

THE PAROUSIA MESSENGER



A HELPING HAND
FOR
BIBLE STUDENTS

EPIPHANY STUDIES IN THE SCRIPTURES

"The Path of the just is as the Shining Light,
That Shineth More and More
Unto the Perfect Day."

SERIES IX

THE PAROUSIA MESSENGER

14,000 EDITION

"Who, Then, Is A Faithful And Wise Servant, Whom His Lord Hath Made Ruler Over His Household, To Give Them Meat In Due Season? Blessed Is That Servant, Whom His Lord, After Coming, Shall Find So Doing. Verily I Say Unto You, That He Will Make Him Ruler Over All His Goods" (Matt. 24: 45-47).

PAUL S. L. JOHNSON
PHILADELPHIA, PA., U. S. A.
1938

To the King of Kings and Lord of Lords

IN THE INTEREST OF
HIS CONSECRATED SAINTS,
WAITING FOR THE ADOPTION,
—AND OF—
"ALL THAT IN EVERY PLACE CALL UPON THE LORD,"
"THE HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH,"
—AND OF—
THE GROANING CREATION, TRAVAILING AND WAITING FOR
THE MANIFESTATION OF THE SONS OF GOD,

THIS WORK IS DEDICATED.

"To make all see what is the fellowship of the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God," "Wherein He hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence, having made known unto us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure which He hath purposed in Himself; that in the dispensation of the fullness of the times He might gather together in one all things, under Christ."
Eph. 3: 4, 5, 9; 1: 8-10.

COPYRIGHT 1938

BY PAUL S. L. JOHNSON

AUTHOR'S FOREWORD.

THIS book treats largely of the Parousia Messenger *as set forth in prophecy and type*, a fact that some dispute, alleging that, apart from Jesus, no individual is pointed out in the Bible's prophecies and types. If such a proposition were true, it would, of course, nullify the applications of type and prophecy to our Pastor herein made. But this proposition is a contradiction of numerous Scriptures. That the Bible in type and prophecy often points out individuals the following proves: Jesus and Judas were so pointed out, also Cyrus, and that by name, 200 years beforehand (Is. 44: 28; 45: 1-5). The twelve Apostles and the seventy "secondarily prophets" of both Harvests and of the Interim were typed respectively by the twelve wells and the seventy palm trees at Elim (Ex. 15: 27). These three sets of seventy were also typed by the seventy elders (Num. 11: 24-30). The twelve Apostles were, among others, typed by Jacob's twelve sons; and they, and St. Paul in particular, were typed by Eleazar (Num. 3: 32; 4: 16; 16: 35-39; 19: 4); and the Parallel shows that he typed our Pastor also. Dan. 11 refers prophetically to the following individuals: Cambyses, Smerdis, Darius Hystaspes and Xerxes (v. 2), Alexander the Great (v. 4), his four successors: Cassander, Seleucus, Ptolemy and Lysimachus (v. 8), Ptolemy Philadelphos (v. 5), Antiochus Theos, Bernice and Ptolemy Philadelphos (v. 6), Ptolemy Euergetes and Seleucus Callinucus (v. 7), the latter's sons and Antiochus Magnus (v. 10), the latter and Ptolemy Philopater (v. 11), Antiochus Epiphanes (v. 12), Scopas (v. 15), Mark Anthony and Cleopatra (vs. 17-19), Augustus (v. 20), Tiberius (vs. 2124), Aurelian and Zenobia (vs. 25, 26, 28) and Napoleon (vs. 29, 30, 36-45). John the Baptist is referred to in Is. 45: 3-5 and Mal. 3: 1. There are four individuals indicated in Zech. 11: 8, 15-17; Bro. Russell is referred to in Matt. 20: 8; 24: 45-47 and Luke 12: 42-46, and J. F. R. in Matt. 24: 48-51. Another brother is pointed out in Rev. 19: 9, 10. Accordingly, we see that the Bible frequently points out by its prophecies and types, not only classes, but individuals of future times.

Apart from our Lord Jesus, no servant of God in the large application of types and prophecies is referred to

so much as our Pastor. The proof of this is in part given in this book and in part will be given in a subsequent volume of this work, according to the proverb: The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Whole books and large parts of others in type treat of him. Thus the second halves of 1 Sam. and 1 Chro. and the whole of 2 Sam. treat of him as the antitype of David. Jeremiah and Daniel type him in their books, as do also the Apostles in the Acts of the Apostles. Additionally, he is typed in Gen., Ex., Lev., Num., Josh., Judg., Ruth and Lam., and prophecy refers to him in Deut., Is., Ezek., Hab., Mic., Matt., Luke and Rev. So prominent was he in the advancing of God's Plan. To God and in themselves the most important events and personages in history are those connected with the outworking of His Plan. Accordingly, if God pointed out certain worldlings in the prophecies and types because of their lesser relations to His Plan, as shown above, we may infer that He would by prophecy and type more markedly point out individuals who could have greater relations to it, especially if they were very usefully connected with furthering it. This reasonable inference God confirms by express statement in Amos 3: 7: "For the Lord Jehovah will not do a thing except He revealed [it as] a secret of His to His servants, the prophets" (I.V.), *i.e.*, in the development of God's Plan nothing, even the least thing, would be done except what is indicated in the types and prophecies of the Bible. If the lesser things in the outworking of God's Plan are set forth in type and prophecy, certainly the greater are; and, except the work of our Lord Jesus, the greatest work ever done on earth in advancing God's cause was that of the Parousia Messenger, hence its detailed description in type and prophecy.

This book will show a part of the Parousia Messenger's work as set forth in prophecy and type. The rest, *D.v.*, will come in a later volume. We trust that its study will prove strengthening to all the Lord's people. And with this wish as a prayer it is sent forth on its mission.

PAUL S. L. JOHNSON.

Philadelphia, Pa., September 9, 1938.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I.

THE GOSPEL-AGE NO-RANSOMISM SIFTING.
Num 11: 1-35.

FIVE SIFTINGS IN VARIOUS PERIODS. ANTECEDENTS OF THE
GOSPEL-AGE NO-RANSOMISM SIFTING. CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN
GOD AND CHRIST. THE SEVENTY. THE SIFTING PROPER
7

CHAPTER II.

MOSES, AARON AND MIRIAM—TYPE
AND ANTITYPE.
Num 12: 1-16.

PRIDE. CLAIMING EQUALITY WITH CHRIST AS MOUTHPIECE.
DIVINE DISPLEASURE THEREAT. ANTITYPICAL DREAMS AND
VISIONS. FIRST PRIVILEGE PECULIAR TO THE STAR-MEMBERS.
SECOND. THIRD. ANTITYPICAL MIRIAM'S LEPROSY. ANTITYPICAL
AARON'S REACTIONS THEREAT. CHRIST'S AND GOD'S PERTINENT
COURSE. ANTITYPICAL MIRIAM'S WILDERNESS EXPERIENCES. . 87

CHAPTER III.

THE TWELVE SPIES—TYPE AND ANTITYPE.
Num 13: 14; Deut. 1: 19-46

THE SPIES. COMMISSIONED. SPYING THE LAND. THE REPORT. THE
RECOMMENDATIONS. THE EFFECTS. SENTENCE TO FORTY YEARS'
WANDERING. EFFORT TO ENTER THE LAND. 179

CHAPTER IV.

THE GOSPEL-AGE HARVEST IN TYPE
AND ANTITYPE.
Num 31: 1-54.

A SPIRITUAL CAMPAIGN. ITS ANTECEDENTS. ITS BATTLE. ITS
VICTORY. THE DISPOSAL OF UNWORTHY AND WORTHY CAPTIVES.
OF ANIMAL PREY. OF OTHER SPOIL. 251

CHAPTER V.
IN MEMORIAM.

ACTIVITIES OF PASTOR RUSSELL. THAT SERVANT. HIS MEMORY
STILL FRAGRANT. WILL HIS WORK ENDURE? GOD BLESS HIS
MEMORY THE EPIPHANY PROVES HIM THAT SERVANT. HIS WILL. . .
..... 319

CHAPTER VI.
SOME SHORTER TYPES OF THE PAROUSIA
MESSENGER.

JASHOBEM. ELEAZAR'S CHARGE AND BEATEN PLATES.
PHINEHAS. PHURAH. 361

CHAPTER VII.
DANIEL—TYPE AND ANTITYPE.
Dan. 1-12.

HISTORICAL PARTS OF DANIEL. PROPHETICAL PARTS OF DANIEL.
..... 431

CHAPTER VIII.
ANTITYPICAL DAVID'S FIRST APPEARANCE.
I Sam. 16.

SAUL'S REJECTION. SAMUEL'S SEEKING AND FINDING A
SUCCESSOR. DAVID'S AND SAUL'S FIRST CONTACTS. 507

CHAPTER IX.
ANTITYPICAL DAVID AND GOLIATH.
1 Sam. 17.

GOLIATH'S ARMOR HIS CHALLENGE. DAVID'S FITNESS.
ACCEPTANCE OF THE CHALLENGE. PRE-COMBAT REMARKS.
DAVID'S VICTORY. DAVID BEFORE SAUL. 541

CHAPTER X.
DAVID'S FIRST OPPOSITIONS FROM SAUL—TYPE
AND ANTITYPE.
1 Sam. 18-20.

THE CAUSE. THE FIRST FORMS. JONATHAN INTERCEDES FOR
DAVID. FURTHER INJURIES. DAVID ESCAPES. FOUR FURTHER
ATTEMPTED INJURIES. DAVID AND JONATHAN'S PERTINENT
INTERVIEW. THEIR PARTING. 575

CHAPTER I.
THE GOSPEL-AGE NO-RANSOMISM SIFTING
Num. 11: 1-35.

FIVE SIFTINGS IN VARIOUS PERIODS. ANTECEDENTS OF THE GOSPEL-AGE NO-RANSOMISM SIFTING. CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN GOD AND CHRIST. THE SEVENTY. THE SIFTING PROPER

UNDER the title, Calls-Siftings-Slaughter Weapons, in Vol. V, Chap. II, among other things, we treated on the siftings of the Gospel Harvest, basing our thought on 1 Cor. 10: 5-14. According to St. Paul's statement (vs. 6, 11), the siftings of the Jewish Harvest also are referred to in this passage. Of these we treated briefly in Studies, Vol. III, 404-410. We also stated in Vol. V, Chap. II that the five siftings 1 Cor. 10: 5-14 applied to five large siftings during the Gospel Age. Experience proves that the five siftings occurred during the Epiphany's small Miniature Gospel Age on a very small scale and that they have ready occurred on a somewhat larger scale in Epiphany's larger Miniature Gospel Age. These also appear in the Harvests of these Miniatures. We pointed out in P '33, 72-77 that in the Little Season there would be another application of these five siftings. And there seems to be good ground for believing that during the Millennium there will be still another application of them. If so, there will be at least eleven fulfillments of the five siftings referred to in 1 Cor. 10: 5-14. It is the Gospel-Age Harvest application the five types mentioned by St. Paul in 1 Cor. 10: 5-10 that we treated in Vol. V, Chap. II. St. Paul in this Scripture does not give us their Gospel-Age application for he there distinctly limits his application of the five pertinent types to the two Harvests. But in Heb. 3: 7—4: 3 St. Paul makes his Gospel-Age application Israel's wilderness typical siftings. It is true that there does not analyze these into their five component parts as in 1 Cor. 10: 5-7; rather he there sums them up as a whole without distributing them.

(2) In this section the Apostle speaks of the day of provocation in the wilderness, when the Israelites provoked God for 40 years by their unbelief and disobedience (vs. 16-19), for which God excluded them from the Canaan rest (vs. 10, 11, 17-19; 4: 2). He further shows that this period was a type of the today, the Gospel Age—"today if ye hear my voice [have done it with the faith and obedience of the high calling] harden not your hearts *AS* [antitypical of] *in the day of* provocation in the wilderness." Not only does the passage show that the Today, the Gospel Age, is antitypical of Israel's 40 years wilderness stay; but that the *ye* and the *we* of this section, Nominal and Real Spiritual Israel (vs. 7, 12-15; 4: 1-3) are antitypical of Nominal and Real Fleshly Israel in their wilderness experience (vs. 8-11, 16-19; 4: 2). Thus we see that without detailing these experiences into five separate siftings, as in 1 Cor. 10: 5-11, he bunches them in both type and antitype. And since in this section the Apostle by the term "Today" covers the entire Gospel Age including both of its Harvests; and since he in 1 Cor. 10: 5-14 points out five siftings as taking place during each reaping period, we are warranted in concluding that there are five siftings during the period between the Harvests, since in an emphatic sense that is the Gospel Age, as distinct from its Harvests.

(3) This conclusion is supported especially by three fulfilled facts: (1) In the smallest Miniature Gospel Age the period between its Harvests, as well as these Harvests, had five siftings on a very small scale. (2) In the smaller Miniature Gospel Age the five siftings have occurred. (3) The period of over 1800 years between the two Harvests had five epochs: Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis and Philadelphia, in each of which there was on a large scale a sifting covering several centuries. These correspond in character and kind to the five siftings of the Harvests: No-Ransomism, Infidelism, Combinationism, Reformism and

Murmursome Contradictionism. These considerations prepare us to understand our subject. The Gospel-Age No-Ransomism Sifting, which, like the first of the Harvest's siftings, appropriately was the one that occurred in the first Church epoch between the Harvests, in the Smyrna period. This sifting, like its counterparts in the Harvests and in the Epiphany, is typed in Num. 11: 1-35, which, in this article, we will expound, type and antitype, with constant reference to its Gospel-Harvest counterpart, whose larger familiarity with our readers will make our interpretation of the Gospel-Age No-Ransomism easier for them to understand.

(4) This chapter does not only type the No-Ransomism siftings proper, but their antecedent events-those more or less causally connected with this sifting. This is true in all its applications. Indeed, minor siftings that immediately preceded and led up to the No-Ransomism Siftings is typed in vs. 1-3. As said above, we will in our expositions give the Gospel-Harvest application of this type to clarify its Gospel-Age applications, which is our special subject. "The people as murmurers were evil in the ears of Yaveh, etc., "(Imp. Ver.). These three verses type for the Gospel Harvest a sifting that set in at Passover, 1875, paralleled by Jesus' first cleansing of the temple (John 2: 13-25). Certain disgruntled Second Adventists were at that time sifted out from among the cleansed sanctuary class. These murmured because of their disappointment at Christ's not coming in the flesh in 1874. We recall that on account of Bro. Miller's beginning the 1290 and 1335 days 30 years before beginning the 1260 days, and that on account of his uncertainty as to whether to begin the 1260 days with the Ostrogoth's raising the siege of Rome, 538, or with the overthrow of their empire, 539, he first set 1843 for Christ's Second Advent in the flesh, which failing, he then set 1844 for that event. When after 1846 some of the sanctuary class got the right thought on the beginning of the

three sets of days, *i.e.*, that they all began at the same time, but retained Bro. Miller's uncertainty as to whether they began in 538 or 539, they were not sure whether Oct., 1873, or 1874, was the date for our Lord's return.

(5) Accordingly, they first fixed it at Oct., 1873, which failing, they set it for Oct., 1874, expecting Him to come in the flesh. This failing, some Adventists, remembering the four Adventist disappointments, became disgruntled—they "were murmurers." They became quite disgusted; and as a result an agitation was made against time prophecy. The Lord was displeased with them (His anger was kindled, v. 1) and gave such up to this agitation (the fire of the Lord burnt among them, v. 1), which resulted in many, some new creatures, others justified, and still others unjustified campers (in the uttermost parts of the camp) as being more or less rejected by the Nominal people, giving up the Truth that they had on Chronology. Thus as the parallels of those whom Jesus at the first cleansing drove out of the temple and of those who disapproved of His pertinent course (John 2: 13-25), these were driven out of the sanctuary, court and camp, losing their previous standings as typed by these three places. These siftings caused distress among the more faithful who besought the Lord Jesus to stop this symbolic burning (v. 2). These are those who earnestly sought to find out the cause of the disappointment in the spirit of believers and not murmurers. Among these were Bros. Keith, Barbour, Paton, Mann, etc., to whom Bro. Russell later joined himself. Moses' praying (v. 2) to the Lord against the fire types our Lord Jesus' asking the Father to stop the sifting from injuring the non-murmurers. The Lord's answer came in giving the Truth—to some on the object and manner, to others on the time of our Lord's Return. This then stopped new ravages of the sifting. The people's calling the place Taberah (v. 3) types the Lord's people

recognizing the destructive effect of the sifting on the siftlings. The sifting as a means of destruction is to be understood as coming from the Lord permissively (2 Thes. 2: 9-12).

(6) As indicated above, the Gospel-Age No-Ransomism sifting occurred during the Smyrna period, which was from the end of the Jewish Harvest, 69 A. D., to Constantine's edict of toleration issued at Milan, 313, whereby the last great, the ten-years-long (Rev. 2: 10), persecution of Christians by Pagan Rome ended. The great No-Ransomism sifting of this period was preceded by a connected sifting antitypical of the experience described in vs. 1-3, just as we saw that the Gospel-Harvest No-Ransomism sifting antecedently was preceded by the one described above beginning at the Passover of 1875. And, true enough, it was very much like the one that antecedently preceded the Gospel-Harvest No-Ransomism sifting. The brethren in the Jewish Harvest hoped for the Lord's soon return to establish the Kingdom. This hope with the uncertainty on the time of the auspicious event let the brethren of those days stand open to deception on the subject, as we know that the Thessalonian brethren were thus deceived (2 Thes. 2: 1-9). Confounding the Second Advent overthrow of Christendom, which in His great prophecy. (Matt. 24: 1-44; Luke 21: 1-36), in some particulars He connected in an antitypical way with the overthrow of the Jewish state in the Romano-Jewish War, 66-73, many Christians, particularly Jewish Christians, expected the Kingdom to be established right after that war. The less sober among the brethren (those in the uttermost parts of the camp) allowed themselves to be aroused to more or less fanatical frenzies of uncontrollable enthusiasm over the prospects of a soon establishment of the Kingdom.

(7) Raised to the heights of expectancy, when their hopes failed to materialize, they fell from these heights to depths of disappointment and despondency. Nor did

some of these recover their equipoise, which others only with great difficulty succeeded in doing. The former, like their Gospel-Harvest like-spirited brethren, became greatly disgruntled and murmured unto the Lord's displeasure (v. 1). Some of these as Gentiles went back to Paganism; and some of these as Jews went back to Judaism, and some of them as Gentiles and Jews remained nominal Christians who gave up hoping for the Lord's return. There were agitations in which Jesus and the Apostles were accused of error on the matter of the Second Advent by those who ascribed their misunderstandings to these as their teachings; and of course those who submitted to such agitations as siftlings lost their standing before the Lord. Thus rejecting the Second Advent message and hope, these manifested that the fire of the Lord, the sifting error and consequent sifting, permissively coming from the Lord, burnt them. But the Lord's people who had maintained a more sober stand in these circumstances, though more or less disappointed, resisting the sifting errors and movement pleaded with our Lord for relief (v. 2), and by His intercession the Lord sent the needed Truth, *i.e.*, that the events connected with Israel's disasters from 66 to 73 merely foreshadowed the trouble on the world accompanying the Second Advent (v. 2). This destroyed the sifting effects on those who stood (v. 2). Those, therefore, who stood in the sifting trial were by this clarification of the pertinent Truth led to recognize the experiences of the siftlings in the sifting as evidences of a destructive work upon such from the Lord (v. 3). This experience was a remote antecedent of the Gospel-Age No-Ransomism sifting, as is apparent.

(8) The nearer antecedents of the Gospel Harvest and the Gospel-Age No-Ransomism sifting are described in vs. 4-31. These were quite varied: some of them were more or less direct bridges leading the unworthy into the No-Ransomism sifting (vs. 4-10); and

others were helps that the Lord provided to safeguard the faithful (vs. 16, 17, 25-30); and intermingled among these were antitypical conversations on the part of God and Christ (vs. 10-23). The rock-bottom cause of all of the No-Ransomism siftings, and therefore of the Harvests', was weariness with the Lord's Truth (manna, v. 6) and desire for other food for heart and mind than the Lord's Word (vs. 4-6). Israel's mixed multitude, the riffraff, a word whose syllables end in a sound somewhat like the corresponding Hebrew word, *asafsuf*, consisted of people of various nations, which had been conquered by the Egyptians, and whose citizens, captured in expeditions of war and plunder, had been reduced to Egyptian slavery. When Israel as slaves were liberated by the humiliated Pharaoh and his Egyptian subjects, those non-Israelitish slaves went forth from slavery into freedom with them, the Egyptians being too greatly broken down to restrain these slaves from departing from their midst with the Israelites. These, accompanying Israel, naturally were the first to begin the outcries against the manna and for the foods of Egypt (v. 4). So in the Gospel Harvest many who were not real Spiritual Israelites first of all wearied of the Lord's Word (manna, v. 6) that they had been having as it was due (fell a lusty and said, Who will give us flesh? v. 4). And, as in the type, the spirit of these, like an unholy contagion, began to infect those who were real Spiritual Israelites, until like the others they, too, became weary of the Lord's Word as due and began to long for other food for heart and mind (the children of Israel also wept and said, Who will give us flesh to eat? v. 4). Certainly these showed bad taste in wearying of the good Word of God (Heb. 6: 5). This becomes manifest when we come to see what they began to long for, as typically set forth in v. 5: The nominal church and heathen creeds (fish), history (cucumbers), science (melons), philosophy (leeks), art (onions) and literature (garlic). The

further they proceeded the more degenerate became their tastes. Certainly this was true in the Harvest time, beginning just after the shaking of 1875, antecedent to the Harvest's No-Ransom sifting.

(9) This same thing was enacted on a larger scale shortly after the false Second Advent sifting which set in when the Kingdom was not established subsequent to the Jewish war of 66-73. As there was a literal mixed multitude that followed Israel out of Egyptian slavery, so there was an antitypical mixed multitude that associated itself with Spiritual Israel coming out of the slavery of sin and error. This was true of that part of Spiritual Israel that consisted of Jewish and of that part of Spiritual Israel that consisted of Gentile believers. Shortly after Pentecost, yea, even before, this antitypical mixed multitude began to make its appearance in antitypical Israel. The five Jewish-Harvest siftings each furnished a supply of these. This is readily discernible in four of these siftings, alluded to in the Gospels and in the Book of Acts. The fifth of these, like its counterpart in the Gospel Harvest, being on the largest scale of all five, must have manifested a goodly number of these among the Lord's people. Then, too, the result of the Jewish war and the subsequent false Second Advent sifting was to manifest from both the Jewish and Gentile world a still larger number belonging to this mixed multitude; so that toward the close of John's life he could with reason speak in his epistles of many false teachers and deceivers and forsakers of the real Truth and introducers of errors among the brethren as misleading many from the right way (1 John 2: 18, 19; 4: 1-3; 2 John 7; 3 John 9, 10). Of course, such were the first to weary of the heavenly Manna, and to long for the Jewish or heathen food for heart and mind, from which but shortly before they had been weaned.

(10) Their example and agitation ere long misled not a few who had been real Spiritual Israelites (v. 4).

These symbolically wearied of the heavenly Manna and, symbolically weeping grievously, longed for the flesh pots of symbolic Egypt, the present evil world. Accordingly, as they were Jews or Gentiles, they began to hanker after Jewish or pagan traditional religion (fish), Jewish or pagan history (cucumbers), Jewish or pagan science (melons), Jewish or pagan philosophy (leeks), Jewish or pagan art (onions), and Jewish or pagan literature (garlic); and for these beggarly elements they were willing to neglect, despise and abhor the good Word of God! A terrible deterioration in mental, moral and religious tastes is typed by the lusting of vs. 4-6. This is emphasized in the Hebrew where in v. 4 it reads "made themselves *lust a lust*." Like Lot's wife, they longed for the things left behind (we remember... which we ate freely in Egypt, v. 5). How ungrateful toward the Lord, who had given them angels' food (Ps. 78: 25), that they should by their thoughts, motives, words and acts have expressed contempt of it (there is nothing at all beside this manna before our eyes, v. 6). Their complaint, now our soul is dry (appetiteless as to the manna and listless, v. 6), received a terrible recompense; for it is written of them that though the Lord gave them their hearts' request, He sent leanness into their soul (Ps. 106: 15). Surely we who had been given the sumptuous repasts of the Parousia and Epiphany Truth should guard well our symbolic appetites, lest we, wearying of the finest of the heavenly Manna, draw down upon ourselves the evil of the antitypical lusts (1 Cor. 10: 6).

(11) Vs. 7-9 treat of the manna and the people's activities with it. V. 7 gives a brief description of the manna, which brings to our attention four qualities of the heavenly Manna. We understand that the manna Israel had as its food represents the Truth, God's Word. Or to put it in another form, Christ is our spiritual food, even as He Himself has interpreted the typical manna to represent Himself (John 6: 32-58).

Some might think that our first definition of the antitypical Manna contradicts our second definition of it; but a little thought will readily show their harmony. Jesus Himself tells us that he is the Way, the *Truth* and the Life (John 14: 6). How is this so? From the fact that the Bible is Christocentric. The whole Word, Plan, of God involves Him and revolves about Him, who of God is made to us now and to the world in the Millennium, wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and deliverance (1 Cor. 1: 30). It is for this, among other reasons, that He is called the Word of Life and the Word of God (1 John 1: 1; Rev. 19: 13). Indeed, His prehuman title, the Logos, Word, among other things, is related to this thought, inasmuch as it presents Him to us as God's mouth (John 1: 1-3, 14), which is one of the Bible's titles (Ps. 45: 1; Is. 1: 20). Accordingly, the Truth is but a description of Him in His person, character, teachings, work and relations, as He is also its Revealer. Accordingly, the twofold definition above given of the antitypical Manna is correct.

(12) Above we said that four of the Truth's qualities are set forth typically in v. 7: "The manna was as coriander seed; and the color [appearance] thereof as the color of bdellium." Coriander seed is aromatic as to scent and is preservative as against corruption—the appreciableness and the salutariness of the Word of God are thereby brought out. The Truth, in the first place, is in its nature and in its effects appreciable. This is because it is Divinely inspired (1 Cor. 2: 4, 5, 13; Gal. 1: 11, 12; 1 Thes. 2: 13; 2 Tim. 3: 15-17; 1 Pet. 1: 10-12; 2 Pet. 1: 20, 21), pure (Ps. 12: 6; 119: 140; Prov. 30: 5), perfect and reliable (2 Sam. 22: 31; Ps. 19: 7, 9; 119: 128, 138, 151, 160; Prov. 22: 20, 21; Is. 25: 1; John 17: 17; Rev. 21: 5; 22: 6); effective (Is. 55: 10, 11; Jer. 22: 29; Heb. 4: 12), soul-satisfying (Job 23: 12; Ps. 19: 10; 119: 47, 72, 103; 1 Pet. 2: 2) and permanent (Ps. 119: 144, 152, Is. 40: 8; Luke 16: 17; 21: 33 ; 1 Pet. 1: 25) . It is also, as typed by

the second quality of coriander seed, in its nature and effect salutary. This is because it makes wise unto salvation (Ps. 119: 98-100; 2 Tim. 3: 15; Mark 12: 24), it works the graces (Rom. 15: 4; 1 John 1: 4; John 20: 31; Rom. 10: 17; 2 Pet. 1: 4-7) and it saves (Rom. 1: 16; Jas. 1: 18, 21; 1 Pet. 1: 5-9). These are the qualities of the Truth as suggested by the manna being as coriander seed, which is a fine type.

(13) Bdellium, according to the best authorities, is among the clearest of the precious stones—the diamond. The qualities of the Truth typed by the color of the manna being like bdellium are clarity and brilliance. And certainly the Truth is when due clear and brilliant like a diamond. By this we are not to be understood to mean that the Bible is clear—purposely it was by God made the obscurest of books, as we have more than once emphasized in these columns (Is. 28: 9-13; Matt. 13: 11-15, 35). But the Truth as due is wonderfully clear to the saints (Col. 1: 27) and will be so to the world (Rev. 22: 1). This clarity is due to the reasonableness of God's thoughts (Is. 1: 18). Its brilliance makes it enlightening—it reflects light from the Lord. The following passages bring out the diamond qualities of the Truth: Ps. 19: 8; 119: 105, 130; Prov. 6: 23; 2 Pet. 1: 19; 1 John 2: 8; John 1: 9; Rev. 22: 1; Is. 30: 26; 29: 18, 25. Thus we see that by the manna being like coriander seed and diamond the Lord has brought to our attention four splendid qualities of the Truth. Let us note well the wisdom expressing itself in poetic form brought to our attention by God's use of these objects of nature to enforce spiritual lessons. Lusters wearied of this, desiring the beggarly elements of this present evil world in Jewish and pagan creeds, history, science, philosophy, art and literature.

(14) The Israelites' activities as to the manna type spiritual Israel's activities as to the Truth, whose mind and heart processes on the Lord's Word are typically set forth in v. 8. Israelites' going about as to dealing

with the manna represents the antitypical Israelites' giving their attention to the Lord's Word privately and in fellowship by conversation and class study. The Israelites' gathering the manna types the Spiritual Israelites' getting an understanding of the meaning of the Truth. Their grinding it in mills or beating it in mortars types the analytical processes whereby one divides, subdivides, sub subdivides, *etc.*, it into its main parts, which are doctrine, precept, promise, exhortation, prophecy, history and type, and into its smaller parts, *i.e.*, as to the subjects coming under each of these general heads and as to the contents of each of these subjects. *E.g.*, on the general division of the Truth's subject matter we might instance the subject of God as a subdivision of doctrine. The subject of God may be subdivided into the following parts: His being, His character, His teachings and His works. Each of these in turn may be sub subdivided, *e.g.*, His being may be divided into its existence, its nature, its faculties, its attributes. Each of these in turn may then be divided, *etc.*, *etc.*, *etc.* This same process can be applied to any other doctrine or to any of the other main divisions of Truth thoughts given above. The Israelites' baking, or, as it might be rendered, boiling, it represents the Truth-proving processes, whereby by proofs from Scripture, reason and facts one demonstrates it as true to his own satisfaction. The Israelites' making cakes of the manna types the adapting of the Truth for fitness to one's heart appropriation unto character development and character correction for oneself and others, individually or in groups, as well as for one's development in doctrine and refutation (2 Tim. 3: 15, 17). His eating these cakes types such appropriations of the Lord's Truth to one's development in the Lord's Word, Spirit and work. We know that just these things were done in the Harvests, have been and are being done in the Epiphany, and they

were certainly done in the Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis and Philadelphia periods of the Church.

(15) The taste (v. 8) of these cakes was like fresh oil. After people have tasted olive oil that is old and thus somewhat rancid, fresh oil tastes very good. This suggests the fine taste of the good Word of God. It tastes very good to the mind and heart, inasmuch as its abounding verity, harmony, reasonableness, beauty, sublimity, sufficiency and practicability satisfy both head and heart. O, how its "taste" enlightens, satisfies, delights and uplifts in the Holy Spirit! The Holy Spirit of it (oil) makes it taste so good to our Holy Spirit. So it has been throughout the whole Age from Jordan until now and will until the Epiphany is past be to real Spiritual Israelites. V. 9 tells us under what circumstances the manna fell: Upon the night's dew it fell. It did not fall directly upon the desert earth, which doubtless would have made it sandy and muddy, but upon the sand-and earth-covering dew. In Bible symbols the dew sometimes represents the Truth (Gen. 27: 28, 39; Deut. 32: 2; Judg. 6: 37-40; 1 Kings 17: 1; Ps. 110: 3, 133: 3) and sometimes God's providences (Prov. 19: 12; Is. 18: 4; Dan. 4: 15, 23, 25, 33; 5: 21). Both of these thoughts apply here. Upon Truth already had the Lord superimposes more Truth, adding line upon line, precept upon precept (Is. 28: 10, 13). The night-long falling of the manna upon the dew suggests the progressive development of the Truth (Prov. 4: 18), ever reminding us of the thought expressed in a hymn. "Still there's more to follow." This is also suggested by the manna's continuing to fall throughout Israel's wilderness journey, even as in the antitype from Jordan to the present the Truth as due came upon the Truth that had already been due among God's people, the antitypical camp. The advancing Truth does not set aside the Truth formerly received, as some deceivers teach. Those of us who during the Parousia watched this peculiarity of the Truth, its dueness, *i.e.*,

its coming as the needs, circumstances and experiences of God's people require, and who during the Epiphany are watching its dueness, know that this is a true principle in practice. The same peculiarity of the Truth was in evidence throughout all the five Church epochs between the Harvests (Ps. 23: 5; 81: 16; 100: 3; 103: 5).

