

THE BIBLE ITS PRINCIPLES AND TEXTS

Robt. G. Huggins

To Janet Stilson
May you enjoy Brother Robert
Huggins book.

From one Hope

Franklyn Ross

10/23/2009

The Bible

ITS PRINCIPLES AND TEXTS



—BY—

ROBT. G. HUGGINS



CLEVELAND, OHIO

PREFACE TO SECOND PRINTING

Those who have the solid foundation of faith in the promises made to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and David have held precious the gems of the Truth that have been written by those of like precious faith.

Such a work is *The Bible, Its Principles and Texts*, written by Robert G. Huggins while pastor of The Church of God of The Abrahamic Faith, located at that time on Lee Avenue in Cleveland, Ohio.

Because of the necessity of keeping this valuable work alive, and due to its scarce supply there have been many requests for a new printing of this book.

This present edition is the result of many hands and many hours of labor spent in editing the scriptural references. It is prayerfully presented to the world in the hope of persuading some to accept the grace of God's salvation through the gospel of the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ; and to give a firm foundation of faith to those who have embraced this blessed hope.

Allan Greif, Pastor
The Church of The Blessed Hope
Fairmount & Taylor Rd.
Cleveland Hts., Ohio 44118
Aug. 1973

PREFACE.

FOR several years we have been Associate Editor of *The Restitution*, Plymouth, Indiana, the official organ of the Church of God in America. The desire of its readers for our writings to appear in a permanent form finds expression in this modest volume. The book is a Monument of their generosity. In it the reader is likely to find thoughts and ideas differing from his own. Isa. 55: 8, 9. We have not written to please men. Gal. 1: 8, 10. It may be, dear reader, that some of the fondest and dearest "affections and lusts" (desires) of your heart (Gal. 5: 24) will be killed by reading this book; for the Word of God is a quick, powerful and sharp sword. Heb. 4: 12. Should this book not please you, remember that Christ "pleased not himself" (Rom. 15: 3); and that instead of condemning it loquaciously, it is your duty to "hear" it patiently, and to desist from "wrath." Jas. 1: 19, 20. We now send it forth upon its mission of transforming and renewing the carnal mind (Rom. 8: 7, 8; 2 Cor. 2: 14)¹ into the Divine Likeness (2 Cor. 2: 10, 16;² Rom. 12: 2); praying the Lord with much entreaty that in the work of enlightening sinners and of confirming saints in the truths of Divine Revelation, it may be the means of doing much good.

ROBT. G. HUGGINS.

Cleveland, Ohio, 10623 Lee Ave.

SYLLABUS.

	PAGE
TITLE PAGE	1
PREFACE	3
SYLLABUS	5

THE BIBLE.

Is Verbally Inspired	11
Not a Mystery	14
Reading the Bible	16
Understanding the Bible	17
Believing the Bible	18
Obeying the Bible	19
Enjoying the Bible	21
The Spirit and the Bible	25
Faith by His Word	27
Understanding	28
Obedience	29
Begettal	31
Conversion	33
Sanctification	33
Salvation	36
Comfort of the Spirit	37
Witness of the Spirit	38
Fruits of the Spirit	39
Belief of the Scriptures Essential	40

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.

The Bible	47
The Gospel	47
The Kingdom of God	48
The Reign of Christ	49
The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit	50
The Nature of Man	50
The Resurrection.	50
Baptism	51
The Breaking of Bread	52
The Commandments	52
Doctrines We Reject	52

EXPLANATIONS OF TEXT.

“Like the Son of God.” Dan. 3: 23.....	57
Christ Before John. John 1: 30.....	59
Seeing God in the Flesh. Job 19: 26.....	60
The Necessity of Christ’s Death. Isa. 53: 6, 9.....	63
Is Salvation Universal? 1 Tim. 4: 10.....	64
Tithing. 1 Cor. 9: 13, 14.....	67
“Not Able to Kill the Soul.” Matt. 10: 28.....	69

SYLLABUS

	PAGE
Visions vs. Realities. Luke 9: 30, 31.....	71
The Progress and Climax of Sin. Psa. 1.....	73
Enoch in Typology.....	75
Did Enoch Die? Gen. 5: 23, 24.....	78
Was the Thief Baptized? Luke 23: 42, 43.....	84
Is Instrumental Music in the Church Scriptural? Amos 6: 5	86
Is the Abrahamic Covenant Fulfilled? Neh. 9: 7, 8.....	88
Did Angels Marry? Gen. 6: 2.....	90
Sprinkling vs. Baptism. Ezek. 36: 25.....	92
Are People Baptized in Holy Spirit when Converted? Acts 10: 44, 45	93
“Translated Into the Kingdom.” Col. 1: 13.....	95
“Absent from the Body.” 2 Cor. 5: 8.....	97
Is the Holy Spirit a Person? John 14: 16.....	99
The Kingdom in Men or Men in the Kingdom? Luke 17: 20	102
Is the Holy Spirit an Intercessor? Rom. 8: 26.....	104
Several Questions	106
“The Land Shadowing with Wings.” Isa. 18: 1.....	108
Principalities and Powers. Eph. 6: 12.....	110
“I Go to Prepare a Place for You.” John 14: 3.....	112
What Became of the Risen Saints? Matt. 27: 52.....	114
“They” in Matt. 26: 52.....	116
The Restoration of Israel. Mi. 4.....	118
Sacrifices in the Reign of Christ. Ezek. 43: 18.....	123
Creed	126
Infant Sprinkling Proved by Inferences	128
Hearing. Acts 9: 7.....	130
Though He was Rich.” 2 Cor. 8: 9.....	131
Did Christ Pre-exist as Creator? Col. 1: 17.....	133
Eliseus—Elijah	136
An Apparent Contradiction Explained. Matt. 27: 44.....	137
The Souls Under the Altar. Rev. 6: 9.....	139
Prayer, Private and Public	143
Christ’s Coming in Flesh. 2 John 7.....	143
Who is the Ancient of Days? Dan. 7.....	145
The New Covenant. Jer. 31: 31.....	147
Preaching the Cross	150
Begotten of God. 1 John 3: 9.....	152
In Adam All: In Christ All. 1 Cor. 15: 22.....	153
Holy Spirit Prior to Baptism, Why? Acts 10.....	157
“As Adam.” Job. 31: 33.....	159
The “Sheep,” “Goats,” and the “Brethren.” Matt. 25.....	160
Did Adam Eat of the Tree of Life?	162
Like a Tree. Psa. 1: 3.....	164
Baptism and the Thief	169

SYLLABUS

	PAGE
The Baptism of the Spirit: Sprinkling or Immersion?	
Acts 1: 5	171
"From the Beginning." 2 Thess. 2: 13, 14.....	173
Christ's Brethren. Matt. 25: 40	174
Feet-washing. John 13	178
The Closed Door. Matt. 25: 10	179
Two Kinds of Sins. 1 Tim. 5: 24.....	183
The Wicked and Chaff. Psalms. 1: 4, 5.....	185
The Millennium	188
The Angels that Left Their Habitation. Jude.....	188
Christ in the Psalms. Psalms. 2.....	191
Skeptical "Impossibilities"	194
"Raised." 1 Cor. 15: 44	195
Pillars. Gal. 2: 9	196
Christ Preached to the Antediluvians Representatively.	
1 Pet. 3: 18	197
"Come Down from Heaven." John 3: 13.....	202
The "Promise" of Acts 2: 39.....	207
Invisibility of Divine Being. John 20: 19.....	209
Is the Spirit an "Undying Entity"? Eccl. 12: 7.....	211
"Ascend Up Where He was Before." Jno. 6: 62.....	216
Limited Meaning of the Word "All." Acts 3: 20.....	223
"All": Impotence of the Word to Prove Universal Salva- tion. 1 Cor. 15: 22	228
Does Hades have Two Departments? Luke 16: 19-31.....	234
Three Days and Three Nights. Matt. 12: 40.....	238
The Burning Up of the Earth. 2 Pet. 3: 10.....	239
"The Whole World." 1 John 2: 2.....	248
Everlasting Life	250
The Personality of the Devil. Luke 4: 1-13.....	252
Bible Days and Years	253
The Spirit of Man. Job 32: 8.....	258
Is Man's Spirit in the "Likeness" of God? Gen. 1: 26....	260
Is the Body a "Tabernacle" for Man's Spirit? Job 4: 17-21	263
Is the Spirit Conscious in the Death State? James 2: 26...	266
Does an Immortal Spirit Make Resurrection Possible? Luke 20: 37	270
Did Christ's Spirit Hold a Protracted Meeting in Hades?	
1 Pet. 3: 18	274
The Where and Condition of the Spirit in the Death State. 2 Cor. 5: 1-10	280
What Part of Man is Unconscious in Death? Phil. 1: 21..	284
"Elijah Went Up by a Whirlwind Into Heaven." 2 Kings 2: 1	290
The Inspiration of the Bible. 2 Tim. 3: 16.....	300
Books and Booklets	307

THE BIBLE

THE BIBLE.

I. *The book currently known as the Bible, consisting of the Scriptures of Moses, the prophets, and the apostles, is the only written revelation God has given to man. This revelation was made by the Holy Spirit through God-selected men, is without error, and is the Word of God.* 2 Tim. 3: 16; 1 Cor. 2: 13; Heb. 1: 1; 2 Pet. 1: 21; 1 Cor. 14: 37; Neh. 9: 30; John 10: 35.

God has spoken to us in the Bible. Heb. 1: 1, 2. His Holy Spirit inspired the writers in all they spake and wrote. Neh. 9: 30; 2 Pet. 1: 21; Matt. 10: 19, 20. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God" (inspired by the Spirit of God). 2 Tim. 3: 16. This inspiration so filled the writers with instruction (Neh. 9: 20) and wisdom (2 Pet. 3: 15, 16) that they had no need of any human teacher. 1 Jno. 2: 2-27.¹ As an energizing power direct from God the Holy Spirit taught the apostles "all things," gave them good, retentive memories, and guided them into "all truth." Jno. 14: 26; 16: 13. This unction² from God made it possible to truthfully say of them: "Ye know all things." 1 Jno. 2: 20. Their words were God's; what they said were commandments of the Lord. 1 Cor. 14: 37. When we despise their teaching we quench the Spirit. 1 Thes. 5: 19, 20. When we reject the doctrines taught in the Holy Scriptures we resist the Holy Spirit. Neh. 9: 20, 26,

30; Acts 7: 51-56. Their very "words" (1 Cor. 2: 13) were God-breathed. Words are used to express thoughts. Accurate thoughts cannot be expressed without accurate words. Verbal inspiration secures right words, and therefore makes the thoughts expressed infallible. So of the Scriptures Jesus could and did say: "The Scripture cannot be broken." Jno. 10: 35. They teach all the "doctrine" God wants us to believe; they administer "reproof" and "correction" for every error; they give all the "instruction in righteousness" we need; they "thoroughly furnish" "the man of God" unto all "good works." 2 Tim. 3: 16, 17. They are able not only to partly furnish but to "thoroughly furnish;" not to some good works, but "unto all good works."

Dear reader, if the Spirit-inspired Word will "thoroughly furnish" you in "doctrine," "reproof," "correction," "instruction" and "good works," what do you need the Holy Spirit for? The Spirit has already revealed "all the truth." Jno. 16: 13. Suppose you had the Spirit in all its power, would it reveal any "truth" to you? What "doctrine" would it teach you, what "correction" would it give, what "instruction" would it impart, what "good works" would it prompt you to perform: in short, how could it "furnish" you in these things more than the Word? If the Book "furnishes" you with "all the truth," "doctrine," "correction," and "good works," and "thoroughly furnishes" you, I ask, Can you be more than "thoroughly furnished"? Of course not. Well, then, you do not need the Holy Spirit, but you do need the Word; and so Paul

charged Timothy before God to “preach the Word.”
2 Tim. 4: 2.

Realize then, beloved reader, the all-sufficiency of the Word for “the man of God.” Other men may need the gifts of the Holy Spirit, but he does not need them. “The whole (complete) armor of God” with which he clothes his saints to protect them from the fiery darts of the wicked, and to make them strong to stand in the “evil day, and having done all, to stand,” consists of. 1, The truth; 2, Righteousness; 3, The gospel; 4, The faith; (and that comes by hearing the Word of God. Rom. 10: 17); 5, “The Sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God;” 6, And prayer. Eph. 6: 13-19. *The gift of the Holy Spirit forms no part of the saints armor.* “The man of God” is “thoroughly furnished” by the Word; he needs nothing more. God has selected men and filled them with his Spirit. They spake words “which the Holy Spirit teaches.” 1 Cor. 2: 13. They uttered words of “spirit and of life.” Jno. 6: 63. Christ and his apostles were filled with the Spirit and they spake “the words of God.” Jno. 3: 34. The “words” they spake was the “testimony” of the Spirit v. 33. And since the testimony has been placed on record in the Bible (1 Jno. 5: 9-14), the written Word is the witness or testimony of the Holy Spirit.

In conclusion, let the student give the following propositions a critical study, and let him make sure that he understands thoroughly the Scriptural basis on which they rest:

1. *The witness of the Holy Spirit is received by our receiving his testimony in the written Word. I*

Jno. 5: 9-14; Eph. 1: 13, 14; Rom. 16: 25, 26; 8: 1-4, 15, 16.

2. *Feelings are not to be trusted.* Jer. 17: 9; Luke 18: 11, 12; Gal. 5: 17, 24.

3. *Feelings fluctuate; God's Word is unchangeable.* Rom. 3: 3, 4; 4: 20, 21; 2 Tim. 1: 12; Rom. 8: 23; 1 Pet. 1: 7, 23, 25; Jno. 3: 34-36.

II. *The object for which the Bible was given to the world shows conclusively that it was intended to be read, understood, believed, obeyed, and enjoyed by all accountable persons.* Isa. 34: 16; Neh. 8: 3; Matt. 12: 3; 21: 42; Luke 4: 16; Acts 8: 30; Col. 4: 16; 1 Thes. 5: 27; 1 Tim. 4: 13; Rev. 1: 3; John 5: 39; Acts 17: 11; John 6: 45; Rom. 15: 4; Ezra 8: 1-12; Luke 1: 1-4; Mark 16: 15, 16; John 20: 30, 31; Rom. 6: 17; 16: 25, 26; Deut. 17: 18-20; Acts 8: 8, 39.

The Apostle Peter in speaking of Paul's epistles, says of them, "In which are some things hard to be understood." 2 Pet. 3: 16. From this statement we extract the following truths: 1. If "some things" written by Paul were "hard to understand," it inevitably follows that there were other things written by him easy to understand. 2. A writing may be "hard to understand" and yet not be incomprehensible. A writing "hard to be understood" is one thing; a writing which cannot be understood quite another thing. 3. Only the "unlearned," "unstable" and the "disobedient" "wrest" and "stumble at the Word." 2 Pet. 3: 16; 1 Pet. 2: 8. The book of Daniel, for instance, is "hard" to comprehend,

yet Christ referred to it, and said we should read and understand it. Matt. 24: 15. And in Daniel 12: 10 it is written: "None of the wicked shall understand; but the wise (the righteous) shall understand." "The secret of the Lord," "his covenant," "yea, the deep things of God" are revealed only to those who "fear him," called "babes." Psa. 25: 14; 1 Cor. 2: 10; Matt. 11: 25. "The wise and prudent," the "unlearned," "unstable," "the wicked, shall not understand." Beware, dear reader, how you confess that you do not understand the Bible, including the book of Daniel. If the wicked shall not understand you cast a reflection on yourself by confessing your lack of understanding. "The wise shall understand." The depths of eternal wisdom are open to "the wise;" to those who "humble themselves under the mighty hand of God," to be taught of him. Jas. 4: 10; John 6: 45.

Against the idea that the Bible is an understandable and comprehensible book, we are pointed to the fact that the gospel is several times called a mystery, (Latin) *mysterium*, (Greek) *musteerion*. A careful reading and deliberate study of the principal passages in which the gospel is so-called, however, will show that the writers did not call the gospel a mystery with the idea that the good news preached was an incomprehensible logomachy.¹ In every text where the word mystery is used it has reference to something about the gospel unrevealed in former dispensations, but now made known and fully understood. Read and be convinced. In Rom. 16: 25, 26 Paul speaks of the mystery "kept secret

since the world began," but "now," says he, it is "manifest" and is "made known to all nations." In Eph. 3: 3-6 Paul speaks again of the mystery, but affirms that by "revelation" it had been "made known" to him. In "other ages" it had been a "mystery"—it had not been revealed that the Gentiles should share the promises with the Jews. All this—formerly a mystery—unrevealed—is now fully and clearly made known by the Spirit through the apostles and prophets of New Testament times. See verse 5. Once more: in Col. 1: 26, Paul speaks of a mystery which had been "hid" from "all ages and generations" previous to his day, and then says: "But is now made manifest to his saints." The word "mystery," you will notice, in all these texts is used to describe a condition of ignorance prior to the revelation of God's Word. Before God spake all was "mystery," "secret," "hid," etc. God, however, granted a "revelation by his Spirit," and mark the result: What was before a mystery, secret, hid, etc., is now "manifest," "revealed," "made known." And his revelation of what was before a mystery is with such perspicuity,¹ that he requires "all nations" to whom he has "made it known" to render "the obedience of faith." Rom. 16: 26.

The Bible then is a revelation from God. The word reveal or revelation means to make visible (Isa. 40: 5; 53: 1, 2; Matt. 11: 25), to make known. Dan. 2: 28. God has revealed his will to us in the Bible. It is our duty to read, understand, believe and obey it. Let us consider:

1. *Reading the Bible.* Specific directions are giv-

en that the Epistles were to be read to and by all the brethren. Col. 4: 16; 1 Thes. 5: 27. They were to "give attendance to reading" (1 Tim. 4: 13), and let the Word dwell in them richly. Col. 3: 16. In doing this they only followed the example of their Lord and Master. He read the Bible; it was his "custom." Luke 4: 16. Beloved, let us imitate our great Example in this matter, and "read" (Isa. 34: 16) "daily" (Acts 17: 11), "all the days of our life" (Deut. 17: 19), the glad tidings which God has "noted in the Scripture of truth." Dan. 10: 21. God help us to do this that we may be "blessed" before the Lord. Rev. 1: 3.

2. *Understanding the Bible.* The writers of the Bible "had perfect understanding" about all the subjects upon which they wrote. Luke 1: 1-4. The Scriptures were written expressly for us to learn. Rom. 15: 4. The blessed Word is to be talked about at all times and under all circumstances. Parents are to teach it diligently to their children. Deut. 6: 6-10. "Every word" (Matt. 4: 4) which God has spoken must be "hid in our hearts" that we may be kept from sin. Psa. 119: 11. Timothy "from a child knew the Holy Scripture" (2 Tim. 3: 15); and Christ vituperated¹ his contemporaries for not "knowing the Scripture and the power of God." Matt. 22: 29. Dear reader, if the Scriptures can be "learned" and "known from a child;" if children can comprehend them; if they can be understood by adults, as expressly affirmed (Ezra 8: 1-12²; Neh. 8: 1-12), what a travesty upon language, what an insult to the Almighty to say of his Word, as is fre-

quently done, "Ah, well, the Bible is so befogged, and beclouded, and difficult, and mystical, that it cannot be understood!!"

3. *Believing the Bible.* Since the Bible is an intelligible book; since it can be read and understood, it can also be believed. Reason says, and says it with the authority of an oracle, that you cannot believe something you have not heard nor understood. Rom. 10: 14; Acts 8: 30, 31, 37. In order, therefore, that God might lodge faith in us, it was necessary for him first to clear up our understanding by giving us a message we could hear and comprehend; and this method of procedure God has used. He sent his apostles throughout the world turning people from "darkness to light" (Acts 26: 18) by proclaiming the gospel message through them, and confirming the Word they preached by signs. 2 Cor. 4: 4, 5; Mark 16: 15-20. He has conditioned the salvation of men upon hearing, understanding and believing his confirmed Word, his heaven-approved, and divinely stamped Word. Mark 16: 16. What Jesus said while upon earth (Jno. 5: 34) and what his apostles preached as the gospel subsequently (Gal. 1: 8)—we must believe in order to be saved. We cannot please God (Heb. 11: 6) nor be justified (Rom. 5: 11) unless we believe. Now faith comes—it can come in no other way than—by the Word of God. Rom. 10: 17. "These things I say," says the Saviour, "that ye might be saved." Jno. 5: 34. We must believe the gospel the apostles preached. John's gospel was written "that ye might believe." Jno. 20: 31. Now learn the importance of believing the

Bible: John says his gospel was "written that ye might believe," and then adds: "And believing ye might have life." Jno. 20: 31. No "life" without believing; no believing without the gospel "written." If we had no Bible we would not know what Jesus said; would not know what the apostles preached; would not have faith, justification; could not please God, and could have no life through the name of Jesus. Read prayerfully the texts quoted: Jno. 5: 34; Gal. 1: 8; Heb. 11: 6; Rom. 10: 17; Jno. 20: 31.

4. *Obedying the Bible.* It is not enough that we hear, understand, and believe the Bible; we must obey it. Jas. 2: 19. "Knowledge puffeth up." 1 Cor. 8: 1. Concerning those who understand, and who, it may be, believe the truth, but who do not render the obedience it demands; concerning those who are "contentious and do not obey the truth," it is said that when the Lord comes they shall "suffer indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish" (Rom. 2: 8, 9) till justice is satisfied; that Christ will "take vengeance" on them for their disobedience and give them over to "everlasting destruction" (2 Thes. 1: 8)¹ which will be the "end" (1 Pet. 4: 17) of all the ungodly. In obedience, Christ, as in all things else, is our pattern. We must be types of him. 1 Pet. 2: 21. He "learned obedience" (Heb. 5: 8) even unto death. Phil. 2: 8. Securing God's approval by obedience he was made Captain of all the sons of the Deity whom he will bring to glory. Heb. 2: 10. Having been made perfect by obedience in times of suffering, "he be-

came the Author of eternal salvation"—to whom? "All them that obey him." Heb. 5: 9. Only those who "obey him" have the promise of salvation. Since, then, obedience is an essential to salvation, remember that the Bible may be well understood, and even believed, and yet not obeyed. Some men read the Bible with unholy motives; many understand it who live ungodly lives; multitudes believe it who deny it "in works." Titus 1: 16. The gospel believed and obeyed is what saves. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "Teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Matt. 28: 19, 20. God's purpose in making known the gospel to "all nations" was to obtain the "obedience of faith." Rom. 16: 26. The "doctrine" he has promulgated must be "obeyed from the heart." Rom. 6: 17. Let us, then, read the Bible with pure hearts and right motives. Let us seek understanding that we may "show forth the praises of him who has called us out of darkness" into light; let us pray for wisdom that we may glorify God. "Give me understanding," David prayed, "and I shall keep thy law, yea, I shall observe it with my whole heart." Psa. 119: 34. The king of Israel was to read God's law "all the days of his life;" the object, the purpose, the design is thus stated, "That he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all the words of this law, to do them: that his heart be not lifted above his brethren, and that he turn not aside from the commandment, to the right hand or to the left." Deut. 19: 19, 20.¹ Read the Bible, then, seek understanding, get wisdom which is from

above that you may “observe,” “obey,” “keep” and “do” with the “whole heart” God’s commandments. “When we obey the voice of the Lord our God” (Jer. 42: 6) all is well with us.

5. *Enjoying the Bible.* Obedience brings joy. A mistaken idea prevails like this: A sinner must be baptized with the Holy Spirit before he can find forgiveness, peace, pardon and joy. A saint even, it is claimed, must have a re-baptism of heavenly power before he can be joyful. But the Bible says of blind and deaf sinners that when they see and hear the “words of the Book” (Isa. 29: 18) they become “the meek,” of whom it is written, “The meek also shall increase their joy in the Lord, and the poor among men shall rejoice in the Holy One of Israel.” (Verse 19). “Thy words were found,” says Jeremiah; joy and rejoicing followed; what caused them? “Thy Word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart.” Jer. 15: 16. The Word when “found” even by “stony places” was anon¹ and “with joy” received. Matt. 13: 20. John the Baptist, the “friend of the Bridegroom,” when he stood before the Lord and heard his “voice”—his Word—“rejoiced greatly because of the Bridegroom’s voice; this my joy therefore is fulfilled.” Jno. 3: 29. “These things have I spoken unto you,” said Jesus to his disciples, “that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full.” Jno. 15: 10.² “The God of hope,” made his children “abound in hope through the power of the Holy Spirit,” and gave them “joy and peace in believing.” Rom. 15: 13. Even when the Word was received in “much affliction” it was

with “joy of the Holy Spirit.” 1 Thes. 1: 6. “Believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.” 1 Pet. 1: 8. O, beloved, we who believe have joys of which the world knows nothing. Unbelievers cannot have the joy which comes from belief. When the people of Samaria had “Christ preached unto them,” (Acts 8: 5), and they had believed and obeyed the Word preached, (verse 12), “there was great joy in that city” (verse 8). When the eunuch heard, believed and obeyed the Word of the Lord, “he went on his way rejoicing.” Ver. 39. After the restoration of Israel under Ezra and Nehemiah, the Word was read and studied “from the morning until the midday.” Neh. 8: 3. The people who “heard the words of the law” (verse 9) cast off weeping, mourning and sorrow, and the “joy of the Lord became their strength.” After Christ rose from the dead (and before he ascended to heaven, and before his apostles were baptized with the Holy Spirit,) the Saviour taught his disciples—“opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures.” Luke 24: 45. Their hearts “burned within” them (verse 32) as he “opened” the Scriptures—made them plain. Of them it is further stated (and remember, they are not yet baptized with the Holy Spirit): “They worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy; and were continually in the temple praising and blessing God.” Luke 24: 52, 53. Again I repeat, they were not yet baptized with the Holy Spirit. The popular doctrine that the Bible cannot be understood; that God cannot be worshipped; that we cannot praise and bless God;

and that we cannot have "great joy" unless baptized with the Holy Spirit is a ruinous delusion. The disciples not only had joy, but they had "great joy." What caused this joy? Certainly not the Holy Spirit, which was not yet given. It was not because they "felt strange;" it was not because the Holy Spirit had thrown them into a paroxysm of felicity. It was not because they were having a revival meeting like we have in modern times. Such meetings are only places of ebullition—excitement without enlightenment. Still the people of God have "great joy." So "great" is it that sometimes they "shout aloud for joy." Ezra 3: 12. Now what causes this joy?

Let the Psalmist of Israel answer this question. Mark what he says causes the saints glory and joy: "Let all those who put their trust in thee, rejoice; let them ever shout for joy," (Why?) "because thou defendest them." Psa. 5: 11. Again: "He that trusteth in the Lord, mercy shall encompass him about. Be glad in the Lord, and rejoice, ye righteous; and shout for joy, all ye that are upright in heart." Psalm 32: 10, 11. Now in these texts, who are addressed? Those who "trust" in the Lord; "ye righteous," the "upright in heart." Why are they to "rejoice," be "glad," and "shout for joy"? Because God had baptized them with the Holy Spirit? No, no. But because the Lord was their defender; because "mercy encamped" about them; because they "trusted" the Lord! If a sinner becomes "meek" and has "joy" it is because he has seen and heard the "words of the Book." If Jeremiah's

heart has "joy and rejoicing," the cause stated is: "Thy words were found." If John the Baptist "rejoices greatly," it was because he heard the "voice" of him who spake as never man spake. If the joy Jesus had is to be given to his followers and "remain" in them; if they are to have it in "full" measure, he speaks "these things." If God gives "joy and peace" to his saints it is "in believing" his words. If there is "great joy" in Samaria it is because the Word has been preached. If the eunuch "goes on his way rejoicing," it is because he has heard, believed and obeyed the Lord, and the "Word of his grace." If the apostles' "hearts burn within them," it is for this reason: The Scriptures have been "opened" and they understand them! You will always find the "full" joy of God's people, that joy of theirs which is "unspeakable and full of glory"—you will always find it caused or produced by the Word of God. How different this to the joy of modern religionists, who have joy in a protracted meeting before they know or believe the Word, and before they obey the Lord in any particular!

Here it is germane¹ to remark that while our joy now is "full," "unspeakable and full of glory," yet it is to be "increased." Isa. 29: 19. God raised Christ from the dead "and gave him glory." (1 Pet. 1: 21)—gave him "fulness of joy" and the "pleasures" of an immortal existence. Psalm 16: 11. The saints of God will not possess this post-resurrectional "joy" until "the morning" (Psa. 30: 5) of redemption comes. When Christ appears in

the East as the "Sun of righteousness" (Mal. 4: 2), he will, as the "Light of the world" dispel the darkness of the present "night," and bring in a "day"—"a morning without clouds." 2 Sam. 23: 4. During this night—which is only "a moment"—the righteous are sowing in tears; are enduring a "light affliction." They "glory in tribulation." When the Day breaks and the shadows of night flee away an "exceeding weight of glory" will be theirs. 2 Cor. 4: 17. Then we shall "reap in joy" and come "rejoicing" with our sheaves. Psa. 126: 5, 6. Then they will have an "increase" of joy. Here our joy has been "full" and "unspeakable;" then, entering into the joy of our Lord we will have "everlasting joy." Matt. 25: 21; Isa. 35: 10. Jesus who is now in heaven has lovingly assured us that he will come again, that he will see us then; "and," says he, "Your heart shall rejoice; and your joy no man taketh from you." John 16: 22. Presented faultless by Christ to the presence of God's glory with "exceeding joy" (1 Pet. 4: 13; Jude 24), we will have the present "full," "unspeakable" joy of mortality "increased" to the "everlasting joy" (Isa. 35: 10) of a faultless and immortal existence. "No man" can take this joy from us then. Throughout eternity we will be "joyful in glory," (Psa. 149: 5), praising God whom we knew, loved and obeyed. "This honor have all of his saints." Psa. 149: 9; Rev. 5: 9, 10.

III. *The Bible was written to give faith, impart understanding, and secure obedience; to beget, convert, sanctify and save sinners, when they obey it; to*

comfort, teach, guide, and to produce love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness and temperance in the children of God. It is the Witness of the Holy Spirit. We bear the "fruits of the Spirit" when we obey it. Rom. 10: 17; Jno. 20: 31; Psa. 119: 98-100; Deut. 11: 13; 2 Cor. 8: 1¹; 1 Pet. 23²; Psa. 19: 7; Jno. 17: 17; Jas. 1: 21; Jno. 15: 26; 16: 13; Gal. 5: 22-25; Rom. 8: 14, 16.

If our reader has been taught that man is unable to understand, believe and obey the Bible unless God gives his Holy Spirit personally to him to enable him to do so, he will be nonplussed³ by this proposition. He will think that we are ascribing a work to the Bible which is the prerogative of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit does the work, is the dictum of popular theology, though confessedly obtruse and nebulous⁴ in its operations. The claim is this, viz., that the Holy Spirit operates personally, abstractedly and miraculously upon the sinner's heart. The Spirit, then, is nonpareil,⁵ not the Word. The Word of God is a mere adjunct to the Spirit. If this be so the Word of the Lord is dethroned; it is relegated to a "dead letter." Now I feel it my duty to say, without prevarication, that a theory that aims such a deadly blow at the intrinsic efficacy⁶ of God's Holy Book is not only preposterous but dangerous. God's "name" is "holy and reverend" (Psa. 111: 9), yet he has so magnified his Word, and made it so honorable, (Isa. 42: 21) that it stands pre-eminent to his great name. Psa. 138: 2. Do not, I beseech you, beloved reader, belittle the Word which God has mag-

nified. It is no niding¹ matter. When men make the Spirit everything and the Word secondary—nothing—let us tell them plainly (without being mordacious)² that they stand committed to a monstrosity—a towering delusion of the apostasy.

Instead of the Holy Spirit operating independently and personally upon sinners, we have the categorical affirmation that it does not—that they cannot receive it. Jno. 14: 17. Then it is not true that it enters into worldly persons to give them understanding, faith and spiritual power. In the ministry of the apostles we find that their converts believed the gospel before they received the gift of the Holy Spirit (Acts 19: 2; Eph. 1: 13); that sinners repented, were baptized and forgiven (Acts 2: 38; 8: 6, 12, 15) and were made sons of God (Gal. 4: 6) and yet never had a “Pentecostal Outpouring” of the Spirit! It is plain, then, that since all this was accomplished in the absence of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit did not enter into these people and work in them, faith, repentance, understanding and obedience. The Word preached did this. We affirm, then, that God gives

1. *Faith by His Word.* We are distinctly taught that faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God. Rom. 10: 17. The apostles preached the Word; people heard it and then believed it. Preaching is not the only way people “hear”—or understand—a matter. Writing is another way of communicating knowledge. The Word was first preached; afterwards it was “written.” Jno. 20: 31. Now whether we have faith by hearing the Word preached,

or reading it as it is written, one thing is evident, namely, Scriptural faith is produced by knowledge of the truths to be believed. Faith is not the result of testimony only. The supernatural truths of Christianity require supernal¹ proof of their truth. Christ entreated men to believe his testimony because he did the works of his Father. Jno. 10: 37, 48.² The testimony of the apostles was confirmed by God. Mark 16: 20. Agreeably with the preceding the sagacious³ among men believed Christ and his apostles when they heard their testimony and say⁴ the miracles they performed. Jno. 3: 2; 2: 11; 4: 50-53; 11: 45; Acts 4: 4; 8: 6-12. Faith in any statement is produced by testimony and proof. So God's way of giving faith is by preaching and writing the statements to be believed and proving them to be true.

2. *Understanding.* The Scriptural way of getting understanding is equally rational. "Thou through thy commandments has made me wiser than mine enemies; for they are ever with me. I have more understanding than all my teachers; for thy testimonies are my meditation. I understand more than the ancients because I keep thy precepts." Psa. 119: 98-100. The Psalmist got his understanding and wisdom from God's Word, from his "commandments" and "testimonies." God gives wisdom truly, but "thou through thy commandments hast made me wiser than mine enemies." "Through thy precepts I get understanding." v. 104. In exactly the same way Daniel was made wise. He set his heart to get understanding (Dan. 10: 12) and he obtained it through information supplied by books 9: 2. Since

understanding is attained by using means to get it, the New Testament exhorts believers to attain it. 1 Cor. 14: 20; Eph. 5: 17. Christ imparted understanding to people by giving them instruction (Matt. 15: 10), and complained when his disciples did not understand what he said. Matt. 15: 16, 17. Now it is true that God gives understanding as well as faith; but it is by supplying the means to enlighten the mind, namely, his Word. And men get what he supplies by giving their minds to attain it, like Daniel; by meditating upon it, like David. We attain to the understanding of any question by giving our minds to it, by studying it, by meditating upon it; and if it refers to the performance of duty, by having a disposition to practice it. The testimony of God—his Word—“enlightens the eyes” and makes “wise”—imparts understanding and wisdom. Psa. 19: 7, 8.

3. *Obedience.* Throughout the divine procedure God’s way of securing this is by setting before men what he requires, and then showing them the consequence of obedience and disobedience. “In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” Gen. 2: 7.¹ God instructed Abraham that the man who did not obey the terms of the covenant, should be cut off from his people. Gen. 17: 14. “Behold I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; a blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you this day; and a curse, if ye obey not the commandments of the Lord your God.” Deut. 11: 26-28; 30: 1. In order to secure obedience God “set before” the people the “blessings” of obedience and the “curses” of disobedience; and asked

them to “choose” which they would have. And in order to give believers power to render obedience he gave the greatest encouragements possible in the shape of motives. 2. Pet. 1: 4; 1 John 3: 3; 2 Cor. 8: 1.¹ God gives power to obey his will; but it is not of a secret and mysterious nature. It consists of spiritual armor which we can understand, appreciate and employ. “Take unto you the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day and having done all to stand.” Eph. 6: 13. And what does the armor consist of? Truth, righteousness, the gospel, faith, the hope of salvation for an helmet, the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, and prayer. This is God’s complete armor—“the power of his might;” and there is nothing mysterious about it. We know that truth will vanquish error. That a righteous character will be able to withstand attacks against it. That the gospel of peace carried with us will be a blessed attendant to our feet. And that faith in God’s Word gives strength to overcome our foes. And we can easily see how the promises of eternal life and glory will protect us from the blows aimed at us; how they will hold us fast to our profession, as an anchor; and stimulate us to prepare by holiness, for the Lord’s approach. And we can understand how God’s Word, the Spirit’s Sword, which the believer (not the spirit) is to “take” and to wield—how that will enable us to vanquish the errors, subtleties, and seduction of lying spirits, though professedly ministers of righteousness. And we also can comprehend now² holding communion with God in prayer, will pre-

serve us from the corrupting influences of this sinful world, and bring us to be holy as he is holy. Now since God supplies testimony and evidence to produce faith, instruction to give understanding, and motive power to secure obedience, we can see the reasonableness of his requiring those to whom these are supplied to believe, understand, and obey his will. And also the reasonableness of his condemning those, who, having these, do not honor him by rendering obedience to his requirements. But if man cannot believe, understand, and obey, without the personal influence of the Holy Spirit, and yet is required to do so without, and condemned for not doing them, we can see no reasonableness or justice in such a procedure. Such a theory mars the divine goodness and wisdom in many distressing ways. Let us rejoice, beloved reader, and thank God, that so unrighteous a method of action is not only diametrically opposed to the Divine Nature, but to his revealed will and constant operations.

4. *Begettal*. The reason Paul gives for not being ashamed of the gospel is, "It is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. 1: 16. The Greek word translated "power" in this text is *dunamis*. Our word dynamics comes from this word. Dynamical power enables men to accomplish their work with celerity,² and to perform an amount of labor impossible without its aid. This word "*dynamis*"² is used by God to convey to our minds the kind of power he uses upon sinners to bring them to repentance and to his favor. The gospel is the power, not a power, not a power among

a hundred other powers, but "*the* power." Now if the gospel is the power God uses to save us, we are not saved by a personal and direct operation of the Holy Spirit. And if the gospel is the saving power it must be the gospel that secures or brings about every prerequisite of salvation, begettal with the rest. Spiritually Paul was a father; he had many sons. The "power" he used in begetting them he explained in writing to the Corinthian Ecclesia: "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." 1 Cor. 55: 15.¹ The begetting power was the gospel; it is the saving power, and the only power. The Spirit of God quickens us, but always by "the words" recorded in the Holy Scriptures. Psa. 119: 50; Jno. 6: 63. We are begotten by God through the "Word of truth" (Jas. 1: 18), by the Word of God (1 Pet. 1: 23), by the gospel. Man changes the mind of his neighbor by giving him information; so God changes the mind of the sinner towards himself by revealing his truth, wisdom and love. While the sinner's mind is changed by the instructions imparted to him, still the change is effected by God and the Spirit of God, inasmuch as the means of changing the mind is supplied by God through the instrumentality of the Holy Spirit. If God had not, through the revelations of his Holy Spirit, supplied the requisite knowledge to change the mind, it would not have been changed. We are indebted to God for the truth, and to the Holy Spirit for revealing it; therefore the change is properly ascribed to God and his Spirit, although it is the truth which operates on the

mind and renews it. The Holy Spirit renews us (Titus 3: 5) but always by knowledge. Col. 3: 10.

5. *Conversion.* In the Greek conversion is always in the active voice. Conversion is a human effort; we are active, not passive, in conversion. We are converted by using our eyes, ears and understanding. Acts 28: 27. As to how conversion is brought about and what does it, we will let David, the inspired prophet of God, instruct us: "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me." "Renew a right spirit within me." Psa. 51: 10, 11. "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, his Word was in my tongue." 2 Sam. 23: 2. David had the "Holy Spirit," a "right Spirit;" his "tongue" was used to proclaim God's "Word." Now how did David convert men? After praying for the retention of God's Spirit he says: "Then will I teach transgressors thy way; and sinners shall be converted unto thee." Psa. 51: 13. David "converted sinners" and "transgressors" by teaching them God's "way"! A man becomes a sinner when he "errs from the truth;" he is converted when he returns to the truth by obedience. Jas. 5: 19, 20. The truth, then, is the power God uses to convert transgressors. "The law (doctrine, margin) of the Lord is perfect, converting (restoring, mar.) the soul." Psa. 19: 7. He who claims the law, doctrine or teaching of God's Word is inadequate to restore (convert) the soul, impugns the perfection of the inspired Word. "The law of the Lord is perfect." Jas. 1: 25.

6. *Sanctification.* The seventh day, Aaron, the tabernacle, and the altar, were all sanctified. Gen.

2: 3; Lev. 8: 10, 15, 30. When people marry they are sanctified (1 Cor. 7: 14); but they are not more immaculate than celibates. The contracting parties are set apart for each other's use in the matrimonial relation. The sanctification of the seventh day and the subsequent sanctifications of the Mosaic Kosmos were one and all a setting apart to the service of God. Now when a sinner is sanctified the same thing happens to him as occurred when the seventh day, the tabernacle and altar, were sanctified, viz.: he is set apart to the service of God. He is now to serve God, and let God use him. How is a sinner sanctified or set apart for the service of the Lord?

We are sanctified by God (1 Thes. 5: 23) and by the Holy Spirit. Rom. 15: 16. Because we are set apart by the Spirit many people have covered the subject of sanctification with a web of mystery. Many a poor soul is groping in chaos, "feeling his way" in the darkness of ancient and modern superstitions, assuming by force of habit that whatever the Spirit of God does, is sure to be of a nature that will flabbergast him. But God, dear reader, is not groggy. He does not mock us with a flatus;¹ he does not ask us to chase a phantom. "God is light and in him is no darkness at all." 1 John 1: 5. The "god of this world" (not the God of heaven) gives you inexplicable riddles to blind your mind. 2 Cor. 4: 4. The God with whom we have to do is a "God of light;" and I am certain that before him I am not esteemed flagitious² because I seek to know his operations by the Spirit. As a father will teach and simplify recondite³ subjects to his children, I feel sure

that my God, "in whom is no darkness at all," will take you in his arms, dear student, if you ask him; and for the promotion of his glory, and the honor of his great name, and to effect your sanctification, he will make his truth shine.

Our heavenly Father is "Light." 1 Jno. 1: 5. As for "darkness," there is none in him "at all." Since he is the author of the Bible, I am led to believe that it is a Book of Light—that it is not a "dark book." If there is no darkness in God "at all," how could he write a "dark book?" The Bible is not an extravaganza. Its doctrine relative to sanctification, like all other doctrines it formulates, is intelligible and soul-satisfying. The Holy Spirit sanctifies, truly, but how? Well, under the Levitical law, some beasts were sanctified—set apart—for man to use as food; others were forbidden. When Christ ended this law in his death, the Spirit of God said: "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused (for food,) if it be received with thanksgiving; *for it is sanctified by the Word of God* and prayer." 1 Tim. 4: 4, 5. The Spirit sanctifies a sinner just like it does food—"by the Word of God." When the interdiction regarding meats in Moses' law was lifted, and when the Spirit said they were all "good" and "nothing to be refused," they were all "clean," "sanctified,"—set apart for use—"by the Word of God." So the Spirit sanctifies a sinner in the same way. That we are sanctified by faith in God's Word is affirmed (Acts 20: 32) and reaffirmed. (Acts 26: 18.) "Sanctify them through thy truth," the Saviour prayed, and then gave this explanation of

what he meant by “thy truth:” “Thy Word is truth.” Jno. 17: 17. We are sanctified by the truth revealed by the Holy Spirit in God’s Word. The Word both sanctifies and cleanses. Jno. 15: 3. Christ cleanses and sanctifies obedient believers of the gospel “with the washing of water—baptism—by the Word.” Eph. 5: 26. When faith in the Word is followed by the “washing of water”—baptism—in the name of the Lord Jesus, we are sanctified—set apart—by God, by the Spirit of God, by the truth, by the Word, by faith, by the “washing of water”—baptism. 1 Cor. 6: 11.

7. *Salvation.* That the Holy Spirit gives faith and understanding; that it begets, quickens, converts, sanctifies and saves, we heartily believe; we are only showing how, through the Word, it accomplishes all this. The chimerical¹ conception that the Holy Spirit independent of the Word as an agent or medium, operates savingly upon a clodpoll,² is not only unscriptural but anti-Scriptural. It enshrouds the plan of salvation with a darkness that is lachrymose,³ and circumvents reason with a circuitous operation that is dubious. It places thousands of honest-hearted people in a quandery, with the result that they spend their lives in John Bunyan’s “Doubting Castle.”⁴ If you, beloved reader, are among this lugubrious⁵ number, accept the soul-liberating and doubt-destroying truth educes⁶ in this proposition. The Word of the Lord is not a hoax. The Spirit is not talismanic, and the Word effeminate. The Word of Jehovah is Kosher, Categorical, Ecu-
menic, and Cognoscible.⁷ It is divinely inspired, and

is a perfect treasure of heavenly instruction. It has truth without any mixture of error for its matter, and salvation for its end.

If the Word gives faith and understanding; if it begets, converts, and sanctifies (as we have proved it does,) shall we deny its power to save? To be sure, No! yet those who divorce the Spirit and Word call us Bibliolaters for believing in the saving-power of God's Word! They quote, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth" (without the Word they mean.) Now the logical upshot of this view is to divest God's Word of all its interest, efficacy and power. Salvation comes through a direct exercise of Omnipotent power; and as this renders the Bible useless and worthless, it is a parasite—a work of naught. But the text when fully quoted reads: "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." Jno. 6: 63. From which we learn that while the spirit "quickeneth" (gives life) it does so by the "words" uttered by Jesus: "They (the words) are spirit and they are life" (giving or quickening.) Because God's word gives life (Deut. 8: 3) Paul called it "The Word of Life." Phil. 2: 16. The Word begets (Jas. 1: 18; 1 Pet. 1: 21),¹ sanctifies (Jno. 17: 17), gives faith (5: 20),² cleanses (Jno. 15: 3; Eph. 5: 26), builds up and saves Acts 20: 32; Jas. 1: 21.

8. *We commit no paralogism³ when we say that the Holy Spirit comforted, led, guided and taught the apostles in the same intelligent manner. The Spirit is called the Comforter (Parakletos, paraclete) Jno.*

14: 26; 18: 13.¹ How did it comfort the prelate members of Christ's Church who were endowed with supernatural power, and the members of the Body who did not have miraculous powers? In exactly the same way. Writing to an afflicted Church Paul says: "Comfort one another with these words." 1 Thes. 1: 18.² The Holy Spirit in comforting the brethren used "words." And Paul declares he comforted others with the same comfort with which he was comforted of God. 2 Cor. 1: 4. And the Spirit led, taught and guided the apostles through the truth, the spirit revealed (of course) 1 Jno. 5: 6. The Holy Spirit still comforts God's people by his inspired revelations; and these same instructions of the Spirit, recorded by the apostles, teach, lead and guide men, in all decades and centuries, into all religious truth.

9. *And the witness of the Spirit is in harmony with intelligence and reason.* To witness is to state what is known on any subject: so the Holy Spirit as a witness testifies or states in his revelations, who, for instance, are children of God: "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil; whosoever does not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother." 1 Jno. 3: 10. "If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is born of him"—is a child of God, 2: 29. "As many as are led by the Spirit of God (by following his instructions,) they are the sons of God." Rom. 8: 14. If any one compares himself with the spirit's testimony, in these and other Scriptures, and his spirit or conscience testifies that he possesses the character of a child of God, as

described by the Spirit, then the Holy Spirit bears witness that the man is a child of God. In this study do not forget this already demonstrated thesis, that the Spirit has revealed the truth through men who spake and wrote under its inspiration. 2 Tim. 3: 16; 2 Pet. 1: 21; 1 Cor. 2: 9-13; Eph. 3: 1-5. And that, therefore, the written Word—the Bible—is the testimony which the Spirit, as a witness, has delivered. 1 Jno. 5: 6-14. To illustrate this by one or two citations: David said: “To-day, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your heart.” Psa. 97: 7.¹ Paul, quoting this language, says: “Wherefore as the Holy Spirit saith, to-day, if ye will hear his voice,” etc., Heb. 3: 7-10. Why did Paul quote what David said as the language of the Holy Spirit? Because the Spirit spake by David. 2 Sam. 23: 1, 2. In the same way Peter quotes David, “The Holy Spirit by the mouth of David spake,” etc., Acts 1: 16. We hear “What the Spirit says unto the churches” when we read the messages written to them in the Apocalypse² 2: 29. “And what shall I say more? for the time would fail me to tell of” (Heb. 11: 32) all the places where the written words of God, recorded in the Bible, are peremptorily declared to be the testimony which the Holy Spirit, as a witness, has stated. We must take these passages at their “face value,” or we stigmatize the Word of God as meritricious.³ Take the Word to your bosom, dear reader, it is the testimony of the Holy Spirit.

10. *If the Bible, then, is the witness of the Holy Spirit, it follows that the “fruits of the Spirit”—love, joy, peace, etc., are produced by the instruc-*

tions and promises of the Spirit revealed in the Scriptures, and not by the Spirit operating personally in a slapdash way upon the mind of the believer. Remember that the witness of the Spirit (Rom. 8: 16), being after the Spirit (v. 5), and led by it (v. 14), is obeying "the (law) of the Spirit of life" (v. 2). The word "law" in Hebrew, Greek, Latin and English means a code of rules to govern human action. Now, Christ said his words were spirit and life. Jno. 6: 63. His "Words" are "law;" and since his words are Spirit, "the law of the Spirit" must mean the Bible, for nowhere else do you find the words of Jesus, the Son of God. Now believers are filled "with joy and peace in believing" (Rom. 15: 13), in believing the precious promises of God; and the disciples are "strengthened with might by his Spirit in their inner man" by Christ dwelling in our hearts "by faith" (Eph. 3: 16, 17); and in the same way are "rooted and grounded in love." So with all the graces of the Spirit: they are realized through the Spirit's instructions and exhortations. Paul exhorted the brethren, saying, "Put on, as the elect of God, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering, love." Col. 3: 12. If the brethren to whom Paul wrote, heeded the instruction and exhortation of the Spirit in the epistle, and "put on" these graces, the "fruits of the Spirit" was then borne by them. Gal. 5: 22-24.

