the judgment shall set, and the books be opened.*'

He says, p. 7, 'In the second chapter of Daniel, beginning at the 31st verse and ending with the 45th, we have a prophecy of the four kingdoms that would arise in the world, from that same time, until the end of all earthly kingdoms.' This chapter contains a description of the great *image*, seen by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. Mr. Miller applies this, as usual, to the Chaldean, Persian, Grecian and Roman Monarchies; to the division of the Roman Empire; the reign of Popery, and the final destruction of all these by the 'stone cut out of the mountain without hands,' which he supposes will take place in the year 1843. He then proceeds to examine the 7th and 8th chapters of Daniel, where all that is represented by the *image*, is more extensively illustrated, by the Prophet, under the figures of *four great beasts, rising out of the sea.* These he explains at length, in 'Chapter 1,'* from page 7 to page 14. As his *general views* of these prophecies are the same as those of Drs. Scott, Clarke and Newton, which the reader can examine, it is not necessary here to transcribe them. But, as the writer thinks he finds abundant evidence, in the 2d, 7th and 8th chapters of Daniel, that there will be no Millennial day until the papal beast, together with all wicked persons shall have been consumed 'in the general conflagration of the world,' and applies the words of Daniel to prove such an event; we shall now examine the correctness of his inferences, only so far as they are designed to show that the wicked and the earth will be destroyed by literal fire. The question is *not* whether

* That which is embraced in Chap 1, of the pamphlet, may be found in lecture 3rd of the book, though in different language.

such an event will ever take place, but whether the passages under consideration assert or imply it. Mr. Miller was doubtless aware that it was absolutely necessary to *first* prove that there will be such an event, and that there will be no Millenium preceeding it, or else all his *calculations* and *data*, in his subsequent lectures or chapters, to prove that it will take place in A. D. 1843, would be labor lost. If then we should show that he has failed to prove the *event* of the destruction of the wicked in this manner, it would supercede the necessity of examining his book further; for if the *event* fails, all the calculations about the *time* when it would transpire would be useless. The reader is requested to carefully examine Dan. 2: 31 to 45. Is there any mention made there of either the destruction of the wicked or of the earth by fire? Is it declared in the 35th verse? 'Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors, and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them; and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth.' Now what is here said about *literally* destroying the earth and its inhabitants by fire, or in any other way? Mr. M. says, 'the reader will readily perceive that the kingdoms of this world will be totally and utterly destroyed when this prophecy is fulfilled.' Yes, all this might take place here, while the present earth is standing; for no mention is made of any change in the earth, or in its productions and seasons. The words, 'and filled the whole earth,' show that the earth would be still standing. The passage only speaks of the destruction of the universal monarchies; hence, other nations might exist, or the probable meaning is, that the governments of the earth will be so far changed, that they will perfectly harmonise with the mild reign of Christ, when 'the wolf and the lamb will feed together.' This is the most that the passage indicates. Does the 44th verse support his theory? 'And in the days of these kings shall God set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever.' Now is any mention made here of the destruction of the earth, or its inhabitants? This passage shows that this kingdom was to be established, not after the earth had been burnt up, but in the days of the reign of these kings; that is, in the days of the

last king or Roman empire, under the peaceable reign of Claudius Cæsar, the kingdom of the Messiah should be established. Christ's kingdom is to be one of universal peace, *to fill the whole earth*, and destroy all tyranical governments:—But, Mr. Miller allows of no such time until the earth has been destroyed by fire; and yet he applies the 2nd, 11th and 25th Chapters of Isaiah which speak of universal peace, or of nations learning war no more, to the past spread of the gospel. Give me the liberty which he claims in understanding Isaiah figuratively, and Dan. 2d and 7th Chapters, literally, and I can prove any thing by the bible.

The reader will please next examine the 7th and 8th Chapters of Daniel. Do we find any thing said there about the burning up of the earth? Is it declared in verse 9th? 'I beheld till the thrones were cast down and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool; his throne like the fiery flame and his wheels like burning fire.' On this text Mr. M. remarks, 'This verse is so obvious, that it needs no comment. It is a description of the Judge of all the earth, when he comes to Judgment.' Now the reader will keep in view the fact, that the question is not whether there will be a judgment, either before or after death, but whether those passages support the position that the earth and its inhabitants will be destroyed by literal fire? If he don't support this one point all his subsequent data fail. Now is there the least allusion in the above verse to such an event? Is it found in the next verse? 'A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him; thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set and the books were opened.' 'This verse,' says Mr. M. 'represents him coming to burn up the wicked, to raise and bring his saints into his presence, and commence the Judgment.' This we consider assertion without proof. Does the text say a word about *raising the dead, burning up the wicked* or bringing saints into his presence? Were not the saints in God's presence? Why then talk of bringing them into his presence, or into judgment, if their condition was unalterably fixed in glory at death? Is any thing said about burning up the *earth*? Keep that point in view. 'I beheld then, because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake; I beheld, even till, the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame,' verse 11th. 'In

this verse,' says Mr. M. 'we have a clear prophecy that papal Rome, or the little horn, will not be destroyed until Christ shall come, and then their bodies shall be burnt in the conflagration of the world.' Now is there any mention made about the earth or world in the text? or about the *bodies* of the wicked being destroyed in a general conflagration? It don't say *bodies*, as Mr. M. asserts; but *his body*, that is, the body of the fourth or Roman beast. This is evident from the next verse. 'As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away; yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time.' Now it is evident that these beasts existed for a '*season and time*,' after the body of the fourth beast, 'strong and terrible,' was destroyed. Please read the verses again. Could their *lives* have been *prolonged* after all the wicked, together with the beast, and all his horns, or antichrist, popery and all, had been consumed in the general conflagration of the world?

The preceeding verses in the chapter show that the phrase, 'the *rest of the beasts*,' refers to the three universal monarchies which preceded the fourth beast. But whether the words refer to those kingdoms, or as Mr. M. supposes, 'to the remainder of the ten horns, or kingdoms, which were not plucked by the little horn,' still they existed *after* the beast was slain. But Mr. M. to avoid this difficulty, transposes these verses so as to make the lives of the rest of the beasts be preserved *unto* the time when the main beast was slain.' He says, 'the prophet has now gone back to see what had become of these other kingdoms, that he might have all present at this last grand scene, and he finds them, as he says, with their dominion taken away, but their lives prolonged even to the coming of the son of man.' Thus he keeps the body of the main beast alive, until he gets all these petty 'horns or kingdoms' present to be burnt up at the *same* time; whereas their lives were prolonged after the 'beast was slain, and his body given to the burning flame.' But he thinks the next verses support his transposition. 'I saw in the night vision, and, behold, one like the son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and he came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion' &c. Mr. M. says,

'In this passage we are carried into the glorified and eternal state of the kingdom of Christ, when his elect from among all nations, will be brought into his immediate presence, to serve and obey him forever.' Now is there any thing said in the above passage about the destruction of the wicked, or of the earth by fire? Certainly not. If the passage extends Christ's triumphant kingdom into the resurrection or immortal state, still it embraces all nations, people and languages,' and not as Mr. M. says, 'the elect out of all nations.' Hence, the Chapter *no where* alludes to the burning up of either the bodies or the souls of men, but only of *the beast;* which must mean the destruction of either civil or ecclesiastical powers. The 'conclusion of the whole matter,' appears to be this. *The beasts* are governments;—the 'Ancient of days,' God; the 'one like the son of man,' Christ;—'the stone cut out of the mountain without hands,' and the 'kingdom set up,' refer to Christ's advent, and the establishment of his kingdom in that age;—'the judgment was,' then 'set'—(see Matt. 16: 27, 28,)—the reign of Christ commenced—the beast has been judged—his power broken—his body slain—the stone or kingdom is increasing—it will 'fill the whole earth—and all nations, people and languages' will ultimately constitute Christ's 'everlasting kingdom.' I have now given all Mr. M's *main* proof that the earth and wicked will be destroyed by literal fire.