(16) The same remarks hold with reference to the manna's falling upon the dew as symbolizing the providence' of God toward His people throughout the entire Age. The Truth as due came to God's people adapted to their varying providential needs, circumstances and experiences; for the Word of God was so framed by God that it is not only adapted to the needs of God's people in general, but it is also adapted to their individual needs amid their varying circumstances and experiences. This shows the practicability of God and of God's Truth. That God arranged His Word so as to be adaptable to the general needs of His people is apparent from Amos 3: 7: "Surely the Lord your God will do nothing [in the outworking of His plan] except He revealed it as His secret unto His servants the prophets." These acts are sometimes revealed in the prophecies and sometimes in the types of the Word, which detail all the unfoldings of God's plan as due. And that God adapted His Word to the particular needs of the individual members of His people in their varying circumstances and experiences is evident from many Scriptures (Gen. 49: 24; Ex. 23: 22; Deut. 10: 18; Ps. 23: 4; 34: 7, 10; 37: 25, 34; 40: 5; 44: 1-3; 68: 6; 105: 16-22; 146: 7-9; etc.). The manna's falling at night (v. 9) suggests that the Truth is due particularly in the nights of controversies for the Truth against error, in the nights of fighting against sin, selfishness and worldliness. It was due in the night of nominal Fleshy Israel in its Harvest, in the night from 1799 to 1954, in the night between the Harvests, in the Epiphany night, and in the individual Christian's night of affliction. Thus the advancing light rests upon, is

built upon the past-given Truth, and rests upon the providences of God's people in the sense of being adapted to their providences in their needs, circumstances and experiences (upon the dew). No wonder the Word, having such qualities and peculiarities as are typed in vs. 7-9, the Apostle Paul calls it the good Word of God (Heb. 6: 5). How great, therefore, must be in God's people the sin of distaste for that Word and turning from an appetite for it to an appetite for Jewish and pagan religious beliefs, history, science, philosophy, art and literature.

(17) Such dissatisfaction with the Truth and lusting after secular religion, history, science, philosophy, art and literature, came to our Lord's attention as the antitypical Moses (v. 10) in the Gospel Harvest. In each church of all denominations and in each ecclesia of the Parousia Truth people (throughout their families, v. 10) this dissatisfaction with the Truth and hankering after secular knowledge had one or more representative. Not only so, but this dissatisfaction and lusting were expressed publicly, often by the ministers and elders as the leaders in those churches and in Truth ecclesiastas (every man in the door of his tent). Accordingly, this was a very general happening. So widespread did it become that it had to receive the special cognizance of the Lord, who was greatly displeased thereat (the anger of the Lord was kindled greatly, v. 10), knowing that one of His choice favors was despised and greatly inferior things were preferred to it by His people, since this betrayed their ingratitude, in appreciation and corruption. Moreover, this course of the people was by our Lord seen to be evil (evil in the eyes of Moses). We know that such things have happened in the Parousia and Epiphany times. But the same phenomenon occurred in the Smyrna period and continued to happen in the following four Church epochs, especially in the first three of these four. During the Smyrna period especially did our Lord note

both in the Jewish and in the Gentile section of the nominal and real people of God that there was increasingly among them dissatisfaction with, and weariness of the spiritual Manna that God provided for His people, and this lusting after Jewish and pagan religions, history, science, philosophy, art and literature. He saw it occurring in every ecclesia of both sections of His people in that period. He saw it occurring not only in a private way, but also in a public way, and that often expressed by the leaders themselves, whose influence over the others made these feelings all the more evil in their nature and effects. No wonder that God at such base ingratitude, in appreciation and corruption was greatly displeased; and no wonder our Lord recognized these things as evil.

(18) Moses, the overworked servant of God, makes plaint, not complaint, at this situation and His office as respects it (v. 11). To him as God's servant his situation as to this condition was an affliction (Why hast Thou afflicted Thy servant?). To Him it was not an expression of God's favor (Why have I not found favor in Thy sight?). To him it was as though an excessive burden was laid upon him (literally, for the laying of the burden of all the people upon me). We may be sure that in the antitype our Lord did not by words utter such a plaint to God. Rather we think His sense of an oppressive burden in view of the situation, and not His words, told God the antitypical plaint. For people in the antitypical attitude toward the Truth and toward secular things above described so to act toward His ministry was an affliction and an infliction to Him; for Him to have to supply such desires as the antitypical Israelites in all the antitypical applications had and expressed was indeed an intolerable burden to Him. It was not a favor of the Lord to Him that the conditions were so. This will become apparent when we remember that our Lord's Gospel-Age ministry has two features: (1) supervising the work of selecting,

developing and delivering the Church (1 Cor. 1: 30; Acts 15: 14); and (2) supervising the work of reprobating the world for sin, righteousness and the coming judgment (John 16: 8-11). It did not belong to His mission to bear the burden of the second death class, nor of the unjustified, particularly those whose justification lapsed as such, a condition forced upon Him. And it certainly did not belong to His mission to provide the six secular forms of mental food for which the antitypical lusts hankered. Nor had God laid such a burden upon Him, except in a permissive sense, but certainly not in a positive sense. The burden had, so to speak, developed in the natural run of events, due to so many nominal people of God springing up among the real people of God, and due to some of the latter becoming wholly or partially unfaithful. These facts show us how our Lord's oppressed feelings under a burden that was not a part of His mission as the Leader of God's people spoke to the Father by the condition and not by word. Our Lord's plaint was for information; it was not a complaint even in feeling.

(19) But one may ask, Was not our Lord omniscient and therefore needed no information, having all knowledge? The Bible implies that He knows all things that He needs to know to carry out His vicegerency for God (Matt. 28: 18), which means that He knows everything about the physical universe so far created, and as much, at least, as is needed for operating matters connected with the process of creating new universes at and for their making. But for several reasons his knowledge, though, nearly omniscient, is short of omniscience. In the first place, God would deny Himself, which He morally cannot do (2 Tim. 2: 13), if He should make any creature His equal in any particular; for that would in that particular be surrendering His supremacy, a thing He will never do. In the second place, in types in which the Bible teaches that certain persons represent Him, e.g., Moses, Gideon,

etc., He is set forth as needing and asking for information after His exaltation. In the chapter that we are interpreting (vs. 11, 21, 22) and in other places (15: 32-36, particularly v. 32; etc.), in His glorified condition, Jesus is represented as needing information, which is implied in all the revelations made by God to Moses while the latter represents our Lord in His glorified condition. Thirdly, not only in types but in non-typical Scriptures this is shown, *e.g.*, in Acts 1: 7 just before His ascension Jesus shows that at that time only the Father knew the time when the Kingdom would be restored to Israel, *i.e.*, in great David's greater Son, just as before His death He did not know when the judgment day would come (Mark 13: 32).

(20) Fourthly, Jesus being in Is. 60: 20 called the glorified Church's Moon and the Father her Sun proves that Jesus will continually get new light from the Father and reflect it upon the Church, even as the natural moon continually gets its light from the natural sun, and then reflects its borrowed light upon the earth. Fifthly, there are hints scattered here and there in the Scriptures that while Jesus' knowledge after His ascension was greatly increased on all general and most detailed features of the plan, *e.g.*, being given the revelations of the book of Revelation after His ascension (Rev. 1: 1), some details, especially on methods of procedure, are given to Him only just before they are due to be given to, or worked toward the Lord's people or others. We saw this typed by Boaz' eating (Ruth 3: 7) as representing Jesus' receiving certain new features of Truth on the Youthful Worthies, in the type of what should be done with the man who gathered sticks on the Sabbath (Num. 15: 32-36), etc. Sixthly, the covenant arrangements shown Moses *in the Mountain*, typing those shown Jesus partly shortly after His ascension and partly during His Second Advent, prove it. Seventh, antitypical Gideon's getting information in the antitypical Midianites' camp (Judg. 7: 9-15)

and Jesus' partaking of the marriage supper of the Lamb (Rev. 19: 9), which, among other things, means appropriating knowledge for His Millennial husbandship toward His Bride and His fatherhood of His Millennial children, with what is implied as to duties, etc., in these relations, prove that our Lord was not omniscient. This is suggested in the moon picture commented on above as an eternal condition, the moon constantly reflecting new light on the earth after receiving it from the sun. The principle contained in the passage, "all things that I have heard of My Father I have made known unto you" (John 15: 15), will prove eternally true. The Father will eternally reveal new things to the Son, who will eternally make them known to the Church.

(21) Jesus knows progressively as much as a creature can know; and He is as great in physical, artistic, mental, moral and religious qualities as is possible for a creature to be; but is in all of these the Father's inferior (John 14: 28; 1 Cor. 15: 28). God would do what is impossible even for Him, ungod Himself, if He made even our Lord His equal in any particular; for that would be denying Himself (2 Tim. 2: 13), which He cannot do. If the matter of our Lord's inferiority to the Father in all things, hence also in knowledge, is kept in mind, it will not stumble us when, as in the case of the passage under consideration, and many others, our Lord in His glorified condition is represented as seeking information from the Father. As on the subject of human immortality on which its exponents cannot find even one Scripture to prove their view, the proponents of our Lord's omniscience cannot find even one inspired Scripture that teaches or implies it; for the Scriptures teach quite to the contrary. We, of course, do not say the above to our Lord's disparagement; for it is no disparagement of Him to hold with the Scriptures, that in all things the Father is greater than He. To over-exalt our Lord is

distasteful to Him, as it is distasteful to the Father to belittle our Lord, or to belittle the Father by over-exalting our Lord to equality with the Father in any detail. The passage in which Jesus says, "My Father is greater than I" (John 14: 28), is eternally true in all respects, hence in knowledge. The Truth on the subject is this: God is the Source of all true knowledge and He gives true knowledge to our Lord as is due for Him to receive it; and therefore the Latter is eternally dependent on the Father for new light, as it is due for Him to receive it from the Father. How evident is this principle is apparent when we note that in every application of this type, and there have been eight of them already fulfilled, Jesus asked for the pertinent information, as typed by Moses' questions.

(22) Moses' plaint (vs. 11-15) takes another form in v. 12. It will be recognized as just throughout. He did not have a mother's relation and consequent duties to the whole people (have I conceived *all* this people? v. 12). He did not have a father's relation and consequent duties to the whole people (have I begotten them?). This language is especially meaningful in the antitype, because the Bible attributes father functions to those brethren who have been used to bring justified ones into consecration and Spirit-begettal; for in this act they represent the Father directly (1 Cor. 4: 15; Phile. 10). Hence, as the two passages just cited show, they are spoken of as begetting such, and that in the sense just explained, as the Father's direct representatives in this act. Again, as we showed in detail in Vol. VI, Chap. VI, the Truth servants in their capacity of ministering the promises, their institutions, arrangements, elaborations, etc., to the brethren are the mother, who conceives (have I conceived?) the New Creature fetus. The language of Moses, therefore, types our Lord's state of mind over the oppressive burden that He was carrying as suggesting to the Father the following thought: Have I by the Truth fathered all who

profess to be Thy people, by begetting of the Spirit through the Truth all of them? Have I mothered all of them by developing all of them as new creatures after they were begotten of the Spirit through the Truth? To both questions the answer of course must be a negative one, though He did thus father and mother the new creatures among them. These works He did in both Harvests and in the intervening period. This alludes to the first of Jesus' Gospel-Age missions, gathering from among the nations a people for God's name. And certainly Jesus had assumed the burden of these; but it was not this that oppressed Him; nor was it the burden of the justified, nor of bringing unjustified ones through repentance and faith to justification, by reproving for sin, righteousness, judgment.

(23) It was bearing responsibility for the unjustified and the second death class and providing for them the kind of food for head and heart desired by them, that was oppressive. These He did not want to bear as a parent (in Thy bosom, as a nursing father does a suckling), to the heavenly Canaan, sworn as theirs in the Oath-bound Covenant to the Faithful only (v. 12). And in this His attitude was right. The words, "that Thou shouldst say" were better rendered "That Thou mightest say." This rendering wards off the idea that God had required the typical oppressive thing of Moses or the antitypical oppressive thing of Jesus; for to act as a leader and teacher does not imply fatherhood and motherhood to all the led and taught, with their consequent duties. Our Lord had such duties to new creatures only, which, as said before, He did not consider oppressive. As Moses did not know whence he could supply flesh for the 2,000,000 Israelites, neither did our Lord in the Harvests and in the intervening period know whence He could supply other than the Divinely arranged mental food for all nominal and real Spiritual Israel (whence should I have? v. 13). This

verse and vs. 21-23 not only prove that our Lord did not know whence He could get even enough food for nominal and real Spiritual Israel, but that He did not know of what it would consist, which disproves the thought of His being omniscient. Both Moses' and our Lord's kind hearts were distressed at the situation. In both cases their sympathies were deeply wrought upon by the weepings of the people for their respectively desired food and their inability to supply it (for they weep, etc., v. 13). In Jesus' case this inability was of course true in all the applications of the antitype, and that throughout all their various periods.

(24) The inability of Moses alone and Jesus alone to do all that their increasing burdens required in harmony with their respective missions, with the addition of satisfying the dissatisfied and lusting people, in Jesus' case in all applications of the text, is set forth in v. 14 (I am not able; it is too heavy for me). Moses said that if God desired him alone to do not only the work of leading and teaching the people which, within certain limits and as variously as were the classes of the people, he had undertaken, but also to satisfy the dissatisfied and lusting people with provisions that were not his to furnish (if Thou deal thus with me, v. 15), he requested death immediately (kill me . . . out of hand) as an act of favor (if I have found favor in Thy sight), and thus be prevented from experiencing (a frequent Biblical meaning of the word see) an unbearable affliction (let me not see my wretchedness). Antitypically, Jesus' distressed feelings, not words, in all applications of the antitype told God that if He must bear so heavy a burden, He would prefer, not a literal death, which is impossible for immortals, but a symbolic death, a cutting off from His office as Leader and Teacher of the nominal and real people of God, variously to be led and taught, dependent on their class standing before the Lord. This phenomenon appeared throughout the harvest periods and the five Church epochs with the

increase of people. He is so conscientious that rather than be unable to fulfill a mission, He would give it up. This cutting off from such an office He desired to take place immediately (out of hand). As such He would consider it a favor from the Father (if I have found favor) and a deliverance from evil (my wretchedness). A thoughtful consideration of what Moses in the type said and of what Jesus acted out in the antitype, all the circumstances being considered, makes us recognize the justice of their plaint—they did not complain.

(25) God's answer, as given in vs. 16, 17, proves the justice of the typical and antitypical plaint. And God's answer as to how He would send relief to an overworked Servant of His, in both type and antitype, so that the real duty, which had increased greatly with the people's increase, especially in the antitype, might be effectively performed, and not be required of Moses and Jesus alone respectively in the type and antitype, is given in vs. 16, 17; and His answer as to how Moses in the type and Jesus in the antitype would be relieved entirely of the burden of satisfying the dissatisfied and lustng people is given in vs. 18-20. God's instructions as to the appointment of the 70 elders in vs. 16, 17, and His appointment of officers and judges in Ex. 18: 25-26 have been seized upon by higher critics as contradictory recitals of the same episode. But this identification is entirely wrong, as a little thought will prove. There were in the one case only 70, in the other many thousands selected; their service was largely different: the 70 were to assist Moses to teach and lead the people, the others were to answer difficult questions and settle controversies. The 70 were selected after leaving Sinai, hence at another place, the others shortly after reaching Sinai, and that at Sinai. The 70 were selected from among, and as the ablest among, the others (whom thou knowest to be elders and officers). Those selected at Sinai represent those elders, auxiliary pilgrims and pilgrims only who functioned during the

Parousia, and whose office persists in the Epiphany, only if they maintain their Little Flock standing, since their types were selected after Israel reached Sinai, which antitypically was reached in 1874; while the 70, representing in a general way all elders and leaders among God's people, specifically type, St. John excepted, the secondarily prophets of the two Harvests and the inter-harvest period. Specifically viewed for the two Harvests and for the intervening period, the 70 have typed literally 70 brothers, as the 70 evangelists (Luke 10: 1) in the Jewish Harvest prove, and as the facts in the other two cases prove. The fact that the *twelve* wells type 12 individuals (the Apostles) implies that the 70 palm trees type 70 individuals in the three applications of the type, the Apostles acting in two of the applications in their recorded words (Ex. 15: 24).

(26) The charge (v. 16) for Moses to gather the 70 to himself types for the Gospel Harvest God's charge to Jesus to associate with Himself in the general ministry the pilgrims who as such were general Elders. These 70 do not include auxiliary pilgrims, who as such went out only on occasional trips and at week ends; but the 70 were such as gave practically their entire time to the pilgrim service or in connection with it gave the rest or almost all the rest of their time to some other branch of the work, like members of the Parousia Bible House and Bethel family, although the less prominent of the latter were only auxiliary pilgrims. To be of the 70 pilgrims one would have had to enter that service at least a year, a symbolic day, before Oct. 1914. All of them as well as the auxiliary pilgrims were appointed by the Lord through Bro. Russell. These were such as our Lord knew to have qualifications for the general eldership and not simply for local eldership (whom thou knowest, v. 16). They were to be selected from among the elders of the Lord's people in the sense of such being specially developed, as well as from among the leaders, even as

the typical 70 were to be selected from among those made judges, even officers, at Sinai (elders of the people, even their officers, v. 16). Moses' taking such up with him to the tabernacle and their standing there with him (v. 16) type that our Lord brought those who were to become pilgrims in among the brethren and gave them among the brethren a special standing with Him as General Elders. It will be noted that the increase of the burden with the increase of the people and the selection of the pilgrims did not occur alone in connection with the No-Ransomism sifting, but from time to time until about 1913. Indeed, Bro. Russell's anointing in the antitypical camp as the Parousia Eldad (vs. 26, 27) began in 1870, even before the Parousia began, and he did not come up to the antitypical Tabernacle, the separated and cleansed sanctuary, until 1876. Why, then, are these matters in the type associated with the type of the No-Ransomism sifting? We reply that, as so often occurs in Scripture types and symbolic prophecy, things introduced at a certain period are given so as to furnish a completed picture, without necessarily limiting them to the period in which they are typically introduced, though, generally speaking, they there had their beginning. Bro. Russell's being selected as one of the 70 before the Parousia began finds its counterpart in John's being selected before Pentecost, not only to be an Apostle, but also to be the principal man of the Smyrna epoch, even as some of the dissatisfaction and lustng set in before 1874 and 69. This time phenomenon, therefore, we find covers the whole Gospel-Age application of the type, as well as its whole Harvests' applications.

(27) As was the case in the Jewish Harvest, the 70 were sent out in pairs (Luke 10: 1), so was it the case in the Gospel Harvest. Some of these are clearly discernible. We will indicate this in the case of ten, including the nine who constituted the three sets of threes among antitypical David's mightiest men. As that

Servant, Bro. Russell, the parallel of the Twelve, had no companion helper, unless the whole 70 be so considered, as the Jewish Harvest 70 in a sense were counted the companion helper of the 12, but as a pilgrim he did. Indeed he had five of such successively, the first four making total shipwreck: Messrs. Barbour and Paton, Mrs. Russell and Mr. M.L. McPhail, whose fall in 1908 occasioned another brother to take his place, who kept it to the end of Bro. Russell's pilgrim work. The second set seems to be Bro. Barton and Jesse Hemery; the third set, Bros. John and Morton Edgar, the fourth set, Menta Sturgeon and Bro. Raymond, and the fifth set, J.F. Rutherford and A.H. McMillan. The rest of the 70 were doubtless also paired, even if we are unable to trace all of them as such. The principle that whoever would fall out of a set of two would not be counted of the 70 in the finished picture, another taking his place, may be seen as true in the case of the companion helpers of Bro. Russell as a pilgrim. In each set above mentioned the leader of the two was mentioned first. During the period between the Harvests our heavenly Father sought to ease from our Lord the too large burden that came from the increase in the numbers of nominal and real Spiritual Israel as epoch after epoch increased the numbers of nominal and real Spiritual Israel, beginning it with the Smyrna period. This God did by charging Jesus for the five epochs between the Harvests to gather to Himself the 70, *i.e.*, draw these to Him as assistants. As indicated above, this began in the case of St. John even before Pentecost, when, as the result shows, His call to the apostleship was a preparation, anointing, for his place as the principal man of the Smyrna Church, *i.e.*, the main teacher among the star members of that Church, the one who gave its fundamental teachings. During each one of these Church periods a varying number of these 70 was called to be Jesus' associates in the work as secondarily prophets, general Elders, whose ministry

was one toward the general Church and the public.

(28) Just as it was in the two Harvests, these 70, distributed variously among the five inter-harvest Churches, were sent forth two by two, which is, how-ever, not the case with St. John who, before and during the Smyrna period, was an Apostle and who never was a secondarily prophet, as an Apostle had no secondarily prophet as a companion helper, though all of the Smyrna secondarily prophets may be considered as a class of such. How these 70 were sent forth two and two will be recognized from the examples of the Philadelphia Church's members of these 70. Wessel and Rudolph Agricola were a set of two of whom Wessel was the leader, as he was also the principal man of the Philadelphia star. Savonarola and (Fra.) Domenico were a set of two of whom Savonarola was leader. Luther and Melanchthon were a set of two of whom Luther was leader. Zwingli and Oecolampadius were a set of two of whom Zwingli was the leader. Hubmaier and Blaurock were a set of two of whom Hubmaier was the leader. Servetus and Laehus Socinus were a set of two of whom Servetus was the leader. Cranmer and Latimer were a set of two of whom Cranmer was the leader. Browne and Harrison were a set of two of whom Browne was the leader. Fox and Barclay were a set of two of whom Fox was the leader. John and Charles Wesley were a set of two of whom John Wesley was the leader. Stone and (Thomas) Campbell were a set of two of whom Stone was the leader, and Miller and Wolf were a set of two of whom Miller was the leader.

(29) Thus we see that of the 70 there were 24 who belonged to the Philadelphia; and the 46 others were unevenly distributed among the Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira and Sardis Churches, the Pergamos period having the least number of them. Of these 70, the leader of each of the 35 sets alone belonged to the five stars of these five Churches. In all there were 49

members of the seven stars, twelve belonging to the Ephesian and two to the Laodicean star. Each of these stars had one principal man, except the last, to which two were assigned (Mic. 5: 5). These inter-harvest 70 were to be well developed in head and heart (from the elders, v. 16). Not only so, but they must be attested men, not only by the brethren, but by Jesus also, (whom thou knowest). This attestation was not to be of them as of obscure men, but as of recognized leaders (elders of the people, even their officers). The charge that the 70 be by Moses brought to the tabernacle types this that Jesus bring such among those who were God's Tabernacle, the general Church. The 70 standing with Moses about the tabernacle represents the thought that after being made by Jesus such secondarily prophets, the 70 inter-harvest leaders should take their places as general teachers of the Church publicly before the entire Church (they shall stand, v. 16).

(30) God's coming down to Moses occurring in the cloudy pillar (vs. 17, 25) represents Jehovah's giving Jesus the pertinent Truth on the subjects needed by the 70 as due in their various times; and this Jesus gave them as a part of their qualification for their various ministries. God's taking from Moses of His spirit and putting it on the 70 (v. 17) types God's imparting from and through Jesus the rest of the power necessary to qualify the 70 for their special work, the spirit of counsel, might and reverence of the Lord in sufficient amounts additional to the already received spirit of wisdom and understanding and knowledge, imparted to them through the Truth given before as the first part of their qualification. This would fit each one to do that particular part of the general work that Jesus needed him to perform in each application of the antitype (v. 17). Thus they would with Jesus bear the burden of the proper service on behalf of the nominal and real people of God (v. 17). This would relieve our Lord of some of the burden, resulting in His

not bearing it alone. This certainly had its fulfillment during both Harvests and during the inter-harvest period. We have observed this as done during the Parousia and Epiphany. And the histories of brethren like St. John, Polycarp, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Arius, Claudius of Turin, Berengar of Tours, Peter Abelard, Arnold of Brescia, Peter Waldo, Marsiglio, Occam, John Tauler, John Wyclif, John Huss, Jerome of Prague, John Wessel, etc., etc., prove that the same thing was done in the inter-harvest period.

(31) After the Lord had told Moses what to do as to the appointment of the 70 elders, He instructed him as to what to say to the people, *i.e.*, to sanctify [to separate] themselves for the morrow, when they would have and eat flesh. Antitypically, God instructed our Lord to tell the people who lusted for other subjects than the Truth to separate themselves unto their partaking of the errors that the Lord would permit the adversary to introduce among them. Our Lord in the Gospel Harvest did this telling, not by words, but by acts whereby He drove away from the faithful the lusters, which occurred in a sifting whereby the separation was made. This sifting was the Gospel-Harvest No-Ransomism sifting. The same was true in the Jewish Harvest No-Ransomism sifting. Similarly did our Lord by act tell the Smyrna, etc., epochs' lusters for Jewish traditionalism, heathen mythology, science, philosophy, art, history and literature, to separate themselves from the faithful, which separation was the Gospel-Age No-Ransomism sifting. As in all siftings, this one first worked a conduct separation, then later a theory or error separation. It was the error separation that more particularly is typed by the people's eating quail flesh, while the pertinent conduct separation occurred by their misconduct with reference to the Truth. In the antitype the dissatisfaction of the people ("ye have wept in the ears of the Lord," v. 18) with the food that the Lord had provided became the

occasion of the Lord's withdrawing restraints from Satan's bringing forth deceptions among the Lord's people. And with these restraints withdrawn Satan introduced No-Ransomism errors. Just as God resented Israel's untruthfully saying that it was well with them in Egypt (v. 18), so was He displeased, in the threefold applications of the type, with the people's false act-statement that it was well with them when they were in harmony with antitypical Egypt, the present evil world, while they were therein. And as God told Fleshly Israel that He, permissively, would send them flesh, so by His acts He told antitypical Israel that He would, permissively, send (2 Thes. 2: 9-11) them the errors connected with No-Ransomism in the three No-Ransomism siftings through which the Gospel Church would pass-those in the two Harvests and in the Interim between them: "ye shall eat" (v.18). And they did.

(32) In vs. 19, 20, the duration of such eating is stated, *i.e.*, "a month of days," or 30 days. (See the margin.) It will be noted that six different time periods are mentioned in these verses, five of them negatively: "Ye shall not eat one day, nor two days, nor five days, neither ten days, nor twenty days" (v. 19), and one positively: "even a whole month," or thirty days. Antitypically, No-Ransomism would be partaken of in all of the Harvests' five siftings, the first two beginning in 33 and 1878 and the last two beginning in 63 and 1908, for in both Harvests No-Ransomism was partaken of from the first Harvests' siftings up to and throughout the Harvests' fifth sifting. This same thing appears in the partaking of the Gospel-Age's No-Ransomism errors. We are not to think that the partaking of such errors was confined to the Smyrna period. It appears in all five epochs of the Church, and this is indicated in the expression, "a whole month" (v. 20), *i.e.*, 30 days. Let us now see how this is indicated in all three applications. Thirty is the product of 5×6 .

As we know, 6 is the number of evil or imperfection. In this case, error and sin, evil, are indicated. The five siftings were, each and all, evils, hence their duration may well be represented symbolically by a number symbolizing a fivefold evil. Thus the symbolic thought of the 30 days in the Harvests and in the Interim is that the evil food, error, would continue to be partaken of during five evil periods, the five sifting periods. The number 30 as touching all five of the sifting periods is by a Hebrew idiom made to include the whole of the five sifting periods in all applications.

(33) This fact of the No-Ransomism sifting continuing in all three applications throughout the five sifting periods and not terminating with the sifting period in which it began, is something that is frequently paralleled in Biblical matters, as the following facts show. The Infidelism sifting did not cease to operate as soon as the period—hour—of its beginning ended; but it continued to operate among susceptible people throughout the following three sifting periods, as the facts of the case prove. Then, too, the Combinationism sifting did not cease to work when the period—hour—of its beginning ended; but it continued to work during the two following periods. The Reformism sifting did not cease when the hour of its beginning ended, but continued throughout the period of the following sifting. The same thing holds of the siftings of the Gospel-Age's epochs; each continued to work during the periods following its beginning period. The same principle is manifest in the working of the seven plagues of Rev. 16: each one continued to work while the following ones worked and did not cease to work when the next one began to work, *i.e.*, each of the previous Volumes continued its plaguing work throughout the periods of the plaguing work of its succeeding Volumes. This enables us to see the fallacy of W.E. Van Amburgh, who objected to our view of the 70 of Num. 11 typing for the Gospel Harvest the 70 pilgrims,

claiming that our view required the appointment of all of them during the first sifting hour, whereas facts prove that they were not all appointed during that hour, most of them coming later. Our reply is that we never said that they were then appointed, nor does our view indicate that they would then be appointed. Rather, the beginning of the appointment of pilgrims is shown in Num. 11: 24-30 to precede the first sifting, and nothing in the passage indicates that they were all appointed before the first sifting's hour of beginning ended; rather, as that sifting continued after that hour ended, so, as needed, the appointment of the 70 pilgrims continued with that sifting's continuance. This disposes of his objection.

(34) V. 20 indicates that the people would eat the flesh until they would have a most copious vomiting spell, in which the mouth would not be sufficient as an avenue of evacuation of the vomit, its exit crowding also through the nostrils. This verse also indicates that the food would become loathsome to them. It will be noted that the time of such vomiting would begin with the end of the 30 days, "month of days." Certainly with the No-Church-Sin-Offering's sifting, the revulsion at No-Ransomism's theories set in, evidenced by the fact that from that time onward until the reaping ceased these theories increasingly ceased to appeal to Truth and Nominal Church people. So, too, was it from the standpoint of the Gospel-Age picture. The vomiting of the theories contradictory of the Ransom began in the Reformation period, the Philadelphia period, and increasingly continued until 1846, when the sanctuary class was cleansed from the last of these No-Ransomism theories—human immortality. What a violent and great vomiting time the Reformation period was along all lines that impinged against the Ransom! This began first with Wessel's and then with Luther's repudiating works-justification, penances, indulgences, the merit of the saints applicable to believers,

transubstantiation and the mass as a sacrifice for the sins of dead and living people, intercession of saints and of the Virgin for sinners, purgatorial fires and Rome's "good works" as expiatory. It was continued by Servetus' repudiation of the trinity, the God-man and the eternal torment theories, which are contradictory to the Ransom. And it was completed by the cleansed sanctuary in 1846 repudiating human immortality. But the vomiting included other than No-Ransomism theories: it included the other main errors of the papacy, the last of such vomiting spells coming in 1869 and 1870 in connection with the infallibility of the pope. In addition to its many oral discussions the vast anti-papal literature of the Reformation shows even to this day the large scale of this vomiting spell—it came up so rapidly and in such large quantities as to require as avenues of exit both the symbolic mouth and nose.

(35) And these errors were during the Reformation period bad to the symbolic taste and smell ("until . . . it be loathsome unto you," v. 20). And certainly these theories, particularly those out of harmony with the Ransom, were bad to the spiritual scent; for these teachings were corrupt food, which emitted a foul smell, just as rotten natural food does. What foul odors came from the doctrines and practices of penances, confessions, indulgences, pilgrimages, expiations, masses, purgatorial fires, hell fires, etc.! How unappetizing, yea, revolting, to the spiritual palate were these and other more or less related teachings! Surely they became "loathsome" to those who were revived Spiritual Israelites in the Reformation period. No wonder that to escape these foul tastes and smells the Spiritual Israelites of those times and even Christendom's honest justified and unjustified ones were willing to endure all sorts of inconveniences, difficulties and sufferings to avoid their taste and odor! From this we may readily infer how great were the sins of the lusters in God's sight, if they moved God to give them up to such foul

symbolic foods. This sinfulness is exactly what v. 20 says ("ye have despised the Lord . . . have wept . . . saying, Why came we forth out of Egypt?") is the reason why God sent during these five epochs between the Harvests the strong delusions more or less connected with Anti-Ransomism. What lessons this brings to us against inappreciation and in favor of appreciation of the Truth. We should learn these.