IV. *We must believe the doctrines that are taught in the Bible in order to be saved.* Matt. 15: 14¹; 2 Jno. 9, 10, 11, 12; Jno. 15: 6, 7; Mark 16: 16; 2 Thes.

2: 10-12; Rev. 21: 8; Heb. 3: 12-19; 2 Thes. 1: 10; Jno. 4: 41, 42; 5: 34; 12: 48.

This proposition is very broad and sweeping, and we ask the reader to consider it well. The plenary¹ inspiration of the Bible clothes it with divine authority. God gave His Word to inspired men (Psa. 68: 11), and the word he put into their mouths they had to speak; they had no "power" to say anything else. Num. 22: 35, 38; 24: 13. Moses was inspired by the Spirit (Num. 11: 17). That inspiration includes the "words" as well as the conceptions, thoughts, and ideas of the prophets, is clear from Jer. 26: 2: "Stand in the court of the Lord's house, and speak unto all the cities of Judah, * * * *all the words that I command thee to speak unto them; diminish not a word.*" So when Joshua read Moses' writings to Israel "there was not a *word* which Joshua read not" (Jos. 8: 35). Hundreds of years after, when Solomon was dedicating the Lord's House, he said with divine wisdom in his heart, "There hath not failed *one word* of all his good promise, which he promised by the hand of Moses." 1 Kings 8: 56. Peter in urging us to study the writings of prophets and apostles says to "be mindful of their *words.*" 2 Pet. 3: 2. In another place he says that the written prophecies are "more sure" than the audible Voice that spake on the Holy Mount (2 Pet. 1: 19)²; and the Master says that "Moses and the prophets" have more "certainty" (Luke 1: 4) and authority than a man would have were he raised from the dead. Luke 16: 31.

That a man cannot be saved unless he believes the doctrines revealed in the Holy Scriptures, is apparent from the texts cited above. When men substitute their traditions for God's Word, his commandments, our Lord says they are "blind" and that their worship of the Father is "vain." Matt. 15: 14, 9. When they "transgress the doctrine of Christ" they have neither the Father to bless them nor the Son to save them. 2 Jno 9: 11.¹ If they consent not to the "wholesome words, even the *words* of the Lord Jesus Christ," they are utterly condemned. 1 Tim. 6: 3-6. Unless Christ's "words" abide in us, we are like the withered branch of a tree. Jno. 15: 7, 6. No man can be a disciple of Christ unless the word of Christ abides in him (Jno. 8: 31). Because his word had no place in the Jews they killed the Lord of glory. v. 37. Hence his sayings are to "save" us (John 5: 34), and his "words" are to judge us 12: 48. We are commanded to believe (Rom. 14: 23; Mark 1: 15; 1 Jno. 3: 23) the word, "the word of truth, the gospel of salvation." (Eph. 1: 13). We must believe the gospel as it was preached by Christ and his apostles in order to be saved. Luke 4: 43; 9: 1, 6; Mark 16: 16; Gal. 1: 8. Without the Bible we could not ascertain what they preached, could not believe, and so could not be saved. Therefore the Bible was expressly written so we could believe, "and believing, have life" through the name of Christ. Jno. 20: 31.

Dear reader, if you have thus far followed our disquisition² on "The Bible," we hope you have been impressed with the dignity and worth of the Holy

Book, and are now fully persuaded that it has God for its author, truth without any mixture of error for its matter, and salvation for its end. Read the Bible. Jno. 5: 39. It is God's book. Isa. 34: 16. Obey the Bible. 1 Pet. 4: 17; 1: 22, 23. It is God's law. Psa. 19: 7. Love the Bible. Deut. 6: 4-9. It is God's gift. Ezek. 20: 11. Trust the Bible. Isa. 26: 4. It is God's promise. Heb. 6: 13-20. We are living in darkness. Eph. 5: 8. It is your lantern. Psa. 119: 105-130. We are in the enemy's land. 2 Cor. 4: 4. It is your sword. Eph. 6: 17. Sin abounds. John 3: 19. It is your safeguard. Psa. 119: 9-11. The world is full of falsehoods. Jno. 8: 44. It is truth. Jno. 17: 17. If you now share with us the profound conviction of the inerrancy¹ of the inspired volume, you will diligently study the following subsume² of our faith, the "Fundamental Principles" of God's Word. God bless you in the study we pray.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.

A DECLARATION, CONTAINING IN BRIEF
OUTLINE A STATEMENT OF THE DOC-
TRINES "MOST SURELY BELIEVED
AMONG US." LUKE 1: 1.

The Bible.

1. The book currently known as the Bible, consisting of the Scriptures of Moses, the prophets, and the apostles, is the only written revelation God has given to man. This revelation was made by the Holy Spirit through God-selected men, is without error, and is the Word of God. 2 Tim. 3: 16; 1 Cor. 2: 13; Heb. 1: 1; 2 Pet. 1: 21; 1 Cor. 14: 37; Neh. 9: 20, 30; Jno. 10: 35.

2. We must believe the doctrines that are taught in the Bible in order to be saved. Matt. 15: 14; 2 Jno. 9: 12; 2 Jno. 15: 6, 7; Mark 16: 16; 2 Thes. 2: 10-12; Rev. 21: 8; Heb. 3: 12-19; 2 Thes. 1: 10; Jno. 4: 41, 42; 5: 34; 12: 48.

The Gospel.

1. Salvation is conditioned upon hearing, believing, and obeying the gospel. Rom. 10: 13-17; 1 Cor. 1: 21; Mark 16: 16; Rom. 1: 16; 1 Cor. 15: 2; 1 Pet. 1: 22-25.

2. The gospel consists of the truths "concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ." Acts 8: 12; Mark 1: 14; Luke 9: 2, 6; Acts 19: 8; 20: 25; 28: 30, 31.

The Kingdom of God.

1. The kingdom of God will be a divine political dominion established on the earth. Dan. 2: 44; 7: 13, 14; Rev. 10: 15;¹ Isa. 32: 6²; 11: 9, 10.

2. At the close of the times of the Gentiles, God will send Christ in person to the earth to "set it up." Acts 3: 20, 21; Psa. 102: 16, 21; 2 Tim. 4: 1; Luke 19: 12-16;³ Acts 1: 9, 11; Dan. 7: 13.

3. The kingdom established on the land bequeathed to Abraham for an everlasting possession at that time will be the kingdom of Israel restored. Micha⁴ 4: 6-8; Amos 9: 11, 15; Ezek. 37: 21, 22; Jer. 23: 3, 8; Gen. 13: 14-17; Heb. 11: 8, 9; Gal. 3: 16; Lev. 26: 42; Micha⁴ 7: 20.

4. The restoration of the kingdom involves the ingathering of God's chosen nation, the Israelites, and the building again of Jerusalem to become "the throne of the Lord" and the Metropolis of the whole earth. Isa. 11: 12; Jer. 31: 10; Zech. 7: 8;⁵ Ezek. 36: 34, 36; Isa. 51: 3; 62: 4; Jer. 3: 17; Mic. 4: 7, 8; Joel 3: 17; Isa. 24: 23.

5. Christ will be King. His associates will be the saints of all generations, developed and immortalized by resurrection, and constituting, with Christ their head, the collective "seed of Abraham," in whom all the families of the earth will be blessed, and including "Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets," and all in their age of like faithfulness. Zech. 14: 9; Dan. 12: 2; Luke 13: 28; Rev. 11: 18; 1 Thes. 4: 15-17; Jno. 5: 28, 29; 6: 39, 40; Luke 14: 14; Matt. 25: 34, 36.

The Reign of Christ.

1. Christ and his immortal saints will reign in the kingdom of God one thousand years, during which time sin and death will continue among earth's inhabitants (the remnants of the Jewish and Gentile nations) though in a milder degree than now. Rev. 20: 7-9²; 12: 15¹; Isa. 65: 20; Ezek 20: 33-39; Zech. 14: 12-20; 13: 7-9; 1 Cor. 15: 24, 29.³

2. A law will be established for the subjects of the kingdom; they will be instructed "in righteousness." War will be abolished to the ends of the earth, and the glory and knowledge of the Lord will cover the earth. Mic. 4: 2; Isa. 42: 14;⁴ 11: 2-5; 2: 3, 4; Heb. 2: 5.⁵

3. During the thousand years reign of Christ and his Brethren "all enemies" will be subdued. "All rule and all authority and all power" of human governments will be destroyed; ignorance will be removed; and finally death itself, "the last enemy", will be extirpated.⁶ Dan. 2: 44; Rev. 11: 15; Isa. 25: 6-9; 1 Cor. 15: 25, 26⁷; Rev. 20: 12-15; 21: 4.

4. After the one thousand years have expired there will "a little season," during which time there is a resurrection and judgment of the "rest of the dead," that is, those who have died during the reign of Christ. Judgment will result in the extinction of all sin and sinners, and the immortalization of those who shall establish a title to eternal life during the thousand years. 1 Cor. 15: 24; Rev. 20.

5. Then the kingdom will be delivered up by Christ to his Father, who will manifest himself as the

“all in all;” sin and death having been taken out of the way, and the earth peopled with sinless immortals. 1 Cor. 15: 28; Rev. 21: 1-10.

The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

1. There is only one God, the Father. Deut. 6: 4; Mark 12: 29-32; 1 Cor. 8: 4-6; Eph. 4: 6.

2. Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of God, begotten of Mary by the Holy Spirit, without the intervention of man. Matt. 1: 23; 1 Tim. 1: 16; Luke 1: 26-35.

3. He died, was buried, and rose again, and ascended to heaven where he is officiating priest for his own house only. Luke 24: 51; Acts 5: 31; 1 Tim. 2: 5; Acts 15: 14; Jno. 17: 9; 1 Jno. 2: 1; Prov. 27: 13.²

4. The Holy Spirit is the power of God in official manifestation. Its possession and gifts were limited to the official members of Christ's church in the days of the apostles. Luke 1: 35; Acts 1: 8; Mic. 3: 5-9; Eph. 4: 8-17; 1 Cor. 13.

The Nature of Man.

1. Man is mortal. Job 4: 17; 14: 10-16; Psa. 49: 14-20; Eccl. 3: 18-22; 1 Cor. 15: 47, 48.

2. During the death state he is unconscious. Eccl. 9; Psa. 146: 4; 6: 5; 88: 10-13.

The Resurrection.

1. Resurrection is an awakening to life and consciousness of people who are dead and in the dust of the earth. Job. 14: 13, 14; 19: 26, 27; Psa. 17: 15; Isa. 26: 19; 1 Cor. 15.

2. The subjects of resurrection consist of two classes—the just and the unjust, the righteous and the wicked of all ages who have been blessed with the privilege of light. The just are those who have obeyed the faith: they come forth at the resurrection invested with immortality, and are exalted to reign with Christ as joint heirs of the kingdom, co-possessors of the earth, and joint administrators of God's authority among men in every thing. The unjust embraces apostates and all others who know the revealed will of God, and have neither believed nor obeyed it: they come forth at the resurrection to be consigned to shame and the second death. Matt. 7: 26; 8: 12; 15: 20¹; Gal. 1: 8; 5: 21; 2 Thes. 1: 8; Heb. 10: 26-28²; Rev. 21: 8; Mal. 4: 1; Psa. 37; Rev. 5: 9, 10; 3: 21; Luke 22: 29-30.

3. A third class, consisting of people who are ignorant of the gospel, and who are not therefore eligible to either reward for obedience or punishment for disobedience post-resurrectionally, are irresponsible; they are not raised from the dead. John 15: 22-24; 9: 40, 41; Jas. 4: 17; 2 Cor. 4: 3; Psa. 17: 14; Matt. 6: 2; Psa. 73: 22; 88: 4, 5; Isa. 43: 17; Prov. 21: 16; Amos 8: 11-14; Obad. 16; Dan. 12: 2; John 5: 28, 29; Rev. 20: 12-15.

Baptism.

Baptism (immersion of a believer in water) is essential to the remission of sins, to adoption into Christ, to heirship of the gospel preached to Abraham, and to salvation and entrance into the kingdom of God. Acts 2: 38; 22: 16; Rom. 6; Col. 2; Jno. 3: 5; 10: 1, 9; Gal. 3: 27³; Mark 16: 16.

The Breaking of Bread.

The breaking of bread on the First Day of the week by obedient believers only, is binding, and essential to our acceptance with God. Matt. 26: 26-30; Acts 2: 42; 20: 7; 1 Cor. 10: 16, 17; 11: 2, 23-34; 5¹; Jno. 6: 48, 59²; Heb. 10: 26-39; 1 Jno. 1: 7-10; 2 Jno. 10.

The Commandments.

None are recognized by Christ as his friends except those who obey the commandments. Matt. 28: 20; Jno. 15: 14; 1 Cor. 14: 37; 2 Pet. 1; 1 Cor. 13.

Doctrines We Reject.

We reject the following propositions as unscriptural: That the Bible is only partly inspired, or if wholly so, that inspiration has made errors or allowed them to be made in the Bible; That God is three persons; That the Son of God personally pre-existed; That Joseph was the father of Christ; That Christ's nature was immaculate; That the Holy Spirit is a person distinct from the Father; That man has an immortal soul; That man consciously exists in death; That the righteous go to heaven when they die; That the punishment of the wicked is eternal torments entered into at death; That the devil is an immortal being; That the kingdom of God is the church; That the gospel is the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ merely; That Christ will not come till the close of the thousand years; That the resurrection of the wicked is confined to apostates; That the law of Moses is binding on believers of the gospel; That sprinkling is Scriptural baptism; That

people in ignorance, those who have not heard, believed, and obeyed the gospel, will be saved unconditionally; That morality and sincerity will save men without the gospel; That "faith alone" will save without obedience to gospel requirements; That we cannot believe the gospel without the direct influence of the Holy Spirit; That men are pre-destined to salvation unconditionally; and That a knowledge of the truth is not necessary to make immersion valid baptism.

EXPLANATIONS OF TEXTS

EXPLANATIONS OF TEXTS.

“Like the Son of God.”

As to Christ's pre-existence, there seems to be some proof of it in Dan. 3. When the three Hebrew children were cast into the fiery furnace, Nebuchadnezzar said, “Lo, I see four men loose . . . and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God.” V. 23.¹ Was not the fourth man the Son of God? and, if so, he must have pre-existed.—*Walter Goodyear.*

REPLY.

If Christ personally pre-existed, and in this pre-existent state was the Son of God, you are enveloped at once in a darkness that can be felt. In order to have a Son you must have 1. A father. 2. A mother. 3. A begetting. 4. And birth. If Christ existed before his begetting and birth of Mary 1910 years ago, and was the Son of God, he must have had a father and mother; and he must have been begotten and born in his pre-existent state. But since he was begotten by God of the Virgin Mary, and was born of her 1910 years ago, it would follow that God was the father of Christ twice; that Christ had two mothers; that Christ was begotten twice by the same father, of different mothers, at different times; and was born twice by different mothers, though begotten by the same Father!!! What a camel to swallow; and how serious a doctrinal mistake to deny, as this pre-existent theory does, the Sonship of the Lord's Anointed!

The suggestion that Christ the Son of God pre-existed, and that he appeared in the fiery furnace and saved the three Hebrew children from hurt, is at war with every principle of revealed truth. To angels, not to Christ, is committed the work of ministration (Heb. 1: 14), providence, etc., as it is written: "The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them," Psa. 34: 7. "Many are the afflictions of the righteous; but the Lord delivereth him out of them all," v. 19. "The angel of the Lord" is appointed to deliver the righteous out of their "many" troubles. When the Hebrew children were thrown into the furnace, they had one of the "many" "afflictions of the righteous;" and as the promise speaks of an angel to encamp "round about" and effect their deliverance, we would expect an angel, not Christ, to do the work. And according to the promise so it came to pass: "The form of the fourth is like the Son of God." The record does not say, "The fourth is the Son of God." Nay, verily; he is "*like* the Son of God." I submit that if a son is "like" his father, he is not his father. If then we are logical we are forced to conclude that since the fourth man in the furnace is said to be "like the Son of God," he was not the being whom he was "like," and *ergo* was not the Son of God. Angels are "like" the Son of the Holy; and it is said in so many words that the angel delivered the Hebrew children (Dan. 3: 28) from hurt in the furnace; and Daniel from the mouth of the lions. Dan. 6: 22. I feel sure that our dear friend Good-year, who loves the truth, but who, on this question,

differs from us, and therefore stands aloof from us, will, upon prayerful thought and meditation, come into "the unity of the faith" and of "the knowledge of the Son of God," Eph. 4: 13. Eternal life turns on him doing this, Jno. 17: 3. May the Lord keep him from idols. 1 Jno. 5: 21.

Christ Before John.

John 1: 30 is a text difficult to understand unless Christ pre-existed.—*Walter Goodyear.*

REPLY.

Speaking of Christ John says, "He it is, who coming after me." Jno. 1: 27. Then speaking of himself John says, "I am sent before him." 3: 28. Physically John existed before Christ. Being six months older than our Saviour (Luke 1: 36) he was "before" him; was "sent before him;" but John decreased while Christ increased, John 3: 30. Our dear friend seems to think that the words, "He was before me" (Jno. 1: 30) mean that Christ existed before John; and as John was six months older than Christ, therefore Christ must have existed before his begetting and birth. But this is sorry logic, for John is not trying to show that Jesus existed before himself. Christ was not "before" John in the sense of existing first. John was a "burning and shining light," Jno. 5: 35; Christ was the light of the world. Jno. 1: 9. God gave Christ "greater witness than that of John." V. 36.¹ John, great as he was, was servant to Jesus as Lord; "Whose shoes," says he, "I am not worthy to bear,"

Matt. 3: 11. Feeling his inferiority as compared with his Master, he "forbade him" to be baptized, and humbly said, "I have need to be baptized of thee." V. 14. When he saw the Spirit publicly designate Christ at his baptism as the Messiah, and the beloved of God, he exclaimed, "Behold the Lamb of God." Jno. 1: 33-36.¹ On first seeing Jesus, realizing the greatness of the Lord's Christ, he said, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me; for he was (preferred) before me." There is a vast deal of difference between preference and existence. The word prefer means "To set above something else in estimation, choice, or liking; to regard or honor before another; to incline more toward; to choose; often followed by to, before or above." In "estimation, choice or liking," God preferred Christ to John. He was "inclined more toward" Christ than John. He preferred Christ "to," "before" and "above," John. "After me cometh a man which is preferred before (above) me: for he was (preferred) before (above) me."

Seeing God in the Flesh.

How do you explain Job 19: 26: "Yet in my flesh shall I see God." Other texts teach man is to have a spiritual form after the resurrection.—*Anna Drew.*

REPLY.

I presume Sister Drew's difficulty is this: "In my flesh" describes a mortal body; and as this makes the

text teach we are to “see God” as mortal beings, it contradicts “other texts” in her mind which teach we are to have a “spiritual form” subsequent to the resurrection. Let us analyze the text, and elucidate it by finding out what is meant by 1. Seeing God. 2. “In my flesh.”

1. *Seeing God.* “In my flesh shall I see God.” Even when Jesus was here in mortal flesh, wearing our sinful nature, he could say, “He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.” Jno. 14: 9. Before his death Christ was like God in character; after his resurrection he was consubstantial with the Father in nature. Jno. 5: 26. He is now morally and physically the “express image of his (Father’s) person,” Heb. 1: 3. Having been raised to life forever more (Rev. 1: 18), Job, as a prophet endowed with pre-science,¹ speaks of him as his Redeemer: “I know that my Redeemer liveth.” 19: 25. “He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth;” he is to re-appear upon earth, in the “image” of his Father; and as he will be a perfect representative of God, Job will “see God,” in the person of his Son.

2. *“In my flesh.”* Job’s “Redeemer” will appear—“stand upon the earth”—in “the latter days.” In the absence of his Redeemer, he knew that he must die, that worms would devour his body, (19: 26); that he would return to the dust. His Redeemer, however, would redeem him; he would “stand upon the earth,” and “in my flesh” I will see him. “I shall see him for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another.” 19: 27. As much as

to say, when I am redeemed from death by resurrection, I will be "myself," "not another" (somebody else). That he will have a "spiritual form" is also a truth we must not forget. A "spiritual form" is not a flatus.¹ Christ had this "form" after his resurrection, but he had "flesh and bones"—"It is I myself." Luke 24: 39. When Christ was a mortal man he was flesh and blood; he lived by blood. 1 Cor. 15: 50; Lev. 17: 11. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." But flesh and bone can. And so then when this mortal body becomes immortal by "change," 1 Cor. 15: 53, we will have a "spiritual body," (verse 44), a "spiritual form;" a body of flesh and bones, living by the power of the Spirit instead of blood. We will then take on the likeness of Christ, (Psa. 17: 15), and see him "as he is," and be "like him." 1 Jno. 3: 2. Our present mortal bodies will be "fashioned like unto his glorious body." Phil. 3: 21. Immortalization does not obliterate "flesh and bones;" our Lord had these in his "glorious body;" he was still "flesh and bones"—"myself." Now since we are to be "like him," we will have an immortal body of "flesh and bones." And although Job as a "flesh and blood" man (1 Cor. 15: 50) cannot inherit the kingdom, he expected a "change" to the "spiritual form" at the "appointed time." 14: 14.² As he expected to be "like" his "Redeemer;" and have a "glorious body" of "flesh and bones" as he had, he could and did say with truthfulness, "In my flesh shall I see God." He will still be in flesh, though "fashioned" like Christ's

“glorious body.” Dear reader, will you be in “fashion” when the Lord comes?

The Necessity of Christ's Death.

During his personal ministry Christ preached to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Was it possible for them to receive him; if so, was his death necessary? If it was not possible for them to receive him, why did he preach to them?—*G. W. Smith.*

REPLY.

We cannot write upon hypothetical questions like this one with the strength of settled convictions. Sometimes Bible writers introduced hypothetical premises, and reasoned out results; but they were inspired, and their conclusions infallible, 1 Cor. 15. Good brethren sometimes venture where angels dare not tread. They reason on the uncertainties of an “if” until they become mere speculators. Once get away from the law and testimony, Isa. 8: 20, and one guess is as good as another. It becomes expositors of the Word to stay close to what is written. Let us be careful. It may be that the following remarks, based on the authority of the Inspired Volume, will be helpful to readers in general, and Brother Smith in particular:

1. *It was not possible for the Jewish nation to receive Christ; this would have falsified prophecies which predicted his rejection by them. See Isa. 53: 6, 9, 10.*¹

2. *After quoting one of these prophecies John says, “They could not believe.” “Nevertheless,” he adds, “among the chief rulers also many believed on*

him," Jno. 12: 39-42. While, then, the nation rejected Christ (Jno. 1: 11), individuals received him, v. 12. Prophecies are generally national in their scope. The prophecies made it impossible for the Jewish nation to accept the Anointed. Good and honest hearted people, however, received him gladly and joyfully. Luke 8: 15.

3. *Therefore Christ's death was absolutely necessary, not only for Christ individually, Heb. 5: 8, 9, but for all of the Jewish nation, and of all nations, who sought and are seeking to escape the condemnation of the law of sin and death. Heb. 9: 15, 22, 28; Rom. 8: 3.*

Is Salvation Universal?

We trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe. 1 Tim. 4: 10. Do you understand by this verse that all men will ultimately be saved?—*E. D. Lindsay.*

REPLY.

We have not so learned Christ. Eph. 4: 20. The word Saviour in 1 Tim. 4: 10 is from *Soter*, and means preserver. God is the preserver of all men, now (v. 8). He sends his rain on the just and unjust, Matt. 5: 45; he deals kindly and fatherly with the wicked as well as with the just. He graciously preserves the life of the wicked, shows them his long-suffering and goodness Rom. 2: 4, that they may be saved if they will. 2 Pet. 3: 9. Delay in their damnation not only gives them opportunity to be saved, but makes God's justice stand out in bold relief when he executes "upon them the judgment written." Psa. 149: 9. Our God has told us that if we

sow to the flesh we shall reap corruption. Gal. 6: 8, but he does not "speedily" (Eccl. 8: 11) give us the harvest; he tells us, however, that he is "not mocked," and that "it shall not be well with the wicked" Eccl. 8: 13. His loving hands now holds in abeyance the penalty of his violated law; he is the Saviour now of even unbelievers (1 Tim. 2: 4); that is, he is their Preserver and Benefactor. He is Saviour of all men potentially (1: 15); of believers alone effectually. 1 Pet. 1: 9. God has decreed that the wicked must die. Ezek. 18: 20. When "Watchmen" (33: 6, 7) or preachers of the Universalist faith, declare that a man may sow to the flesh and then reap everlasting life, they think to "mock" God. When they say "it shall be well with the wicked"—so "well" that he will be saved, they belie the Word of God. When they proclaim that "the soul that sinneth it shall live" they utter blasphemy. They "strengthen the hands of the wicked that he should not turn from his wicked way, by promising him life." Ezek. 13: 22. This was one of the "lies" preached in Ezekiel's time, and which made "the heart of the righteous sad" (5: 22).¹ It avails nothing to say, "O they will not get immortality, just eternal life;" or "O, they will not be kings and priests; they lose this position and reward." The text says it is a lie to promise the wicked "life"—that it strengthens his hands in sin "that he should not turn from his wicked way." What did this? The promise of "life." Not one word about immortality (as distinguished from eternal life;) not a word about "position" or reward. *Life—LIFE—LIFE.* That is what the universalist

promises every man, and that promise, when believed, confirms people in sin. All such die unwarned, and as "watchmen" we are responsible for their blood. We must die for our unfaithfulness, Ezek. 33: 7-9.

Be careful, dear ones in the Lord. In getting away from eternal torment do not get away from "the wrath of God" which is "revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness." Rom. 1: 18. A truth exaggerated becomes a lie. Truth is often over-stated. Sometimes our dear brethren unthinkingly endorse an extreme statement, before they see the absurdities to which they are logically committed. They look only at the point of doctrine under discussion, and do not see other doctrines inseparably entwined with it. Without looking at logical sequences, disconnecting the theory presented from all its dependent doctrines, they decide as to the truth of the dogma, thus isolated! Dear ones, stop and think! Universal salvation will never trouble you if you will keep in your mind conclusions to which it leads. I will state a few of these conclusions. Absurdities to which this view of salvation drives one can be numbered by the dozens; for lack of space we only state two or three:

1. *Salvation means deliverance or rescue.* How can there be any salvation when there is nothing to be saved from? If there is no future punishment there can be no future salvation. If sin is punished in this world there is no salvation in this life; and if there is no future punishment to which sinners are liable, there is no future salvation. Universal salva-

tion when carried to its logical sequence, means no salvation at all!

2. *If men are punished awhile for their sins, and then let go into the home of the blood-washed throng, among the redeemed, themselves redeemed, salvation is separate from, and independent of, forgiveness!*

3. *If the punishment to which the wicked are subject is remedial and not penal (which, by the way, is only purgatory white-washed); if it is disciplinary not punitive; if they come out of it purified, not destroyed; then we should not preach the gospel; we should do nothing else but pray for God to speedily and abundantly pour out his wrath upon the ungodly that they may be "purified"!*

4. *And finally: If sinners are "purified" by punishment their punishment (not Christ) saves them. Therefore salvation is independent of Christ's death, sacrifice and atonement! Salvation through punishment would have been universal had there been no Christ! Jesus is no longer Saviour; his atonement is denied; forgiveness is displaced; his Sonship is repudiated, and God's law of pardon is made void. It sends its shocking vibrations through the entire system of divine truth. "A word to the wise is sufficient."*

Tithing.

We know that God has approved the tithing plan under two dispensations, and why not under this one? If you will read 1 Cor. 9: 13, 14, you will see that the tithing system is transferred to the gospel dispensation. Don't you think so?—
Eld. H. C. Gregg.

REPLY.

Without doubt reference is made to the Levitical priesthood in 1 Cor. 9: 13: "They which minister about holy things live (feed, mar.) of the things of the temple." "Under two dispensations" and under the present kosmos, called by Bro. Gregg, "the gospel dispensation," God has "ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." (v. 14). We are left without doubts on this point by the following plain Scripture: "It is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn." "For our sake, no doubt, this is written; that he that ploweth should plow in hope, and he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope." "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?" (vs. 9, 10, 11). "For our sakes" these Scriptures were "written in the law of Moses." Those who claim it is wrong to pay a proficient servant of God who preaches the gospel, denies to him the pecuniary¹ compensation which is rightfully his. They would not "plow" without "hope" of raising a crop. They would not plow an ox muzzled—they would not, for any consideration, plow a beast without feeding it. Yet they would work a minister unfed! In other words, they would treat an ox better than a minister of God!!

Admitting that those who sow spiritual things have the right to do so "in hope" of reaping "Carnal things," the question arises, How much ought we to give to support the gospel? Bro. Gregg thinks the tenth. Our dear brother is a deep Bible Student,

and his opinion has great weight with me. We have not yet, however, been convinced that the "tithing system" is a part of gospel duties. To me, I must confess, the evidence for the tithing plan is not sufficiently strong to convince the understanding. Love is the ruling principle of this dispensation. The philanthropical basis of the Christian economy contravenes the iron-clad rule of a tenth. Benevolence dislikes a circumscription of its bounty. Liberality by "law established" is the "tithing system;" liberality unbounded, as God has prospered us, is the gospel requirement. 1 Cor. 16: 2. And in keeping with this principle of giving, no definite amount is stated in 1 Cor. 9: 13. This text contretemps¹ tithing. Paul does not say, "Those who preach the gospel should have a tenth;" but "should live of the gospel." This is what God has "ordained"—they shall "live of the gospel." If Paul was seeking to show that the "tithing system" approved "under two dispensations" was "transferred to the gospel dispensation," he should have said, "They shall have a tenth." God bless the reader in his study of this subject.

"Not Able to Kill the Soul."

Give an explanation of Matt. 10: 28.—*Anna Drew.*

REPLY.

The text reads, "Fear not them that kill the body but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both body and soul in hell." The immortal soulist in reading this verse of Scripture puts emphasis on the words, "not able to kill the

soul." To his mind this phrase proves that the soul has a different nature from the body. The body can be killed, the soul cannot be killed, therefore, he concludes, it must be immortal. In order to "rightly divide the word of truth," and to see how weak the expression is, let me ask, Who are "not able to kill the soul?" God sent his apostles into the world as "sheep in the midst of wolves," (v. 16). Kings, governors and wicked men (vs. 18, 22) persecuted and killed the saints, killed their bodies; "and after that," says Christ, "have no more that they can do." Luke 12: 4. Of men it is said, they are "not able to kill the soul." Many things men are "not able to do" can be done. Under certain circumstances a mortal body cannot be killed. An illustration: Suppose a mob undertakes to lynch a prisoner who is incarcerated within the walls of a jail. The Sheriff enlists a sufficient number of the police and other help to defy and defeat the enraged mob. He might address them and say, you cannot, you are "not able," to kill him. Would you conclude from this form of speech that the culprit was immortal? Certainly not. The prisoner is a mortal man, but circumstances of a defensive nature justifies the statement made.

The words, "not able to kill the soul" do not militate¹ against the mortality of man's nature. When we finish the text our interpretation is demonstrated correct: "Fear him which is able to destroy both body and soul in hell." Man, it is admitted, is "not able to kill the soul;" but the text speaks of One who is to be "feared" and who is "able to destroy" it. Under certain circumstances man is "not able" to

kill the soul; under other conditions he can. Rev. 6: 11. Lexicons define the word *apokteino*, here translated "kill," "to kill utterly." In view of the fact that man under stated conditions can kill the soul, together with the truth that God is "able" at all times to "destroy" it,—how weak the statement, "not able to kill the soul;" and how inadequate a foundation upon which to build the Cyclopean¹ doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and all its ramifications!

The text asserts that God is "able," not only to kill the soul, but to "destroy" it as well. This statement is meaningless unless God means to do what he is "able" to do. Here it is declared God has power to destroy the soul; other texts asseverate² that he will. Acts 3: 23. "Every soul which will not hear that prophet, *shall be destroyed* from among the people." It cannot be claimed that God will destroy the soul in some "spiritual sense," for the word "Destroy" is applied to "both body and soul." He destroys the soul in the same sense he destroys the body. He destroys "both." As the soul is destroyed in the same sense the body is, we conclude the soul is just as mortal as the body.

Visions vs. Realities.

Please explain Luke 9: 30, 31.—*Mrs. N. H. Wolf.*

REPLY.

Luke 9: 30, 31 reads: "Behold, there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elias: who appeared in glory, and spake of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem." Christ's transfig-

uration is the theme under discussion when these words were used. Matthew says in his account of the same incident that it was a "vision." Matt. 17: 9. *Horama*, the Greek word translated vision here, occurs in ten other texts in the New Testament. In no instance does the word import the idea of reality. When the Lord spoke to Ananias "in a vision," he did not speak to him personally. Acts 9: 10. When Paul was praying and had a vision of Ananias coming to him and putting his hand on him, he only had prophetic intimation of what was to occur and did occur afterwards. Acts 9: 12. In a vision Peter saw a vessel descend from heaven like a sheet knit at the four corners, full of "four footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air." Acts 10: 3, 11, 12, 17, 19; 11: 3.¹ No one pleads that Peter's vision was literal. Later Peter was released from prison by an angel, and here we are told that a vision is not a reality: "He went out, and followed him; and wist not it was true (real) which was done by the angel; *but thought he saw a vision.*" Acts 12: 9.

The other texts where *horama* is translated vision are Acts 16: 9, 10; 18: 9. Though *horama* occurs eleven times in the New Testament, it always means visionary scenes in opposition to "true" or real existencies. When people argue that Moses and Elias were alive hundreds of years after they had died, that they "appeared in glory" and talked with our Lord as a matter of fact, they are guilty of confounding visions with realities. They might just as well represent that the sheet which Peter saw in his vision,

“knit at the four corners,” was a literal sheet; and that the four-footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air, were all literal, therefore that “heaven,” the place from which the sheet was let down, is literally full of these literal, beastly creatures! The scenes of the transfiguration were not literal. Although Christ had not yet died, he is represented as glorified; although Moses and Elias were both dead, they are represented as there “in glory.” Premature of the reality, the vision instantly passed away. Matt. 17: 8. It exhibited nothing as existing, permanent realities; it was merely prophetic of Christ’s second coming in power and majesty (2 Pet. 1: 16) to establish a kingdom “that cannot be moved” (Heb. 12: 28)—a pictorial illustration of “good things to come.”

The Progress and Climax of Sin. Psalms 1: 1.

“Blessed (*ashre*, happy) is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful.” Psa. 1: 1. The “counsel,” “way” and “seat,” with their corresponding verbs, indicate the way of evil, the gradations of sin. Sin is usually slow in its progress, but like the gentle zephyr, as time goes on, it increases in strength and velocity, until a dangerous and destructive cyclone marks its climax. The sluggard only says and only means “A little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep.” Prov. 6: 10. But this “little folding of the hands to sleep” is protracted until the “little” becomes great. Poverty “as an armed (strong) man” (verse 11)

developed from this "little slumber." Sin is the most deceitful thing in the world. Heb. 3: 13. Beginning with "little" offenses in which there are "pleasures" (11: 25) sin, "as an armed man," carries its victims rapidly along the "way of transgressors" (Prov. 13: 15) until it lands them in irretrievable ruin and endless destruction (Matt. 25: 46; 2 Thes. 1: 9). Therefore in this Psalm, in giving us the program of sin, David, by select, choice expression, gracefully ascends from the beginning of sin to its consummation; from its incipient, "little," trivial offense, to its unblushing impiety. The progress and climax of sin is described by him, first, by three degrees of habit, in the verbs, "walketh," "standeth," and "sitteth;" second, by three degrees in the character, the "wicked," "sinner" and "scornful;" thirdly, by three degrees of wicked action, "counsel," "way" and "seat." The man who walks in sin is an evildoer; when he stands around with sinners he becomes a degree worse. When he walked in sin he acted on the principles of unrighteousness; but when he "standeth in the way of sinners," he became more closely identified with them—cultivated their society. After walking and standing awhile with sinners, he goes farther toward the bad—"he sitteth in the seat of the scornful." He now permanently conforms to the conduct of the wicked. He was first a "wicked" man, then transgressing the law (1 John 3: 4) he became a sinner (1 Pet. 4: 18); and then getting worse still he became "scornful"—the worst kind of a sinner, full of unnameable impieties. Psa. 26: 4, 5; Jer. 15: 17; 2

Pet. 3: 3, 4. He first walked, then stood, and finally sat with a home-like feeling and spirit of perfect contentment, with the unrighteous. Beware of sin, dear reader, beware!!

Enoch in Typology.

Is Enoch a type; and, if so, of what is he a type?—*Wm. Hardesty.*

REPLY.

We are told that Adam was a "figure of him that was to come." Rom. 5: 14. "Figure," from *tupos*, means "a type, impression." Read 1 Cor. 15: 21, 22-29; Psa. 8; Heb. 2: 6-10, and you will see that "the first man Adam" was, in many ways, an "impression" of "the last Adam," the Lord Jesus. 1 Cor. 15: 45. Since we have a type so early in antiquity, we are led to expect types more elaborate and perfect as we come nearer the realities of the new dispensation. That Enoch was an "impression" to be antitypically exemplified, is suggested by his name which means "teacher." He was a prophet; and Jude records one of his prophecies, and shows that while it is primarily applied to the antediluvians, its ultimate fulfilment will be at the final judgment when the Lord comes. Jude 14, 15.

Enoch in typology is an interesting study. Many precious truths are embodied and embedded in him as a typical character. "It is the glory of God to conceal a thing; but the honor of kings (the saints) is to search out a matter." Prov. 25: 2. The following "concealed" truths can be "searched out" in regard to Enoch: I. He pleased God by faith. Heb. 11: 6. II. Enoch—"teacher." He prophesied or

taught the truth. Jude 14. III. He “walked with God.” Gen. 5: 24. IV. He was “the seventh from Adam.” Jude 14. V. And he was “translated that he should not see death.” Heb. 11: 5.

Jude is careful to tell us that Enoch was the “seventh from Adam.” V. 14. This statement, made just before giving Enoch’s prophecy, is full of meaning. The Lord “finished” the work of creation and “rested on the seventh day.” Gen. 2: 2, 3. Here seven is associated with completion and rest; God “finished” and “rested” from his work. From the beginning seven has been a number which signified completeness, fulness. In the Mosaic constitution, every week when “finished” brought the seventh day, a day of “rest,” to the Israelites. Seven is a complete cycle, a round number, a totality of parts. In Enoch the sacred number seven, and his freedom from death, are combined. Six thousand years of sin and death will be followed by a thousand years of “rest” and peace (Rev. 20). This is spoken of as a “Sabbath keeping for the people of God.” Heb. 4: 9. We “enter into rest” (Sabbath keeping)¹ (Mar. Heb. 4: 4-12) when the Lord comes. 2 Thes. 1: 7. “Enoch the seventh from Adam,” as a “teacher” in typology, preached the coming of the Lord “with ten thousands of his saints.” Jude 14. “Enoch the seventh from Adam,” intimates that he, as a typological character, prefigures antitypical realities proximate² to the “Sabbath keeping” or “seventh day” of six³ thousand years, introduced by the Lord’s advent. Divinely guided by God’s instructions as to the time when Enoch, as typically represented, will

be duplicated in the antitypical realities of the kingdom of God, we remark that the following truths are beautifully illustrated. I. When the Lord comes "with ten thousands of his saints," there will be a people on earth who please God by faith. They will have the same "testimony" Enoch had that they please the Lord. Heb. 11: 5, 6. II. They will not only have faith, but they will "walk with God," as Enoch did. Gen. 5: 24; Rom. 4: 12. III. They are alive when Jesus comes, "with his saints" (angels), and they "shall not see death," being "translated" as Enoch was. Heb. 11: 6; 1 Thes. 4: 15, 16, 17; 1 Cor. 15: 50; Jno. 11: 26.

There is one mistake you must avoid in Enoch and all other types, namely, making types realities. Because it is said Enoch was "translated that he should not see death," many have made the mistake of concluding that he never died. *Skia* means "a shade, shadow," and is translated "shadow" in Acts 5: 15: "The shadow (*skia*) of Peter * * might overshadow some of them." You must discriminate between "the shadow of Peter" and Peter himself. His shadow cast on the ground or in the water would perfectly represent Peter; it would be a good photograph of the apostle; but still it would not be a reality. Now the entire Mosaic economy was an enigma, "a shadow (*skia*) of things to come." Only fitting "shadows" in the panorama, flimflam; Christ and his saints being the "heavenly things," "the body" (*soma*). Col. 2: 17. Heb. 8: 5. So when it says Enoch did "not see death," do not conclude that he was physically exempted from death; that epilogue¹ would make a

reality out of a "shadow." The word "translated" (Heb. 11: 4),¹ *metathesis*, means to "pass over." The first born of Israel, when they had applied the blood of the "passover" lamb, according to the commandment, were, like Enoch, "passed over" by the angel of death. Ex. 12: 13. Not that they never died, but in the shadowy representations of the Levitical law, which illustrated in a "figure" and "impression," "good things to come" (Heb. 10: 1), they were "translated," "passed over" by death in "shadow," "in a figure," like Isaac whom Abraham slew. Gen. 22; Heb. 11: 19. Isaac did not literally die, and neither was he literally raised from the dead; it was only "in figure." Enoch's translation "in a figure" will find its reality in the "body" of Christ's brethren when the Lord comes, as Enoch prophesied he would, "with ten thousands of his saints." All of them alive then will "not see death;" one of the "good things to come," typologically taught by "Enoch the seventh from Adam."

Did Enoch Die?

In Genesis, 5th chapter, Moses gives the genealogy, age and death of the patriarchs from Adam to Noah. Of each one he says, "And he died," until he gets to Enoch, and of him he says: "All the days of Enoch were 365 years * * and he was not; for God took him." Verses 23, 24. Instead of saying of him as of all the others, "And he died," he says, "And he was not." Did Enoch die?—*Lillie Filson.*

REPLY.

That Enoch did not die has been a postulate² with the learned for many years. However, in his Homiletical³ Commentary on the Book of Genesis, the learned

“Rev.” J. S. Exell, M. A. confessed that Enoch died. On page 100, when speaking of the longevity of those days and the comparative shortness of Enoch’s life, he says: “We should have thought he (Enoch) would have lived longer than the wicked around him.” On page 101 of the same book he says: “The life of Enoch was a comparatively busy one; he *died* in the prime of manhood.” The prevalent idea that Enoch did not die is thickly beset with difficulties. The mystics, always on the lookout for something with which to play; always ready to darken counsel by words without knowledge, Job. 38: 2, rejoice exceedingly, because they think in Enoch they have found a mystery which defies a rational explanation. And they have if he did not die. The hypothesis confronts us with inexplicable difficulties, and what is worse, the theory carried to its logical upshot, obscures, and even denies some of the plainest elements of divine revelation. Among the inexplicable¹ difficulties of which I speak, I will mention these: I. Death has passed upon all men. Rom. 5: 12. Enoch was one of the “all men” upon whom death passed, and equally with them was under condemnation. II. The testimony of inspiration is that all men (Christ not excepted) have died. Psa. 49: 6²; Eccl. 8: 8; Psa. 89: 48; Job 30: 22.³ III. The veil which divided the Holy from the Most Holy place finds its antitype in mortal flesh. Heb. 9: 3; 10: 20. Christ is our forerunner within the veil. Heb. 6: 19, 20. “Forerunner” means one who runs before or goes ahead. Christ is the first born, the forerunner; the first to pass from the Holy to the Most Holy; from the veil

—the flesh—to the spiritual nature. But if Enoch was immortalized before Christ, Enoch was the forerunner—he ran before Christ into immortality!! IV. Christ died for all—every man. Heb. 2: 9. If Enoch never died—was immortalized hundreds of years before Christ died, he did not die for Enoch! V. Christ is the Saviour of all who will be saved. 1 Tim. 4: 10. But he cannot be the Saviour of Enoch, since he has already been immortalized!!

“And he died,” was said of them all, Enoch excepted. Then to create the impression that something different happened to him, that he did not die, the words, “And he was not,” are quoted. Let us understand phrases, not jingle them. It is unwise to make a distinction when there is no difference. Read Gen. 5, and you will see that in recording deaths, Enoch’s with the others, identical phraseology is employed. “All the days that Adam lived were 930: and he died.” (Verse 5) “All the days of Seth were 912, and he died,” (verse 8). “All the days of Enos were 905 years; and he died.” Verse 11. Coming to Enoch Moses uses exactly the same language he used when speaking of others: “And all the days of Enoch were 365 years. So far the writer speaks of Enoch just like he did of the others; he comes to where you expect him to say, “And he died.” You do not have to use the same words to express the same thought. “And he died,” “and he was not,” are synonymous terms. This is evident from the words, “All the days of Enoch were 365 years.” If he is alive yet; if he never died, 365 years falls short of expressing all the days of Enoch’s life. All the days of Enoch,

is a phrase which indicates, like the words addressed to the serpent, (Gen. 3: 14), limitation of days. 365 years states "all the days" Enoch lived. He died comparatively young for those days of longevity.

So much for inferential evidence. Let us now examine evidence that is cognoscible^k and positive. After stating that all the days of Enoch were 365, we are told, "And he was not." What is meant by this statement? Some people understand it to mean he was no longer on the earth; that he was translated to the skies! This view our Lord flatly denies. Jno. 3: 13. In Lam. 5: 7 we have this statement: "Our fathers sinned, and are not." Does this mean, Our fathers sinned and went to heaven? Enoch walked with God; and was not; "our fathers sinned, and are not." Whatever happened to Enoch when he was not, happened to our fathers when they are not. *Ergo* if the words, "and he was not," mean that Enoch did not die, then our fathers that sinned, never died!! If Enoch was immortalized, so were they; if he was translated to the skies, so were they!! The Bible links death with sin. Rom. 5: 12. As the wages of sin is death (Rom. 6: 23) the decree has gone forth, "The wicked shall not be." Psa. 37: 10. "Our fathers have sinned, and are not," must mean, Our fathers sinned and have died. Indeed, it is affirmed that they did not live forever, that they died. Zech. 1: 5; Jno. 8: 52, Heb. 11: 13. Here is proof that as the fathers sinned and died—are not—so when it says of Enoch, "And he was not," it must mean, "And he died."

All doubts as to the meaning of this statement are removed when we examine its occurrence in the book of Genesis; for it must be admitted that a writer has the right to interpret his own writing; and that the words, "And he was not," as used in the 5th chapter, must mean the same as used elsewhere in the same book. Every time Moses used this expression, he means death—every time. When Joseph's coat was dipped in the blood of a goat, his brethren presented it to his father and said, "This have we found; know now whether this be thy son's coat or no." Gen. 37: 32. Convinced that it was, Jacob said, "An evil beast hath devoured him; Joseph is *without doubt* rent in pieces." Ver. 33. Thinking that Joseph was "without doubt" dead, he said in great sorrow of heart to his children, "Me have ye bereaved of my children; *Joseph is not*, and Simeon is not, and ye will take Benjamin away. 43: 36.¹ Like Reuben, to express his death, Jacob said, "*the child is not.*" Gen. 37: 30. That he means he was dead is positively stated: "My son shall not go down with you; for *his brother is dead.*" 42: 38. One time Jacob says Joseph is not; and then telling the same thing later, says "he is dead." In the same way Joseph's brethren speak of his death. At one time they referred to it as, "one is not," (Gen. 42: 13); at another time they said: "We have a father, an old man, and a child of his old age, a little one, *and his brother is dead.*" 44: 20. "And he was not" always means death; I do not think it can be shown to mean anything else in the Word of God. I feel strong on this point, backed as I am by the words of the infallible Book.

When Herod slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, he killed them, of course. Matt. 2: 16. This fulfilled a prophecy of Jeremiah (verse 17) about Rachel weeping for her children, "and would not be comforted, *because they are not.*" Verse 18. When Jacob was convinced that "without doubt" Joseph was dead, he said, "Joseph is not." When Herod slew the children they were dead, and of them it is said, "they are not." When the wicked are swallowed up in the second death they "shall not be" (Psa. 27: 10)¹—they are dead. Now I claim that in Gen. 5: 23, 24, the words, "and he was not," mean what they mean everywhere else in the Bible; and that therefore Enoch's death is plainly recorded. "All the days of Enoch were 365 years * * * and he was not"—he died. And this is just what Paul thought. To make his death doubly sure the great Apostle records Enoch's death with all the "worthy ones of whom the world was not worthy." Heb. 11: 38. "*These all* died in the faith." Ver. 13. How many does he mean by "these all?" Though he includes many not mentioned by name (verse 32), he certainly means all he has named. Beginning with Abel (verse 4), he names *Enoch*, (5: 5)² Noah (5: 7)³, and others, and then says: "*these all* died in the faith." Verse 13. When the kingdom comes (Rev. 11: 15) the time of the dead (for those who died in the faith) will have come, and God will wake up his servants the prophets (Enoch was a prophet, Jude 14), and reward them with all his saints, whether they be small or great; all will be glorified and rewarded together. Rev. 11: 18; Rom. 8: 17. Amen and amen.

Was the Thief Baptized?

We are told that the thief will be saved in the kingdom of God. Luke 23: 42, 43. It is generally supposed that he was not baptized. Is this a reasonable supposition?—*A. M.*

REPLY.

If there had been no baptismal ordinance in God's law prior to the thief's death, it would be a "reasonable supposition" to suppose he was not baptized. But when you reflect on the fact that not only was there an infrangible¹ law of baptism, Mark 1: 4, and that men generally were baptized, Matt. 3: 5, 6, before the thief's death, then the supposition that he was not baptized is left without feet to stand upon. John's baptism was so generally submitted to that Christ remarked: "All the people that heard him (John), and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him." Luke 7: 29, 30. Upon the authority of Christ we can asseverate² that the contemporaries of John submitted to God's "counsel" to be "baptized of him." "The Pharisees and lawyers" are the only exceptions Christ made; and the thief cannot be numbered with them. In view of these stern truths and real facts, to "suppose" that the thief was not baptized, is to entertain an assumption, pure and simple. It is a gratuitous supposition, unwarranted by facts, and hostile to God's formulated law. It is a miserable subterfuge, made only by those who seek to minimize the importance of baptism.

