

THE
PINE
WOODS
BIBLE
CLASS
—
WILSON

1888

Archives Wilson. W. H.
268.62 The Pine Woods Bible Class
W7540
n. d.
c. 2

1607

e

4607

OREGON BIBLE COLLEGE
OREGON, ILLINOIS

THE PINE WOODS

OREGON BIBLE COLLEGE
OREGON, ILLINOIS

BIBLE CLASS.

By W. H. WILSON.

OREGON BIBLE COLLEGE
OREGON, ILLINOIS

A. S. WILSON, PUBLISHER,
420 N. WILLOW AVE., AUSTIN STA.,
CHICAGO, ILL.

4607

ARCH
268.62
W 754k
mid
copy 2

—
----THIS VOLUME----
IS RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED
TO ALL LOYAL CITIZENS OF THE
COMMONWEALTH OF ISRAEL
—

CONTENTS.

LESSON.	PAGE.
I. The Root of Christianity.	9
II. "He Raiseth Up. . . .	22
III. May Have a Right. . .	37
IV. The Poor and the Rich Man.	46
V. Paul's Desire to Depart and be with Christ.	62
VI. You Need to be Born Over Again.	72
VII. Christian Baptism. . .	82
VIII. How to Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. .	123

4607

IX.	Is the Gospel an Hidden or a Revealed Message?	145
X.	“This Generation Shall Not Pass, Till all These Things be Fulfilled.”	176
XI.	Was our Lord’s Prayers Always Answered? . . .	195
XII.	The One Name. . . .	216
XIII.	Miscellaneous Questions Relating to the King- dom.	232
XIV.	“Ye Shall Be as Gods.”	255
XV.	Is the Bible View of Eter- nal Life, Scientific?	270
XVI.	The Two Babylons. . . .	286
XVII.	The Sacred Name. . . .	303
XVIII.	The Mission of Jesus. . .	320
XIX.	Absent From the Body.	331
XX.	Spiritualism Accounted For.	353

CONTENTS.

5

XXI.	“The Bottomless Pit.”	393
XXII.	“Not of This World.”	411
XXIII.	The Future Judgment.	419
XXIV.	The Sabbath.	439
XXV.	The Strongest Incentive to Watchfulness. . . .	450
XXVI.	“Cunningly Devised Fa- bles.”	462

P R E F A C E.

The lessons contained in this volume, are the result of many years of careful and critical study, being an honest endeavor to arrive at a more accurate understanding of Holy Scripture, unbiased by the creeds and opinions of men.

These lessons were prepared more especially for the instruction of **YOUNG PEOPLE**. An effort has been made to make the lessons very simple and plain.

The Bible Class style makes it very attractive, easy to read, and so much easier to comprehend.

The series of lessons here presented would be a very profitable one for Bible Classes, Young Peoples' Societies, Berean Bands, Sunday School Bible Classes, etc., to study by course. Note the arguments,

and consider the Scriptures cited in support of the argument, and you will not only find it interesting, but very instructive. If young people would follow these suggestions, they would be surprised at the rapid progress they would make.

There is not room enough in this volume to print all the many Pine Woods Bible Class Lessons, that have appeared in "The Restitution," in years that are past. I have enough in reserve, that would easily make another volume.

The Book, as you will observe, is printed from large, clear, open type, so that the aged, and those who have weak eyes, may read it with comfort.

Young men, who are studying for the Evangelical work, will find this Book a valuable aid. Note well the exposition of difficult texts.

This Book is sent forth on its mission with a sincere desire, that it may lead many poor wanderers to the fount of eternal rest.

LESSON I.

Teacher. At our last meeting, our time was consumed in perfecting the organization of the Class, and in laying out a plan by which we expect to conduct the future investigation of the various Bible topics which may be presented for critical study.

We find such study a profitable use of time, and we should spend as much of it as possible in a diligent search for Divine wisdom. Fleshly-minded people cannot see anything more profitable than to spend both their time and energies in the search for, and the acquisition of perishable wealth.

Those, however, who have acquired Divine wisdom, are much better judges of real values. I know of a wise man who has had experimental knowledge with

both. He said: "How much better is it to get wisdom than gold! and to get understanding is rather to be chosen than silver!" The same man further concluded: "Wisdom is the principal thing; therefore get wisdom; with all thy getting get understanding."

"Happy is the man that findeth wisdom, and the man that getteth understanding. For the merchandise of it is better than the merchandise of silver, and the gain thereof than fine gold. She is more precious than rubies: and all the things thou canst desire are not to be compared unto her."

Pine Woods Bible Class have determined to spend their energies in the acquisition of that which exceeds in value either gold, silver, or rubies.

We will now proceed to the study of our first lesson. Will someone please name the topic?

Albert. The topic selected by the Class one week ago to-night, is:

THE ROOT OF CHRISTIANITY.

Teacher. Why was this topic chosen?

Carrie. Why, Arloa suggested that the proper place to begin our studies would be to start at the base, foundation or root. We all thought as she did, and so George suggested "The Root of Christianity," as the title for our first lesson.

Teacher. If I should ask you to select a portion of Scripture as a basis for this lesson, which would you choose?

Ella. I would select 1 Cor. xiii.

Q. Do you find a basic principle in it?

A. I certainly do.

Q. Please name it.

A. This chapter presents love as the basic principle which gives vitality to the entire Christian system.

Q. Please reveal what you have discovered therein?

A. We all know that a tongue gifted with oratory is much prized; we may hold an audience spell-bound by using the oratorical powers of men and angels, with which to picture in glowing colors

the glory of the good time coming, and if love be not the inspiration of such oratory, its value amounts to nothing more than sounding brass, or the tinkling of a cymbal, which for the time being may please the ear with harmonious sounds, but it accomplishes nothing more.

Q. What other lesson does this chapter reveal, to show that love is the real root principle?

A. It shows that men may become such gifted students of prophecy as to be able to solve difficult problems by attaining a marvelous degree of knowledge, and may even have faith strong enough to command the removal of the everlasting mountains; and yet, if such knowledge and mighty faith shall be destitute of the inspiration of love as a root principle, the Divine estimate will be "nothing," "it profiteth me nothing."

Q. Well, let us consider another test. Suppose some one should give all he possesses for the relief of the poor, and some other motive foreign to the real root

principle of Christianity should prompt his gifts, what would be the Divine verdict with regard to such charity?

A. "It profiteth nothing."

Q. Well, then, let me propose a severer test still. Suppose a person should be burned as a martyr, at the stake, on account of preaching the Glad Tidings, and a spirit of fleshly bravado, in place of sincere love, should inspire the martyrdom, will that avail in the day when judgment will be rendered?

A. It will not. "No profit," will still be the Divine verdict.

Q. Can you give some rule by which we may really know those who have the root of the matter in them?

A. Yes, we can.

Q. Please give the characteristics of such people?

A. We may know them because they "suffer long," and are "kind," "envy" is not in their heart, they are not vain and "puffed up," they don't "behave" in an "unseemly" manner, they are not selfish

people, always “seeking their own” benefit, and furthermore, they have so disciplined their temper, that they are no more “easily provoked,” neither are they ever taking an account of, and “thinking” about “evil” things, because their thoughts have been taken “captive” for “Christ.” They no longer take pleasure in “unrighteousness,” but on the contrary they do most heartily “rejoice in THE truth.” They have also learned to “bear” adverse “things,” without easily becoming “impatient,” and will “believe,” “hope” and “endure” unto the end.

Q. Is this root principle as eternal as the great Creator?

A. It is. The chapter selected as a base for our lesson closes by naming three things which abide, and change not.

Q. Name the first of this trio?

A. We have faith as the first, which in the sweet by and by will be lost in fruition, and next comes hope, a child of faith, which in due time will also have completed its mission, but love, the root

principle of Christianity will become intensified, as the years roll by, having neither beginning or end of days.

Q. Please explain why it has neither beginning or end of days?

A. Because "God is love." "Love is of God." Its presence is gloriously manifest in every work of his hands, and is the controlling principle in all his dealings with mankind. It is also his purpose to people the new earth with inhabitants in whose lives this root principle has found a permanent home.

Q. Should this principle abide in God's people now?

A. Unless it does so abide, it never will hereafter.

Q. How does this Divine principle manifest itself in believers at the present time?

A. This holy principle awakens in the believer's heart a responsive harmony which is in accord with the Divine, and manifests itself by breaking forth in rapturous adoration and praise, which

fills the heart with sweetness, joy and peace, which is akin to strains of heavenly music, which is in unison with the Divine Author, from whence it flows. It is a consolation which satisfies the inward craving as nothing else can do.

Q. How does it affect believers while suffering adversity?

A. In adversity it is a stay and solace. We may liken it to a graceful vine, whose tendrils lay hold upon a sturdy oak, and so lifts itself out of a dismal swamp, and ascends upward, into the glorious sunshine. So love with its caressing tendrils attaches itself to the Son of God, and lifts its possessor out of adverse surroundings, into the cheering sunshine of God's favor; thus healing the broken heart, and enabling one to look beyond the present, and by faith view the evergreen shore.

Q. Is its sweet influence far-reaching?

Ella. Oh yes, I have both seen and felt its pure influence. It may be com-

pared to the aroma of the sweet-scented flower which cannot be confined to the garden in which it grew, but is taken up by the passing breeze, and made to regale the senses of others; so hearts filled with divine love, cannot confine its influence, but it will be felt by all those with whom they may associate.

Q. Then this treasure must be a valuable gem to possess?

A. It is even so. Oh, it is a priceless gem, one which graces the brow of the spotless Son of God, the luster of which can never fade, but will increase in brilliancy as the endless cycles of eternity shall succeed each other. "Love never faileth."

Q. Are the people who spend both their time and money in proclaiming this peaceful message, considered among our Heavenly Father's blessed ones?

Arloa. Yes, indeed, they are. We read in Isa. lii. 7, as follows: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that pub-

lisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation, that saith unto Zion, thy God reigneth.”

Q. Does the root spirit of love, give an inspiration to the glad message of the Kingdom?

A. Yes, it does. The grand old “gospel of the kingdom” is a beautiful love message, which thrills the heart of devout believers as none other can. It is a herald of peace, it is sweet music to the ears of those who know the joyful sound; it causes the heart of all such to shout for joy, and to be happy, even while suffering adversity. It lets in the full sunshine of God’s love, and as a consequence, peace and contentment reigns within. It causes believers to love the brotherhood, and to be very anxious to publish the glad tidings of good things to perishing sinners, also.

Q. Can this most beautiful message of life, carry us beyond the storm cloud?

A. There is nothing that can compare unto it. Why, should even clouds of

inky blackness temporarily obscure our vision, the glorious sun of hope, presently emerges from behind the cloud, with a dazzling blaze of glory, which dispels the cloud, like the fog flees before the rising sun.

Q. When we preach the message of the kingdom, what shall we say?

A. "Say unto Zion, thy God reigneth---in the person of his Son---Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion." "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem; behold, thy King cometh unto thee; he is just, and having salvation."

Q. Is not the gospel of the kingdom a message of peace to obedient believers even now, while we experience both sorrow and joy?

A. Yes. It is a message of peace, for even now it calms the troubled sea of life while its raging billows threaten to overwhelm us, and its care and vexations distract us. "Thy watchmen shall lift up the voice; with the voice together

shall they sing; for they shall see eye to eye when the Lord shall bring again Zion. Break forth into joy, sing together ye waste places of Jerusalem; for the Lord hath comforted his people, he hath redeemed Jerusalem.”

Q. Does this love-inspired hope, lead to purity of life?

A. It certainly does. It is not only a joyful, a comforting, but also a purifying hope, as well.

Listen: “He that hath THIS hope in him purifieth himself even as he is pure.”

Q. Is not the character of a pure one, to be greatly admired?

A. Yes. A writer once said, such a person is “a beautiful character, one in which our Lord’s pure image dwells, is the truest wealth. Moth and rust cannot corrupt it; thieves cannot steal it. It is the possession that will stand the crucial test of trial, sorrow, and the fires of affliction, and come forth as silver seven times refined, it is the only treasure we can carry with us through the garden gates into the

pure sunlight of the eternal world.”

Amid the harsh realities of this life, they preserve a sweet and gentle spirit, which can feel for other's woes, and pour the healing balm of heavenly love into every wounded heart.

They are God's messengers of peace, whose mission is to be a blessing to those who need their ministrations. They are flowers full of sweet odors; they leave only fragrant memories behind them.

Teacher. The Class are unanimous in concluding that we have discovered the real root of Christianity.

LESSON II.

Teacher. Good evening, I am pleased to meet with you again, after one week's absence. I trust that our study to-night will be as profitable as it was last week. What lesson have you chosen?

Ella. Well, Carrie and myself were conversing about the contention of the Disciples, as to which of them should be the greatest in the Kingdom of God. We thought the subject of Future Exaltation would be an excellent topic for to-night.

Teacher. Is that the title which you have chosen?

Ella. No. The title we have selected, is:

“HE RAISETH UP.”

Teacher. Upon what Scripture do you base this lesson?

Carrie. Ella and myself both thought that 1 Sam. ii. 8, would be a good starting point.

Teacher. Please read it?

A. it reads as follows: "He raiseth up the poor out of the dust, and lifteth up the beggar from the dunghill, to set them among princes, and to make them inherit the throne of glory."

Q. What do the words, "He raiseth up," signify?

A great exaltation.

Q. How great an exaltation?

A. That must be measured as to how great was their previous low estate.

Q. Could there be a much lower estate than that mentioned in the text?

A. Hardly. It is about the lowest estate a person could reach, to become a beggar from the dunghill.

Q. Do princes choose such people for their associates?

A. They do not.

Q. Is it at all probable that a beggar

from the dunghill would be permitted by men to ascend a throne, and rule over them as a king?

A. It is not at all probable.

Q. Then how are we to understand this language?

A. It is to be seen in the language, "HE raiseth up."

Q. Will God set a man among princes, and give him a throne of glory, simply because he happened to be a beggar taken from the dunghill?

A. No, he will not.

Q. Please explain?

A. Man has regard for the flesh, and an exalted position, but God has not. If the beggar from the dunghill has complied with the conditions of sonship, has a pure heart, has the root of Christianity in him, he is sure to be "set among princes, and made to inherit the throne of glory."

Q. Will self-exaltation answer?

Lucy. I should say that it will not.

Q. Why not?

A. We read in Matt. xxiii. 12: "Who-soever exalteth himself shall be abased."

Q. What is the surest way to a lasting exaltation?

A. "He that shall humble himself shall be exalted."

Q. How does God regard the proud and self-exalted?

A. "God resisteth the proud."

Q. If God resists the proud, how will he regard the humble?

A. "And giveth grace to the humble."

Q. What will be the wisest thing to do then?

A. "Humble yourselves, therefore, under the mighty hand of God."

Q. For what reason?

A. That "he may exalt you in due time." 1 Pet. v. 5, 6.

Q. What will the exaltation in "due time," consist of?

A. "To set them among princes."

Q. Anything else?

3

A. Yes.

Q. What is it?

A. "And to make them inherit the throne of glory."

Q. From how low an estate can such a great exaltation come?

A. "The poor out of the dust," "the beggar from the dunghill."

Teacher. Oh, dear children of God, do you find your frail bark tempest-tossed, rocked to and fro upon the adverse billows of a stormy life? Do you find your fears great, and strength small, when a dark storm-cloud overcasts your sky? If you find the contest fierce and strong, and you feel faint and weary in your efforts to stem the tide, take courage, and remember that "He raiseth up."

Peace be unto you, my brethren, is the sweet benediction of the Prince of Peace. Should a dark cloud cast a shade over your life, and the turbulent roaring of the sea of adversity alarm you, then place trust in him who can calm the troubled waters, be still and let your con-

fidence center in him who "raiseth up the poor out of the dust, and lifteth up the beggar from the dunghill, to set them among princes, and to make them inherit the throne of glory."

Now don't you think that it will be so helpful and encouraging to us all, to let our minds dwell more constantly upon these blessed things?

Bessie. I do. Let us bear in memory that God will not slight "the poor out of the dust," or even "the beggar from dunghill," who have complied with the conditions of sonship, and whose life is in harmony with the Divine purpose. They may be of very "low estate" now, but they have a "high calling," which the proud and exalted of this life can never attain unto. They are called to be the associates of "princes," which will far outrank the princes of this world, and beside all this, they will be made to "inherit the throne of glory."

Q. I sometimes fear that many who profess to be of "the called according to

his purpose," do not from the heart, fully believe what they profess to, because if they did, they would care less for the things that perish, and think about, and labor more for the eternal, don't you?

Lud. It does really seem so. I was thinking somewhat along this line last night. I was all alone, Carrie and the children having gone out to make a call on brother and sister Smith. I thought that if such people really appreciated the greatness of the "prize of the high calling," they would be willing to make much greater sacrifices for it. I fell into meditation about "the eternal weight of glory," and the magnificence of "the throne of glory."

It was a calm still night. I wheeled my chair around, and looked out of the window, and just then, the moon peered out from behind a fleecy cloud, and illuminated the landscape with glory. As I viewed this beautiful sight, my heart was lifted up in adoration of the great Creator, who has thus so beautifully adorned

the work of his hands. And yet, this magnificence "shall be confounded," and even the sun, the glorious orb of day, will hide its face in shame, when "the throne of glory" shall be established in Mount Zion; for then, he whose personal glory out-ranks the sun, "shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously." And all those who would share in this "throne of glory," will have to reach it along the pathway of humility.

Q. Who "raiseth up," or exalts?

A. We must never forget that it is the Lord.

Q. Whom does he raise up?

A. Why him that overcometh.

Q. If you are only an overcomer, it is of little consequence to him as to how low your position among men has previously been, does it?

A. Why no. He will "make you to inherit the throne of glory," just the same. "To him that overcometh, will I grant to sit with me in my throne." The

heart that can conceive of the glory, and appreciate the honor, conveyed in the above promise, will certainly thrill with joy, and expand with love, toward him who would thus bless an overcomer, even though he may simply be "the poor out of the dust," or "the beggar from the dung-hill."

Of such, it will never be said: "Uneasy the head that wears a crown," because they will have nothing to fear, "for the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."

Q. What throne and kingdom is it that is promised overcomers?

A. That which God has promised to Jesus. The kingdom over which King David, reigned.

Q. Over what nation did he reign as King?

A. The people of Israel.

Q. What Scripture proof have you

that Jesus was promised the same throne and kingdom?

A. In the angel's message to Mary, his mother, as found in Luke i. 30-33.

Q. Please read it?

A. "And the angel said unto her, fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favor with God. And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and he shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end."

Lucy. I want to ask, has not the throne and kingdom of David come to an end? How can Jesus occupy endlessly that which has no existence?

Albert. The throne and kingdom of David is only in suspension for a given time.

Lucy. What Scripture evidence have you to sustain the idea of suspension?

4607

OREGON BIBLE COLLEGE
OREGON, ILLINOIS

A. I will read a selection from Ezek. xxi. 25-27.

“Thou profane and wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, thus saith the Lord God; remove the diadem, take off the crown: this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him.”

Lucy. Oh, yes; I see, now, it was only overturned until a lowly one should come, who would have a right to this overturned throne and kingdom of David; and I know that lowly one is Jesus, because God promised it to him. But I want to ask, did Jesus' disciples expect the kingdom to restored back to Israel?

A. Certainly they did; note their enquiry in Acts i. 6: “When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?”

Q. And will this throne of David, be

“the throne of glory,” that we have been talking about?

A. It will.

Q. Well, I want to ask if there is anything being done, at the present time, towards the reorganization of this Kingdom of Israel?

A. There is.

Q. Won't you please tell us what is being done?

A. I will. You will doubtless realize that when the Commonwealth of Israel is reorganized, the Lord will need a large body of assistants to help him in the administration of the affairs of the kingdom. These assistants are now being selected.

Q. And do tell us who they are?

A. They are the ones mentioned in the Scripture lesson: “He raiseth up the poor out of the dust, and lifteth up the beggar from the dunghill, to set them among princes, and to make them inherit the throne of glory.”

But we must remember that no one

can ever "inherit the throne of glory," unless they shall first become citizens of the Commonwealth of Israel. No alien will receive any recognition whatever.

Q. Where do you find Scripture authority for your statements?

A. I refer you to Eph. ii. 11, 12: "Remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, . . . that at that time ye were without Christ,---on account of---being ALIENS from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world."

Q. How can a person become a citizen of the Commonwealth of Israel?

A. No one can be a citizen of the United States, unless he shall first cease to be an alien, by renouncing his allegiance to his native country. And even so, no one can become a citizen of the Commonwealth of Israel, unless he shall first renounce his relationship as a "Gentile in the flesh." We cannot at the same time, be both an Israelite and a Gentile.

Q. When this change is effected, then we cease to be an "alien," or "foreigner," do we not?

A. Why yes. See Eph. ii. 19: "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God."

Q. What is the law governing citizenship?

A. The law by which an alien can be made a citizen, and an heir to "the throne of glory," is given in the third chapter of Galatians.

Q. To whom was the plan originally revealed?

A. To Abraham and his seed.

Q. Who is Abraham's seed?

A. See Gal. iii. 16: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not and to seeds, as of many, but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ."

Q. How can Gentiles come into the Abrahamic stock, and heirship?

A. See Gal. iii. 27-29: "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. . . . And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

Q. Before a person can be received into the Abrahamic family, should not such an one understand and believe a system of truth, known as the Faith of of Abraham?

A. Most assuredly. That is an important part of the naturalization service. See Rom. iv. 12: "And the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham."

As to what is the faith of our father Abraham, we will consider at some other time, as it is now time to adjourn the class.

LESSON III.

Teacher. We are now about to engage in the study of our third lesson. I am well pleased with our work, so far, and I trust the good work will continue.

What is the subject chosen for study to-night?

Albert. By general consent, the following has been selected:

MAY HAVE A RIGHT.

Teacher. What Scripture have you chosen as a starting point for our study?

Arloa. Rev. xxi. 14, has been chosen:

Teacher. Please read it.

Arloa. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

Teacher. People, generally, are very

sensitive over their personal rights, and will often times, hotly contend for them.

That to which a person has a legal right to possess, he will boldly claim as his own. If property has been left him by will, he does not go into the Probate Court to beg for possession, but to claim it as a right.

My mind reverts to a very rich possession, and it depends largely upon the personal acts of the heirs, as to whether they can claim the inheritance or not. The right I speak of relates to the tree of life, and an entrance into the beautiful city of the New Jerusalem, the glorious city of our God.

If you have a right to this inheritance, you can lay claim to it by right. If you have not, then you may have an undisputed right, by complying with the terms which pledges you a right.

Q. What are the terms?

Bessie. They are given as follows: "Blessed are they that do his---Jesus'---commandments, that they may have a

right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.”

Q. Do many find the way to the tree of life?

A. They do not.

Q. How so?

A. Because “strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life; and few there be that find it.” Matt. vii. 14.

Q. Why is it so difficult to find?

A. Because it needs careful instructions, and also care in following out those instructions.

Q. Who can pass the gate?

A. “He that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.” Matt. vii. 21.

Q. Will some some seek an entrance into the Kingdom, who have no right to enter at all?

A. They will, and will even attempt to plead their own case with the Lord, as follows: “Lord, Lord; have we not prophecied---taught---in thy name?and

in thy name cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?"

Q. How will their argument affect the Lord?

A. His reply will be, "I never knew you." "I am the good Shepherd, and know my sheep."

Q. Don't you suppose that these people professed to be Christians?

A. Oh, yes, there can be no doubt about that.

Q. Don't you suppose that at one time, they might have been genuine believers, but had lost their first love, because their life has not been as correct as it should be?

A. No, I don't think that they ever were approved as genuine gospel believers.

Q. And why not?

A. Because the Lord said "I NEVER knew you."

Q. What do you suppose was the trouble with them?

A. I think that it is quite evident

that they never at any time had entered the "narrow way," through the "gate."

Q. Why do you think it quite evident?

A. If they really had entered, they would, at that time, at least, have been approved. But he said, "I never knew" or approved of you.

Q. Do professed Christians of our time, object to the "narrow way?"

A. They do. When the way of the Gospel of the Kingdom is presented, are we not told that "that way" is too narrow for this broad and enlightened age, and we must have something broad enough to take in all Christians. Besides, you are such a 'little flock,' and 'few there be that find it,' that is, find your 'narrow' and contracted way."

Q. Is it any wonder that Jesus will say unto such people, "I never knew you?"

A. No.

Q. Why?

A. Because "He that saith I know

4

him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." 1 John ii. 4.

Q. What are we to understand by the words, "the truth?"

A. Some specific definite truth, as is indicated by the use of the definite article "the."

Q. What is the design of "the truth?"

A. Says Jesus, "ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Q. Will any truth, do this?

A. No, nothing short of "the truth," will set free.

Q. Now, I want to ask, what is "the truth" otherwise called?

A. "The word of the truth of the gospel."

Q. What does it set free from?

A. From sin, when it is believed and obeyed.

Q. What Scripture evidence have you?

A. See Rom. vi. 18: "But God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness."

Q. How were they "made free from sin?"

A. "Ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine."

Q. Should we observe the "form." alone, but have no "heart" in the act, will that be sufficient to bring salvation?

A. Oh, no! Such people only deceive themselves.

Q. Another person may say, well, I will pay no attention to the "form," the spirit of the matter is the main thing, anyhow. Will that answer?

A. It cannot.

Q. Why?

A. Because God never adds anything that is superfluous to his commands, that we may observe, or not, just as we may feel about it.

Q. What "form" of obedience is required, in order to be properly "baptized into Jesus Christ?"

A. "BURIED with him by baptism."
Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 13, 14.

Q. What "form" does the above Scripture require?

A. A burial.

Q. Well, suppose we change the "form" entirely, and substitute in its place, sprinkling, won't that form do just as well, providing that we call it, that which it is not---"baptism?"

A. That is impossible.

Q. Why so?

A. Because, Rom. vi. 17, requires us, to "obey from the heart that FORM of doctrine which was delivered you," and sprinkling was not the "form" "delivered" unto us.

Q. Suppose we adopt the change, would that be considered as keeping the commandments of Jesus?

A. It could not.

Q. Why?

A. Because it would be a willful disobedience of his commandments.

Q. What will be the result of a failure to keep the commandments of Jesus?

A. A forfeiture of all rights to the "tree of life," and of an "entrance in through the gates into the city."

Teacher. The time has come to dismiss. I trust that our study to-night, will give food for thought during the coming week.

LESSON IV.

Teacher. Good evening, I am glad to see you all looking so happy, to-night, and I trust that you are all in a mood to do some close studying to-night. I think Lud intended to introduce a subject for this time. Please name it, Lud.¶

Lud. I would give the title as

THE POOR AND THE RICH MAN.

I would like to have the lesson based on Luke xvi. 19-31.

Teacher. In what portion of this chapter, are these two men mentioned?

Ella. In verses 19-21.

Q. Please read them?

A. "There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day: and there was a certain beggar, named

Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table."

Q. Tell, me, do you regard this Scripture, as a literal narration of historic facts?

A. I do not.

Q. How do you regard it, then?

A. As parabolic language.

Q. Give your reason?

A. Because parabolic language, used as literal, will produce a discord, not in harmony with facts, and in fact, such discord amounts to the ludicrous. In parabolic language, the thing said, is never literally meant.

Q. Please quote some instances, in order to prove your statement.

A. See Matt. xiii. 37-40. This is the parable of the Wheat and the Tares. When Jesus said "tares," he meant "the children of the devil," when he said "field," he meant "the world," when he said "reapers," he meant "angels."

In Isa. xiv., we have a parable of the King of Babylon descending into "sheol," ---hell---The trees in hell rejoiced and talked about it. The thing said was not meant.

In Hab. ii. 11, we have stone and timbers in a wall, conversing together. The thing said was not meant. In Isa. lv. 12, we have mountains and hills singing, and trees clapping their hands. The thing said was not meant.

In Judges ix. 8-15, we have the account of the proceedings of a convention of trees which met together for the purpose of electing some tree to be a king over the trees. The thing said was not meant.

In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, we have the account of three dead men talking together. The thing said, was not meant.

Teacher. What is the condition of both the rich and the poor man, in our lesson?

Bessie. They are both dead. See verse 22: "It came to pass that the beggar died . . . the rich man also."

Q. Can men while literally dead, talk with each other?

A. They cannot.

Q. Why not?

A. Because they are unable to either think, or retain knowledge of any kind. The dead, "know not anything."

In Psa. cxlvi. 1-4, we read: "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish."

Q. Well, how is it, then, that the three men in our lesson, could converse with each other, after they were both dead and buried?

A. In the same sense that other inanimate things, like stone and timber built in a wall can converse, or trees hold a convention, and make speeches. The fact that those three dead men held conversation, shows clearly that our Scripture lesson, must be parabolic.

Teacher. Let us test the literal idea, a little closer. What is said as to the moral status of these two men?

Arloa. Neither of them are charged with being either good or bad.

Q. Then why was the rich man consigned to torment?

A. The only reason given, is that he wore good clothing, and fared well, as to food.

Q. Now, then, if the cause assigned, will consign one man to the tormenting flame, why not all others, who are thus comfortably fixed with regard to temporal things?

A. If it was a sufficient cause for one, it must be for all.

Q. Was it because Lazarus was a good man, that he was sent to heaven?

A. There is not a word said about his going to heaven, he was carried by angels, into Abraham's literal bosom. If the language is literal, that is where he was taken.

As to his moral state, there is not a

word to show that he was any better than the rich man.

Q. Then why was he carried into Abraham's bosom?

A. The only answer that can be given, is, because he was a loathsome, diseased beggar, fed by the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table.

Q. What was the condition of Lazarus when he was carried into Abraham's bosom?

A. Dead: The text reads as follows: "The beggar died, and was carried by angels, into Abraham's bosom."

Q. Do you mean to say that the angels bore away the dead beggar?

A. The language so reads, and if it is to be taken literal, we are shut up to that one conclusion. We cannot change it to a living beggar. It is the beggar which died, and none other.

Q. Now, at this time, where do we find the rich man?

A. In the tormenting flame.

Q. Did he make a request, of Abraham?

A. Yes, he did.

Q. Well, what was it?

A. "And he cried, and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame?"

Q. Does this language favor the idea of torment in literal fire?

A. It does not.

Q. What is your reason?

A. The amount of water that he requested to be sent to him, could not have any effect upon a person suffering torment, in a flame of literal fire.

Q. How much water did he request to be sent to him?

A. As much as would adhere to the tip of Lazarus' finger.

Teacher. We will now briefly consider the symbolical view.

Q. Whom did the rich man symbolize?

Albert. The Israelitish or Jewish people. They always were, and are to-day, a rich nation. "Purple and fine linen," I understand was the clothing of rich Jews of rank.

Q. In what other sense may the Jews be considered as "the rich man?"

A. See Rom. ix. 3, 4, which reads as follows: "I could wish myself accursed from Christ for my brethren, according to the flesh: who are Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption, the glory, and covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises."

Says Jesus: "Salvation is of the Jews." John iv. 22. The "rich man's" table was loaded down with rich bounties, but not one "crumb" of which, can the poor "beggar" receive, unless it shall first come from the "rich man's table."

Q. What other feature do you see?

A. We have the way in which Abraham and the rich man addressed each other.

Q. In what way did they do so?

A. They recognized each other as "Father" and "Son." The Jew would never on any account thus address a Gentile.

Q. Well, tell us by what name would the Jews address Gentiles?

A. They would call them "dogs," right to their face. See Matt. xv. 26.

Q. What did the "beggar" desire to feed upon?

A. "The crumbs which fell from the rich man's table."

Q. How did Jesus address a Gentile woman, who asked the Lord to grant her a favor?

A. He said, "It is not meet to take the children's bread, and cast it to dogs."

Q. How did she reply?

A. She said: "Truth, Lord; yet the dogs, eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table."

Q. This Gentile woman, then, accepted as "truth" the stigma of "dog," on account of being a Gentile, and was willing to accept the place of a dog,

and "eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table?"

A. Yes. Compare this, with the "beggar," which desired "to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table."

Q. Are Gentiles still "beggars" at the "rich man's table?"

A. Why no.

Q. Well, tell us what has happened?

A. Why, all Gentiles who die, or cease to exist any longer as "Gentiles in the flesh,"---Eph. ii. 11-19---are "carried into Abraham's bosom," and the relation of father and son is then established.

Q. What are we to understand by the phrase, "Abraham's bosom?"

A. The Abrahamic family is composed of all those who have Abraham for their father.

Q. Well, who are Abraham's children?

A. All those who have the faith of Abraham.

Q. Please give Scripture proof?

A. See Rom. iv. 16: "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not only to that which is of the law, but to that also which is of the FAITH of Abraham; who is the FATHER of us all." He is the father of all those who are of "the FAITH of Abraham." All such are in "the bosom of Abraham."

Teacher. We read: "The rich man also died, and was buried." We have already seen that the rich man symbolized the nation of Israel, then the death of the rich man, must signify the death of their kingdom. Did God pass sentence of death, upon that kingdom?

A. He did. The record is found in Amos ix. 8, 9.

Q. Please read it?

A. "Behold, the eyes of the Lord God are upon the sinful kingdom to DESTROY it from off the face of the earth."

Q. What will the burial of the rich man, symbolize?

A. The burial of Israel, after the kingdom ceased to exist.

Q. Where were they buried?

A. Among all nations.

Q. Did God so decree that they should find their graves among the nations during the time of their decease as a nation?

A. He did. See Amos ix. 9: "I will sift the house of Israel among all nations, like as corn is sifted in a sieve."

Q. In the case of the rich man, we read: "In hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torment." Did God predict torment for Israel, during their decease, as a nation?

A. Yes, he did.

Q. Where?

A. In Amos ix. 1-4.

Q. Please read it.

A. "I will slay the last of them with the sword; he that fleeth of them shall not flee away, and he that escapeth of them shall not be delivered. Though

they dig into hell, thence shall my hand take them; though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down. And though they hide themselves in the top of Carmel, I will search and take them out thence; and though they may be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea, thence will I command the serpent, and he shall bite them. And though they go into captivity before their enemies, thence will I command the sword, and it shall slay them; and I will set mine eyes upon them for evil, and not for good."

Q. Have not the above curses relentlessly followed Israel, ever since their exile from their fatherland?

A. They have. It is only of recent date, that they could find a resting place for their weary feet among any nation among whom they have wandered as suffering exiles. They have lifted up their eyes in torment, as the cruel flame of persecution has wrapped itself about them. Even, now, in some countries, as in Russia, the flame has burned fiercely; and

how piteously have they cried for some Lazarus to come and bring the cooling draught. It has caused their eyes to be turned longingly toward their fatherland, as their only haven of rest. They are now seeking, to emerge out of their haden condition among the nations, and to stand upon their feet once more, and exist as a nation among other nations.

Q. "I say then, hath God cast away his people" forever?

A. "God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew." Rom. xi. 1, 2.

Q. "I say then, have they stumbled that they should fall?"

A. "God forbid."

Q. Has their fall, or in other words, has the decease of the "rich man, been of any benefit to "Lazarus?"

A. Yes. "Through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles." The "beggar" has been "carried into Abraham's bosom."

Q. When Israel shall again experience God's favor, what will it amount to?

A. It will be equivalent to a resurrection from the dead.

Q. Do the Scriptures teach this?

A. They do.

Q. Please quote a sample text?

A. All right. I will call your attention to Rom. xi. 15: "For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but LIFE FROM THE DEAD?"

Q. Now, must not the reverse of all this be also true?

A. Most certainly. If "the receiving of them," symbolizes "life from the dead," then "the casting away of them" must likewise symbolize their death.

Q. What does the "great gulf" symbolize, which divides between the Gentiles and Jews? •

Q. The greatest gulf I know of, is the Mosaic law. There can be no fraternal blending between the two, as long as that gulf shall remain. The Gentiles will never come under the bondage of the law,

neither will the Jew give up the law, and accept Jesus as the Christ.

Lud. The rich man requested that some one from the dead should be sent to his brethren. Was the request ever granted?

A. Yes. One of his own brethren, "went unto them from the dead," and over five hundred witnesses have borne testimony to that fact.

Q. Did they repent?

A. No. It came to pass just as Abraham said it would.

Q. What did he say?

A. "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead."

Teacher. I think that we will have to stop right here. I see that we have far exceeded our usual time. I think that we have had a profitable study.

LESSON V.

Teacher. What a blessed privilege it is, to have the opportunity of meeting together in harmony, to engage in the delightful study of God's Holy Book.

Has any one a subject, which they would like to submit for examination?

Carrie. Yes, I have.

Teacher. Please state it.

Carrie. I would like to have an investigation of Phil. i. 20-24, which is frequently called:

PAUL'S DESIRE TO DEPART AND BE
WITH CHRIST.

Teacher. What is the prevailing opinion as to the time when the departure takes place?

Carrie. At death.

Q. What is supposed to take its departure at that time?

A. The immortal soul of the deceased.

Q. What does the text say about immortal souls?

A. Not one word.

Q. In what portion of God's Word, do we find the phrase, immortal soul?

A. It is not a Bible phrase; it is an expression altogether foreign to Holy Scripture.

Q. If the Scriptures are silent about the existence of immortal souls, what evidence have we that the departure spoken of in the text under consideration means the exit of an immortal soul from the body at death?

A. We have nothing stronger than a mere supposition.

Q. Is it a proper way to arrive at an accurate exposition of any Scripture to read in our suppositions, and the thinkings of the fleshly mind?

A. It is not; such a procedure will certainly lead to erroneous conclusions.

Teacher. I will ask Lud, in your reading of history, have you ever read anything about a man named William Tyndale?

A. Yes, I have. He lived in the fifteenth century.

Q. What great work did he accomplish?

A. He was the first man who translated the Scriptures into the English language.

Q. Was he a Bible student, as well as a translator?

A. He certainly was.

Q. Were there people in his day, who taught that departure meant going to heaven, at death?

A. Yes.

Q. What did Tyndale think about such teaching?

A. He said: "In putting departed souls in heaven, hell and purgatory, you destroy the arguments wherewith Christ and Paul, prove the resurrection."

Q. Did he give what he considered to be the true Bible faith?

A. He did. He said: "The true faith putteth the resurrection."

Q. Did he say who it was, that denied that the resurrection is the set time for the departed to meet Christ?

A. He did. He said: "The heathen philosophers denying that, did put that the souls did ever live."

Q. Did he say that these heathen philosophers had some company in their belief?

A. He did. He said: "And the Pope joineth the spiritual doctrine of Christ, and the fleshly doctrine of philosophers together---things so contrary that they cannot agree."