Here we commence an examination of the important scripture data and periods from which Mr. Miller deduces his general inferences in support of the position that the earth will be destroyed in A. D. 1843. But before we enter on this examination, it is proper for us to offer a remark or two on the highly figurative style of the prophecy of Daniel and the Apocalypse. The figures of these books are exceeding bold and metaphorical, and, we may add, dark and intricate, and it appears to me vain, not to say presumptuous, for any one to attempt, at this remote period, to determine the precise day, or even year, when their predictions will be fulfilled. All learned commentators differ much in their interpretations of them, and indeed in their general application of the entire books. Some think that all the prophecy of Daniel terminated at the destruction of Jerusalem and the establishment of Christ's kingdom, in the reign of the last beast. The learned Eusebius, in the former part of the fourth

century, applied the whole book of Revelation to the Jews; the destruction of their city, and the establishment of Christianity. He argued from the words, at the beginning and close of the book, 'behold I come quickly,' that it had all been fulfilled: While Newton wades through all the corruptions of the church, the impositions of Mahomet, 'the false prophet,' and the cruelty and superstitions of the Pagan beast, or imperial Rome, to find events corresponding with the language of these books, the learned Dr. A. Clarke is content with saying, 'I do not understand the book,' or Revelation of St. John the divine.

After having been so inconsistent as to give an explanation of the whole book, agreeable to the popular views of believers in endless misery, when he comes to chapter 22: verse 7, '*Behold I come quickly,—'the things that must shortly be done,*' the Dr. remarks, 'there are many sayings in this book, which, if taken literally would intimate that the prophecies delivered in the Apocalypse were to be fulfilled in a *short time* after their delivery to John: and this is a strong support of the scheme of Wetstein, and those who maintain that the prophecies of this book all referred to those times in which the apostle lived; and to the disturbances which then took place, not only among the *Jews*, but in the *Roman* empire. What they all mean, and when and how they are to be fulfilled, God in heaven only knows.' And on verse 19: 'This is termed a *revelation*, but it is a revelation of *symbols*, an exhibition of *enigmas*, to which no particular solution is given; and to which God only can give a solution.'

Let it be observed, that Mr. Miller *literalizes* Daniel, and John, and the words of Christ, in Matt. 24th and 25th chapters, and draws his main support therefrom, of the position that there will be no millenium until the earth and the wicked have been consumed by literal fire. Now, Dr. Clarke admits, '*if taken literally*,' they would all apply to the Jews or end of the first century of the christian era. He farther thinks that, 'God only can give the solution' to the predictions they contain. How much involved in doubts and uncertainty then must be the calculations of uninspired men, in this age, about the *definite period* when these 'symbols' and 'enigmas' will have their fulfillment. And yet, Mr. M. contends that the denunciations of Christ in Matt. 24, will be literally fulfilled in 1843. If his application of the words of Christ is correct, then he has obtained a great-

er knowledge of futurity than either the apostles, angels, or Christ possessed. Christ said, 'Of that day and hour knoweth no man; no not the angels, neither the Son; but my Father only.' Again, 'Unto you it is *not* given to know the times and seasons which the Father has put in his own power.' (Acts, 1: 7.) How then can Mr. M. know the day or hour when, as he supposes, the threatenings of Christ will be fulfilled in the destruction of the earth and its inhabitants? But he may say, he does not determine the day or hour, but only the year; and even admits that it may take place in 1839. Yet, if the apostles did not 'know the times and seasons,' and Christ did not restrict his predictions to any one particular hour, day or year, but, in a broad sense, confined their fulfillment to that '*generation*,' how does Mr. M. even determine the year of such an important and stupendous avent as the burning up of the wicked, &c.

Now for the data and calculations given by Mr. Miller. Assuming with other commentators, that a day figuratively means a year, he says, 'We will now review what we have proved, and if we have a right understanding of Daniel's vision, it is proved that from the pushing of the ram, in the reign of the fifth king of Persia, when the decree or commandment was given to Ezra, to go up to build the walls of Jerusalem, to the first resurrection; to the coming of Christ, or ancient of days, when the judgement should set, the books be opened, and the church be justified, should be 2300 years; (see Dan. viii: 13, 14,) that in 70 weeks of these years, which is 490 years, Christ should be crucified, which leaves 1810 after his crucifixion, and will end in A. D. 1843 after his birth.' (This is one chain of calculations.) 'It has likewise been proved that anti-christ should reign 1260 years; or from the taking away of Pagan Rome to the setting up of papal, would be 30 years, making the 1290 years: and if Pagan Rome was to continue 666 years, as has been mentioned, and which we shall endeavor to prove hereafter, then Pagan Rome, becoming the fourth kingdom in 158 years before Christ, would cease 508 years after Christ; to which add the 30 years, will bring us down to the rise of antichrist in A. D. 538. Then add the length of his reign 1260 years, would end in 1798: or add 1290 to A. D. 508, would be the same 1798: (when the civil power of the Pope was broken by Napoleon.) Now add the remainder of the 1335 years over and above 1290, which is 45, to A. D. 1798, and

it will end in A. D. 1843. Or add 1335 to A. D. 508, when pagan Rome was destroyed, or the daily sacrifice abomination was taken away, and you have the same A. D. 1843.' (This is Mr. M,s second chain, from the league which the Jews made with the Romans, or fourth beast, in 158 B. C. down to A. D. 1843.) Again, '2300 years from 457 before Christ, Daniel's vision will end. (That is, in 1843,) 490 years from the same 457 years B. C. was crucified and the 70 weeks ended. The fourth kingdom, and the last of all earthly kingdoms, was divided into two parts; the first began 158 B. C. and lasted 666 to the end of the pagan daily sacrifice abomination, which was in A. D. 508. The last number given in Daniel (viz.) 1335, carries us down to the resurrection, and will end in A. D. 1843. In this last number is concluded the reign of antichrist, 1260 years, beginning in A. D. 538, and ending in A. D. 1798; also the 1290, beginning in A. D. 508, and ending in A. D. 1798. The remaining 45 years are for the spread of the Gospel; the resurrection of the two witnesses; the church to come out of the wilderness; the troublous times; the last great battle; and the second coming of Christ, to raise his people, and to reign with them personally the thousand years following.'

Here we have the writer's data in a condensed form. Now if we can break any one link in these chains, by showing that the time at which he has fixed the commencement or termination of this or that particular number is incorrect, we explode his whole theory, so far as it is designed to bring us down to 1843. It is not necessary to follow him through all his data and illustrations; for if the foundation or main pillars that support an edifice are swept away, the whole superstructure will, of course, fall. As he makes all the predictions of Daniel, so far as they refer to Christ's kingdom, commence with the number 2300 days, or years, we shall now only notice that number. Remember these 2300 days are made to cover the period from the reign of Artaxerxes to the end of the world. The reader will turn to Dan. viii: 13, 14. 'Then I heard one saint speaking, etc. How long will be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation to give both the host and the sanctuary to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.' On this passage Mr. M. remarks, 'We learn that the vision contained two important things, the *daily sacrtfice* and *trans-*

*gression of desolation.* The first referring to the typical priesthood, or seventy weeks; the other to the sufferings of the people of God, under the abominations of the fourth kingdom, both pagan and papal, when they shall be trodden under foot, until Christ shall be revealed in his glory.' Thus the daily sacrifice and transgression of desolation so divided that the former is made to end with the destruction of the typical priesthood, and the latter to extend through all pagan and papal Rome, to the year 1843. Has he any authority to thus divide them into two different and distinct periods? Now the very construction of the sentence shows that they refer to the same period, and that that period is the time when the sanctuary would 'be trodden under foot.' And when was this done? In A. D. 70, by the Romans. Notice the phraseology, *daily sacrifice and transgression of desolation.* They are united by the conjunction *and,* which shows that they were to be fulfilled at the same time. The phrase *transgression of desolation* evidently means the same as 'the abomination of desolation spoken by Daniel the prophet, standing where it ought not.' So Christ renders it. The Roman armies stood on the holy ground without the city. They 'trod the host and sanctuary under foot.' So I think all learned commentators understand it. Now the whole chapter, and not only so, but the whole book clearly shows that the *daily sacrifice, the transgression of desolation;* the *end of these wonders;* the words, *unto the end desolations are determined; the time of trouble such as there was not to that self same time, &c.,* all were completed in the destruction of Jerusalem. And I state again, that all learned commentators do so primarialy apply them.—The Roman power is spoken of in verses 11, 12. 'Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down.' 'Then I heard one saint speaking to another saint,' &c. See also verse 19. "Behold I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation: for at the time appointed the end shall be.' Now if at the end of the indignation the vision of the 2300 days closed, (and Mr. M. admits this, but applies this *last end of the indignation* to the 'end of all sublunary things') then if we can show that the end of the indignation was at the destruction of Jerusalem, we destroy all his calculations about the extension of the 2300 days down to 1843. See Dan. 8: 23, 24. 'And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the

