

**THE NEW WORLD ORDER
OR
PRE-MILLENNIAL TRUTH
DEMONSTRATED**

By
B. W. NEWTON

An answer to the
**Post-Millennial
A-Millennial and
Anti-Millennial Theories**

LONDON
THE SOVEREIGN GRACE ADVENT TESTIMONY
Secretary: GEO. H. FROMOW, 9, Milnthorpe Rd., Chiswick, W.4

Price 4d.; 3s. 6d. dozen

Pre-Millennial Truth Demonstrated

By B. W. NEWTON

"As I live, saith the Lord, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." "Truth shall spring out of the earth, and righteousness shall look down from heaven." But when, in what period of the world's history is this to be? I cannot find from Scripture that the days are past in which they who would "live godly in Christ Jesus must suffer persecution." I cannot find that these our times are essentially different from those in which the faithful witnesses of the eleventh of Hebrews and the Lord Jesus and His Apostles testified; and all these were, by the mass of mankind at least, scorned and rejected. It would therefore seem to me strange if we, with our scanty measure of truth and yet more feeble grace, should find a reverse experience.

We have to remember when reading the Scripture that there is a difference between understanding, i.e. comprehending the things that God has revealed, and understanding that He has revealed them. For example, I do not understand the mystery of the Trinity: but I understand that God has revealed it, and I *believe*. The exercise of our understandings in ascertaining whether or not God has revealed any given thing is legitimate: but to set ourselves up in judgment upon the word of God, and to say that we will not believe unless we can fathom every thing, and explain every thing, and understand the manner and means of every thing's accomplishment, would be folly and sin. You believe the narrative respecting Jonah: and you do not, because of the

typical and spiritual instruction most properly drawn from the history, nor because of the figurative language that may be found in that book, reject the literality of the fact. And yet it is a fact far more marvellous than that "the lion should eat straw like the ox," or anything else mentioned in the eleventh of Isaiah. Surely we have little occasion to perplex ourselves with difficulties about the manner how—when God is confessedly acting in supernatural power.

I greatly object to the extraordinary manner in which many writers against the pre-millennial advent invent objectionable and imaginary statements, and impute them to their opponents, and then argue against what they have never said. That there may have been very crude and very wrong statements in many millennial tracts I am quite ready to admit. But it is not our place, if honestly enquiring after truth, to attach to a doctrine the mistakes of its defenders—especially when the individual more immediately addressed, as in the present instance, repudiates such statements, and rejects them thoroughly.

Truth the Unchanging System

I understand that Christianity, or the system of divine truth delivered to the Apostles of Christ, is the unchangeable system of God, to be ministered in the millennium as much as now; and that the millennium finds, in the fact of its ministration, its chiefest excellency and joy. The gospel indeed in the millennium may be ministered under happier and more prospering circumstances than now. There will be then no longer failure in three sowings out of four! (See parable of the sower.) Satan will be no longer present (for he will be bound) to pluck away the seed sown—nor to spoil the wheat field by

intermingled tares. The circumstantial of the preaching will be different: but it will be the same gospel of the blood of the Lamb—the “everlasting” gospel, unchanged in every age and every dispensation—the same Priest, ever living to make intercession in the holiest of all—the same truths as to the flesh of man—the same need of the one sanctifying Spirit.

Some say that we teach that the Lord Jesus, “instead of sitting at the right hand of the majesty in the heavens—angels, authorities, and powers being subject unto Him, will sit upon a material throne at Jerusalem, and *have earth alone, instead of heaven and earth*, as the sphere of His authority and glory.” I should certainly agree that for the Lord Jesus to be banished, as it were, from His glorious exaltation in the heavens—to be confined to the earth, and “to have *earth alone, instead of heaven and earth*, as the sphere of His authority and glory,” would be a humiliation scarcely less affecting than His first. All that I can say is, I know nothing about such doctrines, nor do I know any one who does. I hold, that not earth merely, but heaven and earth, and all things, are the sphere of His authority and glory for ever and ever.