Q. Did he say what the Pope did with the Scriptures, in order to establish this heathen doctrine?

A. Yes. He said: "And because the fleshly-minded Pope consenteth unto the heathen doctrine, therefore he corrupteth the Scriptures to establish it."

Q. Did he say that this "heathen doctrine," sustained by "corrupted Scriptures," rendered unnecessary the resurrection?

A. Yes. He said: "If the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in as good a case as the angels be? And then what cause is there of the resurrection?"

Q. Did William Tyndale have confidence enough in his faith to die for it?

A. He did. He suffered as a martyr in 1536.

Teacher. I will request Lucy to state whether or not, Paul gave the time when the departed could be permanently with Christ?

Lucy. Yes. See 1 Thes. iv. 16, 17: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, and the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to MEET THE LORD in the air; and so shall we EVER BE WITH THE LORD."

Q. Paul and Tyndale seem to agree exactly?

A. Yes, but heartily disagree, both with the "heathen philosophers," and also with the "fleshly-minded Pope."

Q. A person could not be a disciple of the "heathen philosophers," and of the "fleshly-minded Pope," which "corrupteth the Scriptures," and a disciple of the Lord Jesus, at the same time, could he?

A. No, sir; things which differ so materially, cannot agree.

Q. If Paul was given his choice between either life or death, which do you think he would select?

A. If the teaching of "heathen philosophers" be correct, he would doubtless select death.

Q. Why so?

A. Because the aforesaid philosophers, and their modern disciples, teach that death is the avenue by which the departed can instantly "be with Christ."

Q. Well, what did he say would really be his choice, anyway?

A. He said: "Yet what I shall choose I wot not, for I am in a strait betwixt two,---LIFE and DEATH---having a desire to depart and be with Christ; which is FAR BETTER" than a choice between death and this mortal life.

Q. Then death could not be the departure Paul had in his mind?

A. No, it certainly was not.

Teacher. Will Arloa please give the Greek, for the word depart?

Arloa. It is "analousai."

Q. What does it mean?

A. Parkhurst says: "It signifies in the New Testament, to return or depart."

Q. Give a Scripture where the word "analousai" is found?

A. See Luke xii. 36: "Be like unto men who wait for their Lord when he shall RETURN---'analousai'---from the wedding."

Q. Please give the study of scholars with regard to the use of the word "analousai," in the text under examination?

A. "There is a feature which the Common Version ignores, the infinitive 'analsai' is preceded by the article 'to.' The significance of the word will be perceived in the light of the following rule of Greek grammar. The infinitive with the article, is in all cases, equivalent to a substantive; as 'ton lego,' the act of speaking. Hence, to 'analsai,'---literally 'the return'---is the act of returning, and should distinctly be 'the returning.' In addition to the verb 'return;' there is the verb 'to be;' this is also in the infinitive, and preceded by the article, it therefore, ought to be understood as a substantive ---the being. Both phrases are preceded by the preposition 'eis,'---for---from which it allows that Paul's desire was for 'the returning and the being with Christ.' The verse translated in strict accordance with the original, would stand as follows: 'For I am straitened by the two, having the earnest desire for the returning, and the being with Christ, FAR BETTER by much.'

Q. Have we other translations which are in strict harmony with the one which is given above?

A. Yes, we have.

Q. Please quote one?

A. I will give a quotation from the "Diaglott," as follows:

"I am indeed hard pressed by the two things;---I have an earnest desire for the returning, and being with Christ, since it is very much to be preferred."

Q. Preferred to what?

A. To a choice between death and this frail mortal life.

Teacher. Won't it be a glorious thing to "depart and be with Christ?" What do you say, Albert?

Albert. It would, indeed, be a desirable thing to leave behind this present groaning condition of things, and experience blessings and joys, which as yet has not fully entered into the heart of man to comprehend of their greatness. "The half has never yet been told."

Q. How can these blessings be obtained?

A. By yielding a heart obedience to the glorious Gospel of the Kingdom, and then continue to be firm in the faith. Refuse all solicitations of compromise with the apostacy. Live a godly life in harmony with the gospel, cut loose from every worldly abomination. Be pure as he is pure. Only the pure in heart shall see God.

Teacher. That is right, Albert, I heartily respond, Amen.

The time having come to adjourn, we will suspend our investigation for tonight.

LESSON VI.

Teacher. Is not this a beautiful moon light night? I am pleased to see you all ready for business once more. I think that Carrie proposed a topic at our last gathering, to be studied to-night.

Please introduce it Carrie?

I would express the topic in the following language:

YOU NEED TO BE BORN OVER AGAIN.

Q. What suggested the topic to your mind, Carrie?

A. It is this. I find so many people who stumble over Jesus' words to Nicodemus: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." I would like to have a critical study of the above text.

All right, we will do the best we can, to develop light.

Q. Who are to experience this new birth?

A. The language of the Savior puts it like this: "Except a MAN be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God."

Q. What are we to understand by the use of the word "man?"

A. It is from the Greek word "anthropos," and signifies an existing human being, without regard to sex.

Q. What is man in his natural or unchanged condition?

A. Nothing higher than flesh and blood, an animal man.

Q. Can the flesh and blood, or animal man, inherit God's eternal kingdom?

A. No. Paul says: "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."

Q. Why cannot the "flesh and blood nature inherit the kingdom of God?"

A. Because the flesh and blood nature, is subject to corruption.

Q. How, then, can the new or everlasting nature be secured?

A. Only in one way.

Q. What is that one way?

A. By re-birth.

Q. What does the re-birth really consist of?

A. Says Jesus: "Except a man be born of WATER and of the SPIRIT, he cannot enter the kingdom of God."

Q. What is the modus operandi of this new birth?

A. To my mind, John iii. 8, as given by the "Twentieth Century Translation," expresses the true idea more clearly.

Q. Please read it from that Translation?

A. It reads as follows:

"Believe me, Jesus answered, unless a man owes his birth to water and Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God. All that owes its birth to human nature ALONE is ONLY human, and all that owes its birth to the SPIRIT is spiritual---or Spirit.---Do not be surprised at my tell-

ing you that you all need to be born over again. The wind blows where it wills, and you can hear the sound of it, but you do not know where it comes from, or where it goes; and it is the same with every one that owes his birth to the Spirit.”

Q. Did you ever hear any person claim that the birth of the Spirit has already taken place in their case?

A. Why certainly, that is quite frequently claimed.

Q. Could they prove it by the phenomena just quoted from John iii. 8?

A. No, not one of them.

Q. That being the case, what must we conclude?

A. That they are deceiving themselves.

Q. Is not the birth of the Spirit a necessary prerequisite, in order to qualify a person to inherit the kingdom?

A. Most assuredly it is; 1 Cor. xv. 50, says: “This, brothers, I declare---that

mere flesh and blood can have no share in the kingdom of God, nor the perishable share in the imperishable.”

Q. What nature is perishable?

A. The flesh and blood.

Q. And what the imperishable?

A. The Spirit.

Q. Were those people who claimed to be born of the Spirit perishable?

A. They were.

Q. Well, then, how about their claim to have experienced the birth of the Spirit?

A. They were mistaken.

Q. Then, these two opposite natures owe their origin to two different sources, do they not?

A. Certainly they do.

Q. Please give them separately.

A. All right. They are as follows:

1. “All that owes his birth to human nature alone is only human.”

2. “All that owes his birth to the Spirit is spirit.”

Q. Should not begettal precede the Spirit birth?

A. It should, as no birth could ensue without it. Jesus says: "Unless a man owes his birth to water and Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God."

Q. Are we to understand by the use of the phrase, "water and Spirit," that two births are indicated, one of water, and the other of Spirit?

A. No. It is only one birth; but we owe that one birth to the two agencies.

Q: How are people begotten that desire the Spirit birth?

A. See James i. 18: "Of his own will BEGAT he us with the WORD OF TRUTH."

Q. What is the "Word of truth?"

A. See 1 Cor. xv. 15: "In Christ Jesus I have BEGOTTEN you THROUGH the GOSPEL."

Q. Can a person be born of the Spirit, before begettal?

A. Why no, that is impossible.

Q. And begettal takes place, by and
"THROUGH THE GOSPEL?"

A. Yes, that is what the Scriptures
affirm.

Q. Well, then, suppose a person
does not know what the gospel is, what
then?

A. No begettal can take place until
he does.

Q. Well, suppose a person simply
understands and believes the gospel, and
takes no further step, is he begotten?

A. Why no.

Q. What is lacking?

A. The "WATER" is lacking, in
order to produce a vital begettal.

Q. What does Jesus say about the
"water?"

A. "Unless a man owes his birth to
water and Spirit he cannot enter the king-
dom of God."

Q. That which operates in produc-
ing the birth of the Spirit, should exist
prior to the birth, should it not?

A. It should.

Q. What is it that assists in producing the birth of the Spirit?

A. "Unless a man OWES his birth to WATER and SPIRIT, he cannot enter the kingdom of God."

Teacher. I want to ask how you like the quotations being made from the Twentieth Century Translation?

Lud. I think it quite an improvement, it makes matters plainer.

Q. When does a person come in contact with the "water," as far as it relates to the new birth?

A. See 1 Pet. i. 22: "By your OBE-
DIENCE TO THE TRUTH, you have purified
your lives, so that there is now growing
up among you a genuine brotherly affec-
tion. Therefore love one another ear-
nestly with all your hearts. Your new
life came from a imperishable not a per-
ishable source, at the Word of the ever-
living God."

Ella. In this connection I will read
Titus iii. 5: "He saved us not in conse-
quence of any righteous actions we have

done, but in the execution of his merciful purposes,---how?---by that WASHING which was a new birth to us.”

Q. How does it read in the Diaglott?

A. It reads: “The BATH of the new birth.” In other words, the “bath” which precedes, or leads to the “new birth.”

Q. When does the new life begin to develop?

A. When we rise from “the bath of the new birth.”

Q. Please give some Scripture authority?

A. See Rom. vi. 4: “Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so, we should also walk in NEWNESS of life.”

Q. In what sense do we owe the new birth to the “Spirit,” as well as the “water?”

A. By “walking after the Spirit,” and “Sowing to the Spirit.”

Q. What will result from "Sowing to the Spirit?"

A. "Shall of the Spirit, reap life everlasting."

Q. Is not that the same as being born of the Spirit?

A. Exactly the same.

Teacher. The time has arrived for us to draw our study to a close. I trust that we have arrived at some satisfactory conclusions on the subject of the Birth of the Spirit.

LESSON VII.

Teacher. One more week has passed, since we met each other. We have come together for the special purpose of engaging in the search for wisdom.

What subject have you chosen?

George. The subject is an old one, but nevertheless, is imperfectly understood by many. We desire a critical study on

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

The occasion which suggested the subject to our minds was a printed sermon by a Chicago pastor, which came into our hands. I would like to read an extract from it, as it will suggest thoughts for our study.

Teacher. We would like to have you do so.

George. It reads as follows:

“This is a question over which there ought to be no controversy. And the fact that there is, is due, as we believe, to two unwarranted and unscriptural assumptions:

First. That the mode is an essential in the place of an incidental part of the sacred rite.

Second. That the New Testament teaches only one way for its proper administration---by immersion.

Now, they are either right or wrong. If they are right, then I, who was sprinkled in my baptism, am deluded, and was not, as I thought, baptized; nay, more, I am not a member of the visible church, nor is my ministry, to which I have been set apart by ordination, authoritative, and therefore, everything done by my office, is invalid. Grave, indeed, is this question, of how we are baptized, if to the mode God has attached such importance as this. We give candidates wishing baptism, their choice of three modes, believing that they are all valid.”

Teacher. Now this minister said: "This is a question over which there ought to be no controversy." Is he correct?

Carrie. There could be no controversy if people would be satisfied with, and practice only that for which they can find Bible precedent.

Q. He says it is an "unscriptural assumption" to affirm that "the New Testament teaches only one way for its proper administration." Tell us how many ways you can find New Testament precedent for?

A. I will quote a few samples of the only way that can be found, and I challenge any one to find a different way.

See Rom. vi. 4: "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism."

See Col. ii. 12: "Buried with him in baptism."

See Acts viii. 38, 39: "They went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water,

the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip.”

Q. Do the best learned men, who are connected with denominations which practice sprinkling, and call it baptism, affirm that the word baptize means only to immerse, dip, plunge, etc., and that the only primitive way of administering baptism, was by immersion?

A. They do.

Q. Then please quote a few instances?

A. Dr. Chalmers, who is a Presbyterian, says: “The original meaning of the word baptism, is immersion.”

Charles Anthon, L. L. D., an Episcopalian, and a professor of the Greek and Latin languages, says: “The primitive meaning is dip or immerse. **SPRINKLING** is entirely **OUT** of the **QUESTION.**”

Dr. Augusti, a Lutheran, says: “Baptisma denotes plunging, dipping and the like.”

Dr. Trenon, a learned Catholic, says: “Plunge into water. Baptize strictly

conveys this signification, as ALL the learned are agreed.”

Mr. Calvin, Presbyterian, says: “The word baptize signifies to dip.”

Martin Luther says: “Baptism is Greek. In Latin it may be translated ‘immersio,’ since we immerse anything into water, that the whole might be covered.”

John Wesley, speaking of Rom. vi. 4, says: “Buried with him---alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion.”

Macknight, who was a Presbyterian, commenting on Rom. vi., says: “Christ submitted to be baptized, that is, to be buried under the water, by John.”

Dr. G. Campbell, Presbyterian, in his Lectures on Pulpit Eloquence, says, “I have heard a disputant, in defiance of etymology and use, maintain that the word rendered in the New Testament baptize, means more properly to sprinkle, than to plunge; and in defiance of all antiquity, that the former was the earliest,

and most general practice in baptizing. One who argues in THIS manner, never fails with persons of knowledge to betray the cause he would defend; and though, with respect to the vulgar, bold assertions generally succeed as well as argument, and sometimes better, yet a candid mind will always disdain to take the help of falsehood, even in the support of truth.”

Another witness, whose association was with those who practice sprinkling, was Scapula. He gives it as follows: “Baptizo: Mergo seu immergo, item submergo, item abluo, lavo. To dip or to immerse; also to sink under, to wash clean, to wash.”

Another witness of the same class, is Dr. Owen, he says: “No honest man who understands the Greek tongue, can deny the word ---baptizo--- to signify to dip.”

Says Dr. Whitby, of the Church of England: “It being so expressly declared here, ---Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12,---that we are buried with Christ in baptism, by

being buried under water, and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his death, by dying to sin, being taken hence; and this immersion religiously observed by all churches for thirteen centuries.”

Boussuet says: “To baptize signifies to plunge, as is granted by ALL the world.”

Teacher. The Chicago pastor said, “We give candidates wishing baptism, their choice of three modes, believing that they are all valid.” Now, who are represented by the word “we?”

Arloa. Why the denomination to which the pastor belonged.

Q. Then who is it that gives candidates for baptism their choice of three modes?

A. “We,” the denomination.

Q. Does that “right of choice,” come from a human or divine source?

A. The right can have no higher source of authority or sanction, than the organization which offers the choice.

Q. Does the New Testament offer candidates wishing baptism, any right of choice?

A. It does not.

Q. What does it do, then?

A. It simply commands obedience to that which Divine wisdom has already chosen for them. There is positively no "right of choice" here.

Q. This pastor said, he believed the choice of any one of the three would be "valid." What do you think?

A. It might be valid as far as the organization in which he holds membership, is concerned, but that does not give it Divine validity. His organization may offer a choice of three modes, but some other denominational organization has just as much right to offer five modes, and claim validity for each one of the five, as his organization has to limit them to just three.

Q. What gives validity to an ordinance?

Lud. Divine approval.

Q. Can you cite any Divine direction to call either sprinkling or pouring Christian baptism?

A. We cannot find any Divine authority at all.

Q. Then what kind of authority does approve of them?

A. Clearly nothing but human.

Q. Who is responsible for the adoption of sprinkling as Christian baptism?

A. I will quote from Mr. Calvin, in answer to that question.

He says, in his comments of Acts viii. 38: "We see from this instance, what was the baptismal rite among the ancients; for they plunged the whole body in the water. Now 'tis the custom for the minister to sprinkle only the body or head. . . . Wherefore the CHURCH did grant liberty to herself since the beginning, to CHANGE the rites somewhat."

Q. Tell us what church had presumption enough to change God's ordinances?

A. I quote from the history of Dr. Wall, part 2, chap. 9: "France seems to have been the first country in the world where baptism by affusion was used ordinarily to persons in health, and in the public way of administering it. It being allowed to weak children---in the reign of Elizabeth---to be baptized by aspersion, many fond ladies and gentlemen first, and then by degrees, the common people would obtain the favor of the priest to have their children pass for weak children, too tender to endure dipping in the water. As for sprinkling, properly so-called, it seems it was at 1645, just then beginning and used by very few. . . . That sprinkling for the common use of baptizing, was really introduced in times of POPERY."

Q. If sprinkling was not introduced as "valid" baptism until times of popery, then it it could not have been introduced, and made valid by Christ, could it?

A. Certainly not, there was no popery at that time.

Q. What Protestant denomination

endorsed this relic of popery, as "valid" baptism?

A. The Presbyterians.

Q. When?

At the time of the adoption of the Westminster creed.

Q. Was the Assembly unanimous in adopting sprinkling as baptism?

A. They were not.

Q. How did they settle it?

A. By a vote.

Q. How did the vote stand?

A. One-half were for immersion, and the other for sprinkling.

Q. How did they settle the matter, being equally divided?

A. The President cast the deciding vote.

Q. Then it was not a question, as to which of the two was Scriptural?

A. Not at all.

Q. Then they must have voted on it very much as a City Council, votes on a city ordinance?

A. Very much the same.

Q. Now, tell me, who was the president?

A. Dr. Lightfoot.

Q. Tell me, what church did Mr. Calvin belong to?

A. The Presbyterian.

Q. Quote again what Mr. Calvin said about a change of the ordinance of baptism?

A. "The ancients plunged the whole body in the water. Now 'tis the custom for the minister to sprinkle only the body or head. . . Wherefore the church did grant liberty to herself since the beginning, to change the rites somewhat."

Q. What church took such an unwarranted liberty?

A. First, it started with the Roman Catholic, in France, and then it spread from there, into all Roman Catholic countries. Then we have the Presbyterian church, by vote, making the same unwarranted change.

Q. Does the Presbyterian church

offer candidates for baptism, "their choice of three modes?"

A. They offer only sprinkling.

Q. But suppose a candidate insists upon being immersed, what then?

A. The minister will have to get a special permit to immerse the candidate.

Q. Do ministers who are conscious of the fact that the change which we have been discussing is surely an unscriptural change, and contrary to the meaning of the original words, still approve of the unscriptural change?

A. Such is the case.

Q. Please quote from one?

A. I call attention to an extract from the pen of Dean Stanley, which was once published in the "Nineteenth Century."

A. It reads as follows: "The change of immersion to sprinkling, has set aside the larger part of the apostolic language regarding baptism, and has altered the very meaning of the word.

The reason for the change is obvious. The practice of immersion, apostolic and

primitive as it was, was peculiarly suitable to the southern and eastern countries, for which it was designed, and peculiarly unsuitable to the tastes, the convenience, and the feelings, of the countries of the north and west. There is no one who would now wish to go back to the old practice---of the apostles and their Master---Speaking generally, the Christian civilized world has decided against it. It is a striking example of the triumph of common sense over the bondage of form and custom.”

Q. Have men the right to change God's ordinances, that they may better suit “their tastes and convenience?”;

A. They have not.

Q. Please tell us why?

A. Because Paul says: “Keep the ordinances as I delivered them unto you.”

Q. Please tell us why Paul is so particular to have them kept just exactly as he “delivered” them?

A. Because, he says, “I received of

the Lord, that also which I delivered unto you.”

Q. Now, then, suppose we change the phrase, “Buried with Christ, in baptism,” to Sprinkled with Christ in baptism, would that be keeping the ordinances as “delivered?”

A. It would be very far from it.

Q. Please say what you think it is, then?

A. I regard it as an unauthorized change of a divinely appointed ordinance.

Q. Do you suppose that a compliance with a human substitute will bring the blessing they desire?

A. No, sir. If it brought anything, it would more likely bring a curse, for disobedience.

Q. Is it not an act of apostacy, to change God’s ordinances, and teach men to disobey them, by accepting a man-made substitute?

A. I so regard it.

Q. Then you cannot regard sprinkling as being an obedience to the gospel?

A. It cannot be, because by accepting a man-made device, we are not obeying the command, to "Keep the ordinances as I delivered them unto you."

Q. Then, what will probably become of those who do not obey the gospel?

A. In answer to that question, I will read to you 2 Thess. i. 8, 9: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that OBEY NOT the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Q. This seems to be a rather serious matter, does it not?

A. I should say so. At that time they will wish that they had rejected both man-made gospels, and also man-made ordinances.

Teacher. Now I desire to call the attention of the class to another extract from the sermon on baptism by our Chicago pastor, it reads as follows: "And when he---the Eunuch---was converted to Christ as the promised Redeemer, and

saw the beauty and appropriateness of baptism as a gospel symbol, they suddenly came in that desert place to water, and the Eunuch asked if he might not then and there be baptized. And Philip ascended. The chariot was stopped, they got down and went to the water, and he was baptized. Oh, says the immersionist, give the record as it reads in Acts viii. 38, and you will see they went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him.

Now I shall not detain you as I might by a critical, and I believe, conclusive argument to show that the Greek preposition 'into,' might, with perfect justice, have been translated 'TO' or 'AT' the water."

Teacher. I will ask Bessie to give a number of passages of Scripture where the Greek preposition "eis"---"into"---is found, and supply in its place, the words, "to" or "at" as suggested by this pastor, and see if it will make sense; if it does

not, then his suggestion cannot be admissible. Try it Bessie?

Bessie. The mariners cast Jonah near "to" but not "into" the sea. How, then, did the whale get him?

The swine ran down "to" the sea, but not "into" the sea. Then what occasion was there for getting drowned?

Jonah was three days and three nights, not "in" the whale, but just near "to" it.

Noah and family did not go "into" the ark, but near "to" or "at" the ark, just like Philip and the Eunuch did not go "into" the water, but just near "to," or "at" the water.

Lazarus was not put "into" the grave, but near "to" it.

Murderers, adulterers, fornicators, etc., are not cast "into" the lake of fire, but near "to" or "at" it.

Daniel was not cast "into" the lion's den, but near "to" it.

The righteous shall have an abundant entrance, not "into" the kingdom of

God, but near "to" or "at" the kingdom, that is, if this pastor's conclusions, are correct.

Paul was not let down the wall "in" a basket, but close "to" or "at" a basket.

According to the preaching of this pastor, the Greek preposition "into" will take people "into" the heaven and the hell which he preaches, but when it comes to baptism, it will only take him "to" or "at" the water.

This sort of thing might be carried almost to any length that is desired, but surely enough has been given to show that the argument made in order to destroy the force of the Greek preposition "eis"---into---as far as it relates to baptism is not sound.

If the preposition "into" did not take them any further than "to" or "at" the water, how did they manage it to come up "ek" out of the water?"

The subterfuges which people resort to, in order to sustain man-made innovations, are easily detected.

Ella. Don't you think it would be well at this time, to introduce some of the testimony of learned men in the languages, who are connected with various denominations, as to the meaning of the word baptize?

Teacher. All right. Suppose you quote a few.

Ella. The following is the testimony of eminent lexicographers as to the meaning of the Greek word baptize.

Stockius. "Baptizo: proprie est immergere ac intingere in aquam. Properly to immerse or dip in water."

Robertson's Thesaurus. "Baptizo: mergo; lavo, to dip, to wash."

Schleusner's Thesaurus. "Baptizo: Immergo, intingo; to immerse, to dip."

Morel. "Baptizo: mergo, immergo, aqua obruo; to dip, to immerse, to overwhelm in water."

Greenfield. "Baptizo: To immerse, immerge, submerge, sink; in New Testament, to wash, perform ablution, cleanse, to immerse, baptize, administer the rite

of baptism. *Baptisma*: Properly what is immersed; hence immersion, baptism, ordinance of baptism.”

Bass. “*Baptizo*: “To dip, immerse, or plunge in water; to wash, bathe oneself; to be immersed in sufferings or afflictions.”

Laing. *Baptizo*: To baptize, to plunge in water.”

Wright: “*Baptizo*: I dip, immerse, plunge, saturate, baptize, overwhelm.”

Grove: “*Baptizo*: To dip, immerse, immerse, plunge; to wash, cleanse, purify; to baptize; to depress, humble, overwhelm.”

Sir D. Sanford, *Greek Extracts*. “*Baptizo*: I dip, I wash, I sink.”

Scapula. “*Baptizo*: *Mergo*, seu *immergo*, item *submergo*, item *abluo*, *lavo*. To dip or to immerse; also to sink under, to wash clean, to wash.”

H. Stephanus. “*Baptizo*: *Mergo*, seu *immergo*. To dip or immerse.”

Schrevelius. “*Baptizo*: *Mergo* *lavo*; I dip, I wash.”

Teacher. I wish to add to the above, a few more testimonies of Pedobaptist ministers and authors.

Dr. Hammond says, "Baptismos signifies an immersion or washing the whole body."

Bishop Taylor. "If you attend to the proper signification of the word baptism, it signifies plunging into water, or dipping with washing."

Casaubon says, "The manner of baptizing was to plunge or dip into the water, as even the word baptizo itself, plainly enough shows."

Zanchius. "It signifies properly to plunge, dip. So the ancient church used to dip those that were baptized."

Joseph Mead, on Titus iii. 2, says, "There was no such thing as sprinkling or rantism, used in baptism, in the apostles' days, nor many ages after them."

Teacher. Now, George, do you find the words sprinkle and immerse, used interchangeable in the Scriptures, which should be the case, if the word baptize

will cover both the words sprinkle and immerse?

A. I do not, in either the Old or the New Testaments.

Q. Give some samples of the use of these words in the Mosaic ordinances?

A. See Heb. ix. 10, 13, 17, 21. In verse 10, we have, "Divers washings, and carnal ordinances," etc.

Q. Give the original for the words "Divers washings?"

A. The words are "diaphoris baptismois," translated divers immersions. See Grotius, Macknight and Whitby.

Q. Now, suppose we use the words divers sprinkling, how would you express it in Greek?

A. I would use the words, diaphoris rantizousa.

Q. In verse 29, we have the phrase, "he sprinkled with blood." Give the Greek, for the words, "he sprinkled?"

A. I would use the words "Errantise."

Q. How is it, would it be proper to

use "Erantise"---he sprinkled, to express another action, he immersed?

A. It cannot be done. Each word expresses only its own action.

Q. Have we other words which express different actions?

A. Yes. I call your attention to the words "bapto" and "baptizo," which means to dip, plunge, or immerse. And then we have the words, "raino" and "rantizo," which means to sprinkle.

Q. When a minister is called upon to perform what is called baptism by sprinkling, how many actions does he employ?

A. He uses the identical three actions, which he terms, three modes of baptism.

Q. Name the actions?

A. In the first action, he shall POUR out---ek chei---water into a basin. In the second act he shall DIP---bapsei---his fingers into the water. In the third act, he shall SPRINKLE---rantize---the candidate.

Q. What was baptized in this case?

A. Only the preacher's fingers.

Q. What did he do to the candidate?

A. He only rantized him.

Q. Did the candidate suppose that he had been baptized?

A. He did.

Q. Why did he suppose so?

A. Because he had confidence in the preacher who deceived him.

Q. How did the preacher deceive him?

A. By rantizing him, in place of baptizing.

Q. Why did he submit to such an imposition?

A. Because he did not know any better.

Well, why don't people inform themselves?

A. Some say that they have no time to study the Bible, and so they pay a minister to do that for them.

Q. It is hardly a safe thing to do, is it?

A. It surely is not.

Q. If a person should have information concerning the meaning and use of the three words which they call three modes of baptism, they would not be so easily deceived, would they?

A. Indeed they would not.

Q. What are those three words?

A. Dip, sprinkle and pour.

Q. Is the meaning of those three words alike, both in the English and the Greek?

A. Exactly the same?

Q. Let us test the use of these three words?

Albert, what have you to say?

A. I was thinking about the custom of some house wives, when preparing for washing, to put her clothes to soak over night, for the purpose of loosening the dirt. Now, suppose she should say to her neighbor, "I put my clothes to soak by sprinkling," what would you think of her?

Lucy. I should be apt to think that

there was something wrong with her mentally.

Lud. Well, then, what was the matter with that Chicago preacher, who said "I was sprinkled in my baptism?"

Ella. That is a parallel case with the clothes washing. It is equivalent to saying, "I was immersed by sprinkling," and that would make sprinkling a mode of soaking or dipping.

Teacher. These words have their distinctive meaning, and if removed from it, creates foolishness. A scholar in the Greek language, says: "The Greek word, EN, means in; if not, then Adam never was "in" Eden, never was "in" innocence; that if the Greek word EK, "out," does not denote "out of," then Eve was not made out of a rib, taken out of Adam, nor were Adam and Eve ever driven out of the garden."

Q. Then what about the Greek word EIS, "into?"

A. "That if EIS, "into," does not most certainly and definitely denote into,

then the breath of life never entered into the nostrils of Adam. If EK, "out" and APO, "from," did not bring Noah and family, EK, "out" of, and APO, "from" the ark, they must still remain there. That if EIS, "into," did not lead Israel and the Egyptians, into the Red sea, the Israelites never passed through it, nor were the Egyptians drowned EN, "in" it."

Q. What about the Greek verbs bapto, raino, cheo, pluno, and louo?

A. "They as certainly and definitely express different actions, as EN, "in," EIS, "into," and EK, "out," and APO, "from," are each one different in application and meaning.

"For example, see Lev. xix. 6-8. Then shall he take the living bird, and the cedar wood, and the scarlet yarn, and the hyssop,---and perform one action, viz.---BAPSEI "dip" them, then he shall---perform another action, viz. PERI RANEI,---'sprinkle' of the blood. Then he who is cleansed, shall---perform another action,

viz., PLUNEI TA IMATLA---wash his garments,---and he must yet perform another action, viz., LOUSETAI---wash his body in water.”

After these four actions are performed,---not one act---he may come into the camp, but he must not enter his house for seven days, nor until he has repeated two of those actions again; after shaving off his hair, he shall repeat the action of washing his clothes, PLUNEI TA IMATAI, he shall wash his clothes, and also, LOUSETAI TO SOMA, wash his body in water,---ver. 9-16---In the ceremony of cleansing a leper, we find the three acts of pouring, dipping, and sprinkling, each totally distinct from the other. The first act of the priest is, to pour out EK CHEI, EIS into his left hand. The next act is, he shall BAPSEI dip his right finger EIS into the oil EN in his left hand. Then comes the third act, he shall RANEI sprinkle it with his finger. Here we have bapto, cheo, and raino, each word representing different acts. The same chapter repeats

these distinctions. See verses 26-51. Ver. 26, and the priest shall EPI CHEEI pour into; and ver. 27, he shall RANEI sprinkle; ver. 41, he shall EK CHEI. pour out; and ver. 51, he shall BAPSEI dip; the same verse, he shall PERI RANEI, sprinkle the house seven times."

Teacher. Leaving the question of the mode of baptism for present, I would like to have the class dwell briefly upon its importance, and design.

Q. Is the matter of the importance of baptism, often underrated by those who are not properly informed upon the subject?

A. Yes, it is.

Q. In what way is it belittled?

A. We are told that it is of no saving efficacy, and as far as our salvation is concerned, it matters little as to whether you are baptized, or not, it is looked upon merely as an initiatory ceremony into a church.

Q. What value does the Scriptures place upon it?

A. It is the official seal to the faith, covenant, or contract, that all believers enter into.

Q. What is the object of a seal?

A. To make sure that to which the seal may be attached.

Q. Give some instance?

A. See Matt. xxvii. 65: "They went and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting the watch."

Q. Please give another instance?

A. See Dan. vi. 17: "A stone was brought and laid upon the mouth of the den, and the king sealed it with his own signet, and the signet of his lords; that the purpose might not be changed."

Q. What, then, would be the design of a seal to the faith, or covenant?

A. "That the purpose might not be changed."

Q. The seal is an important part of the covenant, then, is it not?

A. Very important.

Q. Who was the original covenantor?

A. Abraham.

Q. Did he as the party of the second part, seal the covenant?

A. He did.

Q. What was the seal?

A. Circumcision.

Q. Do the children of Abraham by faith, seal the covenant individually, as parties of the second part?

A. They do.

Q. What seal do they use?

A. Circumcision also. "The circumcision of Christ."

Q. What is the proof that Abraham used circumcision as a seal of the faith?

A. See Rom. iv. 11: "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith."

Q. Was the seal affixed PRIOR to, or after the reception of the faith?

A. After.

Q. Give the evidence?

A. See Rom. iv. 11: "A seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had being yet uncircumcised."

Q. For what purpose was this done?

A. "That he might be the father of all them that believe." Rom. iv. 11.

Q. Believe what?

A. "Who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham." Rom. iv. 12.

Q. Which faith, that which he had before or after circumcision?

A. That "which he had being yet uncircumcised?" Rom. iv. 12.

Q. Having ascertained what the Abrahamic faith and covenant is, how can we receive the benefits contained in the covenant?

A. By becoming a party to the covenant.

Q. How can we become a party?

A. By entering into and sealing the covenant.

Q. What is the seal?

A. The act of circumcision.

Q. What circumcision?

A. The circumcision of Christ.

Q. What does the Bible say about that kind of circumcision?

A. See Col. ii. 11, 12: "In whom ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."

Q. What does the circumcision of Christ---buried with him in baptism---do for us?

A. It puts "off the body of the sins of the flesh."

Q. That being the case, the "Circumcision of Christ"---baptism---is a very important matter after all, is it not?

A. Yes. There is nothing of much greater importance.

Q. Suppose we refuse to be thus circumcised, what will be the consequences?

A. The burden of sin will still re-

main. All such will continue to be uncircumcised "Gentiles in the flesh." See Eph. ii. 11, 12.

Q. When the Jews were convicted of sin, at Pentecost, what were they told to do?

A. "Repent and be baptized---circumcised---every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Thus "putting off the body of the sins of the flesh."

Teacher. I will ask Lud this question, when do men seal the covenants they make with each other?

A. When they understand the covenant, and both parties agree to the terms of the covenant.

Q. God made a covenant with Abraham, when did Abraham, as the party of the second part, attach the seal?

A. After Abraham agreed to the terms of the covenant:

Q. What was the seal?

A. "The sign of circumcision, a

seal of the righteousness of the faith.”

Rom. iv. 11.

Q. Does God offer to make this same covenant with us?

A. He does.

Q. Upon what terms?

A. The same that he required of Abraham.

Q. Does he require a seal from us?

A. He does.

Q. What is it?

A. “A seal of the righteousness of the faith,” “the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism.”

Q. Did Jesus use the same seal that is required of all covenantors?

A. He did.

Q. Where do you find the record?

A. In Matt. iii. 13-15.

Q. Please read it?

A. “Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answer-

ing said unto him, suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to FULFIL all righteousness.”

Q. Can you detect a similarity between the seals of Abraham, and that of Christ?

A. Yes. There should be.

Q. Why should there be?

A. Because they both confirm the same thing.

Q. What do they confirm, or make sure?

A. The “righteousness” which results from the faith, or the covenants of promise made unto Abraham and his seed, the Christ.

Q. What is the object of a seal?

A. To confirm, make sure, establish, bring to completion, or fulfill that which the covenant promises.

Q. What was circumcision to Abraham?

A. A seal confirming or fulfilling the righteousness coming through the faith which he had prior to his circumcision?

Q. What reason did Jesus give John as to why he should baptize him?

A. "Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness."

Q. Through what act did Abraham bring righteousness to fulfilment?

A. Circumcision.

Q. Through what act did Jesus bring righteousness to fulfilment?

A. Baptism.

Q. Through what act do believers of the Gospel of the Kingdom bring the fulfilment of righteousness?

A. "The circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh BY the circumcision of Christ: BURIED with him in BAPTISM."

Q. Was it part of the mission of Jesus to come as a confirmer, or sealer?

A. Yes, it was.

Q. What does the Bible say about it?

A. See Rom. xv. 8: "Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for

the truth of God, to CONFIRM the promises made unto the fathers.”

Teacher. We have seen that the seal required in the obedience of faith, is “The circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism.” I will ask of what value is an unsealed covenant?

A. It is of no effect.

Q. Did you ever know of people who professed to be in the bonds of the covenant, who refused to affix the seal?

A. I have.

Q. What reason did they give for their refusal?

A. Because they were previously baptized as a seal to a covenant which had no party of the first part to their contract, which supposed covenant, insured their supposed immortal souls a home in a sky-kingdom.

Q. Are seals ever transferable from one contract to another?

A. Never.

Q. Is it not strange that intelligent

people, in the name of religion, will act so foolish?

A. Yes. It is almost amazing.

Q. What will be the result, if such folly is persisted in?

A. When the time arrives, to receive the things covenanted, they will find themselves disappointed, because no valid covenant has previously existed, between themselves, and God, as the party of the first part.

Q. What four things are essential in order to secure the prize?

A. 1. Learn the nature of the covenant, and the terms required, in order to become a party to it.

2. Enter into it as a party of the second part.

3. Affix the seal required.

4. Live strictly up to the agreement, and keep inviolate all the terms of the covenant.

Teacher. We have had quite a long lesson to-night, but I feel assured, a very

profitable one, which will prove to be a help in the future, especially upon occasions when we shall be called upon to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered unto the saints. We are now dismissed.

LESSON VIII.

Teacher. As workmen who are all equipped with proper working tools, we are prepared to begin vigorous work, and to dig deep into the mine of truth, in search of precious jewels.

Well, what subject shall we study?

Arloa. During the week I called upon my neighbor, Mrs. Chalmers, and our conversation turned upon the subject of the Gospel of the Kingdom, as a message of life. She said that she did not have any use for that, because the Bible said that the way to be saved, was to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and that was good enough for her.

I have talked with several members of the class, and we thought that we would like to suggest the subject of

HOW TO BELIEVE ON THE LORD JESUS
CHRIST?

Teacher. Did Mrs. Chalmers use any special Scripture to sustain her point?

Arloa. Yes. She quoted Acts xvi. 31, which reads as follows: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved."

Teacher. There cannot be the least question with regard to salvation being fundamentally based upon a Scriptural belief in the Lord Jesus Christ, and the real question at issue is, what constitutes such a belief?