transgressions are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practise, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people.' Reference is evidently here made to the *Roman power*, and the *destruction* of the *Jews*, the holy people, by them. And this was to take place 'when the transgressions had come to the full;' that is, in the end of the seventy weeks, when the 'daily sacrifice and transgression of desolation' should terminate. Now what is said in the 8th chapter of Daniel about burning up the earth or the wicked? It would certainly be a very summary way of 'cleansing the sanctuary,' or *justifying* the saints, to burn up all Jews, Mahometans, Pagans, and unbelievers in the year 1843: before the Jews were brought in with the fullness of the Gentiles; or before nations had learned war no more. In verse 26, we read, 'Wherefore shut up the vision for it shall be for many days.' And in verse 27. 'And I Daniel fainted, and was sick certain days.' Now if, as Mr. Miller says, a day means a year, then Daniel was sick certain years. Again, what is denominated 2300 days is here, in the same chapter, called 'many days.' Thus the number 2300 may be indefinite, meaning no more than 'many days.' Thus we may say 'a thousand and one,' meaning many. And what reliance can be put upon the term day, or days, when Mr. M. sometimes understands them to mean literal days; sometimes years; and in several instances makes them mean each a thousand years; as in Hosea 6: 3. 'After two days he will revive us; in the third day he shall raise us up, and we shall live in his sight.' After applying these days to a long period of the tribulation of the church, Mr. M. remarks, on Page 39, 'There remaineth but one bible way to explain day; and that is, a thousand years.'—Thus the church will be in tribulation two twousand years, and the third day they will be cleansed or justified, and the saints will then reign with Christ this day, that is, a 'thousand years.' Now how shall we understand him? He labors on p. 15, to prove that a day means one year, and quotes, 'I have appointed a day for a year.' And here he tells us that there is but one 'scripture way to explain day, and that is a thousand years.' Thus the term day is made to mean any thing or period we please. Can we with safety depend upon our understanding of these figurative terms, in determining when so important an event

ns the end of all sublunary things will take place. It is evident, therefore, that the vision of 2300 days means the same as 'many days,' which extended down to the end of 70 weeks or the desolations that came upon the *holy people*, when the daily sacrifice ceased. Let us see now, if there is any thing in the 9th chapter of Daniel that will extend the 2300 days or *transgrssion of desolation* beyond the end of 70 weeks. The verse 2d treats of 'seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem.' Thus the subject is still confined to the Jews. From the third to the twentieth verse, we have Daniel's prayer for his oppressed countrymen in Babylon, and for their restoration to the holy land. He confesses their sins, and adds, 'O my God, incline thine ear, and hear; open thine eyes and see, and behold *our desolations*, and the city that is called by thy name.' Now observe, Daniel's prayer referred *entirely to the Jews* in that age, and had no allusion to Gentiles or to the end of the world. In answer to his supplications, an angel came 'to him to make him understand the matter and consider the vision.' That is, the former vision of 2300 or 'many days.' And he delivers to him the prophetic vision of 70 weeks.—'Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression,' &c.—Here the Jews are still spoken of. And in conclusion he speaks of the covenant of one week, when 'the sacrifice and oblation shall cease,' and 'the overspreading abominations,' 'shall be poured out upon the desolate.' Now these did not end at A. D.—33, as Mr. M. supposes, but A. D 70, when the 'daily sacrifice and transgression of desolation came to an end.' Thus I fearlessly assert that the vision 2300 days and the 70 weeks refer to the same events, and are both fulfilled at the same time. I know that Mr. M. first measures off the 70 weeks or 490 years, from Artaxerxes down to the crucifixion of Christ, and then extends the remaining 1810 from A. D. 33, down 1843. But no intimation of such a division is given in the 8th or 9th chapters of Daniel. Neither are we told that the 1260 days, in the 12th ch. are designed, by the angel, together with the 666, to cary out the remaining years of the 2300 days. Now if the daily sacrifice and transgression of desolation refer to the same time, the 2300 days must terminate with the 70 weeks. And if they do, and each means a year, then they would just cover the reign of Daniel's four beasts down to the cutting off of the Messiah in the 'midst of the days of

the last beast.' Thus, it was 2300 years from the founding of Babylon, by Nimrod to the destruction of the 'holy city.' Babylon was 'the head of Gold.' Hence these days embrace all that is set forth by the *image*. Babylon was built 2217 years B. C. Jerusalem was destroyed in A. D. 70, thus making 2287 years leaving 13 years for the 'sword to abide on all their cities.' This is not so much as Mr. M. leaves; for he leaves 45 years, from 1798 to 1843, for 'troublous times,' &c. If, on the other hand, the 2300 days *commenced* at the cessation of the daily sacrifice in A. D. 70, they would extend down to A. D. 2370. Hence the earth would have 534 years more to stand.'

---

## PART THIRD.

[The vision; 70 weeks. 2300 days; many days. Bishop Newton. The vile person; league made; *guessing*. The Romans, a little Republic.]

N. B. *Lectures* here named, mean the Ed. of 1836.

In our last, we partially examined Mr. M's application of Daniel's 2300 days. As he makes them commence with the 70 weeks, we shall now bestow some attention on these. We shall still quote from his pamphlet, as he there studied brevity, and his opinions are more concisely laid down. Yet we shall keep an eye upon his Lectures, for any *additional light* which they may throw upon the subject, or for any change in his data. But as far as we have read, we have discovered no such change.

I showed, in my last, that Mr. M. commenced his 2300 days 457 B. C: first measuring from 490 to A. D. 33, and then extending the 1810 to 1843. I also showed that the 8th and 9th Chapters of Daniel no where express or imply such a division—that the phrase *many days* meant the same as 2300, and that they, as well as the daily sacrifice, and transgression of desolation, ended where the 70 weeks ended. See Dan. 9: 23, 'At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to show thee; for thou art greatly beloved: therefore understand the matter, and consider the *vision*.' On this Mr. M. remarks, 'By

this verse we learn that Gabriel was commanded to instruct Daniel further in the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation; and here follows his instruction;' Dan. 9: 24. 'Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city;' &c. It does not say, as Mr. M. states, 'to instruct Daniel *further* in the vision,' but to 'understand' it; that is, the vision of 2300 days. Now Mr. M. admits that Gabriel came to instruct Daniel 'concerning the daily sacrifice and transgression of desolation.' How did the angel instruct him? Answer; by the period of 70 weeks. Now if we can show that the daily sacrifice and transgression of desolation, and the 70 weeks, both bring us down to the same period, we shall show that the vision of 'many days' alias, 2300 days, does not extend to 1843. We stated before, that the *vision* was explained in the 9th chapter. Now, was the angel faithful? Did he make Daniel 'understand the' whole 'matter,' or did he only explain one fifth part of *the vision*, that is 490 days, leaving 1810 to be explained in the remaining chapters, and by leagues and enigmatical numbers in the Apocalypse? Why did not the angel give some hint of this at the close of the 9th chapter, of the 70 weeks? No such intimation is given. But Mr. M. may say, it is given in the next verse; that is Dan. 10: 1; where the angel told Daniel, 'the time appointed was long.' But this chapter commences an explanation *more definitely* of the 70 weeks, which Daniel did not as yet fully understand, and is extended down through the remaining chapters (that is through the reigns of the beasts, from Cyrus Darius, Xerxes, Alexander, &c.) to the destruction of Jerusalem, when the 70 weeks would end, and the 'holy people,' the Jews, be scattered. Now the whole book will show this to be the true explanation; for '*all these things*' were to '*be finished*' *when* the holy people were scattered; not that saints were to be scattered *a little before* the year 1843, or *before* the 'transgressions of desolation should come to the full;' or be scattered *after* the earth and the wicked should be burnt up. It would surely be a strange way to scatter God's 'holy people,' by raising them immortal, and 'bring them into his presence.'