Leaving this supposition in the hands of those who are satisfied with myths and moonshine, we proceed to examine clearer evidence that the thief was baptized. And first, you will notice, please, that when the thief prayed to be remembered in the kingdom of God, Luke 23: 42, the Saviour granted the request; he gave him perfect assurance: "Thou shalt be with me in paradise"—the kingdom of God. v. 43. In our Version it reads, "Shalt thou be with me in paradise;" but in the original the "thou" is before the "shalt," and reads, "thou shalt"—a declarative sentence. Now dear reader, before Christ gave the thief this unequivocal promise of salvation in his kingdom, he had enunciated, in his ministry, conditions which must be fulfilled before an entrance into the kingdom was possible. Of what use are conditions if they do not exclude those who do not meet the requirements imposed by them? The Saviour, in stating the conditions required of those who enter the kingdom, especially mentions baptism: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," John 3: 5. All the learned, including John Wesley, understand that Jesus meant baptism by the words, "born of water." "Except a man is born of water(baptized) and of the Spirit (immortalized), he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." "Cannot" is a strong word. Are you audacious enough to say the thief can enter the kingdom without baptism, when Christ says "Cannot?" Would it not be atrocious for mortal man to change "Cannot" to can? Beware, dear reader, how you change the Word of the Lord. Anciently God

said to man, "Thou shalt surely die." The devil turned the truth of God into a lie, John 8: 44, by saying, "Thou shalt not surely die." Gen. 3: 4. He only added the word, the little word, "not" to what God had said. When mythologist "suppose" the thief was saved without being "born of water," they play fast and loose with the words of Jesus which he declares shall stand forever. Matt. 24: 35. They presume to change "cannot" into can; and then in a subjunctive way, they represent Jesus as imposing conditions, and then disregarding them! In saving the thief without baptism Christ would brake his own law. Would Christ say one thing and do something different? Would he ignore, violate, and overthrow his own law? Perish the thought! With Christ's indubitable law before us, our conviction that the thief was baptized is solidly built on the law itself. The evidence proving he was "born of water" is simply irrefragible.¹ Syllogistically² stated the evidence is seen in all its beauty and power:

- (1) *A man cannot enter into the kingdom of God unless he is "born of water"—baptized (John 3: 5);*
- (2) *The thief is to enter into the kingdom (Luke 23: 42, 43);*
- (3) *Therefore, he was baptized.*

Is Instrumental Music in the Church Scriptural?

Is David condemned for inventing and using "instruments of music" in Amos 6: 5?—*L. C.*

REPLY.

Musical instruments were among the earliest inventions of men. Gen. 4: 21. The Bible often speaks

of stringed instruments (Gen. 31: 27; Isa. 5: 12; 2 Chron. 13: 8)¹; wind instruments (Dan. 3: 5, 7; Job 21: 12; Lev. 23: 24), and instruments of percussion. Their use was generally confined to religious and social festivities, except the trumpet, which was used to sound battle-calls.

The Israelitish Church, Acts 7: 38, used instrumental music in their worship. David especially was fond of music, and was an expert musician. "Four thousand praised the Lord with the instruments, which I made, said David, to praise therewith," 1 Chron. 23: 5. "The musical instruments of David," Nehe. 12: 26,² were preserved and used in the worship of God after the restoration under Ezra and Nehemiah. He was a man after "God's own heart" (the sin with Uriah and Bath Sheba excepted). This statement exonerates David from all blame in using "instruments of music." Because the profligates³ spoken of in Amos 6: 5, fancied they equaled David in musical proficiency, and because they defended their illegal passion for music by citing the example of David, does not condemn the man after God's heart. David rightly used his "instruments of music," whereas they wrongly used theirs. When God's house of prayer was cleansed in the reign of good Hezekiah, it was written, "He set the Levites in the house of the Lord, with cymbals, with psalteries, and harps, according to the commandment of David, and of Gad the King's Seer, and Nathan the prophet; for so was the commandment of the Lord by his prophets," 2 Chron. 29: 25. Thus instrumental music was used "in the house of the Lord" according to the

commandment of 1. David. 2. Gad the Seer. 3. Nathan the prophet. 4. And the Lord. Not that the Lord gave his reluctant permission, but they were used by “*the commandment of the Lord.*”

Instrumental music in the church has some support in the New Testament. To the Corinthians Paul says: “Things without life (musical instruments) giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sound (notes), how shall it be known what is piped or harped,” (played?) 14: 7.¹ Then he exhorts the brethren to pray with the spirit and understanding, and to sing the same way, (v. 15). He desires his instructions to be carried out when the “whole church be come together,” (v. 23). He obviously means that they were to sing with the spirit and understanding “in the church,” (v. 19) when instruments “without life” were played. Plainly, then, instrumental music was used in the church at Corinth! As the apostle throughout this chapter puts emphasis on understanding (vs. 7, 8), we suggest that the organ should be played softly; and that when we sing, pray or speak “in the church,” we do so slowly and distinctly, for if we fail to be understood we “shall speak into the air,” (v. 9).

Is the Abrahamic Covenant Fulfilled?

To prove that the Abrahamic Covenant was fulfilled, a friend recently quoted Neh. 9: 7, 8. “Hast performed thy words” (v. 8) was an expression specially emphasized to show that God had “performed” (fulfilled) the oath he swore to Abraham. Will you please explain this Scripture?—*Enquirer.*

REPLY.

The question is somewhat intricate, but when the Covenants God made with Abraham are thoroughly understood, such an uncalled for fiasco as made by your friend, is not possible. There is proof in Genesis, and elsewhere in the Bible, that God made two Covenants with Abraham. One was made to Abraham and his seed—Christ (Gen. 12: 1-3; Gal. 3: 16); the other was made to Abraham's seed—his posterity. Gen. 15: 18-21. In making this Covenant God mentioned the different nations then occupying the covenanted land, and said, "Unto thy seed have I given this land." Nehemiah, in extolling the mercies and the faithfulness of God to Abraham's "Seed," says the Lord did choose Abraham and made a covenant with him to give the land—and then names the same land, with the same nations who occupied it, as specified in Gen. 15: 18-21; Neh. 9: 8. This is the covenant in Nehemiah's mind, and the one of which he says, "To give it, I say, to his seed;" not to "Abraham and his seed," but with reiterative emphasis, "I say, to his seed." (v. 8). I believe with the prophet, that so far as this covenant is concerned, God has "performed" it. Jos. 23: 14. Discriminating between the covenant made to Abraham and his seed, and the one made to Abraham's seed, wonderfully facilitates our understanding of God's Word. That God's Covenant made to Abraham's seed has been "performed" or fulfilled, is clearly revealed and heartily believed by the Church of God. But the covenant made to Abraham and his seed—

Christ—has not been fulfilled, is proved by exuberant testimony in both Old and New Testaments. Mic. 7: 20; Rom. 4: 13, 14; Gal. 3: 17; Acts 7: 5.

Did Angels Marry?

Were the “sons of God” who married the “daughters of men,” Gen. 6: 2, angels?—B.

REPLY.

That they were angels was believed and advocated in antique times by Justin and Tertullian; in modern days by Luther, Kurtz, Delitzsch, and others. They were mystics, one and all. Some people “love darkness rather than light,” Jno. 3: 19. They almost go into ecstasy when they succeed in besmoking and blurring the truths which God has made plain. They hate “the right,”¹ Jno. 3: 20, and close their eyes when the sun shines. Shutting their eyes and stopping their ears, they sleep, slumber and dream. The unreal scenery of dreamland fascinates them till it is difficult to rouse them from their stupor, and induce them to look at the glorious realities which the Bible exhibits. They spiritualize and invent difficulties to appear “odd,” and impress the populace with an air of profundity and superiority. And they do this before necessity asks them to undertake the task. There is no exigent² demand for making angels out of the “Sons of God” in Gen. 6: 2. That immortal angels should leave heaven, take up their abode on earth, marry mortal women who were “giants,” (Gen. 6: 4) in sin, raise children—all this is only an armful of unbelievable superstition. That their children had mortal mothers and immortal fathers—this is simply a bundle of absurdity. Destitute of a shred

of proof either from reason or revelation, the inventors and advocates of this dogma have hatched it out of their "darkened understanding," Eph. 3: 18,³ and by tradition, have fastened it upon the children of men. Bewildering mysticism will continue, as heretofore, to tantalize all who do not burst asunder the cords which binds them to the tradition of men. Throw off the shackles of slavery, dear reader, and be a free man in Christ Jesus.

Angels are sometimes called "sons of God" to show that they are members of the great family of Jehovah. Job 38: 7; Eph. 3: 15. That they are not meant in Gen. 6: 2, we are sure for many reasons; a few of them we may state as follows:

1. *Genesis gives "the generations of Adam."* v. 1.¹ We interrupt the "genesis" of the book, when we switch off onto angels and women.

2. *Mortal men who stand in the favor of God, and who belong to his family, are "called the sons of God."* 1 Jno. 3: 1. The spiritual proximity of the Sethites to God gives a solid basis for the appellation, "Sons of God," Deut. 14: 1; Prov. 14: 26; Luke 3: 38.

3. *It destroys the representative character of this apostasy.* The story is no longer for "our admonition." Num. 25; Jude 3: 1;² 1 Kings 11; Rev. 2; 1 Cor. 10: 6.

4. *The Spirit strove with men, not angels; hence we conclude man was the guilty party.* Gen. 6: 3.

5. *Earth, not heaven, was deluged by the flood; men, not angels, were punished for the crime,* Matt. 24: 38, 39.

6. *And finally*: When saints are made immortal at the resurrection they are declared to be "equal to the angels," Luke 20: 36. Since it is said of them, that they "neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more," vs. 35, 36, we conclude that angels, like their "equals," are deathless celebrates.

Sprinkling versus Baptism.

There is some proof that sprinkling is baptism. Indeed Ezekiel expressly mentions "sprinkling clean water," 36: 25. May we not conclude from this Scripture that sprinkling water on a man is as much baptism as if he were immersed?—*L. C.*

REPLY.

The text hinted at but not quoted, with its context reads: "I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land. Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you," Ezek. 36: 24, 25. This Scripture, our correspondent thinks, affords "some proof that sprinkling is baptism." To expose the fallacy of his verdent¹ claim, it is only necessary to call attention to a few salient points that are essential to the performance of baptism. The ordinance of baptism cannot be performed without an administrator, subject, time, place, and design. All these things sprinkling requires as well as immersion. It only remains, then, for us to point out that the administrator is God. "Thus saith the Lord;" "Saith the Lord God:" "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you," vs. 22, 23, 25. The speaker is "the Lord God;" the "I" who does the sprinkling, is the Lord. With those who sprinkle for bap-

tism, the administrator is a mortal man. The subject sprinkled, according to the text, is the peeled¹ and afflicted Jew, dispersed among the heathen,² v. 19. The subject with those who sprinkle for baptism is an unconscious babe, or an adult Gentile. The time when the "clean water" is sprinkled is thus stated: "I will take you from among the heathen²...and bring you into your own land, *then* will I sprinkle clean water upon you," vs. 24, 25. The time with those who sprinkle for baptism is any Sunday in the year! The place stated by the text where this sprinkling occurs is, "your own land," v. 24, "in the land I gave to your fathers," v. 28. With those who sprinkle for baptism, the place where they sprinkle is anywhere in the world! The design of the sprinkling is affirmed to be cleansing and purifying: "From all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you," vs. 25, 26. With those who sprinkle for baptism, the design is to outwardly express a pardon and cleansing already received! To outwardly express an "inward grace!!" Thus at every step this text is at war with sprinkling for baptism. In the Bible sprinkling is always versus baptism.

Are People Baptized in the Holy Spirit When They Are Converted?

At the house of Cornelius we are told that while Peter was yet speaking, "the Holy Spirit fell on them which heard the Word"; that it was "poured out," Acts 10: 44, 45. This leads me to conclude that every time a man is converted the Holy Spirit falls on him, and is "poured out" upon him.—
A. T. B.

REPLY.

That the spirit is “poured out” on every man when he is converted, is a popular idea, but cannot be substantiated by the Word. The Scripture quoted by our friend, and that “leads” him to “conclude that every time a man is converted, the Holy Spirit falls on him,” denies, in an unmistakable manner, and brands as a nefarious imposition, that very idea. Look at the facts in the case. “On the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit;” they “received the Holy Spirit as well as we,” Acts 10: 45, 47. Turn the words, “also” and “as well as we,” over and over in your mind. Then read, “As I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them”—how? “As on us at the beginning.” Acts 11: 15. Follow up the words, “also,” “as well as we” and “as on us” with “the beginning,” and you have the thought that as the Holy Spirit was “poured out” on the day of Pentecost, “at the beginning,” (Luke 24: 47),¹ so it was effused in the house of Cornelius. If the baptism of the Holy Spirit occurred “every time a man was converted;” if it was bestowed upon all converts, why did Peter associate it with “the beginning?” If the Holy Spirit “fell” “every time a man was converted,” to truthfully and appropriately express himself, Peter should have said, “As I began to speak the Holy Spirit fell on them as on all others converted.” Thousands had been converted from Pentecost to the time of Cornelius. Conversions had occurred almost daily, Acts 2: 47; 5: 14; and if the Holy Spirit “fell” at every conversion, it was “poured out” daily; and what occurs daily be-

comes ordinary; yet we read that when the Spirit came in the house of Cornelius it caused the people to be astonished," Acts 10: 45. What occurs every day causes no astonishment. On the day of Pentecost the Spirit was "poured out;" and Peter says at the house of Cornelius it fell as "at the beginning." This language conveys the impression that during the time from Pentecost to Cornelius the Holy Spirit had not been "poured out." And the baptism of the Holy Spirit which occurred in the house of Cornelius was a miracle, the like of which has not occurred from that day to this.

"Translated into the Kingdom."

Please explain Col. 1: 13. This text is often quoted to prove that the kingdom is already established.—*Anna Drew.*

REPLY.

It is a necrosis¹ to the scribe "instructed unto the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 13: 52) to hear the hackneyed expressions, "embryo kingdom," "germ kingdom," "present phase of the kingdom," etc., etc. Such infantile lispings has no place in the vocabulary of the truth. The "church kingdom" theory is as unscriptural a dogma as the immortality of the soul. Col. 1: 13 is "often quoted" as Sister Drew says, "to prove that the kingdom is already established." To make the claim look like it had some face on it, we are pointed to the words, "hath translated us into the kingdom." And then we are looked squarely in the face and asked, How can we be "translated into the kingdom" if it does not exist? There may be no duplicity in this challenge; if not there is a won-

derful exhibition of ignorance in it. Like the pseudo teachers of Paul's day who had "swerved" from the truth, they desire "to be teachers," but they "understand neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm." 1 Tim. 1: 6, 7. Let them become students of the Word themselves, and learn for themselves "the first principles of the oracles of God." Heb. 5: 12. And here is a lesson on the kingdom for them to begin with:

The word *eis* is translated "for" twice in Col. 1; in vs. 16, 25. Young defines the word *eis* in his Analytical Concordance to mean "with a view to." Now let us quote the texts and put Young's definition of *eis* in parenthesis, and you will see that the texts themselves are beautiful paradigms¹ of Young's definition of the word: "For (*eis*, "with a view to") him." (v. 16). "With a view to" the Lord Jesus, God Almighty created everything. Again, "Whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for (*eis* "with a view to") you fully to preach the Word of God." v. 25; Mark 5: 25²; Rom. 15: 19. The gospel was to be preached in "all the world" (Mark 16: 15); it was to be "fully" preached "with a view to" saving all believers. Acts 2: 38 chimes in beautifully here—"Repent and be baptized * * for (*eis*, "with a view to") the remission of sins." The word *eis* occurs in Col. 1: 13: "Hath translated us *into* (*eis*, "with a view to") the kingdom of his dear Son." As the word *eis* is translated "for" in vs. 16 and 25, we can read this text: "Translated us for the kingdom"—"with a view to" it. The astute reader will see that this

passage not only does not support the "present phrase of the kingdom" theory, but with one stroke, as with a wet sponge, it wipes that error from the slate. We are translated (*methistesmi*), "put over" in the favor God now, *eis*, for, "with a view to" gaining the "kingdom of the Son of his love" (Mark 5: 13)¹, and its beatific glories, when the Lord comes. Luke 23: 42; Matt. 25: 34.

"Absent from the Body."

I would like 2 Cor. v. 8² explained. It is often brought up as proof of the immortality of the soul.—*A. E. Drew.*

REPLY.

There are only two kinds of corporeal bodies spoken of in the Holy Scripture. "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." 1 Cor. 15: 44. Both are bodily conditions; the apostle wholly ignores a disembodied existence. One is possessed now by all men: the other is to be possessed at the resurrection by the righteous. The "natural body" is "earthy" (v. 48), "flesh and blood," v. 50, and is corruptible and mortal, verse 53. In this body Paul groaned and was burdened, 2 Cor. 5: 4, with all the ills of mortality. Soon it would be taken down like a tabernacle or tent and "dissolved," (verse 1) into dust. The apostle knew that so long as he was "at home" in this kind of a body, he would be "absent from the Lord," v. 6. Paul, "the least of all saints," loved and served his Lord, and in his presence he longed to bask in bliss. And knowing that his "body of death" Rom. 7: 24, stood between him and his

Lord, he wrote: "I am confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and present with the Lord." 2 Cor. 5: 8. To be "present with the Lord" would be a great blessing; for this he "earnestly desired," verse 2, and longed. As he could not be present with the Lord while "at home in the body," he says he is "willing," perfectly willing to be "absent from the body." Platonic divines say, just so; when he died, Paul's immortal soul went to heaven; then it was "absent from the body, and present with the Lord;" and for this he was willing. To all who thus follow in the wake of Plato, I reply that Paul did not want to die; that he tells us again and again in this chapter that he does not want to be unclothed, but "clothed upon." "Not for that we would be unclothed." Verses 2, 3, 4. Do you think after saying this he would say in the 8th verse that he was "willing" to die—become unclothed? A dead man is not "absent from the body." When and how would Paul be absent from this body? "There is a spiritual body. "First the natural, and afterwards the spiritual." 1 Cor. 15: 44, 45.¹ The spiritual body is the natural body transmuted. When the "natural body" is clothed "with our house which is from heaven," verse 2, "mortality is swallowed up of (immortal) life." Verse 4. When "mortality is swallowed up of life" we will have immortal bodies—the "natural" one, "swallowed up" disappears; and by the "change" to immortality, has become "absent." Then absent from the mortal body we are present with the Lord in a spiritual body.

Is the Holy Spirit a Person?

If not, explain Jno. 14: 16, 17; 16: 7, 8, 13. Why call the Spirit "he" and "Comforter," if a person is not meant?
—*Wm. Hardesty.*

REPLY.

People who subscribe to the Athanasian creed tenaciously hold that "there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost." To deny the personality of the Spirit is, to them, to deny a cardinal principle of the gospel, and to jeopardize one's salvation. Yet evidence in support of the theory consists mostly of assertions and imaginations; evidence which we cannot describe otherwise than most shadowy and tramontane.¹ It does not seem to occur to our dear friends that in affirming the Holy Spirit has a distinct personality from God, they are detracting from the Majesty of the Almighty, who has said, "Is there a God beside me? * * I know not any." Isa. 44: 8. Does not the deification of the Spirit contravene, in both spirit and word, the first of the Ten Mosaic Commandments? And if so, how can those who indorse it escape the charge of idolatry?

That the Bible speaks of the Spirit as "he" and "Comforter" we admit. Peter, however, employs the neuter pronoun "it" when speaking of the same Spirit—"the Spirit of Christ." 1 Pet. 1: 11. If the Spirit is a person how can this grammatical discrepancy be explained? The reason why Christ used "he" and Peter "it" when speaking of the Spirit is simple and easy to comprehend. The Greek word for "Comforter" (*Parakletos*) is masculine, and as pro-

nouns must agree with their nouns in gender, the translators had to give a masculine pronoun as a substitute. The Greek word for Spirit (*Pneuma*) is neuter, and is, therefore, grammatically represented by the neuter pronoun "it." If Jesus had used the word Spirit instead of the word Comforter, "it" would have been the pronoun instead of "he."

Jesus then, did not use the word "Comforter" to show that the Spirit was a person. Wisdom is spoken of as "she" (Prov. 8: 2); and sin and righteousness are said to have "servants." Rom. 6: 17, 18. Personification of impersonal things does not individualize them. This is the reason Christ terms the Spirit the Comforter: *Parakletos* means "one called alongside of for help." Christ was soon to suffer death. For three years his disciples had looked to him as their teacher and Master. They looked for the redemption of Israel (Acts 1: 6), and to be exalted to thrones in the kingdom of God. Luke 22: 30. Upon learning that Jesus must die, be raised, and leave them, and that they could not follow him, Jno. 13: 33, they were troubled (Jno. 14: 1) in heart. Jesus then speaks words of comfort to assuage their sorrow. He promised them "another Comforter," teacher, helper. Unlike Jesus, this Comforter would "abide with them forever"—for the age—the remainder of the Mosaic age. Jno. 16: 16.¹ He would guide them into all truth. Jno. 14: 13² In Christ's absence (Jno. 16: 7) he would take the place of Jesus as instructor, teacher and guide. Hence the Spirit is denominated³ the Comforter—One called alongside of for help. With much wisdom Christ person-

ified the Holy Spirit. His disciples, mourning over his anticipated departure, were not fit mentally to be addressed plainly. Acting on the principle of speaking to them as they were “able to bear it,” Jno. 16: 12, he discoursed to them about the Holy Spirit “in proverbs” (parables, mar. Jno. 16: 25). His language being admittedly parabolical,¹ this style of speech gave him the right to personify things, the Spirit included.

Now Brother Hardesty, read with care this statement: “These things have I spoken to you in proverbs; but the time cometh, when I shall speak no more to you in proverbs, *but I will show you plainly of the Father.*” Jno. 16: 25. Let us now leave the parabolical, and come down to the “time” when, speaking “no more” parabolically, he will show us “plainly” the truth on the subject. The Spirit was to testify of Christ (Jno. 15: 26) when it came; it was to plainly reveal all the truth. “In that day,” said the loving Jesus to his followers, “Ye shall ask me nothing.” Jno. 16: 23. Did a person visit the disciples when “he, the Spirit of truth,” came? Did a person, “the third person of the adorable Trinity,” visit the apostles on the day of Pentecost? The inspired historian writing “plainly” on the subject, says: “Suddenly there came from heaven as of a mighty rushing wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit.” Acts 2: 1-5. Filling the house where they were, and filling at least twelve men with the Holy Spirit—surely such manifestations as these are incompatible with the personality of the Spirit. In-

stead of a person, something like a "wind" appeared in fulfilment of the Lord's promise. Viewing the Spirit as an impersonal power which could at the same time both "fill" and envelope the apostles, all is plain and beautiful, and harmonious.

The Kingdom in Men, or Men in the Kingdom?

I want you to give an exposition of Luke 17: 20, 21.—
A. Brother.

REPLY.

Luke 17: 20, 21 reads as follows: "When he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within (among mar.) you." It is important to note 1. That the kingdom of God had not "come" when the Pharisees made this "demand." Then it is not true that the kingdom was established in the days of John the Baptist. And 2. Since "the Pharisees" demanded when the kingdom was coming, and Christ said, "The kingdom is within you," he must have meant by the word, the pronoun "you," the Pharisees. Of the Pharisees the Saviour says: "Ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but *within* they are full of extortion and excess." Matt. 23: 25. And again: "Ye are like whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are *within* full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness." v. 27. "*Within*," right where our friends try to make us believe the kingdom of God is, is "extortion and excess!" "Dead men's bones," and not the kingdom were

“within” the Pharisees! Now if you will notice the text you will see without an effort that Pharisees is plural, and that, therefore, the pronoun “you,” to agree with its noun, is likewise plural. Had Christ said to one man, “The kingdom of God is within you,” the pronoun “you” would have been in the singular number, and then the language would have put the kingdom “within” the individual spoken to! But since Christ was speaking to a number of the Pharisees, he must have meant “within” or “among” the circle of persons to whom he was speaking. A parallel text to this one is found in Jno. 1: 26: “There standeth one *among* you whom ye know not.” Christ as King of God’s kingdom, was the most important and essential of its component parts; and using language of synecdoche¹ he could affirm that the kingdom, represented by himself, was truly within or among the Pharisees, wicked as they were, for he was standing among them. But to say that the kingdom was in the heart of those abominable Pharisees, is only to exhibit an ignorance of the Word which makes an enlightened believer of the gospel of the kingdom, shudder.

Had the Pharisees been righteous it would still be unscriptural to say the kingdom was within their hearts. Such a theory would put the kingdom in men, whereas the Scripture always puts men in the kingdom. Christ says the kingdom is for men to enter; he lays down the conditions by which we are to get admission to it: “Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter *into* the kingdom of God.” John 3: 5. If the kingdom is in men, how

can men enter into the kingdom? A man would have to enter into himself to get into the kingdom!! Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and all the prophets are to be “*in the kingdom of God;*” the saints are to come from the four points of the compass, and “sit down” with them “*in the kingdom of God.*” Luke 13: 28, 29. Observe, the kingdom is not in the prophets and saints, but they are “*in the kingdom of God.*”

Is the Holy Spirit an Intercessor?

If not, what does Paul mean in Rom. 8: 26, 27?—*A. T. B.*

REPLY.

In 1 Tim. 2: 5, Paul says: “There is one God, one Mediator between God and men.” The “one Mediator” he affirms is the “man Christ Jesus.” If the Holy Spirit intercedes; if it is a Mediator between God and men, there are two Mediators; and Paul made an unpardonable blunder when he said there was “one.” If there is but “one Mediator” and that “one” is Christ Jesus,” the Holy Spirit is not an intercessor.

The “Man Christ Jesus” was born a “natural body,” 1 Cor. 15: 46; his nature was the same as ours. Heb. 2: 24.¹ The Spirit of God at the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, “quickened his mortal body,” Rom. 8: 11; and it became a “spiritual body,” 1 Cor. 15: 44. Being then a “spiritual body,” or a body of Spirit like God, John 4: 24, and the angels, Heb. 1: 13, he is called a “quickening (life giving) Spirit.” 1 Cor. 15: 45. Death has no more dominion over him, Rom. 6: 9; and having been exalted to God’s right hand as a prince and Saviour to give repentance and

forgiveness of sins, Acts 5: 31, he is there a “quicken-
ing spirit”—“The Spirit itself maketh intercession
for us with groanings which cannot be uttered” (by
mortal man). “He makes intercession for the saints
according to the will of God.” Rom. 8: 26, 27. Once
understand that Christ is called a “quicken-
ing spirit,” and then you can easily see that when “the Spir-
it” is said to intercede, Christ is meant. If you had
carefully read the 8th chapter of Romans you would
have found this expressly taught there. After say-
ing the “Spirit helpeth our infirmities,” and that it
“maketh intercession for the saints,” the Apostle
says in the 34th verse: “It is Christ that died, yea
rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right
hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.”
“It is Christ that died” and that makes “interces-
sion for us”—not the Holy Spirit. But since Christ
now has a “spiritual body,” and is a “quicken-
ing spirit,” he is sometimes spoken of as “the Lord the
Spirit.” 2 Cor. 3: 19.¹ With “groanings which can-
not be uttered,” and with pleadings “for the saints”
which are according to the will of God,” we have,
in our “One Mediator,” a High Priest of great in-
fluence and power with God. To say that the Holy
Spirit is an intercessor not only denies the Word, but
robs Christ of his glory, in that in “all things” he is
to have pre-eminence,” Col. 1: 18. And to say that
the Holy Spirit makes intercession for sinners when
they gather around an “anxious seat,” is to deny the
divine statement: “He makes intercession for *the*
saints (not sinners) according to the will of God.”
Become a saint, dear reader; and you will have “the

Lord the Spirit," "the Spirit itself" to plead for your sins, and he will do it with "groanings which cannot be uttered." With so powerful an intercessor you can ask, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth." "Neither life, nor death, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature (created thing) shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." vs. 33, 38, 39.

Several Questions.

Did Christ need to die on account of Adam's transgression? Were Adam and Christ both placed on trial without any tendencies for good or evil? What act did Adam and Eve commit that gave them the knowledge that they were naked? Did the mere eating of fruit make them know this?—*Eld. O. J. Allard.*

REPLY.

1. Adam's sin caused death to enter into the world. Rom. 5: 12. Christ was one of the "all men" upon whom our text says death "passed." His body not only had the "sentence of death" in it (2 Cor. 1: 9) and was, therefore, a "body of death" (Rom. 7: 24), but besides it was "prepared" (Heb. 10: 5) of a woman "under the law" (Gal. 4: 4) of Moses, which, like the Adamic law, was "a ministration of death" (2 Cor. 3: 7), and other curses. Gal. 3: 10, 13. Christ was "under" both the Adamic and Mosaic law; the first gave him a body "in the likeness of men" (Phil. 1: 7)¹; the second cursed him by crucifixion on the tree. Christ needed to die for Adam's sin as much as we need to die for the same.

2. Adam and Christ were both placed on trial with good and evil tendencies. Without them they would have been automatons.¹ Lust, desire, is only a "motion" or tendency to sin (Rom. 7: 5); and the apostle James says that lust conceives sin, that is, "brings forth sin." 1: 15. Sin, therefore, is not a possibility without lust. Adam sinned; therefore as lust must exist before sin, and is in fact the cause of sin, Adam must have had this "tendency" before he fell. That the second Adam had the same lusts as the first one, is easily gathered from the fact that he was "tempted of the devil" (Matt. 4: 1) as Eve was (Gen. 3), and as we are. Heb. 4: 15. "Trial" without both good and evil tendencies, would be the merest sham.

3. Eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil was the particular "act" Adam and Eve committed that gave them a sense of shame when in a condition of nudity. To some it appears strange that the mere eating of "fruit" could communicate knowledge. But stop and think a minute. The text in Gen. 3: 6, 7, says that when Adam and Eve had eaten of the forbidden tree, that the "eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons." Certain results follow eating fruit of any kind. Were you to eat poison fruit, certain effects would soon follow that would "open your eyes"—bring you to realize that you were poisoned. Before Adam and Eve had sinned they stood before the glorious Elohim unabashed. Sexually the feelings of maturity were inoperative; they had no inconvenient emotions towards each other. But so soon as Eve had

eaten of the forbidden tree her hitherto latent passions of the animal nature were set free. So with Adam. "The eyes of them both were opened." Chagrined at the discovery that both were naked, they at once sought to mitigate their sin by an invention or contrivance of their own: "they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons." Called by the Lord from their place of concealment, Adam said, "I was afraid because I was naked." Gen. 3: 10. Shame, which makes the subject of it feel so small that he could hide in a nut shell, now came upon him; and from the day Adam lost his innocency, exchanged his good conscience for a bad one, through yielding his bodily "members servants to uncleanness" (Rom. 6: 19), he and we have invariably kept the "uncomely parts" of our body (1 Cor. 12: 23) "hid," either with fig leaves or some other covering.

"The Land Shadowing with Wings."

What country is meant by the words, "The land shadowing with wings"? Isa. 18: 1.—*John H. Byerly.*

REPLY.

Some interpret the words as applicable to America; Adam Clark says Egypt is meant, but to us these positions are the merest guess. We take the words to represent England; and now give a few reasons for our view of the prophecy.

In the 17th chapter the prophet undoubtedly has reference to the Israelites, the natural descendants of Abraham, who, for the past 2,400 years have been "trodden down" by the Chaldeans, Persians, Macedonians, Romans, Saracens, and Turks. To get all

the prophecy, you must read the 17th chapter very closely. Note the words, "Woe to the multitude of many people," and "to the rushing of nations;" for "God shall rebuke them, and they shall flee far off, and shall be chased as the chaff of the mountains before the wind, and like a rolling thing before the whirlwind." Verses 12, 13. These "rushing nations" the prophet Ezekiel tells us, are "Gog, the land of Magog, Rosh, prince of Mesech and Tubal," in alliance with "Persia, Ethiopia, and Lybia, all of them with shield and helmet; Gomer, and all his bands (companies); the house of Togarmah of the north quarters, and all his bands; and many people with Gog"—a Russian, Tartarian host, which "shall rush" to the battle of their defeat "like the rushing of many waters." The Israelites are partially restored in the country promised to their fathers at the time of this invasion. This is the "evening tide" in which Jacob shall be in "trouble." Isa. 17: 14. Though the trouble is said to be "such as never was," yet we have the divine assurance that Israel shall be "delivered" (Dan. 12: 1) from it. "Before the morning he," the autocrat, "is not. This is the portion of them that spoil us (Israelites), and the lot of them that rob us." Isa. 17: 14.

This mighty victory of Israel over their enemies is partly achieved by the protecting "wings" of a friendly country; and this protecting country is insular and maritime,¹ having possessions "beyond the rivers of Kush." "Ho, to the land shadowing with wings"—protecting Israel with its outstretched wings of power, as a bird protects its young under the

shadow of its wings; "which is beyond the rivers of Kush." The "rivers" here mentioned, water the tract of Asia lying between the Tigris, Caspian Sea, and Persian Gulf, known as Khushistan, the ancient Asiatic Ethiopia. The prophet was in Jerusalem when he made this prophetic invocation, and if you will examine a map you will find that the land "beyond" Khushistan is Kush, Afghanistan, the Punjab, and the Mimalaya, which bound the Anglo-Indian empire on the north.

The nation with its territorial boundary thus indicated—England—is the nation of the Sea which cannot send "an ambassador" unless by sea. Her "vessels" are called "swift messengers;" and they will be used extensively in the resettling of Israel, in bringing them out from the nations, among whom they have been scattered and peeled for centuries, for a "present" unto the Lord, "to the place of the name of the Lord of hosts, the Mount Zion." Isa. 18: 7.

Principalities and Powers.

Will you give an exposition of Eph. 6: 12? What are the principalities and powers and rulers of darkness? Are they your enemies and mine? If so, are we waging an intelligent warfare against them by uniting our forces and by working harmoniously?—*N. D. Titchenal.*

REPLY.

Paul had just concluded his remarks on the Christian's armour and the necessity of putting it "on" to be strong in the Lord, and to be "able to stand against the wiles of the devil," when he wrote the 12th verse: "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against the rulers of the

darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.” To briefly analyze the statement: The wrestling the apostle mentions means his contention and warfare against the various adversaries he specifies. “Flesh and blood” is a Hebraism for human beings. In Gal. 1: 16 the expression is clearly a periphrasis¹ for man; a human being of any kind. The supposition that Paul here means he did not dally with the erroneous suggestions and unrenewed propensities of his own heart, is obviously wrong. The great apostle was fully satisfied that his call was of God; he had no doubts within himself about so great a matter; but he had no occasion to consult man, “confer with flesh and blood.” That by “flesh and blood” he referred to men or human beings other than himself is clearly indicated in the next verse which speaks of the apostles in particular: “Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me.” Now “we wrestle,” says the apostle, that is, we are carrying on the lively exercises of the athletic Olympic, or other national games; a warfare in general; not against “flesh and blood” or men in general, but “principalities” (chief rulers). The warfare is not against ordinary but extraordinary men. Not only against the “chief rulers,” but also against the “powers,” the authorities derived from, and constituted by, the “principalities;” and the “rulers of the darkness of this world:” people who occupy “the high places” in the governments of earth—the most sublime stations. These, mark you, were a kind of religious people, “spiritual” in a way—“spiritual wickedness!” They are charged with being guilty of

the spiritualities of wickedness; highly refined and sublimed evils; sins of culture; disguised falsehood, in the appearance of truth; antinomianism¹; in the fig leaf garment of Adam and Eve. The rabbins² and Jewish rulers are directly referred to. This is proved by the fact that the words, "rulers of the darkness of this world," and "high places," are phrases which often designate the Old Testament and the Jewish system and the New Testament and the gospel system. Psa. 2: 2 which speaks of the "rulers" taking council together is applied by the apostles to the Jewish rulers who persecuted Peter and John for preaching Christ. Acts 4: 26. From these principalities came all the "wiles of the devil" to which Paul and his fellow apostles were subjected. They preached "another King, one Jesus;" and this different kind of government which they preached was to come in the setting up of the kingdom which would destroy all the "principalities" of the present "world." Let brethren who vote be careful; they may be found fighting against God and his plan. Consider well.

"I Go to Prepare a Place for You." Jno. 14: 3.

Sister Esther Richardson has requested us to write an exposition of John 14: 3. We cannot do more in this article than give a brief, but we trust a satisfactory, explanation of the words, "I go to prepare a place for you." Where is the "place" Christ is preparing for his people? "Heaven" is the usual answer given to this question; but it seems to us that heaven needs no preparation. We can understand how a dilapidated house, having stood for a long time

without occupants, needs "fixing up," to use a common phrase which is well understood, before a family moves into it. By papering, cleaning, etc., the house would be "prepared" for habitation. You cannot conceive of heaven being in a dilapidated condition; for our orthodox friends claim that all the good people from Abel to Christ went to heaven when they died. So all the saints who were fortunate enough to die, the holy angels and the Almighty himself, were in heaven before Christ "prepared" it. Did Abel find heaven unprepared when he "got there?" If heaven was good enough for "righteous Abel," the angels and the Lord, unprepared, was it not good enough for the apostles without any preparation? Surely there was no defect in heaven; surely it was all right, as perfect as God himself.

In the second verse we read: "In my Father's house are many mansions, . . . I go to prepare a place for you." From this statement it is evident that the "place" Christ went to prepare for us is in the "Father's house." The word "*mone*," here translated mansion, means a room, an abode, in a house. The "place" prepared, the "mansions" for God's people, are undoubtedly in the "Father's house." In order to ascertain where these mansions are, it is essential to find out where and what the Father's house is: they are in it. With the question thus simplified, note carefully this Scripture: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established (mar. prepared) in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many

people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, and he shall teach us of his ways." Isa. 2: 2, 3. With such lucid information about the Lord's house as is supplied us by this passage of Scripture, we cannot fail to learn: 1. *When it will be established*: "In the last days." 2. *Where it will be "prepared"*: "in the top of the mountain." 3. *And what it is*: "the house of the God of Jacob." Thus it is clear that the Father's house will be upon the earth, where the "nations flow unto it;" and the saints will have mansions, or places of abode in it, as the wheat gathered "into the garner." Matt. 3: 12.

What Became of the Risen Saints?

What became of the saints who are said to have been raised from the dead in Matt. 27: 52, 53?—*C. A. Thomas.*

REPLY.

We transcribe entire the 52nd and 53rd verses: "And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept, arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many." When Christ, "yielded up the spirit" (verse 50,) there came a terrific earthquake (v. 51). Extraordinary rents and fissures are still visible in the rocks near the cross where Christ died. By the earthquake several bodies that had been buried were thrown up and exposed to view, and continued above ground till after Christ's resurrection, and were seen by many persons in the city. Like the two witnesses in Rev. 11: 8, 11, their "dead bodies" lay "in the streets of the great city"

for "three days and a half" before the "spirit of life from God entered into them." Notice that the writer is particular to state that they "came out of the grave after his resurrection;" not before as some have thought, for Christ is the "first fruits of them that slept." 1 Cor. 15: 20. Thus was established the truth of our Lord's resurrection in particular, and of the resurrection of his body in general. Christ, be it remembered, was the "first that should rise from the dead." Acts 26: 23; 1 Cor. 15: 20; Col. 1: 18; Rev. 1: 5. Christ was not the "first" to emerge from the grave in mortal nature; Nain's son, Jairus' daughter, Lazarus, and the man who "revived and stood upon his feet" when he touched the bones of Elisha (2 King 13: 21), were all resuscitated to mortal life before Christ's resurrection. He, however, was the "first" man to emerge from the death state immortal. All resurrections before his, and any that occurred with his, must have been mere revivals to natural life. With this principle settled, we cannot go wrong when we say that the saints who came out of the grave when he was raised, merely emerged from the death state in mortality. And the record of what they did after they were raised, the design or end in view of the resurrection, confirms this interpretation: they "went into the holy city (Jerusalem), and appeared to many." No one would believe in such an extraordinary thing as the resurrection of Christ unless attested by infallible proofs. As God knew this, you can easily see the design he had in raising these saints when Christ was raised, and sending them to the "holy city," to remain there as living witnesses,

like Lazarus, and “appear unto many” in that capacity. 1 Cor. 15th chapter read with this thought in mind appears in a new and beautiful light.

“They” in Matt. 26: 52.

Give an explanation of Matt. 26: 52. To whom does the “they” in the text apply? Just to the apostles on that occasion? or could you and I by taking the sword receive the penalty here pronounced?—*N. D. Titchenal.*

REPLY.

In the 51st verse the writer states that “one of them which were with Jesus stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and struck a servant of the high priest’s, and smote off his ear.” John, in giving a narrative of the same occasion, enters more largely into details than Matthew, by giving us the name of the servant—Malchus—which ear was cut off—the right one—and then singles out Peter as the one who committed the rash deed, John 18: 10. With this additional information given to us with divine limpidity¹ through John, we return to Matt. 26: 52: “And Jesus said unto him,” the “him” being Peter, as we have just learned; “Put up again thy sword into his place.” Thus far we have only singular pronouns, and Peter only involved as yet; but what is true of one individual is true of a multitude of individuals. So when the Master comes to allege a reason why we should desist from deeds of violence, he dropped the individual aspect of the question, and knowing that the principle he enunciated personally to Peter would be equally applicable to all his people upon the basis of representation, he enlarged his meaning by em-

ploying the plural pronoun; "For all they that live by the sword shall perish by the sword." The word "all" placed before "they" forbids any other interpretation of the language than that here given. "All they" exceed in meaning the little band of apostolic believers.

It is a principle of the divine utterance that whatever is said to one man of a certain class, is just as positively true of all individuals of that class. Early in creation's morning God decreed in a positive law, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed" (Gen. 9: 6); and in the closing book of God's message to man, written particularly to his saints, he exhorts them to have faith and patience, and reiterates with solemn assertion his former law; "He that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword." Rev. 13: 10. The word "must" is introduced in this text to make the statement strong and emphatic, and to show that God had not rescinded his former law. That language addressed to individuals is pertinently applied to subsequent generations is made clear by manifold illustrations in the history of Israel.

Addressing the people of his time Moses said in Deut. 28: "The Lord shall scatter you among the heathen," but not an individual Moses addressed was scattered, yet they were the "you" spoken to. So of the people of Christ's time: "What did Moses command you?" Mark 10: 2-6. This language, if interpreted as of national import, becomes beautiful in meaning and luminous in significance. If this principle of representative address is founded in

truth according to the examples we have cited when the pronoun "you" is used, how much more probable is the thought of our Master when he passes from the singular pronoun to the plural "they" in the text before us,—evidently with the design to exhibit, by one sweep of his omnipotence, that he was stating a principle that would materialize in all subsequent generations.

The Restoration of Israel.

I am sending you by this mail, under separate cover, a copy of the "Last Days" for June, 1907. Please read the marked article, "Isaiah Misinterpreted by Adventists." The writer's effort to explain the prophet's statements in the second chapter, and the same prophecy in Mi. 4 is superficial, strained and untrue. The one little but significant word "for" (Mi. 4: 5), demolishes his whole argument. It shows that the prophecy preceding it is the false saying of the people "in the last days" (Isa. 2: 1); that instead of God saying, "many nations shall come and say" (2) the words of the prophecy. And farther, it shows that instead of righteous people saying, "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more" (3) in a time of supposed perennial blessedness, "all people will walk every one in the name of his God"; "for" (5) this is what the prophet says they will do. Do you believe the statements of such idolators?—*A Friend.*

REPLY.²

We have perused the "Last Days" you kindly sent us with more than ordinary interest. The article marked and criticised by you we have read and re-read. The article shows no pusillanimity³ in the writer, yet he maintains a sweet, Christian spirit. His explanation of the prophecy in Micah 4 is so accordant with the immediate context, and is so harmonious with all other parts of God's Word, that I am sur-

prised that you think "one little significant word" will pre-empt his "whole argument." You seize the word "for" (5) with avidity, and try to make this little word do the work of an athlete. By it you expect to "demolish!" The word is so "little," dear friend, be careful that you do not, by sophistry¹ and puerility,² give it too big a task to perform.

Now let us look at this word "for"—this word of such tremendous "significance." It is a Hebrew particle, and means "though it be that." Examine the marginal rendering in Jos. 17: 18; Gen. 8: 21; Exod. 12: 17. "Though it be that all people will walk in the name of his God (nationally "all people" are idolators except Israel,) and we will walk in the name of our God forever and ever." (5) The nations of the earth have been, and are, "against" (11) the Israelites. They have been scattered, peeled, and afflicted by the idol worshipping nations of the earth; and in the midst of this opposition, the Jew is represented as making a resolution something like this: "Though it be that" all people among whom we are dispersed and down-trodden, walk after their gods; "though it be that" in the shame of national disaster, we live for centuries as nomads among idolaters, yet in view of the heart-building prophecy that our temple is to be restored with its sacrifices (1,) we will walk in the name of our God forever and ever." As they were thoroughly cured of idolatry by the Babylonian Captivity, so they will be effectually healed of unbelief by their present dispersion, affliction, and dishonor. Zech. 10: 8-12. "In that day"—here we ask the reader to pause a moment, just long enough

for us to “demolish” something! Keep sedate while we ask “a friend” who says this: “In that day?” Is this the “false sayings of the people?” the “statements of idolaters?” Listen, O my friend: “In that day, saith the Lord, will I assemble her that halteth, and I will gather her that is driven out, and her that I have afflicted, and I will make her that halteth a remnant, and her that was cast off a strong nation; and the Lord shall reign over them in Mount Zion from henceforth, even forever. And thou, O tower of the flock, the stronghold of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem.” Absconding friends, we know it is irksome for you to hear these words of Holy Writ; but if you can endure it remain with us until we quote the 11th, 12th, and 13th verses, and then you can avaunt! “Many nations are gathered against thee. . . . But they know not the thoughts of the Lord, neither understand they his counsel; for he shall gather them as the sheaves into the floor. . . . Thou shalt break in pieces many people; and I will consecrate their gain unto the Lord of the whole earth.” Our friend when confronted with plain statements like this passage, and which undeniably proves the restoration of Israel as a nation, seeks to evade the force of the text by saying, “O, that’s spiritual; it means spiritual Israel—the church.” But beloved, who has been “halted;” “driven out,” “afflicted” and “cast off?” The church? No! Literal Israel. Very well; so far so good. “I will gather her that is driven out.” (6) “I will make her that halteth a remnant, and her that

was cast off a strong nation.” (7) The same “her” that was “cast off” and “driven out” is to be “gathered” and make a “strong nation.” But Friend, like the “many nations” (11,) “understands not the thoughts of the Lord, neither understand they his counsel.” This accounts for and explains why he does not believe the Lord will gather his people “as the sheaves into the floor,” and make them “a strong nation”—in fact the “first dominion” in the coming kingdom, the kingdom which shall “come to the daughter of Jerusalem.”

Our friend thinks that the “perennial blessedness” spoken of in Micah 4 is only “supposed” by the aberrations¹ of an idolatrous people; that it is only a fad, never to be realized; that it is only the “false sayings” of “idolaters,” who are afflicted with a disease which for convenience we shall call inflammation of the imagination! We thought we were pretty well posted in the wily ways of modern theologians. We thought we had seen every dodge human ingenuity could invent in the way of theological quackery; such as, “That’s spiritual;” “the Bible was never intended to be understood;” “it makes no difference what we believe anyway,” etc., etc.; and we have seen the Josephite, scissors in hand, go through the Bible, clipping out a passage here, and a text there, that did not suit him. And occasionally we have seen him when his theory had been made uncomfortable by a cogent argument, sufficiently filled with effrontery to tear out a whole chapter and brand it “spurious.” But for “a friend” to put down as the “false sayings of the people,” prophecies made by the God of Abra-

ham, and to brand as statements of "idolaters," the language of the Most High God, reaches the climax of presumption! He has reached the last round of the ladder; there are no further heights to climb! We warn you friends, one and all, Be careful how you tamper with the words of the living God. He who despises the Lord's Word "shall be destroyed." Prov. 13: 13. Anciently God's people "mocked the messengers of God, despised his words, and misused his prophets," with the fearful result that "the wrath of the Lord arose against his people, till there was no remedy, to heal them." 2 Chron. 26: 16,¹ see margin. "As the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust." O my Lord, against what crime have you decreed such a vengeance? "Because they have cast away the law of the Lord, and despised the Word of the Holy One of Israel, therefore is the anger of the Lord kindled against his people, and he hath stretched forth his hand against them." Isa. 5: 24, 25.

I had rather submit to death in a hangman's noose than "despise" one word "the Holy One" has said: I would lay my neck on the block before I would "cast away" one jot or tittle of God's Word which he has "magnified above his name." Our friends who have "despised" certain parts of God's Word because it did not suit them, and have "cast away" other parts of it because it did not jingle with their theories, will find, when they come into judgment, that they have provoked the Lord to wrath, and that he will stretch forth his hand against them in a fiery

indignation, which shall destroy the adversaries. Heb. 10: 27. They will then find (but alas, too late for them) that God is not mocked; that their "blossom" of beauty, which looked so well and smelled so aromatic, shall "go up as dust," and that their very roots which they thought were securely fastened in the ground, shall be "as rottenness." As they decompose in the rottenness of the grave they will regret ten thousand regrets that there is no remedy that will heal them.

Do you want to turn from such a black, dreary vista, to a lovely and bright future? Then believe the words of the Almighty. And what are his words in Isa. 2: 3, 4?¹ Here they are; accept them: "He shall judge among the people, and shall rebuke strong nations afar off. . . . Neither shall they learn war any more. But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree, and none shall make him afraid; *for the mouth of the Lord of hosts hath spoken it.*" Does this say, The mouth of idolaters have spoken it? Or, for this is one of the false sayings of the people? No, indeed. The mouth of the Lord of hosts hath spoken it.

You conclude your letter with the question, "Do you believe the statements of such idolaters?" We conclude our reply with the interrogation: Do you believe what "the mouth of the Lord of hosts hath spoken?"

Sacrifices in the Reign of Christ.