Q. Is there not a difference between believing ABOUT Jesus Christ, and believing IN him?

A. Yes. There is certainly a great deal of difference. A person may believe about Jesus Christ as an historical character, and still be far from being a believer in him.

Q. How would you illustrate this point?

A. Well, it might be done in this way. In years now in the past, two great religious teachers arose, who taught opposite doctrines.

Q. Give us their names?

A. One was Calvin, and the other was Wesley.

Q. What did Calvin teach?

A. He taught a doctrine known as "Election and Predestination."

Q. What did he mean by that?

A. That the sovereign will of the Creator elected, and predestinated from birth, those who should be saved, and also who would be lost.

Q. Then the will and act of the individual could not have anything to do with either his election to salvation, or condemnation, could it?

A. Nothing, whatever. He taught that so many babies were elected to be condemned, that hell was lined with infants a span long.

Q. You have heard of Calvinists, have you not?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. Who is a Calvinist?

A. A believer in Calvin.

Q. Who is a believer in Calvin?

A. One who understands and believes the teachings of Calvin.

Q. If a person has knowledge about Calvin, in an historical sense, would such an one be a Calvinist?

A. He would not; he must first understand, and then confess belief in his teaching, before he could be a Calvinist.

Q. What did Wesley teach?

A. That the will and acts of the individual determined whether he should be saved or not. Or in other words, "whosoever will, may come?"

Q. Who would be a Wesleyan?

A. A follower of Wesley, as to his teaching.

Q. Who would be a Christian?

A. A follower of the Christ, as to faith and practice.

Q. Could a person be a Christian, while ignorant of the message of life, which the Christ came to deliver?

A. He could not, any more than a person could be a Calvinist, while ignorant of Calvin's teaching.

Q. Do not many people who call themselves believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, regard the phrase merely as a common name, like Samuel Jones?

A. It is quite evident that they do.

Q. Do you so regard it?

A. I do not.

Q. What is his name, then?

A. "Call his name Jesus."

Q. What about that word Christ?

A. It is the official title that belongs to Jesus, like the word President, is the official title which belongs to Theodore Roosevelt.

The Analytical Concordance, by Robert Young, L. L. D., says of the word "Christ,---Christos in the Greek---anointed. The official appellation of the long-

promised and long-expected Savior, denoting his KINGLY authority," etc.

Q. What is the origin of the word Lord?

A. It is of Saxon origin.

Q. What does it signify?

A. Monarch, ruler, governor, etc.

Q. From whom did Jesus acquire the official appellation, "Christ the Lord?"

A. See Acts ii. 36: "Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both LORD and CHRIST."

Q. Then if we must believe on the Lord Jesus Christ in order to be saved, tell me, how can a person so believe, who has not acquired the teaching of Scripture, as to what those words really mean?

A. It is not possible. To suppose that the word "Christ," is a personal name, like Smith, is to surely fail to believe in Jesus, as "the Christ."

Q. Have we other Scriptures which speak of Jesus, as being the "Christ?"

Q. Please give another Scripture?

A. I will call your attention to Luke ii. 9-11: "Fear not: for I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David, a Savior, which is Christ the Lord."

Q. The angel brought gospel news, did he not?

A. He surely did.

Q. What gospel message did he bring?

A. That the long-expected Deliverer was born, even he who is "Christ the Lord."

Q. What power is in the Gospel?

A. "It is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. i. 16.

Q. If we leave the teaching that Jesus was born "Christ the Lord" out of the gospel proclamation, will it have power to save any one? To Scripturally believe in the Lord Jesus as "the

Christ," is it not to believe a gospel which has saving power in it?

A. It surely is.

Q. To say that Jesus was born as "Christ the Lord," what does it mean?

A. It is equivalent to saying that Jesus was born King of the Jews.

Q. Do the Scriptures say that he was born with that "official appellation?"

A. They do.

Q. Where?

A. In Matt. ii. 1, 2.

Q. Please read it to the class?

A. It reads as follows:

"Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea, in the days of Herod the King, behold, there came wise men from the East to Jerusalem, saying, where was he that was born King of the Jews?" or in other words, "Christ the Lord."

Q. What effect did this enquiry have upon King Herod, and the people of Jerusalem?

A. "When Herod the King had

heard these things, he was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him.”

Q. Then what did he do about the matter?

A. He concluded to call the Jewish officials together and question them about the place where they expected their King to be born.

Q. Did he do so?

A. Yes, he did.

Q. What did he ask them?

A. “He demanded of them where Christ should be born?”

Q. Is it not strange that he asked “where Christ should be born?” when he wanted to find, “where was he that was born King of the Jews?”

A. Not at all, both Herod and the Jews knew well that it was but another way of asking for the same information, as both questions meant the same thing.

Q. Now what answer did he get?

A. “And they said unto him in Bethlehem, of Judea: for thus it is written by

the prophet. And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not the least among the princes of Judah: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel."

Q. Now, what question did the wise men ask? ;

A. "Where is he that is born King of the Jews?"

Q. Now, what question did Herod ask?

A. "Where Christ should be born?"

Q. Now, what answer did he get?

A. That the "Governor, that shall rule my people Israel," should be born in "Bethlehem, in the land of Judah."

Q. Then what does it mean to believe in Jesus as "the Christ?"

A. It means to believe in him as "the King of the Jews," or the "Governor of my people Israel."

Q. Suppose we fail to so believe?

A. Then we are not believers in the "Lord Jesus Christ."

Q. How so?

A. Because we then fail to believe in Jesus, as "The Christ?"

Q. Have we other Scriptures where the phrase, "the Christ," is used, where it means the King of Israel?

A. Yes, we have.

Q. Please quote one?

A. See John i. 41-49: Philip "first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, we have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ. . . . Nathaniel said unto him, can there any good thing come out of Nazareth? Philip saith unto him, come and see. Jesus saw Nathanael coming unto him, and saith of him, behold an Israelite, indeed, in whom there is no guile! Nathanael saith unto him, whence knowest thou me? Jesus answered and said unto him, before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee. Nathanael answered, and saith unto him, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel. In other words, "Thou art the Christ," "the King of Israel."

Q. Did Paul preach the same message?

A. He surely did.

A. Where?

A. In Acts xvii. 1-7.

Q. Please read a portion of it.

A. "Now when they had come through Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews: and Paul as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ."

Q. What was the effect of preaching that Jesus was the promised Christ?

A. It set the whole city of Ephesus, in an uproar, and a lot of base fellows committed an assault on the house of Jason, and arrested Jason, and also some of the brethren, and took them before the magistrates for trial.

Q. What charge did they make against them?

A. They said, "These that have turned the world upside down have come hither also; whom Jason hath received."

Q. What world did they turn upside down?

A. The religious world.

Q. Tell us what teaching had this effect?

A. Paul's preaching, that "this Jesus whom I preach unto is Christ."

Q. In doing this, what did they teach?

A. "These all do contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying, that there is another King, one Jesus."

Q. To preach the Lord Jesus, as "the Christ," was equivalent to preaching "another King, one Jesus," was it not?

A. That is exactly just what such teaching means.

Q. When the Jews charged Jesus before Pilate, as claiming to be the

Christ, did he mean by such a claim, that he was the King of the Jews?

A. That is just what he meant?

Q. Have you Bible proof?

A. I have.

Q. Please quote it?

A. "And the whole multitude of them arose, and led him unto Pilate. And they began to accuse him, saying, we have found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ a King."

Q. Now, what did the Jews define the word Christ to mean, in their charge before Pilate?

A. "A King."

Q. King of what?

A. That will be seen in the question which Pilate asked Jesus?

Q. Please give it?

A. "And Pilate asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews?"

Q. Did Jesus answer him?

A. He did.

Q. Tell us what he said?

A. "And he answered him and said, thou sayest it." In other words, it is true.

Q. How do you know that is what Jesus meant?

A. That can be seen by referring to John xviii. 33, where Pilate asked him this question: "Art thou the King of the Jews?" See also verse 37: "Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a King then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a King. To this END WAS I BORN, and for this CAUSE came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto THE TRUTH, ---that I was 'BORN KING OF THE JEWS'--- Every one that is of THE TRUTH heareth my voice." If they do not hear his "voice" before Pilate, regarding his Kingship, they are not "of the truth," and do not believe that Jesus is "the Christ," nor are such people believers in "the Lord Jesus Christ."

Q. Can you give another definition as to the meaning of the word Christ?

A. It is not difficult to do that.

Q. Please give us one then?

A. See Mark xv. 31, which reads as follows: "Likewise also the chief priests mocking said among themselves, with the scribes, he saved others; himself he cannot save. Let Christ the King of Israel, descend now from the cross, that we may see and believe. And they that were crucified with him reviled him."

Q. What definition do you find in the text just quoted?

A. The chief priests and scribes, define the word "Christ," to mean "the King of Israel."

Q. Can you give a definition of the word "Christ," by some real eloquent preacher, who preached earnestly the Word as far as he had learned it himself?

A. Yes, I remember the case of a Mr. Apollos, who was born at Alexandria.

Q. Where can we find some record of him?

A. In Acts xviii. 24, I will read it:

“And a certain Jew, named Apollos, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures, came to Ephesus. This man was instructed in the way of the Lord: and being fervent in spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, knowing only the baptism of John. And he began to speak boldly in the synagogue: whom when Aquila and Priscilla had heard, they took him unto them, and expounded unto him the way of God more PERFECTLY. And when he was disposed to pass into Achaia, the brethren wrote, exhorting the disciples to receive him: who when he was come, helped them much which had believed through grace. For he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, showing BY the SCRIPTURES, that JESUS was CHRIST.” They were not believers in “the Lord Jesus Christ,” before they were convinced “by the Scriptures that Jesus was Christ.”

Q. If the Jews were not, are the Gentiles?

A. They are not. Jews and Gentiles must both accept the same gospel message.

Q. Was Paul's anxiety to convince the Jews that "Jesus" was "the Christ," a heavy burden on his mind?

A. It surely was. See Acts xviii. 1: "When Silas and Timotheus were come from Macedonia, Paul was **PRESSED** in **SPIRIT**, and testified to the Jews, that **JESUS** was **CHRIST**."

Q. Give us the result of his testimony?

A. See verses 8-10: "And Crispus, the Chief Ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord---Jesus Christ---with his house; and many of the Corinthians believed,---on the Lord Jesus Christ---and were baptized."

Q. Was God pleased with Paul's evangelical work at that place?

A. Yes, he was. He told him not to stop, as there were very many more people at that place, who would become believers yet. See Acts xviii. 9, 10, 11:

“Then spake the Lord to Paul in the night by a vision, Be not afraid, but speak, and not hold thy peace: for I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee: for I have much people in this city. And he continued there a year and six months, teaching the word of God among them.”

Q. Please give us a plain Bible sample of how to preach Christ?

A. There is a plain Bible instance recorded in Acts viii. 5-12: “Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them.” Now, refer to verse 12, “When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women.”

Q. We have taken the testimony of witnesses as to what the word “Christ” meant as applied to Jesus. Now, I will ask George to sum up, briefly, that we may make the application.

1. “God hath made that same Jesus,

whom you have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Acts ii. 36.

2. "Where is he that is BORN King of the Jews?" Matt. ii. 2.

3. "For unto you is BORN this day in the city of David, a Savior, which is Christ the Lord." Luke ii. 11.

4. "He---Herod---demanded of them where Christ should be BORN. And they said unto him, in Bethlehem, of Judea: . . . for out of thee shall come a GOVERNOR that shall rule my people Israel." Matt. ii. 3-6.

5. Pilate asked him: "Art thou the King of the Jews? . . . Art thou a King then? Jesus answered, thou sayest that I am a King. To this end was I BORN." John xviii. 33-37.

6. Nathanael said: "Rabbi, thou art the King of Israel." John i. 49.

7. "These all do contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another King, one Jesus." Acts xvii. 7.

8. "Likewise also the chief priests mocking said among themselves with the

scribes, he saved others; himself he cannot save. Let Christ the King of Israel, descend now from the cross, that we may see and believe." Mark xv. 31.

9. "He mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures, that Jesus was Christ." Acts xviii. 24.

10. "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Luke i. 31-33.

11. David "being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." Acts ii. 30.

12. "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the Kingdom to Israel?" Acts i. 6.

Q. Taking into account these and other Scriptures, what position is our Lord entitled to, by virtue of his being created the Christ of Israel?

A. He is entitled to all that is involved in the official titles of "King of the Jews," or "King of Israel."

Q. Who are believers in Christ?

A. Only those who have knowledge of, and believe all that that official title carries with it, as far as the person of our Lord is concerned, as the Christ of Israel.

Q. Then, as far as our Lord is concerned, it carried with it a Divine right to sit upon the throne of David, and reign as "King of Israel," when the "Kingdom shall be restored again to Israel, does it not?

A. Yes, it does. The way Philip preached the Christ at Samaria, was to preach "the things concerning the Kingdom of God," etc.

Q. In the beginning of this lesson, Arloa related the circumstance of a conversation with a Mrs. Chalmers, relating to the Kingdom of God, as a message of life. She told Arloa that she had no use for that, because the Bible said the way

to be saved, was to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." Now, we have seen from the clearest of evidence, that to believe on our Lord as "the Christ," could only be done, by believing in him as "the King of Israel," and heir to the throne of David. It would be impossible to preach the Kingship of Israel, and leave the Kingdom of Israel, out.

Q. Is it not a very serious thing, to reject Jesus, as "the Christ?"

A. Very serious, indeed, as we read in 1 John ii. 22: "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ?"

Q. Suppose we believe in him as the Christ, how will it be then?

A. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is begotten of God," and no person can even be "begotten of God," until they accept our Lord, as "the Christ."

Teacher. It is now time to adjourn. I hope Arloa has gathered some points that will enable her to show Mrs. Chalmers, the error of her way.

LESSON IX.

Teacher. How thankful we should be that we still have the privilege to assemble, and engage in the delightful study of the sacred Scriptures.

A correspondent wrote to me with regard to the Gospel Message. He seems to think, that no one, for a certainty, does know what that message really is.

It seems to me somewhat strange that God should send a message of life to perishing men and women, and that he should state that message in terms so very dark and ambiguous, that no one for an absolute certainty, can be sure that he has guessed the right one.

My impression is, that the darkness is in the mind of the correspondent, and not in God's statement of the case. Therefore, I will select as the topic for to-night's study:

IS THE GOSPEL AN HIDDEN OR A RE-
VEALED MESSAGE?

Will Carrie please read our Savior's commission to his disciples?

Carrie. He said: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned."

Q. What effect followed the acceptance or rejection of the gospel message, as preached by them?

A. Either salvation or condemnation.

Q. Could people be justly held accountable for either the acceptance or the rejection of a message which could not, in fact, be clearly and definitely stated, or made known?

A. They could not.

Q. Did Paul think it possible that the gospel could be made known?

A. He did. See Eph. vi. 19: "That utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to MAKE

KNOWN the mystery of the gospel." That which is "made known," is no longer an hidden message.

Teacher. My correspondent thought that on account of the uncertainty of knowing the make up of the gospel we ought to exercise considerable charity with each other.

Q. Did Paul share in this feeling of charity?

A. He most surely did not; Paul believed that he was able to "make known" the gospel, and that which could be made known, was no longer an uncertainty.

Q. Well, what did he say about the matter?

A. He said just this: "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ." It is because we have so many gospel perverters that the minds of those who do not study

the Scriptures for themselves, become confused.

Q. If we cannot definitely know what the true gospel is, could we distinguish between the genuine and the perverted? If not, why should anyone "marvel?"

A. There need be no marvel about it at all.

Q. If the gospel is an hidden riddle to be guessed at, ought people to be censured, for making wrong guesses at the gospel riddle?

A. No, but Paul did not take much stock in the gospel riddle business, he thought it was such a plain proposition, that should "any man," or even "an angel," be guilty of gospel perversion, he would petition heaven to let its curses, rain down upon their heads.

Q. Don't it seem passing strange unto you, that life and death, blessing and cursing, is suspended upon either the acceptance or rejection of the genuine gospel, if it is obscurely revealed, and

still remains upon the page of inspiration as a dark enigma?

A. It would be strange, indeed, if it were true; but happily it is not true. It is hid only to worldly-minded people, who care but little for Divine things.

Q. Please give Scripture proof?

A. See 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4: "If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." Hence, when you hear anyone complain of gospel blindness, you may know why they are blind.

Q. Is it possible for those who seek the true light, to find it, and not be mistaken?

A. It is possible.

Q. What makes you think so?

A. Because God hath commanded the true light to shine, and whatever he commands, comes to pass.

Q. Where is the command recorded?

A. In 2 Cor. iv. 6: "For God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

Teacher. Now, Albert, are there not a multiplicity of faiths and hopes, in the world?

A. Yes, there are.

Q. Well, can you wonder at that, if the faith and hope of the gospel, is so shrouded in mystery, that no two out of a hundred, as some say, can enumerate the same items, as composing the faith and hope of the gospel, from the Scriptures?

A. We could not wonder at it if such a statement were true.

Q. Is the statement true?

A. It is not true, because "the true light now shineth."

Q. How many faiths and hopes can you find revealed in the Scriptures of truth?

A. Only one, and no more.

Q. Where do you find such a declaration?

A. In Eph. iv. 4, 5, 6.

Q. Will you please read it?

A. Yes, I will: "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism. - One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all."

Q. In what proposition is the one faith and hope found?

A. The one gospel.

Q. What evidence have you for that statement?

A. I refer you to Col. i. 22-24. I will read it. "To present you holy and unblameable and unprovable in his sight. If you continue in THE FAITH, grounded and settled, and be not moved away from THE HOPE of THE GOSPEL, which ye have heard."

Q. Does it not sound strange for the Scripture to exhort us to "be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, if no two out of a hundred, could definitely as-

certain what the hope of the gospel, consisted of?

A. Passing strange, indeed, but that supposition is all a humanism, the Bible says we CAN know.

Q. Indeed, where do you find such a declaration?

A. I will read it to you from Eph. i. 18: "The eyes of your understanding being enlightened: that ye may KNOW what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of his glory of his inheritance in the saints."

Q. How can we "know" it?

A. By "the eyes of your UNDERSTANDING being ENLIGHTENED."

Teacher. I will ask George to tell us what kind of power is centered in the gospel?

George. I will quote to you Rom. i. 16: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

Q. To whom has it the power to effect salvation?

A. The believer of the gospel.

Q. Can those whose minds have not been enlightened as to the make up of the gospel, believe it?

A. They cannot possibly, on account of "having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the LIFE of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart." Eph. iv. 18.

Q. The gospel being "the power of God unto salvation," it must be what the Scriptures otherwise call the "great salvation." Can we really ascertain what that "great salvation" is, so that questions of doubt may be removed?

A. It can be done in the case of all who will accept clear Bible statements as evidence.

Teacher. Ella, will you kindly give the class a brief outline study on this question?

Ella. With pleasure.

I will first call attention to Heb. ii. 3: "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation: which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit."

Here we have naturally three divisions.

First. We have the great salvation; which salvation "first began to be spoken by the Lord." He was the first herald.

Second. Next we have the confirmation of the life message, of which the Lord was the first preacher. "Confirmed unto us by them that heard him."

Third. We have the Divine confirmation and approval, which was attested with "signs," "wonders," and "gifts."

Now, in a systematic study I would first give special attention to the first section. That "which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord." I would next

consider the other two sections, in their order.

Now, let us briefly give attention to the first section: that "which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord."

In the first instance, I would direct attention to Cornelius, the first Gentile convert to the "great salvation." In Acts xi. 12 13, we have the account of a heavenly visitant to Peter, directing him to go with the messengers which Cornelius had sent. Peter, in giving an account, says, "And the Spirit bade me go with them, nothing doubting. Moreover these six brethren accompanied me, and we entered into the man's house. And he showed us how he had seen an angel in his house, which stood and said unto him, send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter. Who shall tell thee WORDS, whereby thou and all thy house, shall be SAVED."

In Acts x. 37, Cornelius further said: "Thou hast done well that thou art come. Now therefore we are all here present

before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God. . . . That word, I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached.”

In order to ascertain exactly what these “saving words” are, it will be necessary to make and trace three more divisions, and then this will enable us to discover also, the “great salvation which first began to be spoken by the Lord.”

1. “Began from Galilee.”
2. “Published throughout all Judea.”
3. “After the baptism which John preached.”

Mark i. 14, records the fulfilment of each one of these three; and adds to them the message of life, or the “word” which was offered to Cornelius and household, for salvation; or in other words, the “great salvation which first began to be spoken by the Lord.”

Mark i. 14, reads as follows: "Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom of God."

Now, to divide this up into sections, it will appear as follows:

1. Time. "After John was put in prison."
2. City. "Jesus came into Galilee."
3. Message. "Preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom of God."

George. I wish to ask Ella a question, it is this: You said that Mark i. 14, would show the saving "word" to Cornelius, and also the "great salvation," first preached by the Lord; please point it out from Acts x. 37?

Ella. All right, compare these divisions with this Scripture.

1. "Preaching peace by Jesus Christ."
2. "The word which God sent unto the children of Israel." "That which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord," was first given to Israel.

3. "Which was published throughout all Judea." What was published throughout all Judea? A. The "word" which God sent unto the children of Israel. See Matt. ix. 35: "And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom." See Luke iv. 43: "And he said unto them, I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also: for thither am I sent."

4. "And began from Galilee." See Mark i. 14: "Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom of God." See Matt. iv. 23: "And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom."

5. "After the baptism which John preached." See Mark i. 14: "Now after that John was put in prison---which was after the baptism which he preached---Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom of God."

Ella. Now considering the Scriptures

which I have presented, I wish to question George a little.

Now, George, turn to Heb. ii. 3: "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord."

Now, George, this takes us back to the time when the Lord first began his preaching, when was that?

A. Well, according to Mark i. 14, he did not begin until "after that John was put in prison."

Q. What did he preach, when he did begin?

A. The "great salvation."

Q. Well, what did he teach, when he preached the "great salvation?"

A. The gospel.

Q. Why so?

A. "For it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

Q. Well, as he did not begin to do any preaching at all, until "after John was put in prison," then the gospel he preached at that time, must of necessity

be the "great salvation," should it not?

A. It could not be otherwise?

Q. Well, what did he preach, as gospel, "after that John was put in prison?"

A. "Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom of God."

Q. Then "the Gospel of the Kingdom of God," and the "great salvation," are but one and the same message?

A. That is what they are proven to be.

Ella. Now, George, you remember the case of Cornelius, which we quoted from the Acts, a short time since?

A. Yes, I remember, he was told to "Send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter; who shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved."

Q. Were these saving "words" the same message as the "great salvation," quoted from Heb. ii. 3?

A. Precisely the same.

Q. Did they begin at the same time and place?

A. Yes, just the same.

Q. Well, please show the proof.

A. I will read Acts x. 37: "That word, I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached."

Q. What was the message preached at that time and place?

A. "The Gospel of the Kingdom." See Mark i. 14; Matt. iv. 23.

Q. What was preached throughout all Judea?

A. "The Kingdom of God." See Matt. ix. 35; Luke iv. 43.

Teacher. You will remember that we made three divisions of Heb. ii. 3, about as follows:

1. The "great salvation which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord."

2. "Was confirmed unto us by them that heard him."

3. "God also bearing witness, with signs, and wonders, etc."

Now, we have already proven by

clear and positive Bible evidence, that the great salvation is the "Gospel of the Kingdom." Now, we wish to consider briefly the second part, "Was confirmed unto us by them that heard him."

Bessie, will you tell us who it was who specially heard our Lord preach "the Gospel of the Kingdom," as the "great salvation."

A. His disciples, who were constantly in attendance upon his preaching.

Q. How did they confirm it?

A. By preaching it after being commissioned.

Q. Give the record of their commission?

A. See Luke ix. 1-6: "Then he called his twelve disciples together . . . and he sent them to preach the Kingdom of God."

Q. Did they do so?

A. See verse 6: "And they departed and went through the towns preaching the gospel." The Gospel of the Kingdom, which they were sent to preach.

Teacher. The third section is, "God also bearing witness, both with signs and wonders, etc."

Q. Where do we find the record of this witness?

A. Mark xvi. 19, 20: "So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, confirming the word---gospel of the kingdom, he sent them to preach---with SIGNS following," just as he had previously promised.

God has made the "great salvation," so plain, that the question may be seriously asked, "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?"

Q. Is the gospel a hidden message, then?

A. "If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost."

Teacher. What does the word gospel, mean?

A. Simply good news.

Q. When it is attached to the phrase, the Kingdom of God, what does it signify then?

A. The good news concerning God's Kingdom?

Q. Well, some say that God's kingdom is his spiritual government in the hearts of his people, while others say, it is a church kingdom, which was set up on the day of Pentecost. What do you say?

A. I should say, that it was the Kingdom, which God promised to Jesus, which was a real literal kingdom, something more substantial, than the spiritualistic surmisings of men. The gospel of that kingdom, would be the good news about that kingdom.

Q. What kingdom was set apart for Jesus?

A. See Luke ii. 32, 33: "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end."

Q. Was David's reign over the house of Jacob, a spiritual reign?

A. No, it was not.

Q. Then the reign of Jesus on David's throne, over the house of Jacob, will be just as literal, as was that of David?

A. It will be just as real.

Q. How long will he occupy David's throne?

A. "Of his kingdom there shall be no end."

Q. Did God make a covenant with David concerning the eternal perpetuity of his throne, with his seed, the Christ, upon it, reigning as King of Israel?

A. He did. See Psa. lxxxix. 3, 4: "I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, thy seed---the Christ---will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to ALL generations."

Q. Will he literally keep this covenant?

A. He will. See verses 34, 35: "My

covenant will I not break, nor ALTER the thing that has gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto David."

Q. The oath and covenant made with David, and the oath and covenant made with Abraham, both relate to the same Commonwealth of Israel, do they not?

A. They do. See Luke i. 69-73: "And hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David; as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets which have been since the world began. . . . To perform the mercy promised unto our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; and the oath which he sware unto our father Abraham."

Q. Is this oath-bound covenant, a place of refuge?

A. It certainly is. That is one of the reasons why "the Gospel of the Kingdom," is glad tidings.

Q. What Scripture shows the oath-bound covenant, to be a secure place of refuge?

A. Heb. vi. 18-20.

Q. Please read a selection from it, which will show that fact?

A. "Wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise, the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath."

Q. For what purpose?

A. See verse 18: "That by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have strong consolation, who have fled for refuge, to lay hold upon the hope set before us."

Q. Where is there a place of hope and refuge?

A. Only in the oath-bound covenant.

Q. What are these oath-bound covenants?

A. The substance or base, of that which was first preached by our Lord, as the "great salvation," in the message called, "The Gospel of the Kingdom of God."

Q. Do you know of a passage in the

Bible where the covenants of promise are related to a person's salvation?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. Where do you find such important testimony as that?

A. In Eph. ii. 11, 12.

Q. Well, what do you find in that Scripture?

A. I find that in verse 12, that aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel, have no Christ.

Q. No Christ!! Is that possible?

A. That is just what it says. Read it for yourself?

Q. Well, what else do you find in that Scripture?

A. In verse 12, I find that strangers from the Covenants of Promise, are in a very pitiable condition.

Q. What is their condition?

A. Only think of it! They have neither God, or hope!

Q. Who are Strangers to the Covenants of Promise?

A. A person may be a stranger to them in two ways.

Q. Please name them.

A. A person may be a stranger to them, on account of being ignorant of their existence.

Q. In what other sense?

A. In the sense of not having an heir's interest in them.

Q. Well, it surely is very important to possess an heir's interest in them, seeing that such momentous issues attach to their possession. I will ask Bessie to tell us who is a covenantor?

Bessie. A person who enters into a covenant relationship with another.

Q. What motive usually prompts the making of covenants?

A. The gain of money or other material interests.

Q. Is that usually the case, with regard to both parties to the covenant?

A. Yes, it is usually selfish interest on both sides.

Q. Do you know of a covenant which is an exception to the general rule?

A. I do.

Q. Where do you find the record of such a covenant?

A. In Isa. lv. 3.

Q. Will you please quote it?

A. It reads as follows: "Incline your ear and come unto me: hear, and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting COVENANT with you, even the sure MERCIES of DAVID."

Q. In offering to make this Davidic Covenant with others, does a selfish motive enter into the offer on the part of the party of the first part?

A. Not at all. He says: "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath NO MONEY; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price. Wherefore do ye spend your money for that which is not bread? And your labor for that which satisfieth not?"

Q. How can we obtain such great

riches without the expenditure of money?

A. By becoming a covenantor.

Q. Covenant with whom?

A. Our Heavenly Father, as the party of the first part.

Q. Who are invited to become parties of the second part?

Ella. The offer is made to all who will "Incline their ear and come."

Q. What covenant is referred to?

"The sure mercies of David," which means a share in the oath-bound covenant that he made with him.

Q. Under the covenant with David, who was to occupy his throne as King of Israel?

A. See Acts ii. 30: David "being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up CHRIST to sit on his THRONE."

Q. What does the Christ promise to all fellow-covenantors?

A. "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne."

Teacher. These things are so plain, simple, and easy to be understood, that I wonder that more people do not comprehend them. I will ask Carrie to tell us what steps people should take in order to be recognized as covenantors?

Carrie. Such people must first acquaint themselves with the covenant. After fully comprehending the covenant, then comply with the conditions required of all who desire to become parties of the second part.

Q. When the throne and Kingdom of David is mentioned in Scripture, what are we to understand by such phrase?

A. The Commonwealth, Government or Civil Polity of Israel.

Q. The Gospel of the Kingdom pictures the future blessedness of the nations through that instrumentality, does it not?

A. Yes. See Gal. iii. 8: "And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen---nations---through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abra-

ham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed."

Q. When a person becomes a covenantor, what relation will he sustain to the Re-organized Commonwealth of Israel?

A. A "Joint heir with Jesus Christ." Rom. viii. 17. "A Royal Priesthood." 1 Pet. ii. 9. "Fellow-Citizens." Eph. ii. 19.

Q. In what position are those who are outside of the bonds of the covenant?

A. They are "Gentiles in the flesh;" "Aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel;" "Strangers from the Covenants of Promise." Eph. ii. 11, 12.

Q. What is the effect of occupying the conditions just named?

A. "Without Christ;" "Having no Hope;" "Without God in the World."

Q. Their outlook don't look very encouraging does it?

A. It does not, surely; but we ought to remember that aliens and foreigners are usually never given equal privileges

with fellow-citizens, in any commonwealth.

Teacher. We have had quite a long lesson, and a large amount of Scripture evidence has been studied. Now, what do you think? Does it seem to you that the gospel is such a clouded and uncertain proposition, that no two out of a hundred, could name the same items as to the make up of the gospel?

Lud. With such clear light before us, the gospel message cannot remain a hidden proposition, except to the blind.

Teacher. To whom is the gospel hid?

Lud. "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost." 2 Cor. iv. 3.

Teacher. The meeting is now adjourned.

LESSON X.

Teacher. The time has arrived to open our exercises, and engage in our usual study.

Last Sunday night I visited a church situated about two blocks north of our home. The minister took for his text, Matt. xxiv. 34: "Verily I say unto you this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled."

He said that the second coming of our Lord took place sometime during that existing generation. I certainly thought the gentleman was very much mistaken. I made up my mind to ask the class to study that Scripture to-night.

I am proud of my class, because I know that when they take hold of an investigation, they generally find out something before they get through.

I give the following, as the title:

**“THIS GENERATION SHALL NOT PASS,
TILL ALL THESE THINGS BE FUL-
FILLED.” MATT. XXIV. 34.**

I presume the thought of the topic centers in the question, What generation does this passage have reference to; the generation to whom the words were spoken, or some future generation?

I will ask Lucy to express her convictions upon this question.

Lucy. The context makes plain beyond question, as to what generation has the promise of witnessing the incoming of the great consummation without passing away.

See verses 33 and 34, “So likewise ye. when ye shall SEE all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors. Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, till all things be fulfilled.”

Q. Did the generation who “HEARD” those words, “SEE” all these things?

A. They did not.

Q. Then if the generation who “heard” the words did not “see” the

signs, then that could not be the generation which "shall not pass, till all things be fulfilled," could it?

A. It could not because it is the generation which "see ALL these things," and the generation who heard the words, did not see the signs.

Q. What do those things to be seen, consist of?

A. See verses 29, 30: "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken; and then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory."

"These things," consist of five distinct points:

1. The darkening of the sun.
2. The moon withdrawing her light.
3. The stars shall fall from heaven.

4. The powers of the heavens shall be shaken.

5. The sign of the Son of Man in heaven.

None of these things has either THIS, or any OTHER generation yet seen.

Teacher. Do not Adventists point to a dark day now in the past, as being a fulfillment of this prophecy?

A. Yes, but it signally failed to meet the case.

Q. In what way?

A. It was too limited in its extent, for "all the tribes," or nations of the earth to see. Besides this, the lapse of time has proved it a failure.

Q. Please show how?

A. The generation witnessing the dark day, has long since passed away, without the events it was supposed to foreshadow, taking place.

Q. When will the day appear?

A. See verse 29, which reads as follows: "Immediately AFTER the tribula-

tion of those days, shall the sun be darkened," etc.

The darkening of the sun, etc., could not possibly take place until "AFTER the tribulation of those days," which tribulation still exists.

Q. What tribulation does this have reference to?

A. See verses 20 and 21: "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day; for there shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be."

The context shows that the tribulation is upon Israel. The corresponding passage in Luke xxi. 20-24, makes it clear that its application is to Israel.

"But woe unto them that are with child in those days! for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people, and they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gen-

tiles, until the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled. And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and upon the earth, distress of nations, etc.”

Notice the phrase: “Great distress in the land,---of Israel---and wrath upon this people,” of Israel, culminates in their being “led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, etc.”

This is the parallel passage to Matt. xxiv. 29: “Immediately AFTER the tribulation of those days, shall the sun be darkened,” etc.

Q. What is the equivalent in Luke, to Matthew’s “Darkening of the sun?”

A. The equivalent is found in Luke xxi. 25: “There shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations.”

Q. When do these signs take place, according to Luke?

A. Not “until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.”

Q. Are those “times” fulfilled?

A. Not yet, because Israel still suffers great tribulation, at the hands of the Russian Gentiles.

Q. When does the darkening of the sun, etc., take place?

A. "IMMEDIATELY after the tribulation of those days."

Q. Well, the "tribulation of those days," commenced, when Israel was "led away captive into all nations," and has followed them in their captivity, and still abides with them, does it not?

A. It does.

Q. Then the darkening of the sun, etc., does not occur until the tribulation is over, does it?

A. It does not.

Q. Well, as the "tribulation of those days" are not yet over, and the darkening of the sun, cannot take place until "AFTER the tribulation of those days," then the time for the darkening of the sun, is not yet due, is it?

A. It is not.

Q. Then the darkening of the sun,

as claimed by Adventists, cannot fulfill this prophecy, can it?

A. No, sir; it certainly is a long way from it.

Q. What date do Adventists give, as to when the sun was darkened?

A. May 19, 1780.

Q. In Matthew's account, the sun and moon were darkened, and the stars fell at the same time. They are a group of events resulting as natural effects, as for instance, whatever affects the sun, must of necessity, affect also the moon. When do Adventists claim that the stars fell?

A. Nov. 13, 1833.

Q. When were they to fall, according to Matthew?

A. "Immediately AFTER the tribulation of those days," like the darkening of sun and moon.

Q. What length of time elapsed between the dark day, and the falling of the stars, according to Adventism?

A. Fifty-three years.

Q. Can you call that "immediately after?"

A. Hardly.

Q. What events follow "immediately after," the darkening of the sun, etc.?

A. "The sign of the Son of Man in heaven," and his "coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory."

Q. Now one hundred and twenty-six years have elapsed, since May 19, 1780, and no such events, have yet occurred. I should certainly call that a very long "immediately after," wouldn't you?

A. I certainly should.

Q. To whom will the sign and coming be visible?

A. "All the tribes---nations---of the earth."

Q. About how soon will the coming in glory take place, after the sun is darkened, etc.?

A. At the very furthest limit, not more than one generation.

Q. Upon what do you base your calculation?

A. Luke xxi. 28, 31, 32: "And when these things BEGIN to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh. . . . So likewise ye, when ye shall see these things come to pass, know ye that the Kingdom of God is nigh at hand.---How near?---Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away, till ALL be fulfilled."

Q. How many generations has already passed away since the alleged dark day of May 19, 1780?

A. More than two of them.

Q. Then the lapse of time has shown that it is a mistake to regard that day as a prophetic sign?

A. Yes, most conclusively.

Teacher. There has been other dark days, besides that which occurred on May 19, 1780. Is there not just as much reason to regard these as prophetic signs as that of 1780 ?

Lud. Yes, there surely is. I have a

newspaper cutting in my pocket, which mentions some of them.

Teacher. At what date did the last one occur?

A. On the morning of April 7, in the year 1895.

Q. Where did it occur?

A. In the Russian Caucasus.

Q. In what Province?

A. The Province of Vandikafkass.

Q. How much territory was affected by the darkness?

A. Nearly 5,000 square miles.

Q. How did the darkness compare with that in the United States, in the year 1780?

A. "It was treated to a period of abnormal darkness, more phenomenal, perhaps, than that which spread consternation throughout the American Colonies in the year above mentioned. The people of the whole province were terror-stricken, fearing an earthquake or a cloudburst, and the entire day was spent groveling around in their caves and cav-

erns, momentarily expecting to be annihilated. The phenomenon appears to have been observed in other provinces of Russia proper, as Siberia, Tartary and Northern China; but at no place was the darkness so impenetrable as that at Vandikafkass, where like the proverbial Egyptian darkness, it could actually be felt.

Teacher. Does history mention any other dark day?

Yes, it does.

Q. Where was it?

A. In the West Indies.

Q. In what year did that event take place?

A. In 1812.

Q. Give the duration of the darkness, at each of these three places?

1. The American Colonies, in 1780, lasted fifty hours.

2. The Russian darkness, in 1895, lasted forty-two hours.

3. The West India darkness, in 1812, lasted five days.

Q. Now as to the stars falling from heaven. At what date do the Adventists say, that prophecy was fulfilled?

A. Nov. 13, 1833.

Q. Has there been another remarkable shower, since that time?

A. Yes, on Jan. 14, 1897.

Q. At what place?

A. Lea Pavy, Boliver.

Q. How long did it last?

A. It lighted the sky for several hours.

Q. Can you quote some old Testament passage, predicting the future darkening of the sun?

A. Yes. See Joel ii. 30-32: "And I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, BEFORE the great and terrible day of the Lord COME. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord---or have called on them the NAME of the Lord, in his own prescribed

way---shall be delivered; for in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, shall be deliverance, as the Lord hath said, and the remnant whom the Lord shall call."