Now Mr. M. admits that the angel, in the tenth chapter, first verse, goes back to Cyrus, and commences more fully an explanation of the 70 weeks. This shows that what I said about the ninth chapter being an explanation of the

2300 days, in chapter eight, was correct. That he so understands it, is evident, from his comments on the ninth chapter. After explaining Dan. 9: 24, 27, he adds, 'We have followed the instruction of the Angel Gabriel to Daniel, thus far, and find that he brings us down to the *end* of sublunary things invariably.' Now what is said in verse 27, about the end of sublunary things? Does the phrase, 'until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate,' mean the end of the world? Has the word consummation no other meaning or application? It means, I think, until the end of the 70 weeks, or rather the end of the 'overspreading of abominations,' just before spoken of. Mr. M. adds, 'He has told us how long the vision shall be, 2300 years; he has shown us that 70 weeks or 490 of those years would be accomplished at the crucifiction of Christ,' &c. Again, 'We can take 490, and find the number of years after Christ's death, before the vision will end, viz: 1810 years—we can add the age of Christ, 33 years, to 1810, and by this calculation find that the vision will be accomplished in A. D. 1843. But Daniel could not do all this, for he was not informed how much time would lapse before the commandment to build the walls would be given,' &c. Hence, the angel, in Chap. 10: 1, goes back to Cyrus, and commences the explanation So Mr. M. explains it. See pamphlet, page 17: and his Lectures, p. 49. Now, as to Mr. M's table of calculations, did the angel say any thing about taking 490 from 2300, or of adding 33 to 1810? Not at all. He left the 70 weeks as a full explanation of his 2300 days and made no additions or subtractions. Mr. M. may say, he has explained that in the remaining chapters: and may cite Dan. 10: 14. 'Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days; for yet the vision is for many days.' This text has no reference (as Mr. M. supposes,) to saints in this day. The phrase, 'thy people,' refers to the Jews, and is used in the 70 weeks; thus 'Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people.' The phrase, 'latter days' is a common expression, applied to the times of the prophets and apostles. Hence Peter says, 'We know it is the last time.' History faithfully tells us what befell the Jews in 'the last end of the indignation,' that is 'the latter days.' Let us now examine the 70 weeks. When did they begin? Mr. M. answers, 457 B. C. So do commentators. But are they correct? See Dan. 9:

25, 'Know therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem,' &c. Two things are embraced in this commandment. 1. To restore the Jews from captivity. 2. To build Jerusalem; yes, even the 'streets and wall in troublous times.' Several particulars here deserve notice. 1. The commandment *preceded* the building of either Jerusalem, the streets, or the walls. 2. It *preceded* the troublous times. Now the date of this commandment is put at 457. B. C. when Artaxerxes commissioned Ezra to cary up certain jewels and vessels for the *use* and *adornation* of the temple. But there is no mention in this commission to 'build Jerusalem,' or to complete *streets* and *walls*. Hence the 7th chapter of Ezra does not agree with 'the commandment.' But the first chapter does. See Ezra 1: 1—3. The temple was built or completed in 515, B. C. (according to Ezra 6: 15,) by king Darius, in the 6th year of his reign; but, according to Josephus, in the 9th. Now if the commandment commenced with the reign of Cyrus, 536 B. C. then the 490 days or 70 weeks would end 46 years B. C. was born, and 79 years before he was crucified. Thus, 1810 years from 46 years B. C.—and the 2300 years would end ; that is, in 1764. Hence the day has gone by.

Again, Dan. 9: 25, we read, 'shall be seven weeks and three score and two weeks.' And in verse 26 we read, 'And after three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off.' Now by the phrase, 'shall Messiah be cut off,' we all understand the prophet to refer to his crucifixion. Hence if we admit that 'the commandment' was given by Artaxerxes 457 B. C. still he must have been crucified either at the end of 62, or at the end (at most,) of 69 weeks. Whether the angel meant that the 65 weeks were to be reckoned from 457, or 49 years after, that is, 408 B. C., Daniel was not informed. But if Christ was crucified at the end of 62 weeks, and these weeks *come first*, that is, commence at the giving of the decree, 457 B. C. then he was cut off 56 years sooner than the christian date of his death, at the end of 434 years from the decree of Artaxerxes. Thus he would be cut off 23 years before the christian era, or before he was born; and 56 years before A. D. 33. But we shall be told that the 7 weeks are first numbered, and then the three score and two weeks, and then the one week. We will admit it. But Mr. M. assigns no reason for it. Seven weeks from 457, (that is, 49 years) would bring us down to 408 B. C. At this time

the 7 weeks would end, and the 62 weeks begin. Now what event is there in history, either sacred or profane, that should fix the end of 7 weeks and the commencement of the 62 weeks, at 408 B. C.? I cannot find any. But if it is so reckoned, the 7 weeks and 62 weeks, (that is 483 years) would only extend from 457 B. C. down to A. D. 26.—Now Mr. M. repeatedly declares that the 70 weeks ended at Christ's crucifixion. Hence the *vision* ends in 1836, instead of 1843, according to his own statement. He says, 'We can add 33 years to 1810, which will make 1843.'. So I say, (if he was cut off at the end of 69 weeks from 457 B. C.) we can add 26 years to 1810 which makes 1836. This is a sad mistake, as the year 1836 has expired, and the earth affords no signs of immediate dissolution.

But Mr. M. so transposes these numbers, or rather lumps them all together, as to make the Messiah be cut off at the end of the 70 weeks, in A. D. 33. Thus, in explaining the 'covenant of one week,' he says, 'John preached three years and a half, and Christ three years and a half: making in all one week.' At '*the last half of the week*' he fixes the crucifixion of Christ. Now the passage says, that, 'in the midst of the week (or least half of it) he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and, for the overspreading of the abominations, he shall make it desolate.' &c. Now did the daily sacrifice and oblation cease in either A. D. 26, or 33? True, Christ then, by his own offering 'finished transgression and made an end of sins;' (prospectively) but daily sacrifices did not cease until A. D. 69. Thus it appears to me that the 'one week' referred to the terrible wars, famines, earthquakes, &c. which were 'the beginning of sorrows,' & that at the end of the 7 years, that which was 'determined,' was 'poured out upon the desolate,' the Jewish city. So Bishop Newton applies the 70 weeks. On page 94; remarking on Matt. 24: 36, *Of that day and hour*'—'It is true, our Saviour declares, *all these things shall be fulfilled in this generation;* it is true, the prophet Daniel has given some intimation of the time in his famous prophecy of the 70 weeks:—But though that great revolution was to happen in that generation; though it was to happen *towards the conclusion* of 70 weeks or 490 years, to be computed at a certain date that is not easy to be fixed; yet the particular day, the particular season in which it was to happen, might still remain a secret to men and angels.' Note; the phrase, '*towards the conclu-*

*sion*,' shows that the Dr. begins the 62 weeks at about 434 years before Christ was crucified, and extends the remaining 8 weeks down to about A. D. 70.

Having noticed the 2300 days and the 70 weeks, I now pass to notice the *League*, and the number 666. After explaining the 70 weeks, Mr. M. continues his illustrations through the 10th and 11th chapters, and, with other writers, applies them to the 4 universal monarchies. The only thing that concerns this review is his main data; therefore, we shall commence with his remarks on Dan. 11: 21. After applying verse 18 to Pompey; verse 19 to Cæsar, who was slain by Brutus and Cassius, and verse 20 to Claudius Cæsar, who died peaceably in his bed, he quotes versses 21, 22, 23; 'And in his estate shall stand up a vile person, (Tiberius Cæsar) to whom they shall not give the honor of the kingdom: but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries, And with the arms of a flood shall they be overflown; yea, also the prince of the covenant.' This Mr. M. applies to Tiberus Cæsar who obtained the kingdom by flatteries; under whose reign the 'prince of the covenant,' i. e. Jesus Christ was crucified, in A. D. 33, and the 70 weeks ended. This is however all *guessing*, which is scarcely allowable in fixing important data. He continues, verse 23, 'And after the league made with him, he shall work deceitfully; for he shall come up, and shall become strong with a small people.' 'The reader will now observe that the angel Gabriel goes back and begins the history of the Roman Government, when, and at the time the same became the fourth kingdom in the world.' Pamphlet, p. 22: and Lectures, p. 68. Here, Mr. M. shifts the subject from *him*, in verse 22 (that is, the *literal* Tiberius Cæsar,) and makes the angel go back to *him* the Roman Government 158, B. C. '*to bring up the national character.*' Thus, verse 22 brings us down to A. D. 33, and verse 23 transports us back 181 years. This is a wonderful transposition! But why do the pronouns *he* and *him* in the preceeding verses refer to the Cæsars, and the pronoun *him* in verse 23 refer to some being or thing 181 years before? Now if verse 22 refers to Tiberius Cæsar, the whole scope of the subject shows that the league was made with *him*, and not 181 years before. But why is this league sought for? Is it done to fill out the 1810 years after the close of the 70 weeks? No—for this league, according to his own calculations, was made in 158 B. C. that

is, 309 years after the decree of Artaxerxes. Hence here is a broken ink of 309 years, as it stands in no way connected with the 70 weeks which, he says, ended in A. D. 33, nor with the 2300 days. Now this league is sought for merely to find some date at which to commence the number 666, that other numbers in Daniel and the Rev. may quadrate with it, and bring us down to 1843. Thus he tells us that the number 666 refers to Pagan Rome from the time it became connected with the people of God, *by league*, in 158 B. C. and extends down to its overthrow in A. D. 508, when pagan abominations came to an end. But this is all *guessing*. As Josephus gives us a long chapter on the leagues which the Jews made with various nations, how does he know that the angel went back and referred to this league rather than to some other with the Romans, or, more likely with the Greeks? If a person has a right to *choose* where he will fix his data,—he can make his chain end where he pleases. On verse 23, he adds, 'This will be evident, first, because it speaks of a *league made with him*, when he was a small (or republican) people. Secondly, this league must mean the first league made between the Romans and Jews, for I could never be able to find any kingdom prophesied of in the scriptures, until the kingdom became connected, in some manner, with the people of God.' Again, 'This league the reader will find an account of in Maccabees 8 & 9 chapters, and also in Josephus' antiquities.'