(36) In vs. 21 and 22 Moses, thinking that as the Lord's executive toward Israel the food was likely to be provided by him, asks in general for information as to where he could get flesh to feed Israel's 600,000 footmen and their probably 1,400,000 others a whole month. He asks in particular whether he should slay all Israel's flocks and herds or whether all the fish of the Red Sea, near which they then were, should be gathered together. Moses' statement, especially as to the fish, implies that he doubted his, not God's ability to provide all of such food. Moses' asking for the pertinent information types our Lord's asking for the pertinent antitypical information; for He did not know where to get such a great amount of symbolic food to satisfy the appetites of the lusters during the Harvests and their Interim, which implies that our Lord is not omniscient. Seemingly, the flesh of the flocks and herds would represent religious truths, and the fish of the sea secular truths, which Jesus thought He might have to provide. Up to the involved antitypical time apparently our Lord did not know that God meant more or less error as the antitypical meat for the lusters. Hence also His particularizing things that represent religious and secular Truth. The slaying of the flocks and herds and the gathering of the fish would represent the preparing of such symbolic food for Israel. Moses' asking for information implies Jesus' lack of omniscience, which only the Father has. Of course our Lord did not doubt the Father's ability to provide such vast amounts of food; it was His own ability therefore that He

doubted. God's asking Moses whether God's hand was shortened, *i.e.*, whether God was limited in the exercise of His power to Moses alone as an agent (v. 23), gave Moses an intimation that God without Moses' instrumentality would see to it that His unlimited power without its usual form, Moses' executorship, would be used to arrange for meat for the lusters. Antitypically, by this question God intimates that His power was not limited to Jesus alone, His usual Arm, power Agent, but apart from Him was sufficient and would be used to arrange for the antitypical food for the antitypical lusters, and that without Jesus' instrumentality as its Agent. The following is the literal translation of the last clause of v. 23: Now shalt thou see thy experiencing [the fulfillment of] My word, though not [by thee]. The A. V. implies that Moses doubted God's power in this matter, which is not true of Moses, as the context proves, *i.e.*, his questions of vs. 21 and 22, and of course antitypically could not be true of Jesus. Antitypically, thereby God assured Jesus that without the latter's cooperation He would see the matter done by His experiencing of God's fulfilling His pertinent promise, which He would fulfill, without Jesus' instrumentality, by removing restraints from Satan's purpose to spread errors against the Ransom. Thus He would arrange permissively through Satan's agency for the antitypical lusters to receive the mental food more or less related to No-Ransomism. Let us not forget that such Divine arranging was permissive and negative, not causal and positive. It simply removed restraints from "Satan, the old deceiver," whereby the latter obtained a measure of tolerated liberty to spread anti-Ransom theories. God, the Author of Truth, in whom is no darkness (1 John 1: 5), could have had no more than a passive and non-restraining part in such a transaction. These considerations show that *morally* Jesus, the Truth, could not ("shortened," "though not") be the Agent to spread

the involved errors as suitable mental food for the antitypical lusters, whose feeder is Satan.

(37) The antitype of Moses' telling the people these things (v. 24) was performed by our Lord, not by words, but by acts, *i.e.*, He let them know by the events and food of the sifting itself that they displeased God and were by Him given up to such a terrible frenzy and feast, as the No-Ransomistic and pertinent errors were. His dealing with the 70 was positive and causal, and not negative and permissive, as was His telling the above things to the antitypical people. As we saw above, the calling of the pilgrims to positions of general eldership for the Parousia occurred throughout the reaping time almost to its end; perhaps the last of these was instated into this office at least a full year before the reaping ended, Sept. 16, 1914. Moses' gathering the elders (v. 24) seems to type Jesus' manipulating providentially the experiences of the prospective pilgrims favorably for their entering the pilgrim work. His placing them about the tabernacle types our Lord's instating the pilgrims into their office as *general elders*, "secondarily prophets," throughout the Church. The expression, "the 70 men of the elders of the people," implies typically that there were other elders of the people, and that the 70 were promoted to be the chief elders of the people by being made their general elders, the elders of all of them, not simply of a few of them; for the successors of these 70 were later called the Sanhedrin, the elders of all the people. Antitypically, this means that the pilgrims were, generally speaking, selected from among those who had already been local elders in the ecclesiastas, and were promoted to general eldership, *i.e.*, were made teachers to serve in any one of the ecclesiastas, and thus were not in their ministry limited to but one ecclesia, as local elders are. Thus they were elders of the general Church, and not simply of a local Church. In the Jewish Harvest the time order of the seventy's

call was in one respect slightly different from that of the other two applications of the antitype. The 70 were provisionally selected before even the first sifting set in; but as some of these fell out others were called to fill in their places, *e.g.*, Barnabas, Silas, Timothy, Titus, Apollos, Luke, Mark, etc. The reason for this difference is the following: the original 70 of the Jewish Harvest as a whole were used only as types of the Interim's and the Parousia's 70, while such of them as proved faithful and the faithful ones later called to take the unfaithful ones' places are not only types of the later two sets of 70, but are also the parallels of the second, the Parousia's, set of 70; and to work out the involved types, not parallel types, it was necessary that the original 70 be all called at once, while in the two sets of their antitypes, apart from the parallels, it was not to be a selection all at once, as the facts of these cases prove. That in all three applications there were in the finished picture 70 individuals we construe from the fact that as the 12 wells represent 12 individuals in the finished picture, Paul taking Judas' place, so the 70 palm trees would represent 70 individuals in the finished picture (Ex. 15: 27).

(38) The cloud in which the Lord came down (v. 25), as we saw in Chap. IX of Vol. VIII, represents the Truth as due. The Lord's coming down means God's pertinent activity through the Logos, through whom generally, though not exclusively, God revealed the Mosaic arrangements (Ex. 3: 2; Acts 7: 38, 53; Gal. 3: 19). The Lord's coming down and speaking to Moses in the cloud, therefore, types Jehovah's making plain to Jesus through the Truth as due teachings with reference to the three sets of 70, *i.e.*, those in the Harvests and in the Interim. Jehovah's taking of the spirit that was in Moses and putting it on the 70 does not mean that God lessened Moses' power by giving of that spirit, power, to the 70. Rather, it means that God gave the 70 the same kind of a power, though not the

same degree of power, as was in Moses, *i.e.*, gave them the same kind of a general oversight over Israel as Moses had, but in a less degree, without thereby decreasing Moses' authority and power in Israel, but by the distribution easing Moses' burdens, without a power and authority decrease. The antitype, as well as the type, evidently proves this view of the matter to be correct; for Jehovah by the appointment of the three antitypical sets of 70 did not decrease Jesus' power and authority, much less take any of His holy disposition from Him. What He did was to give to them an oversight similar, not equal to that of Jesus. He gave them the office of general elders, or shepherds, of whom Jesus is the Chief (1 Pet. 5: 1-4). As a part of such power were the qualifications that these three sets of 70 received, endowing them with the necessary mental, moral and religious abilities and qualities properly to discharge the functions of their office. All of this was given them as new creatures without in the least diminishing the Holy Spirit, or the holy authority and power, that Jesus had as Chief Elder or Shepherd in the Church. They did not and do not share His office; they simply shared and share His burdens in the ministry to the General Church, real and nominal (v. 17; Mic. 5: 4-6).

(39) Nor does this imply that all shared equally the Lord Jesus' burdens. In the Jewish Harvest some of the 70 labored more abundantly, widely and fruitfully than others. Among such were Apollos, Timothy and Silas, who certainly were used more by the Lord than Titus or Judas (Acts 15: 22, 32). Most of us know by experience and observation that the Parousia 70 did not all share equally in the service, e.g., Bros. Benjamin Barton and John Edgar served more fruitfully than most other pilgrims. And certainly there was a difference among the 70 of the period between the Harvests. The 35 star members of that period served better than their 35 companion helpers; and among

these 35 star-members the principal man of each of the five Interim Churches (Mic. 5: 5) did a more responsible work than any of the other star members of his respective star. Again, among those who were not their five principal men some served more fruitfully than others. Certainly Luther, Zwingli and Wesley served more fruitfully than Browne, Fox or Stone. And among the 35 companion helpers there were differences in use and fruitfulness. Melanchthon, Oecolampadius and Charles Wesley, the respective companion helpers of Luther, Zwingli and John Wesley, served more widely and fruitfully than Harrison, Barclay and Thomas Campbell, the respective companion helpers of Browne, Fox and Stone. The 35 star members, and more especially the five principal men, in the Interim Churches were the special mouth, eye and hand of the Lord for their time and service, things in which their companion helpers did not share.

(40) That the Lord gave them the position of general elders in the real Church is typed by Moses' placing the 70 around about the tabernacle (v. 24). That He made them general elders for the Church nominal is evident from the things set forth in vs. 17, 30: "they shall bear the burden of the people with thee," and "Moses gat him into the camp, he and the elders of Israel"; for, additionally to serving the real Church as typed by the last part of v. 24, these passages show that Moses and the 70 had a ministry toward the people as a whole, which types that the ministry of Jesus and the 70 was also that of a general eldership to the nominal people of God. For the finished picture, the statement of v. 25: "*they prophesied, and did not cease,*" is especially significant. It shows that there would be 70 who would be faithful in each of the three sets of 70. This would not mean for the two Harvests that all who were ever nominated for the 70 would be faithful unto death; for the fact that in the Jewish Harvest some became of its ultimate 70 who were not called until long

after Pentecost, *e.g.*, Timothy, Apollos, Luke, Titus, etc., while 70 were nominated to the office before Pentecost, proves that some of the original 70 lost their positions and others were later installed into their office. Again, not only the fact that there were more than 70 who were pilgrims during the Parousia, but also the fact that some of these, *e.g.*, as Ransom and Church-Sin-offering deniers, dropped out of the Little Flock and thus lost their office among the 70, proves that not all of the pilgrims, as distinct from auxiliary pilgrims, were in the finished picture of the Parousia 70. But the statement, "and did not cease," proves that in the finished picture there would be 70 in each of the Harvests who would prove true. This proves that in each Harvest more than 70 held the office designated by the words, "secondarily prophets," though ultimately only 70 in each Harvest held the office to the end faithfully. But the facts prove that none of those nominated as the 70 of the Interim lost his place, but continued therein unto the end. If the history of the brothers that we named (most of the 35 and their companion helpers) above be examined, it will be found that every one of them was faithful, and this is likewise true of the rest of them; for none of these 70 had his place taken by another, but all of them continued therein unto death.

(41) In vs. 26-29 a very interesting episode is introduced, that of the anointing of Eldad and Medad while they were in the camp, where they prophesied before coming up to the tabernacle to Moses and the 70, and that of an effort made to stop them, which Moses' magnanimity foiled. The camp representing the nominal people of God, the anointing of Eldad (*beloved by God*) and Medad (*Loving*) in the camp, and not at the tabernacle, types the fact that their threefold antitypes would not yet be mingling among the real people of God, but among the nominal people of God, when their choice and anointing as of the general elders would

have taken place, and that only after their anointing and prophesying for a while would they come to, and mingle among the real people of God. In *The Present Truth*, No. 1, we pointed out the Parousia Eldad and Medad; and in sufficient details we pointed out the latter's anointing for general eldership before he came to study the Parousia literature or mingle among the Parousia Church; so we need say no more here on the subject than to point out how Bro. Russell was anointed before he came among the brethren of the cleansed sanctuary. His anointing was a longer-drawn-out affair than that of the Parousia Medad, which lasted about 2½ months before he began to prophesy in the camp for a few months, while that of the Parousia Eldad lasted about two years before he began to prophesy in the camp. The explanation that we will give further on of how Bro. Russell got the Truth from about the Fall of 1870 to that of 1874 will in reality be an explanation of his anointing while in the camp. The last part of that anointing occurred in Oct., 1874, when the Lord clarified to him the manner of our Lord's return. But before it was completed he began to prophesy in the camp—among the nominal people of God, first orally, then by his tract on, *The Object And Manner of Our Lord's Return*, which he published in 1875, while it was in 1876 that he as antitypical Eldad came up to the antitypical Tabernacle—the cleansed sanctuary. Thus the latter's pertinent anointing and prophesying in the camp were much longer drawn out than those of the former. Bro. Russell's whole course as a pilgrim proves that he was Eldad, beloved by God for his loyalty.

(42) But who were the Eldad and Medad of the Jewish Harvest? We understand they were Paul and Apollos. Paul was converted before he came in among the real people of God (*Acts 9: 1-6*); and Jesus' statement (*Acts 9: 11, 12*) that Paul was praying and that he was by God granted a second vision imply, in

connection with his zealous and frank character, both his anointing and prophesying in the camp; for how after such experiences stated in vs. 3-12 could he with his zeal and candor have kept from telling of the Lord Jesus' dealings with him? His coming up to the antitypical Tabernacle is shown in vs. 17-19. His whole life proves that he was beloved by God—Eldad. Apollos' anointing in the camp is expressly implied in his preaching while yet among Nominal Israel; and it directly proves his prophesying in the camp (Acts 18: 24-26), as vs. 26-28 prove his afterward coming up to the antitypical Tabernacle, *i.e.*, coming among the real people of God. And his being a loving brother (Medad—*loving*) is evidenced not only by Acts 18: 24-28, but by his subsequent ministry, for in spirit, word and work, he was doubtless St. Paul's most efficient helper, according to the references made to him in the epistles. Indeed, he was so proficient and efficient that against his will some of the carnally weak brethren placed him sectarianly above Paul as a servant of the Truth (1 Cor. 1: 12, 13; 3: 3-9, 22, 23). Both of these worthy brothers were without envy of one another, in spite of the sectarianism of some dividing them as between these, Apollos always regarding Paul as his superior in the Lord; and Paul's attitude toward Apollos is beautifully set forth in 1 Cor. 4: 1-15, where he couples Apollos with himself in describing their joint services of the Corinthian brethren. See also in 1 Cor. 3: 4-10 a testimony pointing out their similar and different services. St. Paul's subsequent references to Apollos are all complimentary and show their oneness of spirit (1 Cor. 16: 12; Tit. 3: 13), as is shown in 1 Cor. 3: 8.

(43) Who were the Eldad and Medad of the Interim—the time between the two Harvests? John, the Apostle, was its Eldad; and John Wessel, the principal man of the Philadelphia Church, was its Medad. A number of facts prove of John that he was the Eldad of the period between the Harvests: (1) His separation

to, and empowerment with, the apostolate before Pentecost, before he could have been brought to the Church, is in line with this thought (Matt. 10: 1, 5-8; Mark 3: 13-15; Luke 6: 12, 13; 9: 1, 2). While this consideration would no more prove that John was the Eldad of the Interim than it would that any other Apostle was, it proves of him that he, as well as they, received the anointing before they came up to the Tabernacle, since there was no antitypical Tabernacle as yet. But the following reasons, connected with the one just given, do prove it: (2) He was the only Apostle, so far as we know, who lived after 70 A. D., *i.e.*, who lived during the Interim. (3) As an Apostle, of course, he, like the two Harvests' Eldads, of necessity was the most important man of his special period, the Interim. (4) His writings, as inspired and as especially fundamental for the Smyrna and Pergamos periods; all produced after 70 A. D., prove him to be the principal man of the Smyrna period. (5) He was the beloved disciple, a title given in his writings, which prove him to be beloved of God (*Eldad*). (6) The extra-Biblical accounts of him, handed down to us, like his conflicts with Cerinthus and other Gnostics, are in line with this thought. (7) His Biblical writings are not only a protest against the main errors of the entire Gospel Age and an inculcation of truths pertinent to the entire Gospel Age, but in the book of Revelation a history of the Church in its relations to itself and its conflicts with the world is given, which proves him to be the chief teacher of the Interim, hence its Eldad. Of course, it is self-evident that John, as the only Apostle living in the Interim, would be its Eldad. Hence we may be confident that we stand on Truth grounds when we hold him to be the Interim's Eldad.

(44) While the evidence is not so strong that John Wessel is the Medad of the Interim, it is still strong enough for an intelligent faith, for: (1) Undoubtedly, next to St. John, John Wessel was used by the Lord to

give the most important truths of the Interim, the foundation truths of the Philadelphia Church: (a) The Bible is the sole source and rule of faith and practice; (b) Jesus is the sole Head of the Church; (c) Justification is by faith alone; (d) Only the truly consecrated, and all of them, are priests of God; (e) The bread and wine in the Lord's Supper symbolize the humanity and life of the Christ, Head and Body, given up unto death for the world; (f) Future probation awaits the non-elect world of mankind; and (g) Joint-heirship in the Kingdom with Christ is the hope of the Church. (2) He was the principal man of the most important epoch of the Interim, the Philadelphia Church. (3) His character was of a most loving (*Medad*) and humble kind. (4) He was one of the ablest scholars and most accurate reasoners of all the star members of the Interim. (5) His ability at harmonizing apparent contradictions in the Bible was so superior to that of others as to make his contemporaries call him the master of contradictions, and his intimates call him the light of the world. (6) His great humility, e.g., it was so great that when Pope Sixtus IV, who had been a pupil of his, and who invited him as his teacher to visit him at the Vatican, offered to give him anything that he desired, he asked for a manuscript of the Hebrew Old Testament and of the Greek New Testament and persisted in his request to the pope's disgust, who urged him to ask to be made a cardinal, as the greatest gift within the pope's power to bestow, but he could not persuade him to accept even an ordination to the priesthood. (7) His ministry through his Writings, preachings, teachings and conversations fully measure up to those to be expected of an antitypical Medad. Luther, who did not become acquainted with his writings until after he, himself, had become world-renowned as a reformer, remarked that had he read Wessel's writings before he became a reformer, so much was he (Wessel) like him (Luther) in spirit, that the world would have

said that he had gotten his views from Wessel. Luther was the first one to publish a miscellany of Wessel's writings, from which he excluded Wessel's treatise on the Lord's Supper, because it rejected not only transubstantiation, which Luther also rejected, but also instrumentalization, which Luther accepted, and all other forms of the so-called real presence in the Lord's Supper. It was before Wessel came among the real people of God and while he was yet a professor in the Heidelberg University that he received his share in the anointing, preached in the antitypical camp, and later came among the real people of God in the Netherlands, to which he fled from the persecuting Inquisition at Heidelberg.

(45) From the fact that the 70 prophets that Jesus sent out were different men altogether from the 12 Apostles (Luke 10: 1), and from the fact that Sts. Paul and John, two of the three Eldads, were of the Twelve, we are not to infer that they are in the antitypes to be considered among the Jewish Harvest's and the Interim's 70. In the type there were only 70 elders taken, Eldad and Medad being two of the 70 typical elders (vs. 16, 24-26). These did not number 72, as Jewish and Romanist writers varyingly claim, the former calling these the Sanhedrin, of which they claim Moses and Aaron were *ex-officio* members, and of which Israel's high priests were always members; and the latter calling them the college of cardinals, which, when full, numbers 72. But we are to understand that in the Jewish Harvest, beside St. Paul, and in the interim, beside St. John, there were 70 "secondarily prophets," respectively. But from this fact we are not to infer that in addition to Bro. Russell as a pilgrim there were 70 other pilgrims in the finished picture of the Gospel Harvest 70; for as a pilgrim he was the antitype of Eldad and one of the 70, but was not as Eldad that Servant. Bro. Russell, *as that Servant* (antitypical Eleazar), was the parallel of the 12 Apostles

and not of St. Paul alone, and therefore as that Servant is not paralleled with St. Paul as an antitypical Eldad, nor did he as such correspond with St. John as an antitypical Eldad. From the fact that the 70 were sent out by twos (Luke 10: 1), and from the fact that Sts. Paul and John as antitypical Eldads of their special times did not belong to the respective 70 of their pertinent times, we infer that they did not have companion helpers, else there would have been 71 secondarily prophets among these respective prophets.

(46) The fact that Bro. Russell, as one person, functioned as that Servant and also as one of the 70 pilgrims ("secondarily prophets") effected it that in the Gospel Harvest it was not necessary to have 70 pilgrims beside Bro. Russell, as was the case in the Jewish Harvest beside St. Paul and in the Interim beside St. John. However, we do not arrive at these conclusions as Jewish and Romanist writers do theirs on 72 sanhedrists and cardinals; for they have known nothing about the threefold antitypes of the 70 and the relations of the three antitypical Eldads to these. The silence of the Scriptures on Moses and Aaron being of the 70, the fact that the 70 were chosen to be Moses' assistants and not members of a body with him as a member, and the fact that Joshua, as *Moses' successor*, was mentioned as separate and distinct from the 70 elders (Jud. 2: 7), sufficiently disprove the Jewish and Romanist view. Their use of v. 25 ("set the 70 about the tabernacle") as a proof that Eldad and Medad were two beside the 70, is refuted by the following considerations: (1) In the finished picture Eldad and Medad were later set there; (2) God expressly limited the number to 70 (v. 16); (3) In the first of the antitypes the Bible proves that there were only 70 "secondarily prophets" (Luke 10: 1); (4) In the Interim antitype facts prove that there were only 70 "secondarily prophets"; (5) While in every case we cannot yet point out the 70 "secondarily prophets" of the Gospel Harvest as

exclusive of auxiliary pilgrims, we believe that this will yet be the case; (6) The fact that in the Millennium there will be 70 elders as distinct from the two spiritual classes and the Millennial Eleazars and Ithamars (Ex. 24: 1, 9) is in line with this fact, as well as the 70 palm trees as separate from the 12 wells of Ex. 15: 27; and (7) The number 70 in vs. 24, 25, can well be regarded as referring to the official body of elders as a whole without necessarily meaning every member of it, even as St. Paul says that Jesus appeared to the official body, as of the 12, but 11 were present (1 Cor. 15: 5).

(47) Vs. 27-29 give us an interesting episode full of human nature and of Divinely wrought magnanimity. The young man that ran to Moses with the intelligence of Eldad's and Medad's prophesying in the camp would have made a first-rate reporter of a modern newspaper in his quick news-gathering, reporting activity and gossipy eagerness. Joshua's busybodying and envy are characteristic of young, aspiring and advancing leaders, while Moses' magnanimity manifests the beauty, nobility and graciousness of the godly character in a Divinely pleasing and mature leader. These three find their antitypes in the three applications of the type being made in this chapter. In the Jewish Harvest's application the antitype is more clearly seen in the case of Paul than in that of Apollos. By what is written in, and by what the type warrants us to read between, the lines of Acts 9: 19-27, we can discern that some of the brethren were quick to spread the news of his preaching to the Jews, and that not only the fear of all actually mentioned, but the busybodying and envy of others can readily be imagined as most natural under the circumstances. Our Lord's beautiful, noble and gracious answer given providentially through His blessing St. Paul's concurrent ministry and verbally through Barnabas' and the Apostles' noble reception of him, is full of Jesus' spirit of magnanimity. In the sectarian partisanship of some Ephesian and Corinthian brethren we are

doubtless to look for the news gathering and spreading of some and the busybodying of others; and in St. Paul's inspired magnanimous discussion of the pertinent situation at Corinth we are to recognize Jesus' pertinent magnanimity as typed by that of Moses (1 Cor. 1: 11-13; 3: 1-4: 21). In the case of St. John as the Interim's Eldad, as we found his pertinent anointing and prophesying to have occurred between Jordan and Pentecost, we are to see the antitype of vs. 27-29 in the same period. We are warranted in believing that the news gatherer and spreader were some gossipy half-disciples of Jesus who brought to Him and to the antitypical Joshua of that time the news of John's preaching on the tour referred to in Matt. 10: 1-4, and described in Luke 9: 1-6, 10. Who was the antitypical Joshua of the St. John antitype? If we remember that until the vail of the temple was rent in twain from top to bottom at Jesus' death (Matt. 27: 51) in symbolization of the end of the Divine sanction on the Mosaic priesthood, temple service and 70 elders as sitting in Moses' seat, and that up to that time the scribes and Pharisees did sit in Moses' seat, unto whom Jesus commanded obedience as such (Matt. 23: 2, 3), we will find in them the Joshua that, among other disciples, busied and envied against the Interim Eldad; for repeatedly did they do this against the 12, thus against John.

(48) Jesus' magnanimity thereat, in wishing all the Lord's people to be prophets, showed itself not only in defending the disciples and thus John, but in sending out 70 others (Luke 10: 1-6) and in commissioning the entire Church to herald the Gospel (Matt. 28: 18-20). Moreover, the question, "Enviest thou for my sake?" is at the same time an accusation of the guilt of envy in each pertinent antitypical Joshua, which the above illustrations abundantly confirm. The antitypical lad that was the gossipy news gatherer and spreader was the Inquisition at Heidelberg, which, while he was a

professor at the Heidelberg University, late in 1478 began to collect evidence against John Wessel as a heretic and moved to apprehend him. Learning of this in time, he wrote to Bishop David, of Utrecht, Holland, asking for refuge and defense from him against the Inquisition, who, as a pupil of Wessel, heartily granted his request. This estopped the bloody plan of the Heidelberg Inquisition, which could function in a diocese only at its bishop's sanction. Wessel, early in April, 1479, escaped in secret from Heidelberg, spending the rest of his life in Holland. Learning of his escape, the Inquisition reported the matter to the Romanist clergy, who sat in Christ's seat until 1878, and thus was for Wessel the busybodying and envious Joshua; but by emphasizing, first through Wessel and then through the other Reformers, etc., the priesthood of all the consecrated, as one of the four chief doctrines of the Reformation (1 Pet. 2: 5, 9), and, secondly, in rebuking the clergy's envy, Jesus gave His answer antitypical of that of Moses. The Gospel-Harvest's Eldad began to prophesy in the camp at the earliest as early as Oct., 1872; and at the latest as late as in 1876. Especially on account of the circulation of his tract on, The Object and Manner of our Lord's Return, gossipy laymen (the lad) reported this to the envious clergy (Joshua), who, sitting in Christ's seat until April, 1878, sought to secure the Lord's stopping of his pertinent activity. Frequently, this envy was by our Lord rebuked and His magnanimity was evidenced not only by continuing and increasing the ministry of the Gospel Harvest's Eldad, but by emphasizing through one of the Truth's teachings the priesthood of all the consecrated and sending all of these into the Harvest work, and by making as many of them as possible orators (prophets) proclaiming in discourses the Lord's gracious Harvest Message.

(49) Before the Gospel Harvest's Medad had begun to study the Dawns and while he was yet a minister in

the Lutheran Church, he began, in the Spring of 1903, to proclaim some of the truths that he had received in his anointing. This fact and his expulsion from his pulpit for such preaching was given wide publicity in the American press all over the U.S. His resuming his public preaching just five weeks later than this expulsion and that at the vote of the Columbus, Ohio, Ecclesia, was again given wide newspaper publicity. This and some member of the Columbus Ecclesia reporting such activity to the Allegheny Bible House, while Bro. Russell was absent on an European pilgrim trip, occasioned some of the responsible brethren there to write a rebuking letter to the Columbus Ecclesia, asking them to discontinue encouraging and cooperating with such a novice in such a work. Thus the Associated Press and at least one member of the Columbus, Ohio, Ecclesia proved to be the Gospel-Harvest's gossip lad for its Medad; and some of the leading brethren at the Bible House who in Bro. Russell's absence represented him, the special one that sat in Christ's seat, proved to be the Joshua for the Gospel-Harvest's Medad. Jesus rebuked this Joshua's busybodying and envy through emboldening the Columbus Ecclesia to refuse to follow the advice of that Joshua, and not only in continuing this Medad in unofficial pilgrim service right along, but in bringing him into the official pilgrim service just a year to a day (May 1, 1904) from the day he renounced the Lutheran Church, May 1, 1903. Moreover, that year witnessed a large increase in the Harvest workers, who from that time forward ever continued to increase until the climax of the reaping work was reached in 1914. Thus our Lord rebuked the Gospel Harvest's Joshua as to its Medad and showed His magnanimity antitypical of that of Moses' expressed in v. 29.

(50) The statement of v. 30 is certainly remarkable as a terse type of events of large antitypical application. Such betaking of themselves, on the part of Jesus

and the 70, into the camp of the Jewish Harvest occurred in the work toward the public throughout the Jewish Harvest: Jesus doing His part therein in His personal ministry and in that of the 12 Apostles from Jordan onward, and the 70 doing their part in their ministry beginning from the time of Luke 10: 1-6, 9, such ministry lasting until 69 A.D. The records of part of these ministries are in part given in the New Testament. The antitype of v. 30 for the Interim occurred in the public activities of Jesus in all His real people of that period and in the public activities of the 35 star members and in those of their companion helpers; and this was by far a larger work than that done in the Jewish Harvest; for it covered all the public work of the five Interim Churches, which combined did a much larger work than the other two Churches did, though in proportion to the 80 years allotted to the reaping work of these two Churches and the 1805 years allotted to the work of the other five Churches, the latter did much less than the former. The antitype of v. 30 for the Gospel Harvest showed itself in the reaping done from 1874 to 1914. During those 40 years there was a larger and more fruitful public work done by Jesus acting in all the Parousia Priesthood and by the 70 pilgrims than was ever done during any other 40 years of the Gospel Age. When we consider the number of the workers and of the agencies therein employed and the numbers reached and helped thereby, we believe the truthfulness of this statement will be manifest to all. There were over 75,000 different consecrated people who took part in this work, over 2,500 of whom were public speakers. In all, perhaps 10,000 persons took part in the colporteur and sharp-shooting work. In all, probably 65,000 took part, more or less, in the volunteer work. In all, between 4,000 and 5,000 newspapers published Bro. Russell's sermons and reports of Pilgrim talks. In the conversational part of the work not only the 75,000 above-mentioned persons

shared, but many thousands of other interested persons. Thousands shared in the newspaper, photodrama and correspondence work; other thousands in the Tower and Dawn circulating, the follow-up work and the public meeting advertising work. All of this was the antitype of Moses' and the elders' going into the camp (v. 30).

(51) Foregoing we have studied the preliminaries of the Gospel-Age No-Ransomism sifting, whose description proper comes in vs. 31-35. This we will now briefly study in its chief aspects, and that comparatively. The wind spoken of in v. 31 represents a controversy-a verbal war resulting from the Truth proclamation going forth and Satan setting up opposition to it. It can therefore be appropriately spoken of as coming from the Lord. As a result of, and amid this controversy, the Lord removed the barriers that hitherto prevented Satan from presenting anti-Ransom theories (the quails) among the Lord's people, real and nominal. We saw in Chap. II of Vol. V what forms these antitypical quails took in the No-Ransomism of the Gospel Harvest. In the Jewish Harvest they assumed the betraying forms of Judas' activities, the murderous and doctrinal forms of the Jewish clergy, the crucifixion forms of the Romans and the philosophical forms of the Greeks. A little later on we will describe those of the Interim's No-Ransomism. The very great numbers of the quails (within and about 15 miles on each side of the camp) type the very numerous forms of No-Ransomism during all three pertinent periods. Their flying only two cubits above the earth [the rendering of *al* (v. 31) should here be *above*, not *upon*, as in the A. V.] types the easy reach within which these No-Ransom theories would come to the people. These No-Ransom theories affected the consecrated, the justified and the unjustified of God's people in all three applications of the sifting; and even those beyond the camp. As in the two Harvests, so in

the Interim, beginning in the Smyrna period, some of these theories were a direct straightforward denial that we are bought by the precious blood of Christ; for some of both Jewish and Gentile consecrated, justified and unjustified professors of Christianity ("the people stood up, etc.,"—v. 32) directly renounced the Ransom, denying totally that Jesus' humanity and life were a purchase price, a substitute, for Adam and his race. Then, too, this was done indirectly, *i.e.*, while professing to hold to the Ransom, doctrines that logically contradict it were set forth as Scriptural teachings and were very widely received by consecrated justified and unjustified professors of Christianity. Then, too, systems of doctrines almost totally alien and throughout contradictory to the Ransom were set up as the real teachings of Christ and were received by multitudes of consecrated, justified and unjustified professors of Christianity. As the following four Interim periods came successively, errors as against the Ransom grew more and more. What such were we need not give here, as a long list of them was given above in its proper place.

(52) We will now give a few details on some of these No-Ransom doctrines and movements. No-Ransomism as a direct denial that we are bought with the precious blood of Christ arose, first of all, among many Jewish Christians who were called Elkesaites, and who not only directly denied the purchase of all by Christ's sacrifice, but who looked upon Jesus as a sinner, descendent through both Joseph and Mary from Adam and making great endeavors to overcome His sinfulness, whereby He furnished an example to all on overcoming. They became in their later representatives doubtful if He was the Messiah, even in their diluted sense of the word. Finally, they insisted on the obligatoriness of the Law upon all who would be saved. Thus they ceased to be Christians at all. Another group of Jewish Christians, called the Ebionites, the poor,

the pious, indirectly denied the Ransom, *i.e.*, while they continued to believe that Jesus was the Messiah and as such was the Son of God as well as the Son of man, they nevertheless held the thought that to be saved a Jew must keep the Law of Moses. Again, not a few of Gentile professed Christians from various heathen philosophical standpoints, especially that of Neo-platonism, directly denied the Ransom—as "to the Greeks, foolishness." Then, consecrated, justified and unjustified professed Christians introduced and accepted during this period the three chief anti-Ransom doctrines of professed Orthodoxy: trinity, human immortality and eternal torment—all of which logically deny the Ransom. Justin Martyr, a Platonic philosopher converted to Christianity, seems first to have introduced from his Platonism into Christianity the ideas of human immortality and eternal torment and the first tendencies toward the trinity. Later in the Smyrna period these errors were deepened and broadened, and in the following four Church epochs were elaborated into various details and embellished by concordant errors, like purgatory, mass, etc. Origenes gave the first clear impetus to the trinity in that he taught the God-man theory as implying the eternal generation of the Logos. Dionesius of Rome, 267 A.D. (a pope), invented the theory of the Son's consubstantiality with the Father, and Athanasius of Alexandria, that of the Son's equality with the Father. During the Smyrna period some began to stress the Holy Spirit as a third person in God, though the doctrine was not officially proclaimed until at the Constantinople Council in 381, *i.e.*, in the Pergamos period. As the Interim wore on more and more were these three and other related anti-Ransom doctrines elaborated and embellished, until they received their completion during the Philadelphia period.

