

SPEAK, AND NOT LIE: THOUGH IT

SECOND ADVENT LIBRARY.

NO. XXXVI.

JUNE 1, 1843.

THE
SECOND ADVENT MANUAL:

IN WHICH

THE OBJECTIONS TO CALCULATING THE PROPHETIC
TIMES ARE CONSIDERED; THE DIFFICULTIES CON-
NECTED WITH THE CALCULATION EXPLAINED;
AND THE FACTS AND ARGUMENTS ON
WHICH MR. MILLER'S CALCULATIONS
REST, ARE BRIEFLY STATED
AND SUSTAINED.

WITH A DIAGRAM.

By APOLLOS HALE.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY JOSHUA V. HIMES,
14 Devonshire Street.

Three Sheets. Postage—under 100 miles, 4½ cts.; over 100, 7½ cts.

FOR THE VISION IS YET FOR AN APPOINTED TIME, BUT AT THE END IT SHALL

TARRY, WAIT FOR IT; BECAUSE IT WILL SURELY COME, IT WILL NOT TARRY.

DEPOT OF SECOND ADVENT PUBLICATIONS,

14 DEVONSHIRE ST., OFFICE OF THE "SIGNS OF THE TIMES."

All communications relative to the *Signs of the Times*, and Publications on the Second Advent, should be addressed to JOSHUA V. HIMES, 14 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.

Important Works

ON THE PROPHECIES OF THE SECOND ADVENT OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOR, JESUS CHRIST.

Miller on the Second Coming of Christ.—In one volume. This work contains nineteen Lectures; to which is added a Supplement, containing a Chronological Chart of the prophetic periods, with an explanation. Price 50 cents.

Miller's Life and Views.—In one volume. This work contains a Sketch of Mr. Miller's Life, his Chronology, the Chart and Exposition, eleven new lectures, reviews, letters, &c. Price 50 cents.

Bible Student's Manual.—This work is compiled from Mr. Miller's works, designed for a pocket note-book and manual. It contains the Chart, Rules of Interpretation, &c., with blank paper, for notes. Price 25 cents.

An Address to the Public, and especially the Clergy, on the Near Approach of the Glorious, Everlasting Kingdom of God on Earth. By J. Litch. Price 25 cents.

No. I., Second Advent Report of General Conference, held in Boston, Oct. 14th, 15th, 1840. This is a very able and important document: it contains two discourses from Mr. Litch, on the Second Advent—Chronology of Prophecy. One from Rev. Henry Jones, on the Restoration of Israel. Two from Mr. Miller, on the Chronology of the Prophetic Periods—Judgment. One Discourse, in three parts, by H. D. Ward, on the Millennium. 174 pages. Price, 37 cents in boards, 25 cents in pamphlet.

No. II., Second Advent Report of General Conference, held in Lowell, June 15th, 16th, 17th, 1841. This is a very able and important document: it contains the Proceedings of the Conference, Circular Address, Dissertation on Christ's Second Coming, Signs of Christ's Second Coming quickly, by Rev. Henry Jones. The Kingdom of God on Earth at hand, the Fall of the Ottoman Empire, and Dissertation on the Millennium, by Rev. Josiah Litch. Price \$20 per hundred, and 25 cents single.

THE
SECOND ADVENT MANUAL:

IN WHICH

THE OBJECTIONS TO CALCULATING THE PROPHETIC
TIMES ARE CONSIDERED; THE DIFFICULTIES CON-
NECTED WITH THE CALCULATION EXPLAINED;
AND THE FACTS AND ARGUMENTS ON
WHICH MR. MILLER'S CALCULATIONS
REST, ARE BRIEFLY STATED
AND SUSTAINED.

WITH A DIAGRAM.

By APOLLOS HALE.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY JOSHUA V. HIMES,
14 Devonshire Street.
1843.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX AND TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
475 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADE IN U.S.A.



P R E F A C E .

It is not the design of this manual to enter into the details of the Second Advent doctrine, as held by Mr. Miller: these may be found in many of our publications, from the pen of Mr. Miller himself, and others. Nor is it intended to be, in any sense, a critical work. The writer makes no pretensions to the qualifications which are indispensable to prepare one's self for exact, learned, biblical criticism; nor has he time. Those who may desire, and have leisure, to make the prophecies the subject of such attention, must necessarily explore a wider field than would be consistent only to give the outlines of it in a work of this kind.

Its design is to present the events of history on which the calculations of *the time* are based, with the texts and some of the arguments which justify the application of the prophecies to these events, and to meet the most important objections which are brought against this application of the prophecies and the calculations of which it is the basis.

Other periods and calculations form an interesting portion of Mr. Miller's views, such as the Jubilees, the Typical Sabbath, &c.; but these are regarded rather as incidental and collateral, and would not of

themselves be supposed to furnish conclusive evidence in support of any theory. The facts and arguments in support of those prophetic periods only which are deemed vital to the system, are contained in this work.

The materials for this purpose are here presented as the writer has been in the practice of using them, when exhibiting the doctrine as a lecturer; others can use them as their taste or judgment may suggest.

The difficulty of access, with many readers, to the original sources of the information contained in this little volume; the oft-repeated wish for such a compilation; the desire that as many as possible may become established in what the writer considers *the particular truth of our time*; and that all who will regard its calls, and yield to its claims, may be prepared for the scene which is to decide the destiny of men, and which is rapidly hastening upon the world,—are the motives for thus occupying the time which he is not permitted, on account of ill health, to occupy at present in lecturing.

BOSTON, May 1, 1843.

OBJECTIONS TO CALCULATING THE PROPHETIC TIMES CONSIDERED.

ONE mode by which the God of truth commends his word to men, is, by exhibiting the absurdity, sometimes the wickedness, of the positions which are taken in opposition to his truth. So Christ repelled the blasphemous slander of the Jews, on one occasion, who charged him with casting out devils through Beelzebub, the prince of devils. "If I, by Beelzebub, cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out?" Are *they* connected with Beelzebub? So, also, the reply of Christ to those who complained of him for receiving "sinners and eating with them," was intended to contrast the position which they condemned with their own position. As much as if he had said, "Yes, I receive sinners and eat with them—you do not; very well; let us make a comparison or two. (See Luke xv.) The father of the prodigal is on my side—and the man who lost a sheep, he is on my side—and the woman who lost a piece of silver, she is on my side—and the angels of God—these are all on my side. But *you* don't receive sinners! nor eat with them; very well, I do." Every age has had its contests for and against some particular form of truth, and the opposition is always characterized by ignorance and absurdity.

If ever there was a time when all the antitypes of the old recorded enemies of the truth, from the magicians of Egypt to Simon Magus, were on the stage at once, and all of them actively engaged, the day in which we live must be the time; and if there is any one particular part or form of truth in reference to

which their special anxiety is manifested, it is the sublime and clearly stated doctrine of Christ's second coming. No person who is at all acquainted with the subject can doubt for a moment, that, if a heathen should come among us, and compare the various and contradictory opinions which prevail everywhere, in reference to it, he must certainly think that the Bible has said nothing about the subject, or that we do not believe our Bibles. The Bible, however, has predicted exactly the state of things which we now witness upon this subject; it has warned us in view of it, and pointed out the only safety—"Behold," says Christ, "I have told you before," &c. Matt. xxiv. 25. "Be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Saviour: knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming?" &c. 2 Pet. iii. 2-4.

But the particular question involved in the subject, against which "the head and tail" of society is moved, is the question of *time*. This is *the* question against which the scoffing infidelity, refined and vulgar,—much of the reputed christian wisdom,—and not a little of the undoubted piety of the land, stand forth in their most expressive attitudes of scorn, contempt, or horror. To the infidelity we have no apology to make, (though we rejoice to know that not a few of its more candid votaries have been converted to Christ, through the special instrumentality of Mr. Miller.) To the literati ecclesiastical, who look upon Mr. Miller with so many airs of affronted superiority,—we say, *Point out the mistakes, and give us a more scriptural explanation of these prophecies.* We solemnly aver, that if any man will do this, we will not only abandon the explanation now defended, but we will labor to disseminate the better one to the utmost of our ability; but, to tell us that we have "no business to meddle with the prophecies," or that "we cannot understand the prophecies until they are fulfilled," will not do. We have never been

able to perceive the value of a chart that would not tell the sailor where to find his port, *until after he had arrived*. We have become the disciples, and advocates, of Mr. Miller's theory from a sincere conviction of its truth, in opposition to all our prejudices and worldly interests,—we do not wish to be deceived ourselves, and we would not for our lives deceive others. If we are mistaken, we will thank any man to set us right. To the piety of the land we bow with the most sincere respect and tender sympathy. We would not take a step or speak a word to give offence for our right hand, and wherein we may seem to offend we frankly and fully give the reasons for so doing. We feel that we have the fullest authority, from the plain statements and directions of the word of God, to give our attention to this particular question; and that we have every reason to believe, from the prophecies, the events of history, and the signs of the times, that the period has come for the question of *time* to be understood. That it has generally been supposed, in every age of the church, that the time in which the end of all things is to take place, is indicated to us in the prophecies of Daniel, we might give a long list of her most worthy names to prove; and although there may have been a difference of opinion upon the time for commencing the prophetic periods of his visions, every age, we believe, has spoken with the strongest confidence that they would be understood before the end should actually come; but if the church had not thus looked upon the subject during this long period, the statements and directions of the apostles would be sufficient to settle that point. Peter has given us an undoubted explanation of the design of these prophecies of Daniel in particular, (though others of course are included,) and he, with Christ and the other apostles, directs us repeatedly to the prophets for "light." Luke xvi. 29—31; xxiv. 25; Rom. xvi. 25, 26; Rev. i. 3—10; x. 5—7; Jude 14—18.

Let us hear Peter.—1 Peter i. 3—13. For whose benefit did the prophets understand their message to be

intended? *Unto whom* (the prophets) *it was revealed, that NOT UNTO THEMSELVES, BUT UNTO US they did minister THE THINGS which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into.* v. 12. Here, then, are “things” brought to view, to communicate which the prophets “did minister;” and “them that have preached the gospel with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, have reported;” and “which the angels desire to look into.” Now if these “things” should happen to involve *the coming of Christ*, and the *time* of his coming, let those sneer and scoff who will; they do it not to men, but unto God.

What, then, are the “things,” in reference to which it is said, “unto us they did minister?” 1. “*The prophets have inquired and searched diligently,—searching WHAT the spirit of Christ which was in them did signify,*” “WHEN IT TESTIFIED BEFOREHAND” of a “salvation” which consisted “of the grace that should come unto you,” and which you should receive “as the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.” v. 9, 10. What grace? “*The grace that is to be brought unto you AT THE REVELATION OF JESUS CHRIST.*” v. 13. And the “salvation” was that “unto” which they were “kept by the power of God, through faith,” and their faith looked “to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven”—and “READY TO BE REVEALED IN THE LAST TIME.” v. 4, 5. Which “faith, more precious than gold which perisheth, though tried with fire,” the apostle desired “*might be found unto praise and honor and glory AT THE APPEARING OF JESUS CHRIST.*” v. 7. These “things” are “WHAT” “the prophets inquired about, and apostles reported,” and “angels desire to look into.”

2. “*The prophets have inquired and searched diligently WHAT MANNER OF TIME the spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and THE GLORY THAT*

SHOULD FOLLOW." v. 11. The "time," which referred to "the sufferings of Christ," has been filled up. "The glory," which belongs particularly to "HIS APPEARING AND KINGDOM," has not yet been realized. The 70 weeks which indicated the *time* of the *sufferings of Christ*, explain the "manner" in which the prophetic times of Daniel are to be understood; and by their exact fulfilment give us a demonstration that "at the time appointed the *end* shall be," when Daniel saw "one like the Son of man come with the clouds of heaven, and 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, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom, that which shall not be destroyed." Dan. vii. 13, 14. "When the SON OF MAN SHALL COME IN HIS GLORY, AND ALL THE HOLY ANGELS WITH HIM, THEN SHALL HE SIT UPON THE THRONE OF HIS GLORY;" (Matt. xxv. 31;) "and them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; and they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever."

That Daniel is particularly referred to by the apostle here, is evident from three considerations. 1. He is the only one of the prophets who has given us the *time* in connection with "the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." Dan. chapters ix. xii.

2. To him "it was revealed that not unto himself he did minister," in the things named by the apostle. Dan. viii. 26, 27; xii. 4, 8, 9. 3. "The angels" are brought to view as having taken a particular interest in these "things" when communicated to Daniel. Dan. vii. 16; viii. 13, 14, 16; ix. 21; x. 10—21; xii. 5—7.

Now to Daniel, with the other prophets, we are specially directed to guide us on this subject. (2 Peter iii. 1, 2.) To their "word" we do well that we take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, *until*

the day dawn." 2 Peter i. 19. And by the plain terms of the prophecy of Daniel itself, the vision is to be understood "at the time of the end:"—that is, a short period before the end shall actually come. And is there not good reason to believe, that, according to *every series of prophetic events*, we have nothing else to look for but "*the end?*" Can any man put his finger upon the prophecies, and point out a single event, which has not already taken place, except those events which are to accompany or follow the coming of Christ? And while these prophecies all tell us that the "time of the end" is come; "*the signs*" which were immediately to precede his coming, *have given their note of warning and retired, or are now hovering over the very point we occupy, to assure us that his coming "is near, even at the doors!"*

Have we not reason, then, to believe that the time has come for the vision to be unsealed? May we not expect to understand the "TIME" as well as the other "*things*" of which it speaks? For ourselves, we think there is at least tenfold more reason to believe that the end of all things will come before another year shall have passed away, (though we cannot but expect it every day and every hour,) than those who were exposed to the deluge—the fires of Sodom—the famine of Egypt, her plagues and the ruin of her armies—the destruction of Babylon or Jerusalem, had to expect those events at the time they came. We are sure no truly serious person, whose mind is sufficiently enlightened upon the prophetic scriptures to appreciate at all their clear and full and awful burden, will lightly treat this question.

CONSEQUENCES.

But you object to making calculations of the time for fear of consequences. What consequences? Why, if we make our "calculations of the time and the event does not come, others will not believe when it is actually coming." Well, perhaps the snare which you are anticipating for other generations, is the one in

which the present generation may be taken. That others who have fixed the time, have been mistaken, we know, and that should inspire us with modesty and caution; but it no more proves that the truth can never be known upon the subject, than the fact that men have been mistaken on other subjects proves that the truth on those subjects can never be discovered. And, after all, is it not better that there should be ten false alarms, than that there should be one surprise without any warning? And may it not be as likely that the false alarms in times past have been given by the great enemy to lull the present generation to sleep, that *they* may be taken in the "snare," as that this is a false alarm to which some future generation may point as a means of quieting themselves when the end, as you suppose, may actually come?

You tell us again—"It will make infidels, if we make such calculations, and the end don't come." Who will be made infidels? Not those, surely, who are opposed to our views. And it would be remarkable indeed if those who are neutral, or "halting between two opinions," should suppose the Bible has failed, and therefore "throw it away," after time shall have *proved* our views not to be the correct explanation of it, when they *now* decline to receive our views as the doctrine of the Bible.

There can be none to "make infidels" of, then, but believers of the doctrine. And why should they turn infidels? They have taken their position not simply from what they believe the prophetic periods to teach, but also from those prophecies which bring the end to view in connection with the history of the world, and "the signs of the times;" so that we must still believe the end to be near, even if the year '43 should pass away, though we may not fix upon any other time for the event. And we think those who have exhibited fortitude enough to bear the opposition already shown to them on account of their faith, will not be quite ready to turn infidel even if they *should* see a few more years on earth, and it should be their lot to suffer more

than they have yet suffered. May we here ask our brethren to pray that *they* may have grace enough to bear with us, if we should not happen to turn infidels, should we be spared to see '44, though *their predictions*, in that case, might fail as well as *our calculations*?

But this objection anticipates the results with as much confidence as any "prophet" might be permitted to do. We do not see any special necessity for such a conclusion. Why should the non-fulfilment of prophecy according to our calculations lead to more startling results than in other cases? According to the calculations of Professor Stuart, Mr. Dowling, and a host of others who believe with them, these prophetic times have never been fulfilled, and are they infidels? We can, at least, fall into the popular current—"have nothing to do with the prophecies"—and be as good Christians as others. We would ask, in turn, where is the propriety, in reference to this particular subject, of leaving the question, *first* to be considered, *Is it true?* and passing to the question, *What will be the results?* or, in looking at the results, to inquire, "*What if it don't come?*" instead of asking, *What if it does come?* All the danger lies there. *What if it does come?*

OBJECTIONS.

Our object, however, in this article, is to direct your attention to the character of the objections to these calculations. If the calculations are so very "absurd" and "ridiculous," it could be no very difficult thing for some of their able opposers to point out some mistake in the facts or dates on which they are based, or in the principles involved in the theory, without resorting to falsehood and slander, or at least without throwing away the most valuable labors of the old defenders of the Bible and Protestantism, or certainly without impeaching the Bible itself.

But we assert it, in the full expectation of speedily meeting the Judge of all the earth, that we do not know of a single writer who has opposed the doctrine, (and some of them we would not speak lightly of, as Christians, for our right hand,) who has not entirely omitted

the only inquiry, which, in the very nature of the case, could amount to any thing, and apparently labored for the mastery in some one or all of the above fruitless, not to say wicked experiments.

No doubt they supposed they were doing God service, and that the cause they had undertaken to defend, demanded the best efforts which could be made for it; and as these were the only efforts they could make, it did not probably occur to them that they were doing evil that good might come, as they understood it, or that they were making concessions to the cause they opposed which must satisfy all candid spectators of the contest, that nothing could be fairly done against it.

We shall speak only of the objections brought against the calculation of the time. And yet not all of them against this, but against that view of it which brings the time so near; for many who pretend to object to "*fixing the time*," as they call it, when the calculations which bring us to the end in '43 are mentioned, go right on and make other calculations which put it off perhaps 20, 50, 100, or 1000 years "to come."

CHRONOLOGY OF THE WORLD.

It is said there are difficulties connected with the subject which make it impossible to fix upon any thing with certainty, and none but fanatics will have any thing to do with it. We will say nothing of the reflection which such a view of the subject casts upon God, who has directed us to the prophecies to guide us in the midst of the greatest dangers, for what is it but tantalizing us to give such a direction if the prophecies cannot answer their design? The supposed difficulties, however, are not so great as we at first sight might apprehend. "It is impossible," we are told, "for any one to tell the age of the world." Very well. No one pretends to tell, *positively*, how long the world has stood, but still it is believed there are serious reasons for supposing that its age is not far from 6000 years. And if a general tradition,—which supposes that the present order of things is to be

changed at the end of six thousand years, and which appears to be founded upon some portions of the word of God, may be worthy of our attention,—from what we *can* tell of the chronology of the world, it appears to harmonize with the more certain indications of the plainer prophecies. Dr. Weeks has strung up a catalogue of what he calls “mistakes of Mr. Miller and his friends, in relation to his chronology,” to the number of sixty. He might, on the same principle, have carried the number up to as many thousands, and then he might find as many more in every other system of chronology. But how he will make the apparent contradictory statements of Josephus; and the variations from Ferguson, Rollin and Jahn, with Mr. Miller’s literary and theological deficiencies, “mistakes of Mr. Miller and his friends in relation to his chronology,” and all this *without any criterion by which to make the test*,—those who have the time and ability to devote to the subject can tell better than we. If any one should think it worth the while to make a new collection of “Curiosities of Literature,” they would find the Doctor’s article a rare specimen; it would be a perfect match for the celebrated performance of a clerical prototype, who preached some dozen sermons on the letter O. We wonder if the Doctor ever had anything to do with a permutation lottery! The Doctor seems to have fallen into the common “mistake” of making a jest of the subject, and to have forgotten that he is old enough to “put away *childish things*.” The fact that our Bible adopts the Hebrew record of time, and that this has been deemed of superior merit to the Samaritan, Septuagint, &c., is argument enough in favor of the *source* of our chronology, in the mind of all but those whose hyper-criticism has destroyed or impaired their confidence in the truth and faithfulness of God. And until some one can show that we may not rely upon it, or will furnish a better account, we cannot but regard its statements with some respect. That the Hebrew text gives a correct record of time from Adam to Moses, and from Saul to the time when

the Old Testament scriptures close, we think there is little room to doubt. The period from which the difficulties arise is the time of the Judges. We have, so to speak, the depots and mile-posts all along on the track of time from Adam down to that period, and again from Saul down to the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. According to Mr. Miller's calculation of the period of the Judges, the time before Christ was 4157 years; according to Usher, 4004. That Mr. M. is near the truth, we have no doubt; that he or any other man can tell the exact time, we do not expect. The time given for that period by Paul, Acts xiii. 20, is very strongly in favor of Mr. Miller's chronology.

Dr. Clarke, in his preface to the book of Judges, makes this remark on "the Chronology of Archbishop Usher on this period," which is the standard generally adopted: "ITS CORRECTNESS IS JUSTLY QUESTIONED."


Dr. Clarke also quotes from Dr. Hales as follows: "It is truly remarkable, and a proof of the great skill and accuracy of *Josephus* in forming the outline of this period, that he assigns, with *St. Paul*, a reign of forty years to *Saul*, (Acts xiii. 21,) which is omitted in the Old Testament. His outline also corresponds, with *St. Paul's* period of four hundred and fifty years from the division of the conquered land of *Canaan*, until *Samuel* the prophet." See Dr. Hales' *Chronology*, vol. i. pp. 16, 17; vol. ii. p. 28.

Now if the reader will take the trouble to examine Mr. Miller's chronology, in the diagram appended to this article, and compare it with the Bible, he can judge, perhaps as well as any one, of its claims to his serious consideration. But let that be correct or not, the prophetic periods which are involved in his theory are not affected by it; they all begin this side of the time of the Judges. In reference to these there is not the uncertainty which exists in reference to the chronology of the world.

The supposition has been named that the addition of 153 years to the age of the world must derange the whole matter of the prophetic times, by throwing the

date of events into confusion. A simple illustration will show that these dates are not affected by this addition.

In the following diagram, B B represents the time from Adam to Joshua. C C the time from Samuel to Christ. D D represents the period of the Judges, according to the shorter calculation. E E the same period according to the longer calculation.



The period from Samuel to Christ is no more according to one calculation of the period of the Judges than the other. And all the intermediate periods or dates between Samuel and Christ stand related to each other exactly alike, according to either computation of the period of the Judges. Now all the prophetic periods involved in Mr. Miller's theory begin *after* Samuel; so that the addition of 153 years before his time only affects the relation of the events in the two grand sections of time which lie before and after the Judges, to each other: that is, it makes the time from Adam to Christ, or from Moses to Christ, 153 years longer; but as the prophetic periods all begin this side of Samuel, they are not affected by the addition.

“MILLER'S RULE.”