These signs given by Joel, as you will perceive, precede "the "great and terrible day of the Lord," or the "great tribulation" upon ALL nations, "IMMEDIATELY AFTER" the "tribulation" upon the people of Israel.

Q. What other Scripture makes use of the signs in the sun, moon and stars. as the forerunner of the coming day of wrath?

A. Rev. vi. 12-17: "And I beheld when he had opened the sixth seal, and lo, there was a great earthquake; and the sun became black as the sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood; and the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig-tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind. And the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of

their places. And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bond man, and every free man, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?" This is equivalent to Joel's "great and terrible day of the Lord." Both of these days, are ushered in, by a "show of wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood before the great and terrible day of the Lord come."

Teacher. Now let us sum up the testimony, and see if we can learn what generation is referred to, when it says, "This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled?"

I will ask Arlóa to show what things

are indicated by the general phrase, "ALL THINGS?"

Arloa. I should say the things which are named in the immediate context, beginning with the tribulation upon Israel.

Q. Why begin there?

1. Because Israel's tribulation will continue through the entire period of their captivity. They are God's peculiar sign nation, they are the sign around which all other signs must cluster; therefore, I begin with the "wrath" upon Israel.

2. The wrath culminates in their expulsion from the father land, and being "led away captive into all nations."

3. During the entire period of their captivity, Jerusalem, the city which was the pride of their heart, shall be "trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled." The fulfilling of the "times of the Gentiles," marks the end of their captivity, and the incoming of better times, towards which all other signs point.

4. The fulfilling of the "times of the Gentiles," will be known by peculiar "signs in the sun, in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth." The signs in the heavenly bodies, will consist of the darkening of the sun and moon, and the falling of stars; followed by a disturbed condition in the atmospheric heavens, indicated by the words, "the powers of the heavens shall be shaken."

5. Next in order appears the sign of the Son of Man in heaven.

6. The appearance of the sign, will startle the "tribes," or nations of the earth.

7. It is "IMMEDIATELY AFTER---NOT BEFORE, OR DURING---the tribulation of those days," upon Israel, that the "sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, the stars fall from heaven,

and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken.”

8. As the “tribulation of those days” upon Israel, STILL exist, it is folly to point to some phenomenon, now one hundred and twenty-six years in the past, as the fulfillment of an event which could not become a fact, until “after” the aforesaid “tribulation,” should cease to exist.

9. It is the “generation” which shall SEE the signs that shall attend the closing of the “times of the Gentiles,” and the consequent tribulation upon Israel. that “shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled,” and not a generation which existed one hundred and twenty-six years ago, which passed away without seeing “ALL” these things fulfilled.

10. “So likewise ye, when ye SEE these things---or signs---come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand.” How near? “Verily I say unto you, this generation shall NOT PASS AWAY till ALL be fulfilled.” Luke xxi. 31, 32.

The generation which shall not cease to exist before the Kingdom of God shall come, must of necessity be the generation which is in existence when "the kingdom of God is nigh at hand," and that will be nigh at hand when the "times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."

Teacher. The time has arrived for us to close our study for to-night. I think that you have quite clearly located the time of the existence of the generation which "shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled." The class is now adjourned.

LESSON XI.

Teacher. Just as I left the house, I met my neighbor, Mr. Horton, driving along the road in his carriage. He invited me to get in and ride with him as far as the corner. I accepted the invitation, and I was glad of the chance, because I did really feel somewhat tired after the day's business.

Well, what topic shall we study tonight? I want to suggest something in relation to the prayers of Jesus. I heard a sermon recently, in which the minister said that God kept Jesus in ignorance as to his future. He asserted that Jesus did not know that the cross was before him, but that he expected to set up his kingdom immediately. When the cross was before him, he prayed to be delivered from the "cup," but God did not grant it.

I will suggest as the subject:

WAS OUR LORD'S PRAYERS ALWAYS ANSWERED?

Bessie. Why that is easily enough answered.

Teacher. How?

A. Why read John xi. 41, 42.

Q. Please quote it?

A. "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. I knew that thou hearest me always."

Teacher. Very true, Bessie, but how about the "cup," which he prayed might pass from him? But we will consider that a little further along.

I wish to ask a few questions which at first may not appear to be relevant to the subject, but you will see where they apply, before we conclude our study.

Q. Was there a SET time, for the Messiah to die, BEFORE which he could not die, and BEYOND which he could not live? "

Arloa. Yes, the time for his cutting off was definitely fixed in the Prophetic

Word, many long years before the Lord Jesus was born.

Q. Are God's decrees always immovable, either by prayer, or any other cause?

A. Such is the case; prayer made contrary to his revealed Word, would also be contrary to his will.

Q. Where can the prophecy speaking of his cutting off be found?

A. In Dan. ix. 45, 46.

Q. Please read it?

A. "Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem; unto Messiah, the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and three-score and two weeks; . . . and after three-score and two weeks shall Messiah be CUT OFF, but not for himself."

Q. Was Jesus aware of the fact that his enemies had no power to LAY HANDS on him PRIOR to the set time?

A. Yes, he was. See John vii. 19, 30: "Why go ye about to kill me?" "Then

they sought to take him; but no man laid hands on him.”

Q. Why?

A. “Because his hour was not yet come.”

Q. What other text have you?

A. John viii. 20: “And no man laid hands on him; for HIS HOUR had not yet come.”

Q. Was Jesus aware of the fact, when his hour did come?

A. Oh, yes, he was keenly alive to that fact. See John xiii. 1: “Now before the feast of the passover, when Jesus knew that his HOUR was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father.”

Q. Can you quote another text, to prove the same thing?

A. Yes. See Matt. xxv. 45: “Behold, the HOUR is at hand, and the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. Rise, let us be going; behold, he is at hand, that doth betray me.”

He was now conscious that the hour

spoken of by the prophet Daniel, for the "Messiah to be cut off, but not for himself," had in fact come.

Q. Did he pray when he realized his "hour was come?"

A. He did. He prayed earnestly.

Q. What did he pray for?

A. See Matt. xxvi. 34: "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt."

Q. Was his prayer answered?

A. It was. The Father let the cup pass from him.

Q. How was that? Was he not cut off, just as Daniel foretold?

A. Exactly. His prayer had no reference to that event.

Q. What is your opinion about this matter, Carrie?

Carrie. I am of the opinion that it would have been inconsistent, and altogether unlike our Savior, to pray to be delivered from that which he knew from his personal study of prophecy, was his

manifest destiny as the gift of God, to be offered for the salvation of sinners.

Q. . Does the language of the Savior, in conversation with his disciples, after his resurrection contain the least hint of his having prayed to be delivered from drinking the cup of the cross?

A. Not in the least. In fact, if he had so prayed, his language to his disciples would betray his inconsistency.

Q. . Who were the disciples?

A. I refer to his conversation with Cleopas, and his companion.

Q. Where did he meet them?

A. He fell in with them while they journeyed to Emmaus. They were very sad, and talked seriously together. Jesus held their eyes, so that they should not recognize him. Jesus then asked them, "What manner of communications are these that ye have one to another, as ye walk and are sad?"

"Cleopas, answering said unto him, Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not known the things which are

come to pass there in these days? And he said unto them, what things?" They then told him the whole story, and added, "We trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel."

Q. Well, what did he say to them about his own death and resurrection?

A. "Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?"

"And he said unto them, thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

Q. What fault did he find with these disciples?

A. That they were simple ones, and very slow of comprehension, on account of not having a better understanding of the teaching of the prophets, and also as

to what was written in the law of Moses, and in the Psalms, concerning him.

Q. Now, considering the words of Jesus, how that it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day, would it have been like him to pray, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me?"

A. It would have been very far from being like our Savior, to give utterance to such a prayer.

Teacher. I will request Albert to read Luke xxiv. 25, 26, from the Diaglott, because I think it states the case in somewhat clearer language?

Albert. It reads as follows: "And he said unto them, O inconsiderate men, and slow of heart to believe all which the prophets have spoken! Was it not necessary for the Messiah to have suffered these things, and to enter his glory?"

Q. The preacher that I mentioned at the opening of this lesson, stated that Jesus was ignorant of the fact that it was "NECESSARY" for him to "SUFFER

these things," and in proof that such was the case, he cited the fact of the prayer uttered by our Savior, "O Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me."

The presumption was, that if Jesus did have knowledge that it was "necessary" for him to "suffer these things," he would not have been inconsiderate enough to pray for deliverance from a cup of suffering which he, himself, considered was "necessary." Did Jesus, himself, consider it necessary that the cup of suffering should be drank?

A. He did. He charged his disciples with being "inconsiderate men," that they had not perceived from the study of the prophets, that it was "necessary for the Messiah to have suffered these things." Now, if Jesus had not perceived that it was "necessary," himself, he could not have had any consistent ground to censure his disciples, and call them "inconsiderate men," for not perceiving that which he had not perceived himself. This is the conclusion that our

preacher's mistaken theory would bring us to.

Q. But was not Jesus well aware of the suffering that awaited him?

A. He surely was.

Q. Did he not also know the exact time when the suffering would come?

A. Certainly he did.

Q. What proof have you?

A. We gather that from expressions like this: "And no man laid hands on him; for HIS HOUR had not yet come." John viii. 20. "Jesus KNEW that his HOUR HAD COME when he should depart out of this world unto the Father." John xiii. 1.

Q. Now, if Jesus "knew" all this, he must have known more than the minister gave him credit for?

A. He truly did.

Lud. I have been watching to see what you are going to do about the Lord's prayer for the cup to pass, while he was in the garden?

Teacher. All right. We will now consider that phase of the question.

Q. After Jesus had rebuked his disciples for their lack of comprehension as to what Moses and the prophets had written concerning him, what did he do?

A. He gave them better instruction.

Q. How did he proceed to do so.

A. "And beginning at Moses and all the prophets he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself."

Q. Well, if Jesus had prayed that the cup of the cross might pass from him, what would that prayer be equivalent to?

A. It would have been equivalent to our Lord asking his Father to let all the things written in Moses, the prophets, and in all the Scriptures, concerning himself, become an utter failure.

Q. Do you suppose, that our Lord would for one moment ever contemplate such a thing?

A. Never! never!!

Q. Why not?

A. Because he said: "ALL things

MUST be fulfilled, which were written in the Law of Moses, and in Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me." Whatever "MUST BE," is mandatory, and could never be set aside, either through petition, or any other cause.

Q. What were those things thus written?

A. The Lord said: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day." These things were mandatory. If the cup of the cross had passed from him, he could not have suffered and rose from the dead the third day.

Q. What was designed should follow the suffering and resurrection?

A. "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

Q. Could it not have been preached just the same, if the suffering had been omitted?

A. It might have been preached,

but it would have been vain preaching.

Q. Why so?

A. Because "without shedding of blood is no remission."

Q. Should the suffering have been omitted, what would it have amounted to in effect?

A. It would in effect have been a prayer for the Father to count as nothing the prophecies written in Moses, the the Prophets, and Psalms.

Teacher. By a little careful study the almost general mistake that the cross was the bitter cup which Jesus shrank from drinking, could have been avoided.

Bessie. Please read Mark xiv. 33-35.

A. It reads as follows: "And he taketh with him Peter, James and John, and began to be sore amazed, and to be very heavy; and saith unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful unto DEATH: tarry ye here and watch. And he went forward a little, and fell on the ground, and prayed that, the hour might pass from him. And he said, Abba, Father,

all things are possible unto thee; take away THIS CUP from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt."

Teacher. What "cup" does Jesus have reference to when he prays, "take away THIS CUP from me?"

A. "Death."

Q. From the cross?

A. No, sir.

Q. What then?

A. Verse 34, shows that excessive sorrow had produced a deadly malady, which must end in death, before the cross could be reached, if his prayer, "take away this cup from me," had not been answered.

Q. Quote verse 34, from the Diaglott?

A. "And he says to them, my soul is encompassed with a DEADLY---fatal---anguish." In other words, "my soul," or life, is in immediate danger, on account of a "DEADLY" malady, caused by excessive "anguish."

Q. Please read verses 33 and 34,

from the "Twentieth Century Translation?"

A. It reads as follows: "He took Peter, James and John with him, and began to show signs of great dismay and deep distress of mind. I am sad AT HEART, he said, sad even to DEATH; stay here, and watch."

Teacher. In order to show that other Evangelists speak of the same fatal malady, I will request you to quote Matt. xxvi. 38?

A. It reads as follows: "Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto DEATH." Death resulting from sorrow, otherwise called a "broken heart."

Q. His heart anguish must have been simply intense, please quote Luke xxii. 44, from the Twentieth Century Translation?

A. It reads as follows: "And as his anguish became intense, he prayed still more earnestly, while his sweat was like

great drops of blood falling on the ground.”

Q. Please read also verse 42?

A. “Father, if it is thy pleasure, take this cup from me; only, not my will be done, but thine.”

Q. Was it the Father’s good pleasure to hear and answer this prayer?

A. It was. See verse 43: “Presently there appeared to him an angel from heaven, who STRENGTHENED him.” His prayer was answered. He was saved from DEATH, which was threatened by reason of a “deadly anguish,” from which he suffered acutely.

Lud. Was the malady from which our Lord was a sufferer, known to the Medical fraternity?

Teacher. I will ask Ella to read to the class this extract from “Smith’s Bible Dictionary?”

Ella. “One of the physical phenomena attending our Lord’s agony in the Garden of Gethsemane, is described by Luke xxii. 44: ‘His sweat was as it were

great drops---lit. clots---of blood falling down to the ground.' Of this malady, known in medical science by the term 'diapedesis,' there have been examples recorded both in ancient and modern times. The cause assigned is generally violent mental emotion."

Teacher. Ella, I now hand you a book by Dr. Millingen, entitled, "Curiosities of the Medical Experience." Please turn to page 489, Sec. Ed., and read the marked extract.

Ella. "It is probable that this strange disorder arises from a violent emotion of the nervous system, turning the streams of blood out of their natural course, and forcing the red particles, into the cutaneous excretories. A mere relaxation of the fibres could not produce so powerful a revulsion. It may also arise in cases of extreme debility, in connection with a thinner condition of the blood."

Teacher. It is quite evident that the "deadly anguish," from which our Lord

suffered, would be likely to excite “a violent emotion of the nervous system.”

The view that our Lord shrank from the physical suffering of the cross, cannot be true. His mental suffering had a much keener edge to it than the cross could inflict. I cannot for one moment entertain the thought that our Lord was deficient in either manly or moral courage. His refined and sensitive nature could not endure the acute mental suffering which pressed so heavily upon him. That his suffering was not from cowardly fear, but solely of the mind, is evident from Mark xiv. 33, 34, 20th Cent. Trans. “He took Peter, James, and John with him, and began to show signs of great dismay and deep distress of MIND. I am sad at HEART, he said, sad even to death; stay here and watch.”

Now, Arloa, do you think that when Jesus prayed so earnestly in the garden, that he sought to be saved from death?

A. Arloa. It does really look that way.

Q. Do you know of any Scripture which seems to favor that view?

A. Yes, I call to mind Heb. v. 7.

Q. Please read it?

A. It reads as follows: "Who in the days of his flesh, when he---Jesus---offered up prayers, and supplications, with strong crying and tears unto him that was ABLE to SAVE him from DEATH, and was HEARD in that he feared."

Q. When "in the days of his flesh," did he offer up such "prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears?"

A. It was during his fearful agony of heart, in the Garden of Gethsemane.

Q. When he had thus so earnestly prayed, what did he think that his Father was able to do for him?

A. "Able to save him from death."

Q. Did he do so?

A. Yes. "And was heard."

Q. Did he ever shrink from that which the Prophetic Word said "must be fulfilled?"

A. He never did.

Q. What did the Scriptures say must be fulfilled?

A. He said, "All things must be fulfilled, which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me."

Q. What were the things written concerning him?

A. He said: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day."

Q. Well, if it "must be," that he should "suffer and rise from the dead the third day," then it could not be otherwise, could it?

A. Why no. That which "must be," cannot be changed.

Q. For Jesus to pray for the removal of the "cup," meaning his suffering on the cross, would be asking for the removal of that which "must be fulfilled," would it not?

A. It certainly would be.

Q. Would Jesus do that?

A. We know that he would not. We

have already clearly seen that he had no reference to his suffering on the cross. He never in all his life shrank from the accomplishment of that which the Prophetic Word said, "Must be fulfilled." Every prayer of the blessed Christ was answered. I call attention to his prayer, quoted by Bessie, at the commencement of this lesson: "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. I knew that thou hearest me always."

Teacher. I believe the Lord's courage, was equal to the trial, on every occasion. I love to honor the noble and courageous character of our Redeemer. He said the predictions concerning him in Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms, "MUST be fulfilled." Now, whatever "must be," he submitted to, without a question.

I think that we have had a good lesson, which has given us a more exalted, conception of the noble self-sacrificing character of God's only begotten Son.

The class is now dismissed.

LESSON XII.

Teacher. Last Sunday afternoon, I took a walk down as far as the mill dam. About a block further down the stream, I noticed standing upon the banks of the river, quite a large company of people, they were singing. Curiosity impelled me to go down there. When I reached them, I found a man, dressed in a long flowing robe, making a prayer. After prayer, about one dozen people entered the stream. They were placed on their knees. The preacher went to the first one and dipped him face forward, saying, as he did so, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father." He then raised him up, and dipped him again, repeating, "in the name of the Son." And also a third time, "and of the Holy Ghost." It set me to thinking as to whether it was proper to

use one or three names in Bible baptism?

George. That interests me. I propose that we discuss the subject of

THE ONE NAME.

Teacher. All right. Give us your convictions, George?

George. I am of the opinion that Matthew's so-called formula requires the use of only one name.

Q. Does not the commission mention the names of three persons?

A. No. It does not say names, in the plural, but uses the singular number, "name."

Q. How many persons are named in the commission?

A. Only two.

Q. Is not the Holy Spirit a person?

A. No.

Q. What is it then?

A. It is a gift from God, which can be poured out as a liquid, and fill a place, or a person, and can manifest itself in

various forms, as a dove, or like cloven tongues of fire.

Q. What is the Holy Spirit?

A. Gramatically, the word is a noun, the name of a gift.

Q. One would hardly expect to be baptized into the name of a gift, would they?

A. I should say not.

Q. Does the Son bear the Father's name?

A. Yes, he does.

Q. How did he get it?

A. By natural inheritance, just the same as any other son bears his father's name. See Heb. i. 4, 5: "He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." In other words, he is my only Son by begettal, therefore he has the sole right to my name by inheritance. The Father and the Son, have but the ONE name, and not two names; conse-

quently you cannot have two names, into which you may baptize separately, and independent.

Q. What is the Father's name?

A. "Yahveh," belongs to the Father exclusively. It cannot be shared by any other "Elohim," or "Theos." The abbreviated name "Yah," is used of the Father fifty times, in the Old Testament. The word "Yah," also enters into the make up of the Son's name, YAH-SHUA.

Q. Now, if the Son has inherited the Father's name, then they both have the same name do they not?

A. Certainly; it could not possibly be otherwise.

Q. Well, then, when a person is baptized in the name of the Son, he is also in the name of the Father, is he not?

A. Most surely.

Q. Tell me, then, is it not superfluous, to repeat the same act, and the same name, to make a separate baptism into the Father?

A. It is even so.

Q. Now, when baptism is administered in the name of the Holy Spirit, is a different name used, designating a different personality from either that of the Father or the Son?

A. No, it is not.

Q. But is not the word Spirit sometimes used as designating a person?

A. Yes.

Q. What person?

A. The Father only. So, then, when baptism is administered in the name of the Son, it is also in that of the Father, because the Son, inherited his own Father's name; now, if the phrase, "The Spirit," designates the Father, it is still the same one name, as Matthew says, "Baptizing them in the NAME---not names ---of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

Carrie. Now, after hearing all this, I have a question to ask. You stated that the phrase "The Spirit," bore reference only to the Father. Now I think that I have got you in a corner, this time. Let

me read to you, John xiv. 26: "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."

That which the Father sends, cannot be the Father, he does not send himself, but the Holy Spirit, which must be a person, because he uses the personal pronoun he. "He shall teach you all things."

Albert. Now Carrie, when did this personal Holy Spirit come?

Carrie. On the day of Pentecost.

Q. Where is it recorded?

A. Acts ii. 1-6.

Q. Are you quite certain that Acts ii. 1-6, is a fulfillment of John xiv. 26?

A. Yes, quite sure.

Q. Well, in what manner does it say that he made his personal advent in among the disciples in the upper room?

A. It says: "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all

with one accord, in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting.”

Q. Well, it seems to me to be a very boisterous way for an expectant visitor to make his advent among those who were looking for his coming. Then, again, how can a person expand himself, so as to fill the space in a whole house?

A. It is rather an impersonal phenomena. I must confess that I don't know how to account for it.

Q. But that is not all, verses 3 and 4, says: “And there appeared unto them cloven tongues as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.”

The record says, he filled the space of the house, filled each person, and sat upon each of them like cloven tongues of fire. Not only was it a fearful, but a very strange, and impersonal procedure.

Verse 17, speaks of the Spirit being "poured out," as a liquid. This, also is an impersonal manifestation.

Now, Carrie, I want to call your attention to the fact, that Acts ii. uses the neuter gender "IT," in place of the personal pronoun "HE," as found in John xiv. 26. Now, if Acts ii. 1-6, is a fulfillment of John xiv. 26, then they should both use the same gender. One cannot be personal, and the other neuter, that is speaking literally. I want to ask our teacher, if the Bible does not frequently personify that which is clearly not personal?

A. Yes; it is frequently the case. I suppose the reason is, that a personification sometimes enables the mind to grasp the thought through that kind of a figure.

I will give a few samples of personification.

1. The world is personified. "If ye were of the world, the world would love HIS own." John xv. 19.

2. Sin is personified. "Whosoever

committeth sin, is the servant of SIN.”
John viii. 34.

“Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, HIS servants ye are.” Rom. vi. 16, 18.

SIN hath REIGNED unto death.” Rom. v. 21.

3. Wisdom is personified. “SHE is more precious than rubies.” “Length of days is in her right hand, and in her left hand riches and honor.” Prov. iii. 13, 15.

“Wisdom hath builded her house. She hath hewn out her seven pillars.” Prov. ix. 1.

4. A disposition to evil personified. “Ye have put off the OLD MAN with HIS deeds.” Col. iii. 9.

“Put off concerning the former conversation the old man which is corrupt.”

“Put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.” Eph. iv. 22, 24.

5. The word DEVIL, is SIN Personified. “Forasmuch, then, as the children

are partakers of flesh and blood, he--- Jesus---also himself likewise took part of the same, that THROUGH DEATH,---the negation of ALL power---he might DESTROY him that had the power of death, that is the DEVIL." Heb. ii. 14.

Jesus, while in the state of death, was bereft of all power, like any other person. The adversary or devil Jesus' death could destroy, is SIN, by his offering upon the cross. The devil or adversary he was to destroy, is that "which hath the power of death." "Sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." Jas. i. 15.

Teacher. After this digression, let us get back to the subject of the name.

Q. Do you find that the commission as given by Matthew, was ever used by the apostles or early Christians, as a baptismal formula?

A. It is quite evident that it was not used, or intended to be so used.

Q. Give some samples as to what name was used?

Carrie. See Acts ii. 38: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." This is the first instance on record, since the endowment with power from on high, and it was in the name of Jesus, the Christ.

Q. Do you find the use of the ONE name, confirmed by other Scriptures?

A. Yes. See Acts x. 48: "And he commanded them to be baptized in THE NAME of the Lord."

Q. Why did he not command the use of a triune name, if that was the essential thing to do?

A. If that had been the essential and proper formula, it surely would have been commanded.

Q. Have you still further testimony along this same line?

A. I have. See Acts viii. 16: "Only they baptized in THE name of the Lord Jesus?"

Q. Why should this name be used?

A. Because it is the saving name.

Q. Do the Scriptures so teach?

A. They do so, in a very clear and decisive manner.

Q. Where?

A. In Acts iv. 12.

Q. Please read it?

A. "Neither is their salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."

Q. Is the name of the Lord Jesus, a life-giving name?

A. It is. The life of the world is involved in it,

Q. Where do you find a clear Bible statement?

A. You will find that recorded in John xx. 31.

Q. Please read it to the class?

A. It reads as follows: "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have LIFE through his NAME."

Q. Is it not also the all-powerful

name in which we should trust and do all our work?

A. It is even so. See Col. iii. 17, which reads as follows: "Whatsoever ye do in word and deed, do ALL in the name of the Lord Jesus." This includes baptism. The apostasy would have you "do ALL" in the name of a so-called Triune God,---"God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost."

Q. Is not the name of the Son the all-important name to every believer?

A. That name is supreme to every believer. It is his alpha and omega. To the authority of that name every knee must bow.

Q. Was not his origin superior to that of Adam?

A. Why, of course it was. See 1 Cor. xv. 47: "The first man is of the earth, earthly; the second man is the Lord from heaven."

Q. What should be the walk in life, of all name-bearers?

A. See 2 Tim. ii. 19: "Let every one

that nameth the name of Christ---in baptism---depart from iniquity.” Iniquity and the name of the Lord, cannot harmonize at all.

Q. How can we secure the remission of sins?

A. See Acts xxii. 16: “And now why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.”

Q. Is not that one name supreme over every other name?

A. Yes. See Eph. i. 21: “He raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavens, far above all principality and power, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.”

Q. What did Saul do to the Lord’s name-bearers, before he became one himself?

A. See Acts ix. 13, 14: “I have heard by many of this man, how much evil he hath done to thy saints at Jerusalem; and

here he hath authority to bind all that call on---them---THY NAME.”

Q. Where and when is that name taken or called on believers?

A. In baptism.

Q. Did Saul put to death them who dared to call on that exalted and sacred name?

A. He did. See Acts ix. 21: “Is this not he which destroyed them which CALLED on this name?”

Q. Did he afterward become a name-bearer?

A. He did. See verse 15: “He is a chosen vessel unto me to BEAR my NAME before the Gentiles, and Kings, and the children of Israel. For I will show him how great things he must suffer for my name’s sake?”

All believers of the Gospel of the Kingdom, who have been buried with the Christ in baptism, have become bearers of the one saving name, and woe the one who shall dishonor it.

Teacher. The triple use of the same

name, as recorded in the commission, in Matthew, it is quite evident, was never used as a baptismal formula, by the early disciples. I find the use of the name, Jesus, the Christ, to be more in harmony with the preponderance of Scripture evidence, and less liable to be mixed up with trinitarianism.

I trust that our lesson has given us a greater reverence for the mighty saving name of our loved Redeemer.

The class is now dismissed.

Q. How many times is it translated by the word church?

A. Never, of course; educated men know better than to be guilty of such folly.

Q. What is a kingdom?

A. An organized civil government, presided over, or governed by a King.

Q. If you were asked to define the word church, would you give the same definition as you would to the word kingdom?

A. I certainly would not.

Q: And why not, if the church and kingdom are the same thing?

A. They are not the same thing.

Q. How can you prove that they are not the same thing?

A. That is a simple matter. Quote a few texts of Scripture where the word kingdom occurs, and supply in its place the word church. Now, if it will make sense, by the use of the supply word, then we may conclude that the two words

are synonymous, and may properly be so used.

Teacher. Let us try it.

Lud. All right. I think that will be a good test.

Teacher. Let each member of the class quote a text containing the word "kingdom," but supply in its place, the word "church," and we will soon learn whether a church can be a kingdom, or not. We will begin with Lud, and then pass around to the right.

Lud. Dan. ii. 44: "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a church which shall never be destroyed."

Carrie. Dan. viii. 18: "But the saints of the Most High shall take the church and possess the church for ever, even for ever and ever."

Arloa. Verse 22: "And the time came that the saints possessed the church." Possessed themselves.

Bessie. Verse 23: "The fourth beast shall be the fourth church upon earth."

Ella. Verse 27: "And the church and the dominion, and the greatness of the church under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose church is an everlasting church," etc.

Albert. Matt. xxv. 34: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the church prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

George. Luke xiii. 28: "Ye shall see Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and all the prophets in the church of God, and you yourselves thrust out."

Lucy. 2 Tim. iv. 1: "Who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his church."

Lud. Matt. vi. 10: "Thy church come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." The church praying for the church to come.

Carrie. Acts xiv. 22: "We must through much tribulation enter the church of God."

Arloa. 1 Cor. xv. 50: "Flesh and

blood cannot inherit the church of God." If they are not all "flesh and blood," what are they?

Bessie. Luke xxi. 31: "When ye---the church---see these things come to pass, know ye that the church of God is nigh at hand."

Ella. Acts i. 6: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the church to Israel?"

George. Jas. ii. 5: "Hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, heirs of the church, which he hath promised to them that love him."

Where is the church, if it is still only at present, a matter of heirship and promise?

Lucy. Matt. xix. 24: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the church." Is that a fact?

Teacher. Now let us try the reverse of this. Select a few texts where the word "church" occurs, and substitute the word "kingdom," in its place, and it will

not take long to determine whether they are equivalent words, or not?

We will take the same order, as before.

Lud. 1 Cor. vii. 17: "So ordain I in all kingdoms."

Carrie. 1 Cor. xvi. 19: "The kingdoms of Asia salute you. Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord, with the kingdom that is in their house."

Arloa. 2 Thess. ii. 14: "For ye, brethren, became followers of the kingdoms of God which in Judea, are in Christ Jesus."

Teacher. Are there not others, who like the Church-kingdomists deny the literality of God's Kingdom?

Albert. Yes, we have those who assert that the kingdom is in the heart.

Q. Upon what Scripture do they base that idea?

A. Luke xvii. 20, 21.

Q. Please read it to the class?

A. "And 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 you.”

Q. What phrases in the text do they rely upon?

A. 1. “The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation.”

2. “The Kingdom of God is within you.”

Q. The question the Pharisees put to Jesus, was, “When the Kingdom of God should come?” If the question was put to you, how would you answer it?

A. I would quote Matt. xxv. 31.

Q. Please quote it?

A. “When the Son of man shall COME IN HIS GLORY, and all the holy angels with him, THEN shall he sit upon the THRONE of his glory.”

Q. What points do you observe in this text?

I observe two, as follows:

1. Before the Kingdom of God can

not take long to determine whether they are equivalent words, or not?

We will take the same order, as before.

Lud. 1 Cor. vii. 17: "So ordain I in all kingdoms."

Carrie. 1 Cor. xvi. 19: "The kingdoms of Asia salute you. Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord, with the kingdom that is in their house."

Arloa. 2 Thess. ii. 14: "For ye, brethren, became followers of the kingdoms of God which in Judea, are in Christ Jesus."

Teacher. Are there not others, who like the Church-kingdomists deny the literality of God's Kingdom?

Albert. Yes, we have those who assert that the kingdom is in the heart.

Q. Upon what Scripture do they base that idea?

A. Luke xvii. 20, 21.

Q. Please read it to the class?

A. "And 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 you."

Q. What phrases in the text do they rely upon?

A. 1. "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation."

2. "The Kingdom of God is within you."

Q. The question the Pharisees put to Jesus, was, "When the Kingdom of God should come?" If the question was put to you, how would you answer it?

A. I would quote Matt. xxv. 31.

Q. Please quote it?

A. "When the Son of man shall COME IN HIS GLORY, and all the holy angels with him, THEN shall he sit upon the THRONE of his glory."

Q. What points do you observe in this text?

I observe two, as follows:

1. Before the Kingdom of God can

come, the Lord must first come, and come in glory also.

2. It is THEN, and not before, that “he shall sit upon the throne of his glory.”

Q. Why, if he should come in such “glory” as that, some one will be apt to see the Lord coming in his kingdom, will they not?

A. They certainly will, and it is designed that they should.

Q. To be observed by how many?

A. See Rev. i. 7: “Behold, he cometh with clouds; and EVERY EYE shall SEE him.”

See Matt. xxiv. 30: “Then shall ALL the tribes or---nations---of the earth mourn, and they shall SEE the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.”

See Matt. xxvi. 64: “Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.”

Now, as to the question of the Phari-

sees, "when the Kingdom of God should come?" For answer, see Luke xxi. 25-31: "There shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth: for the powers of heaven shall be shaken."

Q. And what next?

A. "And then shall they SEE the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory."

Q. And what next?

A. "So likewise ye, when ye shall see these things come to pass, KNOW ye that the KINGDOM OF GOD is NIGH at hand."

Q. Now, had these signs taken place when Jesus answered the enquiry of the Pharisees, as to when the Kingdom of God should come?

A. No, they had not, and only in part since then. At that time, the Kingdom

had not been set up, neither was it even "nigh at hand."

Teacher. The class will doubtless have observed in the Scriptures that we have been studying, that when the Lord does come, it will be "with observation," "every eye shall see him." I call that a pretty general "observation," don't you?

Lucy. I should say so. It is to be observed by all nations.

Q. Are not many people teaching that he "cometh not with observation?"

A. They are. They teach that he came unobserved by any "eye," in 1873, and is now, at this time, going about unobserved, among the people. First he is "here," and then "there." At another time, "he is in the desert," or rural districts. That "he is in the secret chambers;" in other words, he is "here," and "there," in "secret" presence, unobserved by any eye.

Q. Shall we believe it?

A. No; we surely must not.

Q. Did the Lord have foreknowledge that when his coming in "great glory," should draw near, that "secret presence" teachers would arise, saying, he is "here" and "there," in "secret chambers," or presence?

A. He did.

Q. What did he advise about believing such teaching?

A. See Matt. xxiv. 23-26: "Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not."

Q. Why not?

A. "For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets---false teachers, as for instance, those who teach secret presence---and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect."

Q. Will these false teachers, who herald "secret presence," give false reports as to where our Lord is?

A. The Lord says: "Behold, I have told you before. Wherefore if they shall

say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not.”

Q. Has the Lord given some good and sufficient reason, as to why we should disregard all reports as to his “secret presence,” in various localities?

A. He has.

Q. Please give it?

A. Matt. xxiv. 26, 27: “Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers, believe it not.” The next verse gives his reason as to why all reports as to his “secret coming,” and “secret presence,” are to be disbelieved.

Q. Please give his reason?

A. In place of being in secret, and unobserved by any “eye,” it will be as brilliant and luminous, “As the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the COMING of the SON of MAN BE.”

In place of his coming being in secret, he will come in “great glory,” as

great as though the whole expanse of the heavens, "from the east, even unto the west," were covered with one great sheet of lightning.

The theory that the Lord comes in secret, unobserved, gives great opportunity for false reports to be circulated, as to our Lord's coming,---"Lo, here is Christ, or there." But when it is understood, that the coming of the Lord will be attended with "great glory," as above described, then no one can be deceived with reports of his secret personal presence, because they know that before his presence, must "Appear the---glory---sign of the Son of man in heaven." The effect of the glory sign upon the nations, will cause alarm. "Then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and THEY shall SEE the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great GLORY." If worldly people observe his "coming in the clouds of heaven," it could not be attended with much secrecy.

The glory sign is the reason the Lord

has assigned, as to why we should discredit all rumors as to his personal presence, PRIOR to the appearance of "the sign of the Son of man in heaven."

"Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him." Rev. i. 7.

Q. What will cause the glory sign, bright as the lightning's blinding flash?

A. The triple glory of the Father, the Son, and the legions of angels, comingled and blended, shining forth in its majestic strength.

Q. "Every eye," of "all the tribes of the earth," are to witness the grand and magnificent spectacle of the coming of the King of Israel, to claim his right to reign upon the throne of David. How can people of every nation witness the "sign of the Son of man in heaven?"

A. Such could literally be the case, if the sign should remain stationery in the heavens, for the space of twenty-four hours.

Albert. A large amount of Scripture testimony has been introduced, proving

positively, that the Lord's coming, will be in open magnificence, visible to all the world; and that "When the Son of man shall come in his glory then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." So the Kingdom could not come, prior to his coming in glory; therefore the Kingdom of God has not yet been set up, either in the heart, in the church, or any where else.

In the beginning of our lesson, Luke xvii. 20, was quoted: "And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the Kingdom of God shall 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 you."

Now, the bulk of the testimony considered to-night, shows that our Lord will come in his Kingdom, with world wide "observation." Now, how can that be harmonized with the statement, "The Kingdom of God cometh NOT with observation?"

Lud. There are two ways in which we may use the word observe. Sometimes it is reported that a new comet has made its appearance in the heavens, but it is not known just where to look for it. Astronomers then go into their observatories, and through their powerful telescopes make observations. They observe and carefully watch the heavens, for the approach or coming of the comet. When it has been discovered, reports are sent out saying, "see here," or "see there." The view of the comet came to them by observation. But when the comet becomes a large, beautiful, and a brilliant spectacle in the heavens, it no longer comes to them by careful watching and observation.

It is even so, with regard to the Kingdom of God. It does not come to us, by careful watching and observation. We do not look for it at all, prior to the appearance of the "sign of the Son of man in heaven." That sign will need no telescopic observation, it will at once, strike

with terror the inhabitants of all nations. The phrase, "cometh not with observation," Dr. Adam Clark, renders, "Cometh not by narrow watching." The Diaglott has it, "Cometh not by careful watching." The thought is the same as taking an observation through a telescope, by careful watching.

Q. Does not an open, visible coming, render it entirely unnecessary to make critical and careful observations in regard to our Lord's coming and kingdom?

A. Yes, it is even so. It is certainly absolutely unnecessary. Hence, it is true, God's Kingdom comes not by careful observation, even while it may be universally observed.

Arloa. We gather from the language of this Scripture, that when Jesus answered the question of the Pharisees, he did not talk about events then present, but he carried their minds forward to a time when men would say "Lo here! or

Lo there!" and his entire talk related to both that time, and also to that people. At the time he speaks of, "Secret Presence Preachers," will doubtless take observations, as to "when the kingdom of God should come," as they previously did, as to when Jesus should come? Their observations pointed to 1873. They made incorrect observations, and Jesus did not come. They however, covered up their failure, by saying, that he came in "secret presence," at that time. And now we have reports, "Lo, here is Christ, or there." "He is in the desert," "he is in the secret chambers," secretly raising the dead, and secretly organizing his kingdom. It would not be surprising if they should presently take further observations and announce, saying, "See here!" "see there!" by "careful observation," we have discovered the kingdom, organized in its mustard seed form,---nameing the place---preparatory to its removal to Jerusalem. . This will doubtless be led by one of the many false Christs, Jesus said

would come; possibly one who will claim that he is the one who came in "secret" in 1873. This will be a fine opening for some deceiver.