(53) Early during the Smyrna period, Gnosticism and, somewhat later in this period, Manichaeism, a

child of Gnosticism, as anti-Ransom theories, prevailed. These in the early Interim played a part similar to Evolutionism in the Gospel Harvest, though they did not continue to the end of the Interim as did Evolutionism as to the Gospel Harvest. Gnosticism is a compound of the heathen doctrines of India, Persia, Egypt, Greece and Rome, of Jewish and of Christian ideas. It taught that the supreme God was unknown and unknowable, that He caused to emanate from Himself good qualities that developed into personal spirit beings, of whom there were thirty, and whom they called *Aeons*. Christ, they claimed, was one of the highest of these. Yet, lower than these was one who was not a pure spirit, but who was what they called soulical also, and who was the so-called *Demiurg*, whom Gnostics identified with the Jehovah of the Old Testament, the Creator of the heavens and earth. This *Demiurg*, they say, made the mistake of creating the universe out of matter which, according to them, is essentially evil. He further made the mistake of taking some of the light substance or spirit and uniting it with earth matter, from which he made man. According to Gnosticism, both spirit and matter are from eternity, and thus they taught the eternal existence of good and evil. *Demiurg's* mistake they taught resulted in the necessity of delivering the spirits from their natural bodies, which Gnosticism undertakes to do by its science (*gnosis*, Greek for science), so called (1 Tim. 6: 20), and asceticism. They claim that humans are of three kinds: spiritual, soulical and fleshly. For the latter there is no hope; hence they must be annihilated. For the soulical (psychical) there is a partial hope—they may attain a position just outside of the *pleroma* (literally, *fullness*) which is the abode of the Supreme God and the 30 Aeons, while the pneumatics (*spirituals*), who alone are capable of real *gnosis*, will be admitted into the *pleroma*. The great task, then, is to overcome matter—the body. In addition to the help

that they got from *gnosis*, they got rid of matter by avoiding, as far as possible, all contacts with it, *i.e.*, mortified it by celibate lives and abstinence from meats, wines, coarser foods, and by partaking of the finer vegetables and vegetable oils only, though some of the Gnostics claimed that the best way to mortify the flesh was to indulge in all its propensities until one was utterly disgusted with it and would have no more of it. Thus they indulged in the worst debauchery, gluttony, drunkenness, etc. There were many sects among them; and almost everywhere there was a Gnostic Church alongside of a Christian Church.

(54) Their doctrine of salvation was therefore one of works and of necessity denied the Ransom, for which such a system could have no use. Their doctrine of Christ and Jesus was a peculiar one and was subversive of the Ransom. With their soulical *Demiurg gnosis* was impossible, so he, thinking himself to be the Supreme God, thought out a way of helping Israel, who also were only soulical. They taught a heavenly Christ, one of the highest Aeons, and a heavenly Jesus, who was not so high as an Aeon. They also taught an earthly Christ and an earthly Jesus, who was the one born of Mary. At Jesus' baptism the heavenly Jesus united Himself with the earthly Jesus, whereby arose Jesus Christ, who was to be the Savior of the pneumatical (spiritual), as well as the psychical (soulical) among men. But since matter is the seat of evil, they taught that Jesus actually did not assume a real body, but a make-believe body. Nor did He really die; for they taught that the heavenly Jesus forsook the earthly Jesus as He came to the cross, and that it was only a make-believe body that was nailed to the cross, and that its death was only a make-believe death. Jesus Christ, therefore, is not a Ransomer, but a teacher who reveals *gnosis* to the pneumatical as the power of salvation, and is an example to them in the way of asceticism, whereby they will be saved. *Demiurg*, and not

so much Jesus Christ, does his best to save the psychical (soulical) and brings the obedient of them to the frontiers of the *pleroma*, where he also must remain with them. This is the scheme of salvation according to Gnosticism, which was an extreme danger to the Smyrna Church; and it took the strong efforts of Irenaeus, a star member of the Smyrna Church, of Tertullian, his companion helper, and of Hippolytus, a very learned Christian scholar, through voice and pen, with the cooperation of many others, to destroy its influence in the Christian Church. During the third century under these hard blows it died a deserved death, and was resuscitated in Manichaeism, which in the fifth century was destroyed, especially through Augustine's mighty arguments; but, of course, other forms of No-Ransomism arose, not the least of which was Mohammedanism, which appeared in the Pergamos period.

(55) The arising of the people (v. 32) represents their antitypes in the three applications turning their eager and responsive attention to No-Ransomistic theories. Their gathering the quails for 36 hours (all that day, all that night and all the next day), 36 being the product of six multiplied by itself, types the utter, the complete evil of the No-Ransomistic course of their antitypes while it lasted. Certainly, the great evil of the No-Ransomers in all three applications is evident from the facts of the case, even if we had not the time duration of 36 hours in the type to suggest it. The people's gathering the quails types in all three applications their collecting the No-Ransomistic theories and arguments, *i.e.*, giving their mental efforts to a grasping and alleged proving of these theories. This doubtless required much time and mental effort, *e.g.*, the mastery of the philosophical theories of the Greeks in their anti-Ransomistic aspects, or of the theories of the Jewish scribes, in the Jewish Harvest, must have taken considerable of zealous effort and mental strength. The same is true of the various No-Ransomistic theories set

aflloat during the Gospel Harvest, like its various universalistic, infidelistic, evolutionistic and materialistic theories, and other No-Ransomistic theories, like Christian Science, New Thought, Unity, Spiritism, Hindooism, etc., to all of which various and large numbers gave much eager and careful study. The same is true of the people's study of the Interim's Hebraistic, Gnostic, Manichaeistic, Neo-platonistic, Greco-Romanistic, Mohammedanistic, Unitario-Universalistic No-Ransomistic theories. The least gathering ten homers, 860 gallons, is symbolic. The Hebrew homer was their largest dry and liquid measure; the number 10 is that of full human and spiritual (not Divine) capacity. The thought is that the No-Ransomers gathered as many No-Ransomistic theories and as much of each of them as human and demonic ingenuity could invent pertinent to the three applications under study. Especially is this true of the Interim's and the Gospel Harvest's No-Ransomistic theories, as can be seen from a consideration of their chief forms given above. The people's spreading the quails, (v. 32) all abroad round about the camp types the vast widespread and thorough propaganda work in favor of No-Ransomism, whereby they sought to entrap everybody in the antitypical camp in each of the three applications. Their doing this for themselves (v. 32) types the selfishness and self-seeking of the No-Ransomers.

(56) The fact that before the flesh was bitten, while it was yet between the people's teeth, the Lord's wrath expressed itself by a plague, types the fact that before the No-Ransomistic theories were masticated the Lord's wrath gave up the antitypical people of all three applications to the loss of the Truth and its spirit and to the evil mind and heart characteristic of No-Ransomism (a very great plague). As a literal plague effects bodily pains and wastings and bad feelings in the natural heart and faulty reasoning and flighty imaginations in the natural mind, so God uses plagues to

symbolize the sorrows and the loss of the Truth and its spirit and the evil mental and heart conditions that arise in sifters and siftlings. Just as plague-stricken people are in pain and waste away in their bodies and imagine, think and utter the most nonsensical and illogical thoughts, so do plague-stricken sifters and siftlings experience serious loss of the Truth and its spirit and imagine and think the most foolish and nonsensical things. How manifest this is as to the nonsensical and illogical thoughts of such sifters and siftlings in all three applications of this No-Ransomism type, the mere mention of the above systems of error pertinent to their respective applications would suggest to us. *E.g.*, what we said on Gnosticism above certainly shows the wild and flighty imaginations and foolish and illogical reasonings of the Gnostic sifters and siftlings; and what we said on the matters of their conduct proves the sorrows and loss of the Truth and its spirit and the bad heart condition to which Gnosticism as a symbolic plague led its votaries. Doubtless most of us have had contacts with Gospel-Harvest No-Ransomism sifters and siftlings and from them have recognized their sorrows, loss of the Truth and its spirit and imaginative and reasoning aberrations. And those who have had much personal contact with them know something of their blasphemous sentiments, their ungrateful and inappreciative hearts, their treasonable conduct and their self-centered designs. While 2 Tim. 3: 1-9 describes all five classes of the respective Parousia and Epiphany sifters, the worst of these in head and heart are the No-Ransomism sifters. The unholy head and heart qualities that St. Paul in this Scripture ascribes to them not only describe them accurately as sifters in head and heart, but give us an accurate description of the antitypical five plagues, in all of which more or less of these evil head and heart qualities appear. How unutterably terrible is such an antitypical plague: self-lovers, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers,

unpersuaded as their parents, unthankful, unholy, unnaturally affectioned, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, harsh, unappreciative, traitors, heady, high minded, pleasure-lovers, hypocritical, formalists, cunning, fruitlessly studious, Truth-opponents, corrupt in their minds, Truth-repudiators and Truth-repudiated teachers of folly, and publicly exposed errorists! "O my soul, come thou not into their secret; unto their assembly, my honor, be thou not united" (Gen. 49: 6). Truly, "He gave them the desire of their hearts, but sent leanness into their soul" (Ps. 106: 15).

(57) The calling of the place where they buried the lusts *Kibroth-hattaavah* (*graves of the lust*) types naming the condition into which the antitypical lusts were mentally put by those who overcame the sifting and its plaguesome mind and heart. That condition was a grave to the standing that the lusts once had before the Lord. Some of them died as crown-retainers and were symbolically buried in the condition of crown-losers. Some of the latter died as crown-losers and were symbolically buried in the Second Death condition. Some of the sifters and siftlings (in the Gospel Harvest) died as Youthful Worthies and were buried in the tentatively justified condition. Some of them died as tentatively justified and were buried in the antitypical camp conditions. And some of the campers died as such and were buried in the condition of the heathen world. Yea, so was antitypical Kibroth-hattaavah in all three applications. The process of symbolically burying such was to the survivors a most painful thing, even as the surviving relatives, particularly the family relatives, in the earthly relations mourn at the death and funeral of their earthly relations. By experience many of us know of these sorrows. But, as indicated in Lev. 10: 6, 7, this mourning in the Priesthood should not take on the forms antitypically forbidden: (1) uncovering the heads—Jesus

must not therein cast off God's headship and the Church therein must not cast off Jesus' headship; (2) rending the garments—Jesus and the Church therein must not do injury to their official powers and spiritual graces; and (3) leaving the Tabernacle—Jesus and the Church therein must not give up their Priestly service and follow the castaways in their evil course. The end of the antitypical lustng experience is typed by the people's journeying away from Kibroth-hattaavah; and the progress of their journey onward to Hazereth represents progress in grace, knowledge and service, preparatory for the trying experiences typed by their abiding at Hazereth, which, as our study of Num. 12 will show, types the trialsome experiences of the Lord's people with sectarianism, large and small—*Hazereth (villages)* typing such, since many villages combined make a city, a sectarian religious government, and each one separately a small sect.

(58) We have now finished our study of Num. 11. By this study we have learned, among other things, that God in the Biblical types has, among other things, given us a prophetic forecast of matters of Church history. Further typical studies will show us that God in the types has given us a complete history of the true Church, of the nominal Church and of their varied contacts with one another and with other institutions in the world. For the most part, Church history as set forth by Church historians traces the history of the nominal Church and gives us relatively little of that of the true Church. But when we understand the Church historical types, we learn to look for events in Church history that touch on the real, as well as the nominal Church; and thus we get an accurate understanding of the history of the real people of God. This knowledge enables us to set aside the many misrepresentations that the real people and servants of God have suffered at the hands of the nominal people of God, and to recover the true history of God's people from among the

accumulations of the nominal church's historians on Church history, as well as to trace the real course of events of God's people. To learn these three things is one of our purposes in our typical studies, especially of Numbers, and we will be proportionately blessed by such study properly made, especially as a needed preparation for the proper understanding of the book of Revelation. The Lord bless to us the study of His Word in all its parts, and thus in its typical parts.

(1) Among other things, what was treated in the chapter, Calls-Siftings-Slaughter-Weapons? To what other harvest siftings does 1 Cor. 10: 5-14 refer, according to St. Paul? What other application was made of these siftings in our treatise? What has experience shown as to their Epiphany occurrences? Their Harvests? In what other two periods may they be expected to occur? What application of them does St. Paul give, and what application of them does he not give us in 1 Cor. 10: 5-14? How do we know this? Where does he give the Gospel-Age application? How does his treatment of them in Heb. 3: 7-4: 3 differ from that in 1 Cor. 10: 5-14?

(2) What basis does St. Paul in Heb. 3 lay for this Gospel-Age application? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? Of what does he show that the 40-years day of temptation was a type? What does he there show as to the type and antitype of the involved Israels? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? How does St. Paul treat these, type and antitype, in this section? In contrast with what? What facts warrant the conclusion that there were five siftings between the Harvests? What confirms this conclusion?

(3) What three things corroborate it? What are the five siftings' errors? For what do these considerations prepare us? When did the Gospel-Age No-Ransomism sifting occur? Where, like its counterfeit, is it typed? What will be done with Num. 11: 1-35? As to what? Why?

(4) Of what else, beside the No-Ransomism siftings, does Num. 11 treat? Why? Of what is this true? What is typed in vs. 1-3? Why will the pertinent Harvest sifting also be given in this study? How does the Imp. Ver. give the opening clause of v.1? For the Gospel-Age

Harvest what do these three verses type? By what was it paralleled? Who were at that time sifted out of the cleansed sanctuary? Why did they murmur? What Chronological disappointments became the occasion thereto? What made uncertainty as to 1843 or 1844 in the Second Advent movement? What mistake of Bro. Miller's did later brethren correct? Why were they uncertain as between 1873 and 1874?

(5) What failed to set in in 1873 and in 1874? What effect did these four disappointments have on some Adventists? What did this prompt some to do thereover? How did this affect God? What, accordingly, did He do? In what did this result? To whom? How is this shown in the type? What three classes did it affect? How? What two effects did this have on the more faithful? As to action, who were these faithful? In person who were some of them? What is typed by Moses' praying to the Lord to quench the fire? How did the Lord's answer come, in type and antitype? What did it effect? What is typed by the people's calling the place *Taberah*? How are we to understand the typical and antitypical sifting as coming?

(6) What was the period of the Gospel-Age No-Ransomism sifting? When and by what events did that period begin and end? By what was that sifting preceded? In conformity with, and likeness to what? For what did the brethren in the Jewish Harvest wish? To what did this hope, combined with its time uncertainty, expose those brethren? What brethren are an example of this? What two things did many of these brethren confound? What sayings of our Lord, not understood, became the occasion thereto? When did many look for the Kingdom's establishment? Who among them particularly did so? To what did the less sober of them allow themselves to be aroused?

(7) What resulted when they were disappointed? Into what two classes did these divide? What was the effect on the former? What did some of these as Jews, and some of these as Gentiles do? What did others of these as such do? What was charged against Jesus and the Apostles during the ensuing agitations? Under what misunderstandings? What proves that such were antitypically burned? What other kind of believers were there then?

Though disappointed, what two things did they do? What did Jesus do? What did God give in answer? What effect did this have on the sifting for the faithful? What did these truths enable them to recognize? What relation did this sifting have to the Gospel-Age No-Ransomism sifting?

(8) Where are the nearer antecedents of this sifting described? What was the character of these? To what did the first kind of these lead? Please read the verses that describe them. The second kind? Please read the verses that describe them. What were intermingled therewith? Please read the verses that describe these. What was the rock-bottom cause of the No-Ransomism sifting in all its applications? Hence of which one of them? To what did that make those guilty of this open? What types this? What kind of people started this weariness of God's Truth and lustng for other mental food? Who were they? What did they do at Israel's deliverance from Egypt? Why was this permitted by their masters? What in the nature of the case could they be expected to start? What is the antitype of this in the Gospel-Age Harvest? What effect did their wearying of the Truth and hungering for other mental food have upon Spiritual Israelites? What two things prove their bad taste? What is typed by the fish? The cucumbers? The melons? The leeks? The onions? The garlic? What degeneracy is shown in this matter? How did these things stand related to facts?

(9) What occurred on a larger scale? After what? What was the antitypical mixed multitude in the larger-scaled event? Of what two parts of Spiritual Israel was this true? When did this antitypical mixed multitude begin to form? Where is this discernible? How in magnitude in both the Harvests did the fifth sifting compare with their other four? What resulted therefrom in the Jewish Harvest's fifth sifting as to the mixed multitude? What two other things manifested many of these? As a result what could St. John late in his life say as pertaining to the mixed multitude? What, that did occur, could be expected of these?

(10) What did their example and agitation shortly do? What two things did some Spiritual Israelites thereupon do? What is symbolic Egypt? What in each case is the

antitype of the foods typically longed for? Of what two kinds in each case? For these what were they willing to neglect, despise and abhor? What in taste did this manifest? How is it in the Hebrew manifested? Like whom were the typical lusters? What quality marked their course? What recompense did their dissatisfaction and lusting bring? What should we learn from them? Why all the more so than others?

(11) Of what do vs. 7-9 treat? What is the description of the manna in v. 7? How many qualities of the heavenly Manna does this suggest? What does Israel's manna type? In what other way may it be put? Why so? What might some at first sight think of the relation of these two definitions? What will reveal their harmony? What does John 14: 6 contribute toward harmonizing them? How is this so? What is meant by the Bible's being Christocentric? How does 1 Cor. 1: 30 prove this? What title given Him in 1 John 1: 1 shows this? In Rev. 19: 13? According to John 1: 1-3, 14, what pre-human title of our Lord is related to this thought? Why? What, accordingly, is the Truth from this standpoint? What follows from this as to our twofold definition of the antitypical Manna?

(12) How many qualities of the Truth were above said to be typed in v. 7? How does v. 7 read? What two special qualities has coriander seed? What do these type? In the first place, what quality does the Truth have? In what two ways? What is the first reason for this? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? The second reason? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? The third and fourth reasons? How do the cited verses prove this? The fifth reason? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? The sixth reason? How do the cited passages prove this? The seventh reason? How do the cited verses prove this? What is the second quality of the Truth as suggested by coriander seed? In what two respects? What is the first reason for this? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? The second reason? How do the cited passages prove this? The third reason? How do the cited verses prove this? By what are these two Truth qualities brought out in the type under study?

(13) What is bdellium? What two qualities of the

Truth are suggested by the color of the manna being like that of bdellium? How are these suggested by bdellium? What are we not to understand by this of the Bible? Why not? How do the cited passages prove this? When is the Truth clear? To what two classes? In what periods respectively? To what is its clarity due? What does its brilliance accomplish? Prove from the cited passages these two diamond qualities of the Word. What conclusion does our study on coriander seed and bdellium prove? What in this connection should we note well? In this connection what did the dissatisfied and lustful do?

(14) What is set forth in v. 8? What is typed by Israel's going about as to dealing with the manna? Their gathering it? Their grinding and beating it? Their baking and boiling it? Their making cakes of it? Eating these?

(15) Like what was the taste of manna? Under what conditions is fresh olive oil very good? What does this suggest? To what does it taste very good? What seven qualities of it makes it satisfy head and heart? What three things does the Truth's taste do in our holy spirits? Why is this? How long does this last? To whom? When and upon what did the manna fall? Upon what did it not directly fall? Why not? Upon what did it fall? In Bible symbols what does dew sometimes represent? How do the cited passages prove this? At other times? How do the cited passages prove this? What is the meaning of the dew in v. 9? How is this to be understood as to Truth already had? How does the cited Scripture prove this? What is typed by the night-long falling of the manna? Of what does this ever remind us? By what is this fact further typed? How long does this antitype work? What is meant by the dueness of the Truth? Who by observation know the Truth to have this quality? When also was this same Truth quality operative? How do the cited Scriptures prove this?

(16) In what other respect does the manna's falling on the dew apply? What does this type? To what end was God's Word formed? In what two ways is it so adapted? What does this show? How does Amos 3: 7 show the Word to be adapted to the general needs of God's people? In what two forms of the Word do these acts appear? What do these do? How do the cited passages

prove that the Word is adapted to the individual needs of God's people? What five things are suggested by the manna's falling in the night? What does this mean in each of the five cases? What two conclusions are by the above discussion proven by the manna's falling on the dew? In view of the things typed of the Truth in vs. 7-9, over what should we not wonder? From this what judgment must be cast as to wearying of the Truth and hankering after secular mental food?

(17) To whose attention did the Gospel-Age Harvest's antitypical dissatisfaction and lustng come? Where did these then manifest themselves? Antitypical of what? In what two ways were they expressed? Even by whom? Antitypical of what? What did its widespreadness require? How did this affect Him? Why? Antitypical of what? By whom was it seen to be evil? What is our knowledge as to this? When also did our Lord note this dissatisfaction and lustng? In what sections of the people of God? In what of these? In what ways did He see them manifesting themselves? Even among whom? Why was their participation therein all the worse? At what should we not wonder? Why not?

(18) What did Moses not do, and do? Why? What was this situation to Him as God's servant? What was it not to him? How did it seem to him? Of what may we be sure in the antitype? How was the antitype shown? How did the pertinent conduct of the people affect our Lord? Why? Of what were these conditions no expression? What two features of our Lord's Gospel-Age ministry will prove this? How do the cited verses prove this? Whose care was not a part of His Gospel-Age ministry? What certainly did not belong to His ministry? In what sense only could God have laid such a burden upon Him? How had this burden come to exist? To what was this due? What do these facts clarify? For what was our Lord's plaint? What was it not?

(19) What objection may be offered to the thought of our Lord's asking information of the Father? What is the first reason which proves that our Lord's knowledge is short of omniscience? What reasons make this reason true? What second reason proves this proposition? Who is such a typical example? How do the cited verses in

Num. 11 prove this of Him after His exaltation? In what set of Mosaic types is this shown? In what other kinds of Scriptures is this shown? How is this proven in the cited passages that refer to His pre-ascension knowledge?

(20) His Millennial and post-Millennial knowledge? When was Jesus' knowledge greatly increased? What fact proves this? From scattered Biblical hints, what seems to be proven as to Jesus' getting information on some details of God's Truth? How does this appear in Ruth 3: 7; Num. 15: 32-36; Ex. 31: 18; 33: 12, 18? How does this appear from the covenant arrangements

given Moses in the mountain? By what is this pictured forth as an eternal condition in our Lord's knowledge relations to the Father? Accordingly, what principle underlying John 15: 15 is an eternal principle?

(21) How much does Jesus know? How great is He in His physical, mental, artistic, moral and religious faculties? What, however, must He eternally remain? How is this proven in the cited passages? What thing impossible to Himself would God do to Himself, if He made Jesus His equal in any respect? What is this? What will keeping in mind our Lord's inferiority in all things to the Father prevent happening from the thought that even in His glorified condition our Lord seeks and gets needed information from the Father? On what two subjects as generally taught is inspired Scripture silent as to teaching or implying them and vocal in teaching against them? On the contrary, how do such Scriptures teach on them? To whose disparagement is this matter not presented? Why not? To whom is over-exalting Jesus distasteful? Belittling Him? Belittling the Father by over-exalting our Lord to equality with the Father in any particular? How long will John 14: 28 prove true? What does it imply as to Jesus' knowledge in comparison with the Father's? How may the Truth on this subject be summed up? What fact as to the various applications of this type proves this principle?

(22) What does Moses' plaint in v. 12 take on? What characteristic did it have? What proves that he did not have a mother's and father's relations and duties to all the people? Why is this language meaningful antitypically

as to the spiritual father? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? Why can such be attributed to the pertinent persons? Why is this language meaningful as to the spiritual mother? Where was the Scriptural proof given for this? On what basis? What does Moses' pertinent language suggest antitypically as to Jesus? What must be the answer to both questions? Whom did Jesus in this sense father and mother? In what periods did He do these things? To what Gospel-Age mission of Jesus does this allude? What did Jesus assume as to these? What Gospel-Age work did not burden Jesus?

(23) What work did burden Him? What did He not desire as to these? Why not? What must be said of His pertinent attitude? How should the language rendered, *that Thou shouldst say*, be translated? Why? What position and duties are not implied in a leader and teacher? Toward whom alone did Jesus have such duties? What did Moses in this connection not know? What does this mean antitypically? What two things do vs. 13, 21-23, imply antitypically? What thought do these two facts disprove? How did the situation affect Moses' and Jesus' hearts? What in them were deeply worked upon? What, were the conditions that so wrought upon them? Under what circumstances was this true in Jesus' case?

(24) What is set forth in v. 14, type and antitype, as to Moses' and Jesus' inability? What was their real work? What two things make impossible to do everything that was suggested to them? What is meant, typically and antitypically, by the request, "kill me out of hand"? What would this effect in both cases? How did Jesus make His plaint known? In what applications of the antitype? What kind was the death that Jesus requested? Why is this true? When did this thing occur? Why did Jesus desire such a thing? For when did He desire it? As what would He regard it? What proves that Moses and Jesus were justified in the plaint?

(25) Wherein was God's answer given? What answers are given in vs. 16, 17? To whom? What answer was given in vs. 18-20? What two episodes have been confounded and misrepresented by higher critics? What four typical differences were there in the two sets of men? What great antitypical differences have there been? In

what Harvests and inter-harvest periods and their parallel applications were the 70 types? What proves this?

(26) What does the charge that Moses gather to himself the 70 type for the Gospel-Age Harvest? By whom were the Parousia and Epiphany auxiliary pilgrims not typed? What is the difference between pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims? Before what date would one have to be in the pilgrim service to be one of the 70? Through whom did the Lord appoint them? What grade of qualification did they have to possess? From among whom were they to be selected? As having what? What is typed by Moses' taking such with him up to the tabernacle and their standing there with him? To what period of the Harvest was not the selection of the pilgrims limited? Why not? About what was its time limit? When did Bro. Russell's anointing as a pilgrim set in? Until when did he not come up to the antitypical Tabernacle? Why is the type of the selection of the pilgrims connected with the No-Ransomism sifting? Why was this not, and why was that done? What is the counterpart of Bro. Russell's selection as a pilgrim before the Harvest? Why was this so in both cases? In what two capacities did St. John serve? How long did the selection of the entire 70 last?

(27) What parallel between the sending out of the 70 in both Harvests exists? In what cases in the Gospel-Age Harvest is this clearly indicated? As what did Bro. Russell have no companion helper? As what did he have successively five? Who were they? Which of these retained the place to the end? Who seemed to constitute the second set of two? The third? The fourth? The fifth? What principle prevailed in one's being counted among the 70? Who was the leader in each set? What did God seek to do in the inter-harvest period as to Jesus' too heavy burden? What increased this burden? With what period did this increase begin? How did God send Jesus the relief? Who was chosen for such relief before the Smyrna period, yea, even before Pentecost? Of what was he the principal man? What is meant by a principal man? During how many of the inter-harvest periods were general elders, secondarily prophets, selected? How in numbers during these periods did they compare? What is the sphere of service for the 70?

(28) What parallel do we find as to the 70 in the Harvests and the inter-harvest period? Even in whose case was this so? In what capacity of his was this not the case? In what was it? From what Church epoch is this principle illustrated? Who were the twelve pairs during the Philadelphia period? Who in each case was the leader? What additional function did John Wessel have? How many others were distributed among the other inter-Harvests' epochs? What were these four epochs called? How were the remaining 46 so distributed as to number?

(29) How many of the inter-Harvests' 70 belonged to the Philadelphia period? How were the 70 divided? Who alone of these were star members? In all seven epochs how many brothers were star members? In addition to the 35 inter-harvest star members, how many other star members were there? How were these distributed? How many principal men were there among the star members? How were they distributed? How does the cited passage show the 7 stars and the 8 principal men? What development were the inter-Harvests' 70 to have? Additionally, what were they also to have? How was this attestation to be, negatively and positively? What did the charge to Moses to bring the 70 up to the tabernacle type with reference to these? Their standing there with Moses?

(30) What is typed by God's coming down to Moses in the cloudy pillar? What did such truths in part constitute? What is typed by God's taking from Moses of his spirit and putting it upon the 70? Of what did this feature of the qualification consist? Of what did their full anointing consist in all applications of the antitype? What as a result would they bear? How would this affect our Lord? When? When was this a matter of our observation? How do we become aware of it as to the inter-Harvests' period? Who were some of these inter-Harvests' special helpers in bearing the burden with our Lord?

(31) After telling Moses of the 70 elders, as to what did God tell him to say to the people? What did this mean antitypically? How did our Lord in the Gospel-Harvest do this telling? What was this sifting? How did He tell it to the Smyrna, etc., epochs' lusters? What kind of a separation do all siftings first effect? What kind later? Which one of these is typed by the eating of the

quail flesh? How did the pertinent conduct sifting occur? In the antitype what moved God to withdraw restraints from Satan? What result therefrom? What did God resent in both type and antitype? What did God passively send in both type and antitype? In what applications of the latter?

(32) What is stated in vs. 19, 20? How many time periods are mentioned in the type? What and how many negatively? Positively? In the Harvests how long did the antitypical month of days last? What were these periods? Where does this principle apply? What are we in this connection to conclude? How does the number 30 imply this? What, accordingly, is the symbolic thought of the 30 days in the two Harvests and their Interim? What Hebrew idiom operates here and how?

(33) What fact as to the duration, and not termination, of the Gospel Harvest's No-Ransomism sifting is paralleled in other siftings? Which are these? How is this true of each of them? In what other application does this hold good? How so? How is this principle seen in the operation of the seven last plagues of Rev. 16? What does this principle enable us to see of an objection to our view of the Gospel Harvest 70? What was this objection? What fourfold reply should be given thereto? What fifth reply should be given thereto? What do these five considerations do with the objection?

(34) What does v. 20 indicate? How copious would the vomit be? What else does v. 20 indicate as to the flesh? When does v. 20 indicate that the vomiting would begin? With what sifting did the vomiting begin? What fact proves this? In what other application is this true? With what did it begin and end? Why so? What qualities did the Reformation vomiting have? With whose activity did it first begin? With whose next did it begin? What were the main Romish things vomited in the movements begun by these? With what did it continue in the Servetus movement? By what was it completed, so far as Rome's anti-Ransomism is concerned? What else did the Reformation vomiting include? When did the last of such vomiting occur? Of what "flesh"? In what two

forms did the antitypical vomiting manifest itself? As antitype of what?

(35) To what were these errors repulsive? How is this stated typically? How was this as respects spiritual smell? How is this seen in detail on this point? How was this as respects spiritual taste? As a result, how did such "flesh" become? To whom especially? To whom of other classes? To what did this influence them? What may we infer from this as to the sins of the lusters? What words of v. 20 prove this? To what did such sinfulness move God? What lessons does this inculcate?

(36) What do vs. 21 and 22 suggest as to Moses' thoughts? For what in general did this move him to ask? In particular? What doubt did, and what doubt did not Moses' question as to the fish suggest? What does Moses' asking these questions type? Why did he ask these questions? What does his asking God for information imply as to Jesus' knowledge? What does the flesh of the flocks and herds type? The flesh of the sea's fish? What did our Lord not know up to the involved antitypical time? From what does this appear? What is typed by slaying the herds and flocks? Gathering the fish? Of what may we be sure as to our Lord's doubts? What did God's question as to whether His hand was shortened intimate to Moses? What does this type? Without whose agency? How should the last clause of v. 23 be rendered and complemented? What does the A. V. rendering imply, typically and antotypically? Why could this not be true? What does the right translation imply in type and antitype? How antotypically would the Lord permissively arrange for the "flesh"? What should we not forget as to such arranging? How did it operate? What kind of a part only could God have had therein? Why so? What do these considerations show as to Jesus in this connection? What fact proves the 70 to represent 70 individuals in the finished picture of all three applications?

(37) How was the antitype of Moses' telling these things to the people performed? How, on the contrary, were, and were not, Jesus' dealings with the 70? How long drawn out was the calling and installation of the Parousia pilgrims as such? How long at least is it

reasonable to believe that the last of these reaped? What seems to be typed by Moses' gathering the 70? His placing them about the tabernacle? What is implied typically by the expression, "70 men of the elders of the people"? What proves this in the type? Antitypically, how was this? What difference is there in the time order of the call of the Jewish Harvest's 70 and that of the other two applications? Why was this difference made? How were the matters in the finished picture?

(38) What is typed by the cloud of v. 25? Where has this been shown? What is meant by God's coming down in the cloud? Through whom did God usually give the Law Covenant's arrangements? Through whom else sometimes? How do the quoted passages prove this? What is typed by God's coming down in the cloud and speaking to Moses? What is not meant by God's taking of the spirit that was on Moses and giving it to the 70? What is meant by it? What did this not do to Moses' power and authority? What did it do for him? How do we know this especially? What was a part of such power in the three sets of the 70? With what was such qualification not accompanied as respects Jesus? What does this not imply as to His office? What does it imply as to His burden?

(39) What as to Jesus' burdens does this not imply? How is this seen as among the Jewish Harvest's 70? What examples prove it? How is this seen as among the Parousia's 70? What examples prove it? How is this as among the Interim's 70? As to the 35 star members and their 35 companion helpers? As to the Interim's five principal men relatively to each one's fellow star members? As to the non-principal star members? What are some contrasting examples? As to the 35 companion helpers of the star members? What are some contrasting examples? What office did the 35 star members, especially their five principal men, hold? Who, even, did not share in such an office?