Again it is charged upon Mr. Miller as the very climax of “absurdity” and “ignorance,” that he reckons the prophetic periods by supposing them to express in days the number of years intended. And to make the alleged absurdity most palpable, we have been told by those who prefer the charge, that “Miller's rule of a day for a year would leave Nebuchadnezzar at grass at the present time and 130 years to remain. And apply it to the 70 years captivity of the Jews at Babylon, they have at present more time to fulfil than has yet elapsed;” and “that the end of this world, on his own terms, cannot come yet for thousands of years!” It is no new thing for those

who are base enough to attempt to make fools of their neighbors, sometimes to make fools of themselves.

“These calculations” which are ignorantly or designedly ascribed to Mr. Miller, or are said to be “according to his rule,” are no more “according to his rule” than the calculations in “Bowditch’s Practical Navigator.”

The rule of Mr. Miller in the case is precisely that of every intelligent writer upon the interpretation of the word of God, including some of his most noted and influential opposers. We will insert the rules given by Horne, a standard author in biblical interpretation, that the reader may compare them with the rules of Mr. Miller.

“The received signification of a word is to be retained, unless weighty and necessary reasons require that it should be abandoned or neglected.” Horne’s Introduction, vol. ii. p. 504. “Where the literal meaning of words is contrary either to common sense, to the context, to parallel passages, or to the scope of a passage, it must be given up.” Ib. p. 583. And again, in giving the meaning of the word day, in his “Index to the Symbolical Language of the Scripture,” he says, “DAY—1. A year in prophetic language. Ezek. iv. 6; Rev. ii. 10. 2. An appointed time or season. Isa. xxxiv. 8; lxiii. 4.” Vol. iv. p. 494.

The rule of Professor Stuart is similar to the first one given by Horne. Hints, p. 68.

We insert Mr. Dowling’s view of the rule in question, with the note he has appended, for the sake of the important testimony it contains in favor of it—a witness who will not be suspected of any partiality in the case.

“I believe, as Mr. Miller does, and indeed most protestant commentators, that the 1260 years denote the duration of the dominion of the Papal Antichrist.”

“We have every reason to conclude that the time of the continuance of this persecuting power is equally true, viz: a time, times, and half a time, which, we have before seen, is the pro-

phetical designation of 1260 years.* Dowling's Reply to Mr. Miller, pp. 26, 27, 42. N. York Edition.

We here add the rules of Mr. Miller.

“How to know when a word is used figuratively. If it makes good sense as it stands, and does no violence to the simple laws of nature, then it must be understood literally, if not, figuratively. Rev. xii. 1, 2; xvii. 3—7.

Figures sometimes have two or more different significations, as day is used in a figurative sense to represent three different periods of time.

1. Indefinite. Eccles. vii. 14.
2. Definite, a day for a year. Ezek. iv. 6.
3. Day for a thousand years. 2 Pet. iii. 8.

If you put on the right construction it will harmonize with the Bible and make good sense, otherwise it will not.”

Now all the contempt which is cast upon Mr. Miller, under the pretence that his rule is “absurd,” &c., is cast equally upon the worthiest men who have ever lived, including the prophets and apostles themselves.

But those writers who object to Mr. Miller's rule, give us no other by which these prophecies can be understood, and this might be passed over, if they did not *profess to explain* them. We might name at least a score of men who have made the promise and the attempt, but have had to confess, often in plain words, that they could not make out an explanation.

*I have read attentively the attempt of a distinguished Hebrew scholar, in the Biblical Repository, to prove that *days* in prophetical language are always to be understood literally, and never signify years, but am by no means convinced by his arguments. The interpretation of the prophecies in which these expressions are found, is infinitely more improbable and inconsistent, upon his scheme, than upon that which understands in these passages, as Ezekiel was commanded, (ch. iv. 6,) “a day for a year.” Even the weight of authority is vastly in favor of this latter interpretation. On the former side, are, I suppose, most of the Andover school of divines, sitting at the feet of their German oracles, from whom the doctrine advocated in the above article is imported; and on the other, such men as Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, Mede, Faber, Adam Clarke, Scott, Fuller, Robert Hall, &c.

While the writer was lecturing in New York city, a practising lawyer there who became somewhat interested in the subject, attended one of the churches in the city, in which a notice had been given out of an evening lecture against Mr. Miller's theory. The house was crowded, and the minister for the occasion read an article of about half an hour's length, which was of the usual character. The next time I fell in with my friend, I inquired about the lecture against us. "O," said he, "he used up Mr. Miller at once." Ah, indeed, how did he do that? "Why, he proved to us that the Bible was not true." Well, I replied, if he has done that, we are used up. It is a gone case. If the *Bible* is not true, Millerism is dead, (or to that effect.) Then, explaining himself, he said, that according to what the preacher *called* the fulfilment of the prophecies considered, though applied in the past, they had never been fulfilled, and of course the Bible could not be true. How many others have placed themselves and the Bible in the same predicament, it would be impossible to tell.

Now if the contempt shown to the above old and venerable writers on the prophecies were not enough to fix upon these men the brand of theological infamy, their treatment of the word of God will do it. It is virtually saying, *His word is not exactly true*. A higher authority has said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away." Matt. xxiv. 35.

But these writers are forced to take this position or yield in silence to Mr. Miller. It is the *best* they can do, if they do any thing against his views, *or it remains yet to be done*.

Mr. Miller only advances upon the track of time as it has been extended since the days of these worthy laborers in the interpretation of the prophecies, referred to above, and, guided by the same principles, he finds them confirmed, as the prophecies have been filled up by the events of history. The position taken by his opponents may be considered as one of the most striking and clearly marked "signs of the times."

DIFFERENT MODES OF RECKONING TIME.

Again we are pointed to sundry difficulties in the way of calculating the time. It is said the difference in the mode of computing time at different periods, makes it impossible to tell when the prophetic periods run out, even if we can tell when they begin. We will let one speak for a great many. "Our readers are aware that the ancient mode of reckoning the *year was by 360 days*. The 2300 years of Daniel were of course years of 360 days each; in these 2300 years, the 490 years are included: but everybody knows that *we count 365 days in the year*. This fact has been overlooked. The 1810 years which remain of the 2300, after the accomplishment of the 490 years, are too long by 5 days and 6 hours each, and this makes a difference of upwards of 26 years. We must therefore deduct 26 years from 1843, and this takes us back to the year 1817, when, if this scheme had been correct, the world would have been destroyed." Protestant Banner, July 19th, 1843.

We may reply with the strictest propriety in the language of the Protestant Banner. "It is seldom that so large an amount of arrogance, egotism, and ignorance is found condensed in a single sentence; but the author possesses the faculty of condensing these elements in a wonderful degree." The P. B. must presume very largely upon the ignorance of its "readers," to suppose them to be "aware that the ancient mode of reckoning the year was by 360 days." We challenge the P. B. or any other Banner to point out a single nation, "ancient" or modern, whose mode of reckoning the year was by 360 days. If it can be shown that this was ever "the mode of reckoning the year," it certainly has not been since the time stated for the commencement of these obnoxious prophetic periods. See Prid. Con. Preface; Tegg's Chronology, and Roll. It is of very doubtful credit to the emphasized "*we*" of the P. B. that "everybody knows that *we count*

365 days to the year." In our part of the country we have 366 *once in a while*. And this talk about the difference between the ancient and modern computation of the year, and the years that are lost on account of it, is really amusing. We wonder if the sun, moon and stars stood still to accommodate the supposed "ignorance" of the ancients, so that the natural year should agree with theirs! If not, what a state of "confusion confounded" must things have got into when winter came in July, summer in January, autumn in March, and spring in October. At any rate, they might have sung, without any poetic license, once in a while, "December 's as pleasant as May." Though one would suppose they would have felt more like singing with the German poet, especially when May should find the thermometer below zero,—

"The world is out of joint,
O, cursed spite!
That ever I was born
To set it right."

But perhaps they had some P. B. or Rev. Mr. Thomas or Colver, to keep things straight for them.

The great unerring standard of time which God established when he set the sun, moon, and stars to be for signs and for seasons, for days and years, has never varied. And however men have computed time, God's years have always been the same. Moreover, it has been the work of astronomers, mathematicians, chronologers and historians, since men were upon the earth, to bring their defective computations to correspond with the true natural year—the time required for the earth to pass from a particular point in its orbit round to the same point, usually beginning at the equinoxes. This time, it has been demonstrated, is 365 days, 5 hours and a fraction.

It was by referring to this never varying standard that the necessity of the leap year was discovered. It was this which led to the change of O. S. for N. S.—So with the ancients and their modes of reckoning the year. There is pretty clear evidence that they knew

enough about astronomy to know *when the sun shined*, and to know day from night, and winter from summer; and they knew enough to make up the deficiency in their current years by intercalary months or days, as the case required; just as we should have to do at a broker's in exchanging money on which there might be 5 or 10 per cent discount, to get par money,—we must add enough to ours to make it of equal value with his. They always had the true solar year as much as we have, whether their current year included the whole of it or not; and they always contrived some way to keep the current and natural year along together, near enough at least not to lose *more than a whole year every century*.

These lost years are all nonsense, and would never have been mentioned but by men whose “arrogance, egotism and ignorance” are of a sufficiently “large amount” to disqualify them to perceive that they have *lost their reckoning*. Rollin tells us, (vol. ii. p. 627, Harpers' Edition,)

“Though all nations may not agree with one another in the manner of determining their years, some regulating them by the motion of the sun, and others by that of the moon, they, however, generally use the solar year in *chronology*. It seems at first, that as the lunar years are shorter than the solar, that inequality should produce some error in chronological calculations. But it is to be observed, that the nations who used lunar years, added a certain number of intercalary days to make them agree with the solar: which makes them correspond with each other; or at least, if there be any difference, it may be neglected, when the question is only to determine the year in which a fact happened.”

But the years used in the Bible history were undoubtedly Jewish years, so that we know exactly the “difference” to be considered, and what allowance to make for lost time. Horne, vol. iii. pp. 166, 167, 297.

“The ecclesiastical or sacred year began in March, or on the first day of the month Nisan, because at that time they departed out of Egypt.” “The Jewish months were originally calculated from the first appearance of the moon, on which the Feast of the New Moon, or beginning of months (as the He-

brews termed it) was celebrated. Exod. xii. 2 ; Num. x. 10 ; xxviii. 11." "The Jewish months being regulated by the phases or appearances of the moon, their years were consequently lunar years, consisting of twelve lunations, or 354 days and 8 hours ; but as the Jewish festivals were held not only on certain fixed days of the month, but also at certain seasons of the year, consequently great confusion would, in process of time, arise by this method of calculating : the spring month sometimes falling in the middle of winter, it became necessary to accommodate the lunar to solar years, in order that their months, and consequently their festivals, might always fall at the same season. For this purpose, the Jews added a whole month to the year, as often as it was necessary ; which occurred commonly once in three years, and sometimes once in two years. This intercalary month was added at the end of the ecclesiastical year after the month Adar, and was therefore called *Ve-Adar*, or the second Adar."

Now by regulating the "lunar years" so as to correspond with the "solar," their years must, of necessity, at every nineteenth, correspond, "within an hour and a half," with the same number of solar years, a "difference" which would not amount to one month in six thousand years ;* so that the "scheme" of the

* "The Lunar Cycle, called also the Golden Number, is the revolution of nineteen years, at the end of which the moon returns, within an hour and a half, to the same point with the sun, and begins its lunations again in the same order as at first." Rollin, vol. 2, p. 627.

"From the very time of the original institution of the Passover, the observance of it was fixed to the fourteenth day of the first month Nisan, otherwise denominated Abib, or the month of *green ears*, at which time in Judea the harvest was beginning : and, in a similar manner, the feast of tabernacles was fixed to the middle of the seventh month Tisri, and to the time of *the ending of the vintage*. Now, these feasts were thus observed—The Passover they celebrated on the fourteenth day of Nisan or Abib by killing the paschal lamb : the fifteenth was the first of the days of unleavened bread, and was ordained to be kept as a sabbath : and on the morrow after this sabbath, as being *the beginning of the barley-harvest*, they were directed to bring a sheaf of the first-fruits for a wave-offering before the Lord. The feast of tabernacles they celebrated on the fifteenth day of Tisri : and this festival was also called the feast of *ingathering*, because it was celebrated after they had gathered in their corn and their wine.

P. B. and its worthy coadjutors, "which takes us back to the year 1817, when the world would have been destroyed," will afford no relief to their "readers," except to those whose "ignorance" may be of a sufficient "degree" to disqualify them to appreciate the more "wonderful" "arrogance" and "egotism" of the writers.

PROPHETIC AND SOLAR YEARS.

"But does not Mr. Miller reckon some years at 360 and some at 365 days?" No—unless you refer to the prophetic years, as distinguished from chronological or historical years. In history and chronology no other years are ever used but true solar years. Prophetic years, generally called "times" in scripture, are always of 360 days. God has so explained them in his word (compare Rev. xii. 6 and 14); and the

If then the ancient Jewish year consisted of no more than 360 days, and if it were neither annually lengthened by the addition of five supernumerary days, nor occasionally regulated by monthly intercalations, it is evident, that *all* the months, and among them the months Abib and Tisri, must have rapidly revolved through the several seasons of the year. Hence it is equally evident, since the Passover and the feast of tabernacles were fixed, the one to the fourteenth day of Abib and the other to the fifteenth day of Tisri, that *they* must similarly have revolved through the seasons. Such being the case, how would it be possible to observe the ordinances of the law, when the months Abib and Tisri had passed into *opposite seasons of the solar year*? How could the Jews, in the climate of Judea, offer the first fruits of their harvest after the Passover, when the month Abib, in which it was celebrated, had passed into autumn or winter? And how could they observe the feast of tabernacles, as a feast of the ingathering of their corn and their wine, in the month of Tisri, when that month had passed into spring or summer? It is plain, that, unless Abib and Tisri always kept their places in the solar year, unless Abib were always a vernal month and Tisri an autumnal month, the Passover and the feast of tabernacles could not have been duly observed. And hence it is equally plain, that the ancient Jews could not have reckoned by years of 360 days without some expedient to make those years fall in with solar years." Faber, vol. i. pp. 12—14.

history of fulfilled prophecy corresponds with that explanation.

When these two modes of time are used in reckoning, prophetic years are never put alongside of solar years as if they were to be matched together *as years*; i. e. it is not to be supposed that the seven times, for instance, are to be matched with seven solar years:—nor, as some have thought, are we, 1st, to suppose the *days* in the prophetic period indicates a corresponding number of *solar years*; and 2d, that the period thus obtained is to be compared with the same number of *prophetic years*; and 3d, to get at the result, deduct the difference between the prophetic and solar years from the whole period; but prophetic or symbolic times are always interpreted to mean as many true solar years as there are days in the period considered. “Each day” of the prophetic period represents a true solar year—there being 2520 days in 7 times, understood symbolically, the period expresses 2520 true solar years. Prophetic time is the measure, true time the article to be measured. There is the same difference between the measure and the article to be measured in this case that there is in all other cases: the measure is an arbitrary abstract rule, by which the natural and real thing is to be measured off for use.

DIFFERENCE IN THE DATES OF THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.

It has been supposed again that the difference of *four years*, between the *true* date of the birth of Christ and A. D., affects the exact-application of one of the most important prophetic periods, the 2300 days or years of Daniel viii. The 70 weeks, a part of this period, terminated when “Messiah” was “cut off” “to make reconciliation for iniquity,” “and to anoint the Most Holy.” One week, or seven years, he was to “confirm the covenant with many.” In determining this question—*How did Christ confirm the covenant one week, or seven years?*—it has been ascertained, from what the sacred historians say of the age of Christ when he commenced his ministry, (Luke iii. 1—23;

Mark i. 6—15; Acts x. 36, 37,) and of the facts connected with his birth and death, that he was 37 years of age when “cut off”—that he was “cut off” A. D. 33—that he was born four years “before the account called Anno Domini,” and therefore, as he commenced his ministry at 30, he confirmed the covenant, according to the prophecy, by *preaching 7 years*. These facts have all been proved, not to say demonstrated. But the caviller has started a new difficulty, though others besides cavillers may have been entangled with it. It is this: “If Christ was born 4 years before A. D., and was 37 at his death, then the 70 weeks did not run out till the true A. D. 37, and the 2300 days, or years, cannot end till A. D. 1847.” Now in determining the question whether the 70 weeks, as a whole, were fulfilled, so as to “seal up,” or make sure “the vision” which ends at the termination of the 2300 days or years, we have nothing at all to do with the *birth* or *age* of Christ, we only want to know *when* he was “cut off;” as to this simple question, it matters not whether he was 20, 30, or 50 years of age at the time. In determining the question, whether Christ confirmed the covenant one week, or seven years, by his personal ministry, as we know his age when it began, we must ascertain his age at his death. In the other question, whether the 70 weeks expired at his death, we must ascertain whether it took place 70 weeks or 490 years from the going forth of the commandment referred to. The 70 weeks *were* so fulfilled, and God by them has *sealed the vision*. Christ did confirm the covenant, by his personal ministry, 7 years—he was 37 when he died, A. D. 33, and was therefore born 4 years before the “account commonly called A. D.” See note D. in the Diagram.

But let not the caviller make the correction in one particular part of the calculation, in order to introduce difficulties, which, when the whole is corrected, have no existence; if the correction is to be made, it should be carried through.


Let it be understood that the 70 weeks did not run

out till the true A. D. 37, and that the whole period will not run out till the true A. D. 1847; and let it be further understood that the true A. D. 37 was A. D. 33, and the true A. D. 1847 is A. D. 1843, and it is as exactly 490 years from the 7th year of Artaxerxes to the 37th year of the true age of Christ, as from the same year to A. D. 33; and it is as exactly 1810 years from the 37th year of the true age of Christ to the true A. D. 1847, as from A. D. 33 to A. D. 1843. As the "difference" has no connection with *the time of Christ's death*, the difficulty it is supposed to present in applying the prophetic period which brings us to "the end," has no existence.*

THE END HID FROM US.

Again we have been told, that the time of this event (the end of all things) "is not suitable to be revealed," "and it is wisely hid from us." If by the "time" here, "the day and the hour" be meant, the objection can have no fair application to Mr. Miller's calculations; but if it be meant that *every thing* "about the time" "is wisely hid from us," and "is not suitable to be revealed," the objection deserves a passing notice; though to point out its unscriptural character will be

* We will illustrate by a simple diagram.



The line A B represents the whole period of the vision, 2300 years, beginning B. C. 457 and ending A. D. 1843. The line from A to X represents the 70 weeks, or 490 years, which terminated at the death of Christ. C represents the true date of the birth of Christ, four years before A. D. Now you may remove C, the birth of Christ, to any point between B. C. 457, and A. D. 33, and it cannot possibly affect the 70 weeks which terminated at his *death*; it only makes Christ younger or older as it is removed nearer to or farther from his death. You can have no more nor less than 70 weeks, or 490 years, at A. D. 33.—or if any alteration be made here, a corresponding alteration must be made through the whole period: but it would not be very honorable, though honesty and candor demand it. for men of the pretensions of our opposers, to practise an exhibition of wisdom like that of a man who should attempt to add to the dimensions of his house by taking out the lower story and putting it upon the upper one. It is enough for them to pull down the superstructure,—*they are "under no particular obligation"* to put it up again.

sufficient. Has God commissioned his angels to our earth, to tell the prophets, to whom it was revealed that not unto themselves but unto us they did minister, how long it was to these things, and that the wise should understand—have the apostles directed us to these same prophets, telling us that we do well to take heed unto their word as unto a light that shineth in a dark place—has God connected the setting up of his kingdom, the judgment, and the coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven, with the destruction of all earthly kingdoms, telling us which of those earthly kingdoms in the succession should exist at the time—has Christ pointed us to the signs by which we might know when his coming is near, even at the door, and after all is it *hid* from us?

Has God seen it to be "*suitable*" to give notice of the time of the flood which was to destroy the world, even to a day, (Gen. vii. 4,) and of a famine which should affect only a few nations at most—and of the judgment of Egypt, a single nation, for oppressing his people—and of the final dissolution of the ten tribes, and of the captivity of Judah 70 years in Babylon, and of the destruction of Jerusalem, and is it *unsuitable* for God to make known to the world the time of its final destruction! And who shall dare to say what is suitable for God to do in such a case! Away with such affected regard for the character of God, which, assuming to guard the portals of the inner sanctuary, dares to dictate to the Sovereign who sits upon its throne; and while it ignorantly claims to be the guardian of his wisdom, impeaches every one of his perfections, as manifested in the express design of his most wonderful and important transactions.

How de ye doctors "make void the word of God through your traditions!" Do ye know the scriptures, or the power of God!

We defy any man to find in Mr. Miller's works, or even in what is ascribed to him by the ten thousand falsehoods in circulation, any thing more strongly

characterized by ignorance, presumption and impiety than this.

UNFAIR COMPARISONS.

It has been attempted more than once to add to the unpopularity of Mr. Miller's theory, by invidiously comparing him with the "religious theorists" who have assumed to be "inspired to explain the prophecies," or have read the world's destiny in the stars, or have had the dreadful message communicated to them in "dreams and revelations" of their own, or have explained the prophetic periods sometimes by solar years, sometimes by lunar years, and sometimes by the time taken for one of the distant planets to pass through its orbit, and so on.

But Mr. Miller makes no "pretensions of this sort." He claims the gift of inspiration only for the men who wrote the Bible. He has nothing to do with the stars or planets, but for the purposes for which God has expressly made them. He has but one kind of year for chronology or history, and no other but the sanctioned principles in interpreting the prophetic periods which are not understood literally. He has nothing to do with dreams or visions, except those of holy men of old who wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. His views are based upon the word of God, and the undeniable facts of history; and however crudely they may have been expressed to the classic ear, there is no ambiguity about them.

If any mistake can be pointed out in the dates of these events, or any impropriety in the application of the prophecies to them, or if a more scriptural and fair explanation can be given us, let it be done. The man who does it shall have our hearty thanks for ourselves, and our hearty coöperation to confer the benefit upon others. God's word will be verified, and it is to be understood by those for whom it is intended, before the sublime reality shall come to pass. But while we are fully aware that the belief of our views will not hasten the end, we are also sensible that the disbelief

of the word will not defer it. It will be as easy for the world to be deceived now as it has ever been; as easy for sinners to sleep, and for professors to dream under the lullaby of their slumbering watchmen, and for all to be taken in the snare, as at any time; but ready or not ready—awake or asleep, what God hath written he will surely perform.

CONCLUSION.

We have thus considered the principal objections and difficulties which have been presented against calculating the termination of the prophetic periods, especially that view of them which supposes that they bring us to the end in 1843.