Teacher. Is there any need of true gospel believers being deceived?

Bessie. Not a particle.

Q. How can we avoid being deceived?

A. By remembering that the true Christ, when he manifests himself to the world, at large, will not come in secret, but in power and great glory. Every eye shall see him.

Q. Is there not some other notable sign?

A. Yes, the sign of the Son of man in heaven. Accept no one as the Christ, except he who comes in power and great glory, AFTER the sign has appeared in the heavens.

Q. Can deceivers place that sign in the heavens?

A. No, sir; none but the true Christ can manifest that sign.

Q. Then you consider it safe to reject all who does not come by the sign?

A. Perfectly safe.

Q. Would it be safe to disregard the sign?

A. It would be very unsafe. Such a person could easily be led away by deceivers.

Teacher. Luke xvii. 20, 21, asks and answers a question. What is the question?

Ella. "He was demanded of the Pharisees when the Kingdom of God should come?

Q. What answer was given?

A. "Neither shall they say---or have any good reason to say---Lo here! or lo there!---Why not?---For, behold, the Kingdom of God is within---margin among you."

Jesus evidently meant to tell these Pharisees that the coming of the Kingdom would never be discovered by taking close observations; the close observers will report that they have discovered the

kingdom in different localities. One observer will report, "See here!" I have discovered the kingdom at such a place. Another observer will say, "See there!" the kingdom is over yonder, in that direction. Jesus sets these kingdom observers down as deceivers. He says, "Go not after them, nor follow them."

Q. What reason does the Lord assign, for directing his people not to follow these kingdom prognosticators?

This is his reason, as given in verse 24: "For as the lightning, that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall also the Son of man be in his day." The glory sign, renders perfectly useless, all the "see heres," or "see theres," of kingdom observers.

Q. Did the Lord say as much?

A. Yes. See verse 21: "Neither shall they say,---or have cause to say--- Lo---it is---here! or, lo there---it is,---for, the kingdom of God is within---among---you." It will at the time spoken of,

be a demonstrated fact in their midst; and hence, the "see heres," of observatory men, are not worth any notice. The phrase, "within, or among you," has sole reference to the in-coming of the kingdom age, as its context clearly indicates. It has no bearing or connection with any event at the first advent of our Lord.

Teacher. These Kingdom studies interest me, as I believe it does all other people, whose eternal interest is centered there.

We are now dismissed.

LESSON XIV.

Teacher. It is with heartfelt pleasure that I greet you, and express my gratification in that I am privileged to join you in the study of the Sacred Book.

I understand that Ella wishes to present a topic for our study, to-night.

Ella. Yes, I do.

Teacher. Well please name it.

Ella. I have selected the serpentine declaration:

“YE SHALL BE AS GODS.”

Q. Where do you find those words?

A. In Gen. iii. 1-5.

Q. From what original word do we derive the Saxon word gods?

A. It is from the Hebrew word Elohim.

Q. In what Scripture do you find the word gods?

A. See Psa. viii. 4-8.

Q. Please read it to us?

“What is man that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man that thou visiteth him? for thou hast made him a little lower than the angels---Elohim, Gods, or Angels,---and hast crowned him with glory and honor.”

Q. Are the words God and Lord, applied to others, beside the Eternal Creator?

A. Yes. See 1 Cor. viii. 5: “As there be gods---Elohim---many and lords many.”

Q. Do you remember another Bible text?

A. See John x. 34: “Is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods---Elohim---He called them gods---Elohim---to whom the word of God came.”

Q. Have you still another?

A. Yes. See Psa. xcvi. 7: “Worship him all ye---Elohim---gods.”}

Q. Is this text referred to in the New Testament?

A. Yes. See Heb. i. 6: "And again, when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels---Elohim---of God worship him."

Q. Is the word Lord, the proper name to use to designate the Great Eternal?

A. No. Prof Young, in his Analytical, says, "The incommunicable name of the God of Israel, in the Common Version of the English Bible, is generally, though improperly translated by THE LORD."

Q. Has the Father a name that is applicable to him alone? .

A. Yes. See Psa. lxxxiii. 18: "That men may know that thou whose name is YAHVEH---not Jehovah---art the most high over all the earth.";

See Isa. lxii. 2: "I am the Lord---Heb. YAHVEH---that is my name---the Lord---YAHVEH---of hosts is his name."

See Exod vi. 3: "I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty, but by name

YAHVEH, was I not known to them.”

Q. Where did we get the name Jehovah from?

A. A well-known writer says the name “Jehovah according to Masoretic pointing, was invented five hundred years after the time of Christ. It was devised by Jewish superstition, which did not permit an Israelite to pronounce this sacred name correctly.”

Teacher. I will request Carrie to inform the class as to whom the word “gods,”---Elohim---is principally applied?

Carrie. The phrase, quoted from the Psalms, says: “Worship him--YAHVEH--all ye gods.” Elohim, is principally applied to angels. The quotation from the Hebrews, said, “Let all the angels---Elohim---of God worship him.”

Q. Who created man at the beginning?

A. See Gen. i. 26: “And---YAHVEH---God said, let us---Elohim---make man in our image,”---the likeness of the Elohim.

Q. Who were the gods the serpent

alluded to when he said, "Ye shall be as gods?"

Evidently the gods, Elohim, or angels, included in the plural pronoun "US."

Q. What was the nature of the gods, Elohim or angels?

A. The serpent evidently regarded them as deathless beings, as we gather from his declaration, "Ye shall not surely die." The reason he assigned, was, ye shall "be as gods," Elohim---the creative angels.

Teacher. I want to ask Arloa, if our Lord regarded the angels, Elohim, or gods, as being deathless?

Arloa. I should judge that he did.

Q. What Scripture would you offer in support of the idea?

A. I should refer you to Luke xx. 35, 36.

Q. Please read it to us.

A. "They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world---age---and the resurrection from---among---the dead,

neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither can they DIE ANY MORE; for they are EQUAL unto the angels"---Elohim, or the gods.

Q. Jesus' statement is, that all who become as angels, Elohim, or gods, are proof against death, is it not?

A. "Neither can they die any more," is his declaration.

Q. Did the serpent understand it the same way?

A. He says, "Ye shall not surely die," because "Ye shall become as gods."

Q. Was he mistaken?

A. He was mistaken as to HOW to "become as gods." He advised disobedience as the way to obtain the unending life of the Elohim.

Q. Was that the true way?

A. No. It was a fatal error. He selected the way to become as the BEASTS instead of the GODS. As for instance, "He is like the beasts that perish." "Like sheep they are laid in the grave;" "thou shalt surely die."

Q. Did Jesus teach us the true way to become as the angels, or gods?

A. Yes, he did.

Q. By what means?

A. "They that are accounted worthy to obtain that world,---age---and the resurrection from---among---the dead, . . . neither can they die any more for---because---they are equal unto the angels,---Elohim, or gods,---and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Being thus perfected, they become the Elohim of the future age. And none can be thus perfected until they shall first be "accounted worthy."

Q. When was Jesus perfected?

A. See Luke xiii. 32: "I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected."

Q. When are the worthy ones perfected?

A. See Heb. xi. 39, 40: "These all having obtained a good report through faith, received not the---fulfillment of the---promise; God having provided so ne

BETTER THING for US, that THEY without US, should not be MADE PERFECT.”

Q. Will these perfected ones become higher than the Elohim of this age?

A. Yes. See 1 Cor. vi. 3: “Know ye not that we shall judge---the Elohim---angels.” The judged must of necessity be inferior to the judge.

Q. Why will the Elohim of God, be inferior to God’s perfected ones?

A. Because they will then hold the relationship of children in fact, by re-birth. They will belong to the family, are sons and daughters.

Q. What will produce this re-birth?

A. They receive the higher life of the Father, by and through the resurrection.

Q. The world has been in subjection to angels from creation, down. Will it continue to be so, after Yahveh’s children are perfected?

A. No sir; they will not.

Q. Can you cite Scripture proof?

A. Yes, sir; see Heb. ii. 5.

Please quote it?

A. "For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world---kosmos or aion---to come."

"The Saints---Sons, Elohim---of the Most High shall take the kingdom."

Teacher. I will ask Lud to inform the class as to who has the promise of becoming sons? •

Lud. John i. 12, 13, informs all who desire to know, that those who believe on his name as elsewhere made known, can become his sons.

Q. How, or by what means, can people become begotten sons?

A. James i. 18, speaks quite clearly on this matter of begetting. He shows that by means of the Word of Truth, which other Scriptures show is the Gospel of the Kingdom, we can be begotten for the new birth, in the new creation.

Q. Do other Scriptures speak the same thing as does James?

A. Yes. 1 Pet. i. 23, tells the same story. He says the Word of God, which

he explains to be the Gospel, is the incorruptible seed, which is designed to produce the incorruptible life.

Q. You speak about the gospel, what does the word mean?

A. Good Tidings.

Q. What is the good tidings about?

A. Why, it is the good news about the incoming Kingdom of God, when all of God's children will be born again.

Q. Did Jesus, preach about that Kingdom, and call it the Gospel?

Yes, sir; he did.

Q. In what Scripture is such teaching recorded?

A. In Mark i. 14, we are informed about John's imprisonment, and about Jesus' visit to the city of Galilee, and how during that visit, he spent his time in going about that city, and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom, and calling on the inhabitants of Galilee, to repent and believe the Gospel.

Q. Is that the way which leads to sonship?

A. Yes, sir; that is the true way to become sons, to be equal unto the angels, as to life, but above them, as to rank.

Q. The Bible informs us that as many as receive him, he will grant the power to become his sons in fact. Where is that power?

A. Paul, in Rom. i. 16, says that the power, is in the Gospel; of course, that means the Gospel of the Kingdom, because God has only one gospel which has saving virtue in it.

Q. Did not Jesus select other heralds, to go and proclaim the same life-giving message?

A. Yes, Sir; he did.

Q. Where is it recorded?

A. In Luke ix. 1-6.

Q. What did he commission them to preach?

A. The record says, he sent them to preach the Kingdom of God.

Q. Did they do so?

A. The record says, they went every-

18

where preaching the gospel. This shows the fact, that to preach the Kingdom of God, and to preach the Gospel, are equivalent terms.

Q. What does he require of all gospel believers?

A. To be baptized for the remission of sins.

Q. What does that accomplish for the Gospel believer?

A. It puts him in a saved condition, by securing the remission of his sins. No person can be saved; until all his past sins are remitted.

Q. But suppose a person should refuse to believe, what then?

A. Jesus said, he that believeth not, shall be damned.

Q. Suppose we change the Gospel as preached by Jesus and his disciples just a little, not very much, do you think that it would matter very much?

A. Paul says, "there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ." He then says: "But

though we or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached, unto you, let him be accursed.”

Q. The phrase, “any other,” is an exclusive phrase which rules out all, with the exception of the one alluded to by the Apostle to the Gentiles, does it not?

A. That is correct.

Q. He says, in Rom. i. 15, 16: “I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome, also. For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.”

Q. Do you gather from this Scripture, that the same gospel was preached to both Jew and Gentile?

A. Just the same. It was God’s power unto salvation, to every believer, without regard, as to whether such believer be a Jew or Greek.

Q. What gospel did he preach while at Rome, a Gentile city?

A. The same that both he and the rest of the apostles preached to the Jews.

Q. Give a sample of his Gospel teaching at Rome?

A. See Acts xxviii. 23, 30, 31: "And when they had appointed him a day, there came many to him into his lodging; to whom he expounded and testified the KINGDOM OF GOD, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets, from morning till evening."

"And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the KINGDOM of GOD, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ."

Q. How was his preaching of the Gospel of the Kingdom, at the city of Rome, received?

A. See verse 24: "And some believed the things which was spoken, and some believed not."

Q. Did he preach the saving gospel,

when he preached the Kingdom of God, at Rome?

A. He did. See verse 28: "Be it known unto you, that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and they will hear it."

Q. Will hear what?

A. Will hear "IT," the very same "salvation of God," which was sent unto the Jews, and not "another."

Teacher. We have discussed much miscellaneous matter relating to becoming as the "gods," or the Elohim; and the necessary steps to be taken, in order to be recognized as the Elohim of the Age to Come.

I think the study we have engaged in, will be a benefit to all of us.

We will now adjourn.

LESSON XV.

Teacher. As the time is now far advanced, let us commence our studies without any further delay.

It was left with Lucy, to select a topic for to-night. What have you chosen?

Lucy. I have selected the following:
IS THE BIBLE VIEW OF ETERNAL LIFE,
SCIENTIFIC?

Teacher. That is a question which leading scientific men, have discussed a great deal of late. I will ask Albert to open the study.

Albert. All right. Some quotations will be made from Scientists, but especially from Drummond, during this study. I think that when science can demonstrate what the natural life is, then it will have some show in demonstrating what the spiritual life is. Science has.

shown, however, that life, either natural or spiritual, can only be derived from some pre-existing life; but it cannot demonstrate to us what that life is. The spiritual life cannot be an evolution produced by the cultivation of the natural man. Mental effort, good morals, and a correct walk in life, can develop an improved natural man, but it can never evolve the spiritual man, from the natural, by improving the natural.

Q. Why not?

A. Because science has shown that as the natural life can never come to us from spontaneous generation; neither can DEATH generate life of any kind. "Life can only come from the touch of a prior life;" so likewise, the natural life can never be exchanged for the spiritual life, except by the touch of prior existing spiritual life. No cultivation of the natural alone, will give that touch.

Q. How can the natural come in touch with the spiritual?

A. Only by a strict compliance with

the law of regeneration---be born over again. Scientific principles, or laws, govern the development of each kind of life. If the natural law which governs the successive stages of the development of the natural life, is interfered with, in any one of its stages, the new life which has been started, will never come to maturity as an earth-born individual.

Q. Are the laws which govern the development of the life derived from the Spirit, equally as necessary to be complied with, as those which govern the natural?

A. Yes. They cannot be interfered with in any one of their stages of development, if they are, there will be just as great a failure in bringing to the birth, children after the power of an endless life, even as those who violate the laws of nature.

Q. Did Paul recognize the fact, that the new life must be developed according to some well defined law?

A. Certainly.

Q. What did he call that law?

A. "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus."

Q. What law is attached to the natural?

A. The law of sin and death.

Q. Where can the "Spirit of life" be found?

A. "In Christ Jesus."

Q. Where must we go secure the life of the Spirit?

A. To where it is found---"in Christ Jesus."

Q. Won't it do just as well, to go to Adam for that life, as to go to Jesus Christ?

A. No, sir; it will not.

Q. Why not?

A. Because the "Spirit of life," is not found in Adam.

Q. What law is found in Adam?

A. "The law of sin and death." All in Adam die.

Q. What relation does the "law of

the Spirit of life," sustain to "the law of sin and death?"

A. Paul says: "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Rom. i. 2.

Q. What distinction does Paul draw with regard to the origin of these two Adams?

A. "The first man Adam was made a living soul." "Is of the earth, earthy."

"The last Adam was made a quickening Spirit." "The second man is the Lord from heaven."

Q. If the first Adam is of the earth, what are all those in him?

A. Of the "Earth, earthy."

Q. Can the earthy generate that which is spiritual?

A. No, sir; like cause like effect, is true in all cases.

Q. Well, to whom must we look for the higher life?

A. To the one who is in possession of such life.

Q. Why so?

A. Because it is impossible to obtain that life, without first coming in touch with a prior existing spirit life. The simple improvement of the natural cannot give it.

Q. Speaking of our "Lord from heaven," was he personally from heaven?

A. No, sir; the power which generated his being was from heaven, and that is why he is called the Son of God.

Q. Please cite Scripture proof?

A. "The Holy Spirit will come to you, the angel replied, and the power of the Most High shall envelop you, and therefore it is that your child shall be called holy, and the Son of God." Luke i. 35. "20th Cent. Trans."

Q. What is the human nature of all those who are now in Christ Jesus?

A. "Earthy."

Q. Will they always retain that nature?

A. No, sir; "As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the

image of the heavenly.” See 1 Cor. xv. 48. 49.

Q. What will produce such a desirable change?

A. By first coming in touch with a prior existing heavenly life, as required by the “law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus.”

Q: “If the Spirit of life,” is now in Christ Jesus, he is the one whom the seeker for the higher life, must come in touch with, is he not?

A. Yes, sir; but the touch must be made in harmony with “the law of the Spirit of life” which governs its impartation.

Q. Is the quickening power in the Son?

A. It is. “The Son quickeneth whom he will.” John v. 21.

Q. What prior existing Spirit life, did the Son come in touch with?

A. “For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.”

Q. All others, will have to come in touch with the Son, will they not?

A. Such is the case. That life can only be imparted in harmony with the law relating to that life, even also as the natural life can only be generated in harmony with the law which governs that life. As far as science goes, the Spirit life, or the life derived from the Spirit, is as scientifically generated according to law regulating its impartation, as is the natural.

Teacher. Give Prof. Drummond's views on the science of eternal life?

Carrie. He says: "We are all but in sight of our scientific definition of eternal life. The desideratum is an organism with a correspondence of a very exceptional kind. It must lie beyond the reach of those mechanical actions, and those variations of available food, which are liable to stop the process going on, in the organism."

Q. What will happen, when the natural organism is deprived of food?

A. Disintegration would soon ensue.

Drummond says: "Before we reach eternal life, we must pass beyond that point at which all ordinary correspondences inevitably cease. We must find an organism so high and complete, that at some point in the development it shall have added a correspondence whose organism, death is powerless to arrest. We must in short, pass beyond that finite region, where correspondences depend on evanescent and material media, and enter a further region where the environment corresponded with, is itself eternal. The environment of the spiritual life is outside the influence of those mechanical actions, which sooner or later interrupt the processes going on in all finite organisms. If, then, we can find an organism which has established a correspondence with the spiritual life, that correspondence, will possess the elements of eternity."

Ella. Before we go any further, I would like to know in what sense the

words, "correspondence" and "environment," are used?

Teacher. Different kinds of organisms require an environment suited to its organism. For example, the organism of a fish, requires a very different environment from that of a bird.

Place a fish on land, which is the environment of a bird, it would soon die, because in that environment the fish could not find the kind of food that would correspond with its organism. It would have no power of locomotion, outside of its own environment, to search for the food which would correspond with its organism. It would be the same with a bird, if it were placed in the environment of a fish.

"All dissolution is brought about practically in the same way. A certain condition in the environment fails to be met by a corresponding condition in the organism, and this is death. And conversely, the more an organism in virtue of its complexity, can adapt itself to all

the parts of its environment, the longer it will live. The life will continue only while the correspondence continues. The completeness of the life will be proportionate to the completeness of the correspondence; and the life will be perfect only when the correspondence is perfect.”

“The environment must be perfect. If it is not perfect, it is not the highest; if it is endowed with the finite quality of change, there can be no guarantee that the life of its correspondents will be eternal. But grant that a spiritual organism is in perfect correspondence with a spiritual environment, then conditions will exist by which life may be perpetuated endlessly.”

This is the scientific argument with regard to the life eternal.

Lud. But what are your convictions, will the above argument harmonize with Scripture teaching?

Teacher. I will answer this question, by another quotation, from Prof. Drummoud.

“Let us turn for a moment to the definition of eternal life laid down by Christ. Let us place it alongside the definition of science, and mark the points of contact. Uninterrupted correspondence with a perfect environment, is eternal life according to science.

‘This is eternal life,’ said Christ, ‘that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.’ To know God is to correspond with God. To correspond with God is to correspond with a perfect environment. The organism which attains to this, in the nature of things must live forever.”

Q. When may those people who have been begotten for the higher life, expect a change of organism?

A. See Phil. iii. 20, 21: “For our conversation is in heaven, from whence we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall CHANGE our vile body, and fashion it like unto his glorious

body,"---a perfect organism, with perfect environment, and a perfect correspondence.

George. By what means will this change be effected?

Teacher. By regeneration. "It does not come from generation, but from re-generation." Immortality can never attach to the animal flesh organism, as it now exists. Our Lord has introduced a factor, not generally taken into account by the theological theories of our day.

Arloa. What is that factor?

A. It is this: "He that hath the Son of God hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life."

Q. Well, what do you perceive in that?

A. I perceive the correspondence which will bridge the grave.

Bessie. Does science teach that the spiritual, immortal, and eternal, can find a congenial home in that which it cannot have correspondence with, within perishable flesh?

Teacher. No. Science teaches that "Emotion, volition, and thought itself, are functions of the brain. When the brain is impaired, they are impaired. When the brain is not, they are not. Everything ceases with the dissolution of the material fabric, muscular activity, and mental activity, perish alike."

Buchner in "Force and Matter," p. 232, says: "Unprejudiced philosophy is compelled to reject the idea of an individual immortality---by nature---and of a personal continuance after death. With the decay and dissolution of its material substratum, through which alone it has acquired a conscious existence, and become a person, and upon which it was dependent, the spirit must cease to exist."

Lucy. I want to ask for some Bible proof that thought ceases in the event of man's death? I know science teaches it, but the question is, are the Bible and science in harmony, on that point?

Teacher. They are in perfect accord with each other. I call your attention to

Psa. cxlvi. 3, 4: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the Son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that VERY DAY his THOUGHTS PERISH."

George. Then, if man shall live again, it must be derived from some higher source than nature, must it not?

Teacher. It surely must. Drummond says: "It ought to be placed in the forefront of all Christian teaching, that Christ's mission on earth was to give man life. 'I am come,' he said, 'that ye might have life, and that ye might have it more abundantly.' And that he meant literal life, literal spiritual and eternal life, is clear from the whole course of his teaching and acting. To impose a metaphysical meaning on the commonest word in the New Testament, is to violate every canon of interpretation."

"Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life," is still a live question, clearly answered in the Word of Truth.

Mr. Wallaston, an Episcopal minis-

ter, says: "It may startle some of you, when I affirm, without any fear of contradiction, that this popular and common belief, in the natural immortality of the human soul, is not proved by a single text, or a single line or word, in the whole Bible, from the first of Genesis, to the last of Revelation. Moreover, it is essentially a Pagan doctrine, introduced in the early days of Christianity."

Teacher. I trust that we all see that science, Scripture, and common sense, all agree on this great question.

We will now adjourn.

LESSON XVI.

Teacher. I want to suggest as our subject, for to-night:

THE TWO BABYLONS.

The study of this topic, will conspicuously illustrate, how much of the idolatrous worship of Ancient Babylon, still adheres to both the Catholic and Protestant Churches; and how the Babylon of the Apocalypse, has its counterpart in the before mentioned abomination.

Now Lud, have you given any attention to this matter?

Lud. Yes, sir. I have brought with me a pamphlet, entitled "Papal Mysteries," containing much historical matter relating to the two Babylons.

Teacher. For to-night we will deviate a little from our ordinary course. I

will ask questions, and will request Lud, to read answers, as best he can, from his pamphlet, on "Papal Mysteries."

Q. Who founded the Babylonian system?

A. The Babylonian system was founded by King Nimrod, and his wife Semiramis.

Q. Who was this Semiramis?

A. She was a foundling. When an infant, she was said to have been discovered among the rocks, by one of Nimrod's shepherds, named Sima, who brought her up, and named her Semiramis.

Q. When she grew up, whose wife did she become?

A. She became the wife of Menon, who was the President of Nimrod's council.

Q. Did she help Menon in his war plans?

A. Yes. During war Menon laid seige to Boctria. Semiramis conceived a plan by which it might be taken, which proved successful.

Q. Did that bring her into notoriety?

A. Yes. This brought her to Nimrod's attention, who coveted her.

Q. Was Menon willing to give her up to Nimrod?

A. No. Menon refused to give her up to the king.

Q. What did Nimrod do?

A. Nimrod threatened to put out his eyes.

Q. What effect did this threat have upon Menon?

A. This caused Menon to commit suicide.

Q. What became of Semiramis?

A. She became Nimrod's wife, and Queen of Babylon, and was called "Queen of Heaven."

Q. What about her great wit and beauty?

A. History says: "She surpassed all her sex in wit and beauty, . . . possessing unbounded wisdom, and extraordinary talent for government and war."

Q. Was Nimrod and Semiramis worshipped as gods, after their death?

A. Yes. Both Nimrod and Semiramis, after their decease, were deified, and worshipped as gods, by many nations, and in these different nations, were known by different names. In the first place Nimrod was the great-grandson of Noah. See Gen. x. 8, 9. "And Cush begat Nimrod; he began to be a mighty one in the earth. He was a mighty hunter before the Lord; wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod, the mighty hunter before the Lord."

In different countries he was known by the names of Ninus, Belus, Baal Tammuz, Zoaster, Adonis and Osiris. The Jewish Talmud, says Nimrod was also known by the name "Amraphel" as found in Gen. xiv. 1.

Hislop's "Two Babylons," p. 35, says: "Ninus---Nimrod---is sometimes called the husband, and sometimes the son of Semiramis. Osiris---Nimrod---was represented in Egypt, as at once the son

and husband of his mother. He bore the title: "Husband of his Mother." Nimrod was also called Tammuz, in the Bible, as well as in history. Ezek. viii. 13, 14: "He said unto me, Turn thee yet again, and thou shalt see greater abominations that they do. Then he brought me to the door of the gate of the Lord's house which was toward the north; and behold there sat women weeping for Tammuz."

An ancient writer named Maimonides, says: "On the night of his death, all the images assembled from the ends of the earth into the temple of Babylon, to the great golden image of the sun. . . . The images wept and lamented all night long . . . and hence arose the custom every year, on the first of the month Thammuz,---fourth month, a part of June and July---to mourn and weep for Thammuz"---Nimrod.

Q. What titles did Semiramis bear?

A. Semiramis, wife of Nimrod, bore the titles of Queen of Heaven, Ashtaroth, Astarta, Apaphrodite, Isis, Ather, and

Cybele, among different countries. In the Bible, Ashtaroth, is applied to her eleven times. Judges ii. 13: "And they forsook the Lord, and served Baal and Ashtaroth." 1 Sam. vii. 3, 4: "And Samuel spake unto all the house of Israel, saying, If ye do return unto the Lord with all your hearts, then put away the strange gods, and Ashtaroth from among you, and prepare your hearts unto the Lord, and serve him only; and he will deliver you out of the hands of the Philistines. Then the children of Israel did put away Baalim, and Ashtaroth, and served the Lord only." 1 Sam. xii. 10: "And they cried unto the Lord, and said, We have sinned, because we have forsaken the Lord, and have served Baalim and Ashtaroth; but now deliver us out of the hand of our enemies, and we will serve thee."

Q. Were Baalim and Ashtaroth the same as Nimrod and Semiramis?

A. Yes. See 1 Kings xi. 31, 33: "Thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel,

and husband of his mother. He bore the title: "Husband of his Mother." Nimrod was also called Tammuz, in the Bible, as well as in history. Ezek. viii. 13, 14: "He said unto me, Turn thee yet again, and thou shalt see greater abominations that they do. Then he brought me to the door of the gate of the Lord's house which was toward the north; and behold there sat women weeping for Tammuz."

An ancient writer named Maimonides, says: "On the night of his death, all the images assembled from the ends of the earth into the temple of Babylon, to the great golden image of the sun. . . . The images wept and lamented all night long . . . and hence arose the custom every year, on the first of the month Thammuz,---fourth month, a part of June and July---to mourn and weep for Thammuz"---Nimrod.

Q. What titles did Semiramis bear?

A. Semiramis, wife of Nimrod, bore the titles of Queen of Heaven, Ashtaroth, Astarta, Apaphrodite, Isis, Ather, and

Cybele, among different countries. In the Bible, Ashtaroth, is applied to her eleven times. Judges ii. 13: "And they forsook the Lord, and served Baal and Ashtaroth." 1 Sam. vii. 3, 4: "And Samuel spake unto all the house of Israel, saying, If ye do return unto the Lord with all your hearts, then put away the strange gods, and Ashtaroth from among you, and prepare your hearts unto the Lord, and serve him only; and he will deliver you out of the hands of the Philistines. Then the children of Israel did put away Baalim, and Ashtaroth, and served the Lord only." 1 Sam. xii. 10: "And they cried unto the Lord, and said, We have sinned, because we have forsaken the Lord, and have served Baalim and Ashtaroth; but now deliver us out of the hand of our enemies, and we will serve thee."

Q. Were Baalim and Ashtaroth the same as Nimrod and Semiramis?

A. Yes. See 1 Kings xi. 31, 33: "Thus saith the Lord, the God of Israel,

Behold, I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and I will give ten tribes to thee; because they have forsaken me, and have worshipped Ashtaroth, the goddess of the Sidonians."

At Zidon, there was a magnificent temple dedicated to Ashtaroth, Queen of Babylon, and Queen of Heaven. See Jer. vii. 17, 18: "Seest thou not what they do, in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem? The children gather wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead their dough, to make cakes to the queen of heaven."

Q. What was the character of Semiramis?

A. See "Papal Mysteries," p. 7: "She was a very vile woman. She selected the handsomest commanders to be her gallants, and afterward cut their heads off." This is the woman, who was worshipped as "The Queen of Heaven."

Q. What was Israel's estimate of this bad woman?

A. See Jer. xlv. 16, 17: "But we

will certainly do whatsoever thing goeth forth out of our own mouth, to burn incense unto the queen of heaven." Verse 19: "We burned incense to the queen of heaven, and poured out drink offerings unto her, did we make her cakes to worship." Verse 25: "We will surely perform our vows that we have vowed, to burn incense to the queen of heaven."

Q. Was she regarded as the mother of gods, like modern Babylon, regard their "Queen of Heaven," as "The Holy Mother of God?"

A. Yes. See "Papal Mysteries," p. 9: "After her death, she became the object of Assyrian worship. She was called 'The Queen of Heaven.' In Egypt, she was called 'Athor,' i. e., 'The Habitation of God.' . . . She was also called, 'The Mother of the Gods,' and was worshipped by the Persians, the Syrians, and all the Kings of Europe and Asia, with the most profound religious veneration."

"After the death of Nimrod and Semiramis, they were worshipped as 'Goddess

Mother and Son,' with an enthusiasm that was incredible, and their images were everywhere set up and adored. She was also worshipped as Juno, 'the Dove,' in other words, 'the Holy Spirit Incarnate.' Yet she was the very incarnation of lust and all uncleanness."

Teacher. With this short introduction as to who Semiramis was, the class will better appreciate the comparison between the Mysteries of Ancient Babylon, and that of "Mystery, Babylon the Great," of the Apocalypse.

Q. What about the origin of the observance of Lent?

A. "The forty days abstinence of Lent was directly borrowed from the Babylonian goddess---Semiramis. Such a Lent of forty days, in the spring of the year is still observed by the Pagan devil-worshippers of Koordistan, who have inherited it from the Babylonians. This Egyptian Lent of forty days; was held in commemoration of Adonis, or Osiris, the great mediatorial god. Among the Pa-

gans, this Lent was the necessary preparation for the great annual festival in commemoration of the death and resurrection of Tammuz---Nimrod.

Q. What is Easter?

A. Easter is nothing else than As-tarte, one the titles of---Semirainis---Bel-tis, Ashtaroth, the Queen of Heaven. The people of Nineveh, pronounced it Ish-tar. The word Easter, was not used by the true church in the third and fourth centuries. The Festival was called the Passover."

Q. What about the observance of Christmas?

A. Mr. Hislop says, "In the Christian Church no such festival as Christmas, was ever heard of till the third century. Long before the Christian era, a festival was celebrated among the heathen in that precise time of the year, in honor of the birth of the son of the Babylonian Queen of Heaven. In Egypt, the son of Isis, the Egyptian title of the Queen of Heaven was born at this very time, the time of

the winter solstice. . . . There can be no doubt that the Pagan Festival of the winter solstice, or in other words, Christmas was held in honor of the birth of the Babylonian Messiah.”

Q. What about the festival, called Lady Day?

A. The festival called Lady Day, is celebrated at Rome, on the 25th of March, in alleged commemoration of the the miraculous conception of our Lord. Before our Lord was conceived or born, that very day was observed in Pagan Rome, in honor of Cybele, the mother of the Babylonian Messiah.”

Q. What do you find about the feast of Assumption?

A. This is supposed to commemorate the ascension of the Virgin to heaven, and her investiture with supreme power. In the Babylonian system, it is taught, that Bacchus went down to hell, to restore his mother from the infernal power, and carried her with him in triumph to heaven. The mother was Semiramis, the

wife of Ninus---Nimrod, the great god.”

Q. What have you in regard to the Sacrifice of the Mass?

A. “The Unbloody Sacrifice. The great goddess of Bablylon, was adverse to blood. In Bablylon, she bore the name of Myhtta, that is the Mediatrix. . . . In Rome. she was called Bona Dea, the good goddess. In Rome, Mary is’ the Mediatrix. The unbloody sacrifice of the mass, was a small, thin, round wafer. The church of Rome lays much stress on the roundness of the wafer. Why? Because Osiris was the sun divinity, and become incarnate. . . . In the great temple of Bablylon, the golden image of the Sun was exhibited for the worship of the Bablylonians. The wafer is only another symbol of Baal, or the Sun.”

Q. Where did the Rosary originate?

A. “This is from Ancient Bablylon. The heart was one of the sacred symbols of Osiris, when he was born again, and appeared as the infant divinity in the

arms of his mother Isis. The heart in Chaldee is Bel. The worship of the Sacred Heart, was under the symbol, the worship of the Sacred Bel, that mighty one of Babylon."

Q. From whom does the Pope borrow the Mitre?

A. "The two-horned mitre which the Pope wears, when he sits on the high altar at Rome, and receives the adoration of the Cardinals, is the very mitre worn by Dagon, the fish-god of the Philistines and Babylonians."

Q. What do you find about the claim to be infallible?

A. "The Chaldean Pontiff was believed to be incapable of error." The Roman Pontiff, likewise.

Q. What about the custom of kissing the Pope's slipper?

A. "The kings of Chaldea wore on their feet slippers, which the kings they conquered, used to kiss."

Q, What about the custom of the

Roman Church of burning wax candles, during service?

A. "The Babylonians light up lamps to the gods. In Pagan Rome, the same practice was observed."

Q. What about the services conducted by Monks and Nuns?

A. "Rome has armies of monks and nuns. In old Babylon, there were monks and nuns in abundance. In Thibet and Japan, where the Chaldean system was early introduced, monasteries are still to be found."

Q. What have you learned about the Madonna?

A. "The Madonna of Rome, is just the Madonna of Babylon." "The features and complexions of the Roman and Babylonian Madonnas, are the same. Popery has simply placed the Virgin Mary and child, in the place of Semiramis and child."

"The great male divinity of Babylon, was Baal or Belus," "the female divinity, Beltis. Beltis and Baalti, in English, is

My Lady, in Latin Mea Domina, corrupted by the Italians---Madonna.”

Q. How is it that the Roman priests use spittle in baptism?

A. “The priest touches the ear and nostrils of the person to be baptized, with a little spittle, saying, Ephpheta, that is, be thou opened unto the odor of sweetness.”

“In the Babylonian mysteries, the spittle was a symbol of purifying. In Egypt, through which the Babylonian system passed to Western Europe, the name of the Pure or Purifying Spirit, was Rekh. But Rekh also signified spittle. Hence, to anoint with spittle, was to anoint with the purifying spirit.”

Q. Tell us about the cross?

A. “There is hardly a pagan tribe where the cross has not been found. The cross was worshipped by the Pagan Celts long before the death of Christ. The vested virgins of Pagan Rome, wore it suspended from their necklaces as the nuns do now.”

Q. What do we learn about the shepherd's crook?

A. "The magic crook can be traced up directly to the first king of Babylon, that is Nimrod, who as stated by Berosus, was the first who bore the title of shepherd king. The crozier of the Pope, which he bears as an emblem of his office, is neither more or less than the magic rod of the priests of Nimrod."

Q. We will next enquire about the confessional?

A. "The Babylonian system required secret confession to the priests."

We all know that Rome has borrowed this Babylonian custom.

Q. Did Babylon require the celibacy of her priesthood?

A. They did. "The mysteries over which Semiramis, the Queen of Heaven presided, were scenes of the rankest pollution, and yet the higher orders of the priesthood were bound to a life of celibacy. Semiramis originated clerical celibacy."

Teacher. The historical testimony which Lud has read to the class, show the true origin of Papal Rome; by a little reflection, her daughters can easily be recognized.

She has "become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird."

She may say, "I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow," but surely sorrow shall come, both upon the mother, and her faithless daughters, swift as a thunder bolt from heaven.

The class is now dismissed.

LESSON XVII.

Teacher. I find so many well-meaning people wandering about amidst the mists of error, on account of not understanding the true import of the Sacred Name of the Father. I therefore have selected for our study:

THE SACRED NAME.

The topic naturally divides itself into two sections:

1. That which relates to the name of the Father, which is the foundation rock.

2. That relating to the name of the Son, the truths attaching to that name, we may describe as the beautiful superstructure erected upon the foundation rock.

I will request Lud, to kindly give us

some of the names by which the Father has made himself known?

Lud. in my study I find the names, Eloah, Elohim, El Shaddi, I Am, Yahveh.

Q. By what words have these names been rendered in our Common Version?

Lud. By the words LORD, and GOD.

Q. Are those words a correct translation of the names I AM, or YAHVEH?

A. By no means. It is a SUBSTITUTION, in place of a TRANSLATION.

Q. What is the origin of the word Lord, and what does it mean?

A. LORD is of Saxon origin, and means monarch, ruler, governor, or some distinguished person.

Q. From what word is Lord a proper translation?

A. From ADON or ADONAI.

Q. Is the word GOD, a proper translation from the words Adon or Adonai?

A. No, sir; God in Saxon, signifies good.

Q. Can you cite some authorities

to show that the use of those words in the Common Version, is wrong?

A. Yes. Young, in his Analytical Concordance, says that Yahveh, "in the Common Version of the English Bible, is generally, but improperly translated by the word Lord."

Smith's Bible Dictionary says: "The substitution of the word Lord, is most unhappy; for while it in no way represents the meaning of the Sacred Name, the mind has to guard against a confusion with its LOWER USE."

Q. Have these several names by which the Father has been made known, a higher use, as applicable to the Supreme Being, and also a lower use, as applied to others beings?

A. Most of them have; Yahveh being an exception.

Q. Please give some Bible samples, of both the higher and lower use of those names?

ELOHIM.