(40) What proves that the Lord gave the three sets of 70 general eldership in the real Church? The nominal church? What Scriptures prove this latter thought? How

do they do so? For the finished picture, what is especially significant? What does this prove of the three sets of 70? What would this not prove of all who were in the two Harvests nominated as "secondarily prophets"? What facts of the Jewish Harvest prove the answer? What facts of the Gospel Harvest prove this answer? What does the statement, "and did not cease," prove of the 70 as of the finished picture in both Harvests? What two conclusions may we draw from these considerations? What do facts prove as to the Interim's 70? What facts will corroborate this thought? What other fact proves this of the Interim's entire 70?

(41) What episode is introduced in vs. 26-29? What does the camp type? Eldad's and Medad's anointing and prophesying in the camp, and not at the tabernacle? What has already been pointed out in these columns? What about the Parousia Medad has been in sufficient details pointed out there? What does this make unnecessary and necessary here? What in duration is the contrast between the anointing of these two? What was in reality our explanation of Bro. Russell's anointing in the camp? When and wherein did the last part of his camp anointing take place? What did he thereupon do? In what two ways? How much later did he come up to the antitypical Tabernacle? What do these facts prove as to the durations of these two anointings and prophesying in the camp? What does Bro. Russell's course as a pilgrim prove of him in this connection?

(42) Who were the Eldad and Medad of the Jewish Harvest? What Scriptural facts and personal qualities prove St. Paul to have been anointed and to have prophesied while yet in the camp? How is his coming up to the antitypical Tabernacle shown in Acts 9: 17-19? What proves that he was especially beloved by God (Eldad)? What is proven of Apollos as the Jewish Harvest's Medad in Acts 18: 24-26? What is proven of him as such in vs. 26-28? In what two ways is he proven to be the Jewish Harvest's Medad? Why so? How did his proficiency and efficiency affect some carnally weak brethren? How do the cited passages prove this? What was the personal attitude of Paul and Apollos toward one another, in spite of the sectarianism of some of their weak brethren? How does 1 Cor. 4: 1-15 show their relations and sentiments to

one another? 1 Cor. 3: 4-10? What do St. Paul's subsequent references to himself and Apollos show of their relations? How is this summed up in 1 Cor. 3: 8?

(43) Who were the Eldad and Medad of the Interim? What is the first proof that St. John was the Interim's Eldad? The second? Third? Fourth? Fifth? Sixth? Seventh? What fact self-evidently proves St. John to have been the Interim's Eldad? Of what may we therefore be confident as to his being the Interim's Eldad?

(44) How does the evidence of John Wessel's being the Interim's Medad compare with that of St. John's being the Interim's Eldad? For what is it strong enough? What is the first proof for his being the Interim's Medad? What are the seven truths implied in this first proof? What is the second proof thereof? The third? The fourth? The fifth? The sixth? What episode shows his great humility and love for God's Word? The seventh proof? What did Luther say of him and his writings? What did Luther do with some of his writings? Why did he not publish his treatise on the Lord's Supper? Where was he and what position did he hold when he received his anointing and began to prophesy? When and where did he come in among the real people of God? Under what circumstances did he flee from Heidelberg to the Netherlands? .

(45) What two facts prove that Sts. Paul and John as two of the antitypical Eldads were not respectively of the Jewish Harvest's and Interim's 70? How many elders, including Eldad and Medad, were there in the type? What are the pertinent Jewish and Romanist views? What are we to understand the Jewish Harvest's and Interim's number of these to be? What are we not from this to understand as to the Gospel Harvest's 70? How can this be explained harmoniously with the other two conditions? As that Servant with whom was, and with whom was not Bro. Russell paralleled or made to correspond? From what two facts do we infer that Sts. Paul and John did not have companion helpers? What would result if they were of the "secondarily prophets" of their respective times?

(46) What resulted from the fact that in one person Bro. Russell was both that Servant and a pilgrim also? Wherein did this differ from the 70 in the Jewish

Harvest and in the Interim? What is the contrast between this view and the pertinent Jewish and Romanist views? Why this difference? What three facts disprove the Jewish and Romanist views? What seven reasons refute their view that there were 70 elders beside Eldad and Medad?

(47) What kind of an episode do vs. 27-29 bring to our attention? Of what does the young man who reported to Moses Eldad's and Medad's prophesying in the camp remind us? In what respects? Of what was Joshua's pertinent course characteristic? Moses' course? In what do these three find antitypes? In the Jewish Harvest's application, how is this relatively seen as between Paul and Apollos? Who were the antitypical lad, Joshua and Moses, as to St. Paul? How do we see the antitypical lad's, Joshua's and Moses' pertinent activity as to St. Paul? Who were they as to Apollos? What was their activity as to Apollos? Who were they as to St. John, the Interim's Eldad? How do we see this of the first two's activity as to him?

(48) That of Jesus? Of what is the question, "Enviest thou for my sake?" an accusation? Who were the antitypical lad, Joshua and Moses, as to John Wessel, the Interim's Medad? In what were their pertinent activities shown as to John Wessel? Who were the antitypical lad, Joshua and Moses, as to the Parousia's Eldad? In what were their pertinent activities shown as to Bro. Russell?

(49) What facts as to the Parousia's Medad were given wide publicity? Who were the pertinent lad, Joshua and Moses? Wherein is their pertinent activity seen?

(50) What is, then, antitypically remarkable as to v. 30? How did its antitype fulfill in the Jewish Harvest as to Jesus? As to the 70? Where are the records of part of these ministries found? How was v. 30 antityped in the Interim as to Jesus? As to the 35 star members and their 35 companion helpers? How did the Interim's pertinent activity compare and contrast with that of the two Harvests? What did v. 30 antitype as to Jesus in the Parousia? As to the 70? What were the magnitude and ramifications of the pertinent work in themselves and relatively to any other 40 years of the Gospel Age? What are the pertinent statistics of the different kinds of workers? Of what were the above matters the antitype?

(51) What have been studied foregoing? Where is this

sifting proper typed? How will this be treated here? What does the wind of v. 31 represent? How did this controversy start? How may it be appropriately described? What did the Lord do as a result of, and amid this verbal war? What did the quails type? What did we see in Chap. II of Vol. V as to forms of the Parousia's quails? What forms did they assume in the Jewish Harvest? What is typed for all three applications by the very great numbers of the quails? What is the right translation of the word *al* here? What is typed by their flying about two cubits above the ground? What three groups of the Lord's people in all three applications were affected by the antitypical quails? In all three applications, especially in that of the Interim, how did some of these theories deny the Ransom? On the part of whom? How else was the Ransom denied? What does this mean? By whom were these indirect Ransom denials accepted? In what third way was the Ransom then denied? By whom were these received? What occurred on this head in the following four epochs of the Interim? Where was a large list of these given?

(52) What will be now given? Among whom did direct Ransom denials arise, first of all? What other doctrine subversive of the Ransom did they accept? How did they regard Jesus' work for men? What other errors did they later accept? In what did this result? Who were the Ebionites? How did they deny the Ransom? By what teaching? What other group of professed Christians directly denied the Ransom at that time? On what grounds? What class of people introduced another indirect Ransom denial? Through what three doctrines? Who led the way as to two of these doctrines? How so? What in later epochs was done with these two doctrines? Who gave the first impetus to trinitarianism? How? Who invented the theory of the Son's consubstantiality with the Father? Who that of their equality? How were matters carried forward as to the Holy Spirit as the third person of the trinity? What was done with these three and related doctrines later in the Interim? When did they receive their completion?

(53) What two anti-Ransom systems arose during the Smyrna period? In what time order? What kind of a

part in the early Interim did these play? Of what was Gnosticism compounded? What did it teach as to the being and work of the Supreme God? What did they teach of *Demiurg*? What mistake did he make? What, according to Gnosticism, is the character of matter? Of what did he make man? Since when did spirit and matter exist, according to Gnosticism? What teaching resulted therefrom? In what does Demiurg's mistake result? By what, according to Gnosticism, is the deliverance of man's spirit from the matter of his body to be effected? How does it group mankind? What is its teachings as to the destiny of these classes of men? What is its great task? How in addition to *gnosis* does it teach that matter is to be gotten rid of? What were some of the methods thereto? What did some Gnostics teach was the way to overcome matter? What existed among them? How widely were they distributed?

(54) What was the character of their salvation doctrine? What necessarily followed therefrom? Of what was also their doctrine of Christ subversive? To whom was *gnosis* impossible? Why? What did he, accordingly, do? What kinds of Christs and Jesuses did Gnostics have? What was their doctrine of the heavenly and earthly Jesus? How were they combined? What resulted therefrom? What was His mission? What kind of a body did they teach Jesus took? Why? What did they teach of His death? What kind of a Savior did they make of Him? What kind did they not make of Him? Who, according to them, saves the soulical? What does He therein affect? How did Gnosticism affect the Smyrna Church? By whom was it given death blows? When did it die? In what was it resuscitated? Who overthrew its resuscitated form?

(55) What is typed in v. 32 by the people's arising? Their gathering the quails *36 hours*? How does the number 36 type this? What else suggests the great evil of the No-Ransomers? What is typed by the people's gathering the quails? In what application? What did this require? How was this done in the Jewish Harvest? The Gospel Harvest? What illustrations prove this? How was this done in the Interim? What illustrations prove this? What is symbolized by the least gathering 10 homers? What did the 10 homers symbolize? What does this mean for all three applications, especially for the Interim's and

the Parousia's? What is typed by the people's spreading the quails round about the camp? For themselves?

(56) What is typed by the Lord's wrath striking in a plague before the flesh was chewed, but while in the mouth? What things does a literal plague effect in its victims? What do these four things type? How do Gnosticism's errors suggest this as to the mental conditions? Its conduct as to heart conditions? What has the observation of most of us as to these effects of No Ransom's plague been? What has personal contact with No-Ransomers revealed on this head? What sifters does 2 Tim. 3: 1-9 describe? Whom, among others, does it describe, and that most emphatically? What two things does 2 Tim. 3: 1-9 give us of the No-Ransomer sifters? What qualities does this Scripture ascribe to them? What prayer could fittingly be uttered thereover?

(57) What is typed by the plague survivors calling the burial place of the plague-destroyed lusters *Kibroth-hattaavah*? What was in reality that condition of the lusters? How was this the case with No-Ransomer crown-possessors? Losers? Youthful Worthies (in the Parousia)? Tentatively justified? Campers? How did these burials affect the survivors, type and antitype? How do many of us know both kinds of such sorrows? According to Lev. 10: 6, 7, what three things are forbidden the typical and antitypical priesthood? What is the first of these, type and antitype? The second? The third? What is typed by the people's journeying away from Kibrothhattaavah? By their progress toward Hazereth? What is typed by their abiding at Hazereth? What will show this? How is this thought gotten from the word *Hazereth*?

(58) What does our present study end? What, among other things, have we thereby learned? What will further typical studies show us? What, for the most part, does Church history as written by ordinary Church historians record? Of what do they give us but little? To what do the types refer in this respect? In what does an understanding of them lead? What three things does this knowledge enable us to do? How does the learning of these three things stand related to the purpose of our typical studies, especially those of Numbers? What will be our blessing from such studies? What prayer would be appropriate in this connection?

CHAPTER II.

MOSES, AARON AND MIRIAM —TYPE AND ANTITYPE.

Num. 12: 1-16.

PRIDE. CLAIMING EQUALITY WITH CHRIST AS MOUTHPIECE. DIVINE DISPLEASURE THEREAT. ANTITYPICAL DREAMS AND VISIONS. FIRST PRIVILEGE PECULIAR TO THE STAR-MEMBERS. SECOND. THIRD. ANTITYPICAL MIRIAM'S LEPROSY. ANTITYPICAL AARON'S REACTIONS THEREAT. CHRIST'S AND GOD'S PERTINENT COURSE. ANTITYPICAL MIRIAM'S WILDERNESS EXPERIENCES.

ANTITYPICALLY, the subject matter of the book of Numbers can be summed up as a history of the Word and People of God. Our last study in Numbers was on Num.11, under the subject, The Gospel-Age No-Ransomism Sifting. There is a very close connection between the antitype of Num. 12: 1-16 and the antitype of the preceding parts of Numbers from 9: 15 to 11: 35; for Num. 9: 15-23 treats antitypically of the Truth as due on the Old Testament (fiery pillar) and on the New Testament (the cloudy pillar) and of whom these led; Num. 10: 1-10 treats antitypically of the Truth message of the high calling (one of the silver trumpets) and of the Truth message of reckoned and actual restitution (the other silver trumpet) and their announcers; vs. 11-28 treat antitypically of how these messages in various parts of their parts effected the progress of the twelve denominations of Christendom; vs. 29-32 treat of Fleshy Israel sought as a Gospel-Age helper of the Church for the Truth; vs. 33-36 show antitypically that the course of God's people was marked out by God's plan (the ark), the Truth as due (the cloudy pillar) and Christ (Moses); and Num.11 treats antitypically of the three No-Ransomism siftings in themselves and in their relations to Christ (Moses), partly as acting through the Twelve, and to "the Secondarily Prophets" (the Seventy), as the teachers of

the general Church. Num. 12 treats of Christ as He acts through the star members of the seven churches, particularly through the star members of the Laodicean Church, as His mouthpieces, in contrast with all other general teachers in the Church.

(2) Thus through this entire section the Lord's Word and People from a variety of standpoints are the subject. This general line of thought will also be seen to be the subject of Num. 13 and 14. Indeed, the parts of Numbers preceding Num. 9: 15 are more or less related to this general line of thought, as the Lord's people from various standpoints are there set forth in their relation to the Lord's Word. This can be seen from the antitypes of those chapters: Num. 1 and 2 treat antitypically of the twelve denominations of Christendom as gathered by the Word; Num. 3 and 4 treat antitypically of the priests briefly and of the Levites more detailedly, as ministering to the Word; Num. 5 treats antitypically of Gospel-Age sinners against the Word; Num. 6 treats antitypically of the Gospel-Age special priestly ministers of the Word; Num. 7 treats antitypically of the crown-lost princes ministering the Word; Num. 8 treats antitypically of the Levitical ministers of the Word in their cleansing, consecration and services; and Num. 9: 1-14 treats antitypically of the two sets of Passovers' celebrants produced by the Word. Thus we see that antitypically Num. 1-14 treats of the Word and People of God in various of their related aspects. In other words, viewed from the standpoint of the antitype, those chapters hold very logically together under one subject—the Word and the People of God. And as we continue our study of Numbers, as we have already seen this in part from our study of the antitypes of Num. 26, we will find that the antotypical subject matter of the entire book may be summed up as a history of the Truth (the Word of God) and the People of the Truth (God's People) in their mutual relations and in their

relations to others. Thus there is a wonderfully logical connection in the antitypes of this book, which we are studying in such great detail. Surely when we have finished the study of it and its companion book, Deuteronomy, as symbolized by the two corner boards of the Most Holy on the side of the pillar typing our Lord as a New Creature and the Author of the book of Revelation, we will be in a splendid position to study the last-named book. With these words of introduction we are ready to begin our study of Num. 12. The Lord bless its study to all!

(3) The typical story of Num. 12 is easy to understand, but there is a depth of meaning in its antitype that requires more or less deep study, which will by the rich nuggets of symbolic gold and silver that it contains more than repay the efforts expended in its study. The three characters that this chapter brings especially to our attention were three of the four (Joshua being the fourth) most prominent persons noted among the Israelites mentioned so far in the history of the Exodus. Miriam (*rebellion of the people*, in allusion to her typing the Great Company as revolutionists against God's teaching and arrangements) was the most prominent of the Hebrew women of the Exodus, and next to Moses, Aaron (*enlightened*, in allusion to the Little Flock's having the Truth) was the most prominent Hebrew man of the Exodus. But in this chapter Miriam and Aaron, particularly Miriam, do not stand in a favorable light. They become guilty of two evils: of pride, resulting in murmuring, and of self-exaltation. Their pride of family and nation made them resent Moses' having a Cushite wife. Perhaps Zipporah's displacing Miriam as the first lady in Israel may have aroused the latter's envy, also. Moses (*drawn out of the water*, in allusion, first, to our Lord, and, second, to the Church, as selected from among the people, Deut. 18: 15, 18), at any rate, was faulted for having taken Zipporah as his wife, whose

coming to Moses and Israel with her father, Jethro, and her two sons, occurred about a year before, at Sinai (Ex. 18: 2, 5, 6); and her remaining with him since then proved to be a sore trial, especially to Miriam, but also to Aaron. Zipporah (*little bird*) is called an Ethiopian, literally a Cushite. There were two kinds of Cushites: those who were negroes, and who lived in Africa a thousand miles south of the territory of the Midianites of Horeb, and those who were brownish-white, and who lived in Sinaitic Arabia (2 Chro. 21: 16). Seemingly, she belonged to the latter kind of Cushites. Her father, who is usually called Jethro (Ex. 4: 18; 18: 1-24), sometimes Reuel (Ex. 2: 18) and sometimes Raguel (Num. 10: 29), is called the priest of Midian (Ex. 2: 16-21; 3: 1; 18: 1), and is once called a Midianite (Num. 10: 29). In Judg. 1: 16 he is called the Kenite. (In Judg. 4: 11 the proper reading is *chathan* (brother-in-law), not *chothen* (father-in-law).) These passages may well be reconciled by understanding the former to refer to the nation among whom he lived as an official, and the latter to refer to the nation of his origin. The Kenites seem to have been Amalekites (1 Sam. 15: 6). They differed from the rest of the Amalekites in that they were friendly to Israel, when the latter came out of Egypt, *i.e.*, in the wilderness. The Amalekites, as the first of the nations (Num. 24: 20), were evidently organized as such by Nimrod, the first ruler, who was a Cushite (Gen. 10: 8-10), which would seem to imply that they were Cushites, though this is not expressly stated anywhere in the Bible, but is fairly implied in the facts just stated and to be stated in the next sentence. Except in the case of the children of his brother, Raamah (v. 7), Nimrod seemingly founded a kingdom for each of the four sets of his nephews—by his other four brothers—(vs. 7, 10), among others Amalek being in one of these sets. This being true, we can see that, though the priest and (naturalized) citizen of

Midian, Jethro was a brownish-white Cushite, one of those Cushites who dwelt near the Arabians, in the Sinaitic Peninsula, as the Amalekites did (Ex. 17: 8-16; Gen. 14: 7). But even as a brownish-white Cushite Zipporah was by Miriam and Aaron considered inferior to a Hebrew woman. Hence they murmured against Moses for having taken her as his wife (v. 1). Thus pride started them on the wrong way and resulted in their murmuring against their and Israel's Divinely appointed leader.

(4) While the antitype of Num. 12 may in a general way be properly applied to the Jewish Harvest and the interim between the two Harvests, its special application undoubtedly is to the Parousia and the Epiphany, as is evident from the sending of Miriam outside the camp, which is a statement synonymous with sending Azazel's Goat as a class into the wilderness, the special Epiphany work, though undoubtedly with individuals among the crown-losers in the former three periods there was a delivering to Azazel in the wilderness (1 Cor. 5: 5; 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20). Miriam, accordingly, as is indicated by the meaning of her name, by the facts of the fulfillment, and by her being sent outside the camp as partly synonymous with sending Azazel's Goat out into the wilderness, evidently in this story, represents certain ones of the Great Company, especially its abler and more prominent members, who have found much fault with some of the Lord's selections as members of the Bride, and who have actually stoutly aspired to equality with our Lord as mouthpieces of God. Aaron in this chapter represents certain Little Flock members, especially abler and more prominent ones, who found a little fault with some of the Lord's selections as members of the Bride and in a faint manner aspired to equality with our Lord as mouthpieces of God. Moses in this chapter types our Lord (v. 7; Heb. 3: 1-6) as the Church's Bridegroom and as God's special Mouthpiece and Executive. Zipporah

in this chapter represents the Little Flock, especially in its less able and prominent members. This general typical setting of the four characters treated of in v. I will assist us to open up this verse rather easily. When the antitypical murmuring began antitypical Miriam was doubtless in the Little Flock; for their punishment for their wrong-doings was partly relegation to the Great Company. The antitypical Aaron of this chapter remained in the Little Flock. As pride of family, nation and position led Miriam and Aaron into the typical wrong mentioned in v. 1, so pride influenced not a few new creatures, whose real or fancied talents, stations, possessions, influence, etc., led them to think too much of themselves and to despise their Little Flock brethren whom they deemed inferior to themselves in talents, station, possessions, influence, etc., especially the more backward of these, typed by Zipporah, and as a result they set them more or less at naught.

(5) Not a few of us have heard members of antitypical Miriam and Aaron speak of such as follows: "I cannot see what the Lord saw in this one and that one that He should have invited them to be of the Bride. Their education, manners and appearance are so inferior that I am more or less ashamed to associate with them. They are certainly no ornament to the Truth." We have seen such more or less avoid their company, and if thrown into it, they have gotten out of it as soon as possible, feeling they should waste neither time nor words on such. They reserved their time, words, smiles and fellowship for the more gifted and to them more congenial brethren. Some of them may not by their language have spoken despairingly to or of such, but they certainly did by their acts and attitudes. What does such a course, whether by word, attitude or act, mean? It means despising some of the Lord's little ones; it means to reject some that the Lord has accepted as His own; it means to impugn God's choice of fitness

for the Bride of Christ. It therefore means meddlesome busybodying, self-assertion and arrogance. Surely anyone whom Jehovah selects for Christ's Bride and anyone whom Christ accepts as a part of His Bride ought to be satisfactory to everyone else that God has chosen and Christ has accepted therefore. To act contrary to such an attitude certainly is entirely out of harmony with propriety. Yet pride often so acts.

(6) Thus in this matter both typical and antotypical Miriam and Aaron sinned. The former evidently went, in both the type and the antitype, much further wrong than the latter in type and antitype. But sin is not an unprogressive thing. It ever goes from bad to worse, as can be seen in the case before us. It began with sinning against Zipporah as Moses' wife and Moses as Zipporah's husband. This sin was more or less one limited to a family affair. But the pride of Miriam and Aaron developed to worse proportions. It advanced from busybodying in Moses' family affairs to claiming equality with him as God's mouthpiece (v. 2). Antitypically this would mean that antotypical Miriam and Aaron claimed equality with our Lord as mouthpieces of God, *i.e.*, that certain more or less prominent new-creaturely members of Christ's Body claimed equality with our Lord as mouthpieces of God. How could such a thing be possible? Could any member of Christ's Body, yea, even one who was on the way of losing his crown, make such a claim verbally? Certainly none such would verbally utter so blasphemous and arrogant a claim. We doubt that even a Second Deather would verbally do so, unless he were among the worst possible of that class. How, then, are we to understand it? We think that the antitype has been and is being fulfilled by attitudes and acts, rather than by verbal claims.

(7) This answer, however, raises another question, How could any new creature by attitude and act do so? Here again we will have to answer qualifiedly—not directly, but indirectly, and of course not with full

intention of claiming by act and attitude such equality with our Lord Himself personally. To claim so directly by attitude and act would mean to conduct oneself immediately toward our Lord, *i.e.*, personally, as His equal as a mouthpiece for God. This neither antitypical Miriam nor Aaron have done. But they have done it indirectly, which, however, is none the less really doing so. What does this mean? They have arrogated equality with our Lord as mouthpieces of God *as He has exercised His mouthpieceship throughout the Gospel Age in the star-members of the seven churches*. We have given enough details on the star-members in our discussion of Num. 11 to make unnecessary here a lengthier discussion of that subject than to say that they have been Jesus' special mouthpieces throughout the Age, held in His hand (Rev. 1: 16, 20; 2: 1), and that whatever is thought, said or done to them while they act as such Jesus considers in an emphatic sense as thought, said or done to Him (Luke 10: 16). The reason is this: It is He, not really they, who speaks in them while they act as His mouthpieces. So *really* is He the Speaker in such cases that usually in the types of such transactions, not they, but He is represented as the Speaker, they being represented therein as His mouth.

(8) *E.g.*, Moses' speaking to Dathan and Abiram (Num. 16: 12) types our Lord's speaking to the Papacy and the Federation of Churches in the Creed Smashing Sermons spoken through Bro. Russell as His mouth. Again, Moses' telling Korah and his company of 250 Levites to offer incense (vs. 5-7,16,17) types our Lord's telling, through Bro. Russell in the Tower and in certain sermons, the 1908-1911 sifters in and out of the Truth to present their views, if they thought that they had anything better than He was presenting, *i.e.*, through Bro. Russell as His mouth. If this thought of the star-members being the mouth, hand and eye of Jesus in what He says, does and sees through them, is

not kept in mind, they, and not our Lord, would seem to be the antitype of Moses in the above-mentioned and numerous other acts and speeches. Another example will help us to see this: Moses' in the mountain asking to see God's face and being refused on the ground that no man can see His face and live, types our Lord's asking and being refused on the ground that He could not see it and live. How, we ask, can this be true of our Lord personally, who does now in the time of the antitype see God's face and lives? We answer, It does not refer to Him directly and personally. It refers to Him as He has spoken by acts through His Parousia and Epiphany messengers. How so? These two brothers as Jesus' special eye and mouth in their study of God have sought to penetrate deeper into the knowledge of God Himself than was given them to go, which means to speculate on the subject, and were warned as Jesus' eye and mouth that they could not do so and live. See Ex. 19: 21-24 for a somewhat similar thought expressed as to other antitypes along somewhat different lines, wherein the same antitypical lines of thought studied by these two brothers would not be speculation (v. 24, Aaron).

(9) These remarks will enable us to see the antitype of Miriam and Aaron claiming to be Moses' equal in mouthpieceship for God. They type certain prominent new creatures, all of them being at this stage of the transaction still Little Flock members, teaching things contrary to and contradictory of the things that Jesus was giving through the star-members while these have acted as His eye, mouth and hand. Their attitudes in, and acts of so contradicting, and not their words, were assertions of equality with Him as a mouthpiece of God. Of course they did not realize that such contradictions were factual assertions of their equality with Jesus as God's mouthpieces. All they realized was that they were contradicting certain prominent servants of God. In most cases they did not realize that they were

contradicting star-members. But when they were so doing they were actually contradicting Jesus, who was using such as His mouthpieces; and such contradiction by attitude and act, not, of course, by express word, is an assertion of equality in mouthpiecechip for God with our Lord. Such contradictions occurred in the five siftings of the two Harvests and in the interim between them, and have been occurring perhaps most venomously of all times in the two sets of the five siftings, a set in the small and a set in the large miniature Gospel Age of the Epiphany. E.g., St. Paul underwent such contradiction from the Jewish Harvest's combinationist sifters (Acts 15: 1, 2) and from Hymenaeus, Alexander and Philetus (1 Tim. 1: 19, 20; 2 Tim. 2: 17, 18), etc.; and St. John experienced it at the hand of Diotrephes (3 John 9, 10). By contradicting such star-members (who only are included in the statement of Luke 10: 16 and of whom, therefore, is it true that hearing them is hearing our Lord and that despising them is despising our Lord) is not meant a meek presentation of our difficulties and doubts to them for the purpose of learning from them and a meek pointing out of things in their teachings that do not seem correct to the questioner, but a wilful, heady disputatious contention against their true teachings. A proper bringing to them of our doubts and difficulties belongs to the Divinely commanded duty of the entire Priesthood, to prove all things and to hold fast that which is good only (1 Thes. 5: 21). But such a course is entirely different in spirit, in purpose, manner and contents, from the bold, heady and self-opinionated contradiction typed more emphatically by Miriam's and more mildly by Aaron's course as given in v. 2. The statement (v. 2), "And the Lord heard it," does not mean merely that Miriam's and Aaron's words came to God's audition. It means in both type and antitype that God gave to their claims a disapproving attention and reckoning, that He was so displeased as to call them to account,

(10) V. 3 is one with which higher critics have employed their supposed ingenuity, as a proof that Moses could not have written the Pentateuch. If their claim as to the alleged reprehensibility of the statement that Moses was the meekest man in all the earth, if written by himself, were true, at most he should be said not to have written that verse. They should not conclude from their claim that therefore he could not have written the Pentateuch. Their claim is that Moses could not have written these words of himself without sinning in pride thereby, that no man could be justified in making such a statement of himself; for self-praise, they say, is a sin. The basis of their proposition is that no one can without sin speak so complimentarily of himself. We deny the truth of their proposition. We assert that if good things are true of one, and it becomes necessary in justice and love to speak of one's good, and if one can do it without pride, it is no sin to speak complimentarily of oneself. Because it is true and for our good, God speaks of Himself in the Bible in superlative terms of complimentariness. He in the Bible calls Himself supreme in goodness, power, wisdom, justice, love and in every other good quality. He speaks of Himself as being in a class by Himself, above and better than all others. But He does this without the least pride or other evil, because it is true and is for our good to know. Again, under God Jesus refers to Himself in highest terms of complimentariness. He speaks of Himself as good, as the Way, the Truth, the Life, as the only avenue of approach to the Father. He inspired Paul to say of Him that His is the name above every other name and inspired other writers of the Bible to say most complimentary things of Him. Why was this not wrong in Him? Because these things were true, He said or caused them to be said in all humility and did it for our good. Again, in his epistles, especially in 2 Corinthians, St. Paul spoke complimentarily of his own person, character and office. He did it

because it was true and necessary for the brethren, and he did it without the least pride. Our Pastor spoke of an office of his, which under, and next to our Lord's was the most responsible office ever held by a human being, the office of that Servant, and mentioned his qualities in having that office as wise and faithful. He did not speak of these things in pride, but because they were true and necessary for the Lord's people to know. Moses, without pride and because they were true and necessary for Israel to know, wrote the words of v. 3. Hence he could and did write these words of himself without pride. Hence they neither prove that he did not write the Pentateuch nor these words themselves.

(11) There was a deeper reason for these words being written, though Moses did not understand it. They were to type the fact that our Lord as the Antitype of Moses (Heb. 3: 1-6; please note that the typical allusion to Him as Moses' antitype is taken from the chapter under study—Num. 12: 7) is the meekest Being Godward in the entire universe. Meekness means submissiveness of mind and heart. In the mind it makes one teachable and in the heart leadable. God found Moses for His purposes the most teachable and leadable man on earth, and inspired him to state this fact of himself, because God desired thereby to type the fact that our blessed Lord Jesus is Godward the meekest—most teachable and leadable—Being in the universe. And has not our dear Lord always proven Himself to be so? Was not His prehuman course such? Did He not exemplify this fact while He was on earth, and that amid the most crucial trials? And has He not since His resurrection and glorification been proving it to be true? To all eternity He will demonstrate this to be true of Himself. Yea, He is worthy, not only of having the highest place under God in character from this standpoint, but also from the standpoint of every other good quality. He is altogether lovely in this and all other graces. Worthy is the Lamb!

(12) Among other things, God's noting with disapproval the course of Miriam and Aaron is set forth in v. 2; and in v. 4 His beginning to act on the matter is set forth. His starting to act on the matter consisted of a command to all three of them to go forth to the tabernacle. The charge was given suddenly. The Lord did not allow such a wrong act to continue long, though He did permit it to go on long enough for the Israelites in general to learn of it; otherwise God, who commands that private sins be not made public, would have settled the matter privately and not publicly as He did, which is implied in its being adjusted before the tabernacle. So in the antitype, whenever God notes that Jesus speaking through the star-members has been contradicted with any degree of publicity, He sees to it that the matter is adjusted publicly. How is such contradiction made? Not privately, but publicly, at least before the Church and often before outsiders. Such contradiction becomes the talk of those who hear, as Miriam's and Aaron's talk was heard by others than Moses and Zipporah. Such talk always stirs up more or less excitement and usually has resulted in a sifting, first among Truth people, whence it frequently spreads to outsiders. God manipulates such events in such ways as to bring the three parties to the shaking in their activities before the whole Church at least, if not before outsiders. It is by such manipulating of the pertinent events that God gives the antitypical command to the three antitypical parties to go forth to the antitypical Tabernacle, *i.e.*, to appear before the Church.