In the prophetic teaching of Ezekiel 43: 18, and onward, we find a return to sacrificial offerings foretold. We have been taught to believe that in the next age, more intelligent and

glorious than this one, these sacrificial ceremonies would find no place. As Christ was the end of the law, we were led to think that the Old Covenant had passed away forever.—*A. Graves.*

REPLY.

As to what we have been taught, that is a matter of no moment. All who are not doctrinally prejudiced, and who take the Bible as their man of Counsel must admit that when Ezekiel's "house of prayer for all people" is built in the Holy Land, the offerings and sacrifices superseded by Christ's death are restored. Anyone who claims to believe the Bible must admit this. Mal. 1: 11; Isa. 60: 7, 8; 19: 21; Hos. 3: 4, 5; Zech. 14: 21; Psa. 118: 27. We have been taught the "intelligent and glorious" age to come would have nothing of this sort in it; we have reasoned against the possibility of offering sacrifices after the anti-typical "Lamb of God" has offered himself for the sin of the world. Jno. 1: 36. A few moments of sober thought, however, will dissipate the force of this seemingly strong objection. Babes in Christ are familiar with the rudimentary truth that Christ's reign upon earth will be a priestly one: "He shall be a priest on his throne." Zech. 6: 13. The saints associated with Christ are "Kings and Priests." Rev. 1: 6. That they exercise this double function during Christ's reign on earth is evident from Rev. 5: 10. If, then, the Millennial reign of Christ is a priestly one; if he exercises the double function of King and priest then; if he is King to rule and a priest to intercede for sins, it is in harmony with the "eternal fitness of things," that the people

ruled should make offerings in token of their obedience; and that the Priest should have sacrifices to present to the Father on their behalf.

Sacrifices and ordinances are retrospective and prospective in their significance and scope. We learn this from the offerings of the Levitical law. They pointed prophetically to the death of Christ which was not yet accomplished. Jno. 1: 29; 1 Pet. 1: 19, 20. They were typical of the "better sacrifice" (Heb. 9: 23) to come. After Christ's death became a fact our Saviour gave us the ordinance of breaking bread and drinking wine to "show the Lord's death till he come." 1 Cor. 11: 26. This ordinance, you see, looks prospectively to the Lord's coming and retrospectively to his death. It points both ways, backwards and forwards, past and future. Sacrifices, *ergo*, offered before Christ's death, pointed down in a typical way to his death on the cross. Now that his death is an historical fact, we conclude that the sacrifices which will be offered in Ezekiel's Temple in the next age of "more intelligence" than this one, will retrospectively and commemoratively celebrate the Lord's Sacrificial death on the cross. The breaking of bread not only leads the mind forward to the Lord's coming, but sends it backward to his sufferings and death. Sacrificial ceremonies, therefore, are historical and prophetic; and hence the Lord's supper is celebrated in the kingdom of God (Luke 22: 16-18), and the song of redemption is sung (Rev. 5: 9, 10) there—both are historical, retrospective and commemorative. Incongruous at first thought perhaps, that a ritual obsolete for centuries should obtain

again under the rule of the "Prophet like unto Moses" (Acts 3: 22), yet reflection on the subject reveals a grand display of divine wisdom in the arrangement. Christ would not be much "like" Moses if there were an absence of Sacrificial offerings during his beneficent reign.

Creed.

"I do not like THE RESTITUTION; it has a creed in the northeast corner." These words were recently penned by a brother in a letter to us. His statement caused me to ask, Is it criminal to have a creed? Is the little word "creed" dangerous? What does it mean? It is from the Latin *credo*, is found at the beginning of the Apostles' Creed, and means "I believe." "A definite summary of what is believed" says Webster; "a brief exposition of important points, as in religion, science, politics, etc., especially a summary of Christian belief, a religious symbol; as the Apostolic Creed."

After all the word is harmless. It just means you believe something, and that you are able and willing to give "a definite summary" of your faith. Even politicians have platforms which contain "a brief exposition of the important points" for which they stand committed and pledged. And so it is with science and religion. The sane man does not live who has no creed. Faith is the assent of the mind to "a definite summary of what is believed." Belief is not an invention of men; it is the constant and essential act of the human mind. The mind must believe something. Even the skeptic has his creed. The man who

does not believe in religious creeds, believes in something. Our brother who objects to the creed in "the northeast corner" of THE RESTITUTION, has a creed in the southwest corner of Something, Somewhere. To say you have no creed is to say you have no belief, and to unconsciously confess you are an unbeliever.

We remember once when the Christian Disciples were holding a revival meeting in our home town, that the minister denounced creeds in very intemperate language. This sect is very bitter against creeds. He preached one day on them, and represented that they were very dangerous, unscriptural, etc., and yet during his sermon he said "I believe" twelve times! He not only said he believed twelve times, but he gave us "a definite summary" of what he believed on faith, confession, repentance, and he did not forget to bring in baptism good and strong!!

Now "a brief exposition of important points" in one's faith is just as much a creed if spoken as if written. The Campbellites are the worst creed-bound sect in all Christendom, yet they have no written creed. I asked this minister if it was really true that his church had no creed—no belief? Are there no doctrines which you require people to believe? Nothing essential—not a thing? "Our church has no creed," was his reply. Only yesterday three sinners applied to you for baptism, and you asked them, "Do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God?" They said Yes. Suppose they had said No, would you have baptized them? "To be sure, No," he answered; "we do require belief in Christ's Sonship; the whole gospel is wrapped up in that." Never

mind what is "wrapped up;" look at what is on the outside. You *do* have a creed. "Call it what you will," said the preacher, "it is only a little one."

His admission brings to my mind a story which I here insert for illustrative purposes: A nice family once engaged a girl to keep house for them, with the understanding that she was a pure, good girl. After a while the mistress of the home learned that she was a bad character, and the mother of an illegitimate child. "Is it true," she asked the girl, "that you are the mother of an illegitimate child?" "Yes, I am," replied the girl, "but it is only a little one!" So it is with creeds—some people wax warm in denouncing them, but when you run them down you find they have a creed themselves, though it may be a little one.

Infant Sprinkling Proved by Inferences.

A Methodist Bible Class had one member who doubted the truth of sprinkling infants. He became interested in the subject, and became so doubtful of its being Scriptural, he came to be known and was usually spoken of as "the doubter." One day a happy thought struck the teacher, "We will," said he to his class, "just fix the Doubter's doubts. Next meeting I require every one in the class to bring with them a text of Scripture to prove that it is Scriptural to sprinkle infants. Our brother's doubts will be dispelled when he looks at the evidence all in a pile."

The class convened at the usual hour, and the teacher began to call on the pupils for their texts. The first one read, "Suffer little children and forbid

them not, to come unto me.” Matt. 19: 14. “It is not direct proof,” said the pupil, “that Christ baptized the children that were brought to him, but we infer that he did.” “But,” interrupted the doubter, “Jesus baptized not, but his disciples,” (Jno. 4: 2); so if the people wanted their children baptized, they took them to the wrong person.” The teacher then cleared up his throat and muttered, “The point is only an inference; we pass on to stronger and clearer proof; next.” The second pupil read: “And when she was baptized, and her household—and her household—and her—” Acts 16: 15. “While the text does not have a direct bearing on the question,” commented the scholar, “yet it is easy to see that as her household was baptized, it is probable that her household embraced infants. We infer that it did.” “But,” broke out the doubter again, “the household might have been descriptive of the children after they had become grown men and women. I infer that this is the case. Or we might infer that Lydia was an old maid, and that her household embraced the agents who were selling her purple in Thyatira. See verse 14.” So the class went on inferring and guessing until it came the Doubter’s time to read, and when the teacher asked him if he had a text to read, he surprised them all by saying he had, and their surprise increased into amazement when he read, “And Balaam rose up in the morning, and saddled his ass.” Numbers 22: 21. After blushing and coughing the teacher said in a kind of confused way: “Why, that verse has nothing to do with the subject; do you think it does?” to which query the Doubter replied: “It

does not approach the question directly, but we are able to build several inferences on it. 1. The first one may be stated in this form: Most men marry; therefore it is a possible inference that Balaam was a married man. 2. As a rule people are blessed with off-spring in the married state; therefore it is a probable inference that Balaam had children. 3. And finally it is a likely inference that when the text says, "Balaam rose up in the morning," it means that the children were preparing themselves for Sunday-school; and that Balaam "saddled his ass" to take them there to have them sprinkled."

Hearing.

Please harmonize Acts 9: 7, "And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man," with Acts 22: 9, "But they heard not the voice of him that spake to me."—*Nancy Hardison.*

REPLY.

The solution of the confiction stated by Sister Hardison is found in the different senses in which the word "hear" is used. In Scripture and in common parlance there is frequent verbal contradiction. Here is a Bible example: The righteous of past ages are honorably mentioned because they "confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth." Heb. 11: 13. But in Eph. 2: 19, it is a matter of thanksgiving with Paul that the Ephesian ecclesia was "no more strangers and foreigners." The contradiction in these passages grows out of the different senses in which the word "strangers" is used. All books have word contradictions, for the sufficient reason that no word has one fixed meaning. All con-

traditions culled from the Bible and displayed with unbounded confidence by skeptics, are nothing but verbal peculiarities. There is not a contradiction in thought to be found between the covers of the dear old Book. These remarks suggest the solution of Acts 9: 7, and 22: 9. The seeming discord in the two texts is purely verbal. They "heard the voice," and they "heard not the voice"—a cross in words, but there is no conflict in the thoughts expressed. "To hear" is a verb used "after the manner of men" (Gal. 3: 15), and often in the Bible, to mean not only the hearing of sound in the way of being sensible that some one spoke, but it signifies an understanding and obedience to what is heard. Rev. 2: 39; 22: 17, 18; 2 Thes. 1: 8.² The voice which addressed Paul uttered its speech "in the Hebrew tongue." Acts 26: 14. Paul's attendants were Romans, and while they "heard the voice" in the sense that they were sensible of hearing sound, and were conscious that some one spoke, they "heard not the voice" in the sense of comprehending and understanding its meaning. See the translation of these passages in the Diaglott and the Improved Version.

"Though He was Rich."

In what way did our Saviour become poor? 2 Cor. 8: 9.—*Martha Sutterfield.*

REPLY.

In the context the apostle Paul is speaking of the liberality of the Macedonians (v. 1); how they gave financially for the spread of the truth all that they had power to give, "and beyond their power" (v.

3). He commends them because they were as eminent in this "grace" as they were in "faith, and utterance, and love" (v. 7). As exemplifying the spirit of liberality he passes on to the Lord himself, and with admiral address says, "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor." v. 9. Some have trouble in interpreting the statement that Christ was rich, for his family was poor; his parents were very poor; he himself never possessed any property from the time he was born in the stable till he died on the cross. How, then, was Christ rich? Whatever his wealth consisted of, he, "for our sakes," denied himself its possession, and lived a "poor" life. By reading the first chapter of Matthew you will learn that Christ was the "Son" of both Abraham and David (v. 1); and that according to the genealogy there given, he had the legal right to Abraham's inheritance and David's throne of glory. Add to this legal right the fact that when he was of age the Jews were a vassal people, degraded subjects of the Roman Empire; and that galling under the misrule of an exotic and hated power, they were anxious to make him king "by force" (Jno. 6: 15), and surely his riches are apparent. All the kingdoms of earth and their glory were his, if he wanted them (Matt. 4: 8, 9). We can now appreciate the "grace of our Lord Jesus Christ" in denying himself power, glory and riches, which were his, and which he might have possessed, living a "poor" life, a life so poor that he had "not where to lay his head" (Matt. 8: 20); all for our sakes, and that we "might be made rich."

In this self-denial lies the great “grace of the Lord Jesus Christ.”

Did Christ Pre-Exist as Creator?

As showing that Christ personally pre-existed, we need nothing more than the assurance of the apostle Paul that he not only existed “before all things” (Col. 1: 17), but that “by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth: . . . all things were created by him and for him.” Verse 16.—*Walter Goodyear.*

REPLY.

The texts quoted by our friend (Col. 1: 16, 17), are regarded as good proof that Christ personally pre-existed; their “assurances” are looked upon as point blank proof of that dogma. When the absurdities of Christ’s pre-existence are in danger of being exposed, its advocates generally use Col. 1: 16, 17 for a portiere¹ to hide the “skeleton in the closet.” To say that Christ was “before all things,” sounds well for the theory of pre-existence, if not examined too critically; and to say that “all things were created by him and for him” is really triumphant proof of that view, if not scanned too closely. The trouble with our friends who hold to this view of our Saviour is, they have a few texts of Scripture learned by memory, and these passages they can glibly quote. Casually read they apparently favor Christ’s pre-existence. Believers in the pre-existence of Christ (which is a consort of immortal Soulism), do not understand the Scriptures they quote, and they do not see the result of their interpretation of the Bible. If they did; if they declined to accept the position until they had a look at results which follow premises: if they

knew where they would land, nobody would believe or advocate the pre-existence of Christ. We can illustrate these remarks by the texts quoted by Mr. Goodyear. Suppose that Christ existed "before" the creation spoken of in Genesis; and further, suppose that "by him" all things were created; that he was creator of all things: Suppose that all this is true: What about results? What becomes of God? "Thus saith the Lord that created the heavens; God himself that formed the earth and made it." Who is the speaker in this text of Scripture? The Creator of heaven and earth. Who is he? "God himself." But our friend, Mr. Goodyear, by trying to apply Col. 1: 16, 17 to the creation recorded in Genesis, and to Christ as the "God himself" who formed all things, makes Christ the Speaker as well as the Creator in Isa. 45: 18. So he understands, "Thus saith the Lord," and "God himself that formed the earth" to mean "Jesus himself that formed," etc. Therefore the same speaker and same person says, "I am the Lord, and there is none else!" If Jesus is the "Lord" speaking here, then since He says, "I am the Lord, and there is none else," what becomes of God? If Jesus is Lord and there is "none else," "God himself" cannot be Lord!! I solemnly avow it as my earnest conviction that there cannot be even a pinch of truth in a theory which is so derogatory to the Almighty. Not only does the pre-existence of Christ ignore God, and belittle him to a secondary consideration, but it so magnifies Jesus as Lord, Creator, etc., under the "assurances" of perverted texts, that

the very existence of God, apart from Christ, is denied—"there is none else."

That this conclusion was not my friend's desideratum¹I know; that he meant to glide along to the goal of Skepticism, I do not believe; but that he is snuffing the murky²atmosphere of an unbeliever, is painfully evident. Whether he intended it or not, he is face to face with the logical upshot of his view that Christ pre-existed as Creator, that there is no God but Christ—"none else." The fact is, our Father is the "only true God" (Jno. 17: 3); Jesus is only his Son whom he has sent. And when we read Col. 1 with docility we find all of Paul's "assurances" there in perfect accord with this principle of sound doctrine.

I verily believe that Christ was "before" and Creator of "all things;" that he is the "Head of the Body, the church: who is the beginning, the first born from the dead, that in all things he might have pre-eminence" (verse 18). Instead of Paul giving us "assurances" about Christ being "before" and creating heaven and earth as reported in Genesis, we find he is talking about "thrones," "dominions," "principalities," and "powers" (verse 16); about the "church," its "Head," "Beginning," etc. Paul knew that it is an inevitable law which says, "First the natural, afterwards the spiritual." 1 Cor. 15: 46. "Behold I make all things new," says Jesus. Rev. 21: 5. Every man in Christ is a "new creature." 2 Cor. 5: 17. Here then we have "assurances" that Jesus is a Creator most truly, but Crea-

tor of a “new creature” (creation)—“new heavens and new earth.” Isa. 65: 17. Now Col. 1 affirms that Jesus is “head” and “beginning” of this creation; that He is the “first born” of this creation; and that he is to hold a position of “pre-eminence” in it, all of which I accept. But when this Scripture—these “assurances”—are blindly applied to the “first heaven and earth” (Rev. 21: 1), the “natural” (1 Cor. 15: 46) ones (Gen. 1: 1) and not to the Head and Beginning of the New Creation—“the church”—God’s word is perverted and handled “deceitfully.” 2 Cor. 4: 2. The doctrine of Christ’s pre-existence is a fragment of the immortality of the soul, and the Bible is against it negatively, constructively, and positively.

Eliseus—Elijah.¹

Does Eliseus and Elijah mean the same person?—*John H. Byerly.*

REPLY.

Yes, Eliseus is merely the Greek form of Elijah. Luke 4: 27. In the Old Testament names that end in *ah* are ended in the Greek (New Testament) with *as*, as the following instances will suffice to show: Jeremiah, Jeremias Matt. 16: 14; (the shortened English form of Jeremiah occurs once, Jeremy, Matt. 2: 17); Elijah, Elias, (Luke 4: 26); Joshua, Jesus, Heb. 4: 8. The same persons are meant, and the same names are used, only they are differently spelt, owing to the differences of the languages in which they are rendered.

An Apparent Contradiction Explained.

Will you kindly harmonize the records of Matt. 27: 44, and Mark 15: 32, which declare that the "thieves"—"they"—"reviled him," with Luke 23: 39-43, which teaches that but "one of the malefactors . . . railed on him," while the other was promised salvation.—*G. E. Marsh.*

REPLY.

The apparent contradiction in the gospel records mentioned by Brother Marsh has caused some of our brethren much anxiety and trouble. Some of them have been so perplexed and confused by the difference in the records that they have made wild suggestions and advanced unscriptural theories in their efforts to harmonize the different, and to them, conflicting accounts about the thieves on the cross. One theory very unscholarly and decidedly reprehensible is that Luke 23: 43 is a question, not an affirmation: "Shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" If the advocates of this view would only look up the original they would find "thou" before "shalt:" "Thou shalt be with me in Paradise." This is not an interrogative but a declarative sentence. The repentant thief prayed, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." (V. 42) God's word pledges mercy and forgiveness to those who confess and forsake their sins. Prov. 28: 13. How befitting our Lord who came into the world to save sinners (1 Tim. 1: 14)¹ by dying for them (Rom. 5: 10); how like our Lord as he hung between vile transgressors (Isa. 53: 12), to extend love, mercy and pardon to a praying apostate! He answered the thief's prayer with words of loving assurance. "Verily I say unto thee to-day,

Thou shalt be with me in paradise.” “Verily,” says Young, means “So be it, so is it, amen.” If the word “verily,” followed by an emphatic “thou shalt,” does not grant the thief’s prayer and give him a home in the kingdom when the Lord comes, language has no meaning. Because this matter was not told by Matthew and Mark’s gospels, is nothing against Luke’s account. Luke intimates in the preface of his book (Luke 1: 1-5)² that those who had written gospels before him had omitted some things. As he had perfect knowledge of all things “from the very first,” he gives us many things the other writers did not tell. Hence his gospel is invaluable.

Matthew and Mark plainly state that the “thieves” (both of them) reviled Christ. Luke in no way conflicts with their narratives. He does not contradict; he only adds to their account. About half of the difficulties in the two records are created by us. Luke does not say, “but one of the malefactors reviled him.” If he had said “but one” (only one) railed on him, he would have contradicted Matthew who says the “thieves”—both of them—did. Instead of saying “but one,” Luke says: “One of the malefactors which were hanged railed on him.” (23: 39): If the “thieves”—both of them—reviled Christ as Matthew affirms, was not Luke within the bounds of truth when he declared “one” did? As Matthew says two did, I am sure Luke was not over-stating the truth of the matter when he said “one” railed on Christ.

Luke reports a prayer Christ made on the cross (23: 34) which is omitted by all the other writers.

God gives us the truth by the mouth of "two or three witnesses." Deut. 17: 6; Matt. 18: 16; John 8: 17; 2 Cor. 13: 1; Heb. 10: 28. If one writer told the details and omitted nothing, we would only need one gospel record. But God has given us four gospels, revealing "here a little, and there a little" (Isa. 28: 10), until his "whole counsel" (Acts 20: 27) has been made known. It is by taking the different words the Holy Spirit has used in different parts of the Bible; it is by comparing "spiritual things with spiritual" (1 Cor. 2: 13) that we get the "mind of Christ" (verse 16). If one writer told all, others would have been left without anything additional to tell. So after believing all Matthew and Mark tell that happened on the cross, we turn to Luke's record, and there we find this much additional information; Christ prayed, one of the thieves repented, prayed, and as he had been a baptized believer, he was pardoned, and was assured a home in the coming kingdom of our God.

The Souls Under the Altar.

Will you please explain Rev. 6: 9, 10, and greatly oblige yours very respectfully!—*E. E. Slack.*

REPLY.

The 6th chapter of Revelation unfolds the events which were to occur when the Lamb opened the six seals. By reading the chapter with care you will learn that the seals are only time-periods in which certain events transpire. The first, second, third and fourth seals have to do politically with the Roman Habitable; but the fifth seal gives us divine illumin-

ation as to the Body of Christ in its conflicts with the Roman Beast. It shows the "dreadful and terrible" (Dan. 7: 7) beast killing the saints on an altar, "for the Word of God, and for the testimony which they held." It speaks of them in the agonies of death as crying with a "loud voice" for God to speedily avenge their blood on their enemies. In the remarks which follow we limit our comments on the passage to 1. The "altar" on which they were killed; and 2. The "loud voice" which they uttered in their dying moments.

1. *The Altar.* In the Old Testament we often have altars which were erected by God's people called by very remarkable and suggestive titles. Jacob built one and called it Ail-Elohai-Yisraail, "the Strength of the Mighty Ones of Power's Prince." Gen. 28: 18-20. As Jacob could not and did not consider the work of his own power the "Power's Prince," he was taught, and we are instructed, that his altar was only a symbol of him who is the Strength and Power of God. The altar on which the Israelites offered their sacrifices was "an altar of earth." "And," continues the record, "if thou shalt make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone; for if thou lift thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it. Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto mine altar, that thy nakedness be not discovered thereon." Ex. 20: 24-26. "We have an altar" (Heb. 13: 10) in the person of our Lord. He was "an altar of earth," of the same nature we are, and bore "the image of the earthy" (1 Cor. 15: 49), as the type requires. And further, he was, like the

stone of the Levitical altar, not hewn or touched by any "tool" of man's device. They who affirm that Joseph is the father of Christ "pollute" him, and make Joseph the builder of an altar of hewn stone, upon which his nakedness had been discovered.

Christ is the altar on which his faithful followers were "beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the Word of God." Rev. 20: 4. Believers were constantly exhorted by the apostles to be ready at any time to make a sacrifice of themselves. Especially was this true antecedent and concurrent with the fifth seal. Christ's sacrifice is expressed in the prophetic words, "He hath poured out his soul unto death." Isa. 53: 12. Christ showed the apostles by his death how they were to die. 2 Pet. 1: 14. Paul was acquainted with this prophetic intimation, and so says to the brethren at Philippi, "If I be offered (poured forth, see the Greek), I joy, and will rejoice with you all." Phil 2: 17. Just before his death at the hand of Nero he said he was "ready to be offered" (poured out), that is, sacrificed. 2 Tim. 4: 6. A century later, Ignatius was executed by Trajan, and he spoke of being poured out as a libation to God on his altar. The biographer of Polycarp, of Smyrna, who suffered in A. D. 160, says: "Having his hands tied behind him, and being bound as a ram out of a great flock for an offering, and prepared for a burnt sacrifice, acceptable to the Deity, he looked to heaven and said, "O Father, I give thee hearty thanks that thou hast vouchsafed^d to me that at this day and this hour I should have a part in the number of thy witnesses in the cup of Christ, unto the resurrection of eternal

life both of soul and body, in the incorruption of the Holy Spirit. Among whom may I be accepted this day before thee as an acceptable sacrifice, as thou hast ordained." From Polycarp's words we see that the texts of Scripture we have cited led him to regard his execution as a sacrifice, or a pouring out underneath the altar. He cheerfully submitted to the "cup of Christ," and expressed his faith in a future resurrection of his soul as well as his body to the "incorruption of the Holy Spirit."

2. *The "loud voice."* Now the "loud voice" which these men of God uttered when they died at the hands of their enemies, is explained by the words, "poured out his soul," etc. "The life of the flesh is in the blood." Lev. 17: 11. Jesus "poured out his soul" when he poured out his blood on the cross. When he was expiring on the cross he "*cried with a loud voice.*" Matt. 27: 46. Even if there were no words audibly uttered the text would yet express a great truth. The blood of Abel shed by Cain is said to have a voice and to speak—"the voice of thy brother's bloods (Heb) *cryeth* unto me from the ground." Gen. 4: 10. In the same way the blood of Jesus, which was "the life of the flesh," was "poured out" on the cross, and speaks in thunder tones—"speaketh better things than that of Abel." Heb. 12: 24. The blood of Abel only spoke of Cain's sin and murder; Christ speaks of "better things" than that, for it speaks of pardon and peace. As the blood is the life or soul, when it was "poured out" on the altar in sacrifice, it ran down "under the altar," lost its fluidity, and became solid or concrete. As a co-

agulated mass it remained there as a soul under the altar to “speak” by its stains and presence, and to cry “with a loud voice” to the “Holy and True” One to take judicial vengeance on the murderers. Hasten the day, O Lord, when thou wilt avenge thy peoples’ blood on them that dwell on the earth.

Prayer, Private and Public.

If God is not ashamed to be called our God (Heb. 2: 11; 11: 16), his children certainly should not be ashamed to call Him “Father” (Matt. 6: 9) in public (Exo. 20: 24; 2 Chron. 7: 14, 16; Isa. 56: 7; Matt. 12: 9, 18, 19, 20; Luke 4: 16; 11: 2) as well as in private. Psa. 55: 17; 88: 1; Dan. 6: 10; 1 Thes. 5: 17. If our dear Master is a safe pattern to copy, and he prayed, remember, on the cross, right in the presence of, and for, the motley crowd who murdered him (Luke 23: 24)¹, surely it is proper and right for the “spirit of his Son” in our hearts to utter supplications, entreaties, and prayers, in the same way and manner. Gal. 4: 6. There are numerous instances of public prayer recorded in the Bible; we cannot refer to them all, but here are a few: Joshua (Jos. 7: 4-9); David, (1 Chron. 29: 10-12); Solomon, (2 Chron. 6: 12); The Primitive Church, (Acts 2: 46²; 4: 24; 12: 5, 12); Peter and John, (Acts 3: 1); church at Antioch, (Acts 13: 3); Paul and Silas, (Acts 16: 16); and Paul with the Elders at Ephesus, Acts 20: 36; 21: 5.

Christ’s Coming in Flesh.

Please give me your exposition of 2 John 7. Does it refer to the first or second coming of Christ? See the Diaglott. —*Eld. O. J. Allard.*

REPLY.

For the words, "are entered into the world," the oldest Mss. including the Vatican, read, "Went forth into the world." "They went out from us," writes John in his first epistle, 2: 19, and then gives this reason for their segregation, "They were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they are not all of us." They are called "deceivers" and "antichrist" because they transgressed "the doctrine of Christ." 2 John 9. The Greek word translated "transgresseth" in verse 9, literally means to "go beyond." Their transgression took the form of being wise above what is written; and they not only "went forth" from the faithful brethren, but they "went beyond" the "doctrine of Christ" which he had revealed from the Father during his personal ministry in the days of his flesh. In fact they denied that he had come in the flesh at all. This was one prominent plank in their platform or creed. The word "come" in verse 7, is "coming" in the Greek. To deny Christ's coming in the flesh logically denied God's manifestation in his person; and to deny that God was manifested "in the flesh" (1 Tim. 3: 16) in the person of his Son, denies the "doctrine of Christ" in one of its most clearly revealed and important features. The Greek present participle implies both the first and second coming of our Lord. He is called emphatically the "Coming One" in the Greek (see the Greek Testament and Diaglott in Matt. 11: 3; Heb. 10: 37.) Those who deny the incarnation of God in Christ at

his first coming, and his personal coming again, like the Russellites, are more than “deceivers;” they are Antichrist.

Who Is the Ancient of Days?

I would like to ask you a question—Who is the Ancient of Days spoken of in Daniel, 7th chapter?—*Mrs. A. M. Castle.*

REPLY.

The Ancient of Days is spoken of three times in Daniel 7th chapter, (verses 9, 13, 32).¹ A critical reading of these verses will show you that the prophet is speaking about two personages: one called “the Ancient of Days;” the other, “the Son of Man.” That Jesus is the Son of Man is admitted without demonstration; and that by the Ancient of Days his Father is meant must be obvious from the fact that the Son of Man is represented as subordinate to the Ancient of Days. The superiority of the Ancient of Days over the Son is apparent in such statements as, “The Son of Man came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him (the son) near before him” (the Ancient of Days) v. 13. The son is said to “come to the Ancient of Days,” and to be “brought near before him,” before he was “given dominion, and glory, and a kingdom” (v. 14). What is meant by, “And they brought him near before him,” and “There was given him a kingdom,” is lucidly explained by Christ’s parable of the Nobleman in the 19th chapter of Luke. It was the Roman custom for all officials of the provinces, before assuming the throne of government, to make a journey to Rome, the Eternal City, so-called. They were “brought near” the Emperor

in stately style, and then they received from him legal authority or title deeds of their office. Basing his parable upon this Roman custom, Christ represents himself as a Nobleman "going into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." V. 12. "And it came to pass, when he had returned, having received the kingdom." V. 15. One grand purpose of Christ's going to the "far country" (heaven), was to "receive for himself a kingdom." He was "brought near" the Ancient of Days for this very purpose, that he might receive "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, and nations, and languages, should serve him. These things are promised to him, and he is heir of them all, but they have not yet been "given" (Dan. 7: 14) to him; as is manifest from the fact that "all people, nations, and languages" are serving Gentile rulers, and especially that system of government represented by the Greco-Roman Dragon. But when the Son actually "receives for himself a kingdom" he will "return" and "sit in Jerusalem, the Holy City (the true Eternal City), to judge all the nations round about." Joel 3: 12, 13. Then the saints will "take the kingdom" (Dan. 7: 18, 27) and possess it with him.

Thus you see, Sister Castle, that while the prophecy discriminates between the Ancient of Days and the Son of Man, representing the first as superior to the second, yet in the same chapter the two are blended, and the Son of man is called the Ancient of Days. Verses 9, 22. The description of the Son in the 9th verse compared with the description of Christ in Rev.

1: 12-17 shows they are the same person. How the Ancient of Days can be both the Father and the Son may be a little confusing for a moment, but a few thoughts about the manifestation of the Eternal Father in flesh will clarify the subject. Though the Father is primarily the Ancient of Days, and though he is judge of all (Dan. 7: 10), yet he has delegated to his Son all power in heaven and in earth. Matt. 28: 18. "He has," to use the language of our Master, "committed all judgment unto the Son;" so it is true in fact that the Father "judgeth no man." John 5: 22. God's design in this arrangement is that "all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father." V. 23. As he is God's Son, like all other children, he has inherited his Father's name; hence is called "the Everlasting Father" Isa. 9: 7)¹; "The Lord of Hosts" (Zech. 14: 16; "Our God" (Psa. 30: 3)²; "the God of the whole earth." Isa. 54: 5; Jude 14,³ and the Ancient of Days.

The New Covenant.

What law governs the new man; or, in other words, What covenant are believers under? Certainly not the new covenant, for that is to be made with the house of Israel and the house of Judah when they are restored. Jer. 31: 31.—*O. J. Allard.*

REPLY.

The "new man" is a New Testament term which is applied to the "old man" after he has been transformed by the gospel. He is then called a "new man" because he has been made over by the divine energy of the gospel, and has been renewed in heart and spirit. Ezek. 36: 26. After this work of transformation has been wrought upon him, he walks in God's

statutes and keeps his judgments. Verse 27. With God's law written in his heart or "inward parts," "not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God," he is positively in the New Covenant. 2 Cor. 3: 3, 6; Jer. 31: 31; Heb. 10: 15-22. If he is not subject to the laws of the new covenant, to what laws is he amenable? A "better covenant" with "better promises" (Heb. 8: 6), inspiring us with a better hope than the first covenant could give, has been brought in, and it is "by the which we draw nigh to God." Heb. 7: 19. This is the Will by which we are sanctified through the offering of Jesus in his sacrificial death. Heb. 10: 10. How could this will sanctify believers if they are not in it? Christ is the "Mediator of the New Testament," and as testator of that will, it was "by means of death" as a "necessity" that he ratified it in his death. Heb. 9: 15, 16. "A Testament is of force," the apostle affirms, "after men are dead," verse 17. Christ's shed blood is positively "the blood of the new covenant" (Matt. 26: 26)¹; and it was "through the blood" of this covenant that God raised him to life again. Heb. 13: 20. If the new covenant which Christ died to ratify over 1880 years ago has not been brought into force yet, and will not be till he restores Israel, we are plunged headlong into a whirlpool of difficulties and absurdities from which we are helpless to extricate ourselves. Christ is called "the mediator of the new covenant." Is he a mediator now, or must we wait till he makes the new covenant with Israel at his coming before we are blessed with mediatorship functions? "By means of death" as testator of the new will, he brought it

into "force." "A testament is of force after men are dead," says Paul. Then how can we account for the fact that Christ died 1880 years ago, and yet the covenant is not to be in force till his second coming? If the covenant is brought into force then for the first time, and if it is "by means of death," as Paul is bold to say, how are we to dodge the ugly and untrue thought that Christ as testator of the Will will have to die at his second advent to bring it into force!

We avoid all these inexplicable difficulties when we get our mind clearly impressed with the fact that the New Covenant is the Abrahamic covenant, and that the Abrahamic covenant is the gospel. Jer. 31: 31 teaches that the new covenant is to be made with the house of Israel and the house of Judah at a particular time—when they are restored at the Lord's coming. The covenant will not be made with them until then. The house of Israel and the house of Judah are still in captivity. But the covenant promised to them was made in the death of Jesus. It is also made in the adoption of every believer till he comes, and is only another aspect of the fulfilment of the Word and oath God made to Abraham. Jesus is on the right hand of the Father awaiting the fulfilment of the covenant, till his enemies are made his footstool. Strangers and aliens are being brought into covenant relationship in the divine order; first the taking out from the nations a people for his name; then the restoration of Israel, culminating in the blessing of all families of the earth in Abraham and his seed. Thus the fulfilment of the Abrahamic covenant and the

fulfilment of the promised new covenant in Jer. 31: 31 are one and the same thing.

Preaching the Cross.

The Church of God is charged with being remiss in its duty because it does not preach the Cross of Christ. Paul says that the "preaching of the Cross" is the "power of God" to save believers. 1 Cor. 1: 18. Modern theologians have noted Paul's statement, and taking his affirmation to be exclusive of all doctrinal significance, have denounced us because we make prominent in our ministrations The Kingdom of God. The Jews gloried in Christ's kingship, his rule, reign, and supreme power. This spirit so pervaded them that they read the Hebrew prophecies with one eye—if the prophecy spoke of the Lord's exaltation, might, power, dominion and glory, they saw and believed. They became so blinded by thus beholding the glory of the Anointed, they passed over and ignored, and finally deliberately refused to believe the prophecies which spoke of Christ's dishonor and death. To the Jews thus over-zealous for the kingly glory, the apostles constantly preached the cross of Christ. And now the Gentile world is just as erroneously preaching the cross to the exclusion of the kingdom. They frantically cry out that the Church of God preaches the kingdom all the time, and that it does not say enough about the Cross, about Christ and him crucified. Dear reader, do you want us to preach the Cross, and omit to tell of the crown? Do you want us to preach Christ crucified, and never tell why he was crucified? Why did the people hate

Christ and kill him? Was it because “he went about doing good?” Acts 10: 38. Nay, verily. For he was hated, and Herod tried to kill him as soon as he was born. Matt. 2. Why? Because he was born “King of the Jews.” Herod saw in Christ a rival to his throne, and this explains why he “was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him.” And when he was tried for his life, what was the charge—what crime had he committed? Not a thing. The question that “troubled” Herod when our Lord was a babe with chubby hands and feet, was still the disturbing issue, “Art thou the King of the Jews?” Our dear Lord’s life was surrendered by his answer to that question: “Thou sayest it”—the Jewish mode of assent. His kingship claim cost him his life—And after he was dead, indeed while he was yet alive, agonizing in the excruciating pains of crucifixion, “Pilate wrote a title, and put it on the Cross.” Jno. 19: 19. It was written in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, so the different nationalities could read the accusation in their own language. And the writing on the cross was this, “Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews.” Jno. 19: 19. My dear reader, how do you expect us to preach Christ crucified without telling of his kingship claims—the cause of his crucifixion? Why do you want us to ignore his kingly claims when our Lord died for them? Why do you want us to make prominent the “crown of thorns,” and say nothing about the “crown of glory?” How can we “preach the cross” *without preaching what was written on the cross*—the kingship of the Lord’s Anointed? How?

Begotten of God.

I would be glad to get some light on 1 John 3: 9, "Whatsoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God."
—*A. J. Martin.*

REPLY.

The Greek word *gennao* translated born in 1 John 3: 9, is defined "to beget, to bring forth." (See Robt. Young's Concordance). Primarily it means "to beget;" but since begettal is generally followed by a birth, it has the secondary sense of "bringing forth" or giving birth to what has been begotten. It is helpful to the mind to remember that *gennao* has two, and only two, meanings: it always means either to beget or bring forth.

To beget is its primary and therefore prevailing sense. Occasionally it means to bring forth, but it never has this latter sense unless a begettal has preceded it. It is always easy to determine in what sense the word is used by its immediate context. That the expression "born of God" means begotten of God is obvious from the fact the father begets and the mother brings forth, or gives birth. We are begotten by our father but "born of" our mother. "Born of God" is absurd on the first reflection. We may be begotten of God, but born of him—never.

Seed is essential to induce conception. Hence John asserts that not only does God beget his children by seed, but such as have life enough to manifest themselves as his children by doing righteousness, of such converts he affirms, "His seed remaineth in him," v. 9. Now God's "seed" is the Word of God. 1 Pet. 1: 23;

Mark 4: 14; 1 Cor. 4: 16¹; Jas. 1: 18. By this Word we are “begotten to a lively hope” 1 Pet. 1: 3. Christ is formed in us, Gal. 4: 19. A “New creature,” or “inward man,” has been begotten by the “incorruptible word” Gal. 6: 15; and if he is “renewed day by day” 2 Cor. 4: 16, he will be brought forth in the “image,” or “likeness” of Christ at the resurrection Psa. 17: 15. Then we will be “born of the spirit” John 3, and will have a “glorious body” like our Redeemer. But this all depends on his “seed” remaining in us. Phil. 3: 21, 22.²

In Adam All: In Christ All.

Does Paul in 1 Cor. 15: 22, mean the saints only, or all who have lived from Adam till Christ comes?—*Kathryn Townsend.*

REPLY.

People who quote 1 Cor. 15: 22 to prove the resurrection of all, whether just or unjust, interpret the “all” in the first clause of the verse as being identical with “all” in the latter part of the passage. Then they reason that as “all” in the first clause includes every one who has sprung from Adam, the second “all” must embrace the same parties. There is a superficial plausibility in this argument and reasoning. But when we look at the context and get the primary thought in the apostle’s mind before he penned the 22nd verse, and then thoughtfully examine the verse itself, we are led to abandon such a broad application of the text as unwarranted and to restrict the passage in its scope and meaning to the righteous only.

Some of the brethren in Corinth had denied the doctrine of the resurrection. The apostle's hypothetical statement, "if the dead rise not," used several times in the chapter (vs. 16, 17),¹ indicates as much, even if we had not his express statement that "some" among them had denied the resurrection in so many words. (vs. 12). To overthrow this dangerous doctrine of non-resurrection the apostle proceeds to demonstrate that there had been a resurrection (of Christ), verse 20, and that there must be a resurrection of all who are "Christ's" (v. 23); if not, then they were confronted with the direful effects of being in their sins, the nullification of faith, and perishing as a finality. vs. 17-19. These disastrous results would affect not the unjust, but the saints themselves, instancing himself (v. 32) and all they which are "fallen asleep in Christ." vs. 18. Note with care that throughout the chapter Paul is showing how the non-resurrection of the dead would effect the righteous—"they that are Christ's at his coming." v. 23.

With this thought firmly fixed in mind, we have no trouble in interpreting the 22nd verse. It is as clear as a bell. "In Adam all die; even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Some people with childish simplicity suppose that when they find the word "all" in the Bible, that every human being in the universe is meant, both dead and living. Sister Townsend, of course, is not among this word-snatching class; still for the information of the uninstructed reader, perhaps it is our duty to say that "all" is used twice in 1 Cor. 15: 22, each time preceded by the modifying terms, "in Adam," "in Christ." All in Adam is

one class; all in Christ is another and distinct class. If I were to say, "In Indiana all the brethren are well," the word "all," while a universal term, would be squeezed within the limits of Indiana. "In Adam all die." Without controversy the word "all" in this text is universal, but it is limited in its scope by the words, "in Adam." It does not touch thousands of the human race. Thousands of people have "fallen asleep in Christ" (v. 18), have died "in the Lord." Rev. 14: 13. These are saints, the people who have transferred themselves out of Adam into Christ. They have put "off" the old man, and put "on" the new man, Christ Jesus, by baptism. This is the way to "put on Christ." Gal. 3: 27. After they have thus been inducted into Christ, they are said to be "in Christ," to "walk in him," to die in him, to "sleep in Jesus." 2 Thes. 4: 14.¹ So when we read, "In Adam all die; even so in Christ shall all be made alive," it is clear that we are reading about two classes of people. The first "all" is limited to those "in Adam;" the second "all" is limited to those "in Christ." "All" then, in both clauses, is used in a universal sense; both are equally comprehensive; and yet the terms are applied in the two statements to different parties. "All" is universal in both clauses, but different universals are meant. To express our understanding of the text, we paraphrase it thus: "As in Adam all related to him, as their head, die; so in Christ all related to him, as their head, shall be made alive." Think for a moment how natural this interpretation is. Why does "in Adam all die," include all mankind, and exclude all except

the human race? Because it speaks of those, and only those, who owe their physical being to their connection with Adam. In perfect analogy with this, the "all in Christ" refers to all those, and only those, who owe their spiritual existence to their connection with Christ. The first "all" includes all natural men, and excludes all who are not men, because it has to do with natural generation: the second "all" includes all who are believers in Christ, and excludes all who are not believers, because it applies to spiritual generation. If you are "in Adam," you are in the first "all;" if you are "in Christ," you are in the second "all."

Now the apostle says of those who are in Christ that they "shall be made alive." The Greek word *zoopoieo*, here rendered "made alive," is translated "quicken" in Rom. 8: 11. Here the great apostle limits the application of the word to those in whom the "spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead," dwells. The wicked are raised from the dead simply as an act of power and judgment; they are not "made alive" or "quicken" into immortal life by the Spirit. But the people "in Christ" are "made alive;" that is, they are not merely raised from the dead as mortal beings, but as Paul says in 1 Cor. 15, they are raised "incorruptible," "in honor," "in spiritual bodies," "in glory." Vs. 42-44. Daniel says the wicked are raised to "shame and contempt." Dan. 12: 2. Certainly there is no "glory" in that. Hence we conclude that Paul throughout 1 Cor. 15 is talking about the resurrection of the righteous to glory, honor, immortality and eternal life.

Holy Spirit Prior to Baptism, Why?

Did the Gentiles receive the Holy Spirit before baptism in water? If so, what was the reason for reversing the order as recorded in Acts 2: 38?—*Eld. O. J. Allard.*

REPLY.

The question presumes, and Scripturally too, that the ordinary "order" in apostolic baptisms was first water, afterwards Holy Spirit. One cannot read the book of Acts and keep from seeing that this order was rigidly adhered to, as a broad, general principle of inspired procedure.

Yet this rule has an exception in Acts 10. "Reversing the order" here strikes us as so singular that we cannot rest satisfied till the "reason" is ascertained. One unacquainted with the complicated machinery of an engine, could not look at its different parts and conclude what they were for. But if an engineer in his presence makes the different parts perform their offices under his inspection, the observer would learn what the various parts were for by seeing the use to which they are put. So with the gift of Holy Spirit prior to baptism—let us look at the use made of the matter by the inspired historian, and all will become clear to our minds.

Of the man baptized in Holy Spirit it is said,—and mark you, this is said of him before he received the Spirit—"A devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway." Acts 10: 2. Such is the inspired description of Cornelius; this was the kind of man he was before the Holy Spirit "fell"

on him, (v. 44). The Spirit, then, was not given to him to make him "devout;" he was this before. It was not given him to make him "fear God;" he was already a God-fearing man. It was not given him to induce him to give "much alms to the people;" he was already a charitable man. It was not given him to make him pray; he "prayed to God alway" before he had been touched by the Holy Spirit. We have now certainly ascertained what the Spirit was *not* given to do. It was not sent down to make Cornelius a devout, God-fearing, alms-giving, prayerful man; he was, I repeat, all this before he received the gift of God's good Spirit.

Having now shown what the Spirit was not given to do, we can easily discover the "reason" it was given, and what it was given for, by just simply noting, as I have previously intimated, the use to which the Apostle Peter puts the phenomenon. "Certain brethren" (v. 23), all Jews, went with Peter to the home of Cornelius. Preparatory to going among the Gentiles, the Lord had shown Peter a vision, a sheet full of unclean beasts, to encourage him to go to the Gentiles with the gospel message. He presented the gospel for the first time to a Gentile audience. Before he had finished his sermon, "while he was yet speaking" (v. 44), the Spirit in all its Pentecostal power (v. 47) was felt in every soul. Now watch the effect and mark upon whom the effect takes place. "They of the circumcision" were "astonished" v. 45. The effect on Peter and his Jewish brethren was so great that when the question was put, "Can any man forbid water, that these (Gentiles) should not be bap-

tized" (v. 47), not a man, though full of national prejudice against the "unclean" Gentiles, dared to lift up his voice and say, N-o. Later, when Peter was called down by his exclusive brethren for going among the Gentiles, watch the use to which he puts the outpouring of the Spirit on that occasion: "Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us, who believe on the Lord Jesus Christ; what was I, that I could withstand God?" Acts 11: 17. So satisfactory was this argument—so conclusive the design in the Spirit's gift, that even the Jewish brethren with all their national pride and prejudice, at once "held their peace, and glorified God." v. 18. From the use Peter makes of the matter, one can see at once the "reason" why God bestowed the Spirit on Gentiles in advance of their baptism in water. It was to break down national prejudice; to "astonish" the Jews; to present to them such a strong argument for his acceptance of the Gentiles that they could not "withstand" the testimony. Not for the benefit of the Gentiles but for the sake of the Jews, was this display of divine power.

"As Adam."

Please give an exposition of Job 31: 33.—*R. A. Humphrey.*

REPLY.

The text reads: "If I cover my transgressions as Adam, by hiding mine iniquity in my bosom." While Adam is primarily a singular noun and designates a particular man (Gen. 2: 19), yet from him the Lord developed the woman, and

through her have been developed millions of human beings. . . . Of necessity, then, Adam is a plural noun, as appears early in the narrative of creation: "In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him: male and female created he them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created." Gen. 5: 1, 2. Here Adam is represented by a plural pronoun. He was the "first man" (1 Cor. 15: 47); to him Eve and all the offspring of the race are indebted for their existence. In harmony with this fact, for "as Adam" the marginal rendering of the text is, "After the manner of men," showing that Job disclaims "covering" and "hiding" his sin like Adam individually and "after the manner of men" generally. The antiquated idea that Adam, "old father Adam," as he is frequently called, was the meanest man that a finite mind can conceive of, is erroneous in fact, and harmful to his descendants, as the charge indirectly minimizes our own iniquities. It is folly for us to laugh at Adam's "fig tree aprons," for it has been and is to this day "after the manner of men" to wear the same garments.

The "Sheep," "Goats," and the "Brethren."

In the judgment scene of Matt. 25 we find three companies or classes of people spoken of: the "sheep," "goats" and "these my brethren." Who are they, and in what period of the world's history have each class lived?—*S. H. Thomas.*

REPLY.

As the claim that by the sheep and goats is meant the righteous and the wicked, we assume this postulate¹ as a demonstrated proposition, and proceed to

make a few remarks on the third class spoken of in the chapter as "these my brethren." Who are they? As the righteous and wicked have already been mentioned some would-be interpreters have speculated that "my brethren" must be somebody other than the two classes called the just and unjust, probably the Jews. But the textual and common sense meaning of the narrative is simply this: The sheep and the goats represent the righteous and the wicked. The judgment determines that the two classes are righteous or wicked by the conduct of life. The wicked are wicked because they neglected to minister to their fellow brethren, to clothe, feed, visit them, etc. The righteous are righteous because they have ministered to their poor brethren as they would to Christ, to clothe, feed, visit in times of distress, etc.

"Self-preservation is the first law of nature." Before we can clothe, feed, and minister to the distress of any brother, we must ourselves be clothed and fed. We must have something ourselves before we can give anything to any one. Christ reckons that in ministering to "these my brethren" they ministered to Him, for his brethren represent Him. The reward he grants for liberality is an inheritance in the kingdom of God, with eternal life, as is intimated in the last verse of the chapter. But some of the people of God have little if anything to spare after they have supplied their own necessities—must they lose the kingdom because they are poor? No; see how nicely our Lord provides for these dear souls. They are the "my brethren" of the lowly One, of whom it was said that he had no where to lay his head. Though they

are the lowly of earth Christ is not ashamed to call them "Brethren." Heb. 2: 12. They to whom the Saviour is so lovingly and sympathetically identified have lived in all ages of the world (Heb. 11); but when their absent Lord returns he will, as their friend and brother, put down the mighty from their seats, and exalt them of low degree; he will send the rich empty away, and fill them with good things. Luke 1.¹ Our Lord calls poor believers "these my brethren."

Did Adam Eat of the Tree of Life?

Did Adam and Eve eat of the tree of life? It was in the midst of the garden, and they had access to it as well as the tree of knowledge, of good and evil.—*A Brother.*

REPLY.