Now do historical facts bear out the above application? Were the Romans then a '*a small people*' *a little republic*? If not, then the *league* must have been made with some other people. Mr. M. refers us to Josephus, Book xii. Chap. x Sect. 6 There we have a description of the first league the Jews ever made with the Romans. After speaking of the death of the high priest Alcimus, Josephus says, 'and when he was dead, the people bestowed the high priesthood on Judus; who hearing of the power of the Romans; and that they had conquered Galatia, and Siberia, and Carthage, and Lybia, and that besides these, they had subdued Greece, and their kings, Perseus and Philip, and Antiochus also, he resolved to enter into a league of friendship with him.' After describing the form of the league, Josephus adds, 'this was the first league that the Romans made with the Jews and it was managed after this manner.' In a note at the bottom, the compiler says, 'How well the Roman histories

agree to this account of the conquests and powerful condition of the Romans of this time, see the notes in Hanercamp's edition,' &c. Now is it possible for any one to infer from the above statements, that Rome was at this time (when the *first* league was made with the Jews) a small people—a little republic? I repeat it again, the league spoken of in Dan. 11: 23, must have been made with some other people, who were comparatively small. Indeed all history shows that in 158 B. C. Rome as a commonwealth was in the very zenith of her glory. The third punic war ended in 146 B. C. In the same year all Greece submitted to the Roman yoke,—and from the introduction of foreign luxury, taste and fashions, the Republic then began rapidly to degenerate, in so much that it entirely went down in 45 B. C. when Julius Cæsar was proclaimed perpetual dictator.

Rome was about 244 years regal, 450 years a commonwealth, and from Julius Cæsar, to the fall of Western Rome in A. D. 476, a kingly Government. Thus she continued in various forms from the founding of Rome until the final division of the whole Western Empire ; a period of 1228 years. Why then does Mr. M. restrict the whole reign of the pagan beast to only 666 years? And why does he make these years commence at 158 B. C. and terminate 508 after Christ? Did 'PAGAN *daily sacrifice*,' either continue to, or terminate in, A. D. 508? The consideration of these questions will occupy the next number of this review.

[It may be proper to add, that the '*vile person*,' spoken of in Dan. 11: 21, 24, answers to *Antiochus Epiphanes*. He obtained the kingdom 'by flatteries,' and in turn, was *flattered* with the title 'Epiphanes,' *i. e. illustrious*, though he was *contemptible*. 'The prince of the covenant,' was *Onias*, the pious high priest of the Jews, who was removed, and *Jason*, his brother, put in his stead. Antiochus broke the league made with Jason, drove him off, 'as by a flood,' and, for greater gain, made his brother *Menelaus* high priest. Every characteristic of the 'vile person,' seems to be applicable to the treacherous Antiochus. Hence, another link of Mr. M's chain is broken. See, Bish. Newton, and A. Clarke, on Dan. 11th Chapter.]

## PART FOURTH.

[Name of the Beast, 666. Daniel's numbers, 1260, 1290, 1335. 'Daily sacrifice abominations;' not named in the Bible. Errors in dates, pointed out. Wild notions concerning Bonaparte.]

We now come to the consideration of the application which Mr. M. makes of the number 666. He does not apply this number to the *name* of the beast (that is, Pagan Rome) nor to the *name* of the image of the beast, that is, Popery. But he thinks it designates the duration of the beast from the *league* in 158, B. C. to the end of pagan sacrifices in A. D. 508. Mr. M. not only condemns, but ridicules all the expositions of this number, which have been advanced by learned commentators. He says, 'Rivers of ink have been shed to explain its meaning; brains have been addled in trying to find some great mystery which the wisdom of this world could only discover ; and in trying to be wise above what was written, men have lost their balance and fell into absurdities too ridiculous to mention. Some have searched through all the vocabulary of Greek names to find one whose numerical letters would make the number 666.' 'Latin book-worms, not wishing to be outdone by their Greek neighbors, rumaged all the old goatskin parchments and musty books in christendom, and behold, a much greater harvest was the fruit of their labor, for now every Latinus had three or more names to his share.' 'Lectures,' p. 54.

Here the writer, very *modestly*, with a few dashes of the pen, rejects, as ridiculously absurd, all the opinions of learned *predecessors*, who have shed rivers of ink on this enigmatical number. But he does not attempt to show wherein any of their calculations are erroneous. Having thus dispatched them at once, he quotes Job. 14: 5; Ps. 90: 12; Isa. 22: 10; and Dan. 5: 25, 26, in proof that the words *number, numbered*, &c., refer to *time* or *duration*, such as the *days* or *months* or years of a man; the years of kingdoms, &c. We admit that these words are sometimes used *literally*, and sometimes *figuratively*, to mean *duration*. But what will all his quotations prove? Do they prove that the number 666 refered to time, and meant just so many years? We think not. This point, which we deem most important, he assumes without any proof, except references to what he

deems to be analagous passages. But does the passage refer to *time*? See Rev. 13: 17. 'That no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.' Is any thing here said about the *duration* of the beast? Did either the *first* beast, or the *image beast* forbid any to buy or sell who had not the *number* of the *years* of the beast written in his forehead? The passage speaks only of the *mark*, the *name* of the beast, and the *number* of his *name*; but makes no allusion to *time* or years. Does the next verse allude to time or years? 'Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number (not years) of the beast: for it is the *number* of a man; and the number is six hundred three score and six.' Now to what does the number, which is used three times in this passage, refer? Answer, to '*the name of the beast*' and 'the number of his *name*.' The simple meaning of the two verses is, that 'the name of the beast,' and, 'the number of his name,' is 666. Thus the passage has no allusion to time, unless it be inferred from the words, 'it is the number of a man.' Does the word *number* here mean *age*? Or rather, did the Revelator *compare* the *age* of the Roman beast to the *age* of a man? If he did, then it would refer to some man who lived just 666 years. As all learned commentators have understood the number 666 to refer to the name of the beast, we must give Mr. M. credit for originality in applying it to his *age*. Dr. A. Clarke is so confident that it refers to the name, that he quotes verse 18, and adds, 'Here then is the solution of this mystery; *let him that hath wisdom*, or a mind for investigations of this kind, find out a kingdom which contains precisely the number 666; for this must be infallibly the name of the beast. *E. Latine Basileia*. 'The Latin Kingdom, has exclusively this number.' He adduces a mass of unquestionable evidence that prior to 'the invention of figues by the Arabs in the tenth century, letters of the alphabet were used for numbers.' His whole explanation of the passage, to say the least is plausible. Equally plausible is the explanation of Bishop Newton, who finds in the word, or rather numerical letters which compose *Latinos*, just 666; which he thinks is evidence, or *wisdom*, that the Revelator referred to the Latin church, which 'latinizes every thing.' I dismiss this number by remarking that it cannot refer to the *years* of the beast, unless we make St. John say, in Chapter 15: 2, 'I saw as it were a

sea of glass mingled with fire, and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over the *years* of his name,' which would be absurd. What saint could get the victory over the whole *duration* of the pagan beast? Hence the number 666 is too enigmatical to be relied upon as a link in a series of *periods*, which shall end in the year 1843, with the dissolution 'of all sublunary things.'