(13) This course of events we find to take place in connection with all the siftings that unfavorably affect Great Company leaders and some Little Flock leaders. It can be observed in our, the Epiphany day, to the best advantage. The Levite leaders in all cases of the Epiphany contradictions have acted like Miriam; for their contradicting the Epiphany messenger as he in mouthpieceship for our Lord gives the Epiphany

message is a factual, not verbal, telling to our Lord that they are as much a mouthpiece of God as He is. If they continue this any length of time God, by the course of the pertinent events, forces them and our Lord in His mouthpiece to appear before the whole Church in discussion of the matters at hand; and when in a more or less mild manner antitypical Aaron joins in the contradiction they too are forced by God through the resultant circumstances to appear before the entire Church in this matter. Thus it comes to pass that all such actors are forced to appear on the matter before the entire Church. Please note how this has occurred in our controversies with the British managers, Society leaders, the P.B.I. leaders and with leaders of various other groups, like Adam Rutherford, Wm. Crawford, F. Lardent, M. Riemer, Menta Sturgeon, A. I. Ritchie, Carl Olson, R. H. Hirsh, G. K. Bolger, R. H. Bricker, C. Kasprzykowski, M. Kostyn, etc. Looking back to the Parousia times we find this same phenomenon, but in a less prominent form. We have instanced in Vols. VI and VII how this contradiction of our Pastor as the Parousia messenger was done by A.H. MacMillan, Clayton J. Woodworth, W.E. Van Amburgh, Jesse Hemery, J.F. Rutherford and by other members of antitypical Elisha, though for the most part God did not bring them before the antitypical Tabernacle until the Epiphany, but when He did so He did it very suddenly, *e.g.*, note how suddenly the siftings at Bethel and in the Fort Pitt Committee were brought to the attention of the whole Church. It was like a clap of thunder out of a clear sky.

(14) We are to keep the features and workers of such siftings separate and distinct from the features and workers of Second Death siftings. The five Reaping siftings were mainly the latter, though somewhat connected with them and more in the background this feature of antitypical Miriam and Aaron also appeared. *E.g.*, those who sided with antitypical Korah—the antitypical

sons of Korah—in the 1908-1911 sifting. These were by antitypical Korah deceived into believing that the doctrine of the Church's share in the sin-offering implied that the merit of the Church made up for an alleged deficiency in Christ's merit to satisfy justice. Under this false impression, and in loyalty to the ransom merit, as provided by Jesus' sacrifice alone, they contradicted Jesus' teaching through that Servant, that the Church shares in the sin-offering. In this they antityped their part in antitypical Miriam's factual claim of equality with our Lord in mouthpieceship for God. There were also in that sifting some members of antitypical Aaron who more mildly and less perseveringly contradicted the Lord as He spoke in that Servant, especially on the New Covenant as operating only in and after the Millennium. E.g., Bro. John Edgar for awhile was somewhat shaken thereon, but soon recovered his equilibrium. Thus antitypical Miriam and Aaron hung about the fringes, so to speak, of the Second Death siftings of the Parousia, and, because overshadowed by the Second Death sifters, do not appear therein so distinctly as they do in the Epiphany siftings. Doubtless, too, in the Parousia and the Epiphany antitypical Miriam and Aaron appeared also in less general shakings, especially in such as were limited to one ecclesia or to several ecclesiases. In the slight shaking of 1914 on the 1914 date A.H. MacMillan had a large, and the writer a small part, as we will show later. When local shakings occur, the local bodies would correspond to the tabernacle. But in general siftings of this kind the tabernacle types the entire Church. Nor are we to understand from the above that there are no Second Death siftings and sifters in the Epiphany. There are such, as typed by Abihu and his offering strange fire (see footnote in T 119, in editions from 1909 onward), by Aaron and his acting with Moses at the smiting of the rock and by Jambres and his casting down his rod before Pharaoh.

(15) V. 5 tells us of the second, third and fourth steps that the Lord took in the matter of Miriam's and Aaron's assertion of equality with Moses in mouthpieceship for God. The first of these was His coming down in the cloudy pillar. We are not to understand that God did this personally; for He did not leave Alcyone in person and come to the desert of Israel's wandering. He doubtless did this as He did other acts in giving the various arrangements of the Law Covenant—through an agent, the Logos most likely (Acts 7: 38), though it could have been by another angel (Acts 7: 53; Gal. 3: 19). We say most likely it was the Logos because He was the angel who appeared to Moses in the bush, who delivered Israel from Egypt (Ex. 13: 20-22; 14: 19, 20; Acts 7: 30, 35), who gave the Law Covenant at Sinai (v. 38) and who was with Israel throughout the 40 years of the Exodus (vs. 36, 38). In the antitype, especially as it belongs to the Parousia and Epiphany, it has been undoubtedly our Lord who came down in the antitypical cloudy pillar; for, present in the Second Advent, it is His mission to come down in the antitypical cloudy pillar—the Truth. As we have seen, the cloudy pillar represents the New Testament Truth as due during the two reaping periods, and the fiery pillar represents the Old Testament Truth as due in the interim between them and in the Epiphany. When the antitypical pillar applies to the entire four periods, as in the case under study, it would ordinarily be typed by the cloudy pillar, as the more important of the two. Accordingly, the reference to the cloudy pillar in v. 5 should not be understood as excluding the Old Testament Truth as due, nor the Interim and the Epiphany. Just what is meant by God's coming down in the cloudy pillar? We understand it to mean God, by our Lord's bringing out the pertinent Truth as due, manifesting His presence and taking cognizance of the matter at hand, in this case of antitypical Miriam's and Aaron's aspiring to equality with our Lord as a mouthpiece

for God. Always in such experiences before giving His judgments, but while proceeding to do so, the Lord makes pertinent Truth due. His so making the Truth due while proceeding to the pertinent judgment is the antitype of the cloudy pillar in v. 5.

(16) God's standing at the door of the tabernacle types God in Christ bringing the course of antitypical Miriam and Aaron to the attention of the Church *in a public way as a matter that requires public treatment*. He does this by bringing out in a public way the character of what they have been doing. He reveals this by bringing as many or as few circumstances and teachings as the case may require to the notice of the Church. Usually the Lord does this through the pertinent star-member's refuting before the Church the false teachings of antitypical Miriam and Aaron whereby they have contradicted Jesus as He speaks through His mouthpiece and thus by act presumed to be our Lord's equal as a mouthpiece for God. *E.g.*, He has time and again been allowing one Levite after another, and that more markedly, and in some cases some Priests, and that less markedly, to teach that the invitations to the high calling are still being issued, and increasingly, as point after point thereon becomes due, He has been publicly giving the Truth with its proofs that such invitations ceased by Oct., 1914. This Truth as due in its various parts the Lord Jesus has been giving through the Epiphany messenger; and as the latter, as Jesus' eye, mouth and hand, set them forth, the Levites and some priests have contradicted the teaching, but have been quite unable to meet the proofs. And at each stage of their contradiction they are refuted (the Lord coming down in the cloudy pillar), and consequently the Lord brings their case before the whole Church (His standing in the door of the tabernacle). He calls antitypical Miriam and Aaron to stand forth as separate and distinct from the antitypical Moses as He speaks through His eye, hand

and mouth, by manipulating the circumstances of the sifting in such a way as to bring them into prominence as such contraditors and to cause the friends to see that they are in a movement separate and distinct from our Lord as He speaks through the pertinent officiating star-member. Their coming into such a separate and distinct position is typed by Miriam and Aaron stepping forth, away from Moses (and they both came forth, v. 5).

(17) In vs. 6-8 God shows the difference that existed between the ordinary prophets and Moses. V. 6 shows the privileges and limitations of the ordinary prophets. Their privileges and limitations and the distinction between them and Moses God asks Miriam and Aaron to note carefully (Hear now My words, v. 6), since they are the Divine Truth on the subject. Antitypically, God in connection with the Truth as due on the pertinent subject gives the Scriptural proof for the Truth on the privileges and limitations of the antitypical prophets—the pilgrims, auxiliary pilgrims and some of the abler local elders—and the privileges of our Lord as He speaks through His special mouth, eye and hand. These God has exhorted antitypical Miriam and Aaron carefully to note (Hear now My words). He has done this by pertinent exhortations that have come to them through our Lord's speaking through the officiating star-members and by the Scripture proofs that He offers through them. The privileges of ordinary prophets in Israel as mouthpieces of the Lord are in v. 6 given as two: (1) the Lord would make Himself known to them in a vision and speak to them in a dream. This statement suggests that there is a distinction between a vision and a dream, both typical and antitypical. A vision is an external scene that was made to pass before a prophet's physical eyes while he was awake. The book of Revelation is the most noted example of a vision found in the Bible. All prophets saw them.

(18) A prophetic dream was a mental operation that saw things with the mental eyes while the prophet slept. Joseph's dreams of his future greatness are examples of prophetic dreams. Antitypically there seems also to be a distinction between a dream and a vision. According to Joel 2: 28 the Ancient Worthies will be favored with dreams as their Millennial revelations; and the Youthful Worthies will be favored with visions as their Millennial revelations. We think that the distinction here brought out is the same as that brought out typically in the distinction between the parts of the tabernacle that the Kohathites bore, who, from the standpoint of the Millennial picture, type the Millennial Ancient Worthies, and the parts of the tabernacle that the Gershonites bore, who, from the standpoint of the Millennial picture, type the Millennial Youthful Worthies. The things borne by the Kohathites were all invisible to the people, while most of the things borne by the Gershonites were visible to the people. Moreover, the things borne by the Kohathites were more detailed and sacred than those borne by the Gershonites. Hence the thought of the deeper and less deep is implied in the contrasts thereby suggested for the two sets of antitypes. In general the distinction in the antitype may be given as this: the Ancient Worthies will by Divine inspiration give the deeper features of the Millennial truths, while the Youthful Worthies will by Divine inspiration give the less deep features of the Millennial truths. So we understand the expression, "Your old men shall dream dreams; and your young men shall see visions." The idea of *deeper* truths seems also to lie in the thought that to dream a dream is a *mental* operation, while the idea of *less deep* truths seems to lie in the thought that to see a vision is a *physical* operation.

(19) What we have just said on the difference between an antitypical vision and an antitypical dream does not tell us precisely what such antitypical visions

and dreams are; for there are also deep and less deep truths in the Bible that are neither antitypical visions nor dreams; for as we look at the antitypical dreams and visions that the Lord has revealed to the antitypical prophets—the pilgrims, auxiliary pilgrims and the more prominent elders—we find in every case that they are things stated either in symbolic language or in dark sayings. Hence the *visions* and dreams that the Lord has during the Gospel Age been making known to the general teachers and certain local elders of the Church who have not been star-members have in every case been Biblical things expressed in symbolic language or in dark sayings. Such things are types, figures, parables, hidden prophecies, tableaus, representations and enigmatical sayings. The Bible abounds in such things, which is one reason why it is so ambiguous a book. In this verse (v. 6) God promises that He would favor the Gospel-Age general elders who are not star-members and certain local elders with an understanding of some, not all, visions and dreams, the less deep of types, figures, parables, hidden prophecies, tableaus, representations and enigmatical sayings being the visions, and the deeper of them being the dreams. This promise of v. 6 our Lord also tells us He will fulfill in every scribe instructed unto the kingdom, when He says that He will make known to him "things new" (Matt. 13: 52). Accordingly, the Lord has promised each one of the general elders, including the non-star-members, and the more prominent local elders, that they would see something in the way of an antitypical vision or dream before any others of His people would see it—"things new." This promise has had its fulfillment all through the Gospel Age, particularly during the Jewish Harvest, and most particularly during the Gospel Harvest. The columns of The Tower in the Parousia show many cases wherein God fulfilled this promise.

(20) Nor are we to understand from the fact that

v. 6 promises such visions and dreams to the non-star-members among the general elders and the more prominent among the local elders and from the fact that vs. 7, 8 do not mention such visions and dreams as given to our Lord as He speaks through the star members, that such star-members would not have such visions and dreams; for the facts prove, *e.g.*, as in the case of that Servant, that they have more of these by far than all of their contemporary non-star-membered general elders and prominent local elders combined. Rather, we are to understand that the omission of their mention in connection with our Lord's speaking through the star-members is due to the fact that their differing privileges are given, not such as they have in common, and also to the fact that their differing privileges are so much greater than those of the pertinent non-star-member elders, that what they have individually in common is small indeed, so small that their mention is omitted. In other words, there is an ocean wide difference between the pertinent privileges of the non-star-membered general elders and certain local elders on the one hand and of the star-members on the other hand as to mouthpieceship. Again, we know that such star-members have greater privileges in seeing first antitypical visions and dreams than the non-star-membered general elders and certain prominent local elders have, from the fact that they ordinarily and generally, as the special mouthpieces of Jesus, who in ultimate analysis is the sole Interpreter of the Bible (1 Cor. 1: 30; Rev. 5-10), are His agents in interpreting the Scriptures as due. Again, in an emphatic sense the non-star-membered general elders and certain prominent local elders are by their subordination to the star-members obligated first to present their understanding of "things new" to the star members for sanction before presenting them to the brethren in general; for since Satan often gives counterfeit new light to such non-star-membered elders for genuine

new light, the safety of such non-star-membered elders and of the flock requires that such real and alleged "things new" be first referred to the officiating star-member by the pertinent non-star-membered elders for examination as to whether they are genuine or counterfeit new things.

(21) Above we mentioned the fact that The Tower during the Parousia furnishes us evidence that some antitypical visions and dreams as new things were given to non-star-membered elders—the pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims and prominent local elders. Yea, there are not a few instances of such that never appeared in The Tower. We will now give a number of illustrations which prove that God did fulfill the antitype of His statement in v. 6—did give pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims and certain elders such antitypical visions and dreams. Sometimes He did this to them while they were on the way of becoming, but before they became pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims, but so far as we know the facts of fulfillment the scribes of Matt. 13: 52 seem to be almost entirely limited to such brothers; for, so far as we know the facts, local elders who never became general elders were with some exceptions not favored with seeing "things new"—the antitypical visions and dreams. These exceptions were especially prominent and zealous elders. Bro. Barton was favored with a number of such dreams and visions. An account of one of these—one on Is. 18: 1, 2, 7—is given in Z '04, 230-232. See also the comments. In that article Bro. Barton showed how in vs. 1, 2 and 7 the Harvest work as furthered by the Truth literature is described. What he saw in these verses and wrote out was an antitypical dream. Please note the highly figurative language in which this dream is clothed in Is. 18: 1, 2, 7. We might instance another antitypical dream (in the form of a dark saying) that Bro. Barton had on Matt. 12: 29; Mark 3: 27; Luke 11: 21, 22. It is published in Z '10, 315, 316. In this

article, which contains the antitypical dream written out, Bro. Barton shows that Satan, the strong man, was bound by our Lord, the stronger man, between Oct., 1874, and April, 1878, because in April, 1878, the spoiling of his house began, which the passage tells us could not take place, unless first the strong man was bound.

(22) Another illustration of such non-star-membered general elders having antitypical visions and dreams is that of Bros. John and Morton Edgar. In 1904 a Swiss brother went wrong on the Chronology, especially on the 19 years on which the P.B.I. later went wrong, and worked out such a sophistical new view of it that it puzzled Bro. Russell (antitypical David) very much and he was at a loss to refute it thoroughly (2 Sam. 21: 15-17). This view of the Chronology was presented to Bro. John Edgar, and it led him, with Bro. Morton Edgar co-operating, to make a very searching investigation of the Chronology as presented in Vol. II. His study of the subject on the basis of Bro. Russell's chronology led him to see very many confirmations of that chronology and to bring out many details not before seen, whereby he completely refuted the position of the Swiss brother (Abishai smote the Philistine and killed him). His investigations led him to see many Pyramid confirmations of the Plan and the Chronology not previously seen. All of these have been published in the two-volumed work entitled, *The Great Pyramid Passages*, by John and Morton Edgar, though articles on these subjects from Bro. John Edgar's pen previously appeared in Z '05, 179-185, and in the 1906 Convention Report. In these investigations and discoveries of new confirmations to the Chronology and to the Plan in the Pyramid Bro. John Edgar, while the leader in that work, was ably assisted by his Brother, Morton Edgar, who, because Bro. John Edgar died shortly after Vol. I of *The Great Pyramid Passages* was finished, became the sole

author of its second volume, though Bro. John Edgar was of the two brothers the main finder of its "things new." Thus we see how both of the Edgar brothers were in this matter favored with the seeing of some visions and dreams as antitypical prophets. We heartily recommend their work, *The Great Pyramid Passages*, especially in its first edition. We made a careful study of it in its first edition, but apart from small parts of Vol. 2 have not read the second edition, which we understand, especially in Vol. 2, has undergone some changes. We understand that Bro. Morton Edgar repudiates what he inserted into the second edition of Vol. 2 on the millions-now-living proposition. He revised and published the work as the second edition while still with the Society and sought to justify its millions proposition. The Society's president still holds to the millions proposition, apart from a date, and claims that these millions are his (new) Great Company, who, he claims, are not a spiritual class, but his so-called Jonadabs, unconsecrated people who are interested in the Society's message, and who are given as their ambition the hope of surviving Armageddon.

(23) Walter Bundy was given an antitypical vision—the understanding of the parable of the lost piece of silver—as a thing new. We will give here a brief summary of it. According to his understanding, the woman of the parable (Luke 15: 8-10) represents the Church, the ten pieces of silver the ten main Biblical doctrines (the ten strings of the harp of God). Nine of these doctrines were never wholly lost to the Church, though there accumulated much symbolic tarnish on them. But one of them, restitution, was wholly lost for centuries to the Church. The sweeping of the house and the search for the lost piece of silver (truth on restitution) represents the cleansing of the Bible teachings from errors of the Dark Ages and the search of the Bible, the dwelling place of the Church, for a better future than eternal torment for those who died without ever

having come into Christ. This search resulted in the finding of the Truth (silver coin) on restitution, as in the parable the woman's search for her lost piece of silver resulted in her finding it. Her joy over finding it symbolizes the Church's joy over finding that restitution was the hope for the world, instead of its future being eternal torment. Her telling her friends and neighbors of her find and her inviting them to rejoice with her represents the Church preaching restitution as the rediscovered Bible truth, giving hope for the world, and inviting those to whom she preached to join with her in rejoicing thereover. The idea of restitution implies the repentance of this class, the "one sinner" of v. 10, whose repentance will cause joy in heaven. If we may be permitted to set forth, among others, three privileges that we have had along this line during the Parousia, we will give the following: The day after we had our debate (2 Sam. 21: 20, 21) with M.L. McPhail on the covenants, April 19, 1909, in the presence of about 150 members of the Chicago Ecclesia, after most of the audience had left, following the end of the afternoon service, the Lord opened up to us the five calls of the Penny parable (Matt. 20: 1-16), their dates, character and agencies, and the steward of that parable. All of the other parts of the parable remained sealed to us until June, 1914, when the first of these, its evening, became clear to us as teaching the Church's remaining in the world for some time after 1914. In 1917 the Lord opened up the murmuring of the parable to us. He gave Bro. Russell in 1915 the privilege of seeing what the penny was and what its twofold distribution was—the privilege of smiting Jordan, and that in its two times. Doubtless the Lord gave it to him, so as to give that thought greater prestige during the subsequent sifting than had He given it first to us. From a brother in Chicago we got a hint that the day of the parable might be the reaping period (1874-1914) and that, accordingly, each

of its hours might be a twelfth of 40 years. We presented the view of the parable to Bro. Russell, who endorsed it. The next year the Lord gave us to see the five calls set forth as one general work and the five siftings set forth as separate and distinct in 1 Cor. 10: 1-14. We wrote this matter out, the fifth sifting in considerable detail, and handed it to our Pastor, who published an abstract of it in Z '13, 198-200. The Lord, among other things, gave us, as an antitypical dark saying, to understand the prophets of Eph. 2: 20, as a part of the antitypical Temple, to mean the Church's general elders, particularly the star-members. This that Servant endorsed.

(24) In pars. 21-23 we gave a number of illustrations of how God gave antitypical visions and dreams to some of the pilgrims. He gave some of these to each of them, even though we have given only a limited number of illustrations of these. It would be in place also to cite some cases in which He gave such dreams and visions to auxiliary pilgrims. The three cases we will give, as a matter of fact, received these while they were on the way to become such. One of these is Milton Riemer, whom the Lord, on the basis of Ex. 30: 22-33; 31: 2-5; Is. 11: 2, 3; Eccl. 9: 10; Col. 1: 9-11, gave an understanding of the antitypical meaning of the spices and their proportions used in the oil whereby the priests were anointed. He properly sent his understanding of this antitypical dream to our Pastor, who published it in Z '07, 349, 350. He was given this antitypical dream before he was appointed an auxiliary pilgrim, but was evidently on the way to become one. Our readers will profit from a study of his letter. Another brother, likewise while on the way to become an auxiliary pilgrim and before he became such, was also given a number of antitypical visions and dreams. We refer to C. B. Shull, of Columbus, Ohio. The Lord gave him to understand a number of things in the book of Revelation. The most important of these was that

the seven vials (bowls) of Rev. 15 and 16 represent the Seven Volumes. He wrote out his understanding of these and sent it to our Pastor. The latter never published Bro. Shull's letter, but in a private conversation with us he expressed approval of the general thought of that view, *i.e.*, that the seven vials represent the Seven Volumes. Whether Bro. Shull saw it or not, we do not know, but the seven vials do not represent the Seven Volumes in all their aspects, but only as symbolic bowls, *i.e.*, as controversial writings, those features of the Scripture teachings that are covered by the word *reproof* (refutation of error) in 2 Tim. 3: 15-17. Thus these volumes as refutations of errors are Divinely approved. Many have considered Vol. VII as impossible to be Divinely approved in any sense, because of its many errors. We agree that from many standpoints it is certainly not to be approved; but from the standpoint of its being an antitypical bowl, *i.e.*, in so far as it refuted Babylon's errors, it certainly is a symbolic bowl, and it certainly did plague the antitypical air—the ruling powers in state, church, aristocracy and capital. In this respect it is Divinely approved, but not, *e.g.*, as a symbolic cup—doctrinal teaching. A dark saying that the Lord opened to Bro. Shull was the word *torment* as used in Rev. 20: 10; 14: 10, 11, in the sense of *try, test*. Bro. Russell also approved of this; and we gave the interpretation in L-D-H, in the note on pages 86, 87. Bro. Fowler, a prominent elder of the Washington, D.C., ecclesia, was given an antitypical vision: Elijah's twofold feeding (1 Kings 19: 5-8), and journeying 40 days to the mount of God, as typical of the feeding on the Miller and Harvest messages and coming in the 40 years (1874-1914) to the Kingdom, which we have learned means coming to the condition that assures the Church from 1914 onward that all faithful till then will overcome.

(25) Looking back over the part of the chapter that

we have so far studied, and keeping in mind the suggested antitypes of its various parts, we must be struck by the factualness of the interpretation. From Heb. 3: 1-6 (the expression, *Apostle . . .* of our profession, in v. 1, refers to the Lord Jesus as God's Mouthpiece and Executive, even as the two functions of the office of the Twelve Apostles were executive and interpretative) we see, from the fact that vs. 2, 5 are an allusion to v. 7 of Num. 12, that in this Chapter Moses types our Lord as God's Mouthpiece and Executive. From a multitude of facts, particularly from the fact that Miriam became leprous (vs. 10-16), and from what Lev. 13 and 14 show of her kind of leprosy, *i.e.*, that it represents Great Company uncleanness, we are warranted in regarding her as a type of leading Great Company members. See Vol. III, Chap. IV. From the fact of Aaron's *lesser* participation in the sins described in vs. 1, 2 ("And Miriam speaketh—Aaron also—against Moses, etc."—Young's translation) and from the fact of his not becoming leprous and from certain fulfilled facts, we are warranted in understanding him here to type certain leading Little Flock members. From Zipporah's relation to Moses (v. 1) and the fact that many of the more obscure members of Christ have by certain new creatures been considered unfit for the Bride, we are warranted in regarding her here as a type of such. Facts further show that our Lord has been faulted by the course of certain new creatures for some of the selections for His Bride, and that He has been much contradicted by such new creatures as He has spoken through the star-members, particularly during the Parousia and Epiphany (v. 2).

(26) Furthermore, it is apparent that the Lord has given disapproving attention to such antitypical murmuring and contradictions (v. 2). It is also factual that as Moses was toward God the meekest man on earth, so our Lord has been toward God the meekest Being in the universe (v. 3). It is also a fact that God

has brought the antitypical three forward before the entire Church when taking the matter up for His public disposal of the case (v. 4). It is also a fact that God by our Lord has shown Himself active in connection with the advancing pertinent Truth, has done this before the entire Church and in so doing has caused the involved new creatures to take a stand separate and distinct from our Lord as He has spoken through star-members (v. 5). It is also a fact that God has caused the truth to be proclaimed that the privileges of the non-star-membered general and certain local teachers as to discovering new truths have been limited to certain parables, types, figures, hidden prophecies, tableaus, representations and enigmatical sayings. And not only is it a fact that such teachings have been given by the Lord, especially during the Parousia and Epiphany, but it is also a fact that the Lord has in fulfillment of the statements of Num. 12: 6 and Matt. 13: 52 given such new truths to the non-star-membered general elders and to some especially prominent elders who never became general elders. Accordingly, we see that in every detail of the exposition of Num. 12 so far given, our interpretation is proven to be Scriptural, reasonable and factual. Hence it has the qualities that prove it to be the proper exposition of the chapter so far studied. And as we go on with our study, we will find the rest of the exposition Scriptural and factual.

(27) We have seen that in v. 6 God set forth the limits within which He would make Himself known and would speak to prophets—He would make Himself known to them by visions and speak to them in dreams. Beyond these limits He would not reveal matters to them. According to v. 7 God did not limit His revelations to Moses to visions and dreams. We have seen that v. 7 does not mean that God would not make Himself known to Moses by visions and speak to him in dreams; rather, as the contrast suggests, He did not limit these revelations made to Moses to visions and

dreams. Additionally He favored Moses with revelations communicated in more familiar ways. Antitypically, this means that God would not limit His revelations imparted to our Lord as acting in the star-members to visions and dreams. Hence v. 7 does not mean that God would not give our Lord acting in the star-members visions and dreams; for we know that in ultimate analysis Jesus is the only Interpreter of God's Word from God to us, and that whatever of visions and dreams are truly interpreted to the Church from God come through Jesus, the Teacher to the Church (Matt. 23: 8; 1 Cor. 1: 30). This fact, as well as the contrast between v. 6 on the one hand, and vs. 7 and 8 on the other hand, prove that revelations to Christ acting in the star-members do not exclude, but are not limited to visions and dreams. The fact that Jesus by St. Paul and our Pastor as star-members gave the Church true interpretations of more visions and dreams than all the non-star-membered teachers of the Church combined gave, factually proves the thought to be true that Jesus speaking in the star-members is neither limited to, nor excluded from, revelations in the form of visions and dreams. This, then, is the force of the words, "My servant Moses is not so [limited]."

(28) The fact that in Num. 12 Moses types our Lord as God's Mouthpiece, Executive and Leader for Spiritual Israel, acting in the star-members, gives a deeper antitypical meaning to the words, "who is faithful in all My house," than the words would have, if he were not here so typed. If He were here typed as God's Mouthpiece, Executive and Leader for Spiritual Israel apart from His activities by the star-members, the passage would limit the faithfulness here described to our Lord alone. Undoubtedly He is included in the expression, and that in the highest sense of the word possible; but the viewpoint of this chapter connects His faithfulness with the star-members *as working through them*; and therefore it also implies their faithfulness as

star-members, while they act officially as such. When we speak of their faithfulness we do not mean that theirs has been flawless, as our Lord's has been and is, but such faithfulness as is needed for overcoming on the part of star-members, which means faithfulness of a larger than ordinary measure—one that increases the one pound to ten pounds. Accordingly, from the standpoint of this chapter we understand this passage to teach that all 49 star-members are set forth as faithful (see Chap. 1). We have direct statements in the Bible that this is true of 13 of them—the twelve Apostles and that Servant. (Rev. 21: 14; Matt. 24: 45; Luke 12: 42 [faithful].) And the way this chapter presents our Lord as to the star-members, combined with the antitypical statement of v. 7 and the antitypical facts of v. 8, proves, though in a less clear way, that this is true of the other 36 star-members. By this, of course, we do not mean that these 49 brothers could not have fallen, but that they have been so faithful that they have not fallen. The antitypical house—the house of God—St. Paul directly tells us is the Church (Heb. 3: 2, 6). Hence in Christ's ministry exercised in the star-members He and they have been faithful. Hence we conclude that only such new creatures were chosen to be star-members as God foreknew would be faithful—a thing that is not only directly implied by Christ's statements of 13 of them—of 12 of them in Matt. 19: 28 and John 17: 12, in the case of John and James (Mark 10: 39), in the case of John (Rev. 21: 14) and in the case of that Servant (Matt. 24: 45; Luke 12: 42), but is also implied of all 49 in vs. 7 and 8.

(29) Having seen that Jesus exercises in the star-members the privileges of visions and dreams, and that in a higher measure than He does in any non-star-membered servants of the Church, general or local, we are now prepared to see what His unique privileges are as He acts through the star-members. These are set forth in v. 8 typically. Moses was privileged to have

God speak to him (1) mouth to mouth, (2) even plainly and not enigmatically, and (3) to see the similitude of God. These three privileges God says He would not give to a prophet, but would limit them to Moses. Let us look at each of these three privileges antitypically in turn and therein we will see the special privileges of our Lord as He acts as God's Mouthpiece in the star-members. First, then, what is meant by the expression, "With him I will speak mouth to mouth"? To make clear this expression certain explanations will have to be made. Primarily Jesus as Logos was, and as Christ has been and is, God's mouth. The term *Logos*, *Word*, implies this as to His pre-human condition (John 1: 1), and the term *Christ* (Is. 61: 1, 2) implies this for His post-Logos condition. The Bible in many ways shows that He is God's mouthpiece, *i.e.*, mouth (Rev. 1: 1; 5: 7-9, 12; Matt. 23: 8; John 1: 9, 18; 3: 32; 13: 3; 1 Cor. 1: 30; Col. 2: 3; Deut. 18: 18, 19; Is. 11: 2, 3; 50: 4). Hence God revealed His thoughts usually through Jesus in the Old Testament times, and exclusively through Him in the New Testament times (Rev. 5: 5-9, 12). What God revealed through Him God reduced to writing as the Bible. Hence, secondarily, being the depository of the revelations that God made through Him, the Bible is God's mouth (Deut. 8: 3; Ps. 45: 1; 105: 5; 119: 13, 72, 88; 138: 4; Is. 1: 20; 30: 2; 45: 23; 48: 3; 55: 11; 62: 2; Matt. 4: 4; 2 Thes. 2: 8). Hence we understand the first use of the word *mouth* in v. 8 antitypically to mean the Bible as God's mouth. The second use of the word *mouth* in v. 8 antitypically refers to Jesus' mouth. To the *world* Jesus' mouth was up to 1917 the Church, and since 1917 the Great Company; but to the General Church Jesus' mouth specifically has been the star-members, even as they have also been up to 1917 the leading part of the Church as Christ's mouth to the world. This is the thought implied in the seven letters to the seven churches as written *for* [the proper translation] the angels of these

seven churches (Rev. 2, 3). It is the thought implied in the seven stars' being held in Jesus' right hand (Rev. 1: 16, 20), and it is the thought implied in Aholiab's being the special and only named assistant of Bezaleel (Ex. 31: 2, 6). This is especially, though not exclusively, the thought implied in the expression *prophets* in Eph. 2: 20; 3: 5; 4: 11.

(30) We are now prepared to see what is meant antitypically by God's speaking mouth to mouth, with Moses. It means that Jesus by the star-members as His mouth would speak to God, who speaks in the Bible as His mouth, and that God in the Bible would speak to Jesus in the star-members as His mouth. What is meant by the statement that Jesus by the star-members as His mouth would speak to God, who speaks to Him in them by the Bible as His mouth? First, that Jesus has stirred up in their minds the questions pertinent to those truths that are about due, and, second, that they have searched the Scriptures for the answer to these questions; for such a searching is a speaking in question form to God in His mouth, the Bible. Thus Jesus by His mouth (the star-members) speaks to God's mouth (the Bible). And what is meant by God speaking through the Bible, His mouth, to Jesus in His mouth, the star-members? God speaking through Jesus, His Interpreter, by the Bible (God's mouth) to Jesus in His mouth (the star-members), *i.e.*, God giving by Jesus, through the Bible, His answers to the questions on the Truth as due, which questions Jesus has stirred up in the minds of the star-members, as His mouth, to put to the Bible, as God's mouth. In other words, it has been their privilege as Jesus' mouth to study the Bible directly and to get from such study the Divinely due Truth from the Bible, as God's mouth, directly. This is a privilege not given to the non-star-membered servants of the Truth, who whenever they get something new get it not by direct Bible study, but by sudden Divine illumination. It is as though they had

stumbled upon such new things; for it suddenly flashes through their minds, as though by accident. For them to attempt to speak mouth to mouth with God would be the solemnly forbidden gazing, speculation, of Ex. 19: 21. We can readily see why they cannot speak mouth to mouth with God: Jesus being the sole Interpreter of the Bible, and God forbidding such *gazing*, He does not directly from the Bible answer the queries with which they approach it. But He does answer through the Bible the questions of the star-members as due, put by them to Him in the Bible as His mouth. This is one of the three unique privileges of such star-members while acting as such, *i.e.*, as Jesus' mouth.