Elohim is the plural of the singular,

Eloah. I will give quotations without distinguishing between the plural or the singular.

HIGHER USE.

“So Abraham prayed unto God.”

“God said this is the token of the covenant.”

“Enoch walked with God.”

“The Lord God said unto the serpent.”

“The Spirit of God moved upon the face,” etc.

“God formed man,” etc.

LOWER USE.

Jacob said: “I have seen God---an angel---face to face, and my life is preserved.”

“And Manoah said unto his wife, we shall surely die, because we have seen God.”

“According to the number of thy cities were thy gods, O Judah.”

“Have burnt incense to other gods.”

“They choose new gods.”

THEOS.

Theos is the Greek equivalent, to the Hebrew Elohim.

LOWER USE.

“As there be gods many, and lords many.” This text also gives the lower use of the word Lord.

“He hath called them gods unto whom the Word of God came.” You will observe both the higher and lower use in this text.

“Written in your law, I said ye are gods.”

HIGHER USE.

“I adjure thee by the living God.”

“Thou shalt love the Lord thy God,”
etc.

“Ye cannot serve God and mammon.”

EL SHĀDDAI.

This name signifies strength, power to effect. It is in this sense, that it is sometimes applied to the Great Eternal. In its lower use, it is applied to heathen gods, and also to kings, judges, and

others, who are given power by the Eternal.

For examples read: 1 Sam. xxviii. 13; Psa. lxxxii. 1, 6; xcvi. 7; Exod. xxi. 6; xxii. 7, 8.

YAHVEH.

This name has no lower use. It belongs to the Great Eternal alone.

The Jews for fear of profanely using the sacred name, did not pronounce it, but used the substitutes of "LORD," and "JEHOVAH." The word "Lord," in the Old Testament, when printed in small capitals, must always be read in the higher sense, as belonging alone to the Great Eternal. It does not pretend to be a translation from the original name, but a substitution.

Wherever the word "Jehovah," is found in the Scriptures, it must also be read in the higher sense, as designating alone the Eternal One. The word "Jehovah," is not a translation, but a corruption of the original. See page 258, of this book.

The exclusive right to the name Yahveh, is shown in Psa. lxxxiii. 18: "That men may know that THOU WHOSE NAME ALONE IS YAHVEH, art the MOST HIGH over all the earth."

As a sample where the word "Lord," is used as a substitute for the NAME, see Exod. vi. 2, 3: "And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am THE LORD; and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the NAME of GOD ALMIGHTY, but by MY NAME YAHVEH, was I not known unto them."

See Gen. xxi 33: "And Abraham planted a grove in Beersheba, and called there on THE NAME of THE LORD, the Everlasting God."

Teacher. Before he made known his own true name, in what way was he known?

Arloa. He used a descriptive adjective which distinguished him from all other gods.

Q. Please point it out?

A. See Exod. vi. 3. "I appeared

unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God ALMIGHTY, but by my name YAHVEH, was I not known to them.”

Q. Well, what is the adjective alluded to?

A. It is found in the word ALMIGHTY. There were many gods, but he alone possessed Almighty power, and that distinguished him from all others.

Q. By what name did he make himself known unto Israel, in Egypt?

A. See Exod. iii. 13, 14: “Moses said unto God, behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, the God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say unto me, What is his name? What shall I say unto them? And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: And he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.”

Q. What do scholars give as the etymology of that name?

A. They say that "I AM," in its etymology, is the same as YAHVEH.

Q. What is the meaning of the name?

A. Mackay's Lexicon says, "I AM," in its etymology, means SELF-EXISTING.

Young, in his Analytical Concordance says it partakes of the nature of unsearchableness. Hence I AM could be taken to mean the SELF-EXISTING UNSEARCHABLE ONE.

Q. The children of Israel were so long in Egyptian slavery, that they doubtless knew more about the gods of the Egyptians, than the God of their fathers. Would they comprehend the name I AM?

A. A writer speaking of that point, said: "It is believed that I AM is a talismanic word, which the children of Israel readily comprehended. It was evident that the name was known to the Egyptians in their temple worship. It is referred to by an eminent Egyptian scholar, saying that the words were found inscribed on temple stones, lately unearthed

in that land, of very ancient date, as follows: "NUK-PU-NUK," and bears the English translation, "I AM and I AM." One of the speakers of the Parliament of Religions spoke of this discovery.

Teacher. I will ask Albert to speak of the reverence which the Israelites had for the Creator's sacred name.

Albert. Josephus says: "Moses besought the Lord since he had heard and seen him, that he would tell him his name, that when he offered sacrifice, he might invoke him by his name, which had never been disclosed to men before, concerning which it is not lawful for me to say more."

We also read that from a very early date, the Israelites refrained from pronouncing the Sacred Name, for fear of its irreverent use.

Q. What occasioned this fear?

A. That is found in Lev. xxiv. 16: "He that blasphemeth the Name of the Lord, he shall surely be put to death, all the congregation shall certainly stone him: as will the stranger, as he that is

born in the land, when he blasphemeth the Name of the Lord, shall be put to death.”

The Name is also spoken of as being “The Great and Terrible Name,” “The Peculiar Name,” and “The Separate Name.”

It is said that the High Priest, on the day of atonement, when he entered the Holy of Holies, pronounced the Ineffable Name within the sacred enclosure, while the people stood without, in an attitude of reverence and awe, as the Sacred Name was being spoken by the High Priest.

Q. Where was this sacred and Holy Name placed?

A. Bible quotations speak of it in this wise: “To build a house for the Name of the Lord God of Israel,” “that his Name might be there,” “in Jerusalem, will I put my Name forever.”

Q. How is it, that in place of the real Name, a substitute is used?

A. We learn that the Rabbis, sub-
21

stituted "SHEMA," for the Unutterable Name, when spoken; but in reading the Scriptures, they substituted in its place, Adonai---Lord.

Q. Did the Israelites attribute great power to the proper pronunciation of the Sacred Name?

A. They did. They could not deny the fact but what Jesus really did perform miracles. Some said he got the power through a proper pronunciation of the Sacred Name, which he stole from the temple. Others said he derived his power from the prince of devils.

Q. Is there any other name by which the Father is known?

A. We have a contraction of the original name.

Q. Where is it recorded?

A. In Psa. lxxviii. 4.

Q. Please read it to the class.

A. "Sing unto God, sing praises to his Name: extol him that rideth upon the heavens by his Name JAH, and rejoice before him."

Q. Is his name really JAH?

A. No. That is a corruption, the same as the name Jehovah.

Q. What should it be?

A. It should be YAH, a contraction of YAHVEH.

Q. Does the contracted name YAH, enter into the composition of the name JESUS?

A. It surely does.

Q. Please show in what way?

A. A note in the "Diaglott," shows that in the original, the name Jesus, is a compound of two words, YAH-SHUA. YAH signifies, "I shall be," and SHUA, "powerful." "I shall be the powerful One." "All power is given unto me both in heaven and in earth." He will in fact be the powerful YAHVEH of the Coming Age.

Esubius says the name Jesus, means, "The Salvation of God,"---YAHVEH.

Q. What did the aged Simeon say, when he held the infant YAH-SHUA in his arms?

A. "Now lettest thou thy servant

depart in peace according to thy Word, for my EYES have seen THY SALVATION," even the long promised "Yah-Shua."

Q. Did the Old Testament prophets refer to this wonderful personal Salvation which Simeon held in his arms?

A. They did.

Q. Please quote one?

A. I will quote Isa. xii. 2: "God---Yah---is become my Salvation: I will trust and not be afraid; for the Lord Yahveh is my strength, and my song. He is become MY salvation."

Q. Does this refer to a person?

A. It does. "He has become my salvation." He was just as much the Savior of those under the Law, as under the Gospel Dispensation, provided they were Covenantors, and faithfully kept the terms of the Covenant.

Q. How many names are there by or through which men can be saved?

A. Only the one name, "Yah-Shua."

Q. What name was that?

A. "I came in my Father's name."
John v. 43.

Q. What are we to understand by his coming in his Father's name?

A. Simply that he came bearing his Father's name, as his own name.

Q. What Scripture do you base that upon?

A. Phil. ii. 9, 10: "Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name that is above every name: that at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow."

Q. What name is there, "which is above every name?"

A. The Sacred and Ineffable Name of the Eternal Father.

Q. Can there ever be a higher name than that?

A. Never!! The climax has been reached!

Q. Well, he said that he had given him this unexcelled name, and at that name every knee should bow, what name was that?

A. "At the name of JESUS every knee should bow."

Q. Then the name "Yah-Shua," and the Ineffable Name of the Father, are blended as one name?

A. It surely must be so.

Q. Do other Scriptures confirm the above?

A. They certainly do.

Q. Please give another?

A. See Eph. i. 21: "Above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and EVERY NAME that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come."

Teacher. While I was meditating about the exceeding greatness of that Sacred and Ineffable Name of the Father and Son, my mind was carried backward when a brother, who is now asleep in Jesus, called that sacred name upon me. I then became a name-bearer. I was thinking what a fearful thing it would be to dishonor that holy name.

Dear Name-bearers! whenever we

are tempted to depart from the path of rectitude, let us think of the Sacred Name that was called upon us at baptism, and I am sure that we would elect to lay aside that which we may be tempted to do, rather than become a disgraceful name-bearer.

I some times think that the subject of the Ineffable Name, is but imperfectly understood. It is a practical topic of the highest type. There is nothing like it as an incentive to holy living.

What Name is there like that of JESUS? Ever since the angels announced him as the one who would ultimately bring peace on earth, he has been a real live factor in the lives of all true believers. No Name is equal to that in its power to captivate the heart, and stir it to its utmost depths. Blessed be his glorious Name, for ever more.

I believe that this lesson has been a benefit to all of us. We will now adjourn.

LESSON XVIII.

Teacher. Another week has passed away, and how thankful we should all be that we are still permitted to meet and study God's Word.

At the close of our last meeting, Lucy requested that we study to-night:

THE MISSION OF JESUS.

Now, Albert, what do you find from observation the effect of SIN upon mankind?

Albert. I find SIN to be the great adversary, or opponent, which comes in between, and separates mankind from God.

Q. What shall be done with this adversary?

A. It must be met, overcome, and destroyed.

Q. What is an adversary?

A. A Devil.

Q. What is to become of the works of the devil?

A. Destroyed.

Q. Who will destroy it?

A. I find the Son of God was manifested or sent for that purpose.

Q. Where do you find anything of the kind recorded in the Bible?

A. See John iii. 8: "For this PURPOSE, the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil."

Q. How will he accomplish that work?

A. By removing the source from which the works come. In other words destroy the devil. The way to stop the increase of young serpents, is to kill the old serpent which propagates them. So the best way to stop the spread of the works of the devil, is to kill the old devil which does the work. The Bible says,

“For this purpose the Son of God was manifested.” Now, if he was manifested or sent for this “purpose,” then that must be his mission, and whatever is his mission, will surely be accomplished.

Q. Well, what proof have you that he is going to kill the devil?

A. See Heb. ii. 14: “Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also took part of the same, that THROUGH DEATH---his own death on the cross---he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil.”

Q. What weapon will the Lord use, to destroy the devil?

A. “Through death,” his own death on the cross.

Q. Tell us what is the devil?

A. That which “had the power of death.”

Q. What has “the power of death?”

A. The “power of death,” is in the possession of only one adversary.

Q. What is that adversary?

A. By one man SIN entered into the world, and DEATH BY SIN."

Q. Did any one suffer death prior to the advent of sin?

A. No.

Q. When a person is stung by a venomous reptile, what is liable to follow?

A. Death.

Q. Does SIN possess a deadly sting?

A. Yes, Sir; See 1 Cor. xv. 55: "The STING of DEATH is SIN." It is so very clear that the Adversary or Devil, which "has in it the power of death," is SIN. See also Rom. v. 12: "And death BY Sin."

Q. Then from these testimonies, can we definitely ascertain what devil has "the power of death?"

A. We can. It results from the venomous sting inflicted by "SIN."

Q. Have you another text which will confirm those already given?

A. Yes. See Jas. i. 15: "SIN bringeth forth death."

Q. Is SIN personified as a pay mas-

ter. paying wages for service rendered to him?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What compensation does he render to his servants?

A. See Rom. vi. 23: "The wages of SIN is death."

Q. Death to what?

A. Why it is death to the "Soul."

Q. What! the soul! is that possible?

A. Yes, sir; that is just what the Bible says.

Q. Pray tell me where?

A. In Ezek. xviii. 4, 20: "The soul that sinneth it shall die.

Q. Well. if the soul dies, it will then be a dead soul. Tell me what is the condition of dead souls?

A. The Bible says: "The dead know not anything."

Q. What will be the effect of ceasing to serve the Sin Devil?

A. See Rom. vi. 22: "But now being made free from SIN, and become servants

to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the END Everlasting Life.”

Q. How will Jesus destroy the Sin Devil?

A. “That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.”

Q. What was the weapon of destruction?

A. “Death.”

Q. How much power can a dead man exercise?

A. None, whatever.

Q. Did Jesus, when he was dead, have any more power, than any other dead man?

A. No, sir.

Q. Then how could Jesus, “through death,” destroy a powerful, supernatural, omnipresent personal devil?

A. He could not. Such a devil, is nothing more than a creature of the imagination, a relic of Paganism, a twin-brother to immortal-soulism.

Q. Then what is the Devil that Jesus will destroy "through death?"

A. "SIN," the great adversary of all mankind.

Q. How will he do it?

A. See Heb. ix. 26: "He PUT AWAY SIN BY the SACRIFICE of HIMSELF."

Testimonies like this, should forever settle it in the minds of every honest student, that the devil of the Bible, is not the personal devil of Pagan superstition.

Said John: "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the SIN of the world."

Q. Do not many people, when they read the words, "the devil," let their minds at once, revert to the devil of Pagan superstition?

A. They do. It has been drilled into the minds of children, from early childhood. Sometimes thoughtless parents will use the "scare-devil," to frighten their children into obedience.

It must certainly be conceded that the death of Jesus, can never take the physical life of the devil of popular con-

ception, who is pictured as the arch-enemy of the Great I AM. It is not reasonable to suppose that the All-Powerful One, would permit the existence of such a foe.

Q. Is not this supposed Evil Personality, said to be not only supernatural, but also omnipresent?

A. Yes, sir. He is said to be able to practice his seductive art in the hearts of millions of people in every part of the earth, all at the same moment, and at the same time have a personal knowledge of the weak points in each person, of this vast host, and can plan and operate differently in each case.

Such power would fairly rival the power of the Eternal One. It amounts to nothing more than a monstrous piece of Pagan fiction.

Q. What is the mission of Jesus?

A. "For this purpose was the Son of God manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil."

A misconception as to what the devil

is, would also give a misconception as to the works of the devil.

Q. According to testimonies frequently heard in religious meetings, the devil of Paganism must be omnipresent, specially engaged in tempting God's people to renounce their allegiance to God. Is not that the case?

A. I find that is contrary to Scripture teaching.

Q. Well, give us the Scripture teaching on the matter of personal temptation?

A. See Jas. i. 14, 15: "Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death."

"The 20th Cent. Trans." reads as follows: "People are in every case tempted by their own Passions---allured and enticed by them. Then the Passion conceives and gives birth to sin, and sin on reaching maturity, brings forth death."

Now, there is considerable difference

between being tempted by an omnipresent devil, and in "every case tempted by their own passions." The phrase, "every case," allows no exceptions.

Q. How about the temptation of Ananias and Saphira?

A. In the case of Ananias and Saphira, the Sin, or Devil of Covetousness, is personified as Satan.

Q. Well, what do the Scriptures say about the case?

A. See Acts v. 3: "Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart with a lie to the Holy Spirit, and to keep back part of the price of the land?"

Q. What was the Satan, which entered his heart?

A. At first sight, we might attribute this temptation to the personal devil of Pagan superstition, but the verse following, explains it all.

See verse 4: "Why hast thou conceived in thine heart," etc.? Again:

“How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord?”

Hence, we find that it was a lying scheme of their own devising.

Q. What is the Greek word for the word devil?

A. It is “Diabolos.”

Q. What does it mean?

A. Cruden says it means a calumniator, or accuser.

Q. What does Parkhurst give it?

A. Accuser or slanderer.

Q. Is not the word devil of general application to all accusers, slanderers, adversaries, opponents?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then it cannot be narrowed down so as to apply to one person, only?

A. It cannot.

Teacher. This is a subject which is so imperfectly understood. The people, generally have believed traditions handed down from their fathers, rather than the Scriptures.

The class is dismissed.

LESSON XIX.

Teacher. Last Sunday, I visited our Brother and Sister Elmer, at Shenandoa. While reading the newspaper, I saw a notice that the minister of a church a block and half West from us, would preach on the following subject:

“ABSENT FROM THE BODY.”

Sister Elmer proposed that we all go and hear how the man would handle the topic. So we all went.

George. What text did he use?

Teacher. He read to us 2 Cor. v. 6, 8: “Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, while we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: for we walk by faith, and not by sight: we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be

absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord.”

Ella. How did he explain the text?

Teacher. He didn't explain anything. After he had read the text, he shut the Bible, and indulged in some flowery talk. He said the text was a beautiful picture of the victorious escape of the immortal soul from a loathsome body of corruption. He described the escape. He said when the immortal soul, realized that it was really free, it spread forth its glad wings, and began to cleave the blue sky, soaring higher and higher, until it it reached heaven, its home, and was then forever with the Lord.

Bessie. That certainly cannot be true?

Teacher. Upon what do you base your conclusion?

Bessie. Upon two points.

1st. The Bible no where speaks of immortal souls. It is simply a creature of the imagination.

2nd. It could not go to heaven, be-

cause our Lord, himself, said, in John iii. 13: "NO MAN hath ASCENDED UP to HEAVEN." The preacher and the Lord don't agree.

Lucy. The words "hath not," surely covers the past, but how about the future?

Bessie. Our Lord covers the future, also. See John xiii. 33: "Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me: and as I said unto the Jews, Whither I GO, ye CANNOT COME; so now I say to you." Which do you believe? The preacher says, "You can go." Jesus says. "Ye cannot come." These are two direct opposites.

Teacher. We learn from the text, that whenever we are "present with the Lord." we will then be "absent from the body." Now, if it is not an immortal soul, which takes its leave of the body, tell us what it is?

Carrie. I will call your attention to the marginal reading of Rom. vii. 24: "O wretched man that I am, who shall de-

liver me from THIS BODY of DEATH?" Tell me, when Paul is delivered from "the body of death" will that body be present with him? If not present, then must it not be absent? "Absent from the body" of death.

Teacher. What is the key text to this lesson?

Lud. That is found in 2 Cor. iv. 18: "While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are TEMPORAL: but the things which are NOT seen are ETERNAL." The contrast is between the "temporal" and the "eternal." the "body of death," is the "temporal." It would indeed, be a very sad thing, were it "eternal." Suffering is the sad heritage of the "temporal" body. Paul, was doubtless a sufferer in the flesh, which caused him to cry out, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death?" He knew well, that the suffering must continue, as long as the "temporal" life should exist.

See 2 Cor. v: 4: "For, indeed, those being in the tent are groaning, being oppressed; in which we desire not to be divested, but invested, that the MORTAL may be absorbed by LIFE."---"Diaglott." The "tent," or "tabernacle," is the temporal, in which "we groan," and like Paul cry out, "who shall deliver me, from this body of death?" He had no desire whatever, of being relieved, by being "divested," through death; but rather that this "mortal" temporal body "may be absorbed by life." Not the "psuche" soul, or animal life, which he already possessed, but the Life, the "zoeon aionian," that which is eternal, having passed beyond the realm of sorrow and suffering.

Teacher. Did not Paul say that he was willing to make this change, to take a leave of absence from the temporal body, and bid it an eternal farewell?

A. He was not only willing, but also had an intense desire to be absent from this body.

Q. Did Paul expect this change at death?

A. For Paul's answer to this question, see Phil. iii. 20, 21: "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." We learn from this, that Paul did not expect to be absent from the body of humiliation, until the Lord shall come.

Q. What other Scripture shows this distinction?

A. See 1 Cor. xv. 44: "Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual."

Q. Did the the two bodies exist contemporaneously?

A. Why no; the order is:

1st. The Natural Body, which is the "Body of Death."

2nd. "Afterward that which is spiritual."

Q. Well, then, when we receive the

Spiritual Body, what must of necessity happen?

A. Why then we will be "absent from the body,"---the natural body.

Q. Can you show another text, of like import?

A. Yes, sir. See verse 42: "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption." Two such opposite conditions can never exist together. There must first be an absence from the corruptible, before we can have the incorruptible.

Q. At what time will we take final leave of the corruptible?

A. See verse 54: "The dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we---those who are alive---shall be CHANGED."

Q. Can we then be "present with with the Lord?"

A. Yes, sir. See 1st Thess. iv. 15-17: "For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent---precede---them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall des-

cent from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead IN CHRIST shall rise first: then we which are ALIVE and remain shall be caught up---away---with them in clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we EVER be WITH the LORD."

This is the time when we shall become "absent from the---natural---body," and shall ever "be present with the Lord." No one can ever be "present with the Lord," until that glad hour shall come?

Q. Is there not a text which speaks about being IN and OUT of the body?

A. Yes, sir. It is found in 2 Cor. xii. 1-4: "I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord. I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago,--whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth; . . . How he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which is not lawful for a man to utter."

Q. Is Paul dealing with an historic fact?

A. No, sir. "Visions and revelations." Revelations made through visions.

Q. What were the visions about?

A. Verse 2, says about a certain man who was "caught up to the third heaven;" and verse 4, "he was caught up into paradise."

Q. Did he go to two places?

A. No, I think not. Paradise will be in the Third Heaven.

Q. Was the original paradise, in which was the tree of life, on top of a three-storied heaven, in the skies?

A. No, sir. It was on the earth, eastward in Eden.

Q. Is it there now?

A. No, sir.

Q. Was that portion of the earth's surface, hoisted on top of a three-storied heaven, in the skies?

A. We have no record of any such an event taking place.

Q. Do the Scriptures teach the restoration of paradise?

A. Certainly.

Q. Where will it be?

A. Wherever the tree of life is found.

Q. Now tell us where that tree will be located?

A. See Rev. ii. 7: "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches; to him that overcometh, will I give to eat of the TREE of LIFE, which is in the MIDST of the PARADISE OF GOD."

Q. Can you give another text, which will assist in locating paradise?

A. Yes. See Rev. xxii. 14: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have a right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Wherever the "Tree of Life" is found, will be Paradise, because that will be "in the midst of the Paradise of God."

These Scriptures locate Paradise on

EARTH, and not "up," in a three storied heaven.

Q. Does not 2 Cor. xii. 1-4, show that in being "caught up to the third heaven," he was also "caught up unto paradise," because paradise is to be located in the third heaven?

A. Paradise is surely to be located in the third heaven, but as yet, the "Third Heaven" does not exist, and what is more, never has existed.

Q. Well, if that is the the case, how do you account for that man which Paul knew, going there in his day?

A. It was only a visionary trip, and nothing more real.

Q. Well, tell us something about this third heaven, when may we look for it?

A. In order to show this, we will commence with the First Heaven, and trace the existence and passing away of each one, until we arrive at the third, which will never pass away.

FIRST HEAVEN.

See 2 Pet. iii. 3-6: "Knowing this

first, that there shall come in the last days ---of the Second Heaven---scoffers walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation. For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the HEAVENS were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and IN the water: whereby the world that then was, ---including also the First Heaven---being overflowed with water perished.”

SECOND HEAVENS.

See verses 7-10: “But the Heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. . . . But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the---Second---HEAVENS shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat.”

THIRD HEAVENS.

See verse 13: “Nevertheless we, ac-

According to his promise, look for NEW HEAVENS, and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

See Rev. xxi. 1: "And I saw a New Heaven and a new earth: for the first Heaven and the first earth were passed away."

This was the "Third Heaven," which Paul in vision, was caught away to, and not to a three storied heaven in the skies.

Q. But Paul speaks of being "caught UP to the Third Heaven," and "caught UP into Paradise, how about this word "UP?"

A. We are told that Paradise is in Heaven, and therefore, if a man goes to Paradise, he must of necessity ascend "UP" to Heaven. Now, if Paradise is in Heaven, how are people going to get to Paradise? because Jesus says we cannot go to Heaven, and that cuts off all possible access to Paradise, providing Paradise is really in Heaven.

Q. Where is it recorded that we cannot go to Heaven?

A. In John iii. 13: "NO MAN hath ascended UP to Heaven."

Q. But how about the future?

A. On that point, see John xiii. 33: "Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me: and as I said unto the Jews, Whether I GO, ye CANNOT come: so now I SAY TO YOU."

Q. . But look here; how does that harmonize with his promise to the thief on the cross? Didn't he promise to take the thief with him to Paradise, that very day?

A. If he did make such a promise, I believe he would do as he promised, but I doubt very much that he ever promised him anything of the kind.

Q. Well, read Luke xxiii. 42, 43: "And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou COMEST into THY KINGDOM. And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Is not that a promise?

A. Well, I notice a discrepancy between the question and answer, and be-

side that, I find that other Scriptures show that neither of them went to paradise that day. This makes me suspicious that there may have been some human tinkering with that text; that is, if we insist on a twenty-four hour day.

Q. What discrepancy do you discover between the prayer and answer?

A. Now, Jesus spent his time proclaiming the Gospel of the Kingdom about that country. The thief had no doubt heard him, and so requested to be remembered when he should come in his Kingdom. He did not seem to have the remotest idea about being taken to a sky Paradise, that day. As a Jew, he doubtless had a more accurate knowledge as to the location of Paradise. The discrepancy is between the going and coming.

Q. Well, did he not promise him that he should be with him in paradise?

A. Yes. But he could not be there that twenty-four hour day.

Q. Why not?

A. Because the Paradise of God did not then exist, neither does it yet.

Q. What are we to understand by the words "to-day?"

A. In this instance, it is certain that it was not a twenty-four hour day.

Q. How so?

A. Because the facts are against its being so.

Q. State what fact?

A. In the first place, Jesus says to Mary, three days after his death, "I am not yet ascended to my Father." John xx: 17.

Q. What did the thief have in his mind's eye, the DAY of his coming, or the DAY of his going?

A. His request shows it to be the DAY of his coming.

Q. Has that DAY come?

A. No, sir.

Q. Then the DAY in which Jesus promised the thief that he should be with him in paradise, has not come yet?

A. No, sir; it has not.

Q. What day was referred to?

A. The day mentioned by Jesus---the day when paradise is restored. Our Lord was well aware of the fact, that the "paradise of God," had no existence, at the time when he made him the promise. Therefore it must refer to the day when paradise is restored.

Arloa. You will notice that the words, "To-day," is in the text. Don't they point to the day when Jesus made the promise?

Teacher. At first sight they may appear to do so; but we must take into account the use of the words in the Greek language. They are from the word "seameron," and is correctly translated, "to-day." We have to consider the context, as to whether the time is present or future. For a sample, see Heb. iii. 7: "To-day if you will hear his voice, etc." No one would for a moment suppose that that this refers to some special twenty-four hour day.

The phrase "This day," is also from

“semeron,” and is used interchangeably with “to-day.”

See Acts xiii. 33: “Thou art my Son, THIS DAY have I begotten thee.”

Now, see Heb. v. 5: “Thou art my Son, TO-DAY have I begotten thee.” No one supposes the begetting took place on the twenty-four hour day that the words were written.

See Heb. iii. 13: “Exhort one another DAILY, while it is called TO-DAY.” Daily exhortations were to be made during a period of time called, “To-day.”

Matt. xxi. 28: “Son, go to work to-day in my vineyard.” Is the work in the Lord’s vineyard, confined to some twenty-four day?

We do not need to carry this any further. The context will show it when a twenty-four hour day is meant. The day when Jesus promised to remember the thief, was the day when paradise shall be restored.

Carrie. The question was asked once

before to-night, What about this word "UP?"

Teacher. Well, in the texts which have been quoted, we have these phrases: "caught up to the third heaven;" "caught up, into paradise." Right here, I want to say, the word "up," has no business to be there. I will quote those phrases, from the literal word for word translation, in the Diaglott: "Having been snatched away the such a one to third heaven;" "that he was snatched away into the paradise." All there is concerning this matter, is, that Paul's mind, while in extatic vision, was conveyed away, to paradise restored, as it will be located in the "third," or "new heavens and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

The Greek word for caught up, in this text, is "arpazo." This same word is found in Acts viii. 38: "The spirit of the Lord, CAUGHT AWAY Philip."

Mr. Campbell's Version, renders the phrase, "caught up," in the text in question, by "snatched away."

George. In this vision, Paul was uncertain as to whether the man was "in the body," or "out of the body," when in vision, he made his trip to the "third heaven." What are we to understand by "in" and "out" of the body?

Teacher. The phrase, "In the body," is equivalent to the phrase, "at home in the body," and signifies that we are "at home" "in the---natural---body;" whose abode is in the second heavens,---"the heavens and the earth which are now."

The phrase, "Out of the body," is also equivalent to the phrase, "Absent from the body," which signifies the possession of the "Spiritual body," whose abode will be in the "Third Heavens,"---"nevertheless we according to his promise, look for a new heavens, and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

Paganized theology of to-day, teaches that absence from the body, is only possible in the event of death. Then the immortal soul, freed from its cage, can flop its wings and fly away.

Is it not strange that Paul had no knowledge as to whether the soul of his acquaintance was "out of the body," or not, when it ascended up to paradise, since it would require the death of his acquaintance, before his soul could make its exit from the body?

George. Yes, indeed; but then we must expect false teaching to present inconsistent enigmas for its votaries to solve.

Q. What nation is reported as being the first to teach the immortality of the soul?

A. Chamber's Encyclopedia says: "The Egyptian nation appears to be the first to declare that the soul was immortal."

Q. Would you expect light to radiate from Egyptian darkness?

A. I would not expect anything very bright from that source.

Q. What do learned men say is the teaching of the Bible on the immortality of the soul?

A. Olshansen says: "The doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and the name, are alike unknown to the entire Bible."

Dobney says: "The Bible is silent on the point of an absolute and unconditional immortality of all men."

Mortimer says: "An immortality inherent in man is an unscriptural figment."

Graham says: "If immortality is inherent in all men, it is very plain that it cannot be the gift of God to the obedient."

Prof. Neville says: "All teaching which makes the soul immortal, by virtue of a primitive essence, is concealed pantheism."

Prof. Gaussen, says: "Rash the attempt, though so many have tried it, to establish the soul's immortality by arguments founded on its spiritual nature."

Teacher. It might be interesting to continue this study, but it is now time to close. The class is now adjourned.

LESSON XX.

Teacher. The Spiritualists have been holding meetings in the community for the past two weeks, and some strange things which they have done, has confused the minds of many people in the neighborhood. I propose as our subject for to-night:

SPIRITUALISM ACCOUNTED FOR.

Every effect must have an adequate cause, and the question arises, What is the cause of the effect we call Spiritualism?

Q. What do Spiritualists claim is the cause?

A. They claim that it is the work of never-dying disembodied spirits.

Q. Would the Bible sustain their claim?

A. Not by any means. On the contrary, it says, that in death "there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom." "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish." Psa. cxlvi. 1-4.

Q. Is the above the general teaching of Scripture?

A. Yes, sir; the Scriptures teach, that death at once ends all conscious existence.

Q. What, then, is the cause of Spiritualistic phenomena?

A. In my opinion, the phenomena can be traced to a natural, scientific and philosophical source.

Teacher. I have been much interested in reading a pamphlet, entitled: "Odology an Antidote to Spiritualism." We will quote largely from that during our investigation, to-night.

I will ask Lud to read from the pamphlet an explanation as to what the word odology is derived?

Lud. "Now odology, from logos, a

discourse, and OD, is a discourse upon od. The phenomena of Spiritualists are odistic if anything. I have chosen to denominate what I have to say upon the subject by odology, rather than pneumatology, psychology, or any other word which concedes the unproved, and unprovable affirmation of the existence of supposed dead men's ghosts disembodiedly.

Q. Did you ever read what Prof. Reichenbach says of od?

A. Yes. He says that od is a fluid more subtle than electricity, and is thrown off from the ends of the fingers like a blue flame.

Teacher. This is true, I have seen it thrown off from my own fingers.

Q. Why did Reichenbach give the name of od to this fluid?

A. "On this fluid Reichenbach has bestowed the name of od---I suppose for the same reason that Dr. Faraday styles the electrical poles electrodes, from electron amber and odos, away---the poles being regarded merely as the doors or ways.

by which electricity passes. The od is the boundary of the decomposing matter in the direction of the electric current. Reichenbach's fluid passes off at the ods or poles; and as he regards it as something else than electricity, magnetism or galvanism, he calls it by another name, even the Greco-chemical term for the extremity from which it exhales."

Teacher. Is this fluid constantly passing off from the electrodes? How is that, Carrie?

Carrie. The Professor says, that "The electro-magnetic od is constantly passing off from the electrodes, or poles, of animal bodies, and certain crystals. It is probable that our bodies are enveloped with a halo of it,---like that which enveloped Jesus, in a large degree, on the Mount of Transfiguration, and a greater degree still, as he appeared to Saul, on his way to Damascus."

Mrs. Griffith, says: "It is well known that around and adhering to all surfaces, there is a halo of semi-transparent light,

seen only, however, when the object for experiment, is in a certain position with regard to the eye and the light which falls upon it."

Q. Does the halo of our bodies consist of this fluid?

A. Yes. Now the "halo of our bodies it is probable, consists of Reichenbach's odic fluid, the color of which is visible to those who are highly odic, or in a state in which the od is abundantly generated. It is of a delicate blue when given off from the positive electrode, and yellow from the negative pole or crystal. From the finger tips of the male subject, it exhales of a blue color, about an inch long, but from those of a female, the jet is inconsiderable, imparting, as it were, a luminousness to their extremities.

Q. Where can this odic exhalation be seen at night?

A. In grave yards, arising from decomposing bodies beneath the surface, "as a lambent blue haze," which accounts for ghosts seen flitting about among the

tombs of the dead, during the dark hours of the night.

A friend of mine, told me of a visit, that himself and comrades made to an old ruined monastery one night. He said that near by was an unused well. While some distance from the well, they saw a group of ghosts dancing about the well. Others were summoned to witness this strange phenomena. During the daytime, the well was examined, and the decayed corpse of a man was found at the bottom of the well. The ghosts were nothing more than a blue lambent haze, arising from decaying animal matter. An excited imagination could readily see various forms and shapes.

Q. What produces the phenomena of phantom ships, sometimes seen at sea?

A. Phantom ships at sea, are produced by refraction of the light reflected on the firmament from real ships.

Q. How are other phantom appearances produced?

A. I will answer that by reading a

selection from "Odology an Antidote to Spiritualism."

"Phantom appearances are sometimes seen by sensitive nervous systems, produced by refraction of the odic rays in and upon the mirror formed by the magnetic halo of the earth, which emanate from the forms corrupting in the dust thereof. These phantoms are called separate, or disembodied spirits, by the ignorant and superstitious, under the supposition that they are the real men and women, boys and girls, who used to enact life's follies in the flesh! They are no doubt, as real as phantom ships, and as awfully mysterious to the unphilosophical, and Scripturally unenlightened, as they are to the untutored men of the fore-castle; but real as the phantom ships' spectres are, who would be so crazy as to maintain that they are the souls or the spirits of the ships which gave them motion over the dark blue sea? or are they disembodied ghosts of the vessels caught up to the third heavens? Yet this would

be just as rational as the psychological theosophisms of the school, pulpits, and circles, and spirit worlds.”

What is the best time to see this odic light?

A. The night is the best time. Spiritualists understand this matter, and use it to deceive the ignorant. Cora Hatch was asked to explain why it was necessary to work in the dark, in order to manifest the phenomena of Spiritualism? The answer came: “The action of light agitates, dissipates, or in some way disturbs the ---odic---fluid, gas, magnetism, or whatever the instrumentality be called, which is employed by spirits in acting upon grosser matter, that they are unable to control and employ it.” This subtle element pervades all nature, and is by scientists called electricity, and which is used by spiritualists to produce a phenomena which they erroneously attribute to supposed spirits of the dead.

Q. is not this the base of a great deal of this phenomena?

A. Yes. "Now it is a fact that in our day, there has been discovered a subtle, unanalyzable, incomprehensible principle, which though inscrutable in its essence, is found to be at the base of all the phenomena of nature---itself eluding the test of chemistry, or the deduction of philosophy, scientists have called it electricity."

Q. What do the Scriptures call it?

A. Spirit.

Q. Give some samples?

A. "Thou sendest forth thy Spirit and they are created."

"By his Spirit he has garnished the heavens."

"The Spirit of God hath made me."

"The Spirit of God moved upon the waters."

On the day of Pentecost it appeared as "CLOVEN TONGUES LIKE AS OF FIRE." which must be conceded, is a decided electrical phenomena.

Q. When a person is born of the

24

Spirit, and is in fact Spirit, what is their appearance?

A. As yet, the Lord Jesus is the only person who has thus far attained to the Spirit nature, and as to his appearance, see Matt. xxviii. 3: "His countenance was LIKE LIGHTNING, and his raiment white as snow."

Again, when the Lord Jesus appeared to Saul, while on his way to Damascus, intent on persecuting those who believed that the Lord Jesus was THE CHRIST, Saul said, "I saw in the way a light from heaven ABOVE the BRIGHTNESS of the SUN." This light blinded his eyes, and and felled to the ground like dead men, the soldiers that were with him, as surely as if struck by LIGHTNING.

Q. What does Prof. Moser say with regard to the radiation of light?

A. He says that two bodies constantly impress their images upon each other, even in complete darkness. Thermographic experiments, prove these principles, which lead him to the conclusion,

that there is a latent light in certain vapors, as well as a latent heat. The ordinary condition of the human brain, and organs supplied by its nerves, is that of adaptation to the common exterior aspect of imponderable matters, such as light, heat, the grosser forms of electricity, sound, etc. But there is a more exalted or refined perception of these things which the animal organization of its own power, however intensified by inherent excitation, cannot attain to. Our perception of the latent imponderables, latent light, latent electricity, or od, latent sounds, etc., may be rendered more acute than ordinary; but it can NEVER rise to the highest penetration which is possible without the super-addition of something which the animal nature possesses only to a very limited degree. This something is "the SPIRIT OF GOD WITHOUT MEASURE."