The Kingdom of Christ Unmovable

“We have received a kingdom which cannot be moved.” Moses and Elias, Peter and John, on the Mount of Transfiguration, though for the time differing as to their manifested condition, were alike in this kingdom. I believe indeed that all who sleep in Jesus, and all the living members of this kingdom will, when the Lord returns at the commencement of the millennium, rise and join Moses and Elias and Himself in glory: whilst others, to be converted in the millennium, members of the same

family will, like Peter and John of old, tarry on the earth for a season, until the time comes for them to be united with those who have gone before into glory, in the new heavens and the new earth, when "flesh and blood" are no longer found. But all, from the moment they believe, are in one blessed and everlasting kingdom. The changes which take place both at the commencement and at the close of the millennium, instead of moving or shaking it, are appointed for the very purpose of enlarging its circuit and manifesting its glories. It is a kingdom that cannot be moved.

Christ's Unchanging Priesthood

I now proceed to the supposed irreconcilableness of the millennial doctrines with the statements of Scripture, touching the heavenly priesthood of the Lord. Some seek to maintain that the Lord Jesus has *for ever* sat down on the throne of God—and that it is necessary to the exercise of His priesthood that He should be in heavenly courts; whereas they suppose that the millennial theory restricts and confines Him to the earth.

Now as to the last of these points, it has been already answered. The doctrine of the millennium, as delivered in Scripture, does *not* restrict Christ to this earth. "Heaven is His throne, the earth His footstool." He will "set His glory above the heavens." He may visit the earth—He may order and control the nations in it; but heaven will be His home, and there He will exercise His intercessional priesthood, in heavenly courts, even in the holiest of all.

If there is a time when Christ will descend from heaven into the air, and yet continue a Priest—for He is a Priest for ever—why should the circumstance of our saying that His descent takes place at the

commencement of the millennium, instead of the close, destroy the true doctrine of His Priesthood? And if He descends into the air, and yet continues a Priest, why may not His feet stand on the Mount of Olives, as they did of old on the Mount of Transfiguration, and His Priesthood remain unaffected? Air, into which all allow that He descends, is regarded in Scripture as a part of the lower creation. It is beneath the firmament, and is considered as terrestrial in contrast with heaven. I grant, indeed, that the exercise of His Priesthood, especially its intercessional exercise, would be impossible, if He were to tarry on this earth—if He were to lose heaven and have earth instead; but He does *not* tarry on earth. He does *not* forsake the heavenly courts, nor His offices in them. He will still intercede for the millions of His people, who will at that time be on the earth, yet in bodies of sinful flesh, and consequently liable to sin, even though Satan will be bound: and who, therefore, will still need His mercy and His intercession. Yet this does not imply that He is always locally confined to the courts above. A judge or an advocate may have an appointed court in which to judge or to plead, but he is not always present in that court. Yet he does not cease to be judge or advocate, because he may quit it for a season, and discharge other functions. So will it be with Christ. Moses and Elias did not lose their heavenly sphere of being, because they were seen in glory by earthly eyes upon an earthly mountain. The Lord Jesus did not lose His heavenly exaltation, because He was seen by, and spake to, John in Patmos.

The Relation of Heaven and Earth

Angels even now continually visit this dark and sorrowful scene; for they are ministering spirits

sent forth to minister unto the heirs of salvation, and yet they do not forego heaven as their home. Why then in a period of which intercourse between heaven and earth is the especial characteristic—when there will be an antitype to the earthly as well as the heavenly courts of the temple of old—when “ye shall see heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man”—when the antitype of Jacob’s ladder will have come—a figure of connection, not identification, between heaven and earth; why should not the Almighty Son of God pass from heaven to earth, and from earth to heaven, as easily as the high priests of old passed from one court of the temple into another? If He maketh even His angels spirits and His ministers a flame of fire, and they speed more rapidly than light from one end of the universe to the other, surely the spiritual body of the Son of God is still less subject to all material restriction of time and space.