An answer to this question either affirmatively or negatively, must depend largely for its substantiation on reason, logic and inference. Because it is said, "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat" (Gen. 2: 16), it has been inferred by some Bible expositors that Adam ate "freely" of the tree of life. We do not share their opinion. The absence of a taboo does not conclusively establish "access" to that not forbidden. When you notice that the permission to "freely eat" of all the trees in the garden was circumscribed by the fact that both the tree of life and that of knowledge of good and evil were in the "midst of the garden" (Gen. 2: 9), then you can perceive how both trees were excluded from Adam's use. The "midst of the garden" seems to have been the "Most Holy Place," access into which, it seems for the time being, Adam was denied. From the "outer court"—

the surrounding garden—Adam and his wife could look at the trees (Gen. 3: 6), as Moses looked at the burning bush, (Ex. 3: 1-5), to whom it was said in mandatory tone, “Draw not nigh hither.” (v. 5). To “touch” the tree of good and evil would just as surely have brought death upon them as the eating of it did. Gen. 3: 3. They broke the bounds of divine limitation—they both touched and ate of it,—and then the Lord said: “Now, lest he put forth his hand, *and take also of the tree of life*, and eat, and live forever; therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken.” Gen. 3: 22, 23. The word “also” in this remarkable text sheds an incandescent light upon the question of whether Adam had been eating of the tree of life. Admittedly he had not previously eaten of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Then he “put forth his hand;” this act violated God’s law as much as the eating did. So the wording of our text is: To keep him from “also” doing with the tree of life as he had done with the other tree, which shows that he had partaken of the other tree first. And parity of reasoning demands that as Adam had not previously eaten of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and the touching and eating of that tree once brought death, so he had not previously eaten of the tree of life, and the touching and eating of that tree once, would cause him to “live forever”—impart to him eternal life. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that to prevent him from getting to the “midst of the garden” where the tree of life was, the Lord expelled him from the garden and placed at the

east of the garden the cherubim—a fire unfolding upon itself—“to keep the way of the tree of life.” Gen. 3: 24.

Like a Tree. Psalms 1: 3.

Of the “blessed” man, (Psa. 1: 1) whose “delight is in the law of the Lord,” (v. 2), David says: “And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.” God frequently compares people, especially his people, to trees. He called Israel “a green olive tree, fair, and of goodly fruit” Jer. 11: 16. In prophecy they are spoken of “as cedar trees beside the waters.” Numb. 24: 5, 6. As long as Israel was fair and yielded goodly fruit, God spoke of him as a “green olive tree,” and as the cedar; but when he became a “dry tree” (Isa. 56:3) the axman felled him to the earth. Matt. 3: 10. He had enough sap in him (Psa. 104: 16) to live in a comatose¹ slumber; he even yielded leaves, but he was a barren fig tree—cursed by the Lord. Repeated efforts were made to produce fruit on it. As no fruit was born by this tree in God’s well-kept forest, the decree went forth, “Cut it down.” Luke 13: 6-10². However, in the restitution age, Israel will be planted in the “garden of the Lord.” Grafted back into the “good olive tree” by faith, he will take on the beauty and “fatness of the olive tree” and have the smell of Lebanon. Hos. 14: 5, 6; Rom. 11. As the Lord’s people, they will then be “called trees” (Isa. 61: 3), and “branches of the olive.” Zech. 4: 12. Even Christ is spoken of under the similitude of a tree. Rev. 2: 7.

He is also called "a plant of renown" (Ezek. 34: 29), "Stem of Jesse" (Isa. 11: 1), "Offspring (branch) of David," (Rev. 22: 16), "the rose of Sharon" (Cant. 2: 1),¹ "a bundle of myrrh" (13),² and "a cluster of Camphire"³(14)².

"Ungodly men" are also spoken of as clouds driven of wind, fluctuating stars, and "trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots" (Jude 12). While the righteous and wicked are both compared to trees, the reader will notice that different kinds of trees are used to represent them. The wicked are compared to a fig tree with leaves, but no fruit; to trees "twice dead," "without fruit," "plucked up by the roots." The righteous are likened to green olive trees, cedars, "fair," bearing "goodly fruit," "full of sap" (Psa. 104: 16), etc. David (Psa. 1: 3) in representing the righteous under the figure of a tree, does not select a dwarfish, unhealthy tree growing in a semi-desert with scarcely a leaf to play in the winds of heaven, but a tree that grows: 1. *By "the rivers of water;"* 2. *An evergreen; "his leaf also shall not wither;"* 3. *With fruit producing qualities: "in his season;"* 4. *And its growth full of life, thrift, and prosperity: "Whatever he doeth shall prosper."* A tree covered with luxurious verdure, blossoms and fruit; this is the kind of a tree the Lord expects you to be, dear reader. It is interesting and instructive to contemplate the righteous as trees,

I. *"Planted by the rivers of water."* The righteous are uprooted from the world and "planted" (set out) near "water." They are planted by the Lord

himself, Psa. 80: 15; Matt. 15: 13, "in the Lord's house," Psa. 92: 13. Now God is the "fountain of living (running) waters." Jer. 2: 3;¹ 17: 13. He is the reservoir which feeds all outflowing streams; he is the fountain head of life, Psa. 36: 9, and the rivers and rivulets of present pleasure, Rev. 22: 1, 17. In the Lord's House where he is near them to quench their thirst, Ex. 29: 45; Matt. 18: 20, the righteous are like trees on the river bank. Their roots are kept moist by the water running out from God, the fountain head, through the Lord's House—the house of prayer—Zech. 14: 8; Luke 19: 46; and thus the "trees of righteousness" are kept growing, and when the season comes for harvest, "the fruit of the spirit," which has been growing on them (Gal. 5: 22) will be matured into eternal life. John 4: 14; Rev. 21: 6; Ezek. 47: 7.

II. "*Fruit in his season.*"

The planting, watering, etc., was with the design of getting fruit. Fruit-bearing trees are the only ones that are of any worth. Now the saints are "trees of righteousness" and are "the planting of the Lord, that he might be glorified." Isa. 61: 3. The Lord plants, waters and blesses them, not in the skies, for trees do not grow there, but "they shall inherit the earth forever, the branch of my planting that I may be glorified." Isa. 60: 21. "Trees of righteousness" grow in the ground; "they shall inherit the land forever." God does not pull them out of the land and transplant them in skyana!! No, they are to inherit the land, and God's design is that his planting may "glorify" him. I am sure God

would get no glory from them, were he to uproot the trees and plant them in the clouds! How are we to glorify the Lord? Let us answer this question, for thousands of people do not know how to glorify him.

“I am the vine,” says Jesus, “and ye (disciples) are the branches.” John 15: 5. The branch on the vine is there for no other purpose but to bear fruit. So Jesus goes on to say. “Herein is my Father glorified, *that ye bear much fruit*; so shall ye be my disciples,” v. 8. Fruit-bearing is not only the test of discipleship, but it is fruit and “much fruit” that glorifies the Lord. When only a boy the writer remembers attending a Holiness meeting. They vociferated¹ in a frantic way during the meeting, “Hallelujah,” “Glory to God,” “Amen,” etc. We were much impressed by their verbose² service. We thought they were glorifying the Lord in a wonderful manner. On our return home we got out the Old Book to read a little. The first text our eye fell upon was, “Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit.” We gave the leaves of our book a flirt at random, and read, “The tree is known by his fruit.” Matt. 12: 33; 7: 17. We looked again and read, “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.” Matt. 7: 21. Then I said to myself, If we glorify God by “fruit;” if “doing the will of my Father which is in heaven;” if that, in stead of “saying,” gives us the kingdom, those Holiness people are not glorifying the Lord at all! Then I learned that as they did not know the Father’s will, nor do it, they had no “fruit,” and

that all their Hallelujahs, Glory to Gods, and Amens, and "sayings," were only the wordy outbursts of hallucination. They are modern Baalites, whose "Lord, Lord," Jehovah as completely ignores as he did the long loud prayers of the one hundred and fifty prophets of Baal on Mount Carmel. 1 Kings 18.

III. *"His leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper."*

It is not enough for a tree to have a leaf which does not wither. A green leaf shows that there is life in the tree, but having life is not enough. Bearing fruit even is not altogether satisfactory. "Here-in is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit." Hence the tree before David's mind is an ever-green, ever-living, ever-fruit-bearing, an ever-prosperous tree. "What-soever he doeth shall prosper. Dear Ones, "we are God's husbandry," 1 Cor. 3: 9; he has gathered out the stones, built a tower in the midst, made a wine-press, and says, "What could have been done to my vineyard more than I have not done in it?" Having done so much for us he naturally looks for us to bring forth grapes, Isa. 5: 1-5. After God had thus cared for Israel, they brought forth wild grapes, and so God took away the hedge, broke down the walls, and his vineyard was trodden down, vs. 5, 6. Let us beware, lest the same evil come upon us, for the same cause. God help us to "prosper" in the work of the Lord, to glorify him by yielding "much fruit." May God add his blessing to our efforts that we may be "fruitful in every good work." Col. 1: 10.

Baptism and the Thief.

A correspondent has asked if the thief was baptized, and you answered the question in the affirmative. I am wondering what evidence you have for your answer. There was no opportunity for the thief to be baptized, and there is no record in the Bible of it having occurred.—*A Brother.*

REPLY.

There is “no record in the Bible” that the thief was baptized, it is true, but it would be unwise and unsafe to say for this reason he was not baptized. I am sure that many things have occurred since the world began of which no notice is found in the Bible. John 21: 25. The absence of a specific record cannot annul fixed principles. To illustrate: There is no record in the Bible that the thief was ever born. You do not, for this reason, conclude, “Therefore he was not born!” Such stolid reasoning would be illogical, and the conclusion false; still you have no record of his birth. It is an unchangeable law, and we all know it, that a person can’t be brought into existence without a father, mother, begetting and birth. The thief’s existence is in itself a proof of his birth, record or no record. Since causes produce effects, and as effects are dependent on the causes which produce them; we know that whenever we see effects that their causes ante-date them.

In view of these facts, we are now ready to reach some conclusions. I know that the thief was baptized for the same reason that you know he was born. You know in the absence of a “record” that he was begotten and born; that he had a father and mother. Were I to say to you that he was not born as there is “no

record in the Bible” to that effect, that there was no “opportunity” for this to have occurred, I would only be noting details, omitted bits of information which in no way militates against the universal law governing the propagation of our off-spring. Knowing that causes and effects are inseparable, and that the lesser is embraced in the greater, you would conclude, and rightly too, that as the Bible recorded effects, it tacitly recognizes the thief’s birth, baptism and many other things of which it makes no specific mention.

We take our stand upon the formulated principles of God’s law. We must remember, dear brother, that prior to the thief’s death, John the Baptist, the greatest prophet ever born of a woman (Luke 7: 28), and Jesus the Son of God, baptized people by his disciples, and great multitudes of them. Jno. 3: 22, 23; 4: 1, 2. When we remember this historical and significant fact, we will quit talking about the thief having no “opportunity” to be baptized. With all this baptizing going on, he had “opportunity” to obey the Lord; and although there is no “record” that he did, we have other evidence based upon testimony that is explicit and undeniable, viz., fundamental principles and “the eternal fitness of things.” Here is the evidence in part; think it over candidly:

John’s baptism was for the remission of sins (Mark 1: 4); it was “from heaven” (Luke 20: 4); a part of “the counsel of God” (Luke 7: 30; Acts 20: 27), and, therefore, essential to salvation. Prov. 1: 23-33. We now throw the argument into syllogistic¹ form, and let him who can, break the force of the argument:

- (1) *Baptism is essential¹ to salvation* (Luke 7: 30; Prov. 1: 23-33);
- (2) *The thief will be saved* (Luke 23: 43);
- (3) *Therefore, he was baptized.*

The Baptism of the Holy Spirit: Sprinkling or Immersion?

“Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit.” Acts 1: 5. When this baptism occurred the Spirit was “poured out.” Acts 2: 17. Pouring, then, and not immersion, is baptism. Is this true?—*An Interested Reader.*

REPLY.

If “pouring out” is baptism, then what was “poured out” was baptized, and not the object upon which it was poured. Since the Spirit was “poured out” the Spirit was baptized, and not the men upon whom it was poured! The Spirit, in that case, baptized itself!!

Let “interested reader” note that it was men, and not the Spirit, that were baptized: “Ye (men) shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit.” Acts 1: 5. The Spirit was “poured out” that this baptism might be accomplished. The Spirit is not only said to be “poured out” but to be “received” (Jno. 20:22), sent (Jno. 16:7), fall (Acts 10:44), and “shed abundantly.” Titus 3: 6. Men are said to “drink” of it (1 Cor. 12: 13) and to be filled with it. Acts 2: 4. Now if “pouring out” the Spirit is baptism, so is receiving, sending, falling, shedding, drinking, and filling! The pouring is not baptism; the sending, falling, shedding, drinking, etc., is not the baptism. The Spirit had to come in some way from heaven, or men must be taken up to heaven, that the baptism in the Spirit

might be possible. We can say with aplomb¹ that the Spirit was sent as a matter of necessity; that it fell, was shed, etc. This simply brings the Spirit and man together. Something was accomplished after the Spirit descended, and that something was the baptism.

What was the baptism of the Holy Spirit? In 2 Cor. 5: 2 we have the words, *enduo epi*, "clothed upon." In the third verse we have "being clothed" (*endus*). Clothing envelops—covers up. In speaking of the Holy Spirit baptism our Lord says, "Behold I send the promise of my Father upon you, but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem till ye be endued (*enduo*) with power." Luke 24: 49. "Clothed with power." Revised Version. The apostles went out in the power of the Holy Spirit, invested, "endued," clothed with power from on high. They were immersed, enveloped, enclosed, overwhelmed, baptized in the Spirit. "It filled all the house where they were setting." Acts 2: 2. The pouring out of the Spirit brought the Spirit down; but this was no more the baptism, than the going up of the men would have been, if God had taken them up to receive the baptism of the Spirit. To make it possible for men to be overwhelmed, immersed in the Holy Spirit as a mighty influence and power from heaven, it is said that God poured it out copiously; that it was "shed abundantly" on his people. Titus 3: 6. But to say that pouring out the Spirit was baptism is to say that the Spirit was baptized, not men. And since to "pour out" means to turn out in a stream, if a man was to be baptized, he would be turned out in a stream! And if this be so I can only say, God pity the man!

“From the Beginning.”

In 2 Thess. 2: 13, 14, Paul says the saints to whom he was writing, had chosen to salvation “through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth,” and that God had chosen them “from the beginning.” What beginning is meant?—*Enquirer.*

REPLY.

In the Bible several beginnings are spoken of, and we must use care and not confound them. There is

I. *The beginning of creation.* Gen. 1: 1; Matt. 19: 4. II. *The beginning of the gospel as preached by the apostles.* Luke 24: 47; Acts 11: 15. III. *The beginning of the new creation, of which Christ is the first.* Col. 1: 18; Rev. 3: 14. IV. *And the beginning of the new life for believers, which is entered into at their conversion.* 2 Pet. 2: 20; Jno. 15: 27; 1 Jno. 2: 7, 24; 2 Jno. 5. Concerning this beginning the apostle writes: “I write no new commandment unto you, but an old commandment which ye have had from the beginning. The old commandment is the Word which ye have heard from the beginning.” 1 John 2: 7. That they should love one another was “the message” they had ‘heard from the beginning.” 3: 11. What beginning is here referred to? Certainly not the beginning of eternity; for eternity had no beginning. Surely no reference is made to the beginning of the world, the beginning of time, or to any period prior to their birth, for this they “*heard* from the beginning.” Nor can it mean the beginning of the gospel proclamation at Jerusalem, for it is not probable they heard the gospel till years subsequent to Pentecost. It was when they began a new life in Christ; when they put Christ on in

baptism, and rose to walk in "newness of life" (Rom. 6: 4); it was then and in this way they became "new creatures" (2 Cor. 5: 17), began another life, and were made members of the new creation, of which Christ is the "first." Rev. 1: 17. From this beginning they had "heard" the gospel "message"—had the "old commandment"—and knew God. And to this "beginning" (2 Pet. 2: 20) Paul refers in 2 Thess. 2: 13. When Paul said persons were saved "through faith" (Eph. 2: 8), he did not teach that people were saved before they had faith. The President, for instance, is elected through the votes of the people; but he is not elected till he receives their votes. So then when Paul says people were chosen to salvation "through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth," he certainly did not mean they were chosen in eternity, or before time began, but at the time they believed the truth, and were sanctified by the Spirit. As God elects and chooses people to salvation "through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth," it is impossible that the election can antedate the "belief of the truth" through which it is effected. When we believe the truth we are "begotten" (Jas. 1: 18) by it; and when we obey the truth we are sanctified (Jno. 17: 17) by it, and we become the "elect of God;" "new creatures," with a new life. To this "beginning" the Apostle Paul obviously refers in writing to the brethren in Thessalonica.

Christ's Brethren.

Who are the brethren referred to in Matt. 25: 40?—*P. B. Stouffer.*

REPLY.

Speaking of Abraham's descendants God says in Gen. 12: 3: "I will bless them that bless thee, and curse them that curseth thee." From the time these words were uttered by the Deity to the present moment, history, without an exceptional incident, records how minutely God has fulfilled his words. As God has remembered his words to keep them in the past, we can conclude that he will, in the future, "remember his holy covenant," Luke 1: 72, and that without fail he will keep it. We are not left to opaque¹ inference here; we are expressly told that when the Lord comes the nations which have "blessed" the Jewish people in their afflictions, are to be blessed, while the nations which have "cursed" them, are to be cursed. Russia, the inveterate² hater of the Jew, will yet "go forth with great fury to destroy," Dan. 11: 44, the Jews resettled in the Holy Land, Ezek. 38: 11; and as the King of the North, Dan. 11: 40; Ezek. 38: 15, he will defeat the King of the South (England in Palestine), and take half of Jerusalem captive, Zech. 14: 2, and "plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain;" yet, says the prophet, "he shall come to his end, and none shall help him." Dan. 11: 15.³ Having cursed Israel he is himself cursed. While England and other nations have been friendly to the Jews, having "blessed" them in assisting them to return to the land of their fathers, and protecting them there, Isa. 18; 66: 19, 20; 60: 12, will be "blessed" as especially favored subjects of the king-

dom during the benign reign of Jesus the "King of the Jews." Matt. 2: 2.

While all this is plainly revealed and heartily believed by us, we do not believe that the positions of the nations during the reign of Christ, is taught in Matt. 25, neither do I believe that the Jews are the brethren Christ speaks of in verse 40, as "my brethren." The theory which says they are Christ's brethren is decapitated by one simple truth, namely, when Christ "comes in his glory," v. 31, he places the sheep on his right hand and says to them: "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." v. 34. This invitation, "Come," is not given to sheep nations at the end of the thousand years; but when Christ "comes in his glory," v. 31, "then" v. 34, he says this. He does not say to the sheep, "Come, be subjects of the kingdom;" but "inherit the kingdom." There is a great gulf of difference between inheritors of the kingdom and subjects of it. The subjects are mortal, though righteous, people; inheritors of it are immortal saints. "Flesh and blood," says the apostle, "Cannot inherit the kingdom;" they must be changed to immortality, 1 Cor. 13: 50.¹ The sheep, therefore, to whom Christ says, "Inherit the kingdom," are the sheep or saints now grazing in Christ's pasture, who know his voice, and follow him, as the Shepherd of their souls. Jno. 10: 3-15; 1 Pet. 2: 25.

That Christ meant his saints, and not the Jews, by the words, "My brethren;" is further evident from the fact that Christ has explained who his brethren

are. And in explaining who they are, he has inferentially explained who they are not. While Christ was himself a Jew, he has told us that the flesh is "nothing," Jno. 6: 63; and Paul affirms that the Jews who are only children of Abraham by fleshly ties, are not the children of God. Rom. 9: 6¹; Matt. 3: 9. To be plain about it, they are children of the devil, Jno. 8: 44, and can not, ergo, claim spiritual kinship with our blessed Lord. They were "a generation of vipers"—dangerous as snakes. Matt. 3: 7. They "both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men;" for their sins the wrath of God has come "upon them to the uttermost." 1 Thes. 2: 15, 16. That Christ the "Holy Child," Acts 4: 30, the Son of the Highest, Luke 1: 35,² would call these vipers and "children of the devil" "My brethren," is an outrage on reason; it would identify the blessed Lord with the devil. Jesus himself explains who his brethren are; hear him: All of the human race, whether Jew or Gentile, who do his Father's will. Matt. 12: 50. Every one sanctified by the truth. Jno. 17: 17. Of such he says he is not "ashamed to call them brethren." Heb. 2: 11. Christ would be "ashamed" to call "children of the devil" his brethren. Read Heb. 2: 11, carefully and notice particularly why Christ calls us brethren: "They who are sanctified are all of one (Father); for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren." If sanctification is the "cause" why he is not "ashamed" to "call them brethren," he would be ashamed to call an unsanctified man a

brother. The conclusion is inevitable: The saints who do the Father's will, and are sanctified by the truth, in the present dispensation, are the brethren whom Christ owns as his in the day of his coming and glory Mark 8: 38.

Feetwashing.

Is feet-washing a church ordinance?—*A. M.*

REPLY.

That it is a church ordinance, and binding on the people of God now is a conclusion reached by people who look narrowly and unthinkingly at the statements, "Ye ought to wash one another's feet;" "Ye should do as I have done unto you;" and "If ye know these things happy are ye if you do them." Jno. 13: 14, 15, 17. Those who believe in ceremonially washing feet are in the habit of quoting these statements, and then giving a prolix^d discourse about how "awful" to neglect and even deny, as some people do, that we "ought" to wash "one another's feet." There may be such people in the world; I do not know. In all my travels I never met a man who denied we "ought" to wash feet, as Christ instructed us. Of one thing I am sure, and that is, the Church of God teaches we "ought" to wash feet, and that if we take Jesus for our example in this, we will be "happy" if we do as he directs us.

All admit that we "ought" to wash feet; but divergent views are held as to the manner of doing it. We deny it is a church ordinance to be ceremonially observed. Those who believe and observe it as a church ordinance affirm that:

I. Christ did not eat the passover, but a supper especially instituted the night of his betrayal. II. That this supper was a full meal. III. That the Lord washed his disciples' feet at Jerusalem the same time they had the breaking of bread. We destroy all these false positions by the following Scriptural propositions: I. *Jesus ate the passover with his disciples—not a supper of his own institution.* Matt. 26; Luke 22. II. *The feet washing took place at Bethany—not at Jerusalem.* Jno. 13: 1, 2; 12: 1, 2, 3; Matt. 26: 6, 7; Mark 14: 13.¹ (Note, “*They made him a supper.*” Instead of the Lord making them a supper, they made him a supper)! III. *The breaking of bread is not a full meal—not a supper.* 1 Cor. 11: 23-26. IV. *Feetwashing is an act of hospitality, a private duty, to be observed at home—not a church ordinance.* 1 Tim. 5: 10; 1 Pet. 4: 9; Acts 16: 15, 33; Heb. 13: 2; Gen. 18: 4; 19: 2; 24: 32. V. The apostles had the Holy Spirit, and it guided them into all truth. Jno. 16: 13. It guided them to strictly observe baptism and the breaking of bread as church ordinances. *But feetwashing was never observed by the apostles as a church ordinance.*

The Closed Door: Against Whom, and When Closed?

What does closing the door mean in Matt. 25: 10; Luke 13: 25? Against whom and when will it be closed?—*John L. Barnes.*

REPLY.

Noah was a righteous man (Gen. 7: 1, 5), and the Lord could not destroy him with the wicked in the deluge. 18: 23, 25. It is said, “The Lord shut him in” the ark. Gen. 7: 16. On this text J. S. Exell,

M. A., remarks: Literally, "Then does Jehovah shut up round about him." How touchingly beautiful! "Then"—a closing act, as when a mother closes up about her dear ones for the night: "Jehovah,"—the God of covenant grace, the Becoming One, ever becoming some further and something fresh to those who trust him." Noah was a righteous man, therefore the Lord in mercy "shut him in." Truly this is "touchingly beautiful." But we must remember that while God "shut him in" graciously, he, at the same time, and with perfect justice, shut the door in the face of a world of sinners.

In shutting Noah "in" God shut a world of sinners out. "And the door was shut" (Matt. 25: 10) is an expression borrowed from Gen. 7: 16. The thoughts, if not the words, are copied from Moses, and must, therefore, be identical in meaning. The door of God's kingdom now stands ajar for every coming and willing soul. But a time is coming when it will be shut.

I. *The door closed.* A door is used both ways—to either open and admit, or shut and exclude. To Peter was given the keys of the kingdom; the door has been opened in the gospel preached; those who embrace the gospel, and keep their lamps burning till the Lord comes, are wise virgins; they are ready for the marriage of the Lamb; "they went in with him to the marriage; and the door was shut." They are "shut in" as Noah was. Closing the door of the House (Luke 13: 25) or kingdom, means that all God's "wise virgins" who were "ready" for the Lord's coming, and who entered in for the marriage,

are "shut in." When the door is closed every one within the house is "shut in," enclosed, and to every one without, the door is "closed" in their face, and they are excluded from the kingdom to perish in "outer darkness." There is a proclivity¹ among some people, especially the Universalists, to talk incessantly about the love, mercy and goodness of God; but they shudder at the justice, and deny the anger, of God. The anger of God is not inconsistent with his mercy. Not only is not inconsistent, but God's anger is necessary to his mercy. Let those who are fond of talking softly about the love of God remember if God's wrath is not righteous, his mercy is not real. If God's anger toward the ungodly is not right, he is bound to pardon everybody. Pardon made compulsory is no longer mercy. If mercy is real, anger is real also. Destroy anger and you destroy mercy. Mercy is a lovely flower growing on the soil of divine anger, and you cannot take away the ground on which the flower grows without removing the flower too. If you like the flower, and want to keep it, keep the ground where it grows. These observations are for those who can see the mercy, love and goodness of God, but cannot see their opposites—the justice, anger and wrath of the Almighty. The door is closed.

II. *Against whom?* The context in Matt. 25: 10; Luke 13: 25, answers this important question. The "foolish virgins" were not fools in the sense of intellectual weakness, nor were they ignorant of the truth. God's Word is called a lamp (Psa. 119: 105), and this the foolish virgins had as well as the wise. Matt. 25: 7.² Their foolishness consisted in not keep-

ing the light they had. Here apostates are clearly defined. Luke 13: 24 reads: "Strive to enter in at the strait gate." The "Master of the house" (v. 25) is represented as in a sitting posture (Acts 2: 34; Heb. 1: 13), watching those who "strive" and those who do not. When the time arrives for him to make his enemies his foot-stool, he raises up, and the first thing he does is to "shut the door!" We have learned whom he "shuts in;" now whom does he shut out? Every one which did not "strive" to "enter in;" all who sought to enter in by their own plan, and were not able! When the Master closes the door they "knock at the door;" and O, piteous cry of urgency—"Lord, Lord!" An emphatic reduplication. Very earnest now, but too late! They had known Christ (verse 26), had been first (30) in point of time to espouse Christianity, but as they were workers of iniquity (27), they did not strive to gain the kingdom of God; from it, therefore, they are "thrust out" (28) to perish with the dogs and unclean among men. 1 Cor. 6: 9; Rev. 22: 15. There are two classes of men against whom the kingdom of heaven is shut up: 1. "Foolish virgins" those who embrace the truth, run for awhile the race for eternal life, and then quit. Matt. 10: 22; 2 Pet. 2: 21. II. People who know the truth but who refuse to obey it, and are "workers of iniquity" by choice. Rom. 1: 21-32.

III. *As to when the door is closed:* It is closed when Abraham and all the saints are glorified in the kingdom of God, and the wicked are punished; these are all synchronal¹ events. They all occur when Je-

sus comes, the proof for which you will find in Luke 13; Matt. 24: 25.¹

Two Kinds of Sins: The Public and Private.

Will you please explain 1 Tim. 5: 24. What is meant by sins going before to judgment and some following after?—*H. B. Hathaway.*

REPLY.

To “rightly divide the Word of truth” (2 Tim. 2: 15) or to correctly expound any text, especially a difficult one, as this passage admittedly is, we must be guided largely in our exposition by the context. Give verses 19, 20, 21, 22 a thoughtful reading, and they will solve the difficulties and lucidly explain the 24th verse. As rulers in the church, elders were not to be accused of sins unless proved to be guilty by two or three witnesses (19). All who were proved guilty of crimes were to be rebuked before all the church, that others might fear (20). This injunction was to be enforced without preference or partiality (21). “Laying hands” on people, that is, ordaining them to be elders in the church (4: 14; 2 Tim. 1: 6; Tit. 1: 5) “suddenly” (verse 22) lacked judicious deliberation and proper caution. Unknown and untried men put in positions of trust hastily, might bring the truth into disrepute. Suddenly placed in responsible positions before they were known to be trustworthy, they might be sinners, and Old Master Time, who does wonders, might expose their ungodliness. Now “keep yourself pure;” avoid “partaking of other men’s sins” (22). This requires that you “lay hands suddenly on no man.”

Now this contextual reading prepares us for, and brings us to the laconic verse: "Some men's sins are open before hand, going before to judgment; and some men they follow after" (the judgment), verse 24. The Greek for "open before hand" ought to be translated "palpably manifest" (A. R. Fausset, A. M.) The same word is translated evident in Heb. 7: 14: "It is evident our Lord sprang out of Judah." Literally "before" the eyes, that is, notorious. When the apostle speaks of sins which are open before the judgment, he means public sins; sins which are open, palpably manifest, evident, known, etc. Some sinners are hardened—they are past feeling (Eph. 4: 19); they have lost all sense of shame, and cannot blush. Jer. 6: 15. They sin with a high hand, and don't care who knows it. All sinners are not of this kind. Some so effectually cover their sins that they do not become known; their sins will be exposed, and turned wrong side out at the judgment. You see there are two kinds of sins; there is the palpably manifest, open, evident, going before to judgment, known, kind; the other kind Paul defines thusly: "Some men (*i e.*, their sins), they follow after." Their sins are not open public crimes, loudly accusing, and generally known. They are private sinners. Their sins "follow after" the judgment. When the Lord comes in judgment he will bring to light the things of darkness (private sins, sins from which David prayed to be kept Psa. 19: 12), and will make manifest the counsels of the heart. 1 Cor. 4: 5. Our work will then be known of what sort it is. 1 Cor. 3: 13. Sins, unknown before, are known now. Hence

Paul's instructions to Timothy are in substance, "Keep yourself pure;" when others sin rebuke them before all; don't partake of other men's sins. Don't lay hands suddenly on some promising, but unknown brother. Be vigorous as an overseer in carrying out these instructions—in rebuking those who sin, whether in presbyters¹ or people, and avoid participating in other men's sins by ordaining ungodly candidates. Remember there are two classes of sins, those "palpably manifest," and those not so; on the former you must act decidedly, whether to rebuke the people who sin in general, or to ordain ministers in particular. As to private sins, the judgment will bring these "to light." However successfully sins may be hidden now they "cannot be hid" then. You are only responsible for "palpably manifest" sins; you must not connive at these. Those that "are otherwise" the Lord will expose in the day of judgment. This explanation of the 24th verse also Scripturally elucidates the "good works" spoken of in the 25th verse.

The Wicked and Chaff. Psalms 1: 4, 5.

David compares the righteous to a tree with healthful leaves and golden fruit, growing on the banks of a river. Psa. 1: 3. "Winds of doctrine" may blow tempestuously among these trees of the Lord's planting (Isa. 60: 21; Eph. 4: 14), but their roots are so "rooted and grounded in love" (Eph. 3: 17) that they are the more "grounded and settled" by the storm; and, like the sturdy oak, the more the wind blows, the deeper into the earth its roots go, until it gets so securely fixed it cannot be "moved

away" from its place at all. Col. 1: 23. The terrific "winds of doctrine" pluck up a few of them, it is true; but Jude tells us that they were "without fruit," and even those which had fruit on them were so nearly dead that it had "withered." The trees blown down in a storm are generally¹ dead ones. Hence Jude says the apostate brethren in his day who had been "plucked up by the roots" had been unfruitful two seasons," and were "dead." See the Emphatic Diaglott on Jude 12.

The wicked man has no "root in himself" (Matt. 13: 21). Hence David, by one of the strongest and most striking contrasts in the Bible, puts the righteous and wicked in juxtaposition thus: The righteous have roots like trees, when growing on the river banks near water. The tree roots, "through the scent of water," (Job. 14: 9) grow so nicely that the tree becomes so firmly fixed in the earth that windstorms cannot jostle it. "The ungodly are not so." They have no roots, and this fact led David to seek for another image to represent them. He soon found it in this world that is open to our inspection and comprehension. He condescended to our simplicity, and gave us an image to represent them which we can not fail to understand: They are "like the chaff which the wind driveth away." They are "like" chaff, as the reader will notice, in this particular: "which the wind driveth away." Chaff has no adhesion; it has no roots, and cannot fasten itself to the ground. Light and lying loosely on the earth, it is moved from place to place by the wind. The wicked are to be driven away like chaff is driven before

the wind-storm. Job 21: 18; Psa. 35: 5; Isa. 17: 13; 29: 5; Hos. 13: 3. "Therefore," David concludes, "the ungodly shall not stand in the judgment, nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous," (v. 5). By reading verses four and five of this Psalm together, we can get the full force of the word, "therefore." The ungodly are "like chaff" which the wind drives away. Therefore, the ungodly shall not stand in the judgment. By reading the two verses consecutively, we get the idea that the driving away of the ungodly "like chaff" is to occur at the judgment. This thought is on the surface of the text, and is intimated often in the Bible with marvelous simplicity. They are to be punished at the judgment, not when they die. They are not able to "stand" (Rev. 6: 17) at the judgment like the "Congregation of the righteous." What becomes of them, then? They are driven away "like chaff." "As the flame consumeth the chaff" (Isa. 5: 24), so it will consume them. They are to "burn up" like chaff, Matt. 3: 12. They are to be "devoured as stubble fully dry." Nahum 1: 10. Would a man with ordinary intellect take these images and illustrations of Scripture to teach eternal torment? If the wicked are to "burn up" like chaff, if they are to burn like "stubble fully dry," can they roast in fire throughout eternity? Do you call eternal torment burning up a man "like chaff?" If stubble is "fully dry," would it burn like a man in "infinite despair?" Can a reasonable man get eternal torture out of these Bible images? No. The dogma of endless torment is a barefaced and impudent alteration of God's word.

The Millennium.

When and for what purpose is the Millennium?—*Emma Lindsay.*

REPLY.

Millennium is from the Latin *Mille*, a thousand, and *annus*, a year. The word Millennium means the one thousand years during which Christ will personally reign on the earth, assisted by the glorified saints, Rev. 20. Christ's advent is pre-millennial, 2 Thes. 2. His reign begins at his coming. Rev. 11: 15, 16. Therefore the reign of Christ is subsequent to his coming.

The purpose of his reign is tersely stated by Paul to be the subjugation of "all enemies," 1 Cor. 15: 25. I. Governments will be destroyed, Rev. 11: 15; Zech. 14: 9; Ezek. 37: 22. II. Ignorance will be removed, Isa. 2: 3, 4; 25: 6, 9; Jer. 3: 17; Isa. 11. III. And finally death itself, "the last enemy," will be extirpated,¹ 1 Cor. 15: 26.

The Angels that Left Their Habitation.

Will you be kind enough to explain what Peter and Jude mean by the angels that left their habitation, estate, etc.?—*J. S.*

REPLY.

The Hebrew word *Malak*, generally translated angel in the Old Testament, means a Messenger, agent. The Greek word *angelos*, translated angel in the New Testament, has the same meaning. The word angel is like the word general, judge, president, etc.; it states position and not nature. It is an office—one sent, a messenger—Hence one may hold the office

whether mortal or immortal. God may send a mortal man as a messenger to tell glad tidings; or he may send an immortal being as an agent to perform his behests. An angel, therefore, may be mortal or immortal.

That mortal men whom God honors as messengers or agents are called angels is evident from the fact that angels are said to have sinned, 2 Pet. 2: 4; and 95 times the word *Malak* is translated messenger in the Old Testament, and applied to mortal men. See Hebrew Concordance. Haggai, 1: 13, John the Baptist, Mal. 2: 7; Mark 1: 2, some of John's disciples, Luke 7: 24, and the spies whom Rahab received, are called angels (*anggelos*, Messengers), Jas. 2: 26.¹

In looking for the angels that sinned (2 Pet. 2: 4) it is well to remember that immortal angels are immaculate and deathless, Luke 20: 36. God has, in his law, made death the penalty for sin, Rom. 5: 12; 6: 23. An immortal angel can not die; therefore an immortal angel cannot sin. If we will consent to be taught by divine authority, we can easily find out who the angels were that sinned and left their habitation. Jude says, "I will, therefore, put you in remembrance, though ye once knew this," v. 5.² The brethren to whom Jude wrote were not wise above that which is written, surely; and since he presumes they once knew about these angels, it is fair to infer that there was something written about them in the Holy Scriptures. Whoever the angels were, whatever their sin and fall, it was a matter known to those to whom Jude wrote, and therefore the same to us. It is a matter as easily for us to ascertain as that "the

Lord having saved the people out of the Land of Egypt, afterwards destroyed them that believed not," Jude 5—a great and memorable event, a sad story pathetically told in the sacred writings. Now the sin and fall of the angels is one case among many other cases showing that God knoweth how "to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished," 2 Pet. 2: 9. Note his illustrations:

1. *God did not spare the angels that sinned.*
2. *He did not spare Sodom and Gomorrha, 2 Pet. 2: 5, 6.*
3. *Nor the people who sinned after coming out of the land of Egypt, Jude 5. "Ye once knew this." He only writes to jog their memory, to call attention to what they once knew.*

Now we take God's Word and read about the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrha and the unfaithful Israelites after they came out of Egypt. Using these remarkable historic events as mile-posts in the great highway of the past, we expect within reasonable proximity to Israel's fall after their deliverance from Egypt, to find angels who sinned and fell. So we ask, What other remarkable fall, a fall of messengers, took place in the neighborhood of Israel's deliverance from Egypt? Read Num. 13. "Send thou men," v. 2. "And Moses sent them," etc.; v. 17. They were sent—were Messengers—and these spies are called angels. Jas. 2: 25.

Undoubtedly we have here found the angels that sinned! These spies were made messengers by divine command. They were carefully selected as repre-

sentative, intelligent men. But they "sinned;" "left their habitation," "first estate," etc. They spied out the "land flowing with milk and honey." It was theirs by promise (Gen. 15: 18, 19), and they were told to go in and take it, but they "left it" like cowards, and were cast down into the darkness of death, there to be held with "chains of darkness" until the judgment of the great day. Dear reader, take this lesson to yourself. Let us not fail to enter into God's rest through unbelief and sin, as they did. Heb. 4.

Christ in the Psalms. Psalms 2.

In our exposition of this Psalm, we must be careful not to repeat the blunder of the mystical interpreter, who claims to see the prefiguration of Christ in every verse of the psalms; and we must also avoid the greater error of the rationalistic critic, who cannot find predictions of the Messiah in any of them. The attack made upon David by the Philistines (2 Sam. 5), is doubtless the historical fact which caused this poem to be written. Beginning with an earthly king, who makes war with the "kings of the earth" and the "rulers" of the people (v. 2), the prophet of the Lord, perhaps without design on his part (1 Pet. 1: 10, 11), used language too divine, heavenly and prophetic for David or Ahaz or any Jewish monarch to exhaust its meaning. The local and temporal is swallowed up in the universal and eternal. Contemplating God's holy promises, the king who sits on the "holy hill of Zion" (v. 6), becomes glorified and transfigured. The writer concerns himself with the present only in so far as it is typical of "good

things to come.” Heb. 10: 1. In nature the flower is before the fruit; types are thrown off before the arch-type appears; outline sketches are given before the ideal is realized. We are, therefore, justified in finding in the character of David, and in his history, the rough outline and prefiguration of the King of kings, the Lord Jesus Christ, whose reign is a reign of righteousness, and whose kingdom cannot be moved.

Moses wrote of Christ. John 1: 45. Concerning his testimony our Lord says: “Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?” Jno. 5: 46, 47. “The law of Moses and the prophets” (Luke 24: 44), taught the “sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.” 1 Pet. 1: 11. When we understand that Christ is the subject-matter of the prophetic word, that “to him give *all* the prophets witness” (Acts 10: 43), we can appreciate why Apollos, a man “mighty in the scriptures,” convinced the Jews “by the scriptures that Jesus was the Christ,” Acts 18: 24, 28. In preaching Christ, the apostles only reiterated the prophetic testimony, “saying none other things that those which the prophets and Moses did say should come, that Christ should suffer,” Acts 24: 23, 24. In opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered, they reasoned with their audience “out of the scriptures,” Acts 17: 2, 3. Using the Old Testament as their text-book, they “expounded and testified the kingdom of God,” and persuaded their auditors, “concerning Jesus, both out of the

law of Moses and out of the prophets, from morning till evening," Acts 28: 23.

Now if the law of Moses and the prophets had for their subject-matter the Christ, it is reasonable, and as we shall show, it is scriptural to interpret the psalms prophetically and messianically. This method of interpreting the Psalms was not questioned till "higher critics" were born. They, partly through nescience,¹ and partly through a desire to shield their skeptical criticisms, "compass sea and land" (Matt. 23: 15) to interclude² any interpretation of the sacred writings which recognizes the inspirational integrity of the Old Testament. These critics have shown by their tactics, punic³ and otherwise, that they are inveterate⁴ skeptics. With duplicity they inveigle the unsuspecting away from God. They aggressively promulgate theories inimical to the infallibility of the holy scriptures: and while pretending to be friendly, they proceed to reduce the Bible to a medley—to a canard.⁵ This explains why they are so anxious to disconnect Christ and the psalms. But let us see if Christ is in the psalms, as we found him in the law of Moses and in the prophets. In the second verse David says, "The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed." In the New Testament this text is quoted, "against the Lord, and against his Christ," Acts 4: 26. "This day have I begotten thee" (verse 7) are words which the spirit led Paul to apply to Christ, Heb. 1: 5. The same apostle says that God hath "fulfilled" this text of scripture, "in that he hath raised up Jesus

again," Acts 13: 33. "And he saith in another psalm," says Paul, "thou shalt not suffer thine holy one to see corruption," verse 35. The other psalm quoted here is Psa. 16: 10. Showing that this psalm is applicable to Christ, and not to David, Paul goes on to prove by this pertinent comment: "For David, after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption. But he whom God raised again, saw no corruption," verse 36.¹ Psalms 40th chapter is "the volume of the book" wherein it is written of Christ, "I come to do thy will, O God," Heb. 10: 7. And the Lord himself, when he had occasion to refer to the Old Testament, specifically mentioned the psalms as being messianic in character: "These are the words I spake unto you, that all things must be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, *and in the psalms*, concerning me," Luke 24: 44.

Skeptical "Impossibilities."

When skeptics read the miracles recorded in the Bible they call them "Impossibilities." For instance, they read that Christ fed five thousand with five loaves of bread. Matt. 14: 17. They say of this: "Increasing five loaves to feed so many people and doing it instantly—it's an impossibility." Well, give me one grain of wheat and allow me time enough and I will raise enough bread to feed five thousand. "But here Jesus instantly increased five loaves,—an impossibility," responds the skeptic. Of course the skeptic, the poor skipjack,² knows what is possible

and what is impossible! Suppose that fifty years ago R. G. Ingersoll had read a verse in the Bible like this: "The apostle Peter was dwelling in Brooklyn, N. Y., and Paul was in Liverpool, England. Peter, therefore, called to Paul, and talked with him for an hour, saith the Lord of hosts." The Colonel on reading this statement, would, of course, immediately pronounce it a "contradiction." He would tell how many miles Liverpool was from Brooklyn; and for \$100 an evening he would expose the "absurdities" in the Bible; and as he would tell with grandiloquence how Peter talked with Paul, when he was hundreds of miles away, without cable or means,—how he talked through the air—how that was contrary to "natural law" and "experience,"—what an "impossibility" it was; he would be lauded as a "smart" man by the simple minded. Wireless telegraphy, however, is a fact. Why, friend, there is not a miracle in the Bible which is harder for me to understand and believe, than the modern inventions of men.

"Raised." 1 Cor. 15: 44.

Please give an exposition of 1 Cor. 15: 44. Give the Greek words for "raised," "spiritual," and "body," and their meanings. A man here says that the original word for "raised" means dissolution or separation. You can see at a glance what he is trying to do—do away with the resurrection. Is Young's Concordance standard authority?—*E. F. Randolph.*

REPLY.

The Greek word translated "raised" in 1 Cor. 15: 44, is *egeiro*, and means, according to Young who is authority the world over, "to raise up." The word

“spiritual” is from *pneumatikos*; and “body” is *soma* in the Greek, and means the physical organism always, unless it is used in a secondary sense. Your friend’s suggestion that “raised” means separation, the separation of an immortal soul from this “mortal coil,” is a prevalent theological saying, but is as destitute of foundation as an air castle. If he would only note that Paul’s statement is about “the dead,” that “the dead shall be raised incorruptible” (v. 52), instead of an immortal entity being separated from the mortal body at death, he would surely see his mistake and the truth too.

Pillars.

Would it be proper to call James, Cephas, and John (Gal. 2: 9) a first presidency or first presidents of the church? Were they not an earthly head of the church after the Lord’s ascension?—*J. H. Byerly.*

REPLY.

The text referred to, Gal. 2: 9, does not say that James, Cephas, and John were pillars in the church, but they “seemed to be pillars,” says the apostle. Whether these men were what they “seemed” to be or not, is a matter of small importance; the important thing to recognize is, that God has “set some in the church” (1 Cor. 12: 28) with authority to oversee and feed the church of God (Acts 20: 28); and the ecclesia¹ is solemnly charged to obey and submit obediently to those who thus rule in the assembly of the saints. Heb. 13: 17; Matt. 18: 17. The boastful claims made by some brethren that they have no leader, that they follow no man, etc., is both unscriptural and sinful. Paul is declared to be “a pattern to

them which should hereafter believe" (1 Tim. 1: 16); and Timothy, though only a young man, was "an example" to the brethren "in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity." 4: 12. We are exhorted to "be followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises," (Heb. 6: 12), to walk in the "steps" of Abraham, (Rom. 4: 12) and other "good men." Prov. 2: 20. The church of Christ has human "pillars" under it; its "foundation" is not Christ alone, as some Protestants would have us believe. He is the "chief corner stone," but the "apostles and prophets" are part of its "foundation," popish¹ as it may sound to some who are restive under church authority and discipline. Eph. 2: 20.

Christ Preached to the Antediluvians Representatively. 1 Pet. 3: 18, 19, 20.

This text reads: "(Christ) being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit: by which (Spirit) also he (Christ) went and preached unto the spirits (now) in prison, which (spirits) (now in prison) sometime were disobedient when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water." Because this text affirms that Christ preached to the antediluvians, many have blundered as to the time of the preaching, the agency used in the proclamation, and have thereby been misled as to man's condition in the death state. For if the disobedient antediluvians were preached to in times contemporary with Christ by

Christ himself, and that preaching was done during the time of Christ's entombment, the death state is undoubtedly a state of life and consciousness. And since preaching the gospel means announcing "glad tidings" (Luke 8: 1), we cannot take the position that Christ preached to people who were "disobedient" in the days of Noah, without logically admitting a 'second chance' for the antediluvians after death, and for all other "disobedient" souls. With such grave errors loudly calling for recognition as the necessary resultants of this view, we ask the reader to give us his best attention while we try to expound this passage of Holy Scripture.

The first requisite to understand this text is to note that Christ can preach and has preached in two ways: Personally and representatively. At the age of about 30 years Christ began to preach personally; beginning in Galilee (Mark 1: 14) he sounded out the glad tidings of the kingdom for three and one-half years in the Holy Land. He was "sent" (Luke 4: 43) to do this very work. But the gospel he preached, had it been limited to his personal efforts, would not have reached the people generally. Being a man of authority, he selected a band of men to spread his gospel, to represent him, and hence he began to preach the gospel representatively. To these men he said, "Go your ways:" "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me." Luke 10: 3, 16. He represented God; his disciples represented him; and wherever they preached, Christ is said to have preached; whoever they bap-

tied, Christ is said to have baptized. Jno. 4: 1, 2. Even after his ascension he is said to have come to Ephesus and preached there. Eph. 2: 17. He did not personally leave heaven and come to Ephesus and preach; but by Paul and perhaps other disciples to whom he delegated authority, he preached there representatively.

Now when Peter says that Christ preached to the antediluvians, we have only to ask, Did he preach to them personally or representatively? The correct answer to this question solves the whole problem. The answer is given in the verse itself. Peter does not affirm that Christ himself preached to the antediluvians, but Christ by the spirit—"by which (spirit) he went and preached." The spirit "by which" he preached was the spirit of God, the power of God; that power by which Jesus was "quickenened" and raised from the dead. The same spirit (or power) with which Jesus was invested during his ministry (Luke 4: 14, 18), which had left him when he cried, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" and which brought him to life again, giving him "length of days forever and ever" (Psa. 21: 4); it is the self-same spirit which operated upon the disobedient "in the days of Noah." What days were they? In Noah's time. Who were disobedient then? Why, the men who were contemporary with him. Therefore "the men" who were disobedient in the days of Noah are clearly identical with the "spirits" which were in prison in the days of Peter. (For another instance of men being called spirits, see 1 Jno. 4: 1, where "false prophets" are called "spirits").

Now to these disobedient people in the days of Noah, Christ preached by the spirit. A king is said to do what has been done by his ambassador—his representative. On this principle Christ is said to have preached what was preached by his servant Noah. His preaching is distinctly stated to be the striving of God's spirit—"My spirit shall not always strive with man." Gen. 6: 3. The spirit, then, that strove with the wicked of Noah's day is the same spirit that has preached righteousness throughout the whole world in all of its ages—the spirit of the Father which dwelt in Christ without measure. "Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." 2 Pet. 1: 21. "The word which ye hear," said Jesus, "is not mine, but the Father's which sent me." John 14: 24. In the Scriptures God is represented as speaking and doing all the words and works of Christ. In the same representative way the apostle's words and works are said to be Christ's. The application of this principle to the subject in hand is apparent: What Noah preached to the antediluvians was a message of righteousness, delivered by the authority of God's spirit. Speaking of the testimony borne by the prophets (and his statement is as true of Noah as any of them), Peter says that the "spirit of Christ" was in them all. 1 Pet. 1: 11. Then Christ preached to the antediluvians by Noah just like he preached to the people through all the other prophets of ancient times, videlicet,¹ "by his spirit."

That Jesus did not personally preach to the antediluvians is farther shown by the purpose the apostle Peter has in view in referring to the preaching of the

spirit through Noah. By reading 1 Pet. 3: 17-22; 4: 1-6 we learn that Peter was designing to show a parallel between that time and apostolic times. Note the following parallel carefully:

NOACHIC TIMES.	APOSTOLIC TIMES.
I. Disobedience on the part of the people.	I. Disobedience on the part of the people.
II. God makes known his purpose.	II. God makes known his purpose.
III. To Noah (a preacher of righteousness).	III. To the apostles (preachers of righteousness.)
IV. By the Spirit.	IV. By the Spirit.
V. The Spirit which dwelt in Christ.	V. The Spirit which dwelt in Christ.
VI. Christ, by the Spirit, through Noah, preaches unto the people.	VI. Christ, by the Spirit through his apostles, preaches unto the people.
VII. The longsuffering of God waits in the days of Noah.	VII. The longsuffering of God waits in the days of the apostles.
VIII. "Few saved."	VIII. "Few chosen."
IX. "By water."	IX. "By water" — baptism.
X. Through Christ being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit which preached to the disobedient by Noah.	X. Through Christ being put to death but quickened by the Spirit which preached to the disobedient by the apostles.

“Came Down from Heaven.”

Please harmonize Jno. 20: 17, with Jno. 3: 13.—*E. F. Randolph.*

REPLY.

John 20: 17 states that Christ had not yet ascended to heaven, while Jno. 3: 13 affirms, “No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is (now) in heaven.” Christ had just emerged from the tomb when he met Mary and told her he had not “yet ascended to heaven,” the word “yet” implying that in due course of time he would ascend, which he did forty days after making this statement. Acts 1: 3. John’s gospel was written after Christ had ascended to his Father. So when he says that “no man hath ascended to heaven” he had to qualify his sweeping affirmation in the words, “but he (Christ) which came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is (now) in heaven.” That is, at the time John was writing Jesus had ascended to heaven, and his statement that “no man hath ascended to heaven” would have been untrue had he not expressly noted Jesus as an exception to his broad declaration. So far there is nothing to “harmonize” between the texts.

We judge that the real difficulty in Bro. Randolph’s mind is in the words of Jno. 3: 13, “He that came down from heaven.” This expression is instantly seized by believers in the personal pre-existence of Christ, and by it they try to prove that Christ, a personal pre-existent being, existed in heaven before his conception and birth, and that then in some way they cannot and dare not define, he “came down

from heaven!" In the hope of benefiting such theorists, we now desire to make a few remarks of a general nature which will clear up such Bible expressions as are usually urged in support of Christ's pre-existence; such as, "Before Abraham was, I am;" "I came down from heaven," etc. One essential of Bible hermeneutics¹ is that there are two I's involved in the person of Christ. The Father and Son were united. Notice the plural pronouns in this text, "We (Father and Son) speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness." Jno. 3: 11. "We speak;" the result is, "Our witness." We cannot separate the Father and Son without doing violence to the unity and oneness between them constantly insisted upon in the divine Word. Christ's definition of the two I's involved in his person makes plain how we are to understand he came down from heaven; here it is: (1) "The Father is in (2) me. The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works." Jno. 14: 10. They are thus defined by Paul, "God was in Christ." 2 Cor. 5: 19.

These texts speak of the Divine I—the Deity side of Christ's person. Of "the man Christ Jesus" we read concerning the second I—the human side of Christ's person, "Of mine ownself I can do nothing." Jno. 5: 60.² "I am not come of myself." 7: 28. "My Father is greater than I." 14: 28; Mark 13: 32. Now which of these two I's was before Abraham, and that came down from heaven? There is only one answer: The Father. The manifestation of the Father revealed to the world as Jesus Christ,

dates from the days of Tiberius; but the Eternal Father himself, who, by Jesus, did miracles and signs and wonders, (Acts 2: 22), and spake his word (Heb. 1: 2), was before all things. When Christ said, "Before Abraham was I am," he was the Father's voice; the medium of the Father's thoughts and words. "Through the Eternal Spirit" (Heb. 9: 14) Jesus spoke and performed his mighty works; hence it is that we are enabled to recognize what is true of him as the implement of the power in whose shadow his person was hid (Isa. 49: 2) as distinct from his individuality and powerlessness as the Son of Man.

Now we are ready to understand how Christ "came down from heaven." God gives wisdom (Jas. 1: 5), in fact, "every good and perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights." Jas. 1: 17. That Christ, among the very best "gifts" of God, is "from above," and came "down from the Father of lights," we readily and thankfully admit; but when it is claimed that of "every good and perfect gift" which is "from above" only Christ pre-existed; all the others had no existence till they materialized on earth in the form of blessings, we cannot understand such a contradictory interpretation of the Word. If this form of language teaches the pre-existence of Christ, it teaches the pre-existence of "every" other gift of God! The truth of the matter is, the text teaches that all "good and perfect gifts" have their origin in God. If the reader will study James 3: 5¹; Deut. 30: 11-14; Matt. 21: 25; John 3: 27-36; Rom. 1: 18; Gal. 1: 8; Psa. 119: 89; Phil. 3: 20; Jno. 3: 12; Acts 16: 19²; Heb. 8: 5; Deut.

32: 1-3, he will learn that one mode of referring to heaven relates specifically to it as the origin of all divine revelation, and that it is interchangably used with the Father's name. That which comes from heaven comes from God. When Christ said he "came down from heaven," the Jews misunderstood him like our Trinitarians do nowadays, and began to wildly speculate. Jno. 6: 38, 42. To insist that Christ was using literal language when he said he came down from heaven in the 6th chapter of John is to follow in the wake of the Jews who misunderstood him, and to deny every revealed truth concerning the person of the Son of God. If Christ personally "came down from heaven," see what follows: Christ is speaking of himself as the "bread of heaven" when he says he came down from heaven: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if a man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread which I will give is my flesh." Jno. 6: 51, 53. Understand our Saviour literally, and you not only prove his pre-existence, but you also establish that his body of "flesh" pre-existed, and so deny absolutely his conception and birth! And worse yet, for you would also have to believe that somehow his literal "flesh" was changed into a loaf of "bread," and that this dropped down out of the sky, thoroughly "done!" Get behind me, ye speculations. Christ came down from heaven in the same sense that the manna did. Jno. 6: 31, 33. No one believes that the manna pre-existed and was stored away in granaries in heaven; then why claim more for Christ than manna, when the same language is used of them both? Like the

man, Christ came down from heaven in the sense of origin. 'He that cometh from above is above all; he that is of the earth is earthy.' Jno. 3: 31. Here "from above" is in opposition to "the earth." He who claims that a personal pre-existent Christ came "from above," must, to be consistent, claim that these men whom Christ addressed as "of the earth," personally pre-existed in the earth! They were "from beneath" while he was "from above." Jno. 3: 23.¹ They were from beneath in the sense of origin, the devil being their father (v. 44)²; Christ was from above in the sense of origin, God being his Father. Those who refuse to accept this perspicacious³ explanation of the words, "came down from heaven" and "from above," should beware; for these forms of speech are like a two-edged sword; they cut both ways. The words, "of the earth," and "from beneath," are phrases used in opposition to them, and must be subject to the same interpretation and understanding. If they prove Christ's personal pre-existence in heaven, then the Jews whom Christ put in juxtaposition with himself, these opponents of our Master, personally pre-existed with their "father the devil" in the earth before they were born!!

To conclude: "The words, "Come down from heaven" cannot mean more than to indicate the origin of Christ. Instead of proving his pre-existence they destroy that doctrine forever. And for this reason: "He that came down from heaven," the text plainly states, was the "Son of Man." The passage has to do exclusively with the "Son of Man;" it has nothing to do in the most meagre way of inference with

the Son of God in the form of an angel, or any other imaginary form. So the words, "came down from heaven" being used of the "son of man" (a designation that had no truth in it at all till Christ was born of Mary, and thus became related to man by kindred ties of nature), Trinitarians themselves have to explain the text consistent with Christ's humanity. As if by fate this text logically slips from under their feet; and they have to agree with us that the passage teaches the origin and not the pre-existence of our Lord.

"The Promise" of Acts 2: 39.

What is the "promise" spoken of in Acts 2: 39? Notice how universal it is: "to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, as many as the Lord our God shall call." Does not that reach you and me? Was it the Holy Spirit? If not, what was it?—*M. A. W.*

REPLY.

The context, always invaluable in ascertaining the meaning of any passage of Scripture, in this instance unerringly guides us in our answer. Sinners had been "pricked in the heart" by Peter's sermon which they had "heard." v. 37. With penitence they enquired what they, as convicted sinners, guilty of murder in the first degree, should do; if there was anything they could "do" to escape the impending doom which Peter had preached was to be their final destiny. The apostle then explained what they could do and must do "for the remission of sins:" "repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ." Discharge these two duties, fulfill these two conditions, "and ye shall," says the apostle, "receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." This

“promise is to you,” sinners though you be, upon the conditions stated; and it is a “promise” reaching down from you “unto your children, and to all that are afar off, even to as many as the Lord shall call” by the gospel message. 2. Thes. 2: 13, 14. As our Sister clearly intimates, the “promise” was not limited to the hearers then addressed, but was universal, just as universal as repentance and baptism. And what is the promise unlimited in time and to persons? Why, “the gift of the Holy Spirit.”

Now, dear Sister, note that the “promise” is not, “And you shall receive a gift” nor yet “*the gifts.*” There were many “gifts” of the Spirit, “diversities of gifts,” and “diversities of operations,” wrought by “the same Spirit.” 1 Cor. 12. These “gifts” and their miraculous “operations” were bestowed “without repentance.” Rom. 11: 29. They are distinct from, and independent of, man’s power, or even his “holiness.” Acts 3: 12. “John did no miracle” (Jno. 10: 41), yet he was the greatest prophet ever born of a woman. Luke 7: 28. No trouble then to see that these gifts were not universal; they were only given to “some” in the church. 1 Cor. 12: 28; Eph. 4: 8, 11. They cannot, for this reason, if there were no other, be meant by “the promise” in Acts 2: 39, for that promise is as universal as obedience to the conditions of salvation.

The promise is not “a gift;” nor “the gifts;” it is the gift; not the Holy Spirit itself, but “the gift of the Holy Spirit.” God is a Spirit. Jno. 4: 24. Hence God and Holy Spirit are often used interchangeably. A case which will illustrate this is in

Acts 5 where, in one verse it is said that Ananias lied to the Holy Spirit, and in another, that he lied "unto God." Verses 3, 4. Lying to God and lying to the Holy Spirit are plainly equivalents. Therefore "the gift of the Holy Spirit" is the gift of God. And what is the gift of God? "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ." Rom. 6: 23. Now if a man repents and is baptized, he shall "receive the gift of the Holy Spirit;" that is, he shall receive eternal life. Thank God, "this promise" is for every one who will accept it. Dear reader, have you a claim upon this "promise" of God?

Invisibility of Divine Beings.

Will you kindly give an explanation of John 20: 19 26?¹ If Jesus was raised in the body as we believe, how could he appear to the disciples in the room with the doors shut?—*Oscar J. Marsh.*

REPLY.

The 19th verse explains that the doors were shut "for fear of the Jews." Jesus, however, "stood in the midst" of the disciples suddenly, though the doors were shut. Do not make the mistake of Russell, by saying that he came into the building without opening the door. The text does not affirm such nonsense as this. It only says that Christ "stood in the midst" notwithstanding the door-closed precaution to keep their enemies out of their assembly. Russell, the great lover of darkness and mysticism, says he came into the building without opening the door to get in; and that as his body would not admit of this trick normally, he had to disorganize his body, and, as he leaves us to presume, he then went

through the key-hole of the door like gas; once on the inside of the house, he promptly set about re-organizing himself into a body again, which remarkable miracle was soon accomplished!

A few words on the invisibility of divine beings will remove forever from our minds all this incomprehensible jargon. The invisibility of immortal beings must be sought and found in the impotency of man. Man is finite; and of all his five senses, sight is the most imperfect and the most liable to deception. Many heavenly and earthly bodies are visible—we can see them. Many stars are invisible to us; but their invisibility does not argue their non-existence. Let us briefly note a few instances of the invisibility of divine beings, and note with care the reason why they are invisible.

I. *The Sodomites could not see the angels that came to destroy their city*—they could not even see the door of the house where they were lodging. Not because the angels had turned themselves into gas, not because the door of the house had gone out of existence; the angels and door were both in existence, as real as ever they were. The invisibility of these real objects is explained thusly, “they smote the men that were at the door of the house with blindness.” Gen. 18: 11.¹

II. *Though the ass Balaam rode “saw the angel of the Lord standing in the way”* (Num 22: 23), *the angelic being was invisible to the prophet*. His invisibility is accounted for in that divine power exerted upon the optical nerves had caused partial blindness. When the Lord “opened the eyes of Ba-

laam. he saw the angel of the Lord standing in the way.” (v. 31). That’s the explanation—not that the angel disorganized himself!

III. *As in the Old Testament, so in the New; the invisibility of divine beings is a cause in finite man—not in immortal existence.* Christ’s mother did not know him after his resurrection (Jno. 20: 14), nor did his disciples recognize him (21: 4). As two of them journeyed to Emmaus, “while they communed together and reasoned, Jesus himself drew near and went with them.” Luke 24: 15. They did not know him; why? The divine explanation is, “*Their eyes were holden, that they should not know him.*” v. 16. In all the instances of invisibility of immortal beings, the reader will please note that while the divine being remained the same glorious, immortal, substantial and real being, the change, if any, occurred in mortal man. If Christ was not recognized by his friends, mother, and life-long acquaintances, it was not because he was like a chameleon—could change his looks instantly, but “their eyes were holden.” And so we can clearly see that although our Lord had a “glorious body” (Phil. 3: 21), yet he could open the door where his friends were holding a meeting, and by holding their eyes, and for the time needed limit the power of their vision, and enter the room unobserved by them, and unknown to all. In this way he entered, “the doors being shut.”

Is the Spirit an “Undying Entity?”

Believers in man’s mortality go on advocating materialism in the face of the Wise Man’s affirmation that the Spirit is an undying entity. Eccl. 12: 7.—*Rev. W. M. Showers.*

REPLY.

The author of the above Platonic sentence is one of the most popular preachers of the Holiness Band in Southern Illinois. He is reputed to be a scholar and "mighty in the Scriptures," and is "looked up to" as a Leader. He is a personal friend of mine, but since he has waxed so bold in his defense of the immortality of the spirit that he has flung this sentence at me in a communication to the secular press, I feel that I do him no injustice by reviewing his argument for an "undying entity" in man. He has publicly criticised me and my brethren for advocating "man's mortality," and has, in the language of confidence and bombast, said that the "Wise Man" affirms that the Spirit is "an undying entity." He must not, then, complain if we "show him up" to our readers.

This "mortal man" (Job. 4: 7),^A claims he has "an undying entity," a spark of divinity. He claims to have what Paul says "no man" has, viz., immortality. 1 Tim. 6: 16. Thinking himself naturally immortal like God, he refuses to "lay hold on eternal life" (v. 19), claiming he has already "got it;" and what is worse, this view of his equality with God so fills him with pride and self-importance that he worships "corruptible man" as much as he does the "uncorruptible God." Rom. 1: 23, 25. Hence he presumes to place "Reverend" before his name—a word found only once in the Bible, and there applied to God. Psa. 111: 9. How presumptuous for a "mortal man," "a worm of the dust" (Job. 25: 6), to thus exalt himself to equality with God! For the

creature to claim equality with the Creator!! Before long the Lord of glory and majesty will arise “and shake terribly the earth.” Then the “lofty looks of men shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day.” Isa. 2: 11, 19. It will go hard with our friend then, when he is “sent empty away” (Luke 1: 53) to hide in holes and caves of the earth “for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty,” verse 19.¹ And then his willing followers will be startled with the question: “Cease ye from man whose breath is in his nostrils; for wherein is he to be accounted of?” verse 22.² Be warned. Call upon the Lord and seek him now (Isa. 55: 6), and then you will not be ashamed and punished when the Lord comes and “shakes terribly the earth.”

Mr. Showers says the “Wise Man” affirm that the Spirit is “an undying entity,” and then puts down “Eccl. 12: 7.” For once a preacher quotes a text to prove the immortality of the Spirit! Let us hasten to read it: “Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the Spirit shall return unto God who gave it.” Reader, do you see in this statement an “affirmation” that the Spirit is “an undying entity?” Is there in this text a word said about the nature of the Spirit? Why, any little Sunday-school boy or girl can see that the primary thought in this text is the location of the Spirit after death, where it “returns” to—“to God who gave it.” Any man with the comprehension of an ordinary intellect ought to see, and can see, that the text teaches the location, not the nature of the Spirit. The location

of the Spirit—where it “returns” to—is one thing; what its nature is—whether it is “an undying entity” or not—is another and quite a different thing. Who but a preacher in terrible straits to prove a pet theory to be true, would have dreamed that in locating the Spirit, he thereby demonstrated by an “affirmation” its “undying” nature? - The “Wise Man” must have been an advocate of rank materialism; for in Eccl. 3: 21, he says: “Who knoweth the Spirit of man that goeth upward, and the Spirit of beast that goeth downward to the earth?” Notice the words, “Spirit of man,” and “Spirit of beast.” The Hebrew word *ruach*, translated “Spirit” in Eccl. 12: 7; 3: 21, is translated breath in verse 19: “They (man and beast) all have one breath” (*ruach*, spirit*). Well then, if the phrase, “Spirit of man,” proves that man has a Spirit (and it does,) so the phrase, “Spirit of beast” proves that the beasts have the Spirit. As the Spirit of man and beast are “one,” the beasts equally with man possess the Spirit. And if the Spirit is an “undying entity” the beasts have an immortal Spirit. Accepting your premises we hand you this conclusion—a conclusion which you will vehemently repudiate. So do we.

What then, is the Spirit which “returns to God who gave it?” Notice the “Wise Man” says that both dust and Spirit “return” to where they came from: the dust “to the earth;” and the Spirit “to God who gave it.” Eccl. 12: 7. Neither dust nor Spirit go: they “return.” Returning to a place im-

* “They have all one *kind* of Spirit.”—Leeser’s translation of Eccl. 3: 19.

plies you were there once, left it, and are going back. Hence the dust "returns" to the earth, because man was "formed of the dust." Gen. 2: 7. As man was made of the "dust of the ground" the dust when man dies, "returns" to the ground (Gen. 3: 19)—returns to where it came from. The same is true of the Spirit. It was with God before man had it. God "gave it" (Eccl. 12: 7) to man when he "breathed into his nostrils the breath (*ruach*, spirit) of life." Gen. 2: 7. When man dies, "his breath (*ruach*, Spirit, that was breathed into his nostrils) goeth forth (returns to God), he returneth to his earth, and in that very day his thoughts perish." Psa. 146: 4. From this passage you can easily see that the Spirit returning to God is the life of the man fleeing away. And after this, what is man's condition? "In that very day his thoughts perish." Where is the dust? It is back in the earth "as it was," before man was made. Where is the Spirit? Why, it has returned to God, and is now "as it was," before man possessed it. How was it, and what was it, before God "gave it" to man? Was it an "undying entity" then? Was it conscious and intellectual then? Can your "immortal soul" recall events, and assert its consciousness and intellectual power before you were born? No! No!! Then as the Spirit, when with God before you had it, was not a conscious, "undying entity," how can it be such when it "returns" to God?

Dust and Spirit combined made a living man. On dying, the dust returns, and so does the Spirit, to where it came from, and is "as it was." So then as

death reduces a man to the same condition he was in before he was made, it follows he is just as unconscious in death as he was before he existed. And if you are as unconscious in death as you were before you were born, you are as unconscious as "Materialism" cares to make out, and as David affirmed, "In that very day his thoughts perish." Psa. 146: 4.

"Ascend Up Where He Was Before." Jno. 6: 62.

In John 6: 62, Jesus says, "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?" In the same chapter he had assured them that he "came down from heaven." John 6: 38. If Christ was not in heaven personally before he came to earth, he was not there at all in any sense, and his hearers were deceived. If a man should tell me that England was his home, and that he came from England, and that he was going back to England, and then I should discover that he had never been to England at all in his whole life time, but that he just had the promise of going to England, I would lose all confidence in that man, and class him with deceivers, because he might have told me the truth. Jesus could as easily merely have said, "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up," and then paused without adding, "where he was before," if he had never been there. This text can not be taken prophetically, because it points backward instead of forward.

The writer understands that the being who announced himself to Joshua, by Jericho, as "captain of the host of the Lord," Josh. 5: 14, 15, was none other than Christ, as no other being under God was entitled to that position.

Neither does the writer question the identity of that mysterious being who appeared in the "burning fiery furnace," Dan. 3: 15,¹ of whom an astonished king said, "Lo, I see four loose men, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt, and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God." Dan. 3: 25. And truly this was the Christ. And in the light of many texts that can be readily cited, the writer recognizes

and accepts of Christ's presence and joint-labors with the Father in the creation, indicated by God's own words, "Let us make man in our own image, and after our likeness." Gen. 1: 26.

We do not understand how this same Christ could 4,000 years later enter Mary's womb, and become incarnate as man. The mystery of his conception by the Holy Ghost is insolvable when viewed as the beginning of his career, or as a means to perpetuate a career already begun. God has seen fit to couch that mystery in a few simple words, "The Word was made flesh." John 1: 14.

Christ's pre-existence does not necessitate his immortality in that state. The objection to his pre-existence, on the score that an immortal being could not die, is an assumed difficulty. If it pleased the Father, he could have existed as his Son without the fullness of the divine attributes, even as we become sons of God, in this life, without it appearing what we shall be. 1 John 3: 2. The whole redemptive scheme is one of transformations. A change of nature was necessitated for Christ to accomplish his work. He descended the scale of being, passing below the angelic nature, and taking the Abrahamic. Again he ascended the scale of being, "being made so much better than the angels," Heb. 1: 4, making it possible for the elect body to ascend the same scale.—*Samuel M. Ohmart.*

REPLY.

It is not necessary to review Mr. Ohmart's article by offering criticisms on each point in a seriatim² manner. For the sake of brevity we will examine Jno. 6: 62, which is the best text he has quoted in proof of Christ's pre-existence. It must be obvious to the reader that if this passage fails to sustain the Trinitarian theory of pre-existence for which our friend pleads, the other texts quoted by him are impotent to do it. This passage reads, "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascended up where he

was before?" Believers in Christ's pre-existence usually quote this Scripture with a smile; it sounds real good to them. They assume that the word "ascend" means to personally go to heaven; that the phrase, "where he was before," means heaven; and that Christ personally existed in heaven "before" he came to the earth. It is easy to assume that all this is true; it would be safer to prove that it is. Personal pre-existence has not, does not, and cannot, explain this passage of Holy Writ. We must always interpret a text in harmony with its context; and when this sound Scriptural principle of interpretation is tried on John 6: 62, the doctrine of Christ's pre-existence is chased away like a vision of the night. Christ had just uttered some "hard sayings" which filled his disciples with murmur. John 6: 60, 61. The Lord seemed surprised that his followers should be offended at his words. That their offense at him was serious is evident from the statement, "From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him." V. 66. When Jesus noticed that they were offended at his words, he asked them in the language of surprise, "Doth this offend you? What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?" Now whatever "ascend" means, and "before," and "where he was before"—whatever these words and phrases mean, it was something that would give offense to the disciples. According to the theory of pre-existence, the substance of our Lord's meaning is about this: Do my words offend you? If so, what a terrible offense it will be to you when you see me

ascend to heaven, where I was an angel before I came to the earth in an "insolvable" manner! Slowly now. Can our friends tell us why the ascension of the Lord would offend his people? Is it historically true that the disciples got offended when the Lord ascended to heaven? Go to the record and see. "He led them out as far as Bethany, and lifted up his hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven. And they"—were offended? Careful, now. "And they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with *great joy*: and were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God." Luke 24: 50, 51, 52, 53. Instead of offense they had blessing, joy and praise.

But to return to John 6: 62. *Anabaino*, translated "ascend," means "to go or come up." See Young's Concordance. Now when we read of Christ or anyone else ascending we know that the idea is that they were "to go or come up" somewhere; not necessarily to heaven, for we read of Festus ascending "from Cæsarea to Jerusalem," Acts 25: 1, and of Jesus "ascending up to Jerusalem." Luke 19: 28. It is possible for a man to ascend, therefore, without going to heaven. What did Jesus ascend or go to Jerusalem for? To die the death of the cross. Luke 16: 31-34.¹ And what and how was that death accomplished? "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up,"² (*Hupsoo*, "to exalt, to elevate, set on high.") The serpent made by Moses in the wilderness was placed on a pole, lifted up, set on high, that all the

Israelites who were bitten by serpents might look upon it, and live. Num. 21: 9. Christ, in fulfilling this type, was lifted up when he was crucified on the cross. Hence he speaks of those who crucified him in the words, "When ye have lifted up the Son of Man." John 8: 28. "If I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me. This he said, signifying what death he should die." Jno. 12: 32, 33. Notice that Christ in order to signify what death he should die, says that he would be "lifted up from the earth." He did not go to heaven when he was lifted up; he died on the cross. It would be impossible for him to be lifted up without ascending. Therefore the meaning of Jno. 6: 62 is evidently this: Doth my sayings offend you? Then what a terrible offense it will be to you when you see the Son of Man ascend, or be lifted up in crucifixion on the cross and die—return to where he was before he was born. Remember that a dead man is said to be as he was—in the same condition he was in before he lived, Eccl. 12: 7. Did the death of Christ offend his disciples? Listen: "All of you shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad." Matt. 26: 31. The hope of his followers went out with his life (Luke 24: 21), and they had to be begotten into a lively hope again, 1 Pet. 1: 3. When Christ, the Shepherd of the sheep (Jno. 10: 2) was smitten, the flock became offended, and were scattered abroad. But the doctrine of pre-existence destroys the beautiful harmony of the text, and makes the Lord virtually say:

What an offense it will be to you when you see the Son of Man go to heaven, where he was before he came here! Later he did ascend; and we positively deny that a single disciple became offended at it.

Like Mr. Ohmart, we think this subject is a vital one. If by their fruits ye shall know them (Matt.7: 20) is a proper test of men, it is equally true of doctrines. Judged by this standard, the pre-existence of Christ is a false doctrine. It blurs the most beautiful parts of the truth with clouds of darkness, and denies some of the fundamental principles of the gospel. By way of warning we kindly make the following observations on the mischievous results of the dogma:

1. After quoting the words, Came down from heaven, Jno. 6: 38, our writer says: "If a man should tell me that England was his home, and that he came from England, and that he was going back to England, and then I should discover that he had never been in England.....I would lose all confidence in that man." According to this illustration, Christ would have to be born in heaven, as the man was born in England; Christ would have to come from heaven, as the man came from England, which is a denial of Christ's birth, though not intended to do it. There is nothing but confusion in the theory no matter which way you look.

2. The writer says that the angel of the Lord, called the Captain of the host of the Lord (Josh. 5: 14. 15) and that mysterious being who appeared in the burning, fiery furnace (Dan. 3: 15)⁴ were none other than Christ. So according to him Christ not

only pre-existed, but he appeared once in Josh. 5: 14, 15; he appeared the second time in Dan. 3: 15¹; he appeared the third time in Luke 2: 7, where he was born of Mary; and if he ever appears again, it will be the fourth time!! We have been wrong all these years, in that we have talked about the Second Coming of the Lord. We should have preached the fourth coming of the Lord! It is too bad that all these past comings of our Lord, and his appearances, slipped from the memory of Paul when he wrote: "Unto them that look for him shall he appear the *second time* without sin unto salvation!!" Heb. 9: 28.

3. Of saints it is said, "Neither can they die any more." Luke 20: 36. The saints are to be made equal to angels at the resurrection. If Christ was one of these angels, it is hard to understand how he could become so changed as to die. If it is possible for an angel to become so changed that he can die, then the saints who have the promise of becoming "equal" to them in nature, might experience an "insolvable" change to mortality, and have to die again! With such disastrous possibilities in prospect, eternal life is robbed of its glory. This difficulty has been seen by the advocates of Christ's pre-existence, and hence the suggestion: Christ's pre-existence does not "necessitate his immortality." Let that go for what it is worth. Mark this statement: "A change of nature was necessitated for Christ to accomplish his work." He could not do his work in the angelic nature; he had to do this in the Abrahamic! Very well. Of what use then, was his pre-existence? What was the difference be-

tween Christ's nature and ours, after the "necessitated" change occurred? None whatever. Then if Christ pre-existed in a nature which had to be changed for him "to accomplish his work," and after the change had been wrought he was of the same nature we are, his pre-existence was without aim, design, and purpose. It is useless and meaningless. Cast it to the moles and to the bats, and let us stay by the truth in all its simplicity and beauty.

Limited Meaning of the Word "All."

Brother Huggins: I freely admit that I was ignorant of the doctrines taught by your church until I read the title of your paper this evening—THE RESTITUTION. It sent a thrill of pleasure through me when I read it, and the brief "confession of faith" in the right hand upper corner. It is now over fifty years since I first learned the meaning of that text, and it gives me joy whenever I see or read it. Why that word has so much joy for me is because as it stands in Acts 3: 20, 21, it wipes out the God dishonoring, man-degrading, doctrine of endless suffering. But while your faith in the salvation of our race is but partial, I have faith in the universal salvation of the entire human race. But there is great comfort in your creed even though it does not include every being whom God hath created, as among the saved: you do not charge the Father of our race with raising countless millions of erring mortals from the quiet sleep of death with no other object in view only to torture them through eternity. Hence I am not disposed to contend that your people are in error, except to point out that the words, "all things," in your confession of faith means, if any thing, the restoration of every human being to holiness and happiness.

I hold that "all" means all. "All shall know the Lord from the least to the greatest." The Lord is to wipe the tears from off "all faces." "The Father loveth the Son, and hath

given all things into his hand.” “All that the Father hath given me, shall come to me.” “And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me.” “Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.”—*Henry Elsey.*

REPLY.

While we regret that you do not agree with us in some of our doctrines, we cannot but admire the honest and frank way in which you state your opposing views. You say that “all things” in Acts 3: 21 “means if anything, the restoration of every human being to holiness and happiness.” You depend upon the word “all” to hold up the weight of this statement. “All means all,” you say, to which truism no reasonable man can object. All is a universal word, and yet it is only universal to that which it is applied. Sometimes it expresses a general truth with exceptions to that truth understood. Christ says of the antediluvians that the flood “destroyed them *all*” (Luke 17: 27), but Peter explains that “eight souls were saved by water.” 1 Pet. 3: 20. Paul affirms that Christ must put “all things under his feet,” but hastens to qualify his broad assertion with a “manifest” exception. 1 Cor. 15: 27. “All the land of Judea. . . . all were baptized” (Mark 1: 5); but the Pharisees and lawyers were not immersed by John. Luke 7: 30. These passages have the word “all” in them, but they are used to enunciate a general truth, as is manifest from the exceptions expressly stated. Then the word all is a class word, and is generally limited to the class spoken of. On your way to visit your daughter at Aurora, when you get

to Oregon and the porter shouts, "All out for Oregon," you will not vacate the car. When you arrive at your daughter's home and ask, "How are you; all well?" and she says, "I am well; we are all well," you will not say, "All means all;" she says, "All are well," therefore every "human being" on earth is well!!" Although your daughter used the word "all," she only meant that herself, husband and son were well. Here the word only stands for three persons. In the sentence, "We are all well," the word "all" is qualified by the preceding "we," and is no bigger in meaning than that pronoun. If I were to say, "All the people in Kentucky were highly excited when Goebel was shot," instead of the phrase "all the people" meaning "every human being" on earth, it would only mean the people in the specified strip of country. "In Kentucky" is a term subsequent to, and is used to qualify the statement, "all the people." All is universal, but limited in this statement to the people living in the state named. The affirmation should not be strained to mean more than is expressed by the language used. Though I use the word "all," it is limited to the territory named—"in Kentucky." People in Japan were not excited over the matter. Because the Bible says, "All the wicked will he destroy," (Psa. 145: 20), you certainly do not conclude that God is going to destroy "every human being" that is living or that has lived. Though the word all is used, it is a class word, and universal only in its application to the class described—"the wicked." If the word "all" as applied to the righteous, proves universal salva-

tion, the same word all when applied to the wicked would prove universal destruction. One could argue with as much plausibility that all will be lost as you can that all will be saved. We must not take advantage of language nor misuse the meaning of words.

We could take the same texts you have quoted in your letter one by one and show conclusively by the texts themselves that universal salvation cannot be true. But as we are limited as to time we only make a few remarks on Acts 3: 20, 21. You see the word "all" in this text; I am afraid, dear friend, that this little word has kept you from seeing other things there. "All things" you think, "means, if any thing, the restoration of every human being to holiness and happiness." Really, now, your comments are rather inappropriate. The passage does not say, "All human beings," but "all things." "Things" would not stop at "human beings;" they would embrace everything that ever had an existence, from the whale to the tiny sprig of grass. I have yet to meet the man who is really a universalist—one who believes in unlimited salvation. Men who are reputed to be universalists have mental reservations and limits, though some of them are dangerously broad. But as to the text itself: It does not say there is to be a restitution of all things; it says there is to be a restitution, truly, but with this qualification and limit expressly stated: "spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." There is to be a restitution of what they as

“holy prophets,” predicted would be restored. When we make “all things” to mean more than was “spoken” by these men of God, we are exaggerating and adding to God’s word. And look at the conditions of restoration in the context: “Repent and be converted.” v. 19. Restoration and conversion are the same thing (see the margin in Psa. 19: 7). Why repent? Why be converted? Ah, there were some “sins” of which they were guilty. These must be “blotted out.” Repentance and conversion are put prior to their being blotted out. Why repentance, conversion, and blotting out of sins? That when Christ is sent from heaven where he is to now “contained,” there might be “times of refreshing.” But, dear friend, if these “times” would come to them just as certainly whether they repented and were converted or not, why all this ado? If this text teaches an unconditional restitution; if its fulfillment “means, if anything, the restoration of every human being to holiness and happiness,” why did God send Christ to “bless” us in turning us away from our iniquities? v. 26. If every body is to be holy and happy, saved and glorified by these times “of refreshings” and by Christ, how then is our Lord the “Prophet like unto” Moses (v. 22), for under “Moses’ law” transgressors “died *without mercy.*” Heb. 10: 28. If every “human being,” however vile and degraded, is to spend eternity in “holiness and happiness,” how can it “come to pass that every soul which will not hear that prophet (Christ), *shall be destroyed from among the people?*” V. 23,

“All”: Impotence of the Word to Prove Universal Salvation.

Brother Huggins: Yours of June 20 is before me; and I hasten to inform you that I am convinced that the so-called orthodox creeds are “man-made,” and have their origin in “heathen mythology.” I charge the numerous advocates of an endless state or condition, in which countless millions of our race will suffer untold anguish, with being either ignorant or dishonest. Do not think, Brother Huggins, that I am charging all in the vast army of priests and ministers of the Christian churches with knowingly advocating doctrines that are unscriptural; but I am personally acquainted with some who are like Synesius, bishop of Ptolmais, who said, “The people are desirous of being deceived. We cannot act otherwise respecting them. For my own part, to mystify I shall always be a philosopher, but in dealing with the masses of mankind, I shall be a priest.”—Cave’s *Ecclesiastica*. Your admonition that we “must not take advantage of language nor misuse the meaning of words” shall on my part be strictly adhered to. But really, Brother Huggins, it seems to me that you are sadly in error when you try to convince yourself that “all” is but a part of the human race.

In 1 Cor. 15: 22, we read, “As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” Is it right or proper to so construe this universal promise so as to make it read: “Even so in Christ shall a select few, a little sect, be made alive”? The apostle teaches otherwise. The expressions are equally universal in each case. All die in Adam. The same “all” without an exception, without any restriction, shall by Christ be restored to life, and ultimately to holiness and everlasting happiness.

That David had in mind the final victory over sin is evident when he wrote, “All the ends of the earth shall remember, and turn to the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him.” Psa. 22: 27. “All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord, and shall glorify thy name.” Psalm 86: 9. In Isaiah 25: 6-8, we read, “The Lord shall wipe away tears from off

all faces." Jer. 31: 31-34, "They shall all know me from the least to the greatest of them, saith the Lord." God will at some time reduce his erring children to subjection. I feel rejoiced to know that my sinful brethren will be made to bow the knee in submission. I am happy beyond expression to be assured that "God will wipe the tears from off all faces."—*Henry Elsey.*

REPLY.

Mr. Elsey:—Your last letter came to me in due course of mail. With you we think that the religious creeds of apostate Christendom are human, both in origin and matter. And with you we think that the many "advocates of an endless state in which countless millions of our race will suffer untold anguish," are "either ignorant or dishonest;" perhaps both. But we cannot see why you are so exercised about the errors and blunders of the religious world, or why you should condemn the deception of Synesius; for you say that your "sinful brethren will be made to bow the knee in submission," and that holiness and "everlasting happiness" await them all. However mean and degraded, sinful and unclean, let them be devils if they care to be, you are on hand to assure them of God's favor, and of a salvation as complete as the most punctilious¹ Christian can hope to attain. With such a doctrine to encourage immoral tendencies and sin, you are the last man in the world to criticise people for wrong-doing. If "everlasting happiness" is the sure reward for Synesius and the unnamable sinners of the past and present, you cannot hope for more, however good you may be. Living in an age of commercial greed and religious dormancy, it would be convenient and easy for

you to plunge head and ears into sin, and just as compatible with your creed as if you lived the purest and cleanest life. But you do not live your belief, thanks to both you and the Lord! Ah, yes, Mr. Elsey, your life is better than your doctrine.

You say, "I think you are sadly in error when you try to convince yourself that 'all' is but part of the race." Then I am to think that you believe that "all" means all the race—"every human being," as you said in your first letter. The fact is "all" has every latitude of meaning. "All men" may mean the inhabitants of a city, state, or of the earth. "All" has every variety of comprehension of meaning, and no stress can be laid on it; and yet on this little word, so uncertain in its scope of meaning, you build the doctrine of universal salvation. What a weak and uncertain foundation to support such a doctrine! We illustrated in our last letter how the word "all" was used as a general term, with exceptions understood or stated, and as a class word, limited in its application to the class spoken of; and these illustrations were gleaned from Bible usages and common parlance. But in your letter now before me, written in reply to mine, you say not one word about the passages we quoted which show that the word "all" is expressly limited in meaning. You said that Acts 3: 20, 21, always caused you to rejoice when you read it because it "wiped out" the "God dishonoring, man-degrading" doctrine of endless suffering, and "means, if any thing, the restoration of every human being to holiness and happiness." We showed you by the context that repentance and conversion were

urged upon the people addressed, in order to a “blotting out of sins” in the times of coming “refreshing;” and that the passage not only “wiped out” the “God-dishonoring” doctrine of eternal torment, but that with one mighty stroke of Divine Power it “wiped out” “every soul” that is disobedient to “that Prophet.” Acts 3: 23. Because you found the word “all” in the passage, you were led to make the remark that the passage “means, if any thing,” universal salvation. “We must not,” I repeat “take advantage of language nor misuse the meanings of words.” You say you are willing to “strictly adhere to” this rule. We shall see.

Now for a test: In Daniel 3 when the golden image was set up on the plain of Dura, the king issued this edict: “To you it is commanded, O people, nations and languages to fall down and worship the golden image.” verses 4, 5. Listen now to the universal obedience rendered to the king’s mandate; and be sure and look out for the word “all:” “Therefore at the time, when *all* the people heard the sound of the cornet. . . . *all* the people, nations, and languages, fell down.” verse 7. If you were to apply your interpretation to this text, Mr. Elsey, what would be the result? Simply this: It says “all the people” fell down; “all means all;” “every human being;” “without exception, without any restriction.” But your meaning of the word “all” cannot stand. “Certain Chaldeans came near and accused the Jews.” Verse 8. Why accuse the Jews? “These men, O king, have not regarded thee; they serve not thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.” Verse

12. Here "all people" fell down and worshipped the image, but the Jews are excepted. What becomes then of all you¹ do about the word "all?" You quote 1 Cor. 15: 22, and then say, "All is without exception, without any restriction." Excuse me, but you do not believe that comment yourself. You do not believe that Enoch and Elijah died; and you do not believe that the saints who are alive when Christ comes, will die; and yet you say "all" must be understood "without exception, without any restriction." How differently Paul viewed "all" may be seen when, after saying, "He hath put all things under him," he made these explanatory comments: "But when he saith 'all things are put under him,' it is manifest that he is *excepted* which did put all things under him." 1 Cor. 15: 27. All with Paul has an "exception:" all with you is "without exception, without any restriction!" Does it not alarm you to find yourself so diametrically opposed to the great and inspired Apostle?

And so we might go on and review your texts in logical order, but like delicate bubbles, they would burst and totally disappear at the mere touch of criticism. If you find a text with the word "all" in it, you quote it as a passage of undoubted worth in favor of Universalism, without looking at the context to see to whom the passage applies, its subsequent qualifications, etc. This is why you get misled. To illustrate: You read in Isa. 25: 8 that tears are to be wiped off "all faces." Then you privately interpret the prophecy (2 Pet. 1: 21) and begin to cramp free and easy speech in the vise of an arbitrary meaning.

Why not read the next verse, the 9th, and let the prophet himself tell whose "faces" are to be wiped dry. Listen to this statement issued by the people with tearless faces: "Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will have^f us: this is the Lord; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation." It is very wrong in you to quote about "all faces" being wiped dry, and then omit to quote the words descriptive of who is meant. Those who "have waited for him," say with gladness when the Master comes, "He will save us." They break out in song "in the land of Judah" (Isa. 26: 1); the gates open, and the nation "which keepeth the truth" (v. 2) enter on their inheritance in the Holy Land, in obedience to Christ's invitation: "Come, my people, enter into thy chambers until... the indignation be overpast." v. 20. All this is said of people who "have waited" for Christ, "my people" "thy dead men." Isa. 25: 9; 26: 1; 20: 19.² For them there are no more tears but gladness, bliss and song forever "in the land of Judah." God tenderly cares for them until the "indignation is overpast." If all are saved, upon whom can "indignation" descend? After God's people are united to Christ at his coming, indignation is poured out upon the "inhabitants of the earth;" and the earth shall "disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain." Verse 21. Of these "slain" ones it is written in the 14th verse: "They are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise: therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them, and made their memory to perish." Here are people whom the Lord slays, and

of whom he decrees, "they shall not live:" "they shall not rise:" people whom he visits with a mighty destruction and leaves not an iota of their memory. Surely people who are "slain" with a divine visitation, and who are never to rise from the dead or live, or have any "memory:" Surely there can be no salvation for them.

Does Hades Have Two Departments?

Because the narrative in Luke 16: 19, 31¹ is a parable does not in the least imply that the persons, places, actions, language used, etc., are all necessarily fictitious and imaginary, never existing realities. It is evident that Jesus used language in its ordinary significance among the people. He did not hesitate to expose the error of the Sadducees relative to the resurrection; but neither he nor his apostles anywhere contradict the prevalent belief relative to Hades being the abiding place of the spirits, both of the just and unjust, till the day of judgment.

To deny the existence of the place and the two classes of spirits abiding there is to accuse the All Wise Teacher of clothing truth in the garments of falsehood and leaving it to uninspired teachers to tear off the mask. I prefer the words of the Master just as they stand in the inspired record. Peter says (Acts 2: 25, 31)² that the soul ("spirit", 1 Peter 3: 18) of Jesus was in hades while his body was dead. Jesus knew where his spirit was going and the thief fully understood when Jesus spoke to him the cheering word that he should that very day be with him, the gentle Savior, "in paradise."

I believe they went there; and that from paradise, the place of the just in hades, Jesus "went and preached to the spirits in prison." It may seem foolish, but I would rather believe the words of Christ and the apostles than try to explain them away. I am not wise enough to attempt the task.—*A Christian Minister.*

REPLY.

A good story well told has a fascinating charm for most people. But before a tale sounds like music to

the ear, it must be told well; it must have wit, point and Hibernian characteristics, and especially must all its different parts fit together in harmony. If its different parts misfit, it mortifies more than edifies.

The story our friend has told about hades dovetails in nicety with the teachings of the Koran and is in perfect accord with the belief of the Moham-medans. It fills our heart with sorrow of the saddest sort to see people who profess to be Christians turn their ears away from the word of God and take up with the fables of heathens. Let us now take a critical look at my friend's story about hades, and see if he is a good story teller.

It is still fresh in the reader's mind how our friend has said that the rich man and all the disobedient spirits of the antediluvians were in hades.* They were all there "in torments" according to our Master's words in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. They were in the hot, miserable, tormenting department of hades. Christ's soul too was in hades during the time of his death (Acts 2: 26-31); so he had the honor of preaching the gospel to lost souls as they splashed around frenzy "in torments." It is a question whether his audience was comfortable enough to listen to his sermons or not. And we are left in the dark as to whether Christ suffered much in this awful place; perhaps not as he "preached" there for three days. But to hasten on with the story: Just here our friend recalls to mind the promise Christ made to the thief on the day of his death, that on "that very day" they were both going to

* See Page 274.

paradise. Be very careful now; for heaven's sake do not spoil your story. You had just said that Christ was in hades preaching the gospel to lost souls as they wailed in "infinite despair": now you say Christ is in paradise with the thief! How are you going to make these two stories chime together in harmony? Here is a difficulty, and to get out of the tangle our minister invents two departments in hades: one hot, the other cold, one for "torments," the other for "good things"; one the devil's abode; the other Abraham's bosom; one for sinners; the other for saints; one is the place of eternal torments; the other the place of paradise.

In telling this old Pharisee fable he evidently felt that the story was rather "thin," to use a hackneyed term. "It may seem foolish," he admits in advance. Yes, this Pharisee tradition, this Mohammedan fable, this Catholic relic of the "dark ages," does, to be frank and honest, "seem foolish." When the prophet Jonah was in the fish's belly, he was in sheol, hades. 2: 2. I wonder if the fish had both departments in him, the hot and cold place; and I wonder which department Jonah was in! And since sheep are in sheol or hades (Psa. 49: 14), I cannot help wondering which of the two departments they are in! And finally, as hades is to be cast into the lake of fire (Rev. 20: 14), I cannot but lament the awful blunder God will make in giving over paradise with swarms of immortal ghosts in it, to the dreadful lake of fire and brimstone! Oh my Lord, save paradise and its good inhabitants!

After you get Christ in hades, the hot department, preaching, then you have an afterthought. You think of his promise to the thief to go to paradise with him "that very day." Then you try to "explain away" the hitch in your story. You say: "I believe they went there (to paradise); and that from paradise, the place of the just in hades, 'he went and preached to the spirits in 'prison.' " Not too fast, now. We just want you to look at the parable recorded in Luke 16, and we want you to take the words of our Lord just as "they stand in the inspired record." Here they are: "And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you *cannot*; *neither can they pass to us*, that would come from thence." Verse 26. These are the words of Jesus as they stand in the inspired record. They show that a fixed gulf exists between the "evil things" of the rich man and the "good things" of Lazarus; between the "torments" of the rich man and the "bosom of Abraham"; and they show that however badly some on one side of the gulf desire to cross it, they "*cannot*." Yet you say that Christ and the thief went to paradise, "and that from paradise, the place of the just in hades, Jesus went 'and preached to the spirits in prison' "!! According to this Christ himself went over the very gulf he said "*cannot* " be crossed! Do not attempt to explain this gulf away; take the words of the Master "just as they stand in the inspired record," and you will abandon the story you have told, not merely because it "seems foolish," but because it is

positively in conflict with the very words of him who spoke as never man spoke.

Three Days and Three Nights.

Matt. 12: 40.

Let the reader note that the words "Three days and three nights" is peculiarly a Jewish idiom, and only expresses time in round numbers. They count days and nights conventionally. It is not necessary to contumaciously¹ insist upon minutes and seconds. Any part of a day, however small, is counted by us, and is frequently used in Scriptures, for a whole day. Luke 24: 21; Matt. 27: 63, 64; 1 Sam. 30: 12, 13; Esther 4: 16; 5: 1.

When you read these references and take a studious look at the words "three days and three nights" as used in them, you will decide with me that so far as the Bible usage of these words is concerned, they state time roughly, not particularly, generally, nor specifically. To claim that "three days and three nights" means full time, counting minutes and seconds, is to introduce an arbitrary and hypercritical method of interpretation, which is destitute of Bible illustration and countenance. *The words "three days and three nights" are not used in the Bible a single time where they mean full time.* In Luke 24: 21 the disciples said, "to-day is the third day since." As they said this on the "third day," the third day had not yet expired when they used the language; so full time was not expressed. In Matt. 27: 63 Jesus said, "*while yet alive, after three days I will rise again.*" Then his enemies sealed his tomb "until

the third day.” (Verse 64.) If Christ said this “while yet alive” he could not have been dead three days. The Egyptian David fed had “eaten no bread, nor drunk any water; three days and three nights” (1 Sam. 30: 12), yet it was on the third day he fell sick: “three days ago (ago) I fell sick,” (verse 12)¹. And lastly, in Esther 4: 16, the Jews were not to eat or drink “three days, night or day;” after which time of fasting Esther was to go unto the king, “which is not according to law.” Instead of fasting “three days” in full time, we find she went unto the king “on the third day” (v. 1)². If she went in “on” that day, she must have went to the king before the “third day” expired, and hence full time was not intended nor expressed by the language used. With these Bible illustrations of the phrase, “three days and three nights,” we are safe in taking the position that as applied to Christ they mean the same, and are to be interpreted according to established Bible usage.

The Burning Up of the Earth.