(31) It is a widely held view, both among some Truth people and among Protestants, that it is the privilege of all Christians to do direct Bible study, *i.e.*, to use the Bible as a text-book, both privately and publicly, and from such study to learn the Truth. Thus they treat the Bible as a text-book, and not as a book of texts. The Bible certainly is not a text-book, and therefore should not be treated as such. A little consideration will show this. A text-book is a logical progressive and orderly treatise on some branch of learning. Any arithmetic will serve as an illustration. In it the subjects are presented as they logically belong together; each line of thought is kept separate and distinct. The subjects are presented so as to progress in each one from the simpler to the more complex, and in their relations so that one leads up to the next. They are never mixed up, but each one follows in its proper order. In these ways the entire subject of arithmetic is presented in such a text-book. The same general course is followed in every other rightly prepared textbook. But the Bible is not so arranged. In no one place in the Bible is everything on any given subject found, let alone discussed in its logical and progressive order. Rather it is treated "here a little, there a little." Take any one of its subjects, like faith, repentance, justification,

God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, man, the ransom, etc., and it will be found that its thoughts are scattered all about the Bible in connection with other subjects whose subject matter also is given in many scattered places in connection with still other subjects, also presented piecemeal, etc., etc. It is for this reason that the Bible to the non-star-helped student is the most complicated, mixed-up book in existence. It is more of a puzzle than a thousand Chinese puzzles combined into one. And Chinese puzzles are generally considered the most complicated of human inventions. We say this of the Bible reverently. Hence it is certainly not a textbook; it is a book of scattered, disjointed, crazy-quilted and often enigmatical texts.

(32) Both from the facts of experience and from the Bible this is seen to be true. Is not the fact that there are hundreds of sects, all basing their creeds on the Bible, yet contradicting one another, a proof that the Bible is not a text-book, but a book of more or less scattered, disjointed, crazy-quilted and enigmatical texts? Does not the fact that those classes that take up a Bible book and study it verse by verse and chapter by chapter often come to as many opinions on the meaning of many verses as there are members in these classes, prove that the Bible is not a text-book, but a book of more or less scattered, disjointed, crazy-quilted and enigmatical texts? And is not the same thing evident from private text-bookistic study of the Bible? Do not the contradictory results of the studies of Levite leaders prove the same thing? And do not the mistakes of star-members in presenting things before due prove this same proposition? These facts certainly prove that the Bible is not so plain that the wayfaring man though a fool will not err therein (Is. 35: 8). And this is what the Bible itself teaches on the subject. St. Paul (1 Cor. 13: 12) says of Christians as to the Bible: "We now see through a glass, darkly," literally, enigmatically. Again, he says in 1 Cor. 2: 7: "We speak the

wisdom of God in a mystery." Jesus speaks to the same effect in Matt. 13: 35: "I will open my mouth in *parables*; I will utter things which have been kept secret [in the Old Testament] from the foundation of the world." Is. 28: 10-13 tells us the same. The Bible has indeed been given as follows: "Precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little." Vs. 9, 10 show that this structure of the Bible is made so as to give the faithful the kind of teaching calculated to help them trialfully, while v. 13 shows that it is also intended to stumble the unworthy. St. Paul and David give this same testimony (Rom. 11: 9, 10). There is a good reason why this should be true of the structure of the Bible: God knew that the Bible would come into the hands of billions, whom, for the most part, He did not wish to understand it. His reasons for this are gracious: It would be good for the Church as a test of character, especially along the lines of faith, meekness, humility, reverence and obedience; and it would be good for the world, the unbelief class; for if they were now, in a faith dispensation, to understand the Bible, they would inevitably misuse it, which might ultimately result in their losing everlasting life when put on trial therefore in the Millennium. Hence God has constructed the Bible enigmatically, so that they might not understand it, and thus be reserved for a trial for life with better prospects for success in a dispensation in which they can be saved, if they will. "He hath done all things well!" Hence the Bible is not a text-book; but it is a book of texts.

(33) If the Bible is not a text-book it should not be studied as such. Such study of it must result in evil; for it is a misuse of it; and to misuse it, of course, brings evil results. If the text-bookistic study of the Bible is harmful to the Lord's people, should they study the Bible at all? That they should study it is evident from the fact that its study is commanded in,

and approved by the Bible (John 5: 39; Is. 8: 20; 30: 21; Deut. 29: 29; 31: 10-13; 2 Tim. 3: 15-17; Acts 8: 28, 30; 17: 11; Ps. 1: 2; 119: 96-100, 103, 105, 140; 147: 19; Jer. 15: 16; Ezek. 3: 10; Luke 11: 28; Rom. 15: 4; 2 Pet. 3: 2; Rev. 1: 3). These Scriptures show that it should be regarded and studied as the source and rule of faith and practice. But how should it be studied? We answer: It should be studied as it is—as a book of texts. If one asks, What is meant by studying it as a book of texts? we reply: Studying it like the Bereans of old. This is seen in Acts 17: 11, where the Bereans are commended as more noble than the Thessalonians, because they listened with all readiness of mind to the things preached to them by Paul and daily searched in the Scriptures to see whether the things that he declared to them were true. Here we have the Divinely approved method of Bible study: (1) a star-member of Jesus' mouth explains the Divine message, the Word of God; (2) good attention with a ready mind is given to his presentations, and (3) daily search is made in the Scriptures to see whether these teachings come from, and are in harmony with the Bible. Why is this the correct method? Because Jesus, the only true Interpreter of God's Word, almost always, and almost entirely, in the first instance gives the Truth as due through the star-members. Hence the first thing necessary in Bible study is to put oneself in contact with the star-member officiating in his time. This is done sometimes consciously and sometimes unconsciously. In the latter instance Jesus manipulates the true-hearted in a way to bring such in contact with the officiating star-member, either personally or in some of those who recognize him as such, or in his writings. Even when direct or indirect personal contact is established, usually the main contact is in the star-member's writings.

(34) These three methods can be seen operating especially in the Parousia and in the Epiphany. Hence,

usually, the Parousia messenger's and the Epiphany messenger's writings, as main points of contact, are to be used as the text books for Bible study. These writings abound in Scriptural passages cited or quoted as proofs. Hence what they say should be subjected to the test of the Bible as a book of texts; and their teachings and those of the other star-members, who ministered before their times, must be studied with all readiness of mind, with the object in view of determining whether their teachings originate from, and are in harmony with the Scriptures. Such is real Bible study; and as such is fruitful unto increase in knowledge, grace and service. Hence the Berean method of Bible study is the ideal one, and that is the one that the noble Bereans of old practiced. But why, additional to the reason given above, is that not fruitful Bible study which studies it as a text-book? Because God will not talk to all mouth to mouth; He talks that way to Jesus only, as the latter speaks through His mouth, the star-members. Consequently, Jesus does not directly interpret the Word in such study, and consequently instead of such study yielding Truth it produces error. Only to the star-members will direct Bible study result in blessing, for He is the One who does it in them with the Truth, and that as it is due. Hence all non-star-membered brethren, regardless of whether they are teachers in the Church or not, if they pursue textbookism, the study of the Bible as a text-book, will thereby go into error. Their study of the Bible should be to investigate with readiness of mind the teachings of the star-members to learn if they are true, and when they find them true to seek further corroboration of them from Scriptures not cited or quoted by them for proof, which is particularly the privilege of the non-star-membered teachers in the Church. It is because of pursuing text-bookism that false teachers and sifters have arisen in the Church, as *e.g.*, the Parousia and Epiphany experiences so abundantly prove. This

accounts for the many errors of the Levite leaders of the present, not a few of whom advocate text-bookism—the study of the Bible by the brethren as a text-book. For our Pastor's thought on this subject please see Z '10, 298, pars. 3-5, 8.

(35) It is most necessary that students of the Bible as a book of texts study the star-members' writings, like the noble Bereans, with all readiness of mind, else they will get no lasting blessing from their study. There are especially six qualities necessary to constitute all readiness of mind; Humility (Matt. 11: 25), meekness (Ps. 25: 9), hunger (Matt. 5: 6), honesty and goodness (Luke 8: 15), and reverence (Ps. 25: 14). Humility is needed, because with it one feels his lacks and his need of God, Christ, the Bible and the star-member's teaching. Meekness is necessary, because it furnishes the teachableness of mind and submissiveness of heart that will make him open and responsive to the proper teachings. Hunger for Truth and righteousness—strong yearning for them—is needed to make one's love for these strong enough to overcome the obstacles in the way of his attaining the Truth. Honesty of mind and heart are needed to accept as true the Truth, since a dishonest heart naturally impinges against the Truth, while an honest heart has affinity to the Truth. Reverence is needed, because without it one is not, and with it is rewarded by God with the Truth. And, finally, goodness of heart is needed, because, as like likes like, the Truth being an expression of goodness, a good heart naturally appreciates it. Such are the heart qualities necessary for one to have to receive blessing from the Divinely approved method of Bible study. And not only is such a heart needed to get the Truth initially, but it is also necessary to get it progressively, as it is the one needed to retain the Truth received. The reason why people who once had the Truth lose it is that they have lost these

heart qualities. But with these heart qualities retained one becomes a real Berean student of the Bible.

(36) We know that not a few Truth people and almost all Protestants will deny the view of Bible study that we have just expounded, insisting on studying the Bible as a textbook. But while our view of it is the Scriptural one (Acts 8: 27-35; 17: 11), their view is condemned by the Bible; for their view makes one inevitably a speculator, and whoever speculates does a Divinely forbidden thing. God, foreknowing that there would be much speculation during the Parousia and the Epiphany, gives us a special warning against it in Ex. 19: 21-25. The typical setting and chronology of this event is immediately before the giving of the Law Covenant; and St. Paul's reference to it—type and antitype—in Heb. 12: 18-29, shows that the antitype refers to the end of the Age—the Parousia and the Epiphany. This is also typically shown by the expression of v. 16: "On the *third* day in the *morning*." That the Epiphany is also included antitypically in this expression is evident from the fact of the thick cloud (v. 16) and the mountain's being on fire (the great tribulation, 1914-1954), the earthquake (Armageddon; v. 18) and the trumpet (the seventh; v. 19) sounding long (covering at least the Parousia and the Epiphany; v. 13). In fact, the seventh trumpet began to sound in 1874 and will continue to sound until 2874. Hence, we know that the scene here is Parousiac and Epiphaniac. The bounds that Moses set (vs. 12, 23) correspond to (1) the antitypical Curtain, that shuts off the view of the antitypical Court from those in the antitypical Camp; (2) the antitypical First Vail, that shuts off the view of the Holy from those in the antitypical Court; and (3) the antitypical Second Vail, that shuts off the antitypical Most Holy from those in the antitypical Holy. V. 21 types God's Parousia and Epiphany charge against any attempt to break through these antitypical bounds and gaze, *i.e.*, speculate. The

Latin word *speculare*, from which our word *speculate* is derived, means to gaze with one's mental eyes; and to speculate in a religious sense means to gaze into the unknown and forbidden with the mental eyes. The antitype of this charge is easily recognized in the warnings given the Lord's people, both in the Parousia and in the Epiphany, not to speculate. God, Himself, has been giving this charge to Jesus, who has especially announced it through the Parousia and Epiphany messengers, others taking up the cry from them, and also sounding it.

(37) V. 21 also shows the penalty of such gazing—"many of them perish." In the antitype this does not mean literal death, but a ceasing to exist in their former standing. E.g., Mr. Darwin, who was in the antitypical Camp, tried to gaze into the Most Holy and learn what method God used in creation. This caused him and "many" others to go into serious error and resultantly to perish as antitypical Camp members, by becoming infidels, whose place is outside the antitypical Camp. Many justified ones have speculated on matters pertinent to the Spirit-begotten and Spirit-born conditions (the antitypical Holy and Most Holy), which resulted in their and many others going into serious error, and which made them "perish," lose their justified condition and go back into the antitypical Camp. Many a Priest, speculating on matters not yet due in the Holy and on things in the Most Holy, and by such speculation seeking to set aside things due in the Holy, have lost their crowns and occasioned "many" others to do the same, and thus they perished as Priests and thus became of the Great Company. This we see exemplified on all sides in the Epiphany. Some of these have continued their speculations to such a degree as to cause themselves and others to perish as Great Company members, and thus became Second Deathers. Youthful Worthies have speculated themselves into perishing as such, have fallen back into the antitypical

Camp, died as Youthful Worthies. Vs. 21, 22, 24 show that all these classes can do this evil thing—speculate—and reap its consequences—perish. V. 22 urges that especially the priests sanctify themselves, separate themselves from this evil of gazing. This corresponds to the many warnings given the antitypical Priests in the Parousia and the Epiphany not to speculate lest the Lord unpriest them.

(38) Moses' saying (v. 23) to the Lord that the set bounds would prevent the people from dishallowing the mountain by coming up to it, types the fact that our Lord Jesus assured the Father that those in the antitypical Camp cannot see into the antitypical Court, that those in the antitypical Court cannot see into the antitypical Holy and that those in the antitypical Holy cannot see its matters before due, nor see into the antitypical Most Holy, all of which we recognize as true. But while this is true, Jehovah, nevertheless, knows that the attempt so to do would be made and that that attempt would bring the threatened punishment. Hence, He charged our Lord (v. 24) to *go down* and prevent the attempt (by moral suasion, of course). Then, in v. 24, God shows who might approach Him and who might not approach Him. Those who might approach Him were Moses and Aaron. Here Moses represents our Lord. Whom does Aaron type? Because the setting is both Parousiac and Epiphaniac, and because in these two periods two different star-members have officiated, the Parousia messenger and the Epiphany messenger, Aaron types both of these. What is typed by Moses' coming up to God? Our Lord's approaching the Father for the messages due in the Parousia and the Epiphany preparatory to His giving them to the people. Please note the different way Moses is represented as coming to God from that of Aaron's approach: "Thou shalt come up, thou, and Aaron *with thee.*" This shows the subordinate position of Aaron relatively to that of Moses; and it types the subordination

of the Parousia and Epiphany messengers to Jesus in their approaching God.

(39) But how have they done this? The contrast between Aaron and all the others, priests and people, what is forbidden the antitypes of the priests and people, and the office powers of these two messengers, suggest the answer. The antitypical Priests and people do their forbidden speculation mainly by a text-bookistic study of the Bible, while God, speaking mouth to mouth with Jesus as the latter speaks in the star-members, suggests that these two messengers (and all other star-members in their days had the same privilege, as their stewardship truths were due) could, in their direct Bible study, come to God as Jesus' subordinates to study in the Bible the features of Bible Truth about to become due. Thus, we see that these two and all other star-members have had privileges as to Bible study, denied all other brethren. We may be sure that this was not for their sakes. Rather, it was for the sake of the others, in whose interests they have gladly done the labor and endured the toil of their office. All through the Age the star-members have been the special targets of the devil, the world and the flesh. As their privilege of being Jesus' mouth, hand and eye has been great, so have their labors, suffering and dangers been great. They should not be envied for their office; for it is a most difficult and exacting one; but they should be all the more loved, prayed for and cooperated with, therefore; for they have delighted to bless the brethren and have used their office for that purpose, regardless of their resultant sufferings. None of them have felt proud of their position, nor disdainful of their less prominent brethren. All of them have felt that they were elder brothers who gladly exercised a loving watchcare over their younger brethren. And the faithful have always recognized this, have held them highly in love for their works' sake, and have supported them amid their toils and battles for the

Lord, the Truth and the brethren. Some will say that the Epiphany messenger is conceited for writing as he has just done. Nay, beloved, we so write, not for our, but for your sakes; for, as in the Parousia, the many attacks on our Pastor made the knowledge that he was that Servant, the Parousia messenger, helpful for the brethren to stand, so now in the Epiphany the many attacks on the Epiphany messenger make the knowledge that he is such helpful for the brethren to stand. We truthfully can say of ourself what a greater than we said of himself, "By the grace of God I am what I am" (1 Cor. 15: 10). We feel deeply our own personal unworthiness. Our trust is in the grace of God, the High-Priestly ministry of Jesus and the participation of the Holy Spirit for fitness for our work. It is all of grace, for which God be praised!

(40) The fact that these star-members have been our Lord's eye, mouth and hand makes them sustain a closer official and personal relation to Him than any other contemporary members of the Little Flock; and this is due both to their office under the Lord and to their greater faithfulness than the rest of the members of the Little Flock living in their individual times; for these have been preeminently the brethren who have increased their one pound to ten pounds and their five talents to ten talents. And it is because they are the eye, hand and mouth of the Lord Jesus that to them in the most particular sense the thought of Luke 10: 16 applies: "He that heareth you heareth Me; and he that despiseth you despiseth Me; and he that despiseth Me despiseth Him that sent Me." This office; however, does not make them lords over God's heritage, even as St. Paul, the next most eminent of these 49 brothers, whose most eminent one was that Servant, says (2 Cor. 1: 24): "Not that we lord it [the literal translation] over your faith, but we are co-workers of your joy." It is, among other reasons, because they lack the lording spirit and are as tender nurses to the babes,

and elder brothers to the adolescent and full-grown in the Little Flock, and are willing lovingly to serve all, that the Lord has promoted them to this office. Their faithfulness to Truth and righteousness has made them uncompromising in opposition to those who would injure the Church; but to the faithful they have been most loving and self-sacrificing; and thus, despite their natural infirmities, have under the Head given the Body members an example for imitation. And amid all their privileges they have recognized that they have not been lords, but that at most they have been His hand, eye and mouth. God and Him it has been their highest ambition to honor, serve and obey in the service of His body, for which they have taken pleasure in laying down life. Hence, the Lord has been able, for the interests of all concerned, to use them as His hand, eye and mouth.

(41) In v. 8 the second unique privilege of Jesus acting in the star-members is also set forth, "I will speak . . . even plainly, and not enigmatically [literal translation]." Such was not the way (v. 6) that God says that He would speak to the typical prophets, but the reverse. But to Moses He did speak "even plainly, and not enigmatically." What does this mean antitypically? We reply: God would reveal to our Lord acting in the star-members the truths as due in understandable and reasonable ways, and not in ways that would baffle their reason or their understanding, *i.e.*, not in incomprehensible ways. This means that these would so get the Truth by personal Bible study and that none others would so get it by personal Bible study. The nominal-church teachers claim that the Bible teaches many "mysteries" as *incomprehensible things*, e.g., the trinity, human immortality, eternal torment, absolute predestination and reprobation of individuals, the God-man theory, the real presence of Jesus' body and blood in 'the Lord's Supper, in which they are received by the communicants' literal mouths,

the omnipresence of Christ's humanity, the visibility of Christ's second advent during a 24-hour day to all of earth inhabitants, a 24-hour judgment day, the resuscitation of the body that goes into the grave, etc. They use the word *mystery* to mean an incomprehensible, self-contradictory thing, which is not a Bible mystery, but is a Satanic *mixuptery*, Babylon, confusion, while the Bible uses the word to mean a secret not understood until revealed, and then comprehended. Hence, St. Paul speaks of one's *understanding* all mysteries (1 Cor. 13: 2) and of the Ephesians' *perceiving his understanding* in the mystery of Christ (Eph. 3: 3, 4, A. R. V.). Jesus tells the disciples that it was given to them to *understand* the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 13: 11; Luke 8: 10); and His explanations (Matt. 13: 18-23, 37-43) of the parables of the four kinds of soil and of the wheat and tares as among such mysteries proves them to be comprehensible after they were explained. The mysteries of Israel's blindness (Rom. 11: 25-32), of the Parousia saints as dying, but not sleeping (1 Cor. 15: 51), of the oneness of Adam and Eve (Eph. 5: 32), of the Christ as a company (Col. 1: 26, 27), of God and Christ (2: 2, 3), of the Christ (made manifest—4: 3, 4), of iniquity (2 Thes. 2: 7), of godliness (1 Tim. 3: 16), of the seven stars and the seven candlesticks (Rev. 1: 20) and of the woman (Rev. 17: 5, 7), when explained, are all comprehensible. Hence, the nominal church definition of a Bible mystery is wrong. The Bible view of its mysteries is that they are secrets that, when explained, are reasonable.

(42) From this we can see what is meant by the expression, "With him I will speak. . . even plainly, and not enigmatically." It means that Jehovah, when speaking to Jesus in the star-members, will not tell Him in them incomprehensible things, nor things of which He in them will have vague, indefinite notions, but will make them plain and comprehensible to Him in them.

How finely this is illustrated in the teachings of our Lord in these star-members. This we can see in Arius' teachings on the person of Christ, before, during and after His carnation, in opposition to the God-man theory; in Zwingli's teaching on the Lord's Supper, as against transubstantiationism; in Marsiglio's teaching on the headship of Jesus, as against that of the pope; in Servetus' doctrine of the unity of God, as against the trinity; in Hubmaier's teaching on exclusive believers' baptism, as against infant baptism; and, above all, in that Servant's whole setting of the doctrines of God's Plan. How beautifully plain they are! How free from the enigmas of "subtle theologians," whose "mix-upteries" are supposed to be so deep! Yes, deep with the depths of Satan (Rev. 2: 24)! And the Epiphany doctrines and its explanations of the pertinent Bible mysteries are also plain, clear and free from enigmas. If one comes to us teaching incomprehensible doctrines we may forthwith reject him as a messenger of Satan, presenting darkness for light. The Truth commends itself as such by its clarity and comprehensibility, while error, like the mole, always dodges into the hole of "mystery" at the approach of the Truth, which always commends itself to sound reason (Is. 1: 18). Thus God speaks to Jesus in the star-members plainly, not enigmatically, *i.e.*, whenever due the Truth is given plainly, comprehensibly, not enigmatically, incomprehensibly.

(43) The third unique privilege of Jesus acting in the star-members is set forth in these words: "And the image of Jehovah shall he attentively behold [literal translation]." In the type this would mean that God would manifest Himself to Moses by a representation of Himself, a privilege that neither Aaron, as a prophet, nor any other prophet, could have, but that as high priest Aaron could have. This seems to refer to the Shekinah in the Most Holy as the medium of information. This privilege Aaron could have only when acting

as the type of the Church's and the World's High Priest. What is meant by Jesus acting in the star-members as attentively beholding the image of Jehovah? Certainly, this does not mean that they would see an image of God's body (John 5: 37). Rather, by the antitypical image of Jehovah we are to understand His character to be meant, even as Christ's character is called Christ's image (Rom. 8: 29; 2 Cor. 3: 18; 4: 4; Col. 3: 10). How does He do this? By making in them direct Bible study, through which the Bible *doctrines*, which manifest God's character as perfect in wisdom, power, justice and love, become clear to them as due. It will be noted that while God has given the non-star-membered teachers of the General Church and the more prominent local elders visions and dreams, He has never given them to see as a thing new a *doctrine*. This privilege is limited exclusively to our Lord acting in the star-members. Any attempt on the part of a non-star-membered teacher or of a non-teacher as the first one to work out a doctrine would be speculation, and would, therefore, not result in uncovering a new truth, but would result in error. But the star-members from the first to the last have been given this privilege, and by attentively studying the Bible on new doctrines as these became due, they have gotten to see them, and from them are given an ever increasing insight, and that, first of all God's people, into the Divine character, Jehovah's image, as revealed in those doctrines. That this is a privilege of our Lord acting in the star-members can be seen especially in St. Paul and in our Pastor. The former's study of the Old Testament types resulted in his working out, *e.g.*, practically all the doctrines presented in the epistle to the Hebrews; and the latter's study of both the Old and the New Testaments has resulted in his working out almost all Truth doctrines, except some pertinent to the Great Company, the Youthful Worthies, the Epiphany world and to the Priesthood in their relations.

to these three classes. The working out of these excepted doctrines is the privilege of the Epiphany messenger.

(44) Having shown (vs. 6-8) Moses' incomparable superiority as a mouthpiece of His, in contrast with the subordinate mouthpieceship that Aaron and Miriam had as prophets for God, Jehovah pointedly asks the latter, "Why did ye not fear to speak against My [special] servant, against Moses" (v. 8)? Antitypically this means that God caused the question, through various pertinent rebukes, remonstrances and contradictions, given antitypical Aaron and Miriam by faithful brethren, to be brought to their attention: Why did they not have more reverence for our Lord speaking in the star-members than to have contradicted Him speaking in them, and thus by act claiming equality with Him in mouthpieceship for God? This question implies that both in the type and the antitype there was a lack of reverence toward the Lord Jesus in the star-members. Had there been proper reverence present, neither the typical nor the antitypical gainsayers would have factually claimed equality with Jesus in the star-members in mouthpieceship for God. Their lack of reverence in both type and antitype made them too bold, yea, more or less arrogant and impudent. This is true more emphatically of typical and antitypical Miriam than of typical and antitypical Aaron. And certainly their course and God's rebuke of them should also be an earnest warning to us to refrain from murmuring against any of God's choice for membership in Christ's Bride and from contradicting Jesus speaking in the star-members.

(45) Jehovah's disapproval of typical and antitypical Miriam and Aaron is sufficiently shown in vs. 2-8, but v. 9 advances beyond a description of His disapproval and expresses His displeasure. Surely, in type and antitype it is a terrible thing to have fallen into Jehovah's displeasure; for as it is of the greatest blessing

to have God's pleasure, so is it of the greatest evil to have His displeasure. Particularly is this true of the antitype. The expression, "And He departed" (v. 9), types the thought that God had finished His dealing with that phase of the matters hitherto discussed. This is further emphasized in v. 10, by the expression, "And the cloud departed from off the tabernacle," which antitypically signifies that all the pertinent Truth due on the matter at hand having been given, any further Truth on that subject, of course, could not be due and was, therefore, not forthcoming. Now comes an emphasized thing in the type, as the literal translation shows, "Behold, Miriam leprous, as snow [is white]." There is nothing in the type to indicate that she was leprous all over her body. In fact, the only parts of her body that would normally be visible would be her head, neck, hands and feet. The Hebrew reading, "*behold*," like the English, implies that not more than part or all of her visible members were affected, for the attention of *sight* is called upon, in the expression, *behold*, to act. The fact that she is used as a type of the Great Company proves that her leprosy did not cover her entire body, which would type the Adamic depravity (Lev. 13: 12, 13), but was only found in spots, here and there (Lev. 13: 1-11, 14-46; Vol. IV, Chap. IV). The expression, "Aaron *turned* to Miriam, and, behold, leprous!" (literal translation), implies that previously he had not been watching her, that his mind was so intent on his part in the murmuring and factual claiming of equality to Moses as mouthpiece for God as not to have paid much attention to her, which had he done diligently, he might have seen the impropriety of the whole action. But now turning his attention to her, he sees in her condition a sure evidence of the sin and folly of their procedure.

(46) Antitypically, while the scene of the second, third and fourth clauses of v. 10 had a minor fulfillment in the Jewish Harvest, as the cases of Alexander,

Hymenaeus, Philetus and Diotrephes prove; for Apostles by inspiration gave the knowledge to the brethren that these four, and perhaps others, were afflicted with Great Company uncleanness (1 Tim. 1: 19, 20; 2 Tim. 2: 16-18; 3 John 9, 10), yet during the time between the Jewish Harvest and the Epiphany God and Jesus alone knew the Great Company members as such in their uncleanness; for God during that time concealed from the brethren the knowledge as to who was afflicted with Great Company uncleanness. This moves us to conclude that the special and major time for the antitype of vs. 10-16 is the Epiphany, for this is the special period during which the Lord reveals to the priesthood the Great Company as such in their uncleanness. Now no longer, as was the case in the Apostle's days, is inspiration necessary to a Priest in order to his seeing and pointing out an antitypical spotted leper. During the Epiphany the Lord has made known to us the sure symptoms of antitypical leprosy—revolutionism against the Lord's teachings and arrangements and persistency therein on the part of a new creature (hair turned white or yellow and the sore deeper than the skin; Lev. 13). Hence all a Priest now needs in order to see and point out a Great Company member is the pertinent illumination. As between the Jewish Harvest and the Epiphany such illumination was not given any Priest, apart from the minor fulfillment of vs. 10-16 in the Jewish Harvest, these verses had no *full* antitype until the Epiphany, though there was an antityping of vs. 1-9 and the first clause of v. 10 throughout the Age, particularly in the Jewish Harvest, the Parousia and the Epiphany. Hence the special application of Aaron's turning to Miriam belongs to the Epiphany. His turning to her represents the more prominent non-star-membered contradicting Priests, both in and out of the Epiphany Truth, giving their special attention to the uncleansed Great Company. Those in the Epiphany Truth give this

attention understandingly; those not in the Epiphany Truth without real understanding of the situation, which when they come into the Epiphany Truth they will comprehend. Of course, after the Jewish Harvest and before the Epiphany antitypical Aaron saw the actual Great Company uncleanness without recognizing it as such; for these have done much evil.

(47) And what a horrifying sight! It was horrifying to Aaron to see his own beloved sister in such a terrible plight! But it has been even more horrifying to antitypical Aaron to see the uncleanness of the Great Company, and that from two standpoints: (1) Between the Jewish Harvest and the Epiphany, as he saw the evils that antitypical Miriam did as expressions of crown-losers' uncleanness, though not recognized by him as such; and (2) in the Jewish Harvest and in the Epiphany. While it is not sure that they were pictured in Aaron, Timothy and Gaius, to whom Paul and John revealed the Great Company uncleanness of Alexander, Hymenaeus, Philetus and Diotrephes, must have felt horror thereat. Certainly, without understanding that they were actually beholding Great Company uncleanness, antitypical Aaron was horror-struck at the evils and errors of certain popes and Greek hierarchs, error-inventing Greek and Romanist theologians, Calvin's errors and persecuting and securing the burning of Servetus, as well as the errors, etc., of other crown-lost leaders. Some of us recall the horror that we felt at certain brethren in the Parousia manifesting what we later learned was Great Company uncleanness. The cases of Pilgrim Bros. MacMillan, (Clayton) Woodworth, Hemery, Hoskins (the father) and other less prominent leaders who temporarily went wrong in the Covenants controversy, were Parousia examples of brethren who actually had Great Company uncleanness. Though we did not then understand it as such, yet we were horrified at their course. But the special time of horror experienced by antitypical

Aaron came during the Epiphany. All members of antitypical Aaron, despite their being partly guilty, have greatly bewailed and have been horrified by the uncleanness of Great Company brethren in the Epiphany. This is true even of those members of antitypical Aaron who are not yet Epiphany-enlightened, who do not see the real condition of antitypical Miriam, and who yet recognize errors of doctrine and wrongs of conduct in her, so manifest on all sides.

(48) But this is emphatically true of such of antitypical Aaron who are Epiphany-enlightened. How horrified have they been at the persistent revolutionisms in doctrine and practice seen in the Society section of antitypical Miriam. The same is true of them as to antitypical Miriam in the P.B.I., B.S.C. and the leaders in the rest of the nearly 60 groups of Levites. Their Truth repudiations and error advocacies and their repudiations of the Lord's arrangements and their institution of others in their stead, have certainly horrified antitypical Aaron, even though he has not been entirely blameless throughout the Parousia and Epiphany in these respects. This part of antitypical Aaron recognizes the actual situation. Though during the Epiphany the writer and some other Priests are not involved in antitypical Aaron, all of such have been horrified at the course of antitypical Miriam. The revolutionisms of the British managers, the Society leaders, the P.B.I., B.S.C. and numerous other Levite leaders, certainly filled us with horror. We were dumb-struck at some of their evils; for, esteeming these leading brothers above ourself, we were astounded that such brethren could be guilty of such perfidy as we discovered in them; and this horror contributed much to our severe handling of some of them, e.g., H.J. Shearn, Wm. Crawford, J. Hemery, J.F. Rutherford, I. Hoskins, I.L. Margeson, C. Kasprzykowski, M. Kostyn, etc. Our thinking of and loving them as "Christ in you," as part of Jehovah's anointed,

certainly made us feel severe shocks when their gross and persistent revolutionism stood stark-naked before our eyes. E.g., how could we have felt otherwise at H.J. Shearn's and Wm. Crawfords gross disregard of the Lord's arrangements given through our Pastor; when we became well aware of their course shortly after his death, with our hearts filled with appreciation for his faithfulness and wisdom, with deep mourning at our loss of him, with the knowledge that their course had greatly troubled him, especially during his last six weeks, and with the determination to preserve him in loving remembrance as faithful while in the flesh and since leaving the flesh among the greatest of overcomers in glory? Naturally we were horrified.