God MANIFEST in Christ

I thought that all Trinitarians were accustomed to regard the past glorious manifestations of Jehovah, such as that on Sinai, as manifestations of the Second Person in the Trinity—because it is written “No one hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him.” And again, the Apostle says, “dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen nor can see.” I thought that these passages were always understood to teach that the Son is the constituted manifestor of the Father, and if it be allowed as to the past, much more would it be true of the future. But suppose it be not so. Suppose that we understand the passage in Zechariah xiv of Jehovah the Father—“His feet shall stand in that day upon the

Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the Mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley, and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south: and ye (the inhabitants of Jerusalem, being unprepared for His appearing) shall flee to the valley of the mountains; yea, ye shall flee like as ye fled from before the earthquake, in the days of Uzziah king of Judah: and the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee." This passage is so simple, so free from figurative language and is so evidently intended as a plain narrative of facts, that no argument could be employed to set aside its direct meaning, that would not equally tell against the divine appearing on Sinai of old. If then Jehovah is thus to appear on Mount Olivet, is Christ absent when He thus appears? And what difficulty would be avoided by saying that it is a glorious appearing of Jehovah and not of Christ? Look again at the passages in Habakkuk iii. 3, and Nahum i. 3, and you may find reason to judge that though they are in the past tense (and what more common in prophetic visions, see Isaiah liii), they refer also to this same future glorious appearing of the Lord—an appearing that is to precede the millennium, for "in that day the Lord shall be King over all the earth, in that day shall there be one Lord, and His name one" (Zech. xii).

The Throne of David

We have never used the words "identical" throne of David, or even "a material" or anything like them. I suppose that the "identical" throne of David has long since crumbled into dust, never to be restored; and yet I believe that the Lord Jesus

will exercise over the earth the same kind of definite authority and rule as was once exercised by David and Solomon: and this I understand the Scripture to mean, when it foretells that He shall occupy the throne of His father David. I suppose that no one ever thought of enquiring into the nature of that throne on which, it is said, He shall sit when He shall come, and all the holy angels with Him—or into the nature of those garments which, on the Mount of Transfiguration, shone as the light; nor would I desire to be wise above what is written, and to determine *how* the Lord Jesus “shall reign in *Mount Zion* and in Jerusalem, and before His ancients gloriously.”

The truth is, that the question does not turn upon any point about simple or figurative language, nor upon the precise mode or form in which Christ will reign over the nations; but the question is this, whether Christ is at present exercising the same *kind* of power over the nations as He will exercise when the millennium begins. I answer unhesitatingly, No!

It is true that He is now seated on the throne of God, and exercises all the power of that throne—all power is given unto Him in heaven and earth. But what if that Almighty throne has been pleased to delegate a certain portion of its power to others.

Power Delegated to the Nations

Power that I delegate, is power, and power possessed by myself—for else I could neither delegate it nor resume it; but power, whilst so delegated, is for the time vested in others, exercised by others, and not by Him who has delegated it.

If you ask me what Scripture shows that a portion of the power of the Almighty throne is thus delegated, I answer, the Book of Daniel; especially the

second and seventh chapters. Supreme authority in the earth is there committed to four successive Gentile empires—and this authority is not resumed by heaven until the last of these empires has fulfilled its course.

No one has ever yet pretended to say that the last of these empires, under which we are now living, has run its course. No one has ever yet ventured to affirm that the "little horn," or Antichrist, has yet concluded his great words and blasphemies against the Most High: and therefore the Ancient of Days has not yet sat in solemn judgment on these nations, and therefore the Son of man has not yet been brought before Him to be invested with the once delegated, but then resumed, power over the nations. "I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought Him near before Him. And *there was given HIM* (observe these words) 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." From the days of Daniel to the present hour, the Gentile empires whose history he gives, have swayed the earth. Their laws—civil, social, and political (and who undervalues the importance of these things as bearing on the right order and happiness of mankind?), have given a character to the world. Legislation in the world has been their sphere—a sphere granted to them by God, quite as much as legislation in the Church is Christ's sphere; but their legislation will end in "great words and blasphemies" (for who can blot these words out of the seventh of Daniel?)—and God will judge the nations because of this evil, and the power of legisla-

tion in the earth will be taken from human hands, and vested in the hands of the Son of man. I am willing that the whole controversy should be decided by the Book of Daniel.