Please explain 2 Peter 3: 10. Some people claim that the earth is to be burned up; they refer to this Scripture to prove it. Give me the Scriptural proof that the earth will not be burned up.—*J. H. Westerman.*

REPLY.

Poets from Shakespeare to hymn-writers appear to delight in giving pictures of this earth in flames. Dramatic poets, however, are not inspired, and the man of God will turn from all human writers as unreliable and will only consult and submit to God's

oracles. From them he learns that the earth cannot literally be burned up for two reasons:

1. *Because the earth, not heaven, is the future abode of the saints, and God has emphatically pledged its eternal existence.* Isa. 45; 18; 1 Cor. 15: 45;¹ Psa. 2: 8; 37: 9; Matt. 5: 5; Rom. 4: 13; Gen. 12; 1 Cor. 3: 21-22; Rev. 5: 10; Eccl. 1: 4; Psa. 104: 5; 119: 90. ,

2. *Because the passage relied upon to prove the conflagration of the earth, 2 Peter 3, states not only that the earth is to be burned up, but in addition says explicitly that the "heavens shall pass away with a great noise" (verse 19)³; that they shall "be dissolved" (verse 11); and finally that this dissolution is to be by "fire." See verse 12. So if the apostle means that the earth literally is to be burned up, he also means that the literal heavens are to be destroyed. And if this is the correct meaning of his words, the text is as inimical to our heaven-going friends as it is to us: for if we admit that the earth is destroyed by the text, it is just as clear that the heavens are "dissolved" also. With both destroyed, may we not ask our friends where they are going?*

A few words now as to the actual meaning of the apostle Peter. In giving an exposition of his meaning we cannot do better than follow this outline: 1. The overflowing of the world with water; 2. The figurative language of the Bible; 3. The new heaven and new earth; and 4. The old heavens and earth.

1. *The overflowing of the world with water.* This point is invaluable in elucidating Peter's prediction of world-burning, for as a preface to his prediction

he thus makes direct reference to the Deluge: "The world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished," (verse 6). This statement affords a basis for understanding the disputed verse which follows it. We cannot go wrong in interpreting prophecy when we have, as here, historical illustration to guide us. When the apostle says the antediluvian "world perished," he certainly does not mean that the earth "that then was," ceased to exist. He only means that the flood caused the destruction of Noah's contemporaries. The contrast is between the "world that then was" and something existing in his day called the "heavens and earth which are now" (verse 7). The literal heavens and earth existing in Peter's day were exactly the same as those in being when Noah lived. The contrast in Peter's mind cannot apply to two distinct literal heavens and earth; we must look somewhere else for an interpretation of his words. The solution is easily found by regarding his words, "heavens and earth," as referring to the human constitution of things on the earth at the particular periods mentioned. And this brings us to consider:

2. *The figurative language of the Bible.* Students of the inspired writings cannot fail to observe that the spirit of God has made use of nearly every phenomena of nature for the purpose of teaching and illustrating spiritual truths. A few illustrations must suffice for now: "Light" and "darkness" are used for knowledge and ignorance (Isa. 8: 20; Acts 26: 18); "rain" for doctrine (Deut. 32: 2); "clouds," for multitudes of men (Jer. 4: 18¹, Ezek. 38: 9, 16); mountains for kingdoms (Jer. 51: 24, 25); rivers for

an army (Isaiah 8: 7); "waters," for nations (Isa. 17: 13; Rev. 7: 1, 15)¹; and "trees," for men (Dan. 4: 20, 22; John 4: 4)². Literally the sun and moon were made to "rule" the day and night (Gen. 1: 16), but figuratively the sun is used for kings, the moon for ecclesiastical systems, and the stars for princes and governors of inferior grades. These luminaries bear the same relation to the earth that political and ecclesiastical rulers do to the rank and file of mankind. Exalted above the people as kings to "rule" the people under them, they constitute the "heavens" that Peter says shall "be dissolved." The subjects, or the people governed, are represented by "the earth," as in Psa. 76: 8; 79: 1;³ Isa. 14: 16, and they, according to Peter, are to be "burned up."

With these thoughts in mind we can understand why Israel is said to have a "sun" and "moon." Jer. 15: 9; Isa. 60: 20. The setting of the Israelitish sun was the overthrow of the throne of David; and the withdrawing of the Jewish moon was the abolition of the Mosaic priesthood and ritual. Of Babylon it is said in prophecy: "The stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light: the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cease⁴ her light to shine." "I will shake the heavens, and the earth shall be moved out of her place." Isa. 13: 10, 13. This prophecy has been fulfilled; the overthrow of Babylon is in the past, but there is no record of the literal sun, moon, and stars, ceasing to shine on that occasion. See also the same prophet's intimation that Idumea shall be destroyed: 24: 4, 5: "All the host of heaven shall be

dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll . . . for my sword shall be bathed in heaven; behold, it shall come down upon Idumea." The bathing of Jehovah's sword "in heaven" is here explained to mean his judgments on Idumea. This prophecy, too, is now an accomplished fact; yet in its fulfillment the literal heavens were not dissolved; we have the same ones to-day as existed prior to this prophecy. With fulfilled prophecy to guide us, we are on safe ground when we take Peter's prediction as historically illustrated—that his "heavens" and "earth" have to do solely with the political and ecclesiastical arrangements of things on the earth at the Lord's advent. Indeed, the apostle intimates that Old Testament prophecy is the basis of his prediction, and that the way to interpret and understand one is the way to construe the other. This point is obviously inculcated¹ in his allusion to

„

3. *The new heavens and new earth.* To prepare us for his prophecy, he exhorts us in the 2nd verse "to be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets;" and right in the midst of his own prediction he pauses to tell us that all he is saying is "according to his promise" recorded by a prophet "before" his day. Isa. 65: 17. Read the whole of Isa. 65 and you will see that the promise given by the prophet consists of a blessed condition of things on the earth, particularly around Jerusalem. "Behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy." If God means to make a bonfire of the earth; if he intends to turn this globe and the whole astronomical system into a furnace, Jerusalem

could not be "a rejoicing," nor could any "joy" result to God's people from such a catastrophe.

The new heavens and earth, like the old ones which Peter says are to be destroyed, refer to a constitution of things on the earth. There is a "sun" provided for the new heaven in the "sun of righteousness." Mal. 4: 2. Of this sun the prophet spoke to his countryman in the words, "Arise, shine; for thy light (sun) is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. For behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people; but the Lord shall rise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee." Isa. 60: 1-2. In harmony with this calligraphy,¹ spiritual darkness now envelopes the earth. The "sun" or "light" of Israel has not yet arisen in the "new heavens"; his "rule" has not yet commenced. Ere long he will arise, accompanied by other symbolic satellites, of whom it is said, "They shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." Matt. 13: 43. Dissipating the darkness now on earth which the prophet calls "gross," by their instrumentality, "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." Hab. 2: 14. So completely different will the rulers and the people of the earth be from what they are now, it can be truly said there exist "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." Righteousness, inferentially, did not dwell in the "heavens" and "earth" which Peter says are to be destroyed. The point of contrast with him is moral, not material; and this fact affords presumptive proof that the "heavens" and "earth" in

each are symbolic, not literal. The point becomes clearer as we note a few facts about

4. *The old heavens and earth.* We have already noted the fact that Israel had a figurative "sun." Jer. 15: 9. A sun necessitates a "heaven" in which it can shine. To carry out this symbol, then, we find the Psalmist addressing the Lord as follows: "Of old thou laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure; yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; and as a¹vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed." Psa. 102: 25, 27.² The Mosaic "heavens" and "earth" continued to exist until they were fulfilled by him who was typified in all their ceremonials (Matt. 5: 18); then they waxed "old like a garment," and he "changed" them like a man changes his "vesture." Thus they "perished"; "decayed and waxed old," and were ready to "vanish away" in Peter's day. Heb. 8: 13. We say "in Peter's day," for although the old covenant had been legally abolished by Christ's death, it was still recognized as being in force by the Jewish nation generally. It became necessary under this condition of things, to manifest in a more signal manner that the law had been superseded by the gospel and was now useless. The Temple was destroyed, and Jerusalem was captured by the Romans. This had been predicted by Joel and our Lord in the following symbolic language: "The sun shall be turned into darkness and the moon into blood, before the great and notable day of the Lord come." Joel 2: 31. "The sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not

give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken." Matt. 24: 29. The "sun" of the Jewish heavens was darkened by the nation being deprived of all political power; and the "moon" was turned into blood by the overthrow of their ecclesiastical system amidst much bloodshed (the destruction of Jerusalem was attended with the slaughter of 1,000,000 human beings); and the "stars," or nobles of the Israelitish Commonwealth, were cast to the ground (Dan. 8: 9-11), and the people generally were scattered among all nations of the earth. In this way the Jewish "heavens" "passed away with a great noise"; they "vanished away like smoke" (Isa. 51: 6), and the luminaries thereof were totally eclipsed.

Mark the following prophetic language which is descriptive of the event: "Therefore, thus saith the Lord God: Because ye are all become dross, behold, therefore, I will gather you in the midst of Jerusalem. As they gather silver, and brass, and iron, and lead, and tin, into the midst of the furnace, to blow the fire upon it, to melt it, so will I gather you in my anger, and in my fury, and I will leave you there and melt you. Yea, I will gather you and blow upon you in the fire of my wrath, and ye shall be melted in the midst thereof. As silver is melted in the midst of the furnace, so shall ye be melted in the midst thereof." Ezek. 22: 19-22. Here the disobedient children of Israel are represented as base metals, and their punishment is compared to the subjection of silver, lead, etc., to intense heat in a furnace. This shows what Peter means when he says, "the elements

shall melt with fervent heat." When Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans, only the base portion of the nation was gathered in the city. The disciples of Christ fled out of the city according to his instructions (Matt. 24: 15-21), and were saved from all harm in the city of Pella, leaving only the "dross" behind to be melted in the furnace of fire. Some have thought that the "elements" Peter mentions as melting with fervent heat, meant that the very elements of which this mundane¹ system is composed are to be destroyed with intense heat. But symbolic "heavens" must have symbolic "elements" also. Scripturally, the word "elements" may be applied to things material, mental, or moral; it is sometimes used for the atmosphere around us, and sometimes for the constituent substances composing the earth; but its sense is not limited to these things. It may be, and sometimes is, applied to the first rules or primary principles of any science, art, or religion. Hence the first principles of the Mosaic Covenant are called "*the elements of the world*" (Gal. 4: 3, 9; Col. 1: 20)². These words are addressed to Jews who had professed to renounce the abrogated³ law of Moses, and had embraced the gospel; and we submit that if such language appropriately described their former condition, it could just as appropriately be applied to the then condition of all Jews who had not repudiated the Law of Moses; and since the greater part of the Jews were still in this condition when Peter was writing, "the elements" of that "world" were still in existence, but were soon after destroyed in the "fervent heat" of the Roman invasion.

One word more and we close. We do not deny that Peter's language will have another fulfillment in the scenes of the Lord's second advent. But in our exegesis¹ we have confined ourselves wholly to the historical aspects of the subject in order to more clearly show our Baptist friend, that, though the future may witness the accomplishment of this prophecy, we have it already incipiently² fulfilled, and others like it, and yet the literal heavens and earth remain unmoved. Here is solid ground; do not be afraid to stand upon it.

“The Whole World.”

These words occur in 1 John 2: 2. The apostle affirms that Christ “is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.” It is claimed by some that “the whole world” means the entire race of Adam without exception. But the word here translated “world” is *cosmos*, and means “arrangement of things.” As the word only means an arrangement or constitution of things, we have come to classify it in a specific sense; we talk about the “religious world,” the “political world,” the “social world,” etc., etc. The “religious world,” for instance, comes far short of embracing every being on the globe. And while we do not dogmatically state that John means, “Not for our sins only (meaning the writer and the church to whom he is writing), but also for the sins of the entire religious world,” we suggest that this paraphrase perhaps expresses the apostle's meaning.

Of one thing we are certain: he did not mean the whole race of Adam as a totality, both dead and liv-

ing, by "the whole world." Christ says in humble petition to his Father, "I have manifested thy name to the men which thou gavest me out of the world" (John 17: 6); "the whole world" cannot, therefore include these "men," because they were taken "out" of it. Before the apostle says a thing about "the whole world" he informs us that Christ "is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only"; after these remarks he goes on to talk about the "whole world," showing conclusively that, unless we charge him with redundancy, himself and other saints formed no part of the "world" of which he is speaking. Then "the whole world" is not universal. This conclusion may make Universalists feel uncomfortable, but it is good news to us who believe the inspired record. Do you ask why? Then you shall have the reason. "The whole world," says the same writer, "lieth in wickedness." 1 John 5: 19. If "the whole world" is universal, to what a strange conclusion must we come! "The whole world," that is, the entire posterity of Adam, dead and living, "lieth," in the present tense, "lieth in wickedness"!! Good old Abraham, Noah, Job and the rest "of whom the world was not worthy"—all lying in wickedness!! And since the world is to pass away (1 John 2: 17), and since the "world" means all without exception, all the saints of God must pass away! But the phrases, "the whole world" and "all the world," do not in a single instance in all the Book of God mean the whole human family in the sense of totality. In the days of Cæsar Augustus "all the world" was taxed. Luke 2: 1. Did the dead of past ages have to

pay taxes? Did this decree embrace the antediluvians? Was¹ Abraham, Lot, and the Sodomites raised from the dead, so that Augustus could tax them? Did our modern Universalists pay taxes during the reign of Augustus? No!!

Everlasting Life.

Life, unqualified by the adjectives eternal and everlasting, is highly cherished by all. It is freighted with sorrow, laden with affliction, burdened with care, yet we love it, and do all we can to prolong it. In matters of taste and fancy we notice that one thing desired by one is discarded by another. This is true in important as well as trivial matters. For instance, one man will try to gain a knowledge of the truth, forsake sin and try to lead a godly life; another man, equally intelligent, pays no attention to the Bible and the precious truth it reveals, and by a certain course of education arrives at the point in which he discards the whole. But upon the theme of life all are united; all consider it pre-eminently important. Short as it is, all love it. Saint and sinner do all they can to prolong it. "All that a man hath will he give for his life." Job. 2: 4. If they are sick money is freely expended, sacrifices are made to "put off" the grim monster, and, like Hezekiah of old, all are desirous of adding numbers to their years. Isa. 38. The miser must have life to hoard up his wealth, the avaricious to get gain, and the saint to praise God; for "the dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." Psa. 115: 17.

Let us now pass from temporal to eternal existence. Everlasting life is a life without any death in it; and eternal death is a death without any life in it. One is the opposite of the other. One is the reward of the righteous; the other that of the wicked. Eternal life is a subject of promise. 1 John 2: 25. It is a branch of the Christian's hope. Titus 1: 2. It is hid with Christ in God. Col. 3: 4. The wicked do not have this promise of life; therefore they will never receive it. "No murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." 1 John 3: 15. What is true of one class of the wicked is true of them all. Eternal life will far outweigh the present life in importance. It will be endless, boundless, shoreless,—free from sorrow, crying, pain and death. Rev. 21: 4. Its possessors will enjoy eternal happiness and immortal vigor forever. They will unite their heavenly voices in chanting God's glory and in celebrating his praise forevermore. Soon the glorious morn will dawn when eternal life will be given to the worthy of the human race. Soon the face of the Son of man will be seen through the dividing clouds, as the sun bursts in glorious splendor through the rifted clouds to fill the world with light. Soon that day will come in all its splendor, beauty and loveliness. Soon we will unite our voices in praises with the angels who will accompany our Redeemer to the earth, and the dulcet music will roll over the bright landscape and echo back from the golden-crowned hill-tops in the Land of Promise. Dear children of the blessed God, and brethren of our Redeemer, let us wait, watch and pray for that glorious day.

The Personality of the Devil.

I note that you take the position of the non-existence of a personal devil. Will you please give an exposition of Luke 4: 1-13, as I do not remember ever having seen an explanation of this Scripture by one holding this view of the devil. —*N. D. Titchenal.*

REPLY.

We are sorry that Brother Titchenal has construed any of our statements into a denial of the personality of Satan. We do believe in a personal devil. In the Word you remember Judas is called "devil"; and Peter "Satan." John 6: 70; Matt. 16: 23. To deny the personality of the devil and Satan would be a denial of the personality of Judas and Peter. We do believe in the personality of such devils and Satans, but we deny the personality of an immortal rebel, distinct in person from the human race, the "fallen angel" of paganism. How any one can learn the truth about the nature of man, the condition of man in death, the Bible "hell," the extinction of sin and sinners, conditional immortality, and yet hold to the cloven-footed, forked-tailed, and blood-shot-eyed monster of heathen mythology, is a puzzle I am not able to unravel.

In giving a few expository words on the 4th of Luke, we cannot do better than refer to the inspired comments made upon it by the apostle Paul. Christ personally appeared to Paul, and commissioned him to the work of apostleship, so he understood by inspiration all about the temptation of his Master. Hear him, then, in writing to the Hebrews 2: 18: "For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted,

he is able to succor them that are tempted." We "are tempted," and Christ our Lord—"he himself"—has been "tempted" with the same trials we are called upon to endure. The idea is revealed a little clearer in Heb. 4: 15: "He was in *all points* tempted as we are, yet without sin." "All points" does not omit any. And note with care that comprehensive as "all points" is, the temptation on every "point" was "like as" ours is. Here we have the temptation of Christ put in a nutshell. If his temptation "in all points" was like our temptations, we can easily understand his if we understand our own. "Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed." James 1: 14. If this verse correctly tells how we are tempted, it accurately explains how our Lord was tempted; for his temptation, I repeat, was "like" ours. Then how are we tempted; how was Christ tempted? Christ ate nothing for 40 days; "and when they were ended he afterward hungered." Luke 4: 2. Were you to fast 40 days, would you need an immortal devil from the pit of smoke and brimstone to tell you that you were hungry? I wonder! And so on with every temptation to which Christ was subjected; he did not need an immortal fiend to oppose him. These remarks are only suggestive, and we hope our readers will work out the principles we have indicated in the "all points" of Christ's temptation.

Bible Years and Days.

In the Bible and among ourselves, accuracy of expression is often wanting in speaking of time. With us, if a laborer hires to a farmer for a month, he ex-

pects his pay after he has worked 26 days, although there are four days more in the month. A month's labor is only 26 days. If a father decides to send his son to school for six months, beginning the first of March, the full term would be 21 weeks and six days, ending in July. But 20 weeks are six months of school, short of full time two weeks. Even from the 20 weeks you have to deduct two days each week—Saturday and Sunday—leaving only 14 weeks and two days. Six months of school, then, is really only 14 weeks and two days—short of full time just one hundred days! Now if a month is called a month, although it is short of full time four days; and if six months are called six months, although one hundred days are deducted from the time, then may not “three days and three nights,” (Matt. 12: 40) in the accommodative language of parlance, be equivalent to a part of one day, all of the next, and part of the third? It makes no difference how verbally inaccurate the statement may be, or how inadequate it is to express full time, or how strange it may seem to us. If such usage of language prevailed among the Hebrews, and finds illustrations in the inspired writings, its strangeness cannot nullify it. We do not assume the existence of this Hebrew peculiarity of counting time: we will demonstrate it by the word of the Lord. “To the law and to the testimony” (Isa. 8: 20) we appeal. Now as to Bible time expressed in years and days, we affirm that:

I. *It was customary with Bible writers to count a fraction of a year, either at the beginning or end of a series, as each a year.* The Hebrew scriptures abound

with examples of this kind. Thus in the third year of Asa's reign, Baasha began to reign, and reigned 24 years; yet he died in 26th year of Asa, one year too soon for full time. 1 Kings 15: 33; 16: 6, 8. In the second year of Asa, Nadab began to reign, and reigned two years, yet died in the third year of Asa, (15: 25). Abijam began his reign over Judah in the eighteenth year of Jeroboam; he reigned three years and died in the 20th year of Jeroboam (15: 1, 2, 8, 9). Here three years are made up by counting a part of Jeroboam's eighteenth, all of his nineteenth and part of his twentieth. By reading parallel texts in the book of Kings, we learn that this method of computing time was invariably adhered to until the fall of the Northern Kingdom. One consequence of this is, in counting the duration of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, by the regnal¹ years of their kings, we have to subtract half a year from the number given of every one who reigned more than one year. The result obtained is more or less uncertain; for we are not able to tell what part of a year is counted in individual cases, as a year. Hebrew chronology, for this reason, cannot be depended upon. God's munificent design in this was doubtless to hide from us the "day and hour" (Matt. 24: 36) of Christ's coming, that his people might be kept in constant expectancy, and in "watching" and "waiting" for him. He has given us "signs" (Luke 21: 25-31), not figures, to indicate the Master's coming. In our next proposition we affirm that

II. *It was a custom with Bible writers to count a fraction of a day, either at the beginning or end of*

a series, as each a day. This may be seen in Gen. 42: 17, 18, when Joseph put his brothers “into ward three days,” and yet released them “the third day.” But especially in the New Testament does this method of counting prevail. One illustration must suffice: “Four days ago,” says Cornelius, “I was fasting until this hour.” Acts 10: 30. Now let us count the time, beginning at Acts 10: 3, where we find he was praying at the ninth hour in the afternoon. He immediately started the soldiers and servants for Peter (7, 8). This was the first day. They reached Peter’s home “on the morrow,” (9) at noon (10). Not quite one day after his vision yet. They remained with Peter that night, and “on the morrow” (23), that is, the next day, they all started for Caesarea. So far two days. “And the morrow after they entered into Caesarea” (24). This is the third day. And on this day Cornelius said, “Four days ago,” etc. Acts 10: 30. In these four days, he counted less than three hours of the first day, the whole of the second and third, and nine hours of the fourth—in all, short of full time expressed, twenty-four hours. We must recognize facts; specious¹pleading cannot change them one iota.

That we are right in regard to our position on Bible time, we feel certain, confirmed as we are by the fact that when God’s Holy Spirit designed to express definite time by years, months and days, the inspired penmen used the qualifying terms “full” and “whole” before the substantive. Under the Levitical law the owner of a house might redeem it “within a *full* year. . . . for a full year shall he make

the right of redemption.” Lev. 25: 29. The vessels of the Lord’s house were to be returned within “two full years” Jer. 27: 3.¹ Absalom looked upon his father’s face after “two full years” had expired. 2 Sam. 14: 28. Paul preached in Rome “two whole years.” Acts 28: 30. It has been said, “If, in the mouth of Jesus, three days and three nights do not mean three days and three nights....what then can we depend upon?” Certainly, he means what he says, three days and three nights. But while Jesus said three days and nights, some well meaning but mistaken brethren are insisting he meant so many minutes and seconds! If Jesus had been an exact critic, striving to exhibit himself to his followers as an adept mathematician; if he meant to measure time by the tick of the clock, instead of saying he was to be in the earth “three days and three nights,” he should have said three full days and nights, or three whole days and nights. But he said nothing of the kind. Let no one then presume to change the words of Him who spake as never man spake.

Our Lord meant what he said and said what he meant. If the qualifying terms “full” or “whole” had been needed in the text, he would have used them. They are significantly omitted. Why? “Command, therefore, that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day.” Matt. 27: 64. Why say “until the third day” if he was not to rise until after three days? The words, “until the third day” show that the words, “after three days” (v. 63) terminated the third day. He was raised “the third day according to the Scripture.” 1 Cor. 15: 4. But if Christ was

dead three "full" days, as some insist, and came to life on the fourth day, he was raised "the fourth day according to their theory." If Jesus rose "the third day" he must have emerged from the tomb before the third day expired. Hence sometimes our Lord said he would rise on the third day; at other times, after three days. Mark 8: 31; 9: 31; 10: 34; 16: 21; 17: 22²; 20: 19; Luke 9: 22; 18: 33; 24: 7, 46. "After three days" and "on the third day" are, therefore, equivalents with our Lord.

The Spirit of Man.

To my brethren in Christ, Edward Coats and Amasa Richardson, Greeting:—In the interest of truth and Christian unity I write briefly and tersely on the questions in issue between us.

The spirit in man—does it exist? "There is a spirit in man, and the breath of the Almighty giveth them understanding." Job 32: 8. We are here taught that God's revelations ("breath"—"inspiration") are made to the spirit of man because it is the rational, thinking, intelligent part of man's being. I believe it; do you?—*A Christian Minister.*

REPLY.

As above letter is addressed to brethren Coats and Richardson, it is proper to explain that we are writing this reply to it at the solicitation of Brother and Sister Woodward, of Dutton, Mich. Instead of giving the writer's name we sign, "A Christian Minister." With our friend's personality thus hid in the invisible, we hope our minister in the review to follow, will be able to look our reply squarely in the face and to thoughtfully follow the arguments we present, without feeling himself criticised. As his letter is written to two of our brethren with the design

of convincing them that the spirit of man is immortal, we conclude that the writer has developed the strongest arguments and advanced the clearest proof texts in defense of his position that can be found. His arguments are not only plausibly presented, but they are dictated by a good spirit. We pray that the spirit of our Master may rest upon him when he reads our review of his position, and that God may open his eyes wherein they may be closed, to the end that he may have fulness of joy in the things which our Father in heaven has revealed in his written word. 1 Jno. 1: 4.

He begins his argument for the immortality of man's spirit by quoting Job. 32: 8, "There is a spirit in man." We believe as strongly as our minister that man has a spirit. Do not ask the question, "Does it exist," as if we denied its existence. We do believe that "there is a spirit in man;" there is no room for difference of opinion on this proposition. But when our friend tells us what the Spirit is, a wide difference of opinion divides us. He says that the spirit is the "rational, thinking, intelligent part of man's being;" and that therefore to it "the inspiration of the Almighty" imparts understanding by revelation. The statement in Job. 32: 8 is not, "There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth it (the spirit) understanding." A man who is capable of being a minister is supposed to know something about grammar. Elihu says that the inspiration of God gives "*them* understanding." The understanding is predicted of "them." To make a plural pronoun refer to a singular noun vio-

lates the rules of grammar; and while we are sure our friend knows this, yet he was so eager to make a point to favor immortal spiritism that he forgot himself and no doubt unconsciously made the blunder. For the argument's sake we grant your claim that the spirit is the intellectual part of man, and predict in passing that you will regret having made the point. Throughout our review we shall keep this statement ringing in your ears, that the spirit is the "rational, thinking, intelligent part of man's being;" and if we err not in our judgment, you will deplore the moment when you penned the words.

Is Man's Spirit in the "Likeness" of God.

Has it (the spirit) "likeness" (Gen. 1: 26, 27) to the spirit of God? "Who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man which is in him? Even so the things of God none knoweth, save the spirit of God." 1 Cor. 2: 11. If "likeness is not taught here it is not anywhere. "Image" and "likeness" of Gen. 1: 26, 27, are an exceeding strong statement of man's similarity to the Creator. "God is a spirit." John 4: 24. The spirit in man is the only part which can in any sense be in the "image" and "likeness" of God.—*A Christian Minister.*

REPLY.

Concerning 1 Cor. 2: 11, our friend says, "If 'likeness' is not taught here it is not anywhere." We think too that Paul teaches a likeness here, but it is a likeness a Christian minister should be very shy of. The likeness the apostle points out is this: "The spirit of man" sustains the same relationship to man that the "spirit of God" does to God. As man, according to our friend, is a mortal body having within him an immortal spirit, so to carry

out the "likeness" about which our minister is so particular, God would have to have a mortal body inhabited by an immortal spirit! We are sure that when our friend thinks over the "likeness," he will not like it well enough to ever mention it again. "The spirit of man" and the "spirit of God" are no more personalities than the "spirit of the world," of which the writer speaks in the 12th verse.

Here our minister becomes very bold and outspoken in his defense of the immortality of the human spirit. He puts the words, "image" and "likeness" in quotation marks, and refers the reader to Gen. 1: 26, 27 to show where he quotes from. Then he makes this novel statement: "The spirit in man is the only part which can in any sense be in the 'image' and 'likeness' of God." Reader, we will quote Gen. 1: 26, 27, and we ask you to bear in mind our friend's statement, very sweeping in its scope, that the spirit is the "only part" of man that "can in any sense" be in God's likeness. All right; ready: "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth....So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." The 28th verse adds: "And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply," etc. From these instructive and inspired statements we learn

1. *That man created in God's image was "made," "created," etc. Are immortal spirits "made?"*

2. *He was to have "dominion over the fish of the sea," fowl, cattle, etc.* Pray tell us what kind of a "dominion" an immortal spirit in man could have over these material things?

3. *"God created man in his own image," says the Record.* According to this verse it was the being "created;" it was the "man" who was created in the image of God: our friend says it was not the man, but the spirit of the man, so created!

4. *The record farther states that when God made man in his image, he made male and female: "Male and female created he them."* If the spirit is the "only part" referred to, as our writer affirms, then we have male and female spirits!

5. *Not only this unheard of absurdity, but more; for since God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply," etc., we would have the spirit of man, the "only part" referred to, multiplying itself into millions of immortal spirits by sexual cohabitation!*

6. *Adam "begat a son in his own likeness, after his own image; and called his name Seth." Gen. 5: 3.* Did Adam "beget" his son Seth, or did he beget an immortal spirit?

7. *And lastly, we invite your attention to the following passage: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man." Gen. 9: 6.* The mere quotation of this text against your assertion that the spirit of man is the only part which "can in any sense" be in God's image, is most calamitous in consequences. The passage shows that the "man" created in God's likeness, has "blood" that can be "shed." And yet a min-

ister of the gospel comes along and tells us that the spirit is the "only part" of man that is referred to when you read about the image of God! This text written by the hand of Moses, the man of God, has the same effect upon your assertion as an ignited match would have if thrown into a mountain of gunpowder.

Is the Body a "Tabernacle" for Man's Spirit.

Man was made to dwell on earth and have dominion over all animal life upon it. Gen. 1: 26, 28; Psa. 8: 6-8. Consistent with surroundings and duties, God created the body of man of "the dust of the ground" as the "house" or "tabernacle" of the spirit. Gen. 2: 7; Job 4: 17-21; 2 Cor. 5: 1-10; 2 Pet. 1: 13-15. It is with reference to the body that man was made "but little lower than God," or "angels" (mar. Psa. 8: 5); the same fact is affirmed with reference to the body of Jesus (Heb. 2: 5-18, noting verses 9, 14, 15).—*A Christian Minister.*

REPLY.

Our minister is shrewd enough to see that if man was created to "dwell on earth" and to have "dominion over all animal life," "surroundings and duties" logically necessitated a material man. So to be "consistent with surroundings and duties" God set about to make another man, or rather a "tabernacle" in which the spirit-man might be imprisoned. Our friend's own comments are, "God created the body of man 'of the dust of the ground.'" It will richly pay the reader to turn to Gen. 2: 7 and see for himself how our friend has deceitfully used the Holy Word of God, unintentionally no doubt. Moses says, "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground." See now the difference between Moses and

our dear friend: Moses says the Lord “formed man of the dust of the ground: “A Christian Minister” says he “created the body of man ‘of the dust.’” Moses says the “man;” our friend says “the body of man.” Another fulfillment of the words of the wise man: “Add not thou unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.” Prov. 30: 6.

After this effort to pervert God’s word, our friend braces himself up to say that “the body is the ‘house’ or ‘tabernacle’ of the spirit.” For proof of this statement we are cited to Job. 4: 17-21; 2 Cor. 5: 1-10; 2 Pet. 1: 13-15. It becomes our duty to turn to these texts to see if they substantiate his affirmation.

We begin with his first text, Job. 4: 17-21. The prophet begins by saying, “Shall mortal man be more just than God?” We cannot but wonder what a preacher wants of such words to prove the immortality of man. We continue to wonder what he means till we get to the 19th verse where we read about “them that dwell in houses of clay.” By calling to memory that our minister is designing to prove that the “body is a ‘house’” for the spirit to live in, we are able to see that he wants us to understand that by “houses of clay,” our bodies are meant; and that “them that dwell in” these houses are our immortal spirits. Beautiful and ingenious as this interpretation is, it is bound to get spoiled. If the distinction between “them” and the “houses” is what our friend thinks; if “them” are the immortal spirits, and the “houses” the bodies they inhabit, woe be unto the spirits of men! For in the following language the prophet speaks of “them” as “they:” “They (the

immortal spirits) are destroyed from morning to evening: they (the immortal spirits) perish forever They (the immortal spirits) die, even without wisdom." Vs. 20, 21. If "them" who dwell in "houses of clay" are immortal spirits, "they are destroyed;" "they perish;" "they die!!"

Your second passage, 2 Cor. 5: 1-10, speaks of man's body as a tabernacle soon to be "dissolved," in the contrast to the immortal body of the future which is "from heaven," and which is likened to a permanent "house" to stand forever "in the (new) heavens." You cannot find in the entire chapter the least hint that the body is a tabernacle for the spirit of man to dwell in. God dwells in the bodies of his saints by his spirit, and for this reason they are called "the temple of the living God;" but this is entirely a different thing to your conception of man's body being a tabernacle for the indwelling of an immortal spirit of his own.

Turning now to your third and last text, 2 Pet. 1: 13-15, we read, "I think it meet as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance; knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle." Our friend refers to this passage to prove that the body is a house for the spirit to dwell in. So he doubtless understands that the "I" in the tabernacle is the immortal spirit; and the tabernacle the "I" puts off, is the body. We are willing to give his interpretation a fair test, to see if it is "consistent with surroundings and duties." I will put on an overcoat. The coat is my tabernacle, I will suppose; and I am the immortal

spirit enclosed within it. I am the "rational, thinking, intelligent," talking, acting man. I am in there now, and I say, "I think it meet as long as I (who is talking, who is the "I"?) The spirit-man inside the coat. Well.) am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance knowing that shortly I (the spirit-man inside the coat) must put off this, my tabernacle (coat). Moreover, I (the spirit) will endeavor that ye may be able after *my decease*." The spirit is now dead, and we stop for the funeral.

Is the Spirit Conscious in the Dead-State?

Does the spirit live in a conscious state apart from the body? James 2: 26, reads, "The body apart from the spirit is dead." Every logician will grant the natural inference from these words is that the spirit is yet alive after the death of the body. Why mention the separation of the two and the death of one if the other is dead also?

Eccl. 12: 7, says that at death "the spirit returneth unto God who gave it." This settles the question involved in Eccl. 3: 21, relative to the spirit of man. The spirit of man is in God's keeping while the body moulders in the dust. That is why Jesus said, "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit." Luke 23: 46. Matt. 27: 50, reads, "Yielded up his spirit"; Mark 15: 37, "gave up the ghost"; John 19: 30, "gave up his spirit." Stephen called upon the Lord, "saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Acts 7: 59. That is where the spirit of the daughter of Jairus was when the Master said, "Maiden, arise. And her spirit returned to her immediately." Luke 8: 54, 55. Her spirit was alive and responsive to the Master's call.—*A Christian Minister*.

REPLY.

Our good minister begins his argument in defense of spirit-consciousness in the death-state by quoting the words of the apostle James, "The body without

the spirit is dead." 2: 26. His comments on this text are very peculiar. He says that "every logician" will readily admit as a "natural inference" that the spirit survives the death of the body in a conscious state. He would render better service for immortal spiritism if he would pass by "natural inferences" and give us a "thus it is written" for the immortality of the spirit and its consciousness in the death state. "Why mention the separation of the two and the death of one if the other is dead also?" If our friend knew what the spirit of man is, he would blush at the simplicity of his question. The translators of the Bible have given "breath" as an alternate reading for spirit in the margin of Jas. 2: 26. Man was lifeless until God imparted to him the "breath of life" (Gen. 2: 7); and as soon as his "breath goeth forth" (Psa. 146: 4) his body is "without the spirit," and he is as "dead" or lifeless as he was before he ever breathed. No man of intelligence, to say nothing of a "logician," would be foolish enough to admit that the breath is "yet alive after the body is dead." The breath gives life to organized bodies, other things being equal; it gives life, but it is not itself alive. To say of the breath which never was alive that it is "yet alive" in the death-state, is to use language carelessly and to betray a lack of proper discrimination.

Then we are told that the spirit "returns to God" at death (Eccl. 12: 7); that it is in the "hands" of the Father (Luke 23: 46); that it is "received" by Christ (Acts 7: 59); that it is "yielded up" (Mark 15: 37); all of which we accept and heartily

believe. My only regret is that our minister who so glibly quotes these texts does not accept them himself. This the reader will see when we come to review the part of his article which sets up the claim that all spirits, whether good or bad, are in hades in the interval between death and resurrection. But we dismiss this point for the present, and ask, Have you quoted a single text setting forth the consciousness of the spirit in death? Not one! The texts you quote tell us where the spirit "returns" to; into whose "hands" it is committed. They locate the spirit; they tell where it is. Our friend unconsciously confesses as much; for when he gets through quoting his passages he says, "That is where the spirit of the daughter of Jairus was when the Master said," etc. When the proper time¹ comes we will show that you flatly deny the "where" of the spirit. But dear friend, How do you expect to show that the spirit is conscious in death by citing texts to show "where" it is? There is a vast deal of difference between telling where a thing is and showing its nature and condition there. Come, friend, get down to the issue. You started out to prove that the spirit is "in a conscious state apart from the body," and we demand the proof.

Our friend does make one weak effort to perform the impossible task of proving that the spirit is a conscious entity while the body is dead. His attempt would be amusing but for the solemnity of the issue. Mark his words: "That is where the spirit of the daughter of Jairus was when the Master said, 'Maiden, arise.'" "Her spirit was alive," he says,

“and responsive to the Master’s call.” Our writer certainly has a wonderful faculty for getting things mixed. When he starts to make a point, it makes no difference how many grammars he may meet on his pathway, he kicks them to one side, and goes on triumphantly to the goal—his point! The reader will remember how he applied the plural “them” in Job 32: 8 to the singular word “spirit.” Now he says, “Stephen called upon the Lord saying, ‘Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.’” Acts 7: 59. If he will take the trouble to read Acts 7: 59 he will find that “they” stoned, called, said, etc.; and the 60th verse tells what Stephen did; how “he” kneeled, prayed, etc. How our friend can make the plural pronoun “they” represent Stephen, is a twist in polemics¹ we are not familiar with. He made the mistake we presume by gazing intently at the point in his mind when he should have been looking at the text he was transcribing. He does not hesitate to ignore the rules of grammar, as may be seen from his words, “That is where the spirit of the daughter of Jairus was when the Master said, ‘Maiden, arise.’ And her spirit returned to her, and she rose up immediately.” Her spirit was alive and responsive to the Master’s call.” Here he says that when Christ said “Maiden, arise,” her spirit was not only “alive,” but that it was “responsive”—it responded at once to the “Master’s call!!” Here, perhaps for the first time since the world began, the spirit is called a “maiden!!”

Does an Immortal Spirit make Resurrection Possible.

Right here is where the Sadducees made their mistake relative to the resurrection, denying its possibility, because, according to their view, there was nothing alive to answer God's call. Acts 23: 8. Jesus taught them that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were alive when God talked with Moses at the bush; and not only were they alive according to the statement of Jehovah, but Jesus says, "All live unto him." Luke 20: 37, 38; Matt. 23: 29-32; Mark 12: 24-27. If Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were not living when God talked with Moses, then Jesus was wrong in his reply to the Sadducees. But it must have been their spirits living then, for their bodies were dead long before. Is this not the reason he is called "the God of the spirits of all flesh" (Num. 16: 22; 27: 16), because the spirit lives after the flesh is dead, and "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." He is the Father of spirits (margin, "our spirits") to whom we owe obedience much more than to the fathers of our flesh. Heb. 12: 9.—
A Christian Minister.

REPLY.

Strange as it may seem, the reader will observe that our friend in above remarks discusses the "possibility" of the resurrection. He seems to think that if in death there is "nothing alive to answer God's call," resurrection is an impossibility. God is incapable of raising the dead if there is nothing "alive" to help him out a little! His position, nakedly stated, is simply that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and everybody else, for that matter, who are dead, must be alive; there must be something "alive to answer God's call;" if not, resurrection is not a "possibility!" To what a powerless and degraded position does this argument put the Almighty! The resurrection of the dead is not a "possibility" with God

unless he has an immortal, living, "responsive" spirit to help him do the work! If our friend so limits the power of the Almighty One, we wonder how he accounts for the sufficiency of God's power to form "man of the dust of the ground" (Gen. 2: 7), unaided by a "responsive" spirit. No immortal spirits were on the scene to help God in the formation of man; at least no "maiden" spirits were yet in existence! And we have faith to believe that since God managed to form man of the dust by his own power, he will get along somehow at the resurrection in reforming man of the dust, unassisted by semi-gods called the ghosts of dead men.

As our friend has conditioned resurrection upon life and not death, he proceeds to make the following strange remark: "Jesus taught them (the Sadducees) that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were alive." You think so? Moses says that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are dead and buried. Gen. 25: 8, 9; 49: 31, 33. It cannot be that our Lord taught the Sadducees that these men "were alive;" if he did, he disregarded and contradicted the testimony of Moses. And then your grammar—but what does a preacher care for grammar? You say that Jesus taught that "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were alive," and then in the same breath you say, "it must have been their spirits living then." Christ used the nouns "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob;" you use the same nouns and affirm that they "were alive," and then coolly convert the nouns into "their spirits!" A smooth trick that would have served your purpose well had you not got caught "in the very act." But now that your

trickery is exposed, perhaps you will give us a listening ear while we set before you the design Christ had in mind when he uttered the words you have quoted. Addressing the Sadducees who denied the resurrection he said, "Now that the dead are raised, Moses showed at the bush." Luke 20: 37. The very basis of his argument is the fact of their being dead. "Now that the *dead* are raised" is the proposition Christ starts out to demonstrate; not, "Now that the dead are alive." God calls himself the God of these three men who are dead. Now our Lord reasons that as God is "the God of the living" and not of the dead, it follows that since he calls himself the "God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob"—the God of these three men who are dead—the conclusion is inevitable: God entertains the purpose of raising them from the dead. The Sadducees caught the point and could not resist the argument: it was irresistible. To bear out our opponent's sense of Christ's words, "Now that the dead are raised," would have to be changed to read, "Now that the dead are alive, it is plain, for if they are not alive with a 'responsive' spirit 'to answer God's call,' their resurrection would not be a 'possibility!'" And he would have to elaborate his theology by stating that it is 'possible' to raise the dead because they are not dead! To prove the resurrection of the dead you must show that nobody is dead! To prove that the dead are to be raised, just show that they are all alive!! Wonderful logic this. It is a burning shame that the Saviour's argument, so cogently put that it "silenced" the Sadducees, should at this late day be so perverted by a man who

claims to minister the gospel of Christ. One cause which blinds his eyes to the Lord's meaning in this passage of Scripture is, that while Christ was talking about God's intention to raise the dead, our friend is thinking and talking about its "possibility." To prove a thing to be possible, is one thing: to prove it is going to occur, is another. The question is, What is God going to do with the dead? The Sadducees denied that it was God's intention to raise them. Jesus proved it was his intention to do it. Observe the difference between possibility and intention.

God, then, is called the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, not because they are alive, not because "the spirit lives after the flesh is dead," as our minister suggests, but because God intends to raise them from the dead. And since God has All Power back of his intention, he will certainly "quicken the dead" into life again. Entertaining such intentions and having ample power to execute them, all his people "live unto him;" for in the matter of resurrection he "calleth things which be not as though they were." Rom. 4: 17. Yet you say that the Lord is called the "God of the spirits of all flesh" because the "spirit lives after the flesh is dead." Here you need somebody to nudge you and whisper in your ear, "Be careful." You are getting yourself into a trap now from which you will seek in vain to be released. It will require a good deal of work and perspiration to squeeze the words "all flesh" small enough to only mean the human family. Job explicitly states that "all flesh" is a phrase expressive of animals as distinct from man, whom he brings in subsequently for

separate mention. Job. 34: 14.¹ Plain statements of Holy Writ leave no room for doubt that the beasts possess the spirit, and the same spirit man does. Psa. 104: 30²; Acts 17: 28³; Eccl. 3: 19-21. What do you gain by your argument that God is the God of the spirits of all flesh? You gain a great loss, as a Hibernian would say. For, as the beasts, equally with man, have spirit, and as the spirit you say "lives after the flesh is dead," you have quite a lot of animal spirits on your hands to dispose of somehow.

Did Christ's Spirit Hold a Protracted Meeting in Hades?

Turning now to 1 Peter 3: 18-20, we find the strongest possible teaching on this question. Speaking of Christ, Peter says he was "put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit; in which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, that aforetime were disobedient . . . in the days of Noah." What did Jesus do while his body lay in the grave? Preached to the spirits of men "in prison." What men? Men disobedient "in the days of Noah"; hence dead "in the flesh" long before the time when Jesus, "made alive in the spirit," went and preached to them. Could he have preached or they have understood his preaching, if the spirits of speaker and listeners were dead like their bodies? If these words of Peter are true, then the spirits of men are alive and conscious while their bodies mingle in the dust. I believe they are true; do you believe they are?

The "prison" where the spirits of the "disobedient" antediluvians were is undoubtedly the place where God "knoweth how . . . to keep the unrighteous under punishment unto the day of judgment." 2 Peter 2: 9. How can anyone suffer punishment who is dead, unconscious of anything anywhere? The place where "the unrighteous are kept under punishment unto the day of judgment," is where the rich man was in Hades. Luke 16: 19-31.⁴—*A Christian Minister.*

REPLY.

When our writer says that he now gives us the "strongest possible teaching" on his views, he uses language which inspires the reader with expectations. Such language of confidence naturally makes the reader sit up and take notice—makes him expect something in the way of an argument out of the ordinary. With rapt attention we begin to read: "What did Jesus do while his body was in the grave? Preached to the spirits of men 'in prison.'" Notice, please, how our writer discriminates between "Jesus" and his "body," and how he has Jesus holding a revival meeting in hades while his body is in the tomb. To untaught people who do not know anything about Jesus, to them this argument may appeal as the "strongest" our friend has yet advanced. But people who are familiar with God's word, who humbly follow its teachings and who know by its divine authority who "Jesus" is, will not estimate the argument so highly. The Jesus of divine revelation was born (Matt. 2: 1), crucified (1 Cor. 2: 2), killed (1 Thes. 2: 15), died (Acts 2: 36)¹, buried (1 Cor. 15: 3)², and was raised from the dead (Acts 2: 32). Our friend preaches "another Jesus" (2 Cor. 11: 4); he has an immortal spirit-Jesus; one who was not born, was not crucified, killed, died, buried, nor raised from the dead! According to him, after the body of Jesus had died, had breathed out the spirit-Jesus; after the spirit-man had left his body, abandoned it like one would an old "house" unfit to live in, there was a misleading and untrue superscription written over our Lord's "remains," the dilapidated "tabernacle"

of his body: "*This is Jesus!*" Matt. 27: 37. Had this been written to sanction the "strongest possible teaching" for immortal spiritism, and had our preacher been the writer thereof, it would have read, "This not Jesus; it is only the 'house' Jesus once lived in; but Jesus has now vacated it—and is on a preaching tour in hades. Soon as his special revival services are over there, he will return to this old 'tabernacle.' We look for him to return in about three days!"

If our minister has here presented the "strongest" argument for his theory that has been or can be produced, reader, I beg you not to look at his arguments he has unwittingly confessed are weaker! But as strong as his present position may be, suppose we walk right up in its face and pretend that we are not one bit afraid of it. Here we go; keep up courage. "What did Jesus do while his body lay in the grave?" Answer: He 'preached.' To whom did he preach? Answer: To the immortal spirits of the antediluvians. Where were the services held? Answer: In hades "where the rich man was." As the rich man was in "torments" there, we are led to suppose that the antediluvians were in a condition of misery also, and had been enduring everlasting burnings for—well, ever since they had been there. Now, what did Jesus preach to these men during the series of meetings he held there? No dodging, now. What did he preach? No good end is served by looking away from the question and swallowing hard, as if there was a lump in your throat. You dare not dishonor Christ by saying he preached

anything other than the gospel. 1 Pet. 4: 6 says that the gospel was preached to those dead men. Now, since the word gospel means "good news or glad tidings," will you tell us what good news Christ preached to his ghost audience? You do not believe that a single spirit can get out of hell torments; there is absolutely no way of getting out of hell, so you teach. If not, Christ could not break good news to the ghosts there of a coming deliverance. He could not preach salvation, could not offer them any means of escape from everlasting doom. To say that Christ preached gospel or good news to these irredeemable spirits is simply to say that he tantalized them with a mock offer of pardon which it was impossible to grant. If there was no pardon possible for them, then Christ never saved a soul by his preaching tour to hades. If there was no redemption for them, what kind of a gospel, what good news would he have to communicate to them? If you say there was an offer of pardon made to them by the ministry of Christ, then you convert hades into purgatory; and instead of being "A Christian Minister," you should be a Catholic Priest. Thus does your "strongest possible teaching" go down with an everlasting smash.