There are other objections which were not deemed worthy of a detailed examination here,—their fallacy having been so often shown, or their weakness being so very palpable, that nothing but the most obsequious bigotry, or the most unpardonable ignorance, could ever think of them. Of the former, “No man knoweth the day or the hour,” is a specimen,—of the latter, “The doctrine is not according to the standard writers of our church,” and “Mr. Miller is not a learned man,” are examples. We do not think the Saviour meant to say, when he spoke of “the day and the hour,” “that we can know nothing about the time;” (*Dimmick*;) that would make him contradict himself, for he had just told how we might *know* when his coming was *near, even at the door*. (Matt. xxiv. 32, 33.) Nor is it even probable that he meant to say that “man” should *never* know the day or the hour of his coming in the most literal sense, for that would suppose that he himself could never know the day or the hour. The text applies to “the Son” as well as to “man” and “the angels of heaven.” Mark xiii. 32.

The doctrine may not be according to the “standard writers” of any sect, and yet it may be true. Mr. Miller may not be a learned man, in the estimation of men, and yet his calculations may be correct. These objections cannot prove any doctrine true or false—no

man who is seeking for truth at the only source of truth, the word of God, would allow them the weight of a feather. If Mr. Miller's views are the truth, they are worthy of the ablest advocacy of the most learned and able Christian, and it is high time they were received among the "standard writings" of the several branches of the church; if they are not true, no *Christian* is at liberty to treat them or their disciples in any other than in a Christian manner.

Finally, there are several fundamental positions of the doctrine which remain firm and immovable:—

1. God meant what he said when he dictated the prophecies.

2. Whatever the prophecies speak is "a sure word."

3. According to the principles of this theory the prophecies have been so far fulfilled.

4. If we are wrong, those who oppose our views are also wrong. *They cannot be right.*

5. If this view of the prophecies does not bring us to their grand development, we do not know what to make of them.

6. We must therefore lay hold of it as the truth till God shall settle the question, and trust in him for the result.

REMARK. To those who may receive this article on the objections against calculating the prophetic times, we would remark, that the particular illustration of, and argument upon, those prophecies named in the diagram of symbolic times, may be found in the other articles of the series of which this is only one. They may also be found in nearly all our more extended second advent publications. The extract from Ferguson, referred to in the Chronology, may be found in the "Bible Student's Manual," "Miller's Life and Views," &c. &c.

Chronological Order of the Prophets,

From Horne's Introduction, Vol. IV.

“Much of the obscurity, which hangs over the prophetic writings, may be removed by perusing them *in the order of time* in which they were probably written; and, though the *precise* time, in which some of the prophets delivered their predictions, cannot, perhaps, be traced in every instance, yet the following arrangement of the prophets in their supposed order of time, (according to the tables of Blair, Archbishop Newcome, and other eminent critics, with a few variations,) will, we think, be found sufficiently correct for the right understanding of their predictions.

According to this table, the times when the prophets flourished may be referred to three periods, viz. 1. Before the Babylonian Captivity;—2. Near to and during that event;—and, 3. After the return of the Jews from Babylon. And if, in these three periods, we parallel the prophetic writings with the historical books written during the same times, they will materially illustrate each other.

JONAH, . . .	between B. C.	856	and	784.
AMOS, . . .	“	810	“	785.
HOSEA, . . .	“	810	“	725.
ISAIAH, . . .	“	810	“	698.
JOEL, . . .	“	810	“	660, <i>or later.</i>
MICAH, . . .	“	758	“	699.
NAHUM, . . .	“	720	“	698.
ZEPHANIAH, . . .	“	640	“	609.
JEREMIAH, . . .	“	628	“	586.
HABAKKUK, . . .	“	612	“	598.
DANIEL, . . .	“	606	“	534.
OBADIAH, . . .	“	588	“	583.
EZEKIEL, . . .	“	595	“	536.
HAGGAI, . . .	“	520	“	518.
ZECHARIAH, . . .	“	520	“	518.
MALACHI, . . .	“	436	“	420.”

Chronological Order of the Prophets,

From Horne's Introduction, Vol. IV.

“Much of the obscurity, which hangs over the prophetic writings, may be removed by perusing them *in the order of time* in which they were probably written; and, though the *precise* time, in which some of the prophets delivered their predictions, cannot, perhaps, be traced in every instance, yet the following arrangement of the prophets in their supposed order of time, (according to the tables of Blair, Archbishop Newcome, and other eminent critics, with a few variations,) will, we think, be found sufficiently correct for the right understanding of their predictions.

According to this table, the times when the prophets flourished may be referred to three periods, viz. 1. Before the Babylonian Captivity;—2. Near to and during that event;—and, 3. After the return of the Jews from Babylon. And if, in these three periods, we parallel the prophetic writings with the historical books written during the same times, they will materially illustrate each other.

JONAH, . . .	between B. C.	856	and	784.
AMOS, . . .	“	“	810	“ 785.
HOSEA, . . .	“	“	810	“ 725.
ISAIAH, . . .	“	“	810	“ 698.
JOEL, . . .	“	“	810	“ 660, <i>or later.</i>
MICAH, . . .	“	“	758	“ 699.
NAHUM, . . .	“	“	720	“ 698.
ZEPHANIAH, . . .	“	“	640	“ 609.
JEREMIAH, . . .	“	“	628	“ 586.
HABAKKUK, . . .	“	“	612	“ 598.
DANIEL, . . .	“	“	606	“ 534.
OBADIAH, . . .	“	“	588	“ 583.
EZEKIEL, . . .	“	“	595	“ 536.
HAGGAI, . . .	“	“	520	“ 518.
ZECHARIAH, . . .	“	“	520	“ 518.
MALACHI, . . .	“	“	436	“ 420.”

PROPHETIC PERIODS.

THE SEVEN TIMES, OR 2520 YEARS.

THE first of the prophetic periods, which are considered as main pillars in the calculations of Mr. Miller, is found in Leviticus xxvi. 18—28.

The objections urged against this are, 1. That it should not be considered a *prophetic period* at all. 2. If it be so considered,—as the seven times occur *four times* in the text,—it should be understood as a period of *four times seven times*. 3. Admitting it to express only one period of seven times, which, understood prophetically, would be 2520 years, why should the period begin B. C. 677?

1. Why consider the seven times of Leviticus a prophetic period? Answer. That is the *first* meaning we should think of attaching to the text. If the word *times* did not occur in other parts of the word of God, when chronological arrangements are spoken of, there would be some show of propriety in demanding the reasons for so understanding it in this case. But when we read of the *seven times* in the history of Nebuchadnezzar, Dan. iv., in which case only one signification has ever been supposed; and of the *time, times and half a time*, repeatedly spoken of in the prophecies of the Old and New Testaments; and of the *times* of the Gentiles, Luke xxi. 24; and of the *times* of the restitution of all things, Acts iii. 21; and of the dispensation of the *fulness of times*, Eph. i. 10; and of the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which in *his times* he shall show, 1 Tim. vi. 15, &c., &c.; the text in Lev. is at once recognised as one of a most numerous and important class. The text is a part of the last communication which “the Lord spake unto Moses in Mount Sinia, (xxv. 1; xxvii. 34,) and was specially designed for the warning of “the

children of Israel," when they should "come into the land which God gave them"—a portion of truth which brought before them, in a most impressive manner, conditionally, their future history as a nation.

And this, if any doubt might exist, would confirm the idea that the text was intended to be understood *chronologically*. "And if ye will not for all this hearken unto me, then I will punish you seven times more for your sins." "Then will I also walk contrary unto you, and will punish you yet seven times for your sins." "And if ye will not for all this hearken unto me, but walk contrary unto me; then I will walk contrary unto you also in fury; and I, even I, will chastise you seven times for your sins." Lev. xxvi. 18, 24, 27, 28.

"But does not the text mean to express that God would punish them *in measure* according to *perfect justice*?" That is a truth which it could hardly be necessary to assert. None could doubt that his administration would be according to *perfect justice*; and to punish them seven times might be as *perfectly just* as to punish them for any other period.

If any class of expositors should be called upon to give special reasons, *they* should do it who understand the text in *any other sense* than its obvious, *chronological sense*. Besides Mr. Miller, Prof. Bush, Rev. M. Duffield, and Mr. Campbell, and others in our country, understand the text to contain a prophetic period, which they all understand figuratively to be 2520 years—as it must be understood in the nature of the case. Among the European writers, Mr. Philip (I think that is the name) understands and applies the period exactly as Mr. Miller does. I refer to him because he could have no knowledge of Mr. M. (See "Morning Watch"—a rare work in this country.)

2. "If the seven times be understood as a prophetic period, does not the text contain *four* of those periods?" I may be excused for inserting a quotation, which shows at once the *carelessness* and "*igno-*

rance" upon questions which every man may decide who can read his Bible, which are so characteristic of many who fill the most important stations in the modern church. It is from the pen of the editor of the Protestant Banner, published in Philadelphia—a most efficient antagonist of *nominal* popery. The writer had made a display of his powers on that side of the question of "Millerism" so *honorable* at the present time, in which he had shown from "Mr. Miller's own terms," as he called them, that the seven times could not run out till "A. D. 9403," and then adds,—

"It will be in vain for any advocates of Millerism to evade this conclusion, from the premises which they assume; they dare not tell us that the *seven times* here spoken of are merely a repetition of the same period, because it is emphatically stated after each separate enumeration of the different judgments,—which are impending,—that they shall be punished *seven times more*, if they do not hearken."

Such a Protestant would not, of course, claim that kind of *infallibility* which might *correct the written word*; and if the reader will turn to the verses under consideration, it will be seen the word "*more*" occurs but *twice at all*; only once when the seven times are employed in stating their prospect of *continued punishment*, which is the *first* time the period is named; (v. 18,) and once when the *measure of their punishment is compared with their sins*—the only clear case of such comparison, (v. 21,) the *second* time the seven times are used. I am sorry that so many of our able opponents are willing thus to expose such an utter want of every essential qualification for scriptural discussion, as to take *such a position*, and then "*dare* the advocates of Millerism" to take that view of a text which every one, who is at all acquainted with the Bible, must see at once is the most consistent and obviously correct view of it,—"*that the seven times here spoken of are merely a repetition of the same period,*" with the exception, perhaps, of the *second* case referred to

above. I have yet to see "the advocate of Millerism," who is so ignorant of his Bible and so regardless of its contents, as to "dare" to make a statement like the above by the Rev. Mr. B——.

Surely, it can be no strange thing to suppose that God may have made "a *repetition* of the same" thing in the revelations he has given us of his designs and will, especially when the matter is one of such moment to the recipients of the revelation. God saw fit to make known to Pharaoh the seven years of famine by "a repetition" of dreams, which Joseph *dared* to tell the monarch were "one;" and, in explanation, adds—"And for that the dream *was doubled unto Pharaoh twice, it is because the thing is established of God, and God will shortly bring it to pass.*" Gen. xli. 32. In the predicted subjection of the Jews and other nations to the king of Babylon, we have "a repetition of the same period" four or five times by different prophets, (Isaiah xxiii. 15—17; Jer. xxv. 11, 12,) and I do not know that it has ever been considered an evidence of any particular form of courage to suppose this "repetition" to speak of only *one* period of "seventy years." So invincible were the prejudices of Peter, and so important was it that he should understand the truth in the case, that there was "a repetition of the same" thing, *three times*, Acts. x. 9—16. John is remarkable for "a repetition of the same period:"—the forty two months, or its equivalents, are named five times, Rev. xi. xii. xiii.; and the one thousand years are named six times certainly, chap. xx.; and yet I believe there are very few who suppose that the repetition, in each case, refers to more than one period.

The mystery of the seven times is, therefore, explained by the very natural and scriptural supposition of "a *repetition of the same period.*"

One important feature of this prophecy, however, appears to have been overlooked. The language implies, and the history of the Jews proves, that these predictions of national judgments were *conditional*; not

merely in the sense that the conduct of the Jews would determine whether they should *begin* or not,—that is too plain to be mistaken, vs. 14—18; but after they had been inflicted in part, and the different forms of the threatened punishment had *begun*, the remainder of it might have been suspended or remitted; for after the first threatening of the punishment, it says, vs. 23, 24, “And if ye will not be reformed by me by these things, but will walk contrary unto me; THEN will I also walk contrary unto you, and will punish you YET SEVEN TIMES for your sins,”—implying that, after the judgments had begun, if they *would* hearken and do his commandments, he would not punish them to the full; but if not, *then* he would punish them *yet seven times*,—the full punishment of the first threatening shall be poured out upon them. So the prophets understood the subject, and in accordance with it they addressed their countrymen, until they finally rebelled by rejecting their Lord, and the wrath came upon them to the uttermost. Jer. iii. 7—20; iv. 1, 2; vii. 5—7; xvii. 19—26; xxii. 1—4.

3. *Why commence the seven times at the captivity of Manasseh, B. C. 677?*

1. The prediction itself points to that event. The first form of their punishment stated in connection with the first mention of the period is,—“*And I will break the pride of your power.*” If their kingly form of civil government is here referred to, it was never “*broken*” until the captivity of Manasseh. Although it was the case, after the division of the Hebrews into the ten tribes and two tribes, that they were several times made tributary to foreigners, still one division remained independent while the other was subdued and tributary until his captivity; but at this period the ten tribes had *lost their king*, (2 Kings xvii. 1—18,) and as soon as Manasseh, the king of the remaining division, was carried into captivity, their “*power*,” as an independent people, was gone. Manasseh was the *pride* and the ruin of the Jews.

Again; the prediction specifies the particular sins on account of which this evil should befall them.

Some of these sins are as specifically charged upon Manasseh and the Jews as the direct cause of their calamity. Compare Lev. xxvi. 14, 18, 27, with 2 Kings xxi. 9—13; and Lev. xxvi. 1, 2, with 2 Kings xxi. 2—8; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 2—11.

2. Those texts which speak of the instruments of Providence in effecting this judgment, all point to his captivity as the time for the commencement of the period. Compare Isaiah x. 5, 6, with 2 Kings xxi. 10—14. 2 Chron xxxiii. 10, 11. Neh. ix. 32.

3. The sacred historians refer to Manasseh's sins as the cause of their captivity and sufferings long after his captivity. 2 Kings xxiii. 26, 27; xxiv. 1—4; Jer. xv. 1—7.

4. Although Manasseh was restored to his throne, and there were a few other kings of the Jewish nation after him, they have never been an independent people "from the day of the kings of Assyria unto this day." Neh. ix. 32. Nebuchadnezzar brought the kingdom, in its subjected form, to an end; when Babylon was conquered by Cyrus, the Jews passed under the power of the Medes and Persians; then under that of the Greeks; in the division of Greece, they were connected with Egypt; as a part of Egypt, were conquered by Syria; they prospered awhile under the Maccabees, and the protection of the Romans, who eventually "*took away their place and nation.*" Since the destruction of their city, they have been "wanderers among the nations,"—a hissing and a by-word, —pitying none, pitied by none.

5. The prophets, who lived long before the captivity of Manasseh, point to that event as the time of the passing away of the Jewish independence, by connecting it with other events. One of them *gives the date*. Hosea, more than a hundred years before, had said,— "And the pride of Israel (the ten tribes) doth testify to his face: *therefore shall Israel and Ephraim* (the principal tribe of the ten) *fall* in their iniquity; JUDAH

(the other division) SHALL ALSO FALL WITH THEM.” Hosea v. 5. Isaiah, in the year 742 B. C., according to date in the margin, had said,—“*And within three-score and five years SHALL EPHRAIM BE BROKEN that it be not a people.*” vii. 8. From 742
deduct 65

leaves B. C. 677,—the only date ever given, I believe, for the captivity of Manasseh.

For an explanation of the quotations from Hosea and Isaiah, and for the most authentic history of the period before us, we add the following

HISTORY.

Prideaux’s Con., vol. i., pp. 149—151. “In the eleventh year of Manasseh, B. C. 688, died Tirhakah,* king of Egypt, after he had reigned there eighteen years, who was the last of the Ethiopian kings that reigned in that country.

“The same year that this happened in Egypt, by the death of Tirhakah, the like happened in Babylon, by the death of Mesessimordacus. For, he leaving no son behind him to inherit the kingdom, an interregnum of anarchy and confusion followed there for eight years together,† of which Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, taking the advantage, seized Babylon, and, adding it to his former empire, thenceforth reigned over both for thirteen years;‡ he is, in the canon of Ptolemy, called Assar-Adinus. And in the scriptures he is spoken of as king of Babylon and Assyria jointly together.§

In the 22d year of Manasseh, B. C. 677, Esarhaddon, after he had now entered on the fourth year of his reign in Babylon, and fully settled his authority

* Africans and Cyncellum, p. 74.

† Canon Ptolemaei.

‡ Canon Ptolemaei.

§ He is said, as king of Assyria, to have brought a colony out of Babylon into Samaria, 2 Kings xvii. 24. Ezra iv. 9, 10, which he could not have done, if he had not been king of Babylon, as well as of Assyria, at that time. And in 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11, he is said, as king of Assyria, to have taken Manasseh prisoner, and to have carried him to Babylon, which argues him, at that time, to have been king of Babylon also.

there, began to set his thoughts on the recovery of what had been lost to the empire of the Assyrians in Syria and Palestine, on the destruction of his father's army in Judea, and on that doleful retreat which thereon he was forced to make from thence; and, being encouraged to this undertaking by the great augmentation of strength which he had acquired by adding Babylon and Chaldea to his former kingdom of Assyria, he prepared a great army, and marched into those parts, and again added them to the Assyrian empire. And then was accomplished the prophecy which was spoken by Isaiah, in the first year of Ahaz, against Samaria,* that, within threescore and five years, Ephraim should be absolutely broken, so as to be from thenceforth no more a people. For this year, being exactly sixty-five years from the first of Ahaz, Esarhaddon, after he had settled all affairs in Syria, marched into the land of Israel, and there taking captive all those who were the remains of the former captivity, (excepting only some few, who escaped his hands and continued still in the land,) carried them away into Babylon and Assyria; and, to prevent the land from becoming desolate, he brought others from† Babylon, and Cutha, and from Avah, and Hamath, and Sepharvaim, to dwell in the cities of Samaria in their stead. And the ten tribes of Israel, which had separated from the house of David, were brought to a full and utter destruction, and never after recovered themselves again.

Esarhaddon, after he had thus possessed himself of the land of Israel, sent some of his princes, with parts of his army, into Judea, to reduce that country also under his subjection; who, having vanquished Manasseh in battle,‡ and taking him, hid in a thicket of thorns, brought him prisoner to Esarhaddon, who bound him in fetters and carried him to Babylon.

* Isa. vii. 8.

† 2 Kings. xvii. 24. Ezra iv. 2, 10.

‡ 2 Chron. xxxiii. 2. Joseph. Antiq. lib. 10, 4.

Archbishop Usher, after referring to the above facts in the history of Egypt and Babylon, stated by Prideaux, in reference to the points in question, says:—

“Year of the world 3327. Julian period 4037. Before Christ 677. This year also was fulfilled the prophecy of the prophet Isaiah, (chap. vii. 8,) in the beginning of the reign of Ahaz, “Within sixty and five years, Ephraim shall be broken in pieces so that it shall be no more a people.” For although the greatest part of them were carried away by Salmaneser 44 years before, and the kingdom utterly abolished, yet among them which were left there was some show of government. But now they left off to *be any more a people* by reason of the great multitude of foreigners which came to dwell there. New colonies or companies were sent out of Babel, Cuth, Hava, and Sepharvaim; and this was done by Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, as is easy to be understood, by the confession of the Cuthites, mentioned Ezra iv. 2, 10.

“At which time, also, as it should seem, and in the same expedition, whereby these things were done in the land of Israel, some of the chief commanders of the Assyrian army made an inroad into Judea, and then took Manasseh the king, as he lay hid in a thicket; after binding him with chains of brass, carried him away to Babylon. *Jacobus Capellus* hath noted in his Chron. that the Jews in Sedar Olam Rabba, and the Talmudists, cited by Rabbi Kimchi upon Ezra, chap. iv., do deliver, that Manasseh, 22 of his reign, was carried away captive into Babylon, and that he repented him of his sin thirty-three years before his death.”—[Usher’s Annals of the World, p. 75. Lond., 1658. See also Newton on Prophecy, pp. 98, 99. Rollin, B. iii., chap. 2.]

From all the light we have upon the event to which this prophecy refers, and from which the seven times should commence, no other date could be named for the event—no other point for the starting-point, any more than we could fix upon any other date than 1776 for the date of American Independence.

Having thus disposed of the difficulties connected with this first and most important detailed prediction of the history of the Jews, so far as it relates to the prophetic period it contains, we will close our remarks by showing that it must terminate in 1843; and by referring to those texts which assure us that the coming of Christ, and the end of all things, in their pres-

ent state, also come at its termination. God has explained a "time" to be a period of 360 days, (Rev. xii. 6, 14.) In seven of those periods there are 2520 days, which, understood as years,—for they cannot be understood literally,—and commencing B. C. 677, end A. D. 1843.

$$\begin{array}{r}
 360 \\
 7 \\
 \hline
 2520 \\
 677 \\
 \hline
 1843
 \end{array}$$

The proofs that the end will come at the end of this period are found Dan. xii. 1—7. Luke xxi. 24—27. See also remarks on the cleansing the sanctuary and last end of the indignation. Dan. viii.

TWO THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED DAYS.

THE second of the prophetic periods, which are considered main pillars in Mr. M's calculations, is found Dan. viii. 14.

The objections on this period are, 1. "It is *not* to be understood as years. 2. And if it be so understood, the *cleansing of the sanctuary is not the end of the world.* 3. There is no evidence that it *begins with the seventy weeks.* 4. If it does begin with the seventy weeks, *we do not know with which of the several decrees it begins.*"

1. *Should the 2300 days of Dan. viii. 14, be understood as years?*

The difference of opinion which exists upon this question appears to arise from the use of the words "evening-morning," which specify the portions of time enumerated, and which are translated days in the

text, (2300 evenings and mornings, it is contended, make only half that number of *whole days*;) and, from the supposition that the question, in answer to which they are given, refers only to some particular pollution of the sanctuary which might occupy but a small portion of the time comprehended in the whole vision. That the marginal and original reading, *evening-morning*, is the Hebrew expression of the natural day, is admitted by the most respectable Hebrew scholars. Professor Stuart, as a witness, will not be suspected.

“On the whole, then, we must consider these 2300 *evening-mornings* as an expression of simple time, i. e., of so many days, reckoned in the Hebrew manner. So Gesenius, Rosenmueller, Hävernicks, and others.”—*Hints*, p. 100.

On the other point, whether the question and answer refer to a part of the vision or the whole of it, there seems to be less room for dispute.

In determining the true application of any particular portion of prophecy, we should refer, 1st, To the views of standard writers on the prophecies; and, 2d, In a difficult case, we should make use of the following rule. It is quoted from Macknight, and may be found in Dr. Clarke’s notes on 2 Thess. ii. We regard it as a complete “counterfeit detector,” and have no doubt its value will be appreciated at the present time.

RULE.—“In every case where different interpretations of a prophecy have been given, the *proper* method of ascertaining its meaning is, to compare the various events to which it is thought to relate, with the words of the prophecy; and to adopt that as the event intended which most exactly agrees, in all its parts, with the prophetic description.”

These criteria will commend themselves to every enlightened and candid mind.

The Jewish writers appear generally to have understood this and the other periods of Daniel as years.

“Rabbi Isaac Abarbanel proves that the *days* are to be interpreted as *years*, when shall be the days of our redemption, and so have explained them all our other interpreters.”—*Political destiny of the earth*,—Preface.

Bishop Newton, who may be considered a host of himself, and whose works on the prophecies have been considered equal to any other for nearly a hundred years, expresses himself on the point before us as follows:—“*The days, without doubt, are to be taken, agreeably to the style of Daniel in other places, not for natural, but for prophetic days or years; and as the question was asked not only how long the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the transgression of desolation continue, but also how long the vision shall last, so the answer is to be understood, and these two thousand and three hundred days denote the whole time from the beginning of the vision to the cleansing of the sanctuary.*—*Newton on Proph.*, p. 259.

Fletcher, the devout and eloquent vicar of Madeley, in a letter on the prophecies, dated 1775, says, “Chronologists may mistake a few years, but cannot err upon the whole, and as God is true and faithful, so it is manifest that the prophecy of 2300 years must be fully accomplished in our days, or those of the next generation.” See also Dr. Clarke’s notes on Dan. viii. 26.

We might fill a volume of similar quotations from the best and most able men who have ever lived; but we pass to “the words of the prophecy.”

The first thing attempted in the interpretation of this vision, is to show that it extends to “THE END,” (v. 17,) the exact meaning of which is explained to be “THE LAST END OF THE INDIGNATION,” (v. 19,) and, that “the vision,” and the *time given in it*, terminate together,—“AT THE TIME APPOINTED THE END SHALL BE.” (v. 19.) All this was said by Gabriel before a word was said about the historical emblems of the vision—the ram, goat, &c.,—evidently implying that these points were the most important to be understood.

What, then, is “the time appointed?” It must be the time mentioned in “the vision;” for it was “the meaning” of “the vision” Daniel sought, (v. 15,)—it was the vision Gabriel was sent to “make” him “understand,” (v. 16,) and it was the vision Gabriel

“came” to explain to him, (v. 17;) the time appointed, therefore, must be the time given in “the vision,” or Daniel’s prayer was answered with mocking, Gabriel forgot his commission, and directed his attention to something foreign from the matter to be attended to. No other time is given in the vision but the “2300 days,” (v. 14,) and that this was specially designed to be communicated to Daniel is evident from this fact: when the question was asked, “*How long the vision?*” though it does not appear to have been proposed by Daniel, the answer is addressed to him,—“*And he said unto me,*” &c.

This, then, is “the time appointed,” at the end of which “the vision” is to end,—“then shall the sanctuary be cleansed,” “the last end of the indignation” come, and the power represented by the “little horn” “shall be broken without hand.”

It is sufficient to settle the question whether this period is to be understood literally or not, to know that 2300 days, literally, will not cover the history of the power which continued for the shortest time of any one in the vision—the “king” represented by “the great horn” of “the goat”—Alexander.

If anything more were needed, the fact that all who have attempted to apply it literally, have failed to do so, many of them confessing it unequivocally, puts it forever to rest. It must, therefore, be understood symbolically, as equal to 2300 years.

2. *If the period is understood to be years, does the cleansing of the sanctuary bring us to the end of the world?*

What are we to understand by the “cleansing the sanctuary?” To “understand” this correctly we must ascertain what is meant by “the sanctuary.” The word sanctuary is used by the inspired writers in the following significations. 1. It is the name of a particular part of the temple. Heb. ix. 2. 2. The different apartments of the temple. Jer. li. 51. 3.

The temple itself. 1 Chron. xxii. 19; xxviii. 10. 4. Places of worship generally, true or false. Amos vii. 9; Ezek. xxviii. 18; Dan. viii. 11. 5. Heaven is called the sanctuary. Ps. cii. 19. 6. The promised land. Ex. xv. 17; Ps. lxxviii. 54; Isa. lxiii. 18. 7. The tabernacle of God in the heavenly state. Ezek. xxxvii. 26, 28. These are the principal significations of the word sanctuary, in the word of God. According to which of these significations is the word to be understood in the text before us? I think the most obvious sense is that which points out *the promised land*; for it must be evident to every one that the sanctuary here spoken of must be capable of being "*trodden under foot*," and of being "*cleansed*," and, as I think we shall see, of being cleansed *at the coming of Christ and the resurrection of the righteous dead*. The text should also be understood in a sense that will harmonize with other cases in which the word is used by Daniel in particular, with the views of the other prophets, and the word of God generally.

The promised land, of which *old Jerusalem* was the metropolis, was given to Abraham, (Gen. xvii. 4—9,) and to his seed after him, FOR AN EVERLASTING POSSESSION, in a covenant *established* with Abraham, and *to be established* with his seed after him in their generations. And this seed are thus to possess it as a peculiar inheritance when the promise to Abraham that he should be the heir of *the habitable earth* (kosmou) shall be realized. There will be the "*city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God*," to which they have "*looked*" while "*strangers and pilgrims on the earth*." There "*the king shall be seen in his beauty*," — "*upon the throne of David, to order and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even forever*." "FOR THE LORD HATH CHOSEN ZION: he hath desired it FOR HIS HABITATION." "THIS IS MY REST FOREVER: HERE WILL I DWELL; for I have desired it." Ps. cxxxii. 13, 14. "*This is the hill which God desireth to dwell in; yea, THE LORD WILL DWELL IN IT FOREVER*." Ps. lxviii. 16. See also Ex. xv.

17, 18; Isa. lx. 13; Ezek. xxxvii. 24—28; Rev. xxii. 3.

On this territory the great battle is to be fought, which will make an end at once of the desolator and the desolations. "The Lord of hosts hath sworn, saying, Surely as I have thought, so shall it come to pass; and as I have purposed, so shall it stand; that I will break the Assyrian in my land, and upon my mountains tread him under foot: then shall his yoke depart from off them, and his burden depart from off their shoulders. This is the purpose that is purposed upon *the whole earth*; and this is the hand that is stretched out *upon all the nations*. For the Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? and his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?" Isa. xiv. 24—27. See also xxix. 5—8; xxxi. 4, 5; xxxiv. 1—8; lxiii. 1—4; Joel iii. 9—16; Zech. xiv. 3; Rev. xvi. 13—16; xix. 11—21.

"Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed," "and the host" of "the ransomed of the Lord," delivered from the power of death and the grave, and their oppressors on earth, "shall return and come with singing unto Zion; and everlasting joy shall be upon their head."

This cleansing is to take place at *the last end of the indignation*. A remark or two will show that this is to come at the time of Christ's coming to judge the world, to raise the righteous dead, and to enter upon his glorious and everlasting reign. If there were any doubt whether this indignation were God's general indignation against a guilty world, or against the wicked and unworthy occupants of His "heritage"—the promised land,—it would make no difference as to the events which are to take place at *the last end*, or termination of it. In the most general sense it must bring the last manifestation of God's wrath against sinners, and that we know will not be till "*the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.*"

But the indignation is evidently that which is so often spoken of by the prophets, which was poured

out upon the covenant people of God on account of their sins; which first subjected them to the dominion of foreign masters, and afterwards removed them from the land of their fathers, to be fugitives among all nations. See Isa. v. 5—7, 13; x. 5, 6; xlii. 24, 25; Jer. vii. 17—34; ix. 13—16; xliv. 2—6; Ezek. xxxvi. 17—19; Dan. ix. 7—12, 16.

Now we have the clearest proof that this condition of “the sanctuary”—“the holy mountain,” which “*the Lord hath chosen for HIS HABITATION, TO DWELL IN IT FOREVER;*” and which without doubt is to be the location of “the CITY OF THE GREAT KING,” “when the LORD OF HOSTS *shall reign in MOUNT ZION, AND IN JERUSALEM, and before his ancients gloriously,*” “KING OVER ALL THE EARTH;” and which “the heirs” are “*to possess as an everlasting inheritance,*” together with “*the kingdom and dominion under the whole heaven,*”—we have the clearest proof, I repeat, that this condition of the sanctuary is to terminate at the coming of Christ, and not till then. Daniel, in the 9th chapter, the appendix to the 8th, where he gives us the fate of “the city and sanctuary,” says “for the overspreading of abominations *he shall make it desolate, EVEN UNTIL THE CONSUMMATION.*” And also xii. 1—7, the accomplishment of the predicted “*scattering of the power of the holy people*”—in other words, the desolation, or “treading under foot,” of the inheritance—is the point at which the “wonders” stated in the preceding verses, are to “be finished.” What are “*these wonders?*”

1. “*At that time shall Michael stand up, the great Prince which standeth for the children of thy people.*” Michael is one of the names which is applied to Jesus Christ. It means, “*Who is like God?*” To “stand up,” means, in this prophecy, *to reign.* xi. 2—4. The first of *these wonders*, then, is *the reign of Jesus Christ*; which is always stated to commence with the destruction of all earthly kingdoms. See Dan. vii. 9—14; Rev. xi. 15—18. When “He whose right it is” to reign takes the throne, his kingdom will be

“*all the earth;*” and “*the throne*” of every usurper shall be “*cast down.*” Psalm ii. ; Zeph. iii. 8—18 ; Luke xix. 11—27.

2. “*And at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book.*” There is no other “*time*” in which the “*deliverance*” of “*people*” is to be determined by referring to “*the book,*” but in the judgment scene. Dan. vii. 10 ; Rev. xx. 12, 15 ; xxi. 27. The second of *these wonders* is, therefore, the judgment scene, which brings “*trouble*” to the wicked and *deliverance* to the righteous.

3. “*And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.*” This is a clear statement that *the resurrection*, particularly of the righteous, will take place when the predicted scattering of the holy people is “*accomplished.*” It takes place “*at his (Christ’s) coming.*” 1 Cor. xv. 23 ; 1 Thes. iv. 14—17. We would remark upon this text, which has been supposed to be difficult to reconcile with the theory of two resurrections, a thousand years apart, that it certainly *supposes* an arrangement of the process which gives it *a double character*. And if the angel intended to have said that *all* would come forth at once, he could hardly have spoken as he has—“*many of them,*” &c. ; but, *them* that sleep, or, *all* that sleep. The intention, evidently, is not to go into the details of the resurrection, as John has done, (Rev. xx.,) but to state the fact so as to place the righteous dead “*who are written in the book,*” among them who are “*delivered*” at the time referred to, and yet so as not to clash with what was to be more fully communicated as to the *order* of the resurrection at a subsequent period. “*Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake*”—and then, lest the “*many*” should be understood, as in some other cases, to include the whole, he immediately adds—“*some*” of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake “*to everlasting life, and some*” of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake “*to shame and everlasting contempt.*” *The*

order is implied here. John tells how long a time shall intervene between the resurrection of the two classes. But if all were to rise at once, it must take place "at the time" here referred to. The third of "these wonders," therefore, is the resurrection.

4. "And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever." This can mean nothing less than the glorification of the righteous. Paul uses similar language in speaking on the same point. 1 Cor. xv. 41, 42. The Saviour uses very similar language in his parable of the tares and wheat. Matt. xiii. 37—43. And he assures us that "at the end of this world" the righteous "shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."

Now "all these wonders" are to "be finished," "when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people." The testimony of Christ, (Luke xxi. 24—27,) is equally clear, that the desolation of "the sanctuary, the holy mountain," is to end at his coming to judge the world, and to reign forever. "And Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, UNTIL THE TIMES OF THE GENTILES BE FULFILLED. And there shall be signs in the sun, &c. AND THEN SHALL THEY SEE THE SON OF MAN COMING IN A CLOUD with power and great glory." Here the coming of Christ is intimately connected with the fulfilment of the times of the Gentiles, the period during which Jerusalem shall be trodden under foot. Of course the whole country follows the condition of its capital. It must continue in this condition till Christ comes. "And in that day thou shalt say, O Lord, I will praise thee: though thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away, and thou comfortest me." Isa. xii. 1. "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, that her warfare, (APPOINTED TIME, margin,) is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received at the Lord's hand double for all her sins." Isa. xl. 1. "For your shame you shall have double, and for confusion

they shall rejoice in their portion: therefore IN THEIR LAND THEY SHALL POSSESS THE DOUBLE; everlasting joy shall be unto them." Isa. lxi. 7. See also Isa. lxvi. 13—16.

By "the sanctuary," then, I understand to be meant, "the place which the Lord made for himself to dwell in, the mountain of his inheritance,"—the land given to Abraham, "the land wherein he was a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession;" of which he received, during his life, according to the apostle, (Acts vii. 5,) "none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on;" for it was the "place which he should after receive for an inheritance." Heb. xi. 8.

In this sense Daniel seems to have used the word in the 9th chap. verse 17. He had just prayed, "O Lord, I beseech thee, let thine anger and thy fury be turned away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain," &c., and continues in this verse, "Now, therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant, and his supplication, and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate." Can "Thy (God's) sanctuary" mean anything else here but "Jerusalem, thy holy mountain," including the territory to which Moses applies the word the first time it occurs in the Bible? Ex. xv. 17.

By the cleansing the sanctuary I understand to be meant, 1. Its purification from the wicked agents of its desolation, and, 2. The removal of the curse which is upon it, at the termination of its predicted desolation. Isa. i. 27, 28; xlix. 13—17, 19.

It may be asked, perhaps, how can this particular land be possessed in the eternal state? Will it survive the conflagration? To what extent the geological and geographical features of the earth will be affected, when "changed," or "melted" by the fire unto which it is reserved, we do not pretend to say. That it will exist in the same form in which it now exists, a globe, is evident from the fact that there is to be day and night, though "*the city hath no need of the sun, neither*

of the moon, to shine in it ;” (Rev. vii. 15 ; xx. 10 ;) and if it exist in its present form there must be the same diversities of latitude and longitude ; and a portion of the new earth which corresponds with the latitude and longitude of the promised land in this old earth, may be selected for the location of the heavenly Jerusalem, “ the city of the great King.”

But from the repeated assurances that “ the land promised to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob,” “ the mountains of Israel,” “ the holy mountain,” “ Mount Zion,” &c. &c., are to be “ possessed forever,” “ stand forever,” “ never to be removed,” &c., we may suppose that some of the present features of the earth will survive the conflagration.

It may be asked again, Will not the process of cleansing—“ the great battle,” and “ the burning flame,” &c., require a long time for its accomplishment ? We cannot tell how long a time it will require to *complete* the work ; it may be but a few days, it may be as many years as the Israelites were in conquering the Canaanites, after they entered the land—seven years ; it may be more or less ; but that it will be *commenced* suddenly, and by the personal interposition of the “ King of kings and Lord of lords,” and that its commencement will be decisive upon the hopes of mankind, is clearly stated in the word of God. See Zeph. i. 18 ; Isa. lx. 22 ; Luke xxi. 35 ; 1 Thess. v. 2, 3 ; 2 Thess. i. 7—10 ; Jude 14, 15.

The vision *ends* when *the sanctuary is cleansed*, (or justified, as the margin reads,) *and the last end of the indignation comes, at the time appointed—THE END OF THE 2300 DAYS.*

3. *What reasons are there for supposing that the 2300 days, or years, of the 8th of Daniel, begin with the 70 weeks of the 9th ?*

1. It must be, in the nature of the case, that the matters contemplated in the 9th chapter are included in the 8th, just as a part of a thing must be included in the whole. The vision of the 8th surveys the whole

field from Persia to the end; the 9th, though its special burden is the 70 weeks, also reaches "even to the consummation."

2. But the nature of the view taken in both cases points out the special bearing of one upon the other. The vision of the 8th shows the particular relation of the kingdoms of this world to the church—"the host," and her inheritance—"the sanctuary." This, with what is said of the time, character and results of the mission and death of Messiah, is also the whole burden of the 9th.

3. The great question of interest to Daniel in the vision of the 8th, was, as we have seen, "*How long* the treading under foot of the sanctuary and the host" was to continue? It was this also which led him to the acts—"to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes"—which introduce the 9th, and which called forth the communications contained in it. Read chap. 9th, verse 3d to the end.

4. From all the circumstances of the mission of Gabriel, as recorded in the 9th chapter, it is plain that Daniel labored under some mistake in the case. "While he was speaking in prayer, Gabriel, being caused to fly swiftly, touched him and talked with him, and said unto him, O Daniel, *I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding.*" And again, "*I am come to show thee.*" There must have been something that was not understood by Daniel, or Gabriel would not have been sent thus, on express, as it were, "to show" him about it. But what could have been Daniel's mistake? It was not in supposing that the "70 years" predicted by "Jeremiah the prophet" had come nearly or quite to an end; no, that was understood. "*I, Daniel, understood by books the number of the years.*" v. 2. From Daniel's prayer, and the course taken by Gabriel, the mistake seems to have been this: Daniel supposed that "to accomplish 70 years in the desolations of Jerusalem" would make *an end* of her desolations. Mark the words as they fell from his lips in prayer. After confessing the sins of the

“kings, princes, fathers and all the people of the land,” and that “the curse poured upon them” by “the Lord their God,” was “righteous”—being also a fulfilment of “his words,” he proceeds—“I beseech thee, 1. *Let thine anger and thy fury be turned away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain.*” 2. “*Open thine eyes, and behold our desolations, and the city which is called by thy name.*” 3. “*And cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord’s sake.*” 4. “O Lord, hear, O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken AND DO; DEFER NOT, *for thine own sake, O my God.*” Such importunity brought Gabriel from heaven,—not to tell him his prayer should be answered, but to show him that “the city and sanctuary” should be “destroyed,” and continue “desolate *even until the consummation.*” But why should Daniel make such a mistake? There does not appear to be anything in “the books” of Jeremiah, to which he refers, to warrant such an expectation. The most obvious reason which can be assigned is, that Daniel supposed that the vision of the 8th chapter, which brought to view the time when “the sanctuary should be cleansed, or justified,” run out *at the same time with the 70 years* of Jeremiah. This appears still further evident from the first attempt of Gabriel “to show” Daniel. “I am come forth to show thee; therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision.” How could he “give” him “skill and understanding,” and “show” him, by telling him to “consider the vision?” Daniel could not but see that the vision had not run out with the 70 years, and of course there was no reason to expect the sanctuary to be cleansed, for it was to be “trodden under foot” until the vision should end. “Consider the vision!” Daniel. Has the ram—the kings of Media and Persia, been conquered by the rough goat—the king of Grecia? Has Greece, after being a unit, been divided into “four kingdoms?” And have these been followed by a “king of fierce countenance,” who was to arise “in the latter time of their kingdom—and who should “destroy wonderfully, and destroy the mighty and the

holy people—stand up against the Prince of princes?" &c. CONSIDER THE VISION! So far is it from having run out, that "70 weeks (sevens) of the vision are determined, or cut off,* upon thy people, and thy holy

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

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

Mercerus, in his "Thesaurus," furnishes a specimen of Rabbinical usage in the phrase *chäthikah shelbasar*—"a piece of flesh," or "a cut of flesh." He translates the word as it occurs in Dan. ix. 24, by "*præcisa est*"—*WAS CUT OFF.*

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

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

Again, in Theodotion's Greek version of Daniel, (which is the version used in the Vatican copy of the Septuagint as being the most faithful,) it is rendered by *συνετμήθησαν*, "*were cut off*," and in the Venetian copy by *τετμήθηται*, "*have been cut.*" The idea of *cutting off* is pursued in the Vulgate; where the phrase is "*abbreviatae sunt*," have been shortened.

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

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

city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, [fill up their iniquity by putting to death their Messiah, the event which shall] make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in everlasting righteousness, [and by this also] to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy."

Now the point to be settled is, what "vision" did Gabriel refer to? It must be evident to all that he refers to what is stated in the 9th chapter, or to some *previous* vision. This must be admitted, or Gabriel spoke nonsense. If what is said in connection with the 70 weeks may, with any propriety, be considered a vision, it is, to say the least of it, quite singular that Gabriel should call Daniel to "consider and understand" a vision before it had been given. In all other cases the vision is first unfolded, and then, after special prayer for its meaning, in most cases, the interpretation is given; but in this case, that uniform and natural order is departed from, unless *some other vision* besides that in the 9th chapter, (supposing it to be a vision,) is the one intended by Gabriel. Well, what other vision could it be? Why, the one speaking to Daniel in the 9th chapter is "the man Gabriel, whom he had seen in the vision at the beginning," but we have no account of his being seen in any other vision than that of the 8th chapter, verse 16; and there he is commanded to make Daniel understand the vision.

Here, then, is the *same messenger*, Gabriel, seen in the previous vision. *His work is the same*—to make Daniel "understand." The *manner of his address* implies that he had come to finish up the work assigned him in that vision—"to show" Daniel its commencement, the only point before omitted. The words declare it. "Consider the vision," Daniel, to "understand the matter."

And, to put the last query in the case to rest, he adds,— "KNOW, THEREFORE, AND UNDERSTAND, that *from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks*" = 69 weeks, "and he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week," which added to the 69 make out the 70. This makes "the matter" plain. The 70 weeks are made a part of the 2300 days, or years, by telling us they are to be "cut off" from the vision referred to; and being a part of that period, they fix its commencement. For the 70 weeks cannot be CUT OFF from the 2300 days, unless they were included in that period; and if cut off, they must be cut off so many weeks from *the beginning* of the period; and if cut off from the beginning, *they must commence together*. And from what we are told was to be done in the 70 weeks, they must have terminated at the death of Christ; and this settles

the question that they are to be understood to express in *days* the number of years intended. There being 490 days in 70 weeks, we have only to go back that number of years from the death of Christ and we are brought necessarily to the year 457 B. C.* That year is the remarkable *seventh year of Artaxerxes*, when the ram *did according to his will*. That is the year in which the decree of Ezra vii. was issued; and when, according to the plain declaration of the vision,—the undoubted testimony of history,—and the *evident* connection of the 8th and 9th chapters of Daniel, the 2300 years commenced, and of course they terminate in 1843.†

They make sure, “seal up,” the vision; and they demonstrate “the manner” in which the whole period is to be reckoned. If the weeks are weeks, or sevens, of years, the days are of course to be understood in a corresponding manner. And you can no more cut 70 weeks of years from 2300 days literally, than you can cut 7 times 70 yards of broadcloth from 2300 inches of broadcloth.

5. From all these reasons, drawn from the most general character of the prophecy to the most minute particulars of the subject of the two chapters, we are assured of such a connection as we have supposed between them.

Again; without such a connection, one of the portions of the prophecy could not be understood, though an express command to “*make*” it understood was given; and the other is involved in the strangest difficulties.

We cannot therefore but regard the 9th chapter as a designed and indispensable appendix of the 8th chapter. As such, it gives the undoubted clue to the chronological period of the vision, both as to its commencement, and “*the manner*

* The 70 weeks were closed up by the *cutting off of Messiah*, and the great transactions which were essential “to make reconciliation for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to anoint the Most Holy;” all of which were effected near the time—certainly in the same year—of the death of Christ.

In 70 weeks, or sevens, of years,

7

there are 490 years. The death of Christ took place A. D. 33.
From 490
deduct 33

and we have 457 for the year B. C. when the 70 weeks must have begun.

† From 2300 years, the whole period,
take 457, the year B. C. on which they began,
and A. D. 1843 is the year for their termination.

of time the spirit did signify" by that period. We also consider the exact fulfilment of the 70 weeks of the 9th chapter as a *pledge* that the *whole period, which reaches to the end, will be as exactly verified at the time appointed.*

4. *Admitting the 2300 years and seventy weeks begin together, can we tell at which of the decrees issued in favor of the Jews they began?*

Such is the peculiar character of the prophecy of the seventy weeks, that one would suppose there could hardly be a doubt as to the time of their termination; and if a decree could be found which was issued four hundred and ninety years *prior* to their termination, it must follow that that is the decree referred to in the prophecy. Our views on this question are those of nearly or quite all the old evangelical writers upon the subject; and, as they cannot be suspected of any bias in favor of Millerism, they may settle the point for us.

"Many are the opinions concerning the beginning and end of these seventy weeks among chronologers. Some begin them in the *first year of Cyrus*, and end them in the *nativity of Christ*; others, from the *second of Darius Nothus* (successor to Artaxerxes,) and conclude them with the *destruction of Jerusalem*, by Titus Vespasian. Some make them commence from the *20th of Artaxerxes*, and to conclude with the *passion and death of Christ*; and others will have them begin in the *20th year of Artaxerxes Mnemon*, and end in the *desolation of the city by the Romans*. But many there are who, rejecting all these,—with *best reason*,—fix the beginning of them in the *7th of Artaxerxes Longimanus*, and their conclusion in the *death of Christ*—in which termination *most of the learned, both ancient and modern, agree*. For if we seriously consider the account of time, and judge of it according to the best approved authors, the three former opinions will be found either to *exceed* or *come short* of the number. From the beginning of the Persian Empire to Christ's nativity passed about 530 years. From the second of Darius Nothus, indeed, to the destruction of Jerusalem, near 490 years intervened; but concerning any edict made by that prince, *there is not a word in scripture*. From the 20th of Artaxerxes Longimanus, to the death and passion of Christ, are found 476, or 477, which come too short by thirteen of the 490; and betwixt the 20th of Artaxerxes Mnemon and the destruction of Jerusalem, are found but about 450, which come

far short of the account; as also the chronology of such as would fetch the rise of the 490 from the first of Darius Medus, and the second or sixth of Darius the son of Hystaspes.

“But if we reckon from this 7th of Artaxerxes Longimanus, down by his successors in the Persian Empire, the Ptolemies of Egypt, after that of Alexander the Great, and then by the Asmoneans or Jewish princes, till we come at length to Herod the Great, and so to Christ, *the just number of 490 we shall find at his death*, with such small difference as is pardonable to so many authors handling so many things. Or if we reckon the years of the Olympiads and the building of Rome, *we shall find Christ to have died in the 490th year after the promulgation of this decree.*”—[Institution of General History, vol. 1., p. 209; by Wm. Howell, LL. D., London, 1680. “See Dr. Clarke’s notes, Horne’s Int. Vol. 1., p. 336. Vol. 4, p. 191. Also Note D, in the Diagram.]

1290 AND 1335 DAYS, OR YEARS.

THE third prophetic period, which is considered a fundamental part of Mr. Miller’s calculations, is that contained in the 12th of Dan. v. 12—the 1335 days, with which the 1290 are intimately connected. The only material objections against Mr. Miller’s views of this text, I believe, are, “1. We cannot tell what the event is from which the periods are to be dated;” or 2. If we can tell what the event is, “*we know not when it took place.*”

As an attempt has also been made to pervert the evident design and meaning of this text, as to the events it predicts to take place at the termination of the periods it contains, a few remarks in reference to those particulars should be made.

What, then, are the events contemplated in the portion of prophecy connected with these prophetic periods, and which are to take place at their termination? The three verses so inseparably connected,—the last in the prophecy,—are a part of the answer to the

question of Daniel, (v. 8,) which referred directly to the wonders which had just passed before his mind in the vision, (vs. 1—3,) and which in the remarks on the last period considered,—the 2300 years,—have been shown to be, 1. *The reign of Christ.* 2. *The judgment scene.* 3. *The resurrection.* 4. *The glorification of the righteous.* “These wonders” had apparently closed up the vision, (v. 4,) when there appeared “other two,” besides the angel of the vision, (v. 5,) one of whom inquired, HOW LONG SHALL IT BE TO THE END OF THESE WONDERS? (v. 6.) The answer to this question is given verse seventh. “And I heard,” says Daniel, (v. 8,) “but I understood not:” and, as if incapable of repressing his anxiety,—and perhaps encouraged by hearing the answer to the other question—“then said I,” he continues, “O my Lord, what shall be the end of these things?”

What Daniel “heard” that he did not fully understand, it is impossible to tell any farther than the matters which precede his question, and the answer to it, imply. It is very clear that his question referred to the “wonders” stated. “I heard” all that was said of the wonders. “I heard the” question, “How long to the end of” them? “I heard” the answer,—that they were to “be finished” when the predicted political dispersion “of the holy people” should be “accomplished,”—which makes this vision synchronize in its termination, with the SEVEN TIMES and THE 2300 YEARS,—these wonders also come at the *last end of the indignation, the cleansing of the sanctuary and the deliverance of the host.*

Daniel’s question does not appear to refer directly to the *time* of the events brought to view, though the answer, besides removing all doubt as to the propriety of feeling or even expressing an anxiety in reference to it, by giving an apparently gratuitous statement of the time, without any intimation of reproof, would imply that he referred *in part* to that.

It is more clearly intimated that Daniel wished to have a fuller disclosure, 1. Of the fate and history of

the truth—an object of the deepest interest to the heart of every true man of God. 2. Of the future character and condition of “his people,” as these must be determined by the manner in which they should regard the truth; and, 3. Of his own personal prospects.

The answer agrees with this supposition.

“*Go thy way, Daniel.*” It is not consistent fully to remove the veil now, “*for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end.*” But I may gratify you in part. As to *thy people, the church*, “*many shall be purified, and made white, and tried;*”—a most encouraging declaration, inasmuch as it implies a great increase of numbers, superior attainments, and persevering fidelity under affliction; “*but the wicked shall do wickedly;*” “*iniquity shall abound.*” As to the *truth*, “*none of the wicked shall understand*” or regard it; “*but the wise shall understand.*” And as to the “end of these things” *to yourself, Daniel*, “*from the time that the daily (sacrifice) shall be taken away and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, there shall be 1290 days. Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh to the 1335 days.*”

“*But go thou thy way TILL THE END BE, (the end of these wonders,) for thou shalt rest (the condition of the righteous dead from their decease till the resurrection, Rev. vi. 11; xiv. 13,) and stand in thy lot*” (or, more literally, stand up for, i. e., be raised from the dead, to receive thy part in the inheritance) “*at the end of the days.*”

Here Daniel is informed, 1. That he must be satisfied “TILL THE END,” when the “wonders” to which his question referred will undoubtedly “be finished.” 2. That “THE END” SHALL COME “AT THE END OF THE DAYS.” 3. That his reward will take place at the same time that those who wait and come, who are purified, and made white, and tried, who live through all the wickedness of the wicked, are “blessed.”

4. By the evident bearing of Daniel’s question, and the connection of his reward, as to time, with those who are blessed at the end of the 1335 days, we are

assured that the righteous dead and the righteous living participate alike in the glories then to be revealed; and we have also another statement of the time when the "wonders" referred to take place. See Newton on Proph., p. 622. Dr. A. Clarke, Dr. Gill, and Poole, notes.

One clause in this portion of prophecy, which we cannot but consider of the first importance, on account of its bearing upon individual character, has been made the occasion of no small degree of contempt and ridicule on the part of our enemies. It is this—*the wise shall understand*. Only to quote this text seriously, we are thought at once to lay claim to some supernatural endowments of wisdom upon the mysteries of prophecy, which exposes a person to the suspicion, if not the direct charge, of "fanaticism"—perhaps "insanity." As a maxim in theology, which applies to the whole field of practical and experimental religion, the principle of this text is asserted from every truly evangelical pulpit in the Christian world; and why should so many of those who fill these pulpits, and their hearers, take the same position in reference to their second advent brethren that the infidel and neologist take in reference to the whole church? "The wise shall understand!" "The wise man built his house upon a rock!" "The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God!" Have these, and other portions of the word of God, too numerous to mention, no meaning? are or they now to be thrown away? Surely those who would harbor a supposition of the kind are the ones to make an apology for pretensions to fancied endowments. They are the ones who assume to be "wise" enough to decide a question without "hearing it," or without even using the means which man always must use, in his present condition, especially in a case where the plain word and the grace of God are his only hope of success.

Or if the offensive text is used with particular reference to *the events and times* of the prophecy in which it stands,—as the best commentators have supposed,

(see Clarke on vs. 4 and 9,) and as the Hebrew and some other versions positively and clearly assert,—and we can obtain a satisfactory understanding of the prophecy in these respects, we shall certainly rejoice that our attention has been called to the subject,—that we have been favored with the means and opportunities for understanding it,—and above all for a consciousness that God has disposed us by his Spirit to use *these* means, as *all* the means of salvation *must* be used to become effectual. If others prefer to sneer and mock, rather than to take this course, they will have no complaint to make, but against themselves, if they are “in *darkness*, and that day overtakes them as a thief!”

We pass to consider objection 1. *What is the event from which these periods are to be dated?*

“From the time that THE DAILY (*sacrifice*) shall be TAKEN AWAY and the ABOMINATION THAT MAKETH DESOLATE SET UP.”

What may this “daily,” and “abomination that maketh desolate,” be? The word abomination is applied as a general name of every substitute for the true worship of God—the most revolting idolatry, or the nominally true worship corrupted and perverted. Deut. xii. 31. Jer. viii. 12. Ezek. xvi. 50. Rev. xvii. 4, 5. Daniel uses the word in reference to both of these forms of wickedness, chap. ix. 27, where the instruments of effecting and perpetuating the desolation of the city and sanctuary are spoken of; but to which of them does it apply in this text? We may be assisted in settling its true application by determining the meaning of “the daily.” Upon the meaning of this very ambiguous term, there are but two, or at farthest three, opinions. The older and more prevalent opinion applies it to the Jewish worship; a few apply it, in a secondary or figurative sense, to the true Christian worship, of which the Jewish was typical; recently it has been applied, and I think it will be seen to be the true application, to Paganism. That it cannot apply to the Jewish worship is evident from

this circumstance, which has been an insurmountable difficulty with every commentator who has attempted it; these periods, understood *literally* or *figuratively*, and dated from any "taking away" of that worship, cannot possibly bring us to the events predicted, or to *any other events* worthy of note. And this circumstance, if there were no other, would be sufficient to settle the question that the Jewish worship cannot be intended by "*the daily*." There is *no agreement* between its history "and the words of the prophecy" which speak of it, supposing the "daily" "to relate" to the Jewish worship.

Again; the Jewish worship is never called *the daily* or *daily sacrifice*, in any other part of the word of God. There would be as much propriety in calling it the *yearly*, *monthly*, *weekly*, *evening*, or *morning* sacrifice, as the *daily* sacrifice.

The word occurs, as a proper name, only in the book of Daniel; and in each of the five places in which it is found, the word "sacrifice" is in italics, implying that the original would not authorize its insertion, but that the translators introduced it to express what they supposed to be the sense of the passage.

The only other translation of the word rendered "daily," of which I have any knowledge, is equally obscure as the received text. It would read "the continual," or "constant." (Hengstenburgh.) But it is evident that if the Jewish worship had been intended by Daniel, he would have made use of a term which could not have been misunderstood.

Can anything be done, then, to determine the application of that word? Have we any other source of light? I think we have. It is the principle of analogy, or comparison. "*Comparing spiritual things with spiritual.*" I cannot state that principle, in its application to the present case, in a more striking manner than by giving an item of Mr. Miler's experience, as stated by himself. I insert this at length for two reasons. 1. As a striking instance in which God has signally honored the principle he has given to guide

us in the study of his word. 2. To induce others to follow so worthy and successful an example. Preaching on this text, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God," &c., he dwelt upon the mode of studying the Bible. He said—

"I was once a deist, and continued so for twelve years; and I will tell you how I came to be a deist. I was taught to read the Bible from my youth, by my father and mother, and at school. But I was taught in such a manner that it seemed to be full of contradictions. I used to go to our minister, when he called at our house, and ask him what such and such texts meant, and how to reconcile those which appeared so contradictory. He would say, 'You cannot understand it.' I would ask, 'Do you understand it?' 'No,' he would say. Well, did God mean to keep us in the dark? 'O, it is revealed in a mystical manner.' But is not God a wise God? and could not he make it plain? Is he not just and good, and will he punish us for not understanding that which is a mystery? They at last would have nothing to do with me. I looked upon the Bible as priestcraft, and became a deist. I continued so till I came out of the service. I was in the army two years and a half.

"In the month of May, 1816, I was brought under conviction, and O, what horror filled my soul! I forgot to eat. The heavens appeared like brass, and the earth like iron. Thus I continued till October, when God opened my eyes; and O, my soul, what a Saviour I discovered Jesus to be! My sins fell like a burden from my soul: and then how plain the Bible seemed to me! It all spoke of Jesus; he was in every page and every line. O, that was a happy day! I wanted to go right home to heaven; Jesus was all to me, and I thought I could make everybody else see him as I saw him, but I was mistaken.

"During the twelve years I was a deist, I read all the histories I could find; but now I loved the Bible. It taught of Jesus! But still there was a good deal of the Bible that was dark to me. In 1818 or 19, while conversing with a friend to whom I made a visit, and who had known and heard me talk while I was a deist, he inquired, in rather a significant manner, 'What do you think of this text, and that?' referring to the old texts I objected to while a deist. I understood what he was about, and replied—If you will give me time, I will tell you what they mean. 'How long time do you want?' I don't know, but I will tell you, I replied, for I could not believe that God had given a revelation that could not be un-

derstood. I then resolved to study my Bible, believing I could find out what the Holy Spirit meant. But as soon as I had formed this resolution the thought came to me—"Suppose you find a passage that you cannot understand, what will you do?" This mode of studying the Bible then came to my mind:—*I will take the words of such passages, and trace them through the Bible, and find out their meaning in this way.* I had Cruden's Concordance, which I think is the best in the world; so I took that and my Bible, and set down to my desk, and read nothing else, except the newspapers a little, for I was determined to know what my Bible meant. I began at Genesis, and read on slowly; and when I came to a text that I could not understand, I searched through the Bible to find out what it meant. After I had gone through the Bible in this way, O, how bright and glorious the truth appeared! I found what I have been preaching to you. I was satisfied that the seven times terminated in 1843. Then I came to the 2300 days; they brought me to the same conclusion; but I had no thought of finding out when the Saviour was coming, and I could not believe it; but the light struck me so forcibly I did not know what to do. Now, I thought, I must *put on spurs and breeching; I will not go faster than the Bible, and I will not fall behind it.* Whatever the Bible teaches, I will hold on to it. But still there were some texts that I could not understand."

So much for his general mode of studying the Bible. On another occasion he stated his mode of settling the meaning of the text before us—the meaning of "the daily." "I read on," said he,

"And could find no other case in which it was found, but in Daniel. I then took those words which stood in connection with it, '*take away.*' He shall *take away* the daily. '*from the time the daily shall be taken away,*' &c. I read on, and thought I should find no light on the text; finally I came to 2 Thess. ii. 7, 8. "For the mystery of iniquity doth already work, only he who now letteth, will let, until he be *taken out of the way,* and then shall that wicked be revealed," &c. And when I had come to that text, O, how clear and glorious the truth appeared! There it is! that is '*the daily!*' Well, now, what does Paul mean by '*he who now letteth,*' or '*hindereth?*' By '*the man of sin,*' and '*the wicked,*' Popery is meant. Well, what is it which hinders Popery from being revealed? Why, it is Paganism; well, then, '*the daily*' must mean Paganism."

This led Mr. Miller to believe that the "daily" of Daniel was Paganism, or idolatry.

If anything were wanting to confirm this view of the daily, it is found in the exact agreement of history with "the words of the prophecy." There are two or three predicted cases of the *taking away* of the daily in the prophecy of Daniel. The first is in Dan. viii. In speaking of the operations of the "little horn," it is said—"And by him the daily was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. (v. 11.) And an host was given him against the daily by reason of transgression" (v. 12.) But here the question comes up—What power is denoted by the "little horn" of Dan viii.?

I believe our opposers have become *united* in applying it to *Antiochus Epiphanes*. The absurdities of this application have been so often pointed out, not only since, but long before, the present agitation of the subject began, that I shall not state them here.*

Now, whatever may be denoted by this little horn, it is the only power brought to view after the division of Alexander's kingdom, down to the time when the sanctuary is to be cleansed, and the last end of the indignation comes; enough, one would think, to assure us that it never could apply to *any single individual*, for the last end of the indignation has not yet come, nor has the sanctuary been cleansed.

As this vision evidently harmonizes with the other visions of Daniel in its scope and design, this little horn must correspond with the fourth kingdom of the other visions, as the ram and he-goat do with the second and third, and the fourth kingdom must be Rome—*Rome in its comprehensive character,—pagan and papal, a unit or divided.*

Was Paganism "taken away by" the Roman civil power? We present the following statement of the most important and well-known transactions in the history of the church and the world, which we believe to be intended by this prophecy. It refers to Constantine, the first Christian Emperor.

* "Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, and Dr. Hales, have clearly shown that the Roman temporal power, and no other, is intended: for, although some of the particulars may agree very well with that king, (Antiochus,) yet others can by *no means* be reconciled to him; while *all of them* agree and correspond *exactly* with the Romans, and with *no other power whatever.*"—*Horne's Int.*, vol. 4, p. 191.

“A. D. 324. His first act of government was the despatch of an edict throughout the empire, exhorting his subjects to embrace Christianity.”—Croly, p. 55.

What can be meant by the “sanctuary” of Paganism? Paganism, and error of every kind, have their sanctuaries, as well as truth. These are the temples or asylums consecrated to their service. Some particular and renowned temple of Paganism may, then, be supposed to be here spoken of. Which of its numerous distinguished temples may it be? One of the most magnificent specimens of classic architecture is called the Pantheon. The name signifies “*the temple or asylum of all the gods.*” The “place” of its location is Rome.—Goodrich’s Universal His., and Guthrie’s Geog., p. 606.

The idols of the nations conquered by the Romans were sacredly deposited in some niche or apartment of this temple, and in many cases became objects of worship by the Romans themselves. Could we find a temple of Paganism that was more strikingly “*his sanctuary?*” Was Rome, the city or place of the Pantheon, “cast down by” the authority of the state? Read the following well-known and remarkable facts of history:

“The death of the last rival of Constantine had sealed the peace of the empire. Rome was once more the undisputed queen of nations. But, in that hour of elevation and splendor, she had been raised to the edge of a precipice. Her next step was to be *downwards and irrecoverable.* The change of the government to Constantinople still perplexes the historian. It was an act in direct repugnance to the whole course of the ancient and honorable prejudices of the Roman mind. It was the work of no luxurious Asiatic, devoted to the indulgences of eastern customs and climates, but of an iron conqueror, born in the west, and contemptuous, like all Romans, of the habits of the orientals; it was the work of a keen politician, yet it was impolitic in the most palpable degree. Yet Constantine *abandoned Rome*, the great citadel and throne of the Cæsars, for an obscure corner of Thrace, and expended the remainder of his vigorous and ambitious life in the double toil of raising a colony into the capital of his empire, *and degrading the capital into the feeble honors and humiliated strength of a colony.*”—Croly, p. 207-8.

Was there a host given to the state or government of Rome “by reason of transgression?” And, if so, what transgression? We should suppose, at first sight, that, if a host was given against Paganism by reason of transgression, the transgression must be on the part of Paganism. What particular enormity could it be? What is the transgression which God has uniformly interposed to punish? Is it not

brought to view in the following brief but frightful item of history ?

“A. D. 303. The progress of the faith stirred up the last paroxysm of expiring Paganism. The sovereigns, Maximian and Galerius,—ferocious soldiers, and owing their elevation to the sword,—had already been secret persecutors in their camps and palaces. The superstition of the mother of Galerius; the insolence of the tyrant himself, inflated by recent Persian victory; the artifices of the priesthood, dreading the rapid extinction of their shrines; and the cold and infirm nature of Diocletian, perhaps alarmed at the growing multitude of the Christians,—had worked together, until the whole vengeance exploded in one burst of popular, kingly, and military persecution. The 23d of February of the year 303, the day of the festival of the Terminalia, was appointed for levelling to the ground the principal church of Nicomedia, the imperial residence. On the next day, the General Decree of persecution was issued, commanding (1) the *instant demolition of all the Christian places of worship*; (2) the *death of all who dared to worship*; (3) the *delivery of the Scriptures to be burned*; (4) the *confiscation of all property belonging to the churches*; (5) the *acceptance by the tribunals of every charge brought against a Christian, the refusal of every complaint brought by a Christian, and, finally, the exclusion of the whole body from the protection of the law.*”—Croly, p. 205. See Fox’ Book of Martyrs.

If ever the Almighty interposed to avenge the injuries of His people, might we not expect it in this case? Supposing Paganism to be intended by the daily, we have here a most literal and exact fulfilment of this prophecy of the little horn in the history of Rome and its doings in reference to Paganism.

The great subject of the vision of Dan. viii., to which the question (v. 13) refers, is, *the condition of the church and the chosen inheritance*, “trodden under foot.” Now, what agents are brought to view, in the most clear and striking representations of the word of God, as sustaining this relation to the church and the promised land? Daniel, in speaking of the city and sanctuary, chap. ix., says, “For the overspreading of abominations, (*plural*,) he shall make it desolate even till the consummation.” As this prophecy, so far as the agents are concerned, has become history, there can be no mistake about its meaning. The desolation was completed by Rome, to whom Christ undoubtedly refers, Luke xxi. 20, as *one of the agents of the work*; it has been perpetuated by Rome, Pagan or Papal, and the Mohamedans, till the present time.

Paganism and Popery are also brought to view, as the great organizations of depravity by which *the church* has been “trodden

den under foot." The little horn of Daniel vii. (Popery) is to "make war and prevail against the saints until the judgment;" the same power that Paul and John saw "destroyed by the brightness of Christ's coming."

There can be no doubt that Paul spoke of Pagan Rome and Popery in 2 Thess. ii., or that the former is "*what withheld*," that the latter "might be revealed in his time."

John is still more clear. The "great red dragon," Rev. xiii. 3, is the admitted symbol of Pagan Rome. After he and his angels had fought and prevailed not, vs. 7, 8, still, determined to make war with the woman and her seed, 17, he gives his seat, and power, and great authority, unto the beast, (Popery,) xiii. 2; and the same world that worshipped the dragon, worships the beast also, 3, 4; also chap. xvii. 1, 7, 15.

All the arguments from analogy will be seen, we think, to be in favor of Mr. Miller's supposition that this "daily," or continual, denotes Paganism.

By the different forms of Paganism,—which was the *daily*, or *then existing* abomination of Daniel's day, and the "transgression of desolation," Popery,—"the church has been trodden under foot" "from the days of the kings of Assyria unto this day."

On this supposition, also, the question of the vision might be thus paraphrased—"How long the vision" which gives Paganism and Popery "to tread both the" church and her inheritance "under foot?" Or to give a still more specific construction,—as the question, considered in relation to the previous statements of the angel, with the answer, and subsequent communications, seem to indicate that it was intended to be understood,—it might be thus paraphrased—1. How long the vision which gives both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? 2. How long shall the Pagan abomination tread them under foot? and 3. How long shall Popery tread them under foot? The answer to each part is given in the vision and the subsequent prophecy. 1. The sanctuary shall be cleansed AT THE TIME APPOINTED. 2. "He—'the little horn'—(Rome while a unit,) shall take away the daily"—Paganism (viii. 11, 12.) 3. "They"—the conquerors of the Roman empire—"shall take away the daily, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate." (xi. 31.) "And from the time

that the daily shall be taken away and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, there shall be 1290 days. Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh to the 1335 days. But go thou thy way till the end be, for thou shalt rest and stand in thy lot at the end of the days."

Will the prophecy in all these cases apply to Paganism? If the days are understood *literally*, I do not know of any taking away of Paganism from which these periods can bring us to the events spoken of; we must therefore understand them to mean years, as the best of the old writers have supposed.

But if the periods are to be dated from *a taking away* merely, we should not know but it might be the acts of imperial Rome that were referred to, only as time should determine; the text, however, is very exact. The periods are to be dated "from the time that the daily—Paganism—shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up;" a later act must therefore be referred to.

As it is generally believed that Christ referred to the armies of pagan Rome,—Matt. xxiv. 15,—the question may arise—Can "the daily and the abomination of desolation" both refer to Paganism? Ans. Christ undoubtedly referred to that abomination of which Daniel spoke as the instrument of desolating Jerusalem, for it was that of which he was speaking; and of course it is not to be supposed that he referred to any other abomination than that which Daniel had predicted should do that work "of vengeance"—unless Christ may be understood, as in some other mixed prophecies, to refer also to the papal abomination, or antichrist, who should "sit in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God;" which should be the signal to the church that "the desolation thereof was nigh." If we understand Christ literally, the prediction of "Daniel the prophet," to which he refers, must be that in chap. ix. 27.

Paganism or Popery might either of them, however, be called "the abomination that maketh desolate"

when one was spoken of by itself, though, when spoken of in connection, the *then present* desolation might more properly and clearly be called the daily, to distinguish it from that form of the desolation which was to take its place, and of course was yet future. It is very remarkable that Paul is just about as ambiguous as Daniel is supposed to be in speaking of the *existing* scourge of the church in his day; 2 Thess. ii. 5—8. Paul calls the pagan empire of Rome “He who now letteth, or hindereth;” and which was to continue “until he be taken out of the way; and then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.” The view in each case is identical, the terms employed so similar, that there is hardly a difference. See Dr. Clarke’s notes on the words of Paul.

2. *When did the event referred to in the prophecy take place?* The event, for the date of which we are now to inquire, is not the *giving of the saints into the hand* of Popery, but the change of religion in western Rome, which gave to the Catholic faith—“the abomination that maketh desolate,” the “place” and the power to act the part of Paganism. When was this abomination placed in a position to start on its career of usurpation, blasphemy and blood?

The date of the acts of the Christian emperors, as they are called, is well known. It is also well known that the same agents which destroyed the empire, restored Paganism. It must be the Paganism of these conquerors of the empire which gave place to Popery, and to the transition then effected, the prophecy refers. We wish to know its date. That France and other nations of western Rome were pagan up to the time of the conversion of Clovis, A. D. 496, we have abundant proof.

“In the west, Remegius, bishop of Rheims, who has been called the *Apostle of the Gauls*, labored with great zeal to convert idolaters to Christ; and not without success, especially after Clovis, king of the

Franks, had embraced Christianity.”—Mosheim, vol. 1, p. 379.

And still farther. “It is said that the conversion of Clovis gave rise to the custom of addressing the French monarch with the titles of *Most Christian Majesty*, and *Eldest Son of the Church*; for the kings of the other barbarous nations which occupied the Roman provinces, were still addicted to idolatry, or involved in the errors of Arianism.”—*Ib.*, vol. 1, p. 315.

The part taken by Clovis in behalf of the Catholic faith, after his conversion, is clearly brought to view by these extracts from Mosheim. But we wish to present to our readers a more extended view of his history, with the chronology of the important events of his life. We quote from Gifford’s *History of France*, pp. 32, 39.

Speaking of the marriage of Clovis, which took place A. D. 493, the history says—

“The court of Burgundy, fearful of offending a young prince whose arms were everywhere victorious, granted his request, and the princess Clotilda was accordingly espoused to him. The death of their first son, who, with the king’s consent, received baptism, notwithstanding the earnest remonstrances and soothing persuasions of his wife, inspired him with aversion to the Christian religion. His conversion took place 496.

Between that time and 508, “by alliances,” “capitulations,” and conquests, “the *Arborici*,” the “Roman garrisons in the west,” Brittany, the Burgundians and the Visigoths, were brought into subjection.

“A. D. 508. It was on his return from this (last) expedition* that he received, at the city of Tours, the ambassadors

* Mazary, in his *History of France*, page 16, places these latter among the “*religious wars*” of Clovis, and says they “were waged under the specious pretence of religion.” Baronius, in connection with the details of these wars, refers to Clovis as a model for the encouragement of princes, and ascribes the expenditures and toils of the war to his piety, and his success to the favor of God. We give the original.

“His visis, jam narrare aggrediamur, quisnam fuerit Chris-

of Anastasius, emperor of the East, who sent him the title and insignia of patrician and consul, and conferred on him the dignified appellation of *August*. The new patrician, after dismissing the ambassadors, returned to Paris, which he made the capital of his empire. Success had hitherto attended all the plans of Clovis; and, allowing for the ferocious and martial spirit which then prevailed, he had preserved his fame from any material pollution; but his good fortune and his heroism appear to have forsaken him at the same time. It was probably to wipe out the infamy incurred by the commission of so many crimes, that he founded a great number of churches and monasteries. It was probably from similar motives that he assembled a council of thirty-three bishops in the town of Orleans, A. D. 511. We learn from history* that it was not only assembled by his orders, but that he fixed on the topics of discussion. The assembling of the council of Orleans was the last remarkable event in the life of Clovis, who died the same year, at the age of forty-five, and was buried in the church of St. Peter and St. Paul, which he had caused to be built." See also Howel's Int. of Gen. Hist., vol. 3, pp. 342—347.

Paganism in the Western Roman Empire, though it doubtless retarded the progress of the Christian faith, especially in those nations which were molested, as in the case of England,† by the inroads of

tianissimi Principis bellicus apparatus, non nisi praevia religione dispositus: ut simul intelligas, quantum valeat ad debellandos hostes cum Dei timore pietas optime custodita."—Tome 6, p. 695. Venetiis.

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

† At the same time that this change was going on among the nations on the continent, a similar one, though not so mature and positive in its character, nor so fully presented in any history now extant, was at work in another important division of the fallen empire—England. The truth in the case should not be lost.

The conquest of England by the Anglo-Saxons was not effected till about A. D. 585. At the period now before us, Arthur was king, and the Britons triumphant. And amidst all

the barbarous clans, who continued idolaters,—henceforth had not the power, if it had the disposition, to suppress the Catholic faith, or to hinder the encroachments of the Roman pontiff.

From that time, the Papal abomination was triumphant, so far as Paganism was concerned. Its future contests were with the other Christian sects, who were always treated as heretics; and with princes, who were always treated as rebels, or dividers of the body of Christ. The prominent powers of Europe gave up their attachment to Paganism only to perpetuate its abominations in another form; for Paganism only needed to be baptized to become Christian, in the Catholic sense;—they became wedded to it as a matter of policy, and when the interests or vengeance of

the fable and uncertainty with which the history of England, at that period, is surrounded, there is a general agreement among historians,—

1. That Arthur put an end to Paganism among the Britons.

“Having succeeded in this enterprise, (one of his battles,) he directed his course to York, where he is said to have established the Christian worship on the ruins of the Pagan.”—Rees' Encyclopedia, art. Arthur.

2. That he was the first Christian king; and that he was crowned by a Catholic bishop; and that his coronation was according to the Papal mode in its more mature condition. “Arthur was crowned by Dubricius, Archbishop of Cærlleon.”—Kippis. Biog. Brit.

His royal and military equipments exhibited “his shield, whereon was pictured the Virgin Mary, bearing the child Jesus in her arms.”—Ib.

On the date of his coronation there is a difference of opinion among historians. Some place it as late as A. D. 516; others place it in 508.

Rapin, who claims to be more exact in the chronology of events in his history, dates them as follows:—

1. “He mounted the throne of Dammonium in 467, at the age of fifteen.

2. “In 476 he was created Patrician by Ambrosius.

3. “In 508 he was elected Monarch of Britain.

4. “In 528 he assumed the imperial purple.”—Book II., p.

129. See Milton's History of England, Book III., A. D. 508.

its presiding minister made the demand, their possessions and thrones,—perhaps their lives,—must be laid on the altar.

We pass to consider the condition of the See of Rome, as indicated by the history of the ruling Pope at that time, and his relation to the kings of the earth. Symmachus was Pope from 498 or 9 to 514. His pontificate was distinguished by these remarkable circumstances and events:—

1. He “left Paganism” when he entered “the church of Rome.”

2. He found his way to the Papal chair by striving with his competitor even unto blood.—Du Pin.

3. By the adulation paid to him as the successor of St. Peter. “How greatly the ideas of many had advanced, respecting the powers of the bishop of Rome, cannot be better shown than by the example of Ennodius, the insane flatterer of Symmachus, who, among other extravagant expressions, said—*The Pontiff judges in the place of God.*”—Mosh., vol. 1, p. 389.

4. By the excommunication of the emperor Anastasius. The position of Symmachus against the emperor was not to punish the latter as a heretic, but to bear down, whenever prudence would permit, everything which dared to oppose his authority.

Read the following from Du Pin. It shows the interesting position of the bishop at an important point of the contest. According to Baronius, the emperor was excommunicated 499. This letter was probably written about 503.

“The sixth letter of Symmachus is his apology, wherein he vindicates himself from the crimes charged upon him by the emperor. After calling upon the whole city of Rome to witness that he had never warped from the faith he had received in the church of Rome, since he left Paganism, he reproves him (the emperor) for despising the authority of the Holy See, and of the bishop who was successor to St. Peter. He maintains that *his dignity is higher than that of the emperor.* ‘Let us compare,’ says he to him, ‘the dignity of a bishop with that of an emperor. There is as great difference between them as between the things of this earth, whereof the latter has the ad-

ministration, and the things of heaven, whereof the former is the dispenser. Wherefore the office of a bishop is at least equal, if not superior, to yours. Honor God in us, and we will honor him in you; but if you have no respect for God, you cannot claim that privilege from him whose hand you despise. You say I have excommunicated you with the consent of the senate. In this I have done nothing but followed the righteous example of my predecessors. You say that the senate has evil entreated you. If you think that you are abused by exhorting you to separate from heretics, can it be said that you would have treated us well when you would have forced us to join with heretics? You say that what Accasius has done does not at all concern you; if it be so, trouble yourself no more about him, join no more with his followers. If you do not this, it is not we that excommunicate you, but yourself, by joining yourself to one that is excommunicated.”—History of Ecclesiastical Writers, vol. 1, p. 527. Dublin, 1722.

The contest between the bishop and the emperor was but a continuation of the quarrel which arose between the churches of the East and West upon the introduction of this clause: “*Thou who wast crucified for us!*” as an appendage to the established devotions of the church in the days of the emperor Zeno. Anastasius adopted the “Henoticon” of Zeno—a sort of compromise, which in the present case only served to make three parties of two. But Symmachus was not satisfied with that.

“He charged the emperor, and his bishop, Accasius, and others, with contempt for the council of Chalcedon, and some other things. But *in reality*, as *many facts demonstrate*, Accasius became thus odious to the Roman pontiff *because he denied by his actions the supremacy of the Roman See.*

“The Greeks defended the character and memory of their bishop against the aspersions of the Romans. This contest was protracted till the following century, when the pertinacity of the Romans triumphed, and caused the names of Accasius and Peter Fullo to be stricken from the sacred register, and consigned, as it were, to perpetual infamy.”—Mosh. vol. 1, p. 369.

A word of this triumph of “Roman pertinacity,” and we have done with this point. By the strength secured to the Catholic cause in the west, and the

agency of the vicars and other agents of the See of Rome, of whom we hear at this time in several nations, the Papal party in Constantinople were "placed" in a position to justify open hostilities in behalf of their master at Rome. In 508 the whirlwind of fanaticism and civil war swept in fire and blood through the streets of the eastern capital.

"The people of Constantinople were devoid of any rational principles of freedom; but they held as a lawful cause of rebellion the color of a livery in the races, or the color of a mystery in the schools. The Trisagion, with and without this obnoxious addition, was chanted in the cathedral by two adverse choirs, and, when their lungs were exhausted, they had recourse to the more solid arguments of sticks and stones: the aggressors (Catholics) were punished by the emperor, and defended by the patriarch; and the crown and mitre were staked on the event of this momentous quarrel. The streets were instantly crowded with innumerable swarms of men, women, and children; the *legions of monks*, in regular array, *marched*, and *shouted*, and *fought*, at their head. 'Christians! this is the day of martyrdom! let us not desert our spiritual father! anathema to the Manichæan tyrant! he is unworthy to reign!' *Such was the Catholic cry*; and the galleys of Anastasius lay upon their oars before the palace till the patriarch had pardoned his penitent, and hushed the waves of the troubled multitude. The triumph of Macedonius was checked by a speedy exile; but the zeal of the flock was again exasperated by the same question—'Whether one of the Trinity had been crucified?' On this momentous occasion, the blue and green factions of Constantinople suspended their discord, and the civil and military powers were annihilated in their presence. The keys of the city and the standards of the guards were deposited in the forum of Constantine—the principal station and camp of the faithful, (the Catholics.) Day and night they were incessantly busied either in singing hymns to the honor of their God, or in *pillaging* and *murdering the servants of their prince*. The head of his favorite monk, the friend, as they styled him, of the enemy of the Holy Trinity, was borne aloft on a spear; and the fire-brands which had been darted against heretical structures, diffused the undistinguishing flames over the most orthodox buildings. The statues of the emperor were broken, and his person was concealed in a suburb, till, at the end of three days, he dared to implore the mercy of his subjects. (Poperly is triumphant.) Without his diadem, and in the posture of a suppliant, Anas-

tasius appeared on the throne of the circus. The Catholics, before his face, rehearsed the genuine Trisagion; they exulted in the offer, which he proclaimed by the voice of a herald, of abdicating the purple; they listened to the admonition that, since *all* could not reign, they should previously agree in the choice of a sovereign; and they accepted the blood of two unpopular ministers, whom their master, without hesitation, condemned to the lions.”—Gibbon, A. D. 508—514.

This first outbreak in the East was followed by a still more important “rebellion,” in which Vitalian, whom Gibbon styles “the champion of the Catholic faith,” “depopulated Thrace, and exterminated sixty-five thousand of his fellow-Christians.”

As the part taken by Vitalian exhibits in a striking light the *desolating* character of Popery at this time, we give also what Du Pin says of him. Vol. pp. 531, 532.

“Vitalian, general of the cavalry of the emperor Anastasius, rose in arms against him, and came with his army towards Constantinople. He made religion the pretence of his revolt, and declared that he had taken arms for no other reason but to protect the Catholics, and restore Macedonius to the See of Constantinople. The emperor was forced to make peace with him, upon condition that a council should be called to regulate the affairs of the church, by *the advice of the Bishop of Rome*. This obliged the emperor to write to Pope Hormisdas, successor of Symmachus, to pray him that he would be mediator for pacifying these commotions, and that he would labor to restore the unity of the church.”*

We now invite our modern Gamaliels to take a position with us in the place of the sanctuary of Paganism, (since claimed as the “patrimony of St. Peter,”) in 508.

We look a few years into the past, and the rude Paganism of the northern barbarians is pouring down upon the nominally Christian empire of Western Rome—triumphing everywhere—and its triumphs everywhere distinguished by the most savage cruelty; Christians and Christian priests are slaughtered in

* Howel refers to these events as a series which characterized “these years,” i. e. A. D. 508—515.

cold blood, or deem it a mark of peculiar mercy when their petitions, that life only may be spared, are granted them. The empire falls, and is broken into fragments. One by one the lords and rulers of these fragments abandon their Paganism, and profess the Christian faith. In religion, the conquerors are yielding to the conquered. But still Paganism is triumphant. Among its supporters there is one stern and successful conqueror. More through fear than respect, he is allowed to make a Christian princess his wife. But soon he also bows before the power of the new faith, and becomes its champion. He is still triumphant, but, as a hero and conqueror, reaches the zenith at the point we occupy, A. D. 508.

In or near the same year, the last important subdivision of the fallen empire is publicly, and by the coronation of its triumphant "monarch," christianized.

The pontiff for the period on which we stand, is a recently converted Pagan. The bloody contest which placed him in the chair was decided by the interposition of an Arian king. He is bowed to, and saluted as filling "the place of God on earth." The senate is so far under his power that, on suspicion that the interests of the See of Rome demand it, they excommunicate the emperor. In this contest we hear the Pope "speaking great things and blasphemies," and assuming "to change times and laws." And by the power of his spiritual and military agents, who are posted as their service is required,* to use the figurative language of the Bible, in referring to civil and ecclesiastical dignitaries, he

* In the account of a visit of Avitus, bishop of Vienna, and some others, to Gondebald, king of the Burgundians, during the war between him and Clovis, "Gondebald, seeing them, came to meet them, and spoke reproachfully of the king of the Franks, Clovis. The bishops answered him, *That the way to make peace was to agree about the faith.*"—Du Pin, vol. 1, p. 530.

Vitalian was also recognised as the avowed agent and instrument of the Roman See in the East.—Ib.

points to "the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof," and demands their subjection to his will; and in 508 the mine is sprung beneath the throne of the Eastern Empire. The result of the confusion and strife it occasions, is the humiliation of its rightful lord. Now, the question is,—*At what time* was Paganism so far suppressed as to make room for its substitute and successor, *the Papal abomination?* When was this abomination placed in a position to start on its career of blasphemy and blood? *Is there any other date for its being "placed" or "set up" in the room of Paganism but 508?* If the mysterious enchantress has not now brought all her victims within her power, she has taken her position, and some have yielded to the fascination. The others are at length subdued, "and kings, and peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues," are brought under a spell, which prepares them, even while "drunken with the blood of saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus," to "think they are doing God service," and to fancy themselves the exclusive favorites of heaven, while becoming an easier and richer prey for the damnation of hell.

Commencing the prophetic periods of the text at this date, and understanding them as our most able commentators have done, and as they must be understood, (for supposing them to mean literal days, they bring us to nothing worthy of note,) by the first period, 1290 days, or years, the only one now fulfilled, we are brought to the date of events of the most sublime and important character in the history of the church or the world. At the termination of the other, the 1335 days or years, we most assuredly expect the fulfilment of what remains: Daniel, with all the righteous dead, will stand in his lot; the living righteous will be changed, and, "glorified together," they "shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars forever and ever." The first period terminated in 1798, the last will terminate in 1843.

THE TIME, TIMES AND HALF A TIME ; 1260
DAYS, OR YEARS, AND 42 MONTHS.

The "time, times and a half," or its equivalents, express the period, during which "the saints were to be given into the hand of the little horn," (Popery,) Dan. vii. 25,—the "two witnesses were to prophesy in sackcloth," Rev. xi. 3, "the holy city was to be trodden under foot," Rev. xi. 2; the church was to be in "the wilderness," Rev. xii. 6, 14; and "the beast that made war with the saints and overcame them was to continue," Rev. xiii. 5.

The period in any one of these cases evidently synchronizes with all the rest. In the different forms in which they occur, they express the period of the legalized depression of the true church, and of the relative condition of her great persecutor, Popery.

The only objections against Mr. M's. view of this period, which are worthy of our consideration, are

1. "Let us suppose it to commence where we may, it is to end with the *destruction* of Popery, at the coming of Christ, and the introduction of the millennium."
2. "It is difficult, if not impossible, to tell where it begins."

1. *Does the period end with the destruction of Popery at the coming of Christ?* In applying this period to the history of Popery and the church, there are several points which demand our particular attention.

1st. It became a persecutor, "the abomination that maketh desolate," before "*any authoritative effort to give supremacy to the See of Rome.*" 2d. It is to continue to make "war with the saints," after its "dominion is taken away;" and to "prevail against them, until the Ancient of Days shall come, and judgment shall be given to the saints of the Most High, and the time comes that the saints possess the kingdom."

3. This prophetic period is in every case stated to give the time of the dominion of Popery over the true church. "*They, the saints, shall be GIVEN INTO HIS*

HAND." " *The holy city shall they tread UNDER FOOT.*" " AND POWER WAS GIVEN UNTO HIM *to continue forty-two months.*" 4. It could not be in the nature of the case that such an event could take place till *after* the nominally Christian faith had gained the ascendancy over Paganism. This is very clearly intimated both by Daniel and John.

Daniel says, chap. xi. 31, in speaking of the conquerors of Rome, "They shall take away the daily, and *they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate.*" John, in speaking of Popery as the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, which sat upon the beast, says, Rev. xvii., "God hath put in their hearts (the kings) to fulfil his will, and to agree, and *give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled.*" Daniel says again, "And they shall take away his dominion to consume and destroy it unto the end, vii. 26. John adds, xvii. 16, "These shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate, and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire." France, during the reign of Clovis, was the principal actor in *placing* "the abomination;" and France under Napoleon was the prime mover in the drama which brought the desolator into desolation. 'By a very common error,' says Mr. Croly, 'it has been conceived that the close of the 1260 years was to be the extinction of the Papacy, but the prophet says no more than that it shall be *the end of its power over the saints.* Its end is predicted to be subsequent, and cotemporaneous with the great battle of God Almighty. At this moment, the Popedom, shaking off the sackcloth and dust of the French Revolution, is rising into a haughty stature and strength, ominous of the part it is yet to perform, and in the midst of which it shall be extinguished by the last avenging judgments of heaven.'

We have seen that the final change in the religion of Western Rome from Paganism to the Christian faith, was so far effected as to place the latter in the ascendancy in A. D. 508.

2. *When did the bishop of Rome receive "authority," "power" and "dominion" over the saints?*

That Popery is the power denoted by the "little horn" of Dan. vii. is clear, inasmuch as the description of it will apply to no other power. No Daguerreotype likeness can agree

better with the original than this description does with Popery. Nearly all Protestant writers on the prophecies (excepting a few who have recently written with the avowed design of opposing Mr. Miller's calculations) agree in the opinion that Popery is intended by this power.—See Mr. Dowling's note, p. 18: and Dr. Clarke on 2 Thess. chap. ii.

To ascertain the commencement of the prophetic period named for the triumph of Popery, we must take particular notice of the facts stated in the prophecy upon its history prior to the saints being given into his hand.

1. It was to rise "after" the division of Rome into ten kingdoms.

2. It was to "subdue" three "kings" or kingdoms.*

3. These were to be "three of the first" kings, or kingdoms.

4. The period is to be dated from the time that "power was given unto him."

Before A. D. 483 the following ten kingdoms had risen in western Rome.

1. The Huns, about A. D. 356.

2. The Ostrogoths, 377.

3. The Visigoths, 378.

4. The Franks, 407.

5. The Vandals, 407.

6. The Sueves and Alans, 407.

7. The Burgundians, 407.

8. The Heruli and Turingi, 476.

9. The Saxons, 476.

10. Lombards in the north of Germany, 483, in Hungary, 526.—See Meede, Newton, &c.

Have we any account of three of these being "plucked up" (conquered) by, or in behalf of, Popery? The wars in behalf of the Catholic faith began early in the sixth century. The fall of the first of these kingdoms by the agency of Popery, and its date, is thus noticed by Du Pin, who was himself a Catholic. "Gaul was divided between the Burgundians and Franks. The Burgundians were Arians: the Franks were more happy, for most of the nation followed their king, Clovis, who had embraced Christianity, and was baptized in 496. The power of the Burgundians having been *destroyed in 524*,

* By comparing verses 37, 39, and 40 with verse 44 of the 2d chapter, and verses 17, 18, 23 and 24 of the 7th chapter, the reader will perceive that the word "king" is frequently used to signify "kingdom" in the prophecy of Daniel.

the Catholic religion flourished throughout France, under the kings of the first race."—Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History, vol. 2, p. 257, London, 1724.

The kingdom of the Vandals in Africa, who were also Arians, fell A. D. 533 before the arms of Justinian, emperor of the east; a war which was from beginning to end avowedly a Catholic war.

The war against the Ostrogoths, in Italy, commenced A. D. 534, by the same army which had conquered the Vandals, and in March, A. D. 538, the Pope was placed in quiet possession of the capital—Rome.

We have before us a work on *The Apocalypse*, by Rev. George Croly, of England, published in 1827, and dedicated to the Right Rev. Thomas, Lord Bishop of Salisbury, in which he gives the detailed history of the acts from which the supremacy of the Pope is to be dated. We give an extended quotation from his work, with the references and original extracts, which we consider decisive testimony of the time when Popery was "set up," that is, when the saints were formally and publicly given into its hands.

See, also, "Prospects of the Church of Christ," by Hon. G. T. Noel, p. 100; "Political Destiny of the Earth," by Wm. Cunninghame, Esq., p. 28. *Encyclopedia of Rel. Knowl.*, art. Antichrist.

Mr. Croly, pp. 113—117, says:

A. D. 533, the Pope was declared **HEAD OF ALL THE CHURCHES**, by the Emperor Justinian.

The circumstances of a transaction so pregnant with the most momentous results to the Christian world, are to be found at large in the annals of Baronius, the chief Romish Ecclesiastical historian.*

Justinian being about to commence the Vandal war, an enterprise of great difficulty, was anxious previously to settle the religious disputes of his capital. The Nestorian heresy had formed a considerable number of partisans, who, conscious of the Emperor's hostility to their opinions, had appealed to the bishop of Rome. To counteract the representations of Cyrus and Eulogius, the Nestorian deputies, the Emperor sent two distinguished prelates, Hypatius, bishop of Ephesus, and Demetrius, bishop of Phillippi, in the character of envoys, to Rome.

* Vol. 7, p. 194, fol. Antwerpæ.

Justinian had been remarkable for taking an unkingly share in the dubious theology of the time: he felt the passions of a disputant; and to his latest day enjoyed the triumphs of controversy with the delight of a zealot, as he sometimes signalized them by the fury of a persecutor. On this occasion, whether through anxiety to purchase the suffrage of the Roman bishop, the patriarch of the west, whose opinion influenced a large portion of Christendom; or to give irresistible weight to the verdict which was to be pronounced in his own favor; he decided the precedency which had been contested by the bishops of Constantinople from the foundation of the city, and in the fullest and most unequivocal form declared the bishop of Rome the chief of the whole ecclesiastical body of the empire.

His letter was couched in these terms: "Justinian, pious, fortunate, renowned, triumphant, Emperor, consul, &c., to John the most holy Archbishop of our city of Rome, and patriarch.

"Rendering honor to the apostolic chair, and to your holiness, as has been always and is our wish, and honoring your blessedness as a father; we have hastened to bring to the knowledge of your holiness all matters relating to the state of the churches. It having been at all times our great desire to preserve the unity of your apostolic chair, and the constitution of the holy churches of God which has obtained hitherto, and still obtains.

"Therefore we have made no delay in *subjecting and uniting to your holiness all the priests of the whole east.*"*

"For this reason we have thought fit to bring to your notice the present matters of disturbance; though they are manifest and unquestionable, and always firmly held and declared by the whole priesthood according to the doctrine of your apostolic chair. For we cannot suffer that anything which relates to the state of the church, however manifest and unquestionable, should be moved without the knowledge of your holiness, who are **THE HEAD OF ALL THE HOLY CHURCHES**,† for in all things, as we have already declared, we are anxious to increase the honor and authority of your apostolic chair."

The letter then proceeds to relate the matter in question, the heresy of the monks, and the mission of the bishops, and desires to have a rescript from Rome to Epiphanius, arch-

* "Ideoque omnes sacerdotes universi orientalis tractus et subjicere et unire vestræ sanctitati properavimus."

† "Vestræ sanctitati quæ caput est omnium sanctarum ecclesiarum."

bishop of Constantinople, giving the papal sanction to the judgment already pronounced by the Emperor on the heresy. It further mentions that the archbishop had also written to the pope, "he being also desirous in all things to follow the apostolic authority of his blessedness."

The Emperor's letter must have been sent before the 25th March, 533. For, in his letter of that date to Epiphanius, he speaks of its having been already despatched, and repeats his decision, that all affairs touching the church shall be referred to the Pope, "Head of all bishops, and the true and effective corrector of heretics."*

In the same month of the following year, 534, the Pope returned an answer repeating the language of the Emperor, applauding his homage to the See, and adopting the titles of the imperial mandate. He observes that among the virtues of Justinian, "one shines as a star, his reverence for the apostolic chair, to which he has subjected and united all the churches, it being truly the head of all; † as was testified by the rules of the fathers, the laws of princes, and the declarations of the Emperor's piety."

The authenticity of the title receives unanswerable proof from the edicts in the "Novellæ" of the Justinian code.

The preamble of the 9th states that "as the elder Rome was the founder of the laws; so was it not to be questioned that in her was the supremacy of the Pontificate."

The 131st, on the ecclesiastical titles and privileges, chapter 2, states: "*We therefore decree that the most holy Pope of the elder Rome is the first of all the priesthood, and that the most blessed archbishop of Constantinople, the new Rome, shall hold the second rank after the holy apostolic chair of the elder Rome.*" ‡

The supremacy of the Pope had, by those mandates and edicts, received the fullest sanction that could be given by the authority of the master of the Roman world. But the yoke sat uneasily on the Bishop of Constantinople; and on the death

* "Vel eo maxime, quod quoties in his locis hæretici pullularunt, et sententia et recto judicio illius venerabilis sedis correcti sunt."

† "Et ei cuncta subjecitis, et ad ejus deducitis unitatem, quam esse omnium vere ecclesiarum caput, et patrum regulæ, &c."

‡ "The 131st Novellæ contains the following chapters. In the 1st, 'tis ordained that the four first Councils shall be received. In the 2d, *the first place is given to the Pope of Rome, and the second to the Patriarch of Constantinople.*"—Du Pin, *Hist. of Ecclesiastical Writers*, vol. 1, p. 549.

of Justinian the supremacy was utterly denied. The Greek, who wore the mitre in the imperial city of the east, must have looked with national contempt on a pontiff whose city had lost the honors of the imperial residence, and whose person was in the power of the barbarians. Towards the close of the sixth century, John, of Constantinople, surnamed for his pious austerities the Faster, summoned a council and resumed the ancient title of the See, "Universal Bishop." The Roman bishop, Gregory the Great, indignant at the usurpation, and either hurried away by the violence of controversy, or, in that day of monstrous ignorance, unacquainted with his own distinctions, furiously denounced John, calling him an "usurper aiming at supremacy over the whole church," and declaring, with unconscious truth, that whoever claimed such supremacy was anti-Christ. The accession of Phocas at length decided the question. He had ascended the throne of the east by the murder of the Emperor Mauritius. The insecurity of his title rendered him anxious to obtain the sanction of the patriarch of the west. The conditions were easily settled. The usurper received the benediction of the Bishop of Rome, and the Bishop in 606 vindicated from his rival patriarch the gorgeous title, that had been almost a century before conferred on the papal tiara by Justinian. He was thenceforth "Head of all the churches," without a competitor, "Universal Bishop" of Christendom.* That Phocas repressed the claim of the Bishop of Constantinople, is beyond a doubt. But the highest authorities among the civilians and annalists of Rome spurn the idea that Phocas was the founder of the supremacy of Rome; they ascend to Justinian as the only legitimate source, and rightly date the title from the memorable year 533.†

And referring again to these transactions, pages 8 and 9, he says :

"On reference to Baronius, the established authority among the Roman Catholic annalists, I found the whole detail of Justinian's grants of supremacy to the Pope, formally given.—The entire transaction was of the most authentic and regular kind, and suitable to the importance of the transfer. The grant of Phocas was found to be a confused and imperfect transaction, scarcely noticed by the early writers, and, even in its fullest sense, amounting to nothing beyond a confirmation

* "Anastatius Historia Ecc. Paulus diaconus de gestis Longobardorum."

† Gothofredus Corpus Jur. Civ. &c.

of the grant of Justinian. The chief cause of its frequent adoption by the commentators, seemed to be its convenient coincidence with the rise of Mahometanism."*

But these provisions of the Justinian code could not go into effect in favor of the Bishop of Rome at the time they were issued, because Rome and Italy were then in possession of the Ostrogoths,—who, being strongly attached to the Arian faith, were as violently opposed to the religion of Justinian, as they were envious of his imperial wealth and power. It was not till the conquest of Rome, in March, 538, that the Catholic bishop could exercise the power with which he had been clothed by the Emperor. The Vandal war, which commenced in 533, and the Italian war, the result of which was the conquest of Rome in 538, were prompted by the same spirit, as they were a part of the same object, which gave existence to the ecclesiastical provisions of the code; for proof we refer to Gibbon, the most minute historian, in our language, of the events of those times. He tells us that Justinian, even during the reign of his uncle Justin, “assumed the powers of government,” and “already meditated the extirpation of heresy, and the conquest of Italy and Africa, (ch. 39;) and that on receiving the news of the success of Belisarius against the Vandals in Africa, after he had “celebrated the Divine goodness and confessed in silence the merit of his successful general, impatient to abolish the temporal and spiritual tyranny of the Vandals, proceeded without delay to the full establishment of the Catholic church.”—Decline and Fall, vol. 7, page 150.

And again, in speaking of the conquest of Italy, he says: “When Justinian first meditated the conquest of Italy, he sent ambassadors to the kings of the Franks, and adjured them, by the common ties of alliance and religion, to join in the holy enterprise against the Arians.”

* Baronii annal. cen. 6.

This war commenced in 534. On the approach of Belisarius, several cities forsook their Gothic and heretical sovereign, who retired before the armies of the Catholic Emperor, and, after deciding in council to delay the "offensive operations of war till the next spring," allowed Belisarius without opposition to enter Rome. While he was on his way to the city, the "Romans furiously exclaimed, that the apostolic throne should be no longer profaned by the triumph or toleration of Arianism." "The deputies of the Pope and clergy, of the senate and people, invited the lieutenant of Justinian to accept their voluntary allegiance, and to enter the city, whose gates would be thrown open for their reception."

"Belisarius entered Rome December 10th, 536. The first days, which coincided with the old saturnalia, were devoted to mutual congratulation and public joy, and the Catholics prepared to celebrate, without a rival, the approaching festival of the nativity of Christ."

"But the senate, the clergy, and the unwarlike people trembled, as soon as they understood that he had resolved, and would speedily be reduced, to sustain a siege against the powers of the Gothic monarchy."

"The Goths commenced the siege in March, 537."

In the extremities of the siege, Belisarius apprehended the most fatal results from the "despair and treachery" of the citizens. "On the proof or suspicion of treason, several senators were banished, and the Pope, Sylvester, was despoiled of his pontifical ornaments, and embarked for a distant exile in the east. At the Emperor's command, the clergy of Rome proceeded to the choice of a new bishop, and, after a solemn invocation of the Holy Ghost, elected the deacon Vigilius, who had purchased the papal throne by a bribe of two hundred pounds of gold."

"The whole nation of the Ostrogoths had been assembled for the attack, and was almost entirely consumed in the siege of Rome. If any credit be due to an intelligent spectator, one third at least of their enormous host was destroyed in frequent and bloody

combats under the walls of the city." Vitijes, king of the Goths, being informed that another detachment of the Roman army, under "John the Sanguinary," was spreading devastation through other portions of his kingdom, "before he retired made a last effort either to storm or to surprise the city." This effort was fruitless, and in the month of March, 538, the Goths ended the siege, and retired from the city.

"One year and nine days after the commencement of the siege, an army, so lately strong and triumphant, burnt their tents and tumultuously passed the Milvian bridge."*

An extract from a work written by Edward King, Esq., F. R. S. A. S., and published in London in 1798, we believe gives the true idea of the prophecy, as to the commencement and termination of this prophetic period. The author cannot of course be suspected of any partiality to "Millerism."

"Is not the Papal power, at Rome, which was once so terrible, and so domineering, at an end?"

"But let us pause a little. Was not the end, in another part of the Holy Prophecies, foretold to be at *the END of 1260 years?* and was it not foretold by Daniel to be at the *END of a time, times, and half a time?* which computation amounts to the same period.

"And now let us see; hear; and understand. **THIS IS THE YEAR 1798.**—And just 1260 years ago, in the very beginning of the year 538, Belisarius put an end to the empire and dominion of the Goths, at Rome.

"He had entered the city on the 10th of the preceding December, in triumph, in the name of Justinian, Emperor of the East, and had soon after made it tributary to him; leaving thenceforward, from A. D. 538, **NO POWER** in Rome, that could be said to rule over the earth—excepting the **ECCLESIASTICAL PONTIFICAL POWER.**"

"It is true, that, after this entry of Belisarius, Rome was twice re-taken by Totila and the Goths. But instead of setting up any empire there, he, the first time, carried away all the Senate, and drove out all the inhabitants; and, the

* Decline and Fall, chap. 41, Vol. 7, pp. 173—210. Howel, Inst. of Gen. His., Vol. 3, pp. 81—88.

second time, he was himself soon defeated and killed, and Rome was recovered for Justinian by Narses.

“Still, however, NO DOMINION, ‘NO POWER RULING OVER THE WORLD, EVER HAD ANY SEAT THERE, ANY MORE, EXCEPT THE PAPAL.’ For the Duke of Rome, appointed by Longinus, in 568, was no more than a subordinate civil officer; and even under the Exarch. Whilst the Exarch of Ravenna (at the same time that he was, in reality, no residing power at Rome) was, at most, himself only a subordinate officer under the Emperor of the East. And the dominion and power of the Emperor of the East was quite different and distinct from what could at all properly be called the Roman Power. For nothing could, by any means, fairly come under such a description, but either the dominion of the Western Emperor, or the dominion of the kings of the Goths, or the Papal dominion.

“We have reason to apprehend, then, that the 1260 years are now completed, and that we may venture to date the commencement of that period, not, as most commentators have hitherto done, either from Pepin’s giving the Pope Ravenna, or from Charlemagne’s determining and adjudging the Pope to be God’s Vicar on earth, but from the end of the Gothic power at Rome. Because both those other circumstances were only (like subsequent gifts, or acquisitions of territory and revenue) mere augmentations of splendor, and confirmations of that state of Ecclesiastical Supremacy, IN WHICH THE PAPAL POWER HAD BEEN LEFT AT ROME BY BELISARIUS, ON HIS DRIVING OUT THE GOTHS AND RUINING THEIR KINGDOM.”

On the *Fall of Popery* we refer again to Mr. Croly, p. 100. He says—

“On the 10th of February, 1798, the French army, under Berthier, entered Rome, took possession of the city, and made the Pope and the cardinals prisoners. Within a week Pius VI. was deposed; Rome was declared a Republic; the tree of liberty was planted; and the city and the states were delivered up to a long series of the deepest insults, requisitions, military murders, and the general injury and degradation of the feelings and property of all classes of the people. Pius VI. died in captivity. Pius VII. was dragged across the Alps to crown Napoleon, was held in duress, and was finally restored only on the fall of the French Empire. The papal independence was abolished by France, and the son of Napoleon was declared King of Rome.” See also Their’s French Revolution, Vol. 4, p. 246, and Allison’s History of Europe.

To these extended, but important extracts, but one remark needs to be added. The efforts which resulted in the actual supremacy of the See of Rome by placing the haughty Vigilius in full possession, in 538, were commenced as early as 533 : so, in its fall, the first shock of the earthquake which prostrated the Papal throne to the dust in 1798, was given in 1793, when the Republic of France “declared that death was an eternal sleep ; that Christianity was an imposture ; and that there was no God !” (Croly, p. 61.)

The 1260 years must begin somewhere within the period of these transactions,—the writing of the letter of Justinian to the Pope, the issuing of the “*Novellæ*,” and the conquest of the city of Rome. So their end must be dated within the period of the corresponding transactions, the laws of the republic which abolished Popery in France, and the captivity of the Pope in his ancient capital by the republican armies. Mr. Miller adopts the date in both cases when the events were completed.

CLOSING REMARKS ON THE PROPHETIC PERIODS.

THESE several prophetic periods, applied as above, are considered the main pillars of Mr. Miller’s theory of the prophecies. There is one grand consideration in favor of it, yet to be noticed, which distinguishes his from all other theories. It is this. He applies these periods to those events in the history of the people of God, which, of all others, one would suppose, should be made the landmarks, or eras, from which to reckon ; and between the prophecies and the events of history, down to the present time, according to this theory, the agreement is like that between *face and face in a glass*. Indeed, the remarkable naturalness and propriety of the application might at first be considered an objection. On this account more than any other, probably, the question has been so often proposed,—“*Why was it not found out be-*

fore?" And the question would be a puzzling one, if we did not know, as *a matter of fact*, that one of the universal features of the arrangements of Infinite Wisdom is *simplicity*; and, on the other hand, it is as universally true that the pride and blindness of man's heart has presented the greatest difficulty in the way of his discovering what is true, or has disposed him to reject the truth when it is presented. Its common fate has been, like that of its great Author, to be regarded *as a root out of dry ground*. But he who is willing to forsake all for the truth, and with a single eye to lay hold of it, shall see and exclaim, "*The one half has never been told me.*" In this case, also, there is a special provision that the discovery should not be made "*till the time of the end.*" The first grand period, which includes all the rest, and expresses the whole time of the usurpation and triumph of the different forms of worldly power, together with the depression of the visible kingdom of God, begins where every one would suppose it must begin, at the passing away of independence from the Theocracy—an event predicted centuries before it took place, and deplored as the opening of the full tide of all their troubles for centuries after. *It terminates with the overthrow of all worldly power, and the restoration of the visible kingdom of God on earth, with Him upon its throne whose right it is to reign, to order and to establish it with judgment and with justice henceforth, even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this.*

The second of these periods begins at a most important point in the history of the depressed covenant people of God—the issuing of an edict in their favor, under the provisions of which they experienced a partial, though temporary, deliverance, from a condition which threatened their political existence long before it actually took place. But though this period commences some time after the first, they terminate together.

The third begins at that point where the final change

in the visible agents of the long-continued subjection of the people of God took place, so distinctly pointed at by Daniel, but more clearly brought to view by the revelator, and so well understood by Paul, though future in his day. These last-named periods, that given for the desolation of the sanctuary,—the 2300 years,—and the period at the end of which Daniel shall stand in his lot,—the 1335 years,—terminate together, as is evident both from the nature of the prophecy in each case, and from the only possible dates for their commencement. One began B. C. 457, and the 70 weeks are at once the seal of its truth and the pledge of its fulfilment in 1843. The other began, not when the first blow was struck against the worship of Paganism by the Christian emperors, as they are called, but when Popery *stood in the place* and acted the part of Paganism in western Rome. All the histories of the transition point to about A. D. 508, as the time when it took place. The 1290 days, or years, which terminated in 1798, by *taking away the dominion* of Popery, and modifying its character, are the pledge of its termination and fulfilment in 1843.

FIXING THE DAY.

It may be expected, perhaps, that something will be said in this manual upon the days which have been named by some for the coming of the Lord. The opinion of the writer on that point is the same as it has always been, since he embraced the doctrine. He has never seen the propriety of directing attention to any particular day or month with the least degree of positiveness. The only ground for so doing, which has ever been claimed, is the fact that some of the intermediate periods,—the 70 weeks and the 1290 years, in particular,—which have already been fulfilled, are known to have run out, one on the 3d of


April, in the year of our Lord 33, the other Feb. 15, 1798; therefore it has been supposed that the grand periods would run out on the anniversary of the fulfilment of the intermediate ones. But, surely, no plausible argument could be drawn from this fact, because we know nothing, within *the year*, of the commencement of the grand periods; and if we did, it would be difficult to tell *the day* on which the anniversary of their commencement would now occur.

The case has appeared to be like this. Some person, we will suppose, gave his note in 1823, without inserting month or day, for 500 dollars, 100 of which should be paid in ten years, 1833, and the balance in twenty years, 1843, and he saw fit to call and make the first payment on the 3d of April, 1833. Now there might, from that circumstance, be some plausibility in expecting the payment of the balance on the 3d of April, 1843; but still there is nothing in the *terms of the note* to warrant such an expectation. It may be redeemed any time in 1843. The promise, in its different forms, runs thus:—“*At the time appointed the end shall be.*” “*When he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished.*” “*Thou shalt stand in thy lot at the end of the days.*”

But nothing can be determined from the periods with which these promises stand connected, *within the year*, for these reasons: 1. We know nothing of the commencement of the seven times, or 2520 years, nor of the 1335 days, or years, only of *the year* in which the events took place from which they are dated; and in the case of the 2300 years, it would be presumptuous to attempt to fix even upon the *month* in which the decree, from which the period should be commenced, was issued, though the 1st, 5th, and other months are spoken of in the history of proceeding under the provisions of that decree. But we have no positive guide to its date nearer than “*the seventh year of Artaxerxes the king;*” and this, in all probability, means the 7th year from the *commencement of his*

reign, which might not have been either at the vernal equinox, the beginning of the Jewish sacred and Persian year, nor at the autumnal equinox, the beginning of the Jewish civil year. I do not know that any historian gives any intimation of the time of the year when his reign began.

But, by the different modes of reckoning time, we are brought to a different termination; for the termination must correspond, as to the time of the year, with the reckoning adopted in the commencement. We will try to present the idea by a diagram;—



The lines A A and B B represent the whole period of 2300 complete years. 2300 complete years must include 457 full years before Christ, and 1843 full years after Christ; the whole period must therefore extend from *the beginning* of 457, B. C., to *the end* of 1843, A. D.,—the *whole time* between the last moment of 458, B. C., and the first moment of 1844, A. D.; so that we cannot have 2300 full years during 1843, without supposing the seventh of Artaxerxes to have begun before, or with, 457, and that the decree was issued early in that year; the later the period began in 457, the farther the end of it is pushed into 1844.

457 full years from the common date of the birth of Christ, would take us back to Tebeth, the 10th month of the Jewish sacred year, and the 4th month of the Jewish civil year, answering to a part of our December and January. 1843 full years, from the same point, would carry us down to December of 1843.

The seventh of Artaxerxes Longimanus might run parallel with, and cover the whole of, the year 457 B. C. ; it might begin before that year and run half through it, or some time during that year and run into the following year. Of that we know nothing, and of course we cannot tell in what part of the year 457 the decree was issued.

So, also, the months of the book of Ezra being Jewish months, we can get no clue to the date of the decree from them, because we know not whether the year referred to is reckoned from the coronation of the king, from the vernal equinox, according to the Jewish sacred and Persian year, or according to the Jewish civil year ; unless it be obtained by comparing the book of Esther with that of Ezra.

In the account of the marriage of Esther, we are told that, in connection with the feast on the occasion, the king “made a *release unto the provinces*, and gave gifts according to the state of the king.” Esther ii. 18.* Her marriage was in the 10th month, in the seventh year of the king, (ii. 16,) answering to our Dec. and Jan. See Horne, vol. iii. p. 166. We will suppose the seventh of his reign began *with* or soon after the year 457 began ; that he was married on the anniversary of his coronation ; that the decree was issued at the time of his marriage, through the influence of the queen, as on another occasion, Neh. ii. 6 ; that, two months after the marriage of Esther, Ezra started to go up from Babylon, (Ez. vii. 9 ; viii. 21, 31, 32 ;) and that he arrived at Jerusalem four months after he set out, (vii. 9,) and all in the seventh year of the king.

C C, therefore, may represent the 2300 complete years, *beginning with the seventh of Artaxerxes*, early in 457 B. C.

D D represents the same period, commencing with

* The reason for supposing Artaxerxes Longimanus to have been the husband of Esther, may be found at length in Prieux's Connexions. See also Dr. Clarke's Commentary, Pref. to Esther.

the Jewish sacred and Persian year, in the March following.

E E, the same period, commencing in the Jewish civil year, in September.

Now, all the uncertainty which surrounds the commencement of the period, surrounds the termination; one must correspond with the other.

2. We are not only unable to fix upon the commencement of the grand periods, nearer than the year, but we do not know that God will confine himself to the *exact day* of their termination; *anywhere within the year* of the exact point at which the period began, would certainly be in harmony with the fulfilment of periods in analogous cases, and may safely and properly be considered as all that we have reason to expect. The three days predicted to be the time that the Savior should be in the earth, were not fulfilled in three full days; but he arose on the third day—that is, he was crucified on Friday, and arose on Sabbath morning. It may also be considered very clear, that the “week,” or seven years, during which he was to “confirm the covenant with many,” was not fulfilled in seven full years. He commenced his ministry when he “began to be about thirty years of age,” and was “cut off,” as is generally supposed, before the seven years had fully expired—“in the midst,” or last half, “of the week.” So in the 1260 years of Papal triumph: it commenced in March, 538, by the success of the Papal armies, according to the uniform testimony of the most careful historians, and terminated in February, 1798. The fulfilment was surprisingly exact, but *not to a day*. All our speculations, therefore, which attempt to determine the time of events, *within the year*, may be considered of questionable propriety, and doubtful utility.

There are texts which suggest the supposition that there may be an *early* fulfilment of those prophecies which bring the great day to view; there are others, which intimate that it may *seem* to tarry. I need not refer to those texts.

HAS MR. MILLER "CHANGED HIS GROUND?"

IN this work, devoted to the explanation and defence of the chronological questions of the Second Advent doctrine, it may not be improper to say a word upon the complaints against Mr. Miller of "shifting his ground," "putting off the event," &c., which have been rather severely and clamorously made, since his letter (which was written to correct the false reports about his fixing the day, &c.) was given to the public. Not that his position needs to be vindicated by me; he is well able to do that. Nor is it to satisfy those who are acquainted with his works; they know very well that these complaints come only from those who have never looked at the subject, or, if they have, seem to be doomed to an incapability of speaking the truth in reference to it, unless the admission of the truth on some one point may give greater effect to a falsehood against the subject in general.

I wish to show that the true and enlightened view of the point in question, such as Mr. Miller has always expressed, is in accordance with the views of other writers, of unquestioned ability and integrity. The title-page of every edition of his works reads—
"Evidence from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ, ABOUT THE YEAR 1843; exhibited in a Course of Lectures. By William Miller."

The portion of his letter, referred to above, which bears upon the point, we also insert:—

"My principles, in brief, are, that Jesus Christ will come again to this earth, cleanse, purify, and take possession of the same, with all his saints, *some time between March 21, 1843, and March 21, 1844.* I have never, for the space of more than twenty-three years, had any other time preached or published by me; I have never fixed on any month, day, or hour between that time; I have never found any mistake in reckoning, summing up, or miscalculation; I have made no provision for any other time; I am perfectly satisfied that the BIBLE is TRUE, and is the WORD of GOD, and I am confident I rely wholly on

that blessed book for my faith in this matter. I am not a prophet; I am not sent to prophesy, but to read, believe, and publish, what God has inspired the ancient prophets to administer unto us, in the prophecies of the Old and New Testaments. These have been, and now are, my principles, and I hope I shall never be ashamed of them.

Yours, respectfully,

WM. MILLER.

Philadelphia, Feb. 4.

Those who have listened to his lectures know very well, that the sentiments advanced by him from the pulpit have been in accordance with those of the letter and title-page.

Now, supposing the greatest possible precision in the historical dates, (and Mr. Miller does not fix the dates of the events on which his calculations are based, but adopts those which are commonly received,) there will not have been 1843 complete years, from the common era of the birth of Christ, till the 1844th year begins; just as, in our own case, a man is not 20 years of age, complete, until he enters upon his 21st year.

Far be it from the writer to open the door for a supposition that the Savior may not come at any moment, or to protract, unnecessarily, the interest which ought to be excited by the obvious import of the prophetic periods. He does not wish to be misled, nor does he wish to mislead others; he only wishes to know and express the truth. If he can do it, the truth shall be stated plainly and without equivocation; and, although he has usually regarded these minute points as comparatively of little consequence, he was not aware that a question, like the one involved in the particular point now under consideration, had been publicly discussed, and settled so as to harmonize with Mr. Miller's position, until his eye was directed to the following passage in a favorite author, whom the writer has considered the most profound and exact theologian of the present age, Richard Watson:—

“There is not a more prolific source of confusion and embarrassment in ancient chronology, than the substitution of the

cardinal numbers, one, two, three, for the ordinals, first, second, third, &c., which frequently occurs in the sacred and profane historians. Thus, Noah was six hundred years old when the deluge began, Gen. vii. 6; and, presently after, in his six hundredth year: confounding complete and current years. And the dispute whether A. D. 1800, or A. D. 1801, was the first of the nineteenth century, should be decided in favor of the latter; the former being in reality *the last of the eighteenth century*, which is usually, but improperly, called the year one thousand eight hundred, complete; whereas it is really *the one thousand eight hundredth*."*

If the 1800th year did not terminate till 1801 began, then the 1843d year will not terminate till 1844 begins; and if the years of the long period began at the vernal equinox, about March 21, 457 B. C., 2300 complete years will not have passed till the same point 1844.

To our brethren and sisters I would say, "*Be patient!*" To our enemies, *Improve the time!*

* Theological Dictionary, Art. *Year*; to which the reader is directed, in addition to the works on chronology referred to on page 20.

DIRECTION. We here give, for the assistance of those into whose hands this manual may fall, who are not acquainted with our publications, a partial list of works which treat of some of the most important topics connected with the subject.

For a full exhibition of the subject,—Miller's Works, 3 vols.; Exposition of the Prophecies, by J. Litch, 2 vols.

For a compendious view of it,—Midnight Cry, by L. Fleming; Reasons, by C. Fitch; Litch's Address; Synopsis of Miller's Views.

On the question of the Jews' return,—Israel and the Holy Land, by H. D. Ward; Judaism overthrown, by J. Litch; Return of the Jews, by G. Storrs.

On the Millennium,—History and Doctrine of the True Millennium, by H. D. Ward; Spaulding's Lectures.

The two Resurrections,—a tract by Br. Litch; Spaulding's Lectures.

The Battle of Gog and Magog,—Spaulding's Lectures.

Those who may wish for an able vindication of the Second Advent doctrine, will find it in a sermon preached at the dedication of the Tabernacle at Boston, by Br. S. Hawley.

MILLER'S RULES OF BIBLE INTERPRETATION.

IN studying the Bible, I have found the following rules to be of great service to myself, and now give them to the public by special request. Every rule should be well studied, in connection with the Scripture references, if the Bible student would be at all benefited by them.

RULES.	PROOFS.
I. All Scripture is necessary, and may be understood by diligent application and study.	2 Tim. iii. 15, 16, 17.
II. Every word must have its proper bearing on the subject presented in the Bible.	Matt. v. 18.
III. Scripture must be its own expositor, since it is a rule of itself. If I depend on a teacher to expound it to me, and he should guess at its meaning, or desire to have it so on account of his sectarian creed, or to be thought wise, then his <i>guessing</i> , <i>desire</i> , <i>creed</i> , or <i>wisdom</i> , is my rule, not the Bible.	Ps. xix. 7—11; cxix. 97—105. Matt. xxiii. 8—10. 1 Cor. ii. 12—16. Eze. xxxiv. 18, 19. Luke xi. 52. Mal. ii. 7, 8.
IV. To understand doctrine, bring all the Scriptures together on the subject you wish to know; then let every word have its proper influence, and if you can form your theory without a contradiction, you cannot be in an error.	Isa. xxviii. 7—29; xxxv. 8. Prov. xix. 27. Luke xxiv. 27, 44, 45. Rom. xvi. 26. James v. 19. 2 Pet. i. 19, 20.
V. God has revealed things to come, by visions, in figures and parables; and in this way	

RULES.	PROOFS.
the same things are oftentimes revealed again and again, by different visions, or in different figures and parables. If you wish to understand them, you must combine them all in one.	Ps. lxxxix. 19. Hos. xii. 10. Hab. ii. 2. Acts ii. 17. 1 Cor. x. 6. Heb. ix. 9, 24. Ps. lxxviii. 2. Matt. xiii. 13, 34. Gen. xli. 1—32. Dan. ii., vii., and viii. Acts x. 9—16.
VI. Visions are always mentioned as such.	2 Cor. xii. 1.
VII. How to know when a word is used figuratively. If it makes good sense as it stands, and does no violence to the simple laws of nature, then it must be understood literally; if not, figuratively.	Rev. xii. 1, 2; xvii. 3—7.
VIII. Figures always have a figurative meaning, and are used much in prophecy to represent future things, times, and events; such as <i>mountains</i> , meaning <i>governments</i> ; <i>beasts</i> , meaning <i>kingdoms</i> . <i>Waters</i> , meaning <i>people</i> . <i>Lamp</i> , meaning <i>Word of God</i> . <i>Day</i> , meaning <i>year</i> .	Dan. ii. 35, 44; vii. 8, 17. Rev. xvii. 1, 15. Ps. cxix. 105. Ezek. iv. 6.
IX. To learn the true meaning of figures, trace your figurative word through your Bible, and, where you find it explained, put it on your figure, and if it makes good sense, you need look no further; if not, look again.	
X. Figures sometimes have two or more different significations; as day is used in a figura-	

RULES.	PROOFS.
<p>tive sense to represent three different periods of time.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Indefinite. 2. Definite, a day for a year. 3. Day for a thousand years. 	<p>Eccles. vii. 14. Ezek. iv. 6. 2 Pet. iii. 8.</p>
<p>XI. Parables are used as comparisons to illustrate subjects, and must be explained in the same way as figures, by the subject and Bible.</p>	<p>Mark iv. 13.</p>
<p>XII. To know whether we have the true historical event for the fulfilment of a prophecy. If you find every word of the prophecy (after the figures are understood) is literally fulfilled, then you may know that your history is the true event. But if one word lacks a fulfilment, then you must look for another event, or wait its future development. For God takes care that history and prophecy doth agree, so that the true, believing children of God may never be ashamed.</p>	<p>Ps. xxi. 5. Isa. xlv. 17—19. 1 Pet. ii. 6. Rev. xvii. 17. Acts iii. 18.</p>
<p>XIII. The most important rule of all is, that you must have <i>faith</i>. It must be a faith that requires a sacrifice, and, if tried, would give up the dearest object on earth, the world and all its desires, character, living, occupation, friends, home, comforts, and worldly honors. If any of these should hinder our believing any part of God's word, it would show our faith to be vain. Nor can we ever believe, so long as one of these motives lies lurking in our hearts. We must believe that God will never forfeit his word. And we can have confidence that He that takes notice</p>	

of the sparrow, and numbers the hairs of our head, will guard the translation of his own word, and throw a barrier around it, and prevent those who sincerely trust in God, and put implicit confidence in his word, from erring far from the truth, though they may not understand Hebrew or Greek.

These are some of the most important rules which I find the word of God warrants me to adopt and follow, in order for system and regularity. And if I am not greatly deceived, in so doing, I have found the Bible, as a whole, one of the most simple, plain, and intelligible books ever written, containing proof in itself of its Divine origin, and full of all knowledge that our hearts could wish to know or enjoy. I have found it a treasure which the world cannot purchase. It gives a calm peace in believing, and a firm hope in the future. It sustains the mind in adversity, and teaches us to be humble in prosperity. It prepares us to love and do good to others, and to realize the value of the soul. It makes us bold and valiant for the truth, and nerves the arm to oppose error. It gives us a powerful weapon to break down infidelity, and makes known the only antidote for sin. It instructs us how death will be conquered, and how the bonds of the tomb must be broken. It tells us of future events, and shows the preparation necessary to meet them. It gives us an opportunity to hold conversation with the King of kings, and reveals the best code of laws ever enacted.

This is but a faint view of its value; yet how many perishing souls treat it with neglect, or, what is equally as bad, treat it as a hidden mystery which cannot be known! Oh, my dear reader, make it your chief study. Try it well, and you will find it to be all I have said. Yes, like the Queen of Sheba, you will say the half was not told you.

INDEX.

	Page.
Abomination, meaning of the word,	63
Age of Christ, (see diagram, note D.,)	25, 26
Christ confirmed the covenant by his ministry seven years, (diagram, note D.,)	25, 26
Chronology of the world, (see diagram,)	13—16
“ of the period from Adam to Christ,	15
“ of the period of the judges,	15
Chronological order of the prophets,	32
Clarke, Dr., testimony on Usher’s chronology of the judges,	15
Clovis, history of,	72—74
“Cut off,” the proper meaning of the word trans- lated determined, Dan. ix. 24,	55
Daily (<i>sacrifice</i>), what,	63—70
Date of the death of Christ,	26
“ of the birth of Christ, different views of it considered,	25—27
“ of the captivity of Manasseh,	37—41
“ of the decree from which the seventy weeks and 2300 years begin,	59
“ of the final change of Paganism for Popery in western Rome,	72—81
“ of the decree of Justinian,	85—89
“ of the conquest of Rome by Belisarius,	91—93
“ of the captivity of the Pope by the French,	92, 93
Day, fixing the,	95
Day for a year, when so understood,	17, 18
Days, 2300, to be understood as years,	42—45
Dowling, Rev. Mr., testimony of,	17, 18
End, the, is it hid from us?	27, 28
End of the present order of things in 6000 years, traditional,	13, 14
England, change in religion about 508, (note,)	74, 75
Evening-morning, the Hebrew expression of a natu- ral day,	43
Faber, extract from, on the Jewish year,	23, 24
Hales, Dr., testimony of, on the period of the judges,	15
“Infidels” to be made by our calculations, why,	11, 12
Indignation, the, what,	47

Macknight's rule,	43
Mr. Miller, has he changed his ground?	100
" unfairly compared with "religious theo- rists,"	29, 30
Mr. Miller's experience, sketch of,	65
" mode of studying the Bible,	66
" Rules,	103—106
"Miller's Rule," alleged "absurdity" of it con- sidered,	16—19
Objections to calculating the prophetic times con- sidered,	5
Pantheon, the, sanctuary of Paganism,	68
Paul's view of Paganism and Popery like Daniel's,	72
Prophecy designed to inform us of the <i>time</i> of events,	7—10
Prophetic and solar years,	24, 25
" periods,	33
" " closing remarks upon,	93—95
" " not affected by the chronology of the judges,	15, 16
Sanctuary, significations of the word,	45, 46
" the, the land of promise,	46, 51
" " the place of the great battle,	47
" " its cleansing, what,	51
" " its condition till Christ's second ad- vent,	48
" " the metropolis of the future and ever- lasting kingdom,	46
Time of the events predicted may be understood,	10, 28
" different modes of reckoning,	20
" times, and a half, &c., considered,	82—93
" " " or 1260 years, begin 538, and end 1798,	89—93
Times, seven, or 2520 years,	33
" " a prophetic period,	33, 34
" " its repetition not designed to express four periods,	34—37
" " begin with the captivity of Manasseh, B. C. 677,	37—41
" " terminate in 1843,	41, 42
Weeks, the seventy, seal the vision,	26, 58, 95
Wise, the, shall understand,	62, 63
Year, solar, the standard always referred to,	21
" " generally used in chronology,	22
" " Jewish, regulated necessarily by the seasons,	22—24
Years, 2300, begin with the seventy weeks,	52—58
" 1290 and 1335, considered,	59—81

SECOND ADVENT PUBLICATIONS.

Scriptures Searched.—By Henry Jones. This is truly an evangelical work, and will be read with profit. Price 62½ cts.

Present Crisis.—This is a valuable little work, by Rev. John Hooper, of England. Second American edition. Price \$7 per hundred, 10 cents single.

Miller's Works.—In one volume. New edition, \$1,00.

Thoughts on the Second Coming of Christ.—Just published. An Irish work, first published in Dublin, in 1831. It is a very valuable work.

Hymn Book.—"Millennial Musings: A choice selection of Hymns, designed for the use of Second Advent Meetings." By J. V. Himes and J. Litch. Price \$2,40 per dozen, 20 cents single; in paper covers, 17 cents.

Miller on "The True Inheritance of the Saints," and the 1260 Days in Daniel and John. With an Address to the Low Hampton Conference. 20 cents in boards, 12½ cents in pamphlets.

Review of Eight Fundamental Errors in Miller's Theory, pointed out by Charles K. True and Wm. C. Brown, in Zion's Herald, March, 1840. By J. Litch. Price \$3 per hundred, 4 cents single.

Letter to Rev. J. Litch, on the Second Coming of Christ; with the sentiments of Cotton Mather on the same subject, approved by Thomas Prince; both eminent ministers of Boston in the last century. By Charles Fitch, of Haverhill. Price, in boards, 20 cents, pamphlet 12½ cents.

Spalding's Lectures.—Sentiments concerning the Coming and Kingdom of Christ, collected from the Bible, and from the writings of many ancient and some modern believers. In nine lectures; with an Appendix. By Joshua Spalding, Minister of the Gospel at the Tabernacle in Salem. To which is added a Preface, containing a brief sketch of the recent rise and progress of the Doctrine of the Advent Near. By J. V. Himes and J. Litch. Price 62½ cents.

Miller's Exposition.—A Familiar Exposition of the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, and the fifth and sixth chapters of Hosea. To which are added an Address to the General Conference on the Advent, and a Scene of the Last Day. By Wm. Miller. To which is added an extract from Dr. Cotton Mather's Latin Preface, &c., on the Second Coming of Christ. Edited by Joshua V. Himes. Price 25 cents.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Is published on the 1st and 15th of each month, at No. 14 Devonshire St.

JOSHUA V. HIMES, AND JOSIAH LITCH, *Editors.*

Terms.—One Dollar a year, payable in advance. Six copies for Five Dollars, Thirteen copies for Ten Dollars. All communications should be directed to "J. V. HIMES, Boston, Mass.," post paid.

BE PATIENT, BRETHREN! THE COMING OF THE LORD DRAWETH NIGH. THE END

THE LORD IS COMING WITH HIS SAINTS TO REDEEM THEM FROM ALL UNDOING

SECOND ADVENT.

THE Lord will come! the earth shall quake,
 The hills their fixed seat forsake;
 And, withering, from the vault of night
 The stars withdraw their feeble light.

The Lord will come! but not the same
 As once in lowly form he came,
 A silent Lamb to slaughter led,
 The bruised, the suffering, and the dead.

The Lord will come! a dreadful form,
 With wreath of flame and robe of storm,
 On cherub wings and wings of wind,
 Anointed Judge of human-kind.

Can this be He who wont to stray
 A pilgrim on the world's highway,
 By Power oppressed, and mocked by Pride?
 Oh God! is this the crucified?

Go, tyrants! to the rocks complain!
 Go, seek the mountain's cleft in vain!
 But Faith, victorious o'er the tomb,
 Shall sing for joy—the Lord is come!