The Figurative, the Literal, the Facts

No one, as far as I know, has ever asserted that in the literal interpretation of Scripture there are no symbolic visions and no figurative language. Figurative language abounds in Scripture, and two of the most important books of prophecy, Daniel and the Revelation, consist almost entirely of symbolic visions. But all symbols and all figurative language, be it remembered, mean something. They teach us *facts*: and even if the language does happen to be figurative, I am not on that account to suppose that it means nothing, nor to regard it as mere hyperbole and poetic exaggeration. Poets *do* exaggerate—Scripture never. The poet draws a picture that is heightened above the reality. It is more or less ideal. The Scripture never heightens beyond the reality—never adds an expression simply for the sake of adornment. If the whole of its description were to be fully apprehended, it would leave no impression on the mind that would in the least degree exceed the reality. If I read the eleventh of Isaiah as a description from God, I expect to find *every* statement in some way or other, whether spiritually or otherwise, minutely fulfilled—but, if I read it as “poetry,” I may pass over whole clauses in my interpretation, and say that they are the mere embellishments of high-wrought description. In other words they mean nothing—they are mere accompaniments to the picture. It is very easy thus, under the plea of the language being figurative or poetic, to destroy all definiteness of instruction in the word of God.

Did Peter say, that because the animals which he saw in the sheet let down from heaven were symbols, and unreal, that therefore the Gentiles whom they represented were symbols too? Am I to say that the seven Churches in Asia were "figurative" and all the instructions given to them "figurative," because they are represented by symbolic candlesticks in a vision? Was the Church at Ephesus "figurative," or its threatened punishment "figurative," because itself and its punishment were symbolically represented? Why then should the symbolic chain held by the angel, or the symbolic souls seen re-united to their bodies, represent "figurative" things, simply because they themselves are symbols? Is it meant that every thing that is represented by symbols must be itself figurative, or that symbols can only represent symbols—in other words that the seven candlesticks are symbols, and the seven Churches too? And if this is not meant, what is meant? No one doubts that the symbols in the Revelation are symbols—no one thinks of asserting that they are literal existences—but the question is, "What do they teach us? facts, substantial facts, or nonentities?" And if the first resurrection be not real, because we are taught respecting it in a symbolic chapter—are the last resurrection, the final judgment, and the second death, equally figurative and unreal—for we are taught respecting them in the same symbolic chapter? If we persist in saying that things taught in figures are themselves figurative, I do not see how we can avoid the worst depths of Neology.

Read Rev. xix. 11 to xxi. 27

Read the whole passage as if it were one chapter. It extends from the second appearing of the Lord, through the millennial reign on to the creation of

the new heavens and new earth, and forms one connected history: and although the medium of instruction is symbols seen in vision, yet I doubt whether throughout the whole of Scripture a more simple narration can be found. The subjects are: I. The coming of the Lord Jesus in glory, and the armies of heaven following Him, "He treadeth the winepress of wrath." II. The destruction of Antichrist and the false prophet. "These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone, and the remnant were slain by the sword of Him who sat upon the horse." III. The binding of Satan. IV. The millennial reign. V. The final judgment and final resurrection. VI. The new heavens and new earth.

Now it is true that these things are taught in symbols, but as I said, symbols represent realities. No one doubts that the white horse and his rider—the vesture dipped in blood, and the sword proceeding out of His mouth, are symbols, not realities. But what do they represent? Not surely an intervention in mercy, but in judgment. So also as to the beast. No one doubts that it is a symbolic representation. But whom does it represent?—The facts are almost too obvious to need a comment.