(49) And what a horrible condition was that in which antitypical Miriam found herself! While all through the Age the uncleanness of the crown-losers could be seen, apart from those specially pointed out as such by inspiration during the Jewish Harvest, this uncleanness was not recognized as that of crown-losers until the Epiphany; but in the Epiphany this uncleanness has not only been seen, but it has also been seen as Great Company uncleanness. In all cases it has manifested itself in persistent revolutionism against either the Lord's teachings or arrangements, or against both, with power-grasping, lording and sectarianism, in very arbitrary usurpations, as the case of J.F.R. shows the most plainly of all. The list of unholy characteristics set forth in 2 Tim. 3: 1-9 is seen more or less in all of the leaders of the Levite groups—self-lovers, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers (lying slanderers), disobedient to (spiritual) parents, unthankful, inhuman, implacable, false accusers, without self-control, fierce, haters of good men, traitors, heady, highminded, pleasure-lovers rather than God-lovers, formalistic, without religion's power, deceivers of weak-minded, corrupt-hearted and fickle-willed women, unfruitfully studious, corrupted in opinions, apostates from the Truth,

liars, hypocrites. What horrible characters! Yet whoever knows thoroughly men like Wm. Crawford, J. Hemery, J.F. Rutherford, A.H. MacMillan, C. Kasprzykowski, M. Kostyn, etc., cannot doubt that this description fits them, some more, some less, yet more or less fitting all of them. Yes, and some of them have been proven to be thieves! Leprous, indeed! And what shall be said of their partisan followers? Not a few of them are spotted with similar leprous sores, though, of course, not so badly. Yea, antitypical Miriam can now be seen as such—leprous. Truly, antitypical Miriam is a sight to grieve angels and distress saints! And she does it!

(50) Typical Aaron recognized from Miriam's sad plight the actual state of affairs—that both of them were guilty and that the Lord was expressing His disapproval of the course of both of them, at Miriam's course more than at his, yet at the course of both. So in the antitype, the more conscientious and less sinning non-star-membered teachers as Little Flock members quickly from the evil characteristics of the unclean crown-losing leaders recognized that the leaders in both classes had sinned and committed folly (v. 11). We will give several examples of these. It will be noted that our dear Bro. Barton once had a share in the antitype of Aaron as set forth in this chapter. He went wrong on the matter of accepting and teaching that in addition to the papacy's being Antichrist, there would be an individual personal Antichrist at the end of the Age (Z' 16, 76-78). He made the mistake of teaching this thought to the brethren before submitting it to Bro. Russell, which act made him share in antitypical Aaron's claiming by act equality with our Lord in the officiating star-member (that Servant) as a mouthpiece for God. The public, though gentle, rebuke that he got by God's reply through our Pastor moved him to recognize and acknowledge the wrong and folly of his course, which was his share in the

antitype of Aaron's acknowledging his sin and folly (v. 11). Bro. John Edgar, in the opening part of the Sin-offerings, Mediator and Covenants controversy (1908-1911), offered a mild dissent from the view of the New Covenant that Jesus was giving through the officiating star-member, and thereby became involved in the antitype of Aaron as set forth in Num. 12, claiming by the act equality with our Lord in the officiating star-member as a mouthpiece for God. But he soon saw the unholy spirit manifested by the Truth's opponents in that sifting, and, recognizing the wrong, acknowledged and confessed it, and then took the side of the Truth thereon, which course was his share in the antitype of Aaron as set forth in v. 11. In contrast, Jesse Hemery sharply attacked that Servant's pertinent view, preaching against it, not only at Glasgow, but elsewhere, and thereby involved himself in antitypical Miriam, proven by his later course.

(51) We had an experience that should be set forth here as partaking in the antitype of Aaron as given in this chapter, since it helps to clarify the subject. It was as follows: While in 1912 our Pastor began to doubt that the Church would leave the world by Oct., 1914, apart from several guarded expressions before the Bethel family, he kept silent on the subject until late in 1913, when he faintly, in a Tower article, indicated his doubts on the subject, *i.e.*, to the effect that while it was possible that the Church leave by Oct., 1914, it hardly seemed probable. Our mental comment on the subject, on reading the article, was: Faith can trust the Lord to fulfill this matter despite its seeming not very probable. In March, 1914, in a question meeting in the Washington, D.C. ecclesia, a question was asked on whether we were to expect the Church to leave by the coming October. We answered, Yes, and then gave somewhat oppositionally and dogmatically the arguments in favor thereof, as presented in the Studies and in Bros. John and Morton Edgar's writings,

whose findings were given in the Berean Manual, and had been approved by our Pastor. A stenographer present took notes on our answers, and, without submitting the notes to us for our approval, circulated them widely. In the May, 1914, Tower our Pastor came out plainly, denying that the Church would leave the world the following October. This plain statement of his caused us to decide to refrain from advocating the former thought any more, since we felt that it was not for us to contradict him when speaking plainly; for we would not have answered the question asked us at Washington as we did, had he in the Dec., 1913, Tower come out plainly on the subject, as he did in May, 1914. However, the notes on our answer were arousing not a few to reject our Pastor's clear statement of his changed view. We were troubled exceedingly to find ourself not in sympathy with this changed view, but kept our doubts out of our pilgrim teaching. It was very torturesome to us to find ourself out of harmony with our Pastor; for we knew that he was that Servant, and was, therefore, more probably right than ourself, though so far we could not see his view to be Biblical.

(52) Earnestly did we seek the throne of grace for help in the matter, asking the Lord, if the changed view were true, graciously to open our eyes thereto, but if it were untrue, to show it to us as such. A number of circumstances came wherein we were tested by questions, etc., as to whether we would oppose our Pastor's plainly expressed changed view, from which we still dissented. We answered the questions to the following effect: Our Pastor has set forth his reason for changing his view; and the brethren should study his reasons. Then we gave them. We were much troubled for nearly two months. This came to a crisis at the Columbus, Ohio, Convention, during the latter part of June, 1914. At this convention there was considerable dissent from the changed view. A number of

brethren who had read the notes on our answer to the question mentioned above came to us at that convention and expressed themselves to the following effect: Bro. Johnson, we are glad to see your stand in favor of the Church leaving by next October. Keep up that stand firmly, and we will back you; for we are on your side against the changed view. The effect of this remark was the opposite to the intended one; for we saw Satan back of that remark. Knowing that the brethren who made it were evidently in an unclean condition, we immediately rebuked the spirit that prompted a remark calculated to arouse us into opposing the Lord's eye, hand and mouth, and became very fearful that perhaps after all Satan was seeking to use us to sift the brethren. Of course, we would not lend ourself knowingly to such a thing. We went to the Lord, telling Him that none of the reasons that our Pastor gave for the changed views seemed conclusive to us, while the arguments for the old view seemed to be cogent, especially the one on Elijah coming to the mount of God after 40 days. But we also told the Lord that we would in nowise oppose Jesus' eye, mouth and hand, and pled with Him to open our eyes to see the new view, if it were true. Quickly that prayer was answered, by the Lord's calling to our mind that the penny was not given until the evening, *i.e.*, after Oct. 1914—a view not previously seen by anyone. But we did not wish to trust the thought before submitting it to our Pastor, whom we met by appointment the next day to discuss the subject. We then told him of our trouble over the question, and of our deep regret that after he had expressed his doubts on the subject we had somewhat dogmatically and oppositionally set forth the old view in the Washington question meeting, assuring him, however, that we had used only such arguments as we knew he had sanctioned. Then we stressed our doubts and emphasized especially Elijah's 40 days' journey to the mount of God. We told

him how the remarks of the brethren, mentioned above and made the day before, had affected us. Then we told him what seemed to be the first ray of light to come to us in favor of his changed view—the distribution of the penny after the end of the twelfth hour. Several days later, at the Clinton Convention, he told us that he approved this view. This settled our mind on the subject; and our heart was glad.

(53) In contrast with the way we acted on the subject, when sharing in antitypical Aaron's part, we should show A.H. MacMillan's pertinent course, when sharing in antitypical Miriam's part. Instead of our Pastor's plain statement in the May, 1914, Tower on the subject, from which he sharply dissented, moving him to silence and to waiting on the Lord, he waged a regular campaign on the subject, arguing against the changed view on various occasions during that spring, summer and early autumn up to about Oct. 1. As three-and-a-half years later, *i.e.*, March 27, 1918, he solemnly told an audience at the Society's Brooklyn Convention that the door to the high calling was closing that day, so at the Saratoga Springs Convention (Sept. 27-Oct. 4, 1914), a day or so before Oct. 1, 1914, he preached quite sharply against our Pastor's changed view and in favor of the Church leaving by about Oct. 1. We were informed that he declared that it was as true that it was to occur about that date as anything else in the Bible was true. We were further informed that against the objection that there were evidently thousands of members in Christ's Body then in the earth, he insisted that to fulfill His Word on the subject God would cause a great calamity to occur about that day, by which He would deliver the Church by the fixed time. He even said he was buying a ticket to the Pleiades—and that it was no return ticket, when he left Bethel after said Convention, and he was later located at his birthplace in W. Va., quite despondent. But Oct. 1, 1914, came and went, and parts of the

Church are still here 24 years later, and a part of it will perhaps remain here nearly 20 years more! After the separation occurred in the Society, A.H. MacMillan, to disparage us before the Church, referred to a letter on which we will comment in the next paragraph, and which we on our own initiative offered to write and then did write to steady the brethren on the subject, as a thing that proved how our Pastor so greatly disapproved of our pertinent course as to require it of us as a public retraction, whereas so far as we know our Pastor never heard of the matter until we spoke of it to him toward the end of June, 1914, at the Columbus Convention, and never uttered one word of rebuke to us on it, since he knew that our reasons were identical with those that he had used, and that he at the time had given no Scriptural reason for the changed view, merely basing it on the seeming improbability that so many brethren would leave the world in the next ten months. While slurring us on the subject, A.H. MacMillan, who, so far as we know, never expressed repentance over his long-drawn-out oppositional course, was silent on his long-continued opposition to clearly demonstrated Biblical reasons given to justify the changed view. J.F.R.'s fighting our Pastor for years on tentative justification, etc., to his face at Bethel and elsewhere is another illustration of one involving himself in antitypical Miriam.

(54) At Columbus, during the above-described interview, we told our Pastor that we wanted to counteract the effect of those notes on our answer given to the question, and on our own initiative suggested to him that we write a letter for him to publish in *The Tower*, with this end in view, which letter, though written immediately thereafter, appeared two months later in Z '14, 271. It will be remembered that above we showed that as a thing new the Lord in 1909 gave us the understanding of the penny parable up to the end of the twelfth hour, and also of who the steward was. It was

not until later, and that piecemeal, that the Lord gave us as "things new" to understand the rest of the parable's details, except its penny, which as a thing new He gave to that Servant. After 1909 the first new understanding that we got on the parable came to us on the evening of the parable coming after Oct., 1914, and that late in June, 1914, as described above. It should be noted that the Lord held back that item until due time, and that He gave it to us only after we had come to regret our course in that Washington question meeting, which we now recognize as a partaking in the antitype of Aaron as set forth in Num. 12, and after we firmly and successfully resisted Satan's efforts to arouse us to oppose our Pastor's plainly-stated changed view in the May, 1914, Tower. We have given Bros. Barton's and John Edgar's and our own experience in the antitypical Aaron of this chapter, as illustrations of experiences that were and are yet quite general among the non-star-membered leaders of the general Church and of local elders. The Parousia experiences of J. Hemery, A.H. MacMillan, etc., we have given as samples of antitypical Miriam's pertinent Parousia experiences. We can recall no experience of ours in which we may have shared in the antitype of Aaron's complaining against Moses for having Zipporah as his wife. It would be profitable, we believe, if the Epiphany-enlightened leaders would examine themselves to see whether they shared in the antitype of Aaron as set forth in this chapter. Doubtless later many of the Priestly leaders among the Levite groups will realize in their opposition to Jesus speaking in the Epiphany messenger that they have partaken in the antitype of Aaron in this chapter and will take their part in the antitype of Aaron's action in v. 11. It will be noted that Miriam took no part in the acknowledgment of sin and folly in the petition for forgiveness of v. 11. This was because of her uncleanness at the time, typical

of antitypical Miriam's impenitence before delivery to Azazel for her wilderness stay.

(55) Not only does Aaron appear in true humility in v. 11, but he appears in true charity in v. 12, where he prays for the life and healing of Miriam. What he prays for is that she die not, especially not like one born dead, with his flesh half-rotted away. His contrasting, in a petition for forgiveness, his and Miriam's folly and sinfulness with Moses' leadership ("my lord"), shows that he was cured of the disease of factually claiming to be Moses' equal as mouthpiece for God, even as in the antitype the same things were done and shown, as the three brothers' experiences given above manifest. And by the antitypical Aaron there has been an earnest prayer offered to our Lord that antitypical Miriam be saved from the Second Death and be healed from her symbolic leprosy, Great Company uncleanness. As suggested by Aaron's prayer, the Second Deathers are expelled from the womb of the Sarah Covenant as dead, and so rotted as to have their new creature irretrievably corrupted; for one born dead, with his flesh half-rotted away, has been dead for some time. The expulsion of such an one from the womb of the Sarah Covenant occurs ordinarily in Second Death siftings; and as Miriam here stands for a class, the expulsion of the Second Deathers as a class from the womb of the Sarah Covenant is here, as a thing to be prayed for, brought to our attention. It was from such a terrible fate that antitypical Aaron has prayed, prays and will pray that antitypical Miriam be delivered; for antitypical Miriam is in great danger of going into the Second Death, even as we read of this class in Ps. 107: 10: "Such as sit in darkness (error) and in the shadow of death (danger of the Second Death)." It is antitypical Aaron's knowledge of such a danger surrounding antitypical Miriam that has made, continues to make and will make him intercede for antitypical Miriam's life

and cure. This prayer, as in the type (I pray thee), is made with all the more earnestness, inasmuch as antitypical Aaron realizes that he gave antitypical Miriam more or less encouragement in the wrong, *e.g.*, the Little Flock leaders scattered among the Levite groups have given the Levites more or less encouragement in their revolutionism against Jesus in the star-member now officiating; and when they come to see the real condition, as they even now recognize more or less of antitypical Miriam's revolutionism, they will all the more earnestly, for that encouragement, pray for her forgiveness and healing.

(56) Moses heeded Aaron's humble, loving and earnest prayer (v. 12). The fact that he offered the prayer of v. 13 in answer to the pertinent petition of Aaron given in v. 12, proves that he had already forgiven Aaron's and Miriam's folly and sin, as Aaron prayed for this in v. 11, even though there is no verbal mention made of his expressing such forgiveness. Moses' prayer, even as given in v. 13 of the A. V., is a very earnest intercession, but its Hebrew is still more emphatic, as the following literal translation shows "And Moses cried out unto the Lord, saying, O God! I pray, heal, I pray, her!" This prayer out-does the prayer of Aaron given in v. 12, and shows Moses' forgiveness and love toward Miriam, the worse of the two sinners. Antitypically, this prayer represents our Lord's intercession with His star-members to God on behalf of antitypical Miriam. It was an earnest prayer, most heartfelt, as typed by the very earnest prayer of Moses for Miriam. It will be noted that the typical prayer was offered before the repentance and healing of Miriam, as proved by the facts given in vs. 14-16 and by the fact that it was offered for the healing itself. So, antitypically, before the Great Company repents and before it is healed, our Lord in the pertinent star-members has felt a forgiving spirit toward antitypical Miriam and has prayed for her healing. The

prayer itself implies that God is besought by Jesus in the pertinent star-members to forgive the Great Company its sins as the antecedent of its cleansing; and that forgiveness implies repentance on antitypical Miriam's part.

(57) God does not forgive the impenitent, since such a course would encourage sin. But His readiness to forgive by providing the conditions conducive to repentance is shown by the arrangements that He makes (vs. 14, 15) for bringing this class to repentance. Thus God and Jesus show their graciousness, even before repentance sets in. It has always been so in God's Plan; He graciously sets arrangements into operation to help the sinner to come back to God. Had He waited for the world or the Church to repent before He sent His Son to die for the world and Church, He never would have sent His Son into the world to become our Redeemer. But, praised be our God, who "commendeth His love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us," as "in due time Christ died for the ungodly" (Rom. 3: 8, 6)! This great grace our dear heavenly Father exercises toward His rebellious Great Company children also, for which they will yet glorify Him. Hence we see His readiness to make it possible for Him to forgive antitypical Miriam, even as He typed this in vs. 14-16. For Him to forgive and heal the Great Company without repentance on their part would encourage their continued sin; and His graciousness in willingness to forgive and heal them moved Him to arrange the experiences necessary for their repenting and cleansing. He types this by the arrangement that in vs. 14, 15, He made for Miriam's repentance and cleansing. Of course, He who waits to be gracious was glad to hear the earnest prayer of Jesus in the pertinent star-members and to arrange for its answer. Brethren, let us praise His grace, that He is so ready to forgive, heal and again receive into fellowship His rebellious children of the Great Company!

And let us cooperate with Him in executing His arrangement whereby the unclean Great Company can be rescued out of its terrible condition. We are now ready to look at this arrangement.

(58) First God justified His course in making the arrangement whereby Miriam might be forgiven and healed of her leprosy. He justifies it by a comparison:

If a daughter were so to misbehave as to disgust her father into spitting into her face, should she not be ashamed for a full season—seven days? Among occidental people, spitting in the face is a thing never indulged in, except among the lower grades of society. But in oriental countries such a thing is indulged in regularly by all classes of society, as the proper thing to express great disgust. And the Bible in this case presents the matter from the standpoint of oriental customs. For an oriental father to be so disgusted with a daughter as to spit in her face is almost as disgraceful a thing as a daughter could be made to endure. It would force her to be put out of her family's society until the thing could be wiped measurably out of the feelings of the family—seven days. This is the figure here used, whereby God justifies His course toward Miriam. From the standpoint of Israel's being God's typical children ("Ye are [represent, type] the children of the Lord your God," Deut. 14: 1), Miriam, a typical daughter of God, had so misbehaved as to disgust her typical Father into treating her as a literal father treats a daughter into whose face his disgust of her compelled him to spit—put her to such shame as to drive her out of the family circle until His feelings of disgust and her sense of shame had largely abated—for seven days. During these seven days she was to feel the shame and disgrace that her conduct had deservedly brought upon her. And after she had experienced it sufficiently to bring her to genuine repentance and amendment she could be brought back again into the family circle. After this manner and for this purpose God as a typical Father would treat Miriam:

drive her, disgraced and ashamed, out of the family circle of Israel, His typical family, outside the camp into the wilderness for seven days. This, then, was the arrangement for healing and forgiveness that God revealed to Moses as that to which Miriam must submit herself.

(59) In studying Ruth (Vol. IV, Chap. VI) we explained the antitypical spitting, when done by God through His people. God's people have from certain standpoints been His mouthpiece—His mouth (Rev. 3: 16; John 9: 6; please see comment). The secretions of them as His Mouth are the Word of God—its truths as due. Sometimes they must use this Word in God's disgust and severe rebuke of wrongdoers. When they do so, God symbolically spits in the face of the wrongdoers. The revolutionisms of the Great Company, accompanied with more or less of the unholy qualities mentioned in 2 Tim. 3: 1-9, set forth above, have provoked the disgust of God, who, therefore, through His Priesthood has spit in their faces—by the word of God rebuked their gross wrongs of teachings and arrangements. This spitting is done by God, through the Priesthood as His mouth resisting the revolutionisms of Azazel's Goat. Thus, as the Father of antitypical Miriam, He has spit in her face. This spitting has been done verbally and through the printed page, also by letters from Truth friends, sermon notes, etc. In the first case it is and has been done in discourses, lessons and conversations. In the second case it has occurred and is occurring through The Present Truth and through The Herald Of The Epiphany, also through other Priestly publication, Light After Darkness, Harvest Siftings Reviewed, Vol. VII Errors Booklet, etc., God, mainly through the first magazine doing it to the Truth section of antitypical Miriam and mainly through the second magazine doing it to the nominal-church section of antitypical Miriam. This work has been going on ever since Nov. 25, 1917, having its beginning with our questioning of H.J. Shearn and

Wm. Crawford on their plan for the elders' control of the London Tabernacle arrangements. It has been progressing through the various resistances that God has been making, through His Priesthood as His mouth, to the revolutionisms of one Levite group after another, as they have come one after another into existence, and to the revolutionisms of the Protestant and Catholic sections of Azazel's Goat. Thus it is primarily through the Epiphany movement that this spitting has been done to Truth Levites; and secondarily through the Priests scattered among the Truth Levites it has in a milder form been done to the Truth Levites. And both sets of Priests have been doing it to the nominal-church Levites. Thus we see that God, through the antitypical Priests, is doing the spitting typically referred to in v. 14.

(60) The sense of shame was to be borne seven days in the case of a natural daughter into whose face her father spat. So God declared that the typical shame, the expulsion from the camp and being shut out therefrom, must be borne seven days. So in the antitype, God has arranged that the antitypical shame must be borne the antitypical seven days—an expulsion from among the clean people of God and a keeping of the expelled ones shut out from the clean ones until a sufficient time has elapsed to effect the cleansing of antitypical Miriam, when they would as clean ones be forgiven and restored to the fellowship of God's clean people (v. 15). In other words, God here shows that antitypical Miriam is to go into the antitypical wilderness and undergo the experiences that by another type He shows that the antitypical Goat of Azazel must undergo (Lev. 16: 20-22); for the same experiences are typed by these two different transactions, the difference being not in the experiences themselves, but in the effects, and the things effected, the one showing the destruction of the flesh, the other showing the cleansing of the New Creature, the flesh being typed by the goat and the New Creature by Miriam. This, then, is God's

will with reference to the healing and consequent forgiveness of antitypical Miriam. And when some object to, and criticize our cooperating with the Lord in the antitypical spitting and delivery of these revolutionists to the fit man and Azazel for their wilderness experience, let this neither dismay nor deter us from the good work. We know that their objection and criticism is really against God, whose purpose in the matter is punitive, corrective and salutary—hence just and loving; for if this process were not wrought on this class every one of them would become a Second Deather. Let us see to it that there is mingled with our feelings of horror at antitypical Miriam's wrongs, a deep pity for them as individuals, and a loving desire for their delivery from their antitypical leprosy; and with these motives let us zealously cooperate with and under the Head of the World's High Priest as body members in dealing with this class according to Num. 12: 14, 15, and Lev. 16: 20-22. If we do this in the spirit just described, when cleansed antitypical Miriam will bless us for the work done on her, as being the only possible method of securing her healing from her antitypical leprosy and will thank us!

(61) But let us remember that the Miriam figure does not cover the whole Great Company class, as the Azazel's Goat figure does. She represents, not all the Great Company, but those leaders among them who, without losing life, have factually, not verbally, claimed equality with our Lord speaking through the star-members as mouthpieces for God. As such antitypical Miriam in part has gone outside the Camp, excluded therefrom, in part is on the way of going there, and yet in some of her parts is still to go there—into an unclean condition and work, away from association with God's clean people. While thus in Azazel's hands they have exceedingly untoward experiences. Their leprosy at first increases there, into horrible conditions: new swellings (sins), new boils (selfishness), new hot burnings (worldliness), new scalls (errors), new

leprous spots on their garments (power-graspings and lordings) and new leprous outbreaks (sectarianisms) in their houses (Lev. 13; 14). Truly horrible is this; yet it must be their experience, until finally, like some drunkards who, experiencing delirium tremens, are by the consciousness of their unutterable degradation brought to their senses and give up drink, awakening as from a nightmare and recognizing the horror of their conditions by the wild rampage of folly and wrong into which they have come, they see into what a state their wrong heart's and head's condition has led them, when, broken up, cast down and in despair of their supposed abilities in leadership, "they cry unto the Lord in their trouble; and He delivereth them out of their distresses." He will by the Epiphany Truth deliver them out of darkness (error) and the shadow of death (danger of the Second Death) and will break their bands of sin, selfishness, worldliness, power-grasping, lording and sectarianism in sunder (Ps. 107: 12-14). Then, as Ps. 107: 15 says, they will praise the Lord for His goodness and for His wonderful works for the children of men! O glad day! We hail it as the day when our bound and Azazel-controlled brethren will come to the liberty of God's daughters (2 Cor. 6: 18)! How we long for it, pray for it and labor for it! And it surely will come. Though the winter has been ever so severe, spring must finally come. Only let us labor and wait for it; for it will as surely come as God's Word is sure. And then we will again have goodly fellowship with our brethren whose wilful revolutionisms forced us to withdraw it from them

(62) The second sentence of v. 15 is meaningful in the antitype. In the type it is simple enough to understand: "And the people journeyed not until Miriam was brought in again [literally, gathered]." We have already from Israel's marches learned that the journeys of Israel in the wilderness represent new sets of experiences as to growth in grace, knowledge and service. The thought, therefore, antitypical of Israel's not

journeying until Miriam was gathered into the camp again, seems to be the following: The Lord's clean people in the Epiphany will have no other new set of experiences for growth in grace, knowledge and service connected with another form of work than that of dealing with Azazel's Goat, until that work is finished and the Great Company takes up its proper place and work among God's people; for Miriam's joining the people in journeying types the Great Company, especially in its leaders, doing the clean work that will be theirs after their cleansing—building the Epiphany Camp, first, from among the nominal-church believers after the nominal church is destroyed and, second, from among Fleshly Israel after they look upon Him whom they pierced and mourn for it (Zech. 12: 10). The literal translation, *gathered*, instead of *brought in*, is not to be overlooked; for it suggests the thought that antitypical Miriam is not an individual, but a company of individuals, a part of a great company. While we do not use the word *gathered* of an individual, it does fit a company. And so far as even Miriam is concerned, it implies that a work was done on her to bring her into the attitude to return to the camp. It seems to imply that she had to be reasoned with and instructed as to her return to the camp. This doubtless will have its antitype in the reasonings and instructions given the cleansed antitypical Miriam to fit her to return to the antitypical Camp.

(63) That our conclusion is right, that Miriam journeyed with the people, is not only evident from the nature of the case in the type, but is certainly true from the standpoint of the antitype; for that journey was taken to Paran, which we already have seen represents the Kingdom (Num. 10: 12; Vol. VIII, Chap. X). Hence in the antitype Miriam will be in the antitypical journey, among other things, engaging in her work of gathering Gentile and Jewish believers into the Epiphany Camp, the service performed as a part of the final journey, which is the final Gospel-Age growth in

grace, knowledge and service. It will be noted that the encampment where the episode of Num. 12 occurred was at Hazereth. We have already seen that this word means *villages* and represents sects singly and combinedly (Num. 11: 35; Chap. 1, par. 27). Certainly the Epiphany experiences with antitypical Miriam have been connected with trials on matters of sectarianism, for the Levite leaders have formed many Epiphany sects; and amid and with these have some of our peculiar Epiphany trials been. This was also true in the Jewish Harvest and between it and the Epiphany. While not known as a class, the crown-lost princes and other sectarian leaders and their new-creaturely partisan followers gave the Priesthood many trials amid and with the sectarian systems and movements. But the severity of these trials will give way by and by, for they will be milder after antitypical Miriam is cleansed, but as the cleansing and the encamping at Hazereth a little while at least show, they will be present, nevertheless, though in a milder form than now, and that because the cleansed Levites will be decidedly less sectarian than they now are. This type of their dwelling in Hazereth awhile after Miriam's return to the camp proves that, generally speaking, the Great Company divisions as forming while antitypical Miriam is unclean will remain after she is cleansed; for each group will doubtless have its special work after the cleansing and before leaving this world, while the beginning of the cleansed work will set in while they are at antitypical Hazereth. Because of the trialsomeness of its first part that cleansed work will go on during the journey to antitypical Paran; for that journey represents the final experiences of growth in grace, knowledge, and service before the Kingdom is reached —antitypical Paran. How glorious is the thought that the Kingdom is near! Well may the nearness of it encourage us to be faithful in the last stages of the career of the Church; for after labor comes rest; after storm comes calm.

(1) How may the subject matter of the book of Numbers be summed up? What chapter of Numbers did we last study? Under what subject? What kind of a connection subsists between the antitypes of Num. 12 and Num. 9: 15-11: 35? Of what does Num. 9: 15-23 treat antitypically? Num. 10: 1-10? 10: 11-28? 10: 29-32? 10: 33-36? 11? 12: 1-16?

(2) What, accordingly, is the subject running through this entire section? Of what two chapters also is this the subject matter? In this connection what may be said of Num. 1: 1-9; 14? How does this appear in Num. 1, 2? 3, 4? 5? 6? 7? 8? 9: 1-14? What, then, is a summary of Num. 1-14? How may this be stated in other words? How are Num. 26 and 31 related to this subject? The rest of the book? What kind of a connection is there in the antitypes of this book? For what will an understanding of the antitypes of Numbers and Deuteronomy be helpful? How is this symbolized in the Most Holy?

(3) So far as understanding them is concerned, what contrast exists between the type and the antitype of Num. 12? What profit can be gotten from the effort to understand its antitype? How do the three characters treated of in Num. 12 stand out in the history of the Exodus? How does Miriam stand among the women of the Exodus? What does the word *Miriam* mean and what does she type? How do Moses and Aaron compare with each other and the other Israelites of the Exodus? What does the word *Aaron* mean? What does he here type? In what kind of a light do Aaron and Miriam, particularly Miriam, not stand in this chapter? Of what two evils did they become guilty? What made them resent Moses' having a Cushite wife? How may envy have influenced Miriam? What does the word *Moses* mean? What does he here type? For what was he faulted? When and where did Zipporah finally join Moses and Israel? To whom did her remaining with Moses become a trial? What does the word *Zipporah* mean? What was her ancestral origin? How many and what kinds of Ethiopians (Cushites) were there? To which branch did she belong? What were her father's three names? What was his office? How may we reconcile Num. 10: 29 and Judges 1: 16 as to his nationality? What considerations make it reasonable to conclude that Jethro was a Cushite,

though an official and citizen of Midian? Even though Zipporah was a brownish-white Cushite, how did Miriam and Aaron yet regard her? What did this move them to do? To what degree of wrong did pride lead them?

(4) How in a general way may Num. 12 be applied antitypically? In a particular way? Why are both of these applications right? What three considerations prove Miriam to represent certain Great Company members? Especially which ones? What two great evils have they done? Whom does Aaron in this chapter type? Especially which ones? What two milder evils have they done? Whom does Moses in this chapter type? Zipporah? To what will the understanding of these four antitypes assist? What was antitypical Miriam's standing when the antitypical murmuring began? What later development proves this? In what did the antitypical Aaron remain? What is the antitype of pride leading Miriam and Aaron into wrong-doing? What was antityped by their wrong-doing?

(5) What have not a few of us heard some new creatures say of our humbler brethren? What proud acts have we observed in them as against such brethren? Whose society did they prefer? In what did some of these not express themselves? How, then, did they do it? What does either course mean? In ultimate analysis what does it mean? Who ought to be satisfactory to us as a part of the Bride? What would contrary conduct be? What often so acts?

(6) What did Miriam and Aaron, type and antitype, do in this matter? Which one sinned the more? What is the course of sin? From what and to what did this progress in vs. 1 and 2? What is typed by Miriam and Aaron claiming equality with Moses as a mouthpiece of God? How could such a thing not be true of a new creature? Even of whom is it doubtful? With the possible exception of whom? How has the antitype been fulfilling?

(7) What question does this answer raise? What kind of an answer must this question receive? How must the answer further be qualified? What would such a direct claim by act or attitude toward our Lord mean? Who have not done this? How have they done it? What was it really? What does this mean? What is not necessary to explain further as to star-members? What is here necessary to explain of them? What bearing has Luke

10: 16 on this statement? Why could Jesus truly say of them what He says of them in Luke 10: 16? How is this principle shown in the pertinent types?

(8) How does the case of Moses' speaking to Dathan and Abiram show this? The case of Korah and his Levitical company? If this principle is not kept in mind, who, and who not, would seem to antitype Moses in these and many other acts? What very marked Mosaic antitype is solvable only on this principle? How is it not, and how is it to be explained harmoniously with facts and Scripture? How are certain lines of study condemned in others as speculation not considered such in these two brothers?

(9) For what will the foregoing remarks be helpful? Whom in the typical transaction do Miriam and Aaron type? Wherein did their assertions of equality with our Lord as a mouthpiece for God consist? In what events of the Harvests did these assertions manifest themselves? Of the Interim? Of the two miniature Gospel Ages of the Epiphany? In which of these were they perhaps the most venomous? What were some of St. Paul's experiences along these lines? St. John's? To whom is exclusive reference made in Luke 10: 16? What things are not to be considered such contradictions? What are? To what proper thing does bringing our doubts and difficulties to them belong? What differentiates it from the contradicting course of antitypical Miriam and Aaron? What is not simply, and what is meant by the statement, "And the Lord heard it"?

(10) How have higher critics used v. 3? If the basis of their objection were true, to what conclusion should it not, and should it have led them? What are their claims as to the Mosaic authorship of v. 3? What is the basis of their claim? What is the relation of this proposition to truth? Under what circumstances may one say good things of himself? How does the example of God's self-praise disprove their proposition? What are some examples of His self-praise? What justifies His so doing? How does the example of Jesus' self-praise disprove their proposition? What are some examples of His self-praise? What justified His so doing? How does the example of St. Paul's self-praise disprove their proposition? What are some examples of his self-praise? What justified his so doing? How does the example of our Pastor disprove

their proposition? What are some examples of such self-praise? What justified his so doing? How could Moses properly write v. 3? What two things claimed in their pertinent view of Num. 12: 3 by higher critics are not true?

(11) What is the deeper reason for Moses' writing these words? Of whom in this connection was our Lord the antitype? How does Heