

## ARTICLE VI.

# THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW ENGLAND DIVINES.

BY THE REV. FRANK H. FOSTER, PH.D. (LEIPZIG), PROFESSOR OF CHURCH  
HISTORY, OBERLIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

### III.

THE first generation of the New England divines, Edwards, Bellamy, and Hopkins, worked in close co-operation with one another, and, though independent thinkers, agreed with one another to a remarkable extent. The younger Edwards, the pupil of Bellamy, was also a pupil, and later the friend and co-laborer, of Hopkins. He might well be called a "Hopkinsian;" but, inasmuch as Hopkins' "System" was published after Dr. Edwards had become well known as an independent thinker, I have chosen to regard him as the founder of another branch of the school, for a time parallel with Hopkins and those who took their ideas more immediately from him. Certainly in the department of eschatology Hopkins has worked out the subject in its speculative aspects more thoroughly than Dr. Edwards. The simple fact that we possess his theological views in the form of a system, and are thus able to study his eschatology in its bearings upon the related doctrines, enables us to conceive and state it more perfectly. Were the two men in all other respects to be regarded as contemporaries, this fact alone would locate Hopkins at a later point in the history of our doctrine. We come, then, for our next study to—

### V. SAMUEL HOPKINS.

A word or two of preface as to the man himself is necessary before we pass to his doctrines. He was a good man. His own phrase to express the sum total of virtue was "disinterested benevolence," and he lived it as faith-

fully as he preached it. He secured the personal esteem and love of those of his neighbors who differed most widely from him in his theological views. His great mental trait was that which was so clearly marked upon his daily life that he received the nick-name Old Honesty. He was humble, and honest in expressing a depreciatory opinion of his own services. He was honest in his theological convictions, and thorough in carrying them out into their manifold ramifications. So honest was he, that he did not stop always to select language not likely unnecessarily to offend. He expected men to study his books till they got the great sweep and purpose of the whole, and interpret single expressions by his general meaning. If one will read him thus, and do him the justice now and then to re-state his thought in modern styles of expression, the grandeur of his fearless consistency will impress, as much as the deep solicitude and heart-searching faithfulness of this preacher-theologian will move and profit in the reading.

Hopkins' views are briefly stated in his *System*.<sup>1</sup> The older Calvinism is not friendly to the idea of a true probation for every man, but Hopkins set out from this idea. Adam himself, after the fall, was put under a "new constitution," and into a "new state of probation."<sup>2</sup> "The only time of probation allotted to man is that of this life, to which the death of the body puts an end; so that every one will be happy or miserable in the future, endless state according to his character, which is formed before the soul is separated from the body."<sup>3</sup> "The soul does not die with the body, but exists in a separate state till the general resurrection of all the bodies of men which have died."<sup>4</sup> "The souls of the redeemed are delivered from all sinful imperfection," "are set at liberty," "rise into light," "seeing and enjoying the glory of the Redeemer, and the prosperity and success of the work of redemption

<sup>1</sup> Works (edit. of the Cong. Pub. Soc., 1852), vol. ii. pp. 37-69.

<sup>2</sup> p. 37.

<sup>3</sup> p. 38.

<sup>4</sup> p. 40.

among men."<sup>5</sup> "The spirits of those who die in their sins pass into a state of darkness, despair, and tormenting wickedness. . . . These are the *spirits in prison* of which the Apostle Peter speaks, who are reserved to the general judgment, when each one shall receive according to what he has done in the body."<sup>6</sup> Then comes the general resurrection, in which the bodies of all who have died shall be united with their souls.' Hereupon will follow the general judgment, at a fixed time, not limited to the space of a natural day, but continuing perhaps "during the term of many thousand years,"<sup>7</sup> in which the whole history of the universe, comprehending both the plans and conduct of God, and the thoughts and actions of all men, will be reviewed. Thus the whole universe will be prepared for the righteous judgment of the judge. Hopkins now enlarges upon the nature of heaven, and the joyous activity and progressive development of the redeemed in the presence and society of God.<sup>8</sup> He touches briefly<sup>9</sup> on the miseries of hell, on the bodily sufferings of the lost, on the mental pain and suffering which will be "the chief part of their punishment." Their sense of the greatness of God; their own disposition, and the wicked exercises of their hearts; their enmity, rage, and jealousy; their absolute friendlessness; their company; their reflections on the past and their prospects for the future,—will constitute some of the elements of this.

A more thorough discussion of the subject is given in the special treatise entitled *An Inquiry concerning the Future State of those who die in their sins, or Endless Punishment consistent with divine Justice, Wisdom, and Goodness.*<sup>11</sup>

The introduction shows us the views which Hopkins endeavored to meet in this work. They were annihilation, either immediate upon death, or after conscious punishment for a proper period; and final universal salvation,

<sup>5</sup> pp. 43, 44.<sup>6</sup> p. 44.<sup>7</sup> p. 45.<sup>8</sup> p. 49.<sup>9</sup> pp. 55-64.<sup>10</sup> pp. 64-68.<sup>11</sup> Works, vol. ii. pp. 365-489.

either after a period of punishment terminating at the judgment or even subsequently, or following immediately upon death.<sup>12</sup> The antithesis of the work is for the most part between those who hold to a doctrine of probation, and believe that man may finally bring upon himself an adverse and unchangeable sentence, and those who deny this possibility, and so deny the doctrine of probation. It is not between a probation limited to this life, and some other. The discussion of the issue between conscious eternal punishment and annihilation is comparatively brief. Like the other works of Hopkins, this book was written for the times (1783). Chauncy's work had not yet appeared, but similar arguments to his were had in mind in the preparation of this treatise.<sup>13</sup> Jeremiah White is mentioned by name.<sup>14</sup> Murray was already preaching in New England, and advocating Rely's doctrine of Union. The first signs of the approaching Universalist controversy were in the air. But Murray is never mentioned. In general the argument is strictly impersonal, and the work is without references to other writers. The cause was to stand on its merits.

We may divide our review of this book into several convenient divisions.

#### 1. *The Limit of Probation.*

This is not assumed without argument, but proved, though briefly.<sup>15</sup> The arguments are two: (1) There is not in the Scripture "a word, or the least hint of another state of trial after the death of the body." (2) Positively, this life is the time of sowing for the future reaping (Gal. vi. 7, 8); of laying up treasure in heaven; of making ourself friends in the eternal habitations; of making our peace with God (Matt. v. 25, 26). The state of Lazarus and the rich man was "*fixed* . . . . immediately upon

<sup>12</sup> p. 368.

<sup>13</sup> See p. 424 ff., where Chauncy's principal text is discussed.

<sup>14</sup> p. 473.

<sup>15</sup> p. 38.

their going out of this world." Heb. ix. 27, and particularly 2 Cor. x. 10, are also cited.<sup>16</sup>

As already stated, we find no discussion of any other kind of probation. But incidentally certain recent arguments are touched upon. The famous text, 1 Pet. iii. 19, was quoted in Hopkins' day as favoring universal salvation. He replies to this, but his reply is equally applicable to the modern use of the text.<sup>17</sup> The argument is not grammatical, but logical, and contextual. Granting that Christ did preach the gospel to these spirits while in prison, "it does not follow that all the rest of mankind who die in their sins, *or that so much as one*, . . . . will be saved, but the contrary may be very strongly inferred. For if all that had died in their sins [and by parity of reasoning Hopkins might have added, if any class of men, like the unevangelized heathen,] . . . . were to be saved, why are those who perished by the flood singled out from all the rest, and the preaching of Christ confined to them? This looks as if they were to be distinguished from all others, who are left in prison without hope of deliverance." But the true understanding of the text, according to Hopkins, is that Noah was the preacher, who, inspired by Christ to foretell the flood, was a preacher of righteousness for one hundred and twenty years. The men who heard were disobedient, and they have been confined in prison, where they are now, awaiting the judgment of the great day. "That this is the true sense of this passage is confirmed by the apostle's evident design. It is introduced to encourage and animate Christians to faithfulness, patience, constancy, and cheerful resolution in following Christ under all opposition and suffering from wicked men. He mentions the sufferings of Christ, and his triumphant resurrection and deliverance; and then introduces this instance of Noah, and those with whom he lived before the flood, who opposed him and the spirit of Christ

<sup>16</sup> Comp. p. 393, end, and 394, for an additional argument.

<sup>17</sup> pp. 432-434. Comp. p. 391.

preaching to them by him. God waited on them with long-suffering, and Noah went through his suffering and work with patience and resolution, till at length the time of vengeance came, when Noah and his family were saved; but the disobedient . . . . were shut up in the prison of hell, where they now were . . . . not as prisoners of hope, but of justice, reserved unto judgment and final, eternal condemnation. This representation is suited to support and encourage Christians . . . ." For a final argument Hopkins adduces the parallel passage, in which the destiny of these spirits is clearly stated: "For if God spared not the old world, but saved Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly; . . . . the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and *to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment, to be punished*" (2 Pet. ii. 5, 9).

As to the peculiar condition of the heathen, we do not find any special discussion in Hopkins. Doubtless he agreed with his two friends and constant correspondents, Drs. Bellamy and Edwards.<sup>18</sup> He was exceedingly clear

<sup>18</sup> I may introduce here a reference, inadvertently omitted in its proper place, to Dr. Edwards' views of the state of the heathen (Works, vol. ii. pp. 465, 466). He says: "In favor of the salvation of the heathen, it is sometimes said, if a heathen be truly virtuous, what will become of him? Will he be cast off *merely because he is ignorant of Christ*; though, if he had known him, he would most cheerfully have received him as his Saviour? On this I observe, no doubt if any heathen be truly virtuous and holy; if he love God supremely as an infinitely great, wise, holy, and good God, and his neighbor as himself, he will be saved." It will be noted that this is a distinct statement and rejection of the necessity of a knowledge of the historical Christ to constitute saving faith. Edwards continues: "But the question is, *whether any such persons can be found among the heathen.*" The conclusion, after reference to Socrates, Plato, and Cicero, as favorable examples, is: "Such a heathen has not yet appeared." Hence Edwards and those with him thought that the whole heathen world was going down to ruin, but not because of a lack of opportunity of salvation, but in conscious guilt. Later New England theology has come to have a somewhat more favorable view of exceptional cases, but reflection and missionary experience have confirmed the general position of the earlier writers.

and positive in his statements of that doctrine of human ability which was the basis of Bellamy's as it has been of the later New England theory. There is a marked advance in Hopkins upon President Edwards in his forms of statement. Though he constantly refers to the "Freedom of the Will" with the most commendatory language, his own theory, so far as it can be gathered from his System, which was written with studious suppression of the philosophical element, was more radical than that of this treatise. Edwards defines freedom as ability to execute our volitions. The freedom is that of the *man*, not of the faculty of the will." Hopkins says, on the contrary: "Every exercise of the will in choosing or refusing *is* the exercise of freedom: and it is impossible for a man to will and choose without exercising moral liberty." And most emphatically: A man "may not be able to accomplish the thing . . . which is the object of his choice; . . . but this is not inconsistent with his exercising perfect freedom in his choice . . . And in these exercises of will and choice his moral character does wholly consist."<sup>19</sup> Hence in his system ability constituted responsibility. The theory is more radical, perhaps, than any other in the theologies of Christendom. Man's ability to repent is not *lost* in the fall of Adam, as some maintain; it is not *regained* by a special gift of grace, as the Arminians teach in their "gracious ability;" it *inheres in the nature of free choice*. A man, to be a man, must be free. Freedom is ability to repent. Ability constitutes responsibility. So that a man, *in that he is* a man, is responsible for his moral position towards God, and will be judged for it.

Whether, now, Hopkins ever considered the point made by the advocates of continued probation in our own day or not, he had settled on the principles which will always be held to be decisive in respect to it. It is advo-

<sup>19</sup> "Liberty is the power, opportunity, or advantage that any one has to do as he pleases." "To talk of liberty as belonging to the very will itself is not to speak good sense." Works, ii. p. 38. <sup>20</sup> i., pp. 83, 84.

cated to-day on the ground of the *inability of the heathen to repent*," which is a doctrine disowned utterly by Hopkins. In fact, if, as Hopkins taught, all men, as such, are fully responsible, there is no occasion for a theory of continued probation.

We are led from this topic, by a natural transition, to the next division of our theme.

## 2. Hopkins' central Idea controlling his Eschatology.

This is his lofty conception of the government of God. It is not peculiar to Hopkins, for here is another example of the perfect harmony existing between the three choir-leaders of New England. But in Hopkins it comes to its fullest and most consistent expression. It comprises peculiar views of the being governed, Man, of the Being governing, and of the character of that government. As to man, Hopkins exalted him to a very lofty position. Not only did he give great scope to man's natural ability, and emphasize his responsibility, but he viewed him as clothed with the most exalted intellectual powers. He was totally depraved, that is, he was totally turned away from God and engaged in his own pursuits. But, though thus morally fallen, his intellectual powers were unimpaired," and he was capable of piercing by their exertion even into the counsels of eternity, and certainly of knowing fully, and with the most absolute clearness and distinctness, his duty towards God and man. Thus there was never any disposition on Hopkins' part to *excuse*

<sup>21</sup> See Progressive Orthodoxy, passim. E. g.: "Man's sinful state is such that he has no power of deliverance from it." This is explained a sentence or two further on: "All men are so under the control of sinful propensity and sinful character that they *have not in themselves the power of renewal*," i. e., *repentance* (p. 241.). Compare pp. 54-56. Note such forms as: "If man unaided *could* become truly repentant;" "Man of himself *cannot* repent;" "Christ, laying down his life, makes the race . . . . *capable* [italics theirs] of repenting," etc. This is not the New England "moral inability," but it is a supposed "natural" inability.

<sup>22</sup> Comp. i. 229, 369, 370.

sin. He emphasized the evil of sin as strongly as Edwards. He shrunk from it, not so much like a pure man repelled from that which is vile, as like the loyal subject shocked by wicked, deliberate, ungrateful, and persistent rebellion against a beloved sovereign. His expressions against it are very strong, as we shall see, and have doubtless led to the common opinion of Hopkinsianism that it degraded man. On the contrary, as no other system, it exalts man, and then holds him strictly responsible for the right use of his exalted powers.

In respect to God, Hopkins' new ideas may be compendiously expressed in the single phrase, that he viewed him more constantly than others had done as a Governor. Under this conception it was his intention to make his readers feel the infinitely lofty and amiable character of the divine government as the reflection of the divine character, which, in accord with his teacher Edwards, he summarized in the word love. Hopkins does not differ from Edwards in the great features of the theory of virtue. He himself edited the first edition of Edwards' treatise. His own work on Holiness" makes a great improvement on the original in point of form. He applies the theory to the atonement in much the same sense as Dr. Edwards, ordinarily called the founder of the New England (Edwardean) theory of the atonement;" and in respect to eschatology far surpasses him in comprehensiveness. Holiness is the loftiest thing in the universe. A God of love, who chooses the well-being of the universe, must choose its holiness first of all. Love of holiness is the same as hatred of sin. God hates it for what it is towards himself, who is the chief being in the universe. He hates it as a governor for its harmful tendency to his government. He hates it *in that* he loves holiness, for this hate and love are as inseparable as the two sides of a piece of paper. Thus he punishes it, and his punishment of sin is as amiable as his rewarding of

<sup>23</sup> Works, iit. p. 5.

<sup>24</sup> i., 322, 323.

righteousness. The one motive extending through all his actions is love.

### 3. *The general Course of Hopkins' Argument.*

The first section of the work is entitled: The holy Scriptures teach that the wicked will be punished in the future state. It comprises twenty-eight pages of almost continuous quotation. The next section advances to the proof that the punishment will be endless. The argument here is the same as that found in Dr. Edwards. *Αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* are treated in the same way. Next the passages quoted by Universalists and others are examined. Then comes, after sixty-eight pages in all of biblical discussion, the rational argument. Many particulars of this are common to Hopkins' predecessors. The argument for the justice of eternal punishment because sin is an infinite evil, is substantially that of Edwards. It is Hopkins who adds the thought already mentioned,<sup>18</sup> that the infinite evil of sin is seen in the evil which it aims at and tends to produce." "It tends to dishonor and dethrone the Almighty; to destroy all his happiness, and to ruin his whole interest and kingdom; to introduce the most dreadful confusion and infinite misery, and render the whole universe infinitely worse than nothing, to all eternity. . . . Nothing short of an endless punishment can be its proper reward." But all this never happens! "Why then," asks Hopkins for the objector, "should the sinner be punished as if he had actually effected infinite evil?" It is a principle of government, he replies, to judge of a crime by its tendency, and not its actual effect. He continues: "God, in punishing the wicked forever, *will do no more to them than they would have done to him*, had it been in their power. . . . If they have cast God behind their back, and cared nothing for his honor, interest, or happiness, do they not deserve to be cast off by God, and that he should take no care of their interest or happiness."