The question therefore respecting the pre-millennial advent of the Lord may be decided without reference to any passages on which there is disagreement as to the nature of the language employed. It may be decided either from passages in which it is *agreed* that the language is simple—or from passages in which it is *agreed* that it is figurative—or from visions that are allowed to be symbolic.

Remember that if there be a *supposed* tendency in us, who teach the pre-millennial advent, to regard language as simple that is really figurative, there is a tendency in others, and I must add a *real tendency*,

to explain away the plain statements of Scripture, by supposing figures where none exist. I mention, as an instance, the arbitrary meanings so frequently attached to Jerusalem and Zion.

Throughout the historical Books of the Old Testament, no attempt, as far as I am aware, has been ever made to explain these words in any other than their simple and obvious meaning. But the moment we read the Prophets, a different, and as it is said, a "spiritual" meaning is assigned, for no other reason, as far as I can discover, than because they are places in which there will by and by be a peculiar development of spiritual blessings, similar to those which we, who believe in Jesus, at present enjoy: and upon this principle, texts which belong to Zion and Jerusalem are not *applied* merely, but *interpreted* of us, and the literal Zion and Jerusalem are altogether excluded.

When God speaks of His holy mountain in Isaiah xi He means the literal Mount Zion—the place from which by and by, as from a centre, the truth of God, i.e. Christianity—for nothing is superior to Christianity—will be diffused among all nations. And as to the interpretation of the whole connected passage—where some seem to regard the hypothesis of the language being simple, as so peculiarly absurd, and assail the supposition and assail us with no very measured sarcasm—I will briefly state

The Rules that Guide Us

In the first place, I adhere to the ancient canon, that where a literal interpretation can be adopted, the furthest from the literal is commonly the worst: and that the literal may be adopted where no proved absurdity or impossibility follows its adoption.

Secondly, I enquire whether a different principle

of interpretation could be adopted consistently throughout the whole passage; so as for no clause to be dropped out or set aside on pretence of poetic exaggeration.

Thirdly, I ask which interpretation would best agree with the testimony of the rest of Scripture—especially those parts of Scripture which definitely apply to the same period.

These would be my chief criteria. As regards the first, some allege that there is absurdity, if not impossibility, in supposing that all these animals, the lamb, the lion, and the bear, should be gathered upon Zion, mainly, because Zion is surrounded by a city. Now whether it be possible or not, we have little need to enquire, if we admit that the time alluded to is one of miraculous interference on the part of God. Not that I can see any such great impossibility in children and animals being found scattered over the hill or hills around which many of our modern cities are clustered, say, for example, Edinburgh—and if such sights could be seen there, and if it were the metropolis of the earth, I should say that they were a significant and beautiful emblem of the universality of peace. And seeing that we know nothing of what the physical characteristics of Zion in that day will be—that we know not how its configuration may be changed at a period when “heaven and earth are to be shaken”—Mount Olivet cleft—and Zion miraculously exalted above the hills—we may well suppose that its capacities will be adapted to the requirements of its new condition.

Mount Zion will be full, as it were, of living symbols, sights happy in themselves, but yet more as indicating the moral and outward peace which shall pervade the earth. It will be the centre of the earth's government and laws—“for out of Zion shall

go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem"—and as such, its condition becomes the criterion of the world's condition. It represents what the world then is. If the knowledge of the Lord did not cover the earth—hurting and destruction would not be banished from Zion—but seeing that the knowledge of the Lord will be covering the earth as the waters cover the seas, therefore nothing shall hurt—nothing destroy—no, not even a reptile, on all the holy Mountain of God. 'The type of creation's blessing would otherwise be broken.

And when I apply the second of my rules, and enquire how far the Spiritualizers consistently apply their system of interpretation to all the clauses of this beautiful passage, I can hardly suppose that they would attempt a definite explication of such passages as these—"the lion shall eat straw like the ox—the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp—the cow and the bear shall feed, their young ones shall lie down together." How could these passages be spiritualized without again plunging into all the wild extravagancies by which Origen ruined the Church, and made Scripture bend to the imaginations of his own misguided mind?