With the "strongest" argument thus demolished, it now remains for us to give the reader a brief and true exposition of 1 Pet. 3: 18-20. "Quickened by the spirit," the King James' translation, is rejected by our writer, and instead of it he approves and quotes, "Made alive in the spirit." Well, "quickened" means to "make alive;" and it would be the worst kind of folly to talk of anything being made

alive unless it was dead. Notice that made alive is preceded by the words, "Put to death in the flesh." What part of Jesus was made alive? Certainly the part, and only the part, that had died. If the flesh part of Jesus was "put to death," it must have been the flesh part of him that was made alive. But our friend understands the text differently. He follows it with comments in which he affirms that the spirit of Jesus and the spirits to whom he preached must have "been alive and conscious!" Let him think twice and he will see that in trying to keep the spirit alive as a separate entity from the flesh "put to death," he has killed it! Think, my friend. If the spirit is what was "made alive," if it was "quicken- ed," then it must have been dead! How could the spirit of Christ be "made alive" if it had not died? Impossible. Here are the facts in the case: Jesus was put to death. Three days after his death he was "quicken- ed" (made alive) by the spirit. It was "by" the same spirit that made him alive that he "went and preached to the spirits in prison." Peter's words cannot be misunderstood or misinter- preted: "By which (spirit) also he went and preached," etc. Going anywhere and preaching there "by the spirit" contravenes the idea of person- al presence. When bodily absent from a church, Paul wrote that while he was absent from them in the body, he was "present with them in spirit." Col. 2: 5. In the same way, although Christ was bodily in heaven, yet he came and "preached" at Ephesus. 2: 17. Learn now how the Spirit of the Father, called "the spirit of Christ," was in all the proph-

ets (1 Pet. 1: 10-12), and especially was Noah full of it, for he is called a "preacher of righteousness" by way of marking him off for special eminence. 2 Pet. 2: 5. Through him the spirit of God strove mightily with the antediluvians for 120 years. Gen. 6: 3. As they were "disobedient" to the strivings of God's good spirit all the time "the ark was preparing," they were doomed to destruction at the expiration of the time mentioned. They were like so many criminals incarcerated "in prison." Still the "long-suffering of God" was very marked in that all this long time the spirit strove in its ministry and offered them a reprieve of the sentence, a full pardon. Though the spirit thus "preached" this good message to them, they persisted in "disobedience," Peter says. Common-sense demands that they were "disobedient" to the preaching they heard; and that therefore, the preaching and disobedience were at the same time. When was the preaching done, Peter? When were they disobedient? When did the "long-suffering of God wait" for them to repent? When were the "eight souls saved," Peter? All of this was "in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing." Tell us once more, Peter, When was the preaching, disobedience, and the salvation of the eight souls? "*In the days of Noah.*" Then this is the time when the gospel was "preached" to them; when they were "disobedient;" when the "longsuffering of God" waited; "*while the ark was preparing.*" Oh the simplicity and beauty of this passage. But in order to bolster up the "strongest possible teaching" for immortal spiritism and consciousness in the

death-state, this text is “wrested”—given such a twist that its historical basis is denied, God’s “long-suffering” in ancient times is ignored; and all this for the sake of extracting from the text the “strongest possible teaching” for immortal spiritism! In a vain effort to show that Jesus was alive when he was dead; that he was holding a protracted meeting in hades when he was in the tomb; that the gospel was preached the second time to sinners who had spurned God’s “longsuffering” for 120 years; that there are opportunities of salvation for sinners after they have disregarded the gospel in this life—the delusive and dangerous “second chance” theory of Russellism and the Purgatory of Catholicism!

The Where and Condition of the Spirit in the Death State.

A study of 2 Cor. 5: 1-10, shows that Paul considered man’s spirit lived while “absent from” the “dissolved” bodily frame. “Our habitation which is from heaven” is not heaven itself, but the immortal body which shall be given us when Jesus comes. After our spirits are clothed with this “habitation which is from heaven” we shall not be found naked. Ver. 3. “Naked” is rendered “discarnate” in Twentieth Century New Testament. That means “we shall not be found” disembodied after receiving that. Paul says that he is willing rather to be absent from the body (ver. 8), and at home with the Lord, which would necessitate the death of the body and his living in spirit life apart from the body, while in that state he must be fully conscious, else he could not say, ‘We make it our aim, whether at home (in the body) or absent (from the body) to be well-pleasing unto him.’ Ver. 9.—*A Christian Minister.*

REPLY.

Our minister is very hazy as to “where” the spirit is in the interim between death and the resurrec-

tion. Christ's spirit was very restless when it was absent from his body; at least it appears so from our friend's representation. Soon as it got "discarnated" from his body it went on the wings of the wind to paradise; then remembered having an appointment to preach in hades, the hot part of that region, whither he went, although he had to cross a gulf that in his preaching on earth he had said could not be crossed! Somehow his ghost got over the gulf, delivered a few sermons to the antediluvians (we are not told why the antediluvians were favored above the rich man, the devil and other inhabitants there), then left them to their doom; and coming back by way of paradise (?) his spirit re-entered its "house"—the body. Flitting like this from place to place one could not state definitely "where" his spirit was at any given time. According to this theory, the spirits of men, whether just or unjust, go neither to heaven and bliss, nor to hell and final punishment; they both go to hades, though they occupy different apartments there. With the spirit thus located in the Phariseeical hades where "is a place not regularly finished; a subterraneous region, wherein the light of this world does not shine," and where there is "perpetual darkness" (Josephus, page 901), what business does our friend have with such passages as, for instance some he has quoted, about the spirit returning to God (Eccl. 12: 7). Is God in hades? In "perpetual darkness?" Why should he tell us that Stephen called upon Christ to "receive" his spirit? Is Christ in hades? Surely our friend can see if he thinks a moment that if the spirit goes to

hades, as he claims, he has no use for 2 Cor. 5: 1-10. For if that portion of Scripture proves that the spirit lives apart from the body, where does it live? You cannot say it lives in hades; for Paul answers the question differently. He says the life enjoyed while "absent from the body," is one lived "present with the Lord!" Is the Lord in hades? If the Lord is in heaven (Matt. 6: 9), and if hades is an "unfinished part of the earth" where "perpetual darkness" reigns, how could Paul get disembodied, go to hades, and there be "at home with the Lord?"

But dropping this thought for the present, we wish to consider the condition of the spirit in its unclothed state. Paul says not one word about the body being the clothing of the spirit, about the spirit being unclothed in hades or anywhere else. Yet our writer affirms that "a study of 2 Cor. 5: 1-10" will show that Paul believed that man's spirit "lived while" the body is dead. He talks about "living in spirit apart from the body;" and that in this discarnated state "he must be fully conscious." We have not forgotten your words in your first article, that the spirit is the "rational, thinking, intelligent part of man's being." Later you said that the body was only the "house" this "rational, thinking intelligent" being lived in. If I shoot an unconscious house, and a "rational," thinking, "intelligent" man escapes from it unharmed, is any thing rendered unconscious by the act? If I shoot an unconscious body, and the conscious spirit escapes from it unharmed, do I render anything that was conscious, unconscious by the act? Surely not. Then

if during life the spirit is the “rational, thinking, intelligent part of man’s being,” and if at the death of the body this spirit escapes from the body with its intellectual powers unimpaired, no part is rendered unconscious by death. Look now at this simple statement of David: “The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence.” Psa. 115: 17. If this passage relates to the intellectual part of man, it clearly negates the doctrine of consciousness in death, and tells us that men “go down into silence,” where they “praise not the Lord.” Don’t say, “Oh, that text relates to the body,” for if it does, then only the body praised the Lord before death. If there is any point to the statement it indicates that whatever praised the Lord previous to death, cannot praise him after death. If then, only the body praised the Lord before death, then the body is the intellectual man, for praise is impossible without intellect; and if the body, instead of the spirit, possesses intellect before death, then the spirit, having never been the intellectual part, cannot possess intellect after death; so, from this standpoint, death must produce unconsciousness in man in the fullest and truest sense. If you insist on your previous statement, that the spirit is “the rational, thinking, intelligent part of man’s being,” instead of the body, and that the spirit praises the Lord through the body, then the conclusion is inevitable that the part which praises the Lord previous to death enters into “silence” at death; so from this point of view, too, it is seen that death must envelope man in total unconsciousness. But if as a desperate and last resort,

you should claim that the spirit and body jointly "praise the Lord" before death, then it follows that spirit and body jointly cease to praise God, and enter into a state of "silence" at death. To say of some part of man that never did and never could praise the Lord while alive that when dead it should not praise him, would be nonsense too ridiculous to charge upon an intelligent man, to say nothing of imputing it to the Lord of hosts. Whatever praises the Lord in life, let it be a part of man only, or the entire man; let it be the spirit or the body, or both, just that intellectual something ceases to praise him after death, and is enveloped in "silence." Let him insist who will that the spirit is the "rational, thinking, intelligent part of man's being," there is no loop hole to escape from the conclusion this text forces upon us, namely, that the intellectual part of man, the part that "praises the Lord" ceases to praise him when paralyzed by the hand of death.

What Part of Man is Unconscious in Death?

The same teaching is brought out in Phil. 1: 21-25. "For me to live is Christ," meaning "that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith" (Gal. 2: 20) and "to die is gain," because he would then be in a better state personally, than his life in the body permitted. But when he contrasted the benefit his presence in the flesh would be to the Philippians with the gain to himself to die and be with Christ, he was in a "strait betwixt two," not knowing which to choose; "having the desire to depart (from the flesh) and be with Christ, for it is very far better (for my sake); yet to abide in the flesh¹ is more needful for your sake." I have seen columns written to show that Jesus and Paul and Peter do not mean what they

say of "life in the body" and "out of the body:" but I greatly prefer the plain, simple words of Christ and his apostles relative to these questions.

God give us grace to accept his Word as it stands.—*A Christian Minister.*

REPLY.

Concerning the texts cited by our friend in this his last effort to establish the consciousness of the spirit apart from the body, we have but few words to say. The theory of going to heaven when you die is an old worn out song, we know, still we verily believe there is more melody in it than zigzag hadean rhapsodies. If our friend had not abandoned the old, old story of heaven going, he could quote Phil. 1: 21-24 with some show of consistency. Though the apostle says nothing about his spirit departing and being with Christ, and not a word about it being a gain to his spirit to be absent from the body, and drops not the least hint that it would be "far better" for his spirit to leave his body and go to hades, our friend presumes to say and interpret his words as if he had said as much. But adding to God's Word does not help out his hadean story one bit. With his additions to the text, it is still worth nothing to him. Our friend believes that the spirit "departs" to hades as soon as the body dies, while the passage talks about "departing and being with Christ." The text is worse than useless to him to countenance the claim that the spirit goes to hades, unless he believes that Paul could be "with Christ" in hades, and that therefore, Christ is in hades! The non-progressive part of Christendom who sing the old threadbare hymn

of "mansions in the sky," can beat you singing. Better go back to singing the old song you have thrown away.

Our friend who started out by saying that the spirit is the "rational, thinking, intelligent part of man's being," still talks about the spirit escaping the power of death and surviving the death of the body in a conscious state. What we want to know is, What part of man becomes unconscious in death? If we "accept the word as it stands," we shall have to believe that something, some part of man, becomes unconscious in death. As he claims that the spirit is the "rational, thinking, intelligent part of man's being" in life, and remains the intellectual man after death, he denies that any part of man is unconscious in death. But David says that when a man dies, "In that very day his thoughts perish." Psa. 146: 3.¹ If the spirit is the "thinking" part of man, it is the spirit that has "thoughts." Then if "thoughts perish" when man dies, and the spirit produces them, does not death reduce the spirit to unconsciousness? Or take this text: "In death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave (sheol, hades, the very place you say the spirit is conscious) who shall give thee thanks." Psa. 6: 5. If David's allusion here is merely to the body, and to the body only, then it follows that the body is the part that had memory prior to death, instead of the spirit; and if this is so, the spirit must be destitute of memory after death as really as before. Thus without controversy, this text leaves man unconscious in death. That which could remember in life, ceases to remember

after death, whether we ascribe memory to body or spirit, or to both jointly. In life we possess the faculty of memory; in death we are deprived of it—the very being that can remember in life, cannot remember in death.

Then we read again; “There is no work, nor knowledge, nor device, nor wisdom, in the grave (sheol, hades!) whither thou goest.” Eccl. 9: 10. We hope our friend, after reading this statement about hades, will be a wiser man. But to limit ourselves now to the spirit and its consciousness in death: According to this passage the very part of man that possesses “knowledge” goes into sheol. Now if the body is the part that goes to sheol, the body is the intellectual part of man while he is alive, and consequently the spirit is destitute of intellect even in life, and therefore cannot be conscious in death; but if the spirit is the intellectual man in life, the “rational, thinking, intelligent” part of man, as our friend claims, then it is the spirit that goes into sheol at death, where there is “no knowledge,” “nor wisdom.” In such a place no doubt Jesus gave some very stirring sermons; and no doubt that his audience listened with undivided attention! But to resume our thread of reasoning: If the intellectual man is the spirit and body combined, while in life, then it follows that this very intellectual man goes into a state at death where there is no “knowledge.” This address, “whither thou goest,” is made to a living, conscious being, whether to the spirit or body, or both united in one; and whatever part is here addressed, goes to a realm where there is no

“knowledge,” “wisdom,” etc. That part of man which lacks knowledge and wisdom before death, must be without knowledge and wisdom after death; and that which possesses knowledge and wisdom in life, is dispossessed of them in sheol, which is a realm where there is no “knowledge,” “wisdom,” “nor device,” whether occupied by physical men, or disembodied ghosts.

One more text, please: “The living know that they must die; but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished.” Eccl. 9: 5, 6. This text attributes knowledge to some part of man while alive, and denies it to the same part when dead; “the living know” something; “but the dead know not anything.” Now I repeat that only the intellectual man can possess knowledge, whether that be the body, the spirit, or both combined; and only the intellectual man can be dispossessed of knowledge by death; for that cannot be taken from a being which he never possessed. If the body is the part of man that possesses intellect in this life, then the spirit is destitute of knowledge, and cannot be the intellectual man, the “rational, thinking, intelligent part of man’s being,” and, of course, having never possessed knowledge before death, cannot possess it after death; then death leaves man absolutely unconscious. If my friend recovers from this staggering blow, and asserts in righteous indignation that the spirit is the “rational, thinking, intelligent part of mans’ being,” that it is the knowing part of man, then it follows

that as that which possesses knowledge while alive, shall be deprived of knowledge after death, the spirit must be consigned to unconsciousness under the blow of death; for whatever part of man knowledge is attributed to during life, it is deprived of it in death; therefore, if the spirit is the intellectual part of man before death, it will "know not anything" after death. If body and spirit united constitute the intellectual man prior to death, then both combined will be deprived of consciousness, and "know not anything" subsequent to death; for whatever may be said to "know" while alive, is as positively said to "know not anything" in death. And more: "Neither have they any more a reward." They do not "have" any reward during the death-state; they have to wait for the resurrection for their "recompense." Luke 14: 14. While there is to be no reward in death, there is to be a reward when the reign of death is over. The dead are described in the words, "Their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished." It is a fact that the passions of love and hatred belong to the intellectual man, let that be what it may; for it is impossible to love or hate without intellect; and if they belong to the body and not to spirit, then the body is the intellectual man and the spirit is devoid of intellect previous to death, and consequently cannot possess it in death. But if the passions of "love" "hatred," "envy," etc., which are guided by the intellect, are passions of the spirit—not of the body—then the spirit must be affected by the stroke of death, under which these passions

“perish.” Turn and twist all you can, death plunges the intellectual man into utter unconsciousness.

With these words we close our reply to our friend in the ministry. We have, like Paul, used “great plainness of speech” (2 Cor. 3: 12,) but we can assure our dear friend that notwithstanding our plain words we have a warm heart, and that our desire is to see the truth shine forth in all its beauty. If our remarks have been helpful to him in giving him a clearer understanding of the Divine Word, or if they have ministered to the enlargement of our reader’s knowledge of the truth, we are thankful. God bless our humble effort to elucidate his truth, and may all who read these remarks have, as our minister words it, “grace to accept his Word as it stands.” Amen.

“Elijah Went Up by a Whirlwind Into Heaven.”
2 Kings 2: 1, 11.

The ascension of the prophet Elijah to heaven by a whirlwind as related by the texts given at the head of this article, has been misunderstood and misused by both the world and the Church. It has been quoted by the world to prove and sustain a precedent for heaven going at death for the good. Obviously this Scripture cannot be used legitimately to countenance this dogma; for Elijah ascended to heaven in a whirlwind, publicly and bodily, and without dying; whereas in the heaven going taught by the world, it is to be noted with proper wonder and amazement, is on “angels’ wings,” instead of a whirlwind; the spirit or soul, which Bucks’ Bible Dictionary calls “an immaterial substance,” goes, instead of

the body; and no one is permitted to go, no matter how good he may be, till he dies, whereas Elijah went without dying. Here we have no parallel, but positive antithesis.¹

But the church of God, equally with the world, has misapprehended the meaning of Elijah's ascension. Some claim that the prophet was carried to the presence of God in mortal nature, and remains there to this day a mortal man—that God has supernaturally prolonged his natural life all these thousands of years! The mere statement of this fanciful imagination refutes it. Others upon whose ears this absurd view and unbiblical speculation have grated, have objected to such dreamy and improbable, and visionary expositions of God's Word, and well they may. Only a spiritual body like Christ had after his resurrection, is independent of atmospheric air for its support, as is proved by our Lord's ascension to the right hand of power. A mortal body can only live in water and air, and then only at a comparatively low altitude above the surface of the globe. The air only extends from forty to fifty miles from the surface of the earth; beyond that limit, therefore, even if it could be attained, mortals supported by the breath of life could no more live than fish in air. Beyond this belt of air is the ether through which no being dependent on the inhaling and exhaling of the breath of life, can pass and live. Only beings like angels, God, and his son Jesus, all of whom are spiritual beings, can live where there is no air. The only admissible conclusion then is, that if Elijah has lived in heaven, the realm of celestial beings, for so

many thousands of years without dying, he must be essentially a spiritual being, an immortalized body. But this theory only adds an absurdity to an absurdity. Paul makes one statement in his letter to the Hebrews which shatters this nebulous¹ theory into atoms. He is representing that the Mosaic rites were all typical; and that by them the Holy Spirit "signified" that the "way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing." Heb. 9: 8. "It was not possible," he writes, "that the blood of bulls and of goats could take away sin." 10: 4. The Mosaic sacrifices could not of themselves do this; they all had to be ratified by the death and blood of Christ. Now Elijah lived while the "first tabernacle was yet standing;" the "holiest of all" was not therefore "made manifest" to him. So this statement by Paul about the first covenant, and Christ's death as affecting those who were under it, is just as true of Elijah as any one else who lived under it: "For this cause he is the mediator of the New Covenant, that by means of death, *for the redemption of the transgressors under the first Covenant, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.*" Heb. 9: 15. From this passage it appears that Christ's death was as much designed to effect the "redemption" of people under the "first Covenant" as if no sacrifices had been offered under it. The claim that Elijah has been immortalized is certainly a very grave error; for it represents him as attaining to the "holiest of all" by sacrifices which were powerless to "take away sin;" that the holiest of all had been "made mani-

fest while as the first tabernacle was yet standing," while Paul says it was not! And it represents the prophet as realizing the "promise" before the death of Christ, the very "cause" and "means by which," Paul says, "they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." If Elijah was immortalized and taken to heaven hundreds of years before Christ died, and has enjoyed the "holiest of all" and realized the "promise" prior to and independent of Christ's death—then he did not partake of the "redemption" effected by Christ's sacrifice, and so far as he is concerned, the blood of Christ is an "unholy thing"—without worth or merit. Heb. 10: 29. When the blood-washed throng break out in glad song in the morning of redemption and say, to the honor and glory of Christ, "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God *by thy blood*" (Rev. 5: 9), Elijah, not having been a beneficiary of Christ's death, but having been his own saviour, will be banished from the heavenly choir to some anti-room in the kingdom, where, in the solitude of isolation, he can by himself sing his own praise forever more!! Dear reader, reject without hesitation or parley a doctrine so derogatory to the life and mission of our blessed Redeemer.

We now pass from prefatory remarks to the texts themselves: "When the Lord would take up Elijah into heaven by a whirlwind:" "There appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven." 2 Kings 2: 1, 11. Our remarks of explication¹ will be under the headings I. Heaven. II.

Whirlwind. III. And then the positive proof of our interpretation.

I. *Heaven.* David says in Psa. 115: 16, "The heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's: but the earth hath he given to the children of men." The contrast in this verse is very marked. While both heaven and earth are the Lord's in the sense of ownership, yet he has reserved "heaven, even the heavens," for Himself, and has only "given" us the earth for our abode. He has never "given" the heavens to Elijah or any other man; we defy any one to show that he has. If this prophet is in heaven he is a trespasser and usurper. That the heavens "are the Lord's" in an exclusive sense we learn from Paul in 1 Tim. 6: 16: "Dwelling in the light which *no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see.*" Heaven where the Deity dwells is a place of such "light" that "no man" can approach near it; for this reason no man has seen nor can see God. If Elijah ascended to heaven, let him be careful and not "approach" too near the Deity enthroned in "light!" That the Lord's throne, the place of his residence, is barred from all human beings is plain from the challenge of Agur: "*Who hath ascended to heaven or descended? Who hath gathered the wind in his fists? * * * What is his name and his son's name, if thou canst tell?*" Prov. 30: 4. Heaven going people, can you meet Agur's challenge? Show us a man who has "ascended up into heaven," and Agur will show you a man who can "gather the wind in his fists!" Pressed on this matter, all have to admit that the only "name" that

ascended into heaven is spoken of in Jno. 3: 13: "*No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the on^d of man which is in heaven.*" Angels have ascended and descended in all the different ages, but Christ is the only "man" that ever did ascend (and then only after he had been changed to an immortal being). Christ excepted, Enoch, Elijah, or any other man, dead or living, never went to the heavens, into the abode and presence of God.

How then are we to understand that Elijah "went up by a whirlwind into heaven?" Heaven, we must remember, does not always designate the place of God's throne. The original words in the Hebrew and Greek translated "heavens" only mean "heaved up things," and are frequently applied to the air and sky. (See Young's Concordance). In Gen. 1: 6-8 the firmament, the "expansion" over our heads, is called "heaven." V. 8. In this expansion or belt of air, extending as we have observed before, some forty or fifty miles above the surface of the earth, the birds of the air are said to "fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven." v. 20. Because they are denizens² of the air or firmament, they are called the "fowls of heaven." Zeph. 1: 3. That this is the "heaven" into which Elijah ascended is plainly indicated by the statement that he ascended

II. "*By a whirlwind into heaven.*" Soon as the expansion was formed by dividing the waters from the waters, those on the earth into rivers and seas, those above into mists and clouds, the "expansion" between them called air, before full of humidity and

weight, now became rarified, and began to circulate in breezes and winds. Gen. 1: 1-30. Now air in motion is called "wind." The cool of the day is literally the "wind of the day," (Margin, Gen. 3: 8.) The stirring of air or wind was the means God used to assuage¹ the waters after the flood. Gen. 8: 1. When wind becomes violent, and moves with more than ordinary velocity (Hos. 8: 7), with circuitous movements, it "whirls;" hence "whirlwind" is a word which defines itself. Its whirling rolls chaff and other objects before it (Isa. 17: 13), carries them long distances and scatters them all along its pathway. Is. 41: 16.² But as a wind is only a disturbance of air, there can be no wind higher than the air belt. No object taken up by a whirlwind can go higher than the wind goes, for the simple reason that the attraction of the earth draws everything to its surface. Balloons and flying machines have to resist the power of attraction. The moment their power becomes exhausted or gets even the least bit weaker than the earth's power of attraction, they are speedily drawn to the earth. When a man ascends into the expansion in a balloon, he will not go an inch higher than the balloon goes, for he is dependent on it to carry him every inch he gets away from the earth. A stone thrown upward does not ascend by centrifugal power; it is moved by an outward force, consequently when the activity of that force ceases, the stone quickly falls to the ground. Such is the irresistible power of the earth's attraction over all things and mortals. But with Christ, after he was immortalized, it was quite different; the attraction

of the earth had no power to hold him; and without balloon, aeroplane, whirlwind, wings, or any kind of appendages to resist the earth's attraction, he ascended up to the right hand of power. Elijah, a man of "like passions with us" (Jas. 5: 17), had no such power. It is a remarkable fact repeatedly stated that he ascended to heaven "in a whirlwind." This statement not only shows that the "heaven" into which Elijah ascended was the "expansion" above us where the wind moves, the place and the only place subject to whirlwinds, but it also shows that the whirlwind was the power or means "by" which the prophet was taken up. As a mortal he was dependent on some power to ascend; and as he ascended "by a whirlwind," he could not and did not go an inch higher than it went! Here reason and revelation join hand in hand. But putting reason, logic, induction, deduction, and all other indirect evidence on the shelf, let us look at the

III. *Positive proofs in the case.* We first submit

1. *The testimony of fifty sons of the prophets.* They were attending the prophetic schools at Bethel and Jericho. 2 Kings 2: 3-7. No one can object to them or their testimony; for God revealed to them both the time and place of Elijah's ascension, vs. 5, 7. It is not likely that God would reveal all this to them, and then leave them ignorant about the ascension itself. They witnessed the prophet's ascension (v. 15); we are anxious to hear what they thought about it. Listen to their opinion: "Behold now there be with thy servant fifty strong men; let them go we pray thee, *and seek thy Master*; lest per-

adventure the spirit of the Lord hath taken him up, and cast him upon some mountain, or into some valley." v. 16. They sought him for three days. v. 17. Unlike moderns, these men, actual witnesses of Elijah's ascension, and therefore competent to have right views about it, had no idea that the prophet had left the earth permanently. Though he ascended into the firmament before their eyes, they had no other idea than that the spirit had dropped him upon "some mountain, or in some valley." Their failure to find him cannot be urged as an argument that the prophet was not on earth. Because

2. *The spirit of the Lord had before and frequently taken Elijah up, as it did here, and protected him in places of seclusion.* In 1 Kings 17 we learn that he had spent three years (18: 1) by the brook Cherith and at the home of a widow in Zarephath. No one knew where he was. One day Elijah met Obadiah in the way as he walked alone, and said to him, "Go tell thy lord, Behold Elijah is here." 18: 7, 8. Obadiah was afraid to deliver this message to Ahab. Why? Listen to the reason: "There is no nation or kingdom whither my lord hath not sent to seek thee: and when they said, He is not here; he took an oath of the kingdom, that they found thee not." None of his contemporaries, whether malevolent or friendly, though¹ he had migrated to the skies because he could not be found. God had only "hid" him (Jer. 36: 26) from his enemies. Now mark why Obadiah did not want to report, "Behold, Elijah is here:" "It shall come to pass as soon as I am gone from thee, that *the spirit of the Lord shall carry thee*

whither I know not; and so when I come and tell Ahab, and he cannot find thee, he shall slay me." 1 Kings 18: 12. That the spirit of the Lord had previously and frequently carried this prophet to "some mountain, or into some valley," where he was fed by ravens, sustained by angels, and was protected from his enemies, is clearly apparent from Obadiah's words. So usual and common was it for the "spirit of the Lord" thus to carry away the prophet, that Obadiah anticipated were he to go and tell Ahab he had seen Elijah, "as soon" as he left him, even before he could return to the spot where Elijah then was, the spirit would carry him to some unknown place! In that case his report would appear to be a lie, and for this Ahab would slay him. Such operations of the spirit upon Elijah, I repeat, must have been very common, or Obadiah could not have entertained such fears. Instead then of his ascension being unusual, something that had never occurred before, it was usual and recurrent. No more can be claimed for one ascension than another. And lastly we affirm

3. *That to other prophets the same phenomenon has occurred.* Ezekiel says (3: 12, 14): "The spirit took me:" "The spirit lifted me up, and took me away." Jesus was "led up of the spirit into the wilderness." Matt. 4: 1. "The spirit of the Lord caught away Philip." Acts 8: 39. When the Lord comes the saints are to be caught up into the air. 1 Thess. 4: 17. No more can be claimed for Elijah's ascension than is claimed for the same language when

applied to Ezekiel, Jesus, Philip and the saints. And here we rest our case.

The Inspiration of the Bible. 2 Tim. 3: 16.

The Higher Critics have advocated various theories of inspiration. Some of them say, "The thoughts only of the penmen were inspired;" others say, "Inspiration was only partial;" "There were different degrees of inspiration;" "The writers were inspired in the supervision of the work they did;" and "In directing their work," etc., etc. Sometimes they talk about "Dynamic" inspiration, but this expression is very vague and misty. Others say that the "Concept" is inspired. None of the gentlemen attempt to tell us what the "Concept" is; indeed we doubt if any of the critics know. They have to admit inspiration of some kind, and to some extent, or belie God's word in every chapter; therefore they reservedly assent to the fact of inspiration in words, and then proceed to render nugatory⁴ that admission by limiting the action of inspiration to the "thoughts," "conceptions," and "supervision" of the writers. However divergent their views on the "degree" of inspiration, they all to a man disbelieve in verbal inspiration. The one thing and the only thing they are emphatic about and are agreed and united upon is, that the Bible is not verbally inspired.

When the Revised Version rendered 2 Tim. 3: 16, "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable," the Higher Critics rejoiced greatly, because they thought they had gotten rid of one text which taught verbal inspiration. The verb "is" does not occur in

the Greek text, so these men pleaded on the basis of scholarship that our rendering of the text is faulty because it reads, "All scripture (is) given by inspiration of God," etc. But the absence of the verb is only an idiomatic omission, which required to be supplied in translating into English. All translations supply it somewhere in the text. Hoping to make a point in favor of partial inspiration the Higher Critic inserts the verb "is" after "God," making the text read: "All scripture given by inspiration of God (is) profitable," etc. But hold on, ye self-styled great scholars of the world: *Kai*, "and," is in the Greek text, and your translation of the passage throws it out to make room for the omitted verb in a false position! Truly great men are not always wise. Job. 32: 9.

As to the translation of the verse by the Revised Version, "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable," we condemn it for the following reasons:

I. It is tautological.¹

II. It violates the laws of Greek syntax.² We challenge the production of a single instance in the whole compass of the Greek language where such a violent divulsion³ of two adjectives connected and standing as they are in 2 Tim. 3: 16 can be found and justified.

III. Surely the Greek fathers knew their own language better than our modern Higher Critics. Clement says, "The apostle calls the scripture inspired of God." Origen says: "Every scripture is *theopneustic*,⁴ and is profitable." Gregory (of Nyssa)

says: "Every scripture is, by the apostle, said to be inspired of God." We could quote similar words from Theodoret, Basil, Cyril, etc., etc.

IV. In 1 Tim. 4: 4, the apostle says: "Every creature of God is good and nothing to be refused;" while in Heb. 4: 13 he says, "All things are naked and opened (exposed) to the eyes of Him with whom we have to do." Here are two passages that are positively identical in form and construction as 2 Tim. 3: 16. But the Revisers left them unchanged; why? Because if they had changed them as they did 2 Tim. 3: 16 they would have made absolute nonsense of them and fools of themselves.

V. The Revised Version's rendering of 2 Tim. 3: 16 has been condemned by many of the best scholars on earth. Bishops Wordsworth and Moberly, Archbishop Trench and others of the Revision Committee disclaimed all responsibility for the translation. Dean Burgon and Dr. Schrivener both pronounce it a blunder; the first, "the most astonishing as well as calamitous literary blunder of the age;" the second, "A blunder such as makes itself hopelessly condemned." It was condemned by Dr. Tregelles, the only man ever pensioned by the English Government for scholarship.

In 2 Tim. 3: 15 Paul is speaking of "scriptures" which Timothy had known from a child, and these he calls "holy" or "sacred" writings. The word *graphie*, "scripture," means writing. He says these scriptures or writings are "holy" because they were "given by inspiration of God." Writing is composed of words. How can any writing be inspired

unless the words of which the writing is composed is¹ inspired. Translate 2 Tim. 3: 16 as you please, and what else can you make of it but a positive claim of verbal inspiration?

Apart from textual criticism let us see to what extent God inspired the utterances of Bible writers. Moses wrote the law; and God says: "*I have written unto him (Israel) the great things of my law.*" Hos. 8: 12. Moses was not a man of merely natural functions. God's spirit was put within him (Num. 11: 17, 29). Moses wrote God's commands; his writings therefore were necessarily a spirit-regulated or "God-inspired" performance. The plan of the Temple was given by the spirit: "*the Lord made me understand in writing by his hand upon me * * * the works of this pattern.*" 1 Chron. 28: 11, 12, 19. How could God cause a man to "understand in writing" if he had no interest or supervision over the words of the writing? If words are the signs of ideas, how can the Bible be inspired in "thought," "idea" or "concept" (ion) when we are wholly dependent on words to rightly express thoughts, ideas, and conceptions. If wrong words are used would not wrong "thoughts" be expressed, false "ideas" signified, and erroneous "conceptions" received? Any "degree" of inspiration short of the verbal leaves us without any words of authority from God. Our Lord's language when speaking of David's writings is, "David himself said in the Holy Spirit." Mark 12: 36. He does not say David "thought," but he "said." Says David: "The spirit of the Lord spake by me and his *word* was in my tongue." 2 Sam. 23: 2. He

does not say, "The spirit gave me a thought, idea, or conception," but the spirit "spake." Words were uttered. To Jeremiah God says: "I have put my *words* in thy mouth." 1: 9. In a prophecy of Christ God's promise is, "I will put my *words* in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all I shall command him." Deut. 18: 18. Moses pleaded his lack of eloquence when God commissioned him to deliver Israel from bondage; to him God promised, "I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt speak." Ex. 4: 10-12. On another occasion he fulfilled his promise in this verbal way: "*Write thou these words.*" Ex. 34: 27. The Lord's promise to this man, the reader will please notice, is not, "I will be with thy head, and give you 'thoughts,' 'ideas' and 'conceptions;'" but with his "mouth" —with his "words." In the same way the spirit inspired the words of the apostles. Matt. 10: 19, 20; Mark 13: 11; Luke 12: 11-12. Without any meditation on their part, without a 'thought,' 'idea,' or 'conception' on their part, the spirit inspired them in the very "hour" of their need, and gave them appropriate "words" to use. Luke 21: 14, 15; Acts 2: 1, 4, 7, 11. The inspiration of the Holy Spirit was independent of the thoughts, ideas, conceptions and wills of the writers. 2 Pet. 1: 21. As they wrote the scriptures by God "given" wisdom (2 Pet. 3: 15, 16), they did not understand their own writings, except as they "searched diligently" into their meaning. 1 Pet. 1: 11, 12. Balaam's dumb ass had no 'thoughts,' 'ideas,' or 'conceptions' to inspire, but "the Lord opened the mouth of the ass." Num. 22:

28, 30. Caiaphas uttered words "not of himself." Jno. 11: 49-52. Here is a case of inspiration independent of thought—"Now this he said not of himself." "Prophecy came not in old time by the will of man," Peter says. Balaam was compelled to speak against his will. He said, "Lo, I am come unto thee; have I now any power at all to say anything? The *word* that God putteth in my mouth, that shall I speak." He did his utmost to curse the Israelites, but as often as he tried it he blessed them. Num. 22: 38; 23: 26. Here is inspiration of words independent of, and in conflict with, the prophet's will. We may go farther and say that independent of any living agency God sometimes has revealed his word to us. With his own hand he wrote the words of his law upon the tables of stone, in the top of smoke-wreathed and fire-crowned Sinai. Ex. 24: 12; 31: 18. "*The writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables*" (Ex. 32: 16) "plainly," that is, legibly and deeply cut (*baar*), Deut. 27: 8, and inspired in every jot and tittle. Matt. 5: 18.* He caused a hand to write upon the festal hall the words, "Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin," to the consternation of Belshazzar and a thousand of his lords. At the baptism of Jesus he said to the multitude, "This is my beloved Son" Matt. 3: 17. Do not let the idea of God speaking words shock you, my reader. Men themselves speak words. When did they

*That our reader may see the full force of our Lord's declaration in Matth. 5: 18, about the "jots and tittles," not one of which was to pass away unfulfilled, we will say that the "jot" (*iota*) was the smallest letter in the Greek and Hebrew alphabet; and that the "tittle" (*Kerata*) means the ornamental curls of Hebrew letters. Let those who deny the verbal inspiration of the Bible, take notice that Christ vouches for its inspiration from the "least Commandment" (V. 19) to the "jot," the least letter in the alphabet: and from the letter "jot," to the mere "tittle"—the insignificant "horns" or curls of the letters.

learn to talk, and from whom? Some people assume that language is natural to man, because he has organs of pronunciation; but one might as reasonably argue that Greek is natural to man because he has the power of pronouncing that language. Who ever spoke a language he did not first learn from another? We have our vernacular—the language our mother taught us. Adam had no mother, so he could have had no mother tongue. God must have taught him to speak *viva voce*,¹ for language is only the imitation of distinct and intelligible sounds. The first human speaker must have heard God himself speak. The Bible is composed of words: Words express thoughts. It is not possible to express thoughts apart from words, or even to entertain them. If the Bible is not verbally inspired, it is not inspired at all: it is only a human composition. But 2 Tim. 3: 16 says “all scriptures” are God-breathed. Whether they were written or spoken by Balaam, the false prophet, contrary to his will, or by his ass, which was “dumb,” or by Paul the educated and cultured apostle, or by Christ “the Holy One,” God’s word has come to us by “inspiration of God,” “not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, *but which the Holy Spirit teacheth*” (1 Cor. 2: 13; Jno. 3: 34; 5: 47; 6: 63, 68; 12: 48; 15: 7); and we must accept it in every “jot and tittle” as being, “not the word of man, but as it is in truth, **THE WORD OF GOD.**” 1 Thess. 2: 13.

BOOKS AND BOOKLETS

THE BIBLE: ITS PRINCIPLES
AND TEXTS

AS indicated by the title, this book is divided into three sections: The first consists of a remarkable disquisition on "The Bible"; the second simplifies its "Principles" in formulated propositions; and the third expounds in a clear, impressive, and homiletic manner, particular "Texts." The knotty and perplexing texts of the Bible are untied and solved satisfactorily to the most fastidious and critical. More than one hundred and fifteen Bible subjects of intense interest to every Bible student are formally discussed. Both scholarly and simple—the child is fascinated and taught; the scholar is entertained and instructed. Bible-lovers, here is a feast for you. Throw open the door of your home; let "The Bible, Its Principles and Texts" come in and bless you and your family. 309 pages, 5x7½ inches, durably and handsomely bound in whole cloth, with title embossed on back in gold. Single copy, \$1.10; two or more copies \$1.00 each. Order of the Author,

ROBT. G. HUGGINS,

10623 Lee Ave.,

Cleveland, Ohio.

ADDENDUM

A listing of typographical and reference errors, and definitions of archaic words, occurring in the first printing of this book. To locate a note, find the Page and Note Number below.

General Notes: Throughout the book are these abbreviations:

Jno. = John
mar. = marginal

Page & Note No.	Note
3-1	1 Cor. 2:14
3-2	1 Cor. 2:10, 16
11-1	1 Jno. 2:27
11-2	grace
14-1	Neh. 8:1-12
15-1	enigma
16-1	understandability
17-1	berated
17-2	Inapplicable — omit
19-1	Include vs. 9
20-1	Deut. 17:19, 20
21-1	at once
21-2	Jno. 15:11
24-1	relevant
26-1	Inapplicable — omit
26-2	1 Pet. 1:23
26-3	puzzled
26-4	vague
26-5	supreme
26-6	inherent power
27-1	trifling
27-2	sarcastic
28-1	divine
28-2	Jno. 10:37, 38
28-3	wise
28-4	saw
29-1	Gen. 2:17
30-1	Inapplicable — omit
30-2	how
31-1	“ <i>dunamis</i> ”
31-2	swiftness

ADDENDUM

Page & Note No.	Note
32-1	1 Cor. 4:15
34-1	wraith
34-2	wicked
34-3	deep
36-1	visionary
36-2	victim
36-3	pitiful
36-4	John Bunyan was the author of <i>Pilgrim's Progress</i> (1678), a work of allegorical fiction. The reference here probably means "trapped in doubts and assailed by despair."
36-5	dismal
36-6	testified
36-7	Ascertainable
37-1	1 Pet. 1:23
37-2	Rom. 10:17 & 1 Tim. 4:6
37-3	<i>faulty reasoning</i>
38-1	(Jno.) 15:26
38-2	1 Thess. 4:18
39-1	Psa. 95:7, 8
39-2	Rev. 2:29
39-3	valueless
40-1	Include vs. 9
41-1	absolute
41-2	Include vs. 18
42-1	2 Jno. 9
42-2	formal inquiry
43-1	infallibility
43-2	summary
47-1	Include vs. 9
47-2	2 Jno. 9
48-1	Rev. 11:15
48-2	Isa. 32:1 & Isa. 2:2, 3
48-3	Luke 19:12-26
48-4	Micah
48-5	Zech. 8:7, 8
49-1	Rev. 20:7-9, 12-15
49-2	Rev. 20:4-6
49-3	1 Cor. 15:24, 25
49-4	Isa. 42:1-4
49-5	Include vs. 6-9
49-6	wholly destroyed
49-7	1 Cor. 15:24-26
50-1	Isa. 7:14

ADDENDUM

Page & Note No.	Note
50-2	Heb. 9:24
50-3	Eccl. 9:4-6, 10
51-1	(Matt.) 15:16-20
51-2	Include vs. 29
51-3	Include vs. 28, 29
52-1	1 Cor. 5; (entire chapter)
52-2	Jno. 6:48-59
57-1	(Dan. 3) v. 25
59-1	(Jno. 5) v. 36
60-1	Jno. 1:29-36
61-1	foreknowledge
62-1	wraith
62-2	(Job) 14:14
63-1	Also Isa. 53:3 & Luke 17:25
65-1	Inapplicable — omit
68-1	monetary
69-1	complicates
70-1	work against
71-1	vast
71-2	certify
72-1	(Acts) 11:5
75-1	Heb. 11:5
76-1	(Sabbath keeping, mar.) (Heb. 4:4-12)
76-2	near
76-3	one (thousand years)
77-1	outcome
78-1	(Heb. 11:5)
78-2	basic principle
78-3	“The Art of Writing and Preaching Sermons”
79-1	unexplainable
79-2	Psa. 49:6-10
79-3	Job 30:23
81-1	understandable
82-1	(Gen.) 42:36
83-1	(Psa. 37:10)
83-2	(Heb. 11:) (vs. 5)
83-3	(Heb. 11:) (vs. 7)
84-1	unbreakable
84-2	affirm
86-1	undeniable
86-2	Logically
87-1	(1 Chron. 13:8)
87-2	Neh. 12:36
87-3	shameless people

ADDENDUM

Page & Note No.	Note
88-1	(1 Cor.) 14:7
90-1	light,"
90-2	urgent
91-1	(Gen. 5:) v. 1
91-2	Jude 3-11
91-3	Eph. 4:18
92-1	innocent
93-1	plundered
93-2	nations
94-1	(Luke 24:49)
95-1	vexation
96-1	examples
96-2	Inapplicable — omit
97-1	Inapplicable — omit
97-2	2 Cor. 5, v. 8
98-1	1 Cor. 15:44, 46
99-1	Def.: inapplicable
100-1	Jno. 14:16
100-2	Jno. 16:13
100-3	named
101-1	in the form of parables
103-1	a part for the whole
104-1	Heb. 2:14
105-1	2 Cor. 3:17
106-1	Phil. 2:7
107-1	robots
109-1	on an island and seagoing
111-1	roundabout description
112-1	From Antinomian sect — belief that faith without obedience is enough for salvation
112-2	rabbis
116-1	clarity
118-1	(Mic. 4:1)
118-2	In this article numbers given in parenthesis (1), (2), (5), etc., are verses in Mic. 4.
118-3	timidity
119-1	faulty reasoning
119-2	triviality
120-1	depart
121-1	delusions
122-1	2 Chron. 36:16
123-1	Mic. 4:3, 4
131-1	Rev. 2:29
131-2	1 Thess. 1:8

ADDENDUM

Page & Note No.	Note
133-1	curtain
135-1	desire
135-2	murky
136-1	Error in transcription; Eliseus is not the same as Elijah. Luke 4:27 shows that Eliseus is the same as Elisha (2 Kings 5:9). See also 1 Kings 19:13, 15 & 16.
137-1	(1 Tim. 1:15)
138-1	(Luke 1:1-4)
141-1	granted
143-1	(Luke 23:34)
143-2	(Acts 2:42)
145-1	(verses 9, 13, 22)
147-1	(Isa. 9:6)
147-2	Inapplicable — omit
147-3	Dan. 7:22
148-1	(Matt. 26:28)
153-1	1 Cor. 4:15
153-2	Delete non-existent vs. 22
154-1	(vs. 15, 16)
155-1	1 Thess. 4:14
160-1	basic principle
162-1	Luke 1:52, 53
164-1	lethargic
164-2	Luke 13:6-9
165-1	Canticles — Song of Solomon 2:1
165-2	Song of Solomon, Chap. 1:
165-3	cypress
166-1	Jer. 2:13
167-1	shouted
167-2	long-winded
170-1	formally logical
171-1	<i>essential</i>
172-1	assurance
175-1	obscure
175-2	habitual
175-3	Dan. 11:45
176-1	1 Cor. 15:50
177-1	Include vs. 7 & 8
177-2	Luke 1:32
178-1	long
179-1	Mark 14:3
181-1	tendency
181-2	Matt. 25:7

ADDENDUM

Page & Note No.	Note
182-1	simultaneous
183-1	Entire chapters — Matt. 24 & 25
185-1	elders
186-1	generally
188-1	totally destroyed
189-1	Jas. 2:25
189-2	(Jude), vs. 5, 6
192-1	than
192-2	Acts 26:22, 23
193-1	ignorance
193-2	cut off
193-3	treacherous
193-4	habitual
193-5	false story
194-1	Include verse 37
194-2	upstart
196-1	congregation
197-1	Pertaining to Roman Catholic Church &/or Pope
200-1	that is
203-1	interpretation
203-2	Jno. 5:30
204-1	James 3:17
204-2	Inapplicable — omit
206-1	Jno. 8:23
206-2	Jno. 8:
206-3	clear
209-1	John 20:19, 26
210-1	Gen. 19:11
212-1	Job 4:17
213-1	Isa. 2:
213-2	Isa. 2:
216-1	Dan. 3:25
217-1	point by point
219-1	Luke 18:31-34
219-2	John 3:14
221-1	Dan. 3:25
222-1	Dan. 3:25
229-1	conscientious
232-1	your
233-1	save
233-2	Isa. 25:9; 26:1, 20, 19
234-1	Luke 16:19-31
234-2	(Acts 2:25-31)

ADDENDUM

Page & Note No.	Note
238-1	stubbornly
239-1	(verse 13)
239-2	Esther 5:
240-1	Inapplicable— omit
240-2	Gen. 12:1-3
240-3	(verse 10)
241-1	(Jer. 4:13
242-1	Inapplicable — omit
242-2	Mark 8:24)
242-3	(Psa.) 97:1
242-4	cause
242-5	(Isa.) 34:4, 5
243-1	pressed
244-1	writing
245-1	a
245-2	Psa. 102:25 & 26
247-1	worldly
247-2	Col. 2:20
247-3	repealed
248-1	critical analysis
248-2	beginning to be
250-1	Were
255-1	reigning
256-1	showy
257-1	Jer. 28:3
258-1	Matt.
258-2	(Matt.) 17:23
258-3	(Luke) 24:7 & 46
268-1	time
269-1	argument
274-1	Job 34:15
274-2	Psa. 104:29
274-3	Acts 17:25
274-4	Luke 16:19-31
275-1	1 Cor. 15:3
275-2	1 Cor. 15:4'
284-1	flesh
286-1	Psa. 146:4
291-1	exact opposite
292-1	hazy
293-1	explanation
295-1	Son
295-2	dwellers
296-1	calm

ADDENDUM

Page & Note No.	Note
296-2	Isa. 41:16
298-1	thought
300-1	worthless
301-1	repetitious
301-2	sentence structure
301-3	tearing apart
301-4	<i>inspired by God</i>
303-1	are
306-1	<i>orally</i>

INDEX

Adam	106-108, 159, 160, 162-164
“All”	223-234
Altars	140-142
Angels	90-92, 188-191
Apostles	37, 38, 116
Baptism	51, 84-86, 92-95, 128-130, 157-159, 169-174
Begettal	31-33
Belief	18, 40
Bible	11-43, 47, 300-306
Body	97, 98, 209-211, 263-266
Bread (Breaking of)	52
Brethren	160-162, 174-178
Christ	116-118, 131-133, 143-145, 150-156, 191-194, 209-211
Christ (Pre-existence?)	57-60, 133-136, 197-207, 216-223, 274-280
Commandments	52
Communion	52
Conversion	33, 93-95
Covenant	88-90, 147-150, 292, 293
Creation	173, 174
Creed	126-128
Days and Nights	238, 239
Days and Years	253-258
Death	63, 64, 106-108, 142, 143, 266-274, 280-290
Devil	252, 253
Disciples	196, 197
Doctrines	52, 53
Door	179-183
Earth	239-248
Elijah	290-300
Eliseus	136
Elisha	136
Enjoyment	21
Enoch	75-83
Eve	106-108
Faith	27-28
Father, Son and Holy Spirit	50

INDEX

Father's House (Mansions)	112-114
Feet-washing	178, 179
God	60-63, 145-147, 152, 153, 207-209, 260-263
Gospel	47, 173, 174
Grave (Hades)	234-238, 274-280
Hades (Grave)	234-238, 274-280
Heaven	112-114, 202-207, 290-300
House	112, 113
Immortality	97, 98
Infants	128-130
Inspiration	300-306
Isaiah	118-123
Israel	118-123
John (the Baptist)	59, 60
Kingdom (of God)	48-50, 95-97, 102-104
Life	250, 251
Man	50, 284-290
Millennium	188
Miracles	194, 195
Music	86-88
Nations	110-112
Nature (of Man)	50
Obedience	19-21, 29-31
Prayer	143
Preaching (Christ)	197-201
Pre-existence	57-60, 133-136, 197-207, 216-223, 274-280
Principalities and Powers	110-112
Promise	207-209
Prophecy	108-110, 139-143
Psalms	191-194
Reading	16
Reign (of Christ)	49, 50, 123-126
Restoration	118-126
Resurrection	50, 51, 114-116, 143-145, 195, 196, 270-274
Sacrifices	123-126
Saints	114-116
Salvation	36, 37, 64-67
Sanctification	33-36
Scriptures	300-306
Seals	139, 140
Sheep and Goats	160-162

INDEX

Sin	73-75, 183-185
Son (of God)	57-59
Soul	69-71, 97, 98, 139-143
Spirit (Holy)13, 25-27, 37-39, 50, 93-95, 99-102,104-106, 157-159, 171, 172, 207-209
Spirit (Man and Beast)	50, 211-216, 258-284
Sprinkling128-130, 171, 172
Sword	116-118
Tabernacle	263-266
Thieves	137-139, 169-171
Tithing	67-69
Tree	164-168
Tree (of Life)	162-164
Understanding	17, 28
Visions	71-73, 139-143
Voice	130, 131, 139-143
Wicked	185-187
World	248-250
Years	253-258