<sup>18</sup> See above, p. 9.

<sup>19</sup>p. 443.

And then he proceeds, in a strain fully characteristic of him, to say:—<sup>27</sup>

“As God and his kingdom are infinitely distinguished from every thing else in their infinite greatness, excellence, and importance, so rebellion against him, and opposition to his interest and kingdom, and an attempt to destroy the whole, must be equally distinguished from any other possible or supposable crime, and, therefore, it is right and proper that it should have an equally distinguished punishment, that is, an endless one. A temporary punishment, which is infinitely less than this, and infinitely less than the evil of sin, cannot answer the end of punishment; it will neither express the evil or crime of injuring the infinitely great *JEHOVAH*, nor serve in the least degree to show his infinite worth, grandeur, and greatness, but speak a contrary language, viz., that this being, character, and kingdom are of infinitely less worth than they really are, and so would be a real dishonor to him. . . . And if God should punish rebels against him, who have defamed him, and highly injured his character, with a temporary punishment only, this would be as far from answering to his infinitely superior, excellent, and important character, and properly vindicating it, as if no punishment at all were inflicted; yea, it would be infinitely worse than none, and really degrade his character, and be a reproach to him.”

With such thoughts in mind, he will not hear any thing of the various excuses as if man were too insignificant or ignorant to commit an infinite evil. “If a finite being can affront and abuse his Creator,” if he can desire to dethrone his Maker and destroy his kingdom, he can commit an infinite evil.<sup>28</sup>

Another striking argument in the same line is from the atonement. “One end of the atonement which Christ made for sin was to show what evil there is in sin and its ill desert. But this is every way sufficient to atone for sin which has infinite ill desert; therefore this declares sin to be an infinite evil, or to deserve infinite or endless punishment.” In modern phrase, God will not put forth more force in the atonement than the occasion demands. He continues: “To deny that there is infinite evil in sin, is, in effect, to deny the divinity of our Saviour.”<sup>29</sup> To understand this last sentence we must remember that Hopkins lived in the shadow of two great coming con-

<sup>27</sup> pp. 445, 446.<sup>28</sup> pp. 446-448.<sup>29</sup> p. 449.

troversies, the Unitarian and Universalist, which he thus recognizes as closely allied.

But we must pass on now to Hopkins' more important contributions to the progress of thought upon this subject.

4. *The Relation of the Goodness of God to Eternal Punishment.*

The contribution here is not to the essential thought, but consists only in the greater fullness of statement, and certain applications. He dwells first upon the necessity of proper punishments to the maintenance of government, and upon the demand of goodness that it shall be maintained. Punishment performs a further good office in promoting the perfect display of God's character. It displays his terrible majesty, his displeasure and anger with sin, and thus his righteousness and goodness, to which anger and displeasure against sin are essential.

And now we come to the peculiarly Hopkinsian passage. It is all intelligible to one who has the eagle's eye and can look upon the sun. If one does indeed prize holiness above all things, and think pain of little account in comparison with sin, and has true disinterested benevolence such as this old divine preached and lived, he will understand and profit spiritually, while he trembles. But let not the weak, or the superficial, or he who does not believe sin to be truly inexcusable guilt, read either our author or this exposition of him.