Q. Is man naturally in harmony with the latent imponderables?

A. He is not ordinarily so?

Q. Is God?

A. Yes; intensely and completely so.

Q. Would not this make light and darkness all the same to the Creator?

A. Light and darkness is all the same to him?

Q. Do the Scriptures so teach?

A. They do. See Psa. cxxxix. 12: "The darkness and the light are both alike to thee."

Q. Then is it possible for anyone to hide from God under the cover of darkness?

A. It is not. See verses 11, 12: "If I say, surely the darkness shall cover me; even the NIGHT shall be LIGHT about me. Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee; but the DARKNESS SHINETH AS THE DAY." "If a man was imprisoned in darkness, a thousand feet below the surface of the earth, God would see him as distinctly as we see each other above ground, at noonday."

Q. "Upon what principle is it that God sees thus in darkness?"

A. Because his nature is like unto condensed lightning, glowing with such an intensity, that its radiation is felt throughout the boundless universe, penetrating through all substances, and developing life and motion in all things."

Q. How did it affect Moses when he came in contact with heavenly beings?

A. His face became so luminous, that the children of Israel "were afraid to come nigh him." Exod. xxxiv. 29-35.

Deut. iv. 24: "The Lord thy God is a consuming fire."

Exod. xxiv. 17: "The sight of the glory of the Lord was like a consuming fire upon the top of the mountain."

Heb. xii. 20: "For our God is a consuming fire."

Psa. xcvi. 4: "His LIGHTNINGS enlightened the world: the earth saw and trembled. The hills melted like wax at the presence of the Lord."

Q. Have we other instances of this kind, as applied to Jesus?

A. Yes; see the following:

Luke ii. 9: "The glory of the Lord shone round about."

Acts xxvi. 13: "I saw in the way a light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun."

Rev. i. 16: "His countenance was as the sun shineth in its strength."

2 Thess. i. 7, 8: "And to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in **FLAMING FIRE**---an electrical quality of spirit personalities---taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not **THE** gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ."

2 Thess. . ii. 8: "Then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the **SPIRIT** of his mouth, and shall destroy with the **BRIGHTNESS**---the electrical '**FLAMING FIRE**'---of his coming."

"The rays from his presence, called spirit, diluted with the grosser menstrea of the earth's products, place him in the inner relation to the imponderables which

are but one and the same principle, variously developed by the media through which it passes, into the receptacle from whence it came. Thus, for instance, the most subtle principle on the earth's halo is spirit, which is called by different names, such as electricity, magnetism, etc. This halo is its reservoir, as it were. It is diluted with atmospheric air. We breathe it. It pervades every atom of our bodies, and having enabled, our organization to perform its functions, it exhales from the electrodes of our system, as od into the reservoir where we derived it by breathing. Thus a circle or circuit exists of the external atomic form-changing fluid, internal transformed matter, and nervous current, closing the circuit by od--latent light radiating in darkness---exhaling into the outer fluid."

Q. If the air we breathe, should lack the vital spirit, would it sustain life?

A. No, sir; breath vitalized by the life-giving spirit, is necessary in order to sustain animal life.

Q. Are the words breath and spirit used as synonymous terms?

A. Yes, but not exclusively so; the word spirit sometimes designates the entire person, as for instance, "Believe not every spirit," or person. "The spirits ---persons---of just men made perfect." It also describes a quality of the mind, as for instance, "The spirit of disobedience." It also has reference to the vital electrical element in the air we breathe. Job said: "If he gather unto himself his SPIRIT and his BREATH, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." Job xxxiv. 14, 15.

Q. Do we not at times perceive the oppressiveness of the atmosphere, when it lacks spirit? and how weak and spiritless the physical system becomes?

A. We certainly do. But after an electrical storm all life, both animal and vegetable, is inspired with new life and vigor. As already quoted, "we breathe it, and it pervades every atom of our bodies, and having enabled our organism

to perform its functions, it exhales from the electrodes of our system as OD into the reservoir where we derived it by breathing. Thus a circle or circuit exists of the external atomic form-changing fluid, internal transformed matter, and nervous current, closing the circuit by OD---latent light radiating in darkness---exhaling into the outer fluid.”

“Now, this outer reservoir of fluid may be regarded as a highly-polished and extremely sensitive mirror, in which can be excited latent ODIC SPECTRES, which become visible sometimes to those whose brains are subjected to odic exaltation.”

Q. From what may spectral impressions arise?

A. “They may emanate from corrupting bodies, and from living brains acting upon other living brains. Reichenbach’s grave-yard experiments have demonstrated the first; thermo-electrography the second; and animal magnetism, in all its varieties. the third.”

Q. Can you illustrate what is meant by spectral impressions?

A. Yes. "Take a piece of glass, the temperature of which is low, lay a coin upon it, and breathe upon the surface: allow the breath to entirely disappear: then toss the coin off the surface and examine it minutely; no trace of anything is visible, yet a spectral impression exists upon that surface, which may be evoked by again breathing upon the surface of the glass. A form resembling the coin at once appears."

Q. Can a more perfect impression be produced by an electrical machine?

A. Yes. "M. Karsten placed a coin upon a piece of plate glass, which being supported by a plate of metal not insulated, the sparks from the conductor of an electrifying machine were made to strike on the coin, thereby causing them to pass simultaneously through the coin and metallic plate. After one hundred turns of the machine, the coin was removed, the glass plate appeared perfectly

unaltered, but when breathed upon, a perfect impression of the coin in its most minute details became visible to the eye."

Q. Will these impressions remain after all traces of electricity has disappeared?

A. Yes, sir; even after being wiped off with an handkerchief.

Q. How does God speak to man?

A. "He does it by the same spirit that shivers the sturdy oak, or rends the rocks assunder," and which sat upon the disciples as "Cloven tongues like as of fire." "Sometimes he communicates his mind by making direct spectral impressions on the magnetic mirror of the brain." "Things, ideas, or images may exist upon the brain's tablet or sensorium, and yet be invisible---that is not recollected by the individual who received them---and consequently invisible to all other persons, from his inability to utter them."

Q. Though the person may not be

conscious of it, may not the ideas exist in the person?

A. Yes, sir; "though thus invisible, the ideas are nevertheless existent, and actually present within. They exist, however, in the state of latent spectral impressions, and in order to be evoked or made visible, they need to be breathed upon by the same principle that impressed them upon the sensorium. Now the sensoria, or magnetic mirrors, or minds of the Apostles had been prepared or polished by the process they had undergone by the ministry of John. They were in a state represented by the polished metal or glass, ready for the coin to be impressed upon it. Jesus came, the medium through which the Father operated in word and deed. John v. 30. He spoke the words, laying them, so to speak, like coin upon---the glass---their hearts; while the Father, who performed the miracles, passed by their effect, the electricity of his spirit, as it were, through the Word, and their sensoria,

stamping impressions there, as by M. Karsten's experiment with the glass, coin and electrifying machine."

Q. Did not Jesus recognize the fact that he was operated on by a power not of himself?

A. Yes. He said, "I can do nothing of myself."

Q. Did not the Apostles hear many things which for a time remained upon their minds as spectral impressions?

A. Yes, sir; "the Apostles saw and heard many things during their attendance upon the instructions of the Great Teacher, which continued to the end of months, as hidden spectral impressions upon their sensoria, but which were afterward evoked in lines of living light."

Q. How was it evoked?

A. See John xiv. 26: Jesus promised to send them the Holy Spirit, which shall "bring all things to your REMEMBRANCE, whatsoever I have SAID unto you."

Q. Give an example?

A. I will call the attention of the

Class, to the time when Jesus rode into Jerusalem, on the colt of an ass, as foretold by Zechariah. See John xii. 16: "These things understood not his disciples at the first; but when Jesus was glorified, then remembered they that these things were written of him, and that they had done these things unto him."

George. They knew these things were written by the prophet, and had witnessed the actual fulfilment with their own eyes, why didn't they understand them?

Carrie. It does seem strange, but it evidently laid upon their minds, merely as a latent spectral impression, and in order that it may be evoked, they needed to be breathed upon, like the coin upon the glass, that latent impressions may be evoked. Jesus seemed to understand this. He said: "When the spirit of truth is come, it will guide you into all truth."

Teacher. In what manner did the breath from God come?

Arloa. "As of a mighty rushing wind."

Q. Was it electrical in appearance?

A. Yes, sir; "as cloven tongues like as of fire."

Q. Is it a common thing for people to constantly read the prophecies of both the Old and New Testament, and see the literal fulfilment of them, and actually know nothing about it?

A. Yes. Hundreds of thousands of people daily read those prophecies, and actually don't know it when they are literally fulfilled.

Teacher. I have seen so much of this in my work as an evangelist. When the latent spectral impressions on their minds has been evoked by expounding the Scriptures, they have been astonished that they have not previously seen that which they now see is plainly revealed upon the Sacred Page.

Lud. Yes, that is truly the case, I have personally experienced it.

Teacher. Are angels phantoms, or

the supposed immaterial ghosts of dead men?

Ella. They are not. I know the hymn book says:

“I want to be an angel, etc,”

but no such expectation is found in the Bible. Angels are ponderable beings, occupying space. According to pictures men never turn into angels, that is reserved for women and babies. We sometimes see “winged heads of chubby babies, peeping out of clouds, on the margin of inner glory, they are spectres of minds bewitched or crazed by the philosophy of vain deceit of theosophical magicians, and prophets of the so-called spirit-world---a world of electro-magnetic spectralia. Such angels as the people’s heads are filled with, flourish there; and the darker the intellect, the more vividly are they seen in all their glory.”

Q. How about Bible angels?

A. Man was made “a little lower than the angels,” in nature. Angels are “capable of corporealing a thunderbolt

without deterioration, or hazard of destruction. They can walk in the glowing furnace unaffected. They can also mantle others with a halo of their spirit. See Dan. iii. 25. They can also eat and drink, and be washed with water." Gen. xviii. 8.

Q. What about death bed impressions?

A. In death bed scenes, latent spectral impressions become quite vivid, they see angels beckoning them to come up higher; they hear rapturous heavenly music, etc. The death bed scene of a Mohammedan, will be different. He will see the spectral impressions made upon his brain. He will see a harem of spirit-wives, and sensual enjoyment. Death bed scenes, will vary, just as much as the spectral impressions that have been made upon the brain may differ. Some have agonizing death bed scenes. They see a blazing hell, with black and red devils to torment their immaterial souls, which has neither body, parts, or passions.

A Catholic will see the flames of purgatory, etc. They see that which has made the most vivid impression upon the brain.

Teacher. Tell me, what is the mission of angels?

A. See Psa. cii. 20: "The angels of Jehovah do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word."

Q. Can they be evoked by consultants of the dead?

A. No, sir; angels are ponderable beings, and not phantom ghosts of the dead. They can never be evoked by those who consult the dead on behalf of the living.

Q. Are the messages received by those who consult the dead, in harmony with Holy Scripture?

A. No, sir; but they do harmonize with the latent spectral impressions made upon their own brains.

Q. Can divine revelation be made without previous spectral impressions?

A. Yes, sir; an angel was sent to

John, while he was in Patmos, for the express purpose of revealing future things to him. These things had no existence, except in the mind of the Creator, and no one could see them, unless he should first be placed "en rapport" with the mind of the Father.

Q. Could they be perceived when thus placed "en rapport?"

A Yes. "When this should be effected, he could behold them there in all their wonderful symbolization, glowing on the Divine sensorium. No one, however, was allowed to gaze upon this manifestation proximately, but Jesus. Hence the Apocalypse is styled, 'the revelation which God gave to Jesus Christ;' that he might communicate it to his servants on earth. In doing this he sent an angel, called 'his angel,' who was qualified to signify it to John, that he might write a description of it to Christ's servants."

Q. In what way could the angel show it to John?

A. He "had to present visible spectral impressions before him, when he was 'in the spirit,' to daguerreotype his sensorium in the camera obscura of his brain, with the objects transferred from the mind of the Father to the Lord Jesus, and then to the angel. This was effected by the spirit shining upon the divine scenery, and being thence reflected upon John's sensorium, 'SHINING into his HEART, to give him the LIGHT of the KNOWLEDGE of GOD in the face of Jesus Christ.' He had to place John en rapport with himself, so that the spirit passing from him to John, would transfer the spectral impressions to him, and make him clairvoyant. The circle being complete, the spiritual current circulated through the group; and John records the fact, saying: 'I was in THE SPIRIT on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a GREAT VOICE, as of a trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and what thou SEEST write in a book.'"

Q. Can man in some degree, imitate

the angels, God's glorious messengers?

A. Yes, in an imperfect manner. "The 'Quaker light within,' can be made to shine with latent or odic light upon the sensorium of a prepared medium. 'If the LIGHT within you be DARKNESS, how great is that darkness.' This is the character of the Quaker light, which that sect teaches, every man brings with him into the world."

Q. What is that light?

A. "Take two persons, make one a medium, and the other a consultor of the dead through him or her. In preparing the medium, you have preternaturally exalted, or rendered unusually sensitive, the sensorium, you have so highly polished the plate as to prepare it to receive impressions---its electro-magnetic halo is susceptible to the most delicate touch. Now place the seeker to the dead en rapport with the medium, and cause to pass from his sensorium a current of electricity, magnetism, od., or what not. This done, there is a connection established

between them, which unites the halos of the two; so that even the hidden spectral impressions of the seeker are daguerrotyped on the sensorium of the medium, and the witch sees and hears in dream-sight, and dream-sound, things which the seeker may have forgotten himself. But the relationship established is not limited to the seeker and the witch; but through her it extends to all she may know, and through them to others, and re-acting upon herself, and so through the seeker to all the ramifications of his acquaintanceship, both living and dead.”

Q. Have we a case of this kind, recorded in Scripture?

A. Yes, sir; we have.

Q. Who was the seeker?

A. Saul, King of Israel.

Q. Who was the medium?

A. The witch of Endor.

Q. Who did the King ask for?

A. The Prophet Samuel.

Q. Did he say, Bring me Samuel down from heaven?

A. Why, no; he said "bring me UP Samuel." He knew Samuel was buried, and he expected the witch to bring him "up," from where they buried him.

Q. Did Saul see anything?

A. Not a single thing. He asked her what she saw in her dream-vision. He said to her, "What sawest thou?" She replied, "I saw gods---elohim, or judges---ascending OUT of the EARTH." He asked her to give a description of the person of one of these gods which she in her vision saw "ascending out of the earth." He asked, "What form is he of?" She replied, "An old man cometh up;---not down---and he is covered with a mantle. And Saul perceived---from her description--- that it was Samuel" that she saw only in trance, or mental vision.

"The conversation between the spectral impression, and Saul, was carried on through the witch, as through a medium at this day. Saul's spectral forebodings, she could read from his mind, and became prophetic in her mouth. Science has de-

monstrated the fact, that so-called spirit-communications both begin and end with spectral impressions upon the sensorium, and are never from a higher source. Mediums are rendered peculiar sensitive to receive and express impressions when placed en rapport with the seeker.”

Q. How are spectral impressions made?

A. In many ways.

Q. Please name one?

A. Stomach disorders will create them. A gentleman who had dyspepsia, saw a pig's head sitting on his left shoulder for six weeks. When an healthy action of the stomach ensued, the pig's head departed. This was just as much the ghost of some dead pig, as was the apparition the witch saw, was Samuel. Saul did not see anything, he had to simply trust what the witch said.

Q. Do the words and actions of men, cause spectral impressions to be made on the external magnet halo of the earth, which may remain after their decease?

A. Such is the case.

Q. Can these external spectral impressions be discerned by mediums?

A. Clairvoyants of peculiar sensibility, will sometimes perceive them.

Q. Please give an example?

A. See 2 Kings vi. 8-13. Here we find that the King of Israel and the King of Syria, were in war with each other. The King of Syria held secret councils of war in the privacy of his own room. They devised ambucades, where they might entrap Israel. The King of Syria, became suspicious that he had traitors in his camp, because the King of Israel was several times informed of the plans made in his secret councils. He was told that there was no spy in his camp, "but Elisha, the prophet that is in Israel, telleth the King of Israel, the WORDS that thou SPEAKEST in thy BED CHAMBER."

See also Eccl. x. 20: "Curse not the King, no not in thy THOUGHT; and curse not the rich in thy bed chamber; for a BIRD of the air shall CARRY thy VOICE,

and that which hath wings shall TELL the matter.”

Q. Where was Elisha, when he informed the King of Israel?

A. At Dotham.

Q. How, then, did Elisha get his information?

A. The “spectral impressions made upon the universal magnetic mirror by the Syrian’s words, were breathed or shined upon by God, and evoked by God upon the sensorium of the prophet, by the daguerreotypism of his spirit, which gave wings to the matter. This is the ‘Bird of the Air,’ that reveals even the inmost thoughts of men. Let no man do wrong, and say, ‘No eye sees me, therefore the offence, shall be hid.’ Sooner or later his sin may find him out. The impressions of his deeds upon the earth’s magnetic halo, may happen to be reproduced upon the sensorium of some sleeping or waking medium, and behold his actions written like Belshazzar’s doom, on

the magnetic page, in words of living light.”

Teacher. The above theory has received a wonderful confirmation by the statements of a Mrs. Piper, a medium whose fame has astonished the world. For fifteen or more years, she has been receiving, and giving out to the world, these so-called spirit-messages.

After so many years experience in receiving what was supposed to be messages from the supposed spirits of the dead, what conclusion did she arrive at?

Lud. I cut the following statement from a newspaper: “Mrs. Piper says: ‘I must truthfully say that I do not believe that spirits of the dead have spoken through me.’”

Q. Did she claim that the phenomena of spiritualism could be explained in any other way than that they came from the supposed spirits of the dead?

A. Yes. She said: “The world to-day knows that among scientific men, the opinions on psychic phenomena could be

explained in other ways than by the intervention of disembodied spirit forces.”

Q. What theory did she favor?

A. She said: “The theory of telepathy strongly appeals to me as the most plausible and genuinely scientific solution of the problem. To strengthen this opinion, are many authentic experiences which have all been satisfactorily explained by means of the telepathic hypothesis.

She was asked the following questions:

Q. “Have you ever had any convincing proof of the possibility of spirit return?”

A. “I cannot truthfully say that I have.”

Q. “Do you think that communication with the spirit-world can be scientifically proved?”

A. “For my own part I cannot see how it can be scientifically proved that we hold communication with the so-called spirit world.”

Q. What did she say about the theory of unconscious telepathy?

A. "I have never heard of anything being said by myself, while in a trance state, which might not have been latent in

1. My own mind.

2. In the mind of the person in charge of the sitting.

3. In the mind of the person who was trying to get communication with some one in another state of existence, or some companion present with such person, or

4. In the mind of some absent person alive somewhere else in the world.

I have said that if the knowledge of facts stated by me while in the condition was not latent with me, or with any of those present in the room with me at the time of a sitting, it might still have been in the mind of some other person alive somewhere in the world. It might have been latent, or it might have been active knowledge, and have been transferred to the mind of those in the room, then to

my subjective mind, then automatically uttered or written by me. I do not find it as hard to grasp this theory as that of a disembodied spirit telling the things."

She once had a sitting with a Boston physician, and he asked her this question.

"What made you talk about nothing but the top of an old pencil? Why didn't you talk about God and the angels?" She said to him: "What do you know about God and the angels? He was good enough to smile, for of course, the pencil was part of the scientific test, and the other talk would not have been."

Q. Speaking of Mrs. Piper, what did Dr. Patch, say?

A. "It would seem to one who has followed the discussion on this subject for many years, that the spiritualistic theory utterly fails to account for the phenomena of so-called mediumship."

Teacher. It seems to me that the conclusions of this world famed medium, when taken in connection with the tests

of scientific men, ought to account for something.

Bessie. Won't the theory of unconscious telepathy, account for the case of the King of Syria at war with the King of Israel. You will remember how that words spoken by the King of Syria, in the privacy of his own bed chamber, was carried by Elisha to the King of Israel. At the time the words were spoken, Elisha was at Dotham?

Lucy. Yes, and then the theory of "spectral impressions," is doubtless but another way of expressing the very same thing.

Teacher. The supernatural fallen-angel-devil theory it seems to me to be too closely akin to the bugbear of an omnipresent devil. A writer, speaking along this line, said: "From what I have read of spirit-worldism, I have no hesitation in saying that is a mere lying divination. The dark and malarious thinkings of the flesh, rioting in the spectralia of musty theosophisms, talked into it by

gospel-nulifiers. They talk of separate spirits, which are nothing more than spectral impressions on magnetic halos, hidden, indeed, from light-stimulated optics, but disclosed to electro-magnetically excited brains. Such is the phantom-soul, for whose salvation from Pluto's realm of fire and brimstone, the whole machinery of clerical superstition has been erected. A stupendous fabric of moonshine---a pious cheat, for the salvation of a magnetic spectre, and nothing more real."

Teacher. To my mind, the phenomena of spiritualism is more satisfactorily explained by spectral impressions on the sensorium, and unconscious telepathy, than by creatures which exist only in a distorted imagination, or by angelic-demons, which seems to me to be too closely allied with the prevalent theological specters of our day.

Our lesson has been lengthy, but very interesting, and I think carefully studied. We are now dismissed.

LESSON XXI.

Teacher. A correspondent writing to me, says: "I have a lady friend,---not of our faith---who asked me to explain about the bottomless pit, if there is no hell. Will you please explain?"

Our topic for to-night will be:

"THE BOTTOMLESS PIT."

I will ask Arloa to give a few ideas along this line.

Arloa. I should say that it needs no explanation.

Q. How so?

A. Because it don't mean anything.

Q. What reason have you for saying so?

A. Because the phrase "bottomless pit," is not really a part of Holy Scripture.

Q. How is that? I find the phrase seven times in the Book of Revelation.

A. Yes, I know you do, but it is not there by proper authority.

Q. Please explain why not?

A. I will quote authorities to prove that the phrase, "bottomless pit," is not a proper translation of the original Greek word.

Q. Please give the Greek, and also what it means.

A. "Ek ths abussun"---out of the abyss" The Diaglott so renders Rev. xvii. 8.

The Revised Version has it: "To come up out of the abyss."

The three best manuscripts we have, the Vatican, Sinaitic, and Alexandrian, gives it as "abusson,"---abyss.

S. P. Tregelles, LL. D., who has proba-examined more ancient manuscripts, than any other man in the world, gives it: "To ascend out of the abyss."

Ella. What is the meaning of the word abyss?

A. It signifies a very deep place, but not necessarily so deep, that it has no bottom.

George: I notice that both in Rev. xvii., and Rev. xi., the beast is seen coming up out of the bottomless pit, what special abyss does that refer to?

A. See Rev. xiii. 1: "I stood upon the sand of the SEA,---the great deep---and saw a beast rise up out of the SEA,"---the abyss.

Albert. Is not the word "sea," in the text quoted, a symbolic expression?

A. It probably is. It is used symbolically in the Apocalypse. See Rev. xvii. 12: "The WATERS---sea---which thou sawest, where the harlot sitteth, are peoples, and multitudes and nations."

Lucy. Is not "the bottomless pit," preached as a place in which sinners are endlessly tormented?

A. Yes, I know it is, but it certainly is a gross misuse of both literal and symbolical language.

Albert. I was talking with a man on

the street the other day, and he quoted Matt. xxv. 41, which reads as follows: "Then shall he say unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into EVERLASTING FIRE, prepared for the devil and his angels." How would you use it?

A. I would ask the gentleman what he expected to prove by this text? If he said the endless torment of sinners, I should ask him to show from the text, where such an idea could be found?

Albert. Why, I did, and instead of answering me, he took a book out of his pocket, and read the following extract from Spurgeon: "When thou diest, thy soul will be tormented alone; that will be a hell for it; but at the day of judgment thy body will join thy soul, and then thou wilt have twin hells, thy soul sweating drops of blood, and thy body suffused with agony. In fire exactly like that we have on earth, thy body will lie, abestos-like, forever unconsumed, all thy veins roads for the feet of pain to travel on, every nerve a string on which the devil

shall play his diabolical tune of Hell's Unutterable Lament."

Teacher. What did you do with that?

Albert. I was going to put it in contrast with some Scripture quotations, when he took out his watch, and said, "I am sorry, but I will have to go now, as I have an engagement at this time."

Teacher. Spurgeon said this fire in the bottomless pit, is "exactly like that we have on earth." But why don't it act the same? The fire we have on earth, consumes that which it preys upon? Spurgeon says, they are abestos-like forever unconsumed.

Lud. Well, what do the Scriptures say that everlasting or eternal fire, will do for those who are cast into it?

A. See Jude 7: "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them, in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth as an EXAMPLE suffering the vengeance of ETERNAL FIRE." Now this is given to us as "an example," of what

those people will experience who suffer the "Vengeance of Eternal Fire."

Q. But this text does not give the effect which "eternal fire," had on those who suffered its "vengeance?"

A. No, sir; but Luke xvii. 29, does, it reads as follows: "The same day that Lot went out of Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and DESTROYED them ALL. . Even THUS shall it be in the day when THE SON of MAN shall be REVEALED." This reveals to us how sinners in the future will suffer "the vengeance of eternal fire."

Q. At what time in the future?

A. "When the Son of man is revealed?"

Q. What other Scripture confirms this?

A. 2 Thess. i. 8.

Q. Please read it?

A. "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, TAKING VENGEANCE on them that know not God, and that obey

not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be PUNISHED with EVERLASTING DESTRUCTION.”

Q. What does “everlasting destruction” signify?

A. It means a death from which there can be no awakening.

Q. When fire completely destroys an object, what is there left?

A. Nothing but ashes.

Q. Will “eternal fire” do that much for sinners?

A. It will. See 2 Pet. ii. 6: “And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ASHES, condemned them with an overthrow, making them an EXAMPLE unto those who shall after LIVE UNGODLY.”

See Mal. iv. 3: “Ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts.”

Q. What are we to understand by the phrase, “Eternal Fire?”

A. Nothing more than a fire which is eternal in its effect. When we speak

of "eternal judgment," it is a final judgment, a judgment that is eternal in its effect.

Ella. What about the Lake of Fire, mentioned in the Apocalypse?

A. There is no such literal lake. It is highly symbolical language, teaching the final destruction of whatever is said to be cast into it. That the language is symbolical, can easily be seen, by taking note as to what is cast into it.

Q. Well, what is said to be cast into this lake of fire?

A. In the first place we have the devil. Now, the devil is not a supernatural personality, possessing animal life. Hence could not suffer torment. I need not give proof texts, at this time, as they are given in abundance, in Lesson xviii. page 320.

Q. Well, what next?

A. We next have the beast and false prophet. The beast symbolizes a corrupt civil system. "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth." No

one supposes it to be a four footed living creature.

The false prophet is supposed to symbolize corrupt false religion. There can be no animal life here. Nevertheless, Revelation in its highly symbolical language, speaks of them as follows: "These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone."

Q. What next?

A. Why death and hell is cast into the lake of fire. Death is a condition, it therefore, is not material, has neither form, weight, or circumference; it cannot be handled, it has nothing about it which fire can prey upon. It takes but very little discernment to discover that the lake of fire, as described in the Apocalypse, is purely symbolical language.

Q. Well, what about hell being cast into the lake of fire?

A. Well, then, if the lake of fire is hell, as some hell fire preachers affirm, then there must be two hells. Then if

one hell is cast into the other hell, it will then be a hell within a hell. It is a question with me, as to where the power is to be had, that can pick up a great pit of fire, which is large enough to hold millions of people, and toss it into the lake of fire? Then again, what effect could the lake of fire have upon a supposed fire-proof bottomless pit?

These are a few of the foolish inconsistencies, which always arise, when anyone attempts to read symbolical language as literal.

Q. Then tell us, what does the lake of fire mean?

A. I don't have to go into any exposition of its symbolisms, because it explains itself.

Q. Where?

A. See Rev. xx. 14: "And death and hell was cast into the lake of fire. **THIS IS THE SECOND DEATH.**"

Now it says in just so many words, that the "Lake of Fire," is "The Second Death," if it is that, then we have

no right to even attempt to make it mean anything else.

Q. Is this passage confirmed by others?

A. It is. See Rev. xxi. 8: "The fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: WHICH IS the Second Death."

Q. Where will the "fire" come from which will inflict the "Second Death?"

A. See Rev. xx. 9: "And fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them."

Q. Did the "lake of fire," which "came down from God out heaven," preserve them alive for torment?

A. No, sir; it "devoured them," it inflicted the "second death," from which there can be no resurrection.

Q. Who are exempt from the "second death?"

A. See Rev. xx. 6: "Blessed and

holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath NO POWER, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

See also Rev. ii. 11: "He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death."

Q. What great blessing is the "lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death," going to bring to the world?

A. We must understand, that whatever evil thing is cast into the lake of fire, is forever bereft of all power to continue to do evil.

The beast, the last phase of corrupt civil government, and the false prophet, the last phase of a very corrupt ecclesiastical system. "These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." Whatever life political and ecclesiastical systems may have, every one not bereft of reason, are assured that it is not animal life. We know well, that

the world can never be at rest, until corrupt political and religious systems, are supplanted by the kings and priests who are chosen of God. This will never be until the beast and false prophet are removed by the lake of fire. In this way, an end will be put to all their evil doings.

Sin, personified as the devil, will also be removed. Jesus was manifested to "Destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil."

All evil doers are removed by the lake of fire. "Fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them."

When the lake of fire has completed its work, then the world will pass into the eternal rest prepared for the people of God. The lake of fire does a most blessed work. Whatever evil is removed by the "second death," will never be revived.

Carrie. I want to ask if the words, forever, for ever and ever, everlasting, etc., always denote endless time?

A. No, they do not.

Q. Will you kindly give us the original words?

A. Yes. We have the Hebrew word "olam," and the Greek word "aion," and its adjective "aionois."

Q. Then these words are sometimes used in a limited sense?

A. Yes, sir; in both Testaments they are used to denote an endless as well as a limited period of time.

Q. How many times are they used in a limited sense?

A. About two hundred and forty.

Q. How are we to ascertain the fact when the time is limited or eternal.

A. Take into consideration the context, ascertain whether or not the person or object is capable of endless duration. If we find that it is not, then the "forever," as applied to such person or object, will terminate with its existence:

Q. I would like to have you apply that rule to the case of Idumea, as recorded in Isa. xxxiv. 5-11: "For my sword shall be bathed in heaven: behold, it shall

come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse, to judgment. . . . The streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up forever: from generation to generation it shall lie waste, none shall pass through it for ever and ever.”

The word “forever,” is predicated of the “smoke” and the perpetual desolation of the country. The smoke could not ascend from the fire; any longer than than the fire continued to burn. The fire ceased ages ago; therefore that forever ceased with the extinction of the fire. The waste and desolation continues, therefore that forever is continuous.

Smith’s Bible Dictionary says: “This nation once so powerful has entirely passed away. Modern travelers, whether favorable to revelation or otherwise, have all shown how literally the predictions concerning Edom---Idumea---are fulfilled.

So visibly does the withering curse of an offended God rest upon it.”

Q. Now please consider Rev. xiv. 10, 11: “He shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb. And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever,” etc.

A. You will doubtless notice, that the word forever is predicated solely of the smoke, and not of the continuity of either the fire or the torment. When that upon which the fire feeds, is consumed, the fire must cease, and when the fire ceases, the smoke must cease to ascend from the fire, like it did in Idumea.

Q. Now I want to ask you to comment on Rev. xx. 10: “And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and false prophet are, and they shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever.”

A. The torment is here predicated of the devil, beast and false prophet. As I have previously shown, Jesus was man-

ifested to "Destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil." Heb. ii. 14. Therefore the devil must be exempted from endless torment. As far as the beast and false prophet are concerned, it is pretty generally conceded that they are not organic personalities, possessing animal life, but political and religious systems. But even if they were, their forever would end with the end of the "Day and Night" period. - That period will end with the passing away of this order of things. See Rev. xxi. 23-25: "And the city had no need of the SUN neither of the MOON,---having passed the day and night period---to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. . . . And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day, for there shall be no NIGHT there." There cannot be "day and night," when "there is NO NIGHT." May God hasten the time when it shall become a fact.

Q. Please quote some authorities for the use of the words forever, etc., in the senses named?

A. Says Prof. Stuart: "The classical sense of 'aion' is length or space of time. Long time, eternity, indefinite space of time"

Parkhurst, on the word "olam," says: "It seems to be much more frequently used for an INDEFINITE than for INFINITE time."

Commenting on the words "aion," and "aionios," he says: "The Hebrew word "olam," answers as the corresponding word for these two words in the Greek, which words denote time hidden from man, whether indefinite or definite; whether past or future."

Says Prof. Hudson: "All the terms for eternity are very often in the Bible used in a modified sense."

Teacher. We could extend the consideration of this topic with profit, but we must now adjourn. We are now dismissed.

LESSON XXII.

Teacher. When I was at Kentwood, last week, I went into the post office, and while there, I saw a preacher conversing with some men about a man who had been holding meetings in their town, and that he preached that Jesus was coming again, to set up his Kingdom on this earth. I heard the preacher remark, "I don't see what these fellows want to be going about the country for, preaching such stuff as that, when Jesus said in plain words, 'My Kingdom is not of this world.'" He said, "I think Jesus ought to know where his kingdom is going to be set up. I am going to preach a sermon on that subject, and warn the people to beware of those fellows."

I suggest that we examine to-night, the following topic:

“NOT OF THIS WORLD.”

Teacher. Where did this preacher make a mistake?

Albert. He erred in not distinguishing between the words earth, and world.

Q. What are the Greek words?

A. “Kosmos,” and “Ge.”

Q. What do they mean?

A. “Ge,” signifies land, while the “Kosmos” is the order of things existing on the land; for instance, the fashionable world, the commercial world, the religious world, “these have come hither also which have turned the world upside-down,” the political world, etc.

Q. When Jesus said, “My kingdom is not of this world,” what branch of the kosmos, did he have in his mind?

A. Evidently the political arrangement of things which constitute the make up of the kingdoms of this world. The Divine Kosmos, or political order of things, are so decidedly adverse to each other, that they could not amalgamate. “If my kingdom were of this world, then

would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews.”

Q. Tell me, can the social order of this kosmos, enter into, or harmonize with the social order upon which the kingdom of Jesus is to be founded?

A. Not in the least. The children of the kingdom cannot mingle with, or be a part of either the social, political, or the religious kosmos of this world, and become a part and parcel of the order of things which will obtain when the kingdom of God shall come.

Q. Did Jesus mean, when he said, “My Kingdom is not of this world,” that it would not be founded upon this “ge,” earth?

A. No, he did not. He always said, that it would be established on the earth. See Rev. v. 9, 10: “Hast made us unto our God, kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth.”

Q. Did he not teach that the existing kingdoms of this kosmos, would finally drop this kosmos, and take that of

The Divine order, in place of his Kingdom, being of THIS kosmos?

A. Certainly. See Rev. xi. 15: "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The KINGDOMS OF THIS WORLD are become our Lord's and his Christ's; and he shall reign for ever and ever."

Q. What is the Hebrew word for land?

A. It is "erets."

Q. Please give a text where the word "erets," is found?

A. See Zech. xiv. 9: "The Lord shall be KING over ALL the EARTH."

Q. Why is it that the Lord's Kingdom could not be of this kosmos?

A. See 1 John ii. 17: "The world---kosmos---passeth away and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." Those who "inherit the kingdom," must be as enduring as the kingdom, which "shall not pass away," like the kosmos of this world.

Q. Now, if of "the kingdom there

shall be no end," the earth, upon which the kingdom is set up, must of necessity last as long as the kingdom, should it not?

A. Of course. See Eccl. i. 4: "The earth---erets---abideth forever."

Q. Why should there be a change of kosmos?

A. Because of the lack of righteousness, both socially and politically. In the kosmos to come, "A King shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment." This will contrast strongly with the kingdoms of this kosmos.

Q. Who are these princes which "shall rule in judgment?"

A. See Rev. xiv. 4: "These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. They were redeemed from among men, being the firstfruits unto God and to the Lamb. And in their mouth was found no guile: for they are without fault before the throne of God." This status can never be reached without strict discipline and rigid training. Here they

learn righteousness and judgment, and become efficient, and qualified to "rule in judgment." If these qualifications are not sought for in this kosmos, you will never possess them in the new kosmos. Those who spend their time and energies in trying to patch up and improve the present political kosmos, are doing a vain and useless work. The decree of the Infinite One has been issued that it shall "pass away."

George. I was over to see my nearest neighbor, last night, and I talked with him some about the setting up of the kingdom, when Jesus comes. He said that could not be true. I asked him why not? He said because the world is to come to an end when Jesus comes. I asked him if he could prove it from the Bible? He said, "Yes, I can." I then requested him to do so. He quoted Matt. xxiv. 3: "And as he sat upon the mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the

sign of thy coming and the end of the world?"

Now, I want to ask, what is the true solution?

Teacher. Everything depends upon the meaning of the word "world." Your neighbor evidently thought it meant the literal earth, did he not?

George. Yes, I know he did.

Teacher. If it did mean the literal earth, what should the original Greek word be?

A. "Ge;" and "Erets," in the Hebrew.

Q. Well, what is the original Greek word for world, in the text quoted?

A. It is "aionos."

Q. What does it mean?

A. An age, a dispensation, a period of time.

Q. Please quote the text from the Diaglott: "Tell us, when these things will be? and what will be the sign of thy presence, and of the consummation of the age."

Q. What does the Revised Version give?

A. See the margin, and you will find practically the same thing.

Q. What other Scripture speaks of the end of the world?

A. Heb. ix. 26: "But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."

Q. What is the original word for "world," in this text?

A. It is "aionon,"---ages. Rendered in Diaglott: "Completion of the ages," ending with the Jewish age, when the sin offering was made.

Teacher. Now, George, you will no doubt see that your neighbor made a mistake in supposing the end of the world, meant the end of the "Ge,"---earth.

Teacher. We will now bring this lesson to a close, and adjourn until next week.

LESSON XXIII.

Teacher. According to a previous agreement, we will now study the subject, entitled:

THE FUTURE JUDGMENT.

The Scriptures are explicit in teaching, that there is surely a Great Day of Judgment coming, when that which is wrong, will be corrected.

Especially is God going to bring the nations to judgment, "And he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats."

"Let the heathen be wakened, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphet: for there will I sit to judge all the heathen round about. Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe: come, get you down;

for the press is full, the fats overflow; for their wickedness is great. Multitudes, multitudes in the valley of decision: for the day of the Lord is near in the valley of decision." Joel iii. 12-14.

But would it not be so much better to be placed in a position where we will not be required to come into the judgment?