Having applied this number to the years of the beast, Mr. M. makes them commence in 158 B. C. and end in 508 after. But did western Rome fall in 508? All historians tell us that it went down in A. D. 476. It, hence, ended 32 years sooner than his calculations make it end. Therefore all Daniel's figues or days, such as 1260, 1290, 1335, should end 32 years sooner, that is, 1811, instead of 1843. A sad mistake. We will quote his own words. 'Lectures,' p. 61.* 'About the year A. D. 476 the western empire of Rome crumbled to ruins' (of course the beast fell) 'and the pagan nations of the north crossing the Rhine and the Danube, established ten kingdoms in what was considered the western empire. These kingdoms were all governed by pagan kings, and history informs us that in the city of Rome and other places in the empire, these pagan conquerors sacrificed men, women and children to their supposed deities. And that in the year 496 Clovis, king of France, was converted and baptized into the Christian faith, and that the remainder of these kings embraced the religion of Christ shortly after, the last of which was baptized in 508, and of course Paganism ceased.' Does the writer here show that Rome, as a nation or empire, continued to 508? Or does the fact that Clovis was baptized in 496, and the last of the ten pagan kings in 508, prove that the 'sacrifice of men, women and children to pagan deities' ended 508? What evidence have we that pagan sacrifices continued *precisely* to that time and no longer? Who was this last king that was baptized in 508? Why did not the writer give his name? I do not find him noticed, in any large chronological table, as a convert at that time. So far from pagan abominations continuing to, or coming to an end in 508, Tytler, professor of history in the University of Edinburgh, in his 'Elements of General History,' says, p. 121, 'In the 4th century, the christian church was alternately persecuted and cherished by the

*Late Ed. p. 92.

Roman Emperors.—Among its opposers we rank Diocletian, Galerius, and Julian. Among its favorites Constantine and his sons, Valentinian, Valens, Gratian, and the excellent Theodosius, in whose reign the pagan superstition came to its final period.' He tells us that Theodosius, died in 395. Hence pagan superstitions ended 113 years before 508.

Mr. M. talks much of pagan daily sacrifices, &c. Did any of the kings of the 4th century enact laws requiring the daily sacrifice of men, women and children to their supposed deities?' Did ever the Jews or Gentiles have a law requiring the *daily* sacrifice of one or more human beings, as a religious rite or observance? We think not. Again why apply the 'transgression of desolation,' (Dan. 8: 13) to the pagan superstitions; or 'the *abomination* that maketh desolate' to Gentile superstitions and idolatries? Speaking of the baptizing of the last king in 508, he says, 'Here was the accomplishment of two important prophecies; the daily sacrifice abomination taken out of the way, and the pagan beast receiving his deadly wound by the sword.' The phrase, 'daily sacrifice abomination' is not in the Bible. In Dan. 12: 11, sacrifices and abominations are mentioned as distinct things. '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.' Daily sacrifice ceased before the temple was entirely overthrown; and the abomination that maketh desolate stood 'where it ought not.' The Jews had *daily sacrifices* of beasts, but not of human beings. See Heb. 10: 11. 'And every priest standeth daily, offering often-times the same sacrifices which can never take away sins.'

But we must close our examination of Mr. M's application of Daniel and John's enigmatical numbers. The figures now to be noticed are recorded in Dan. 12th Chapter, verses 7, 11, 12: *i. e.* 1260, 1290, 1335. These are assumed to mean years. Now if they mean years, and the words '*daiiy sacrifice*,' '*and the abomination that make desolate*' refer, as we have shown, to the destruction of Jerusalem, then, '*from the time*' of these events the above numbers would only extend, at most, down to the thirteenth or fourteenth century. Thus, from A. D. 70, the 1335 would extend to A. D. 1405. Hence they have long since been fulfilled. But they may mean *literal* days, which lasted three years and a half, or to the end of the seige. Thus, 'He that endu-

reth to the end shall be saved.' That is, as it reads in Dan. 'Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh to the thousand three hundred and thirty five days,' when the christians who survive these troubles shall have rest, &c.

But Mr. M. makes these sacrifices end in A. D. 508, as we showed in a former number. He then makes the 1290 commence at that date and end in 1798. But it would not do to have the 1260 begin at 508, for it would end in 1768, and thus vary his calculations 30 years. To avoid this, he allows 30 years from 508 to 538, when the *image beast* was set up.* But the Bible no where allows it, or intimates such an interim. Daniel mentions, 'time, times and an half,' *first*, and then 1290 days. By what authority then does he make the latter number commence 30 years before the former? And why does he fix the date of the *civil* power of popery at 538? Were the people for *just* 30 years exempt from pagan sacrifices and papal abominations? *I find no events in history that will support such a position.* There were many popes before 538, and much abomination during the above 20 years. Did the *civil* power of the Pope commence in 538? This Mr. M. has *not* shown, either in his pamphlet or Lectures. As we quoted his whole table of calculations, in a former number, on page 31 of his pamphlet, we cannot quote them here.

All the evidence which he gives is found on page 72 of his 'Lectures.' He says 'The ecclesiastical historians tell us that in the beginning of the sixth century, about A. D. 538, a number of writers undertook to prove that the papal chair, together with the councils of his approval, were infallible, and their laws binding on the whole church.' Again, same page, remaking on Dan. 11: 13, he says, 'Those who instructed the common people and opposed the infallibility of the Pope and councils, the cannonizing of departed saints, were persecuted by the civil power, (the sword) were burnt by order of the ecclesiastical courts established by the laws of Justinian, emperor of Constantinople, whose code of laws published about A. D. 534, gave unto the bishop of Rome power to establish courts for this purpose.'

The reader will notice the words *published about* A. D. 534. Does this fix the commencement of the civil power of the pope and his councils at 538? No—but it fixes it at

*Late Ed. p. 93.

least four years sooner. This would make his chain end in 1839. And he has admitted that the world *might* be destroyed in 1839. But this admission deranges all his calculations about A. D. 1798, as it throws them all back, four years, to 1794. Now, did the *civil* power of papacy commence either in 534 or 538? Dr. Johnson, in his Chronological table, says, in 606, 'The power of the popes, by the concessions of Phocas, emperor of the east, begins., It was not supreme until some time after.

Again, did the *civil power* end in 1798? Before we answer this question, we must notice M. M's comments on the last verses of the 11th Chap. of Daniel. He applies verse 25 to Pompey and the Cæsars; verse 26 to Ptolemy and Cleopatra; verse 27 to Anthony and Octavius; and thus he proceeds until the 40th verse commences a lucid prediction of Bonaparte's career.* Thus he makes the prophet, from verse 25 to verse 40, travel over a space of time of about 1700 years. This is doing up the work of prophecying, on no small scale; to crowd the important events of so long a period into the short space of 15 verses. It is as much as we should dare do to stretch them from Artaxerxes to the 'time of trouble,' when Michael, the nominal God of the Jews, should stand up to fight their battles.

Our limits will only admit us to quote his remarks on verses 40, 41, and to the end. He paraphrases the verse thus, '40, and the time of the end (of Antichrist) shall the king of the South (Spain) push at *France* (Vendean war) and the king of the north (Great Britian) shall come, against *France*, like a whirlwind, with chariots and with horsemen, and with many ships, and the *French* (or *Bonaparte*) shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over.†

41. '*Bonaparte* shall enter also into the glorious land, (Italy) and many countries shall be overthrown; but these shall escape out of *Bonaparte's* hands, even Edom and Moab, and the cheif of the children of Ammon,' Ottomons and eastern nations.

42. '*Bonaparte* shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries, and the land of Egypt shall not escape'

43. 'But *Bonaparte* shall have power over the treasures of gold and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt; and the Sybians and Ethiopians shall be at his steps.

*Late Ed. p p. 90, 96. †Late Ed. p. 103, &c.

44. 'But tidings out of the east and north (holy alliance) shall trouble *Bonaparte*: therefore he shall go forth with great fury to (Moscow)to destroy and utterly to take away many.'

45. 'And *Bonaparte* shall plant the tabernacle of his pallace (the crowned king) between the seas of (Milan) in the glorious holy mountain, (Italy:) yet *Bonaparte* shall come to his end, and none shall help him.'

After endeavoring to support this application by historical facts, Mr. M. concludes that it is so plain that it can be 'but very little doubted by skepticism itself.'

Now if the 21—25 verses apply to the Cæsars, or the Roman power, (as supposed by Mr. M.) would not the remaining verses infinitely better represent the conquests of that nation, which had control over the *powers* and *treasures* of the *east* and of Egypt: whose own head or power was in the *eternal city* of Rome; who conquered the Jews, and extended its power over '*the glorious holy mountain*' of Judea; but who were never able to conquer, 'Edom and Moab (the Arabs) nor the chief of the children of Ammon.'