Hopkins advances the proposition that "the eternal punishment of the wicked will many ways promote the highest good of the blessed, especially the redeemed from among men, and is the most proper and necessary means of their unspeakably greater degree of holiness and happiness than could otherwise take place; and therefore must be agreeable to infinite goodness, and a strong expression of it."<sup>30</sup> In proving this proposition he says: "God, in vindicating the righteous cause of his servants, by delivering and saving them, and manifesting his high

<sup>30</sup> p. 456.

displeasure against their enemies by condemning and punishing them as they deserve, exercises and displays his righteousness; and, at the same time, this righteousness is nothing but kindness and mercy to his church and people." Two pages of Scripture quotations follow in defence of this doctrine, among them many from the imprecatory psalms, but many also from Revelation and the other Scriptures. He continues:—

"It has been already observed and shown how well suited and necessary endless punishment is, to make a full and most glorious display of the divine character, in the view of the blessed. In this will be seen, as could not be seen so clearly and to such advantage by any other medium, or without this, the infinite greatness, power, and terrible majesty of JEHOVAH; and also his infinite excellence and worthiness, and his hatred and displeasure, his indignation and wrath against sin, and his infinite benevolence and goodness, to which sin is opposed. The smoke of their torture shall ascend up in the sight of the blessed forever and ever, and serve, as a most clear glass, always before their eyes, to give them a constant, bright, and most affecting view of all these. And all this display of the divine character and glory will be in favor of the redeemed, and most entertaining, and give the highest pleasure to all that love God, and raise their happiness to ineffable heights, whose felicity consists summarily in the knowledge and enjoyment of God. This eternal punishment must therefore be unspeakably to their advantage, and will add such immense degrees of glory and happiness to the kingdom of God, as inconceivably to over-balance all they will suffer who shall fall under this righteous punishment, and render it all, in this view and connection, an infinite good."

It was upon this passage that the caricature of Hopkins was issued, representing him as "entertained" at the sufferings of the lost. Yet the passage reads: "This *display of the divine character . . . .* will be most entertaining." Hopkins was not insensible of the dreadful character of the sufferings of the lost in themselves.<sup>81</sup> If sin were not, a happy universe, without trace of suffering, would be the only one consistent with the perfections of God. But sin having entered by man's free choice, punishment increases the glory of God.

In further pursuit of the proposition above set forth, Hopkins says of the punishment of sin, that it will forever

<sup>81</sup> p. 459.

<sup>82</sup> See p. 463.

serve to manifest the excellence of holiness by the painful contrast it presents to it. In this sense he even goes so far as to say that it is "necessary to the highest happiness and glory of heaven."<sup>22</sup> It will also serve to keep ever vividly before the minds of the redeemed their own "infinite ill-desert."<sup>23</sup> The feelings inspired by the punishment of the lost are not those of selfish exultation, but of deep humility. Thus the saints will be led to see the greatness of the grace which has rescued them from their deserved fate, "and their enjoyment and happiness, their love, gratitude, and praise, will rise in proportion to their view and sense of God's infinite, astonishing goodness, and distinguishing sovereign grace to them, and all the redeemed."<sup>24</sup> Their sense of the greatness of the Redeemer's sacrifice will be enhanced in like manner, and with this their enjoyment and delight in him.

In our view this is the apex of the defence of the doctrine of eternal punishment. Unless continued punishment serves some continued good end, benevolence does not call for its infliction. But when it serves not only as a safeguard against sin, but as a positive means of promoting holiness among the redeemed, its continuance is justified by benevolence. This is the meaning of Hopkins' argument.

We pass over the reply now given to several objections, and, for want of space properly to consider it, we must pass for the present also over his slight allusions to the connection of election with this subject. Certain expressions are employed which cannot be understood without a prolonged study of the principal ideas of Hopkins' system, and of his manner of expressing himself. Unexplained, we must confess, they shock modern sensibilities, because they lay a degree of emphasis upon divine sovereignty which seems to reduce men to mere machines. Yet Hopkins, as above said, did really give great promi-

<sup>22</sup> p. 460.

nence to human freedom. In closing we must, however, consider his view of—

5. *The Relative Number of the Lost.*

Hopkins does not regard this as a vital question. If there be any insoluble speculative difficulty as to future punishment, it will not be removed if very few are punished, or if only a single soul. If there be injustice in it, that militates against the character of God if only one suffers, as truly as if millions suffer. We are dealing with an infinite and perfect being. Hopkins says, speaking of the matter speculatively, "To suppose that the less number of those that shall be punished is so much the better, seems . . . . to suppose it would be, on the whole, best to have none lost." Still, when we contemplate the sufferings of the lost, it is a legitimate source of relief to believe that comparatively few are lost. This is Hopkins' doctrine. He denies that the Scriptures, properly understood, teach that few are saved, for the passages which seem to imply this are of temporary application, whereas the general scope of prophecy points forward to a time of final triumph for the church. Even should the greater part of those who shall have lived before the millennium perish, in that glorious time so many shall be saved, that, as compared to the lost, they may be "many thousands to one."<sup>34</sup>

The thought here presented was introduced by Edwards, enlarged upon by Bellamy<sup>35</sup> in a sermon upon the

<sup>34</sup> pp. 470-473.