Ella. It certainly would, if that can be done. Do the Scriptures make any provision for that?

A. They do.

Q. Where can it be found?

A. In John v. 24: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my Word, and believed on him, that sent me, hath ---aionion zoen---everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation---judgment---but is passed from death unto life."

Q. What is the Greek word for condemnation, in this text, and what does it mean?

A. It is "krisin"---judgment.

Q. Please read the Diaglott translation?

A. "Indeed, I truly say to you, he who hears my Word, and believes him who sent me, has aionian life; and COMES NOT INTO THE JUDGMENT, but has PASSED out of DEATH into LIFE."

This is a plain unvarnished statement that all who believe as required, and maintain the standard, "Comes not into the Judgment."

Q. What is the judgment about?

A. It is clear upon the face of the text, that it is a judgment made, or a decision already rendered, as to who shall or shall not receive everlasting life.

Q. What reason does the text assign for not coming into a future judgment?

A. Because as far as the judgment is concerned, you have already "passed out of death unto life." If that has already been "passed" upon in the case of those complying with the requirements named in the text, it would be useless to revise the matter in the future.

Q. Do other Scriptures confirm this text?

A. Yes, sir; in abundance. I will call your attention to John iii. 36: "He that believeth on the Son HATH---aionian zoen---everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life."

Here we have judgment already rendered, in the cases of both believer and unbeliever. The believer, as far as the judgment is concerned, is already awarded everlasting life, and consequently "shall not come into judgment," as saith the word of the Lord; but as far as the unbeliever is concerned, the judgment already rendered, is, "shall not see life."

Bessie. I notice so many texts that speak of believers already having everlasting life, in what way is it true?

A. That is made very plain in 1 John v. 10-12: "He that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God HATH GIVEN to us Eternal Life, and this life is IS IN HIS SON. He that HATH the Son HATH

LIFE; he that HATH NOT the Son of God HATH NOT LIFE.”

Q. Yes, I see that believers have everlasting life assigned to them, in the custody of the Son, but what I want to know is, when will it become a fact in our own organisms?

A. See Col. iii. 3, 4: “For ye are dead, and your LIFE is HID with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our LIFE, shall appear, THEN shall ye also appear with him in glory.”

Q. Now I will quote John iii. 36: “He that believeth on the Son HATH everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.”

Now, some very serious questions come to me: if believers at this time have attained to a position spoken of as having ---JUDICIALLY, but not as a physical fact--- “Passed from death unto life,” and on account of having thus judicially passed, “Comes not into---future---judgment,” on the question of determining his fitness

or not, to receive everlasting life, because "he that believeth on the Son HATH everlasting life," "hid with Christ, in God," and if it be true, that "he that hath the Son, hath life," is it not a strange thing if they are in ignorance of the possession of such a priceless treasure?

A. It certainly would be a very strange piece of ignorance?

Q. Well, then, how about those believers, who expect to come forth from their dusty beds in mortal flesh, for the purpose of undergoing a judicial investigation as to their fitness to receive everlasting life?

A. They certainly have but but a very limited conception of the Savior's clear and very emphatic declaration, when he said: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my Word, and believeth on him that sent me, HATH---by judicial decision---everlasting life, and---for this reason you---SHALL NOT come into JUDGMENT; but is---judicially---passed from death unto life."

Q. Is it really possible to attain a position in life, in which we can absolutely be free from "condemnation?"

A. Paul said it could be done.

Q. Where?

A. In Rom. viii. 1, 2: "There is therefore now **NO CONDEMNATION** to them which are **IN Christ Jesus**, who **WALK** not after the flesh, but after the **Spirit.**" There are two things here, that place a person beyond all possible danger of future condemnation, and these are the two things:

1. We must be "In Christ Jesus."

2. We must not "walk after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

Q. Then, if any person can have knowledge that they really are "in Christ Jesus," and are not walking "after the flesh," they also know that "no condemnation," awaits them in the future. Is that not so?

A. That is the case.

Q. Then what would be the sense of

28

citing such people over whom there is "no condemnation," before a tribunal for trial as to whether they ought to be condemned, or not?

A. Why such a procedure would be as inconsistent as a human farce.

Q. Did Paul know whether he was accepted, or not, before he died?

A. He did. See 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness," etc.

The words, "There, is," indicates positive assurance, not even a question of doubt is left open; whence comes this assurance in advance of an investigation at the judgment seat? It is found in the words, "I have kept the faith," etc.

Q. Do mortal resurrectionists teach that no one can know how it is going to fare with them until after the inquisition?

A. They do. I will quote from Mr. Roberts: "They will all be gathered together into one Great Presence, for the

one great dread purpose of inquisition. Not until they hear the spoken words of the King will they know how it is going to fare with them.”

Q. Well, Paul said he knew in advance of the inquisition. Are there any others who also knew in advance of the inquisition?

A. Yes, sir; David said he knew. See Psa. xvii. 15: “As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied, when I AWAKE WITH THY LIKENESS.” I think I hear some mortal resurrectionist say: “David, you haven’t got that straight at all, we don’t awake in the Lord’s likeness, at all; we awake in sin’s flesh, and then go before the inquisition, for examination, and if we pass that, then we can have the Lord’s likeness flashed upon us.”

Q. Are there still others?

A. Oh, Yes; we have Job. See Job xiv. 14, 15: “O that thou wouldst hide me in the grave, that thou wouldst keep me secret, until thy wrath be past, that thou

wouldst appoint me a set time, and remember me! If a man die, shall he live again? all the days of my appointed time will I wait till MY CHANGE COME.”

I can imagine the correction, about as follows: “David didn’t get this resurrection and judgment matter straight, neither have you, you ought to know that we don’t wait in the grave until the change come. We wake from the grave in mortal flesh, and if we successfully pass the inquisition, then the change will come.”

Q. What other Bible character has got the resurrection and judgment matter crooked according to the mortal resurrectionist teaching?

A. Jesus is the next. See Luke xx. 35: “But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: neither CAN they DIE any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.”

Q. Now in this Scripture in what

particular points does Jesus differ from mortal resurrectionists?

A. In the first place, they differ materially as to the TIME when the accounting occurs. They teach a resurrection of a mixed multitude in mortal flesh, who will be cited before an inquisition, which tribunal will determine who shall be accounted worthy or otherwise.

Q. Now, please show where Jesus differs from the teachings of this sect?

A. Examine carefully this Scripture, and you will find that only one class are raised at that time, and it is composed of those who had previously been "accounted worthy." The Lord don't need a board of inquisition, to find out who is worthy.

Q. Why not?

A. Simply because "The Lord knoweth them that are his." "He discerneth the thoughts and intents of the heart," and "needeth not that any man should tell him what is in man."

Having knowledge as to who were his, he accounted them worthy not only to

obtain that world---age, but also “the resurrection from the dead.” Now, if they were accounted worthy to be raised, then the accounting worthy must take place prior to the resurrection, it could not be otherwise.

Q. What will be the nature of the resurrection they are accounted worthy to obtain?

A. “Neither CAN they DIE any more: for they are equal unto the angels.”

Q. What two things has Jesus taught in this Scripture?

A. 1. The accounting worthy takes place prior to the resurrection.

2. It cannot be a mortal resurrection, because Jesus says, “Neither can they die any more.”

Q. Then who is right, Jesus, or mortal resurrectionists?

A. Jesus, every time.

Q. Does Jesus, The Faithful Witness, bear further testimony that only one class is raised at the first resurrection?

A. Why certainly he does.

Q. Where?

A. In Rev. xx. 6: "Blessed and holy is he that hath PART in the FIRST resurrection: on such the SECOND DEATH hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

Q. If they are raised proof against death, they must have been previously accounted worthy. Is not that the case?

A. Certainly. A selection out from among the dead, could not have been made without it.

Q. What became of the remainder of the dead?

A. "The rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished."

Q. Then if a thousand years intervenes between the resurrection of those accounted worthy of eternal life, and "the rest of the dead," who were not, so judged, then the two classes could not be raised simultaneously, and taken before

an inquisitorial tribunal, to settle the matter of being "accounted worthy?"

A. That would be simply impossible.

Q. Have we any other Bible character, who is at variance with the sect of mortal resurrectionists?

A. We have something further from Paul, the champion reasoner, and student of the doctrine of the resurrection. He says, 1 Cor. xv. 42-44:

"It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption."

"It is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory."

"It is sown in weakness; it is raised in power."

"It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body."

Q. Do you find it stated anywhere in the Scriptures, that it is sown an animal body; and raised a mortal body.

A. Never. When speaking of those in Christ, who are "accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection

from the dead," they are always spoken as being raised in exactly the opposite condition from that in which they were sown.

Q. In this plain and unambiguous language of Paul, can anyone detect the least hint that a mortal resurrection and a citation before an inquisitorial tribunal has come in between being sown a natural body, and raised a spiritual body?

A. No, sir; such teaching is purely of human devising.

Q. But how do they get along with such unequivocal language?

A. They don't get along with it at all; they twist it out of all recognizable shape, in their efforts to make it fit in with their man-made theory of mortal resurrection and judgment.

Q. Paul teaches the change from the corruptible to the incorruptible, under the figure of the sowing and germination of seed. How do they handle that?

A. In their efforts to make it harmo-

nize with their theory, they completely destroy the figure.

Q. How?

A. The body is recognized as being the seed. Before it reaches a point where it becomes incorruptible, it must pass through two stages: the sowing and the raising. When a farmer sows seed how does he perform the act? He casts the seed INTO the ground. Mortal resurrectionists say the body the seed, is sown, when it is cast forth OUT of the ground. Did you ever hear in all your life, of seed being sown after that fashion? Farmers would never have a crop if in place of casting their seed "into" the ground, they cast it forth "out" of the ground. Such reasoning destroys the figure, which all intelligent people must admit.

Q. Well, when does their "raising" take place?

A. The "cast forth seed" is taken before an inquisitorial tribunal, and if it passes a favorable examination, it is then raised or exalted to the incorruptible life.

Q. Is that a resurrection of the dead?

A. No, sir; it is simply an exaltation of the living.

Q. Well, coming back to the figure of seed sowing, what becomes of the seed before it germinates?

A. "Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die."

Q. Well, if the sowing consists of the casting forth of a live body out of the ground, then it must "die," before it can be "quickened;" what would that be?

A. A second death.

Q. We read "Thou sowest NOT that body which SHALL BE;" how about mortal resurrectionists?

A. They have the very same corruptible mortal body sown, cast forth out of the ground, that went into it.

Q. When do mortal resurrectionists have the dead judged?

A. Why, not at any time. They have all the dead liable to judgment, made quick, before the judgment takes place.

Q. But don't the Bible teach a judgment of both the quick and the dead?

A. It most surely does. See Acts x. 42: "And he commanded us to preach to the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of the QUICK and the DEAD." The "Quick" and the "Dead," are the two opposite extremes, and they are judged while they are still in those conditions.

Q. When will they be thus judged?

A. See 2 Tim. iv. 1: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who SHALL JUDGE the QUICK and the DEAD at his appearing and his Kingdom." See also Rev. xi. 18: "And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the DEAD, that THEY should be JUDGED," etc.

Q. Why can't mortal resurrectionists believe the Bible, when it so plainly says the dead are judged?

A. Because they have a theory that all will be judged according to a verbal account, which each person must render.

They know that the dead cannot render verbal accounts.

Q. Will they be judged by a verbal or a written account?

A. "The DEAD were JUDGED out of those things which were WRITTEN in the books.

Q. Will every one who is liable to the Judgment, be judged by a written account?

A. "Whosoever was not found WRITTEN in the book of LIFE was cast into the lake of fire." "This is the second death."

The word "whosoever," is of wide application, and covers every one who is liable to the Judgment.

Q. Does not the Bible indicate a personal appearance at the judgment seat of Christ, and if so, what for?

A. See 2 Cor. v. 10: "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may RECEIVE the things in body, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad."

This is a judgment where rewards

are received, according work, whether good or bad. Accounts of increase of talents are received. The other judgment is of Life, where the Book of Life, is consulted.

See also 1 Cor. iii. 13-15: "Every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it: because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If a man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If a man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire." If he shall have done bad work, he receives "according to that he hath done, whether good or bad." "He himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire." That matter is settled out of the Book of Life.

Teacher. Our time has expired, so we must adjourn for to-night.

LESSON XXIV.

Teacher. While at Bonner Springs, I met a Seventh Day Adventist preacher, named Neal, with whom I had some conversation, on the Sabbath. He said that God made the seventh day a part of creation, that the Sabbath might stand forever.

I propose for to-night, that we study the question of

“THE SABBATH.”

Will Arloa please tell us on what day creation was completely finished?

Arloa. At the end of the SIXTH DAY. “And the evening and the morning were the sixth day, thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of of them.”

Q. What! “ALL finished,” and the

Seventh Day never even mentioned, and in point of fact, never had any existence, until after God declared the creation "finished?"

A. Such are the facts in the case.

Q. How could the Seventh Day be a part of creation, then?

A. It could not. The gentleman has made a mistake.

Q. Well, then, suppose the seventh day had been a part of creation, would that fact alone, have made it a Sacred Sabbath, any more than it would any other day of the week?

A. It could not have made any difference.

Teacher. Mr. Neal says: "There is no power in heaven or earth, that can change the least part of God's creation." How about that?

Bessie. The gentleman is correct. The Seventh Day Sabbath being omitted from the six day's work of creation, "There is no power in heaven or earth, that can change the least part of God's

creation" so that the Seventh Day Sabbath might be added to it.

Q. Was there any command given at creation, to keep holy the Sabbath Day?

A. There was not.

Q. How much time elapsed, between creation, and the first command to keep the sabbath?

A. Some 2500 years.

Q. To what nation was the first command given?

A. To Israel.

Q. Where is it first mentioned?

A. In Exodus xvi. 23-29.

Q. What reason is assigned as to why the sabbath was given to Israel?

A. That "I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law or not."

Teacher. Mr. Neal says, "God did not make every day a sabbath, but just ONE DAY only made he holy."

Lud. He must have made a mistake.

See Exod. xxi. 13: "Verily my SABBATHS shall ye keep."

Q. For what purpose were Israel to keep them?

A. "For a sign between me and you."

Q. When was the Sabbath first made known to Israel?

A. At Sinai. See Neh. ix. 12-14: "Thou camest down upon Mount Sinai, and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath."

Q. Is it not strange if it was made a part of creation, that it was never made known to them, before?

A. It certainly would be exceedingly strange.

Q. Israel at Sinai, made a covenant with God, that they would keep the sabbath, as the Lord God had commanded. Did he make the same covenant with their fathers before them?

A. "The Lord God made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day."

Q. What did Paul, denominate a ministration of death? .

A. Something that was written on tables of stone.

Q. Where?

A. See 2 Cor. iii. 7: "The ministration of death, written and engraven in stone."

Q. What was written on "tables of stone," in which death was the penalty for its violation?

A. Deut. xxxiv. 1-4: "Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh there shall be to you an holy day, a sabbath of rest to the Lord; whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death."

Here we have the ministration of death written and engraved on tables of stone.

Q. Was it intended that the ministration of death should continue?

A. See 2 Cor. iii. 7: "Which was to be done away."

Q. Could Israel be made to comprehend that it was abolished?

A. See verse 13: "Israel could not look to the end of that which was abolished."

Q. Why not?

A. See verse 14: "Their minds were blinded."

Q. What obscured their vision?

A. See verse 14. A veil, "in the reading of the Old Testament."

Q. Should they not discard the veil?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Why?

A. See verse 14; "Which veil is done away in Christ."

Q. Do not many Gentiles bind that same veil over their eyes?

A. They do.

Q. What is the effect?

A. Like Israel, they cannot "look to the end of that which is abolished."

Q. Is not Christ the END of the law to believers?

A. Yes. See Rom. x. 4: "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Yes, says a

Sabbatarian, the ceremonial law, but not the commandments.

Q. Are the commandments included?

A. See Eph. ii. 15: "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments."

Q. Well, how about the handwriting of ordinances?

A. See Col. ii. 14: "Blotting out of the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross."

Q. Seeing that the ministration of death is "done away," how does it affect Sabbath keeping?

A. See verse 16: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an HOLY DAY, or of the new moon, or of the SABBATH, which are a shadow of things to come."

Q. Does it appear a sensible thing, to see men chasing a shadow?

A. It surely does not. Yet we have to witness that spectacle.

Q. Was the law a burden to the observer?

A. It certainly was?

Q. Did Paul find some who still desired to hang on to that which was abolished?

A. He did.

Q. What did he say to them?

A. "How turn ye again unto the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto do ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe---Sabbath---days, and months, and times and years."

Q. What did Paul fear would be the effect of observing these "days," etc.?

A. See Gal. iv. 14: "I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain."

Q. What was Paul's advice about the yoke of bondage?

A. "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." Gal. v. 1.

Q. Do Sabbatarians teach that we

must observe the Sabbath law in order to be saved?

A. They do.

Q. What was Paul's opinion with regard to justification by the law?

A. Gal. v. 4: "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law."

Q. Why of no effect?

A. Verse 4: "Ye are fallen from grace."

Q. Where was the Sabbath law given?

A. At Mount Sinai.

Q. What does the Mount Sinai covenant do for us?

A. "The one from Mount Sinai gendereth to bondage."

Q. Paul speaks of two women, who were they?

A. One was a bondwoman, and the other a free woman.

Q. Tell me, who are the children of the bond woman?

A. "Ye that desire to be under the law."

Q. Next, who are the children of the free woman?

A. "The free woman was by promise."

Q. Can we be children of both mothers?

A. See verse 30: "The son of the bond woman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman." They cannot be co-heirs together.

Q. Is the observance of the Sabbath one of the works of the law?

A. Yes, sir; it is.

Q. Does salvation come through any of the works of the law?

A. See Gal. ii. 16: "By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified."

Q. Now where are the ten commandments found?

A. In the Book of the law.

Q. How many are saved by the deeds of the law?

A. See Rom. iii. 20: "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight."

Q. What does justify in his sight?

A. See Rom. i. 16: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." There is far more satisfaction in trusting that for salvation, than there is in trusting "the ministration of death." Some try to carry both, but it will not work. Remember, that "The son of the bondwoman SHALL NOT BE HEIR WITH THE SON OF THE FREEWOMAN."

Teacher. Let us rejoice that we are made free from "the yoke of bondage." For the sake of emphasis, I wish to repeat a text already given: "Christ is become of NO EFFECT unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are FALLEN from grace."

The time has now arrived for us to adjourn. May the good Lord be with us until we shall meet again.

LESSON XXV.

Teacher. By common consent, the topic chosen for to-night's study, is:
THE STRONGEST INCENTIVE TO WATCHFULNESS.

I regard personal interest as the very strongest incentive to watchful action, that I know of. Let a person's personal interest in something he values highly, be jeopardized, and he will be very watchful of his interest.

I cannot conceive of any interest so vital, as that which is involved in the second coming of the Christ. Every other interest known to man, pales into insignificance, when placed in comparison.

Q. Tell us what instruction the Lord left us?

Carrie. See Matt. xxiv. 42: "Watch therefore, for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." There are so many points to watch, that we have got considerable business on hand, if we take care of them.

Q. Not having accurate information as to the time of the Lord's coming, what does it necessitate?

A. Careful watchfulness along many lines, that our personal interest may be preserved.

Q. Is not this conspicuously illustrated in the parable of the ten virgins?

A. It is.

Q. Who do they represent?

A. The whole company of those who are looking for the coming of Jesus?

How many were prepared to meet him?

A. Only one half.

Q. Tell us what was the trouble with the other half?

A. They lacked light.

Q. Now, why did they need light?

A. Because of midnight darkness.

Q. Tell us, what kind of light was necessary?

A. See 2 Cor. iv. 4: "The light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them."

Q. Do not many who look for the second coming of Christ, walk in darkness?

A. Yes, in midnight darkness.

Q. Didn't they have lamps---empty professions?

A. Yes, but they did not have any gospel oil, consequently they did not have gospel light. Nothing but gospel light will guide any one through midnight darkness unto the coming Bridegroom.

Q. Can you give a sample of those who have gone forth to meet the Bridegroom, who are destitute of gospel light?

A. Yes, sir; I would call attention to the denomination known as Second Adventists.

Q. Tell us what light they need?

A. They need light concerning the

essential features which constitute the Gospel of the Kingdom, as preached by Jesus and his disciples, as the message of life.

Q. Please state what teaching will alienate from the life of God?

A. Let me direct special attention to a passage of Scripture which enumerates doctrines, which if not believed, will alienate such a disbeliever, from Christ, and as far as the future is concerned, such an one is in the sad and lamentable condition of being without hope. See Eph. ii. 11, 12: "Wherefore remember that ye being in times past Gentiles in the flesh, that at that time ye were without Christ, ---on account of---being ALIENS from the Commonwealth of Israel, and STRANGERS from the Covenants of Promise, and having No HOPE, and WITHOUT GOD in the world."

Q. Do not all who believe in the second coming of Jesus, have the light concerning the restoration of the Commonwealth to Israel?

A. The sect of Second Adventists teach that Israel will never again exist as an independent Commonwealth. They say that Israel as a nation, will never return to the land covenanted to their fathers, but must ever remain an hopeless ruin.

Q. How about the Covenants of promise?

A. As far as they relate to the land covenanted to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and their Seed, the Christ, is concerned, their teaching would render such covenants null and void, by affirming its destruction by fire, prior to its being possessed, by those to whom it was covenanted.

Q. What personal interest can any people have in a commonwealth, they would consign to a hopeless ruin?

A. They can have none. They are in need of gospel oil, that they may have gospel light sufficient to dispel the midnight darkness which they are in. Without it they will be unable to see clear enough to find the "narrow way," which

leads to the coming Bridegroom. Self interest should lead any one to secure the genuine article.

Q. Are the Scriptures clear in their statements about the future restoration of the Commonwealth of Israel?

A. They are very clear. The Scriptures are very explicit.

Listen: "Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen---nations---whither they be gone, and I will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land; and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and ONE KING shall be King to them all; and they shall be no more two nations; neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all." Ezek. xxxvii. 21, 22.

Q. Did not God suspend this commonwealth?

A. Yes, sir; but not forever. See Ezek. xxi. 25-27: "It shall be no more

UNTIL he come, whose right it is; and I will give it to him.”

Q. Tell us, can the cross of Christ be preached, independent of the Commonwealth of Israel?

A. It cannot. See Matt. xxvii. 37: “This is Jesus, the KING OF THE JEWS.” Jesus could never reign as “King of the Jews,” should the Jews forever remain a dispersed people, and disorganized as a commonwealth.

Now the Adventists boldly affirm that God will not “Bring them into their own land;” and will not “Make them one nation in the land.” They strongly affirm that Jesus will never reign over restored Israel, as “King of the Jews.” They hesitate not in declaring that the exiled sons of Jacob will never in a national capacity, occupy their fatherland.

Q. Is not such teaching contradictory to the angelic message to Mary?

A. Certainly. See Luke i. 31, 32: “The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall

reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.”

Q. In watching, should we not also watch the national movements of Israel?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What for?

A. Because Israel is the great sign nation of the world.

Q. Do you regard watchfulness along this line, to be necessary?

A. I do. Unless we do so, we may find ourselves walking in darkness.

Q. Strict watchfulness along practical lines, is also needful, is it not?

A. Yes. “Not every one who 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.” The phrase, “doeth the will,” covers both to believe what he teaches, and do what he says.

Q. Will the virgins who lacked oil, seek admission into the kingdom?

A. They will. We read: "Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, Lord open to us. But he answered and said, I know ye not."

See also Matt. vii. 21-23: "Many will say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophecied,---taught---in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you." They were professed Christian people, some of them preachers, but "I never knew you," says Jesus.

Q. Should not the above be a lesson of warning to us?

A. It should, indeed. Let the lesson be a solemn warning to all, and see to it that the requisite oil is provided, before the cry rings out upon the air, "Behold, the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him." Now is the time, but when the door is locked, it will be too late.

Q. Do the signs indicate that a great change is at hand?

A. They do. A tremendous crisis

is impending, people in general perceive it, politicians, statesmen, financiers, and men of the world, who know not the prophetic Word, say that things are heading up for some mighty change, but as to what that change will consist of, they have but very little conception.

Teacher. In conclusion, I would say: Beloved, we are not in darkness, we know what is coming. We know that the dark ominous storm cloud now visible in the social and political heavens, will shortly burst, and shake terribly the aforesaid heavens and earth. See Heb. xii. 26-28: "Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven. And this word, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things that cannot be shaken may remain. Wherefore we receiving a KINGDOM which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear."

After the storm will come "The King

of the Jews," the revival of the Commonwealth of Israel, the New Life, and the Blessing of the Nations in Abraham and his Seed.

The great concern of all virgins should be, how about my "oil?" Have I a sufficient supply for my lamp? We have all received a sufficient warning that it will be everlastingly too late to lay in a supply after the word comes, "Go ye out to meet him." The supply must be laid in now or never. A plea of religious profession alone will be of no avail. Remember his words, to the foolish virgins, "I know you not." I entreat you as one who seeks only your own best interest, to consider well, and meditate seriously over the statements made in Eph. ii. 11, 12, they mean so much. It is the pivot on which our eternal destiny will turn.

Have you a citizen's interest in the Commonwealth of Israel? If you have, then jealously watch and preserve your rights. The benefits that citizens will possess, over aliens, is simply immense,

and so we cannot afford to trifle with that interest. It is said of the Ephesian Gentiles: "Now therefore ye are no more strangers---from the covenants of promise---and foreigners,---aliens---but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." None but citizens belong to the "household."

We will now adjourn.

LESSON XXVI.

Albert. I was reading in the New Testament, about a time that is coming, when people would prefer fables to the truth. I will therefore ask the class to consider to-night, the topic, entitled:

“CUNNINGLY DEvised FABLES.”

Teacher. Where is it taught that men would be turned unto fables?

A. In 2 Tim. iv. 3, 4: “For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts shall heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto FABLES.”

Q. To what period of time does this text refer to?

A. The context reads: “This know

also, that in the last days perilous times shall come.”

Q. Have those times come?

A. They have.

Q. What do you find to be in peril?

A. The faith of many is severely tried by teachers of all kinds of fables.

Q. Well, from among them all, which would you select as being peculiarly dangerous?

A. I would select the fables taught by Russellites.

Q. I thought they taught a great deal of truth, says one; is that not the case?

A. They do; and that is what makes it so dangerous. People are attracted by it, and are thus unsuspectingly led into its meshes.

Q. What overthrew the faith of some in apostolic days?

A. See 2 Tim. ii. 18. Speaking of Hymenæus and Philetus, he says: “Who concerning the truth have erred, saying

the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some.”

Q. Well, if to deny a future resurrection of the dead, is subversive of the faith; surely what would it be to deny the resurrection of the blessed Lord Jesus, who suffered on the cross as the Savior of sinners?

A. There could be no question about that being subversive of the faith.

Q. Why so?

A. Because Paul says in 1 Cor. xv. 14-18: “And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching VAIN, and your FAITH is also VAIN. . . . Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are PERISHED.”

Bessie. I would like to see some genuine evidence that Mr. Russell really does deny the resurrection of the Crucified One?

A. You can find all you want, by reading Chapter V. of “Millennial Dawn,” Vol. II.

Q. Can't you give us a quotation right now?

A. I can. I will quote as follows:
“Many Christians have the idea that our Lord’s glorious spiritual body is the VERY SAME BODY that was CRUCIFIED and LAID in Joseph’s tomb; they expect when they see the Lord in glory, to identify him by the SCARS he received on Calvary.”

“We KNOW nothing about what BECAME of it, except that it did not decay or corrupt. Whether it was DISSOLVED into GASES, or whether it is still preserved somewhere as a grand memorial of God’s love, of Christ’s obedience, and our redemption, no one knows, nor is such knowledge necessary.”

Ella. I would like to have the Class put this quotation from Mr. Russell, in contrast with Matt. xxviii. 5-7: “And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek JESUS, who was CRUCIFIED. He is not HERE; but is RISEN, as he said. Come see the place where he lay. And go quickly, and tell his disciples that he was RISEN from the DEAD.”

Q. Who did the angel say “was risen from the dead?”

A. Why the very same “Jesus who was CRUCIFIED.” I wonder if Mr. Russell has conceit enough to presume that he knew more about this matter than the angel, when he said: “Many Christians have the idea that our Lord’s glorious, spiritual body is the very SAME body that was CRUCIFIED and LAID in Joseph’s tomb.” It seems to me that all true Christians are bound to believe the angel when he said, “Ye seek Jesus who was CRUCIFIED. He is not here; for he is risen.” They were also invited to “come see the place where he lay” in Joseph’s tomb. There was no body there. The angel accounted for its absence, by saying, “He is not here; for he is risen, as he said.”

Arloa. I would like to know how Mr. Russell accounts for the vacant tomb?

Teacher. I will answer that by giving another quotation from “Millennial Dawn.” It is as follows: “Our Lord’s

human body was SUPERNATURALLY REMOVED from the TOMB; because had it remained there it would have been an insurmountable obstacle to the faith of the disciples, who were not yet instructed in spiritual things." "We know not what became of it," etc.

Lucy. Why don't he know "what became of it?" Does he not accept the testimony of the angel, when he said, "Ye seek Jesus which was crucified. He is not here; for he is risen?" It seems to me, that his idle speculation, that it may have been "dissolved into gases," is worse than the story told by the soldiers, who guarded his tomb.

Q. How many ways are suggested to account for the empty tomb?

A. Three.

Q. Please name them?

A. 1st. THE SOLDIERS.---"His disciples came by night, and stole him."

2nd. MR. RUSSELL.---"Supernaturally removed." May be "dissolved into gases;" or may be "preserved somewhere

as a grand memorial," a relic of imagination and guess work.

3d. THE ANGEL.---"He is risen from the dead."

Lud. Why does Mr. Russell claim that it was necessary that the body must be gotten rid of, either by being "dissolved into gases," or some other way?

A. I will answer that by giving one more quotation from "Millennial Dawn." It reads as follows: "After they had become partakers of the Holy Spirit and understood spiritual things, they could have believed the angels at the sepulchre, that he had risen from the dead condition, even if they had seen the fleshly BODY of the man Christ Jesus STILL LYING in the TOMB; but not so before. The BODY MUST be AWAY to make faith in the resurrection possible to them."

Q. What does this language indicate?

A. If it indicates anything, it indicates that a deceptive trick must be played on the disciples, the body must be gotten away from the tomb, either by be-

ing "dissolved into gases," or in some other way, and when they fail to find the crucified body of the Lord in the tomb, then they will believe it has been raised from the dead. We want them to believe and preach that he has been raised from the dead, while in point of fact, it has only been "supernaturally removed from the tomb." "The body must be removed, to make faith in his resurrection possible to them." In point of fact, the absence of the body from the grave under such conditions, would be no proof of his resurrection at all. To preach a resurrection based on deceptive tricks, would most certainly be preaching a cunningly devised fable.

Ella. I noticed Mr. Russell said that after the disciples had become partakers of the Holy Spirit, they could have believed that the Lord had risen from the dead, even if they could actually see the body of the Lord "still lying in the tomb." What do you think of that?

Teacher. It seems to me that if Mr.

Russell's conception of the Holy Spirit is such that it could lead the disciples to believe a lie, and also to contradict their own God-given senses, it must be on a par with the rest of his fables.

Q. What good evidence have we, that the crucified Lord himself, has actually and literally been raised from the dead, and not "dissolved into gases?"

A. We have his own testimony.

Q. Please give it?

A. See Rev. i. 18: "I am he that liveth, and WAS dead; and, behold, I am alive for ever more."

Q. How strangely this sounds, when compared with the fables of Russellism, which has him "supernaturally removed," "dissolved into gases," or any other way to nullify the actual and literal resurrection of the blessed Redeemer who suffered on the cross. Notice very particularly his language: "I AM HE" the real identical one---"the very same body that was crucified and lay in Joseph's tomb," as "many Christians have the idea."

“Identify him by the scars he received on Calvary.” Test him, “Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing.” Believe that “I am He that Liveth, and WAS DEAD; and, behold, I am ALIVE forever more.” Why is it that Mr. Russell has so little use for the resurrection of the Crucified One?

A. I presume that it does not harmonize with some of his notions.

I will quote again from pp. 130, 132, Vol. II., “Millennial Dawn.” It reads as follows: “If his BODY after his resurrection were flesh and bones, and the SAME body that was crucified, with all the features and SCARS, why did he perform miracles, etc.?”

“If the SCARS and marred human features are a part and parcel of our exalted Lord, he would be far from beautiful.”

Carrie. Is it really possible that Mr. Russell has no regard for the clear tes-

timony of our dear risen Lord, when he said, "I am He that WAS dead?" The tone of the last quotations from Millennial Dawn, seems to doubt that "his body after his resurrection were flesh and bones, and the SAME body that was crucified, with all the features, and SCARS?"

Lud. Well, if he does doubt, he will still have to set aside some more straight testimony of the risen Lord.

Arloa. What testimony do you have have reference to?

Lud. I refer to his testimony as given in Luke xxiv. 38-40: "And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he shewed him his hands and his feet."

Mr. Russell is sceptical about our Lord having "flesh and bones," in his resurrection body, but the Lord said that he had, all the same. "Handle me and

see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." He invited them to exercise their sense of sight and touch, and be convinced. Furthermore, he twice invited them to examine "his hands and his feet," where they could actually see the nail prints, and by this be convinced, that his resurrection body, was in point of fact, the very same body which hung upon the cross.

Q. Have we further evidence concerning the nail prints?

A. Yes, we have?

Q. Where?

A. In John xx. 19, 20: "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled, for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. And when he had so said, he showed unto them his hands and his side."

Q. Was it not his design in showing

31.

them "his hands and his side," to convey to their minds the impression that he was truly the very Christ which their own eyes had so recently seen hanging on the cross, and that they may "Identify him by the SCARS he received on Calvary," just as Mr. Russell, says, "Many Christians" "expect when they see the Lord in glory?"

A. There can be no doubt but what that was his purpose.

Q. Were the disciples all present when Jesus appeared?

A. No, sir; "Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came."

Q. Did they tell Thomas about having seen the Lord?

A. They did. They "said unto him, we have SEEN the LORD."

Q. Were the disciples sure that they had really seen the Lord, and had not been deceived by some imposition?

A. "He shewed unto them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples

GLAD when they SAW the LORD.” They did not seem to have the least idea that those SCARS were COUNTERFEITS.

Q. Well, what did Thomas say about the report that they had seen the Lord?

A. “He said unto them, Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe.”

Q. Well, supposing that Thomas could do all that, what good would that do him, providing those nail prints, and the spear wound were all BOGUS, put there for the purpose of DECEPTION?”

A. None, whatever.

Q. Well, did Thomas ever have an opportunity to make a personal examination of those scars?

A. He did. “After eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and he stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you.

Then saith he to Thomas, Reach

hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless but believing.”

Q. What was the effect of his examination?

A. Thomas exclaims, “My Lord and my God.”

Q. What did Jesus say?

A. “Thomas, because thou hast SEEN ME, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.”

Q. Well, now, suppose that no nail had ever pierced the hands where those nail prints appeared, into which Thomas pressed his finger, and no spear had ever entered the side, where Thomas put his hand, what then?

A. Why, such an insinuation would practically charge the Lord with being a fraud, a deceiver, and a counterfeiter.

George. Now, suppose we ask Mr. Russell a few questions, and we will try and ascertain if we can, whether or not

the wounds examined by Thomas, were the genuine wounds which our Lord received while on the cross.

Now, Mr. Russell, tell us, do Christians in general, believe, that the body which hung on the cross, and was laid in Joseph's tomb became our Lord's glorious resurrection body?

Mr. Russell. "Many Christians have the idea that our Lord's glorious, spiritual body is the very same body that was crucified and laid in Joseph's tomb?"

George. Well, if the crucified body was not raised, what became of it? You know the angel said to the women who visited tomb, "Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here; for he is risen." Now, do you agree with the angel who said the crucified Jesus was risen? If not, tell us what became of the crucified body?

Mr. Russell. "We know nothing about what became of it, except that it did not decay or corrupt."

George. As you don't seem to agree

with the angel that the crucified Lord was raised from the dead, can't you suggest some idea as to what became of it?

Mr. Russell. "Whether it is dissolved into gases, or whether it is still preserved as a grand memorial of God's love, of Christ's obedience, and of our redemption, no one knows, nor is such knowledge necessary."

George. This not knowing what became of the crucified body, is somewhat unsatisfactory. Can't you give something more definite? If you dispute the idea that "the very SAME BODY that was crucified and laid in Joseph's tomb," was "risen from the dead," as the angel declared it was, you should have some strong evidence to show that the angel bore false testimony?

Mr. Russell. "Our Lord's human body was, however, supernaturally removed from the tomb."

George. Why was it so removed?

Mr. Russell. "Because had it remained there it would have been an insur-

mountable obstacle to the faith of his disciples, who were not yet instructed in spiritual things.”

George. Faith in what?

Mr. Russell. “The body must be AWAY to make faith in his resurrection possible to them.”

George. Now, if the crucified body, showing the nail prints, was never raised but “supernaturally removed.” How do you account for our Lord exhibiting the wounds to his disciples, and also inviting Thomas to inspect them, and satisfy himself that they were genuine wounds, and no counterfeits?

Mr. Russell. “For the purpose of instructing them,---he---appeared as a man in various bodies of flesh and bones which he CREATED and DISSOLVED AS OCCASION REQUIRED.”

George. Then when Jesus appeared in the midst of his disciples and showed them his hands and his side, and convinced them that he was indeed, the real crucified Lord raised from the dead, and

also invited Thomas to personally examine his wounds, and satisfy himself that such was in fact the case. Now, according to the fables of Russellism, such was not the case. The disciples never saw that body before; it never hung on the cross. The wounds examined by Thomas were forgeries, placed in one of those bodies, "which he created and dissolved as occasion required." The "occasion" at this time, was one of deception. As to the real body, Mr. Russell says: "We know nothing about what became of it."

: Teacher. Answers attributed to Mr. Russell, are quotations from "Millennial Dawn." The Class is dismissed.

For a further expose of Russellite fables, read from page 239, to end of lesson.

EVANGELISTIC SERVICES.

Should any of our readers desire to have the Leader of Pine Woods Bible Class; proclaim the Gospel of the Kingdom, and its kindred truths in your neighborhood, arrangements can be made, by corresponding with

W. H. WILSON,
420 N. Willow Ave., Austin Sta., Chicago.