And thirdly, when I ask what the testimony of the rest of Scripture is, regarding this same time, I find it written that creation is to be freed "from the bondage of corruption." Now if this text be true—if creation means creation in its lowest, as well as its highest spheres—if all things—"all sheep and men, yea, and the beasts of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the sea" (Ps. viii) are to be "seen" by and by (see Heb. ii) placed beneath the feet of Christ, I do say that it would be very strange if they continued to tear and to devour one another then. It would be strange to see man still trembling

before the lion and the bear—strange to behold wars ceasing even to the end of the world, and warriors beating their swords into ploughshares, and yet to find the animals at war with man, and with one another. But this is the supposition I am compelled to take, if I reject the simple interpretation of this passage. And as regards the impossibility of the lion eating straw like the ox, all things are possible with God, and if His power changed the nature of these animals once (for in paradise they all ate the herb of the field, see Gen. i. 30), and changed it because of man's sin, why, when the curse is removed from the earth, and man placed in millennial happiness, why should not the animals also partake in the blessed change? I should have thought it strange indeed, if Scripture had spoken of every other part of this lower creation and passed them in silence by.

The Objections of Anti-Millenarian Teachers

I have now for many years been accustomed to hear such, but I have seldom heard even an attempt made to grapple with the main arguments of their opponents. Isolated texts are referred to—supposed difficulties are stated, but no attempt is made to explain throughout such a chapter as the seventh of Daniel, the fourteenth of Zechariah, or the twentieth of Revelation. When it is asked whether the parable of the sower, and of the wheat and tares, are not characteristic of this present dispensation, and whether it is possible to apply such parables to the millennial period of universality, no answer is returned. When it is asked whether the epistles do not describe the condition of the Church, up to the glorious appearing of our Lord and Saviour (see 1 Tim. vi. 14), and whether they do not throughout describe the Church as suffering from man and

from Satan, and not in millennial rest, no reply is made.—It is indeed an argument unanswerable, and of itself sufficient to prove that the glorious epiphany of the Lord precedes the millennium.

I have also observed that the denial of the Lord's pre-millennial advent is connected with a tendency to set aside the character of the Lord Jesus, as the Holy One, who is to take vengeance—and to speak of Him exclusively as the "Prince of Peace and Saviour." I have even heard it attempted to explain the description of His appearing in the nineteenth of Revelation—where His vesture is seen dipped in blood, and Himself treading the wine-press of wrath, of His own past sufferings on the cross. He is spoken of as the Lamb—but it is forgotten that He is also the Lion of the tribe of Judah, who shall "cry, yea, roar and prevail against His enemies." The sufferings of the Lamb are spoken of, but the "day of the Lamb's wrath," and the specification of those on whom it will peculiarly fall, is forgotten: and the result of this is the saying, "Peace, peace," when sudden destruction is at the door. I would unfeignedly desire that we might be preserved from this—but they cannot, who continue to deny that of which all Scripture testifies, "that the world will grow worse and worse as to religion, more corrupt and more wicked, as time rolls on, and that it will only have reached its climax of pollution and guilt, at the moment when Jesus shall return." "As it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be when the Son of man is revealed." These are words which, as I apprehend, determine the question, and are too plain to need comment.

The subject is more fully treated in:
**"THE MILLENNIUM AND ISRAEL'S
FUTURE."**

By B. W. NEWTON.

Cloth boards.

200 pages.

Price 2/-

A list of the published works of
B. W. NEWTON, Dr. S. P. TREGELLES
and others sent free on application.

Watching & Waiting

is a periodical magazine containing articles,
doctrinal, expository, prophetic, experimental,
noting the signs of the times in scriptural light.
2/6 per annum.

Hunt, Barnard & Co., Ltd., London and Aylesbury.