<sup>35</sup> Bellamy employs arithmetic to show that the number of the saved will be greater than the lost (Works, i. 457). If the population doubles every fifty years during the millennium, and has stood during each of the six preceding thousand years at the same number as at the beginning of the millennium, the ratio of the saved to the lost will be more than seventeen thousand to one. Edwards had thought it "very moderate . . . . if we say it is probable that there will be an *hundred thousand* times more that will actually be redeemed to God by Christ's blood, during that period of the church's prosperity, than ever had been before, from the beginning of the world to that time" (Works, iii. 473).

“Millennium,” but first fully developed by Hopkins. The latter appended to his System a Treatise on the Millennium, occupying 143 pages, large octavo. It is dedicated “to the people who shall live in the days of the Millennium”! The doctrine of the treatise is that after a great struggle with the powers of evil, a happy period will be ushered in when the church shall be greatly prospered for a thousand years. Then there shall be another period of trial, and then the Lord shall come in person, and the resurrection and judgment shall take place. The argument in favor of the doctrine is purely scriptural, and very extended. One section of the work enters, on the basis of the biblical statements and suggestions, upon a “particular description” of the state of the world during the millennium. It is to be a time when most probably “every individual person who shall then live will be a real Christian,”<sup>36</sup> and Hopkins’ entire conception of the world is of one in which perfect holiness shall produce the greatest conceivable prosperity of every kind. There will be the greatest progress in knowledge; universal peace and positive love will prevail; there will be the greatest conceivable outward prosperity produced by great advance in agriculture and the mechanic arts; the numbers of men will greatly increase, and, on account of the greater prosperity, be supported more easily than now; one language will prevail over the earth; and then religion will appear in its true light, and God be glorified.

Scientific men in our own day have looked with gloomy eye on the present condition and future prospects of the world. It is now but a struggle for existence, which is to be intensified with the progress of time and the increase of population, till the finer arts and pursuits all disappear before the grim necessity of wringing a subsistence out of the too scanty area of arable land. Hopkins recognized the miseries of the world, but he traced them all to sin. For this rebellion against the infinite Sovereign he

<sup>36</sup> p. 271.

had nothing but condemnation, and for the rebels he foresaw a terrible fate. Yet even their destruction should contribute to the glory of God. And finally the rebellion was to be overcome, and the earth filled with the loyal subjects of the King. Then, sin having largely ceased, the evils now afflicting the world would also cease.

Thus Hopkins' eschatology, stern with the sternness of facts, and ruggedly expressed through the rugged honesty of his mind, ends nevertheless in a prophecy of unutterable glory, in attempts to outline which the hidden poetry of his heart appears. Says Channing: "Whilst to the multitude he seemed a hard, dry theologian, feeding on the thorns of controversy, he was living in a region of imagination, feeding on visions of a holiness and a happiness which are to make earth all but heaven."

TO BE CONTINUED.

---

ARTICLE VII.

THE BOOK OF JUBILEES.

TRANSLATED FROM THE ETHIOPIC BY PROFESSOR GEO. H. SCHODDE, PH.D.,  
CAPITAL UNIVERSITY, COLUMBUS, O.

CHAP. XXIV. 1. And it happened after the death of Abraham that the Lord blessed Isaac, his son, and he arose from Hebron and went and dwelt at the fountain of the vision, in the first year of the third week of this jubilee, seven years. 2. And in the first year of the fourth week a famine began in the land, in addition to the first famine which was in the days of Abraham. 3. And Jacob cooked a mess of lentils, and Esau came from the field hungry. 4. And he said to Jacob, his brother, "Give me of thy mess of pulse;" and Jacob said to him, "Give up to me thy right of first birth, and I will give thee bread