Indeed the very next verse which commences chap. 12th, and which speaks of the 'time of trouble,' so strikingly applied to the Jews in the 24 chapter of Matt. would seem to fully justify such an application. Thus Julius Cæsar 'came to his end;' and so did the Roman power. But the application of the passage to Bonaparte is *entirely forced and far fetched*; and *unsupported* by *history*. The *treasures of Egypt were never* at his steps. True, he gained a small victory over the Mamalukes and the Pacha's army at St. Jean d' Achre. But his soldiers died by starvation in Egypt while the generals of his army *stamped their gold laced hats in the sand*, and cursed him to his face; and his soldiers ironically said, 'he had promised them gold, but had given them only acres of sand.' Finally he fled to his own country in disgrace, leaving his men to die in Egypt.

But 'the 1290 days ended in 1798.' Now did the Roman See exercise *civil power* up to that time? I find no proof of it. Did the Papal power, either *civil* or *religious* receive any material check by Napoleon? Were not the Bourbons restored by the *holy alliance*; and all the territories conquered by him restored to their former sovereignties; and did not bleeding France have to pay the price of her own subjugation? Yes, Popery was restored in France in 1802, and Pope Pius,

VII. was restored in 1800 by Napoleon *himself*. After this act, Napoleon was crowned emperor, *by the pope*, and became a *Catholic*. So much for the downfall of popery by Napoleon.

[To conclude. There is no more propriety in calling 'the glorious holy mountain,' *Italy*, than to say it means *Nova Scotia*. Of the truth of this, every one can be convinced by comparing Dan. 9: 16, 20, and 11: 41, 45, with Zechariah 8: 3. The prophets say '*Jerusalem*, thy holy mountain,' not *Italy!* The vain mystagogue who contradicts the express words of the holy prophets, to bolster up a crazy system, will meet with ultimate disappointment and deep mortification. If sincere, he is entitled to pity and forgiveness.]

FIRST RESURRECTION.—This number will be devoted to a review of Mr. M's views of the first resurrection. On Rev. 20: 6, 'Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection,' &c., he remarks, 'The word resurrection means to revive or resuscitate, or bring to life *again* one now dead, which was once alive. It no where in the word of God conveys an idea of a new creation, and the word is no where used in the Bible expressing any idea less or more than a union of soul and body, and deliverance from natural death.' Lectures, p. 27. If Mr. M. is correct in this broad statement, all controversy about the above word is at an end. Dan. 12: 2, and John 5: 29, and all others, must refer to a natural resurrection. And so must John 5: 25. 'The hour is coming, and now is,' &c. To meet this objection, he says, 'they must first prove that Christ meant regeneration,' in John 5: 25. Thus he intimates that even *that* verse referred to a resurrection from the grave. But in this he contradicts his whole theory, which places the 'first resurrection' in 1843, whereas, the words, '*now is*,' if they referred to a literal resurrection, would place it back 1700 years. But what proof has he given, except bare assertion, that the word resurrection, in the above passages, referred to the literal grave? None. The primary or *literal* definition of the word is, the *rising* from a *chair, promotion, elevation*, The secondary or oblique definition is resuscitation, or raising a body to life. Has he then shown that the word always refers to the literal dead? and is never used in a spiritual sense in the bible? Certainly not.

On the phrase, '*first resurrection*,' he then remarks, 'The

resurrection of saints is first as it respects order and time.' In proof of this he refers to Dan. 12: 2.—John 5: 29. 1 Cor. 15: 23, etc. Now is there the least intimation given in Dan. or John, that those who come forth to life, should be raised a 1000 years before the wicked should come forth to '*shame* or '*damnation*? No, not the least. Neither does 1 Cor. 15: 23, nor 1 Thess. 4: 16, imply any such intervention of a 1000 years. Instead of any such thing, the very words of Dan. 12: 2, and John 5: 29, show that the two classes or characters were raised at the *same* time. The words, 'and at that time,' equally include both classes. Let us examine the passage. 'And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake.' Did Daniel mean to embrace all men by the word many? If he did, how shall we understand the words that follow, '*of them*?' These show that after both the good and bad were raised, there were some still sleeping in the dust of the earth. How can this be, after the first and second resurrections are past? But if this resurrection was figurative, refering to the deliverance of Christians, in the Jewish siege, and the 'damnation' of the Jews, there might still be millions in different parts of the earth, sleeping in the dust of moral sin and death. The 'whole world *lay* in wickedness.'

Again, the words, 'some to everlasting life, *and* some to shame and everlasting contempt' are entirely incongruous with Mr. M's views of the resurrection of saints in 1843, and sinners just a 1000 years after. The conjunction, *and*, would seem naturally to purport a simultaneous resurrection of the two classes. The 7th verse refers the fulfillment of all events to the time when God's holy people should be scattered. Mr. M. thinks that 'he,' *anti-christ*, is now scattering the christians or God's holy people, by dividing and subdividing them 'into contending scisms,' etc. But would it not be more consistent to suppose that the Christians will triumph over anti-christ, than to suppose that anti-christ will continue to scatter them until the world is destroyed, the judgment sets, etc?

We will now briefly follow Mr. M. through the 20th chap. of Rev.

Verse 1. '*And I saw an angel come down from heaven.*'

'This angel I consider a no less being than the Lord Jesus Christ,' '*having the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain in his hand.*' Verse 2, '*And he laid hold of the dragon.*' *etc.*

On this Mr. M. says, 'I suppose this verse needs no explanation. It can only be understood in a literal sense.' So he says, the bottomless pit in verse 3d, 'is hell.' Again, verse 3, '*and shut him up and set a seal upon him,*' etc. 'This passage must be understood in its simple, plain meaning; no mystery in this.' Thus, it appears that the angel, Jesus Christ, will in the year —43, bind the arch fiend, old nick 'the devil' and satan, with *literal* chains, in a literal hell, that is *bottomless*, and seal him, and mark him, and keep him there just 1000 years. Now both Bishop Newton and Dr. A. Clarke, think the bottomless pit, was opened when Mahometanism arose: and all learned commentators, I think, refer it, figuratively, to either anti-christ, the beast, or the false prophet, here on earth. Mr. M. next applies verse 4th to the apostles, verse 5th to 'all the family of the redeemed,' who, verse 6th, reign with Christ a 1000 years. Thus the world will be burned up or rather purified by literal fire, the saints, who had been suspended, during the purification, with 'the Lord in the air,' will decend and dwell on it with Christ just 1000 years. All the wicked that were alive in—43, together with all that had died before, will be shut up in hell with satan this 1000 years. Then verse 7, '*When the* 1000 *years are expired, satan shall be loosed out of his prison.*' On this verse, Mr. M. remarks, 'We may reasonably expect that when satan is let loose, all the damned spirits are let loose with him, and it has been strongly implied that they were to live again in the body at the end of the thousand years.'* What! all the wieked that had died since the days of Adam, and all the apostate angels, from heaven, with the devil at their head, coming up out of the bottomless pit, hell, or prison, to fight the saints, who had lived here in perfect peace for a 1000 years!! Did this innumerable host break loose or were they let loose by God, for 'a little season' merely to annoy the saints? And how did they cross the impassable gulf?—But verse 8, '*And shall go out to deceive the nations.*' What nations? Will the immortal saints sustain their national distinctions, customs, or characters? And, if the first resurrection is literal, can it be possible that the devil and his host, from hell, can be *so foolish as to expect to deceive*

*Late Ed. p. 28.

*immortal saints*? But Mr. M. understands by nations, all the wicked, 'who are ashes under the fact of the saints.' How so?—Were not they *all* swept to hell, a 1000 years before? Ah! this host come from hell, and 'go out, on the breadth of the earth,' to deceive *themselves!!* Wonderfully consistent!! 'Ashes' now, in a perfectly pure new heavens and earth?

Again' '*Gog and Magog; to gather them to gather*,' etc. Now the devil and his host could not be Gog and Magog; for he goes out *to gather them to battle.* Who then were they,—if all on earth were righteous? and why *attempt to fight immortal* saints?

I have examined Mr. M's views of the first resurrection, and pointed out the inconsistency of supposing that, after the earth had been purified in 1843; the saints raised and the wicked sent to hell, for a 1000 years; this infernal host, Gog and Magog, would be let loose from the bottomless pit, and come up, on the breadth of the *pure* earth to fight *immortal* saints. These saints must have been invulnerable. Hence there could be no propriety in supposing that God would unlock the bottomless pit and permit all the wicked *disembodied* spirits, whether men or apostate angels, to come and encompass the beloved city, when they could accomplish nothing. Such an attempt would seem to be too *foolish* for the devil himself to make. We may be told that God only permitted them to thus shew their enmity to the saints, and the *unchanged* nature of the 'human will,' but guarded his beloved flock by 'sending fire from heaven,' which 'devoured them.' If fire *devoured* this innumerable host, how can they be raised at the close of the 1000 years? 'The rest of the dead lived not until the thousand years were finished!' Now although Satan and all the infernal host went up on the breadth of the earth, still, they were without bodies; for John speaks of the resurrection of the dead, 'small and great,' *after* fire had devoured all the wicked. Thus we read, Rev. 20: 10, 'and the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night, for ever and ever?' This is before the wicked are raised. It is all on earth where there are 'day and night.' Now, Mr. M. has, throughout his writings, placed the beast (popery) and the false prophet, (Mahomet) on the earth. Their whole reign is here, where there is day and night. And here Drs.

Scott, Clarke, and Newton place the bottomless pit that is described in Rev. 9th chapter.

Again, verse 11, 'And I saw a great white throne and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and heaven fled away.' &c. These words shew that the *first* resurrection and *second* death, spoken of in verses 5, 6, had not changed the literal heavens and earth. To surmount this difficulty, Mr. M. says, the angel has gone back and commenced a new vision at the above verse. But John does not hint at any new vision or change of a 1000 years in the one he was then recording. He says, in verse 12, 'And I saw the dead small and great stand before God,' etc. Now if the angel had gone *back*, at 11th verse, 'to another view' of the subject, than the judgment in verse 12, would be fixed at 1843; *before* the first resurrection. But John places this judgment *after* the binding and loosing of satan; the 1000 years, &c.

Verse 13. 'And the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them.' From this passage we learn that the sea, death and hell were all here in existence, on the *earth* 'after the thousand years were finished.' How could this be if the earth was entirely purified by fire in 1843? Could the sea, death and hell exist in the new heavens and earth which at that period were created? Certainly not, for 'I make all things new.' 'There was no more sea.' 'No more death.' Now which horn of the dilemma will Mr. M. choose? If he applies Rev. 20: 12—14 to a resurrection and judgment *after* the 1000 years are *finished*, then the *earth, sea, death and hell* experienced *no change* at the commencement of the millennium. If he applies the events spoken of in those verses to 1843, then 'the sea will give up the dead' 'small and great,' *before* the 1000 years commence; whereas 'the rest of the dead lived not until the 1000 years were finished.' But Mr. M. admits of no resurrection of the wicked, from either the 'sea,' 'death,' or 'hell,' until the 1000 years expire. Therefore either of the aforesaid applications of the verses directly contradicts the theory that the earth is to be purified in '43, and the wicked enjoy a resurrection from the *pure* earth after the millennium closes.

But further, Rev. 20: 12—15, flatly contradicts the notion of two *separate* resurrections. The words, 'Lamb's book of life,' 'out of the books,' *according to their work*, 'small and great;' show that all *come* forth at the *same time*,

from sea, death and hell. These expressions clearly refute Mr. M's. views, and indeed the views of all who think that two *literal* resurrections are set forth in that chapter. So do the words, 'death and hell were cast into the lake of fire, which is the second death,' show the absurdity of literalizing any part of the chapter; for if we hold that the first resurrection is literal, we must hold that the 'key, pit, chains, devil, dragons, sea, death, hell, fire, brimstone, lake,' &c. are all literal. I have just as much right to say the first resurrection is figurative, as another has to say that the lake of fire represents the horror of conscience. Now Mr. M. seems to literalize the whole chapter; for he says, 'the 15th verse,' plainly 'shews, that persons, not inanimate things are cast into a lake of fire. This is the last we know of the children of the wicked one.'—p. 56. The reader will observe that he leaves them all in the lake of fire. Now, if this is literal, then the second death is literal fire; and literal fire and brimstone is the second death. If this view be consistent then, literal death and hell (grave) were cast into literal fire in the eternal world. If by death and hell is meant only the bodies of the wicked that come forth from the grave, then the phrase, death and hell, would signify life and immortality. But can we consistently say that life and immortality are cast into eternal death? If the partialist again shift ground and say, 'the lake of fire means horror of conscience,' I reply, you must spiritualize the whole passage, or you will cast the literal grave, (or at least immortal bodies) into the horror of conscience. Thus, 'all that die in Adam' will be cast into the second death. And this will embrace all men, for 'death passed upon all.'—What a glorious conclusion! Universal death, a second death, would be the consequence of making all alive in Christ. But we forbear. It must, we think, by this time be apparent to the reader that insurmountable difficulties attend a literal construction of the 'first resurrection,' the 'last battle,' Gog and Magog,' &c.

By this time the reader may wish to know the writer's opinion. He may say, it is much easier to pull down than to build up; let me have your views of the whole subject. I reply, it is one thing to review or examine the statements of another, and it is quite another to advance our own theories. I might rest satisfied with penning the words of Dr. A. Clarke 'I do not understand the book.' And, did I profess to understand it, it would require more time and

room to explain my views than could be consistently embraced in one communication. Were I to give a synopsis of my views, I would say that I view the first resurrection to be spiritual: and that blessed and holy were all the christians, of the first centuries, who had their part in it. 'The whole world lay in wickedness.' Hence 'the rest of the dead lived not' during that time. That is, none but believers enjoyed spiritual life.

The second death is the apostacy of the 7 churches of Asia, or rather of the whole christian church. This was at its height at about 1000 years from Christ, when all sects seemed to have lost the spirit of the gospel; and from that even to the present to have imbibed an anti-christian spirit. For this lake of fire we have a 'death and hell,' the 'sea,' of wars and commotions, the devil, *accuser*, dragon, beast, &c. These are all 'on the earth' where the seven vials were poured out, in which were 'filled up the wrath of God.'

[In conclusion, we would barely observe, *first*, that since we have fairly proved that 'the end of the world,' mentioned in the N. Testament, means the *end of the Mosaic age*, or of the *first* dispensation, it follows that Mr. M's. notions upon that subject, are unscriptural and erroneous. The same is meant by the *burning up or passing away* of the *heaven and earth*, as shown by Lightfoot, Clarke, and others. The new 'heavens and new earth' mean, the new order of things under the *second* or gospel dispensation; which is the New or 'heavenly Jerusalem,' 'the kingdom that cannot be moved,' to which the apostle says, '*we are come.*' Heb. 12: 22—28. And, *secondly*, it must be evident that Mr. M. is wrong in the assumption, that, *to close up and seal* the words of a vision, *till the time of the end*, means only to make them *sure*, till that time. As the very terms imply, the meaning unquestionably, is, that the prophecy shall not be understood, as to the time, etc. but in its fulfillment. The same is true, of prophecies, generally, as shown by Sir Isaac Newton, and all learned commentators. Had Mr. M. duly considered Isaiah 29: 11, his own delusive notion would have been manifest. The prophet speaks of a 'vision which became as the *words of a book that is sealed*' of which it is said, 'I cannot read it;' for '*it is sealed.*' The meaning is, that the book could not be fully understood, while it was sealed. And Mr. M. contradicts himself; for he admits, in his remarks on Rev. 5th and 6th chapters, that the contents

of the 'book *sealed* with seven seals,' were hidden or concealed, till the seals were opened. He does not attempt to read the *seventh* division of the book, because that seal has not been broken. It is not only scriptural, but according to the analogy of language, to say that the words of a letter, a scroll, a book or writing, which is 'closed up and sealed,' till a given time, cannot be read or understood, till the time arrives. A man writes to his friend, and seals his letter, *till the time* it is delivered to him, longer or shorter; then it is to be opened. He makes his will, closes up the scroll and seals it, *till* the death of the testator. The object in *sealing* such writings, is not so much to make them sure, as to prevent their being read, 'till the time of the end,' for which they were designed. Hence, when it is said, 'Go thy way Daniel; for the words are closed up, and sealed till the time of the end,' the meaning is, that the prophecy they contained was not to be fully understood only by its fulfillment. And, what prophecy, pray tell us, was ever clearly comprehended and realized, in any other way. If the important *events* in the prophecy of Daniel, were realized in the destruction of Jerusalem, as it would seem from Matt. 24: 15, 21, then we can understand them. But those which are still future, if any, can not be understood till the time of the end of their fulfillment arrives; for this plain reason, as says Dr. Clarke, '*God has* SEALED *them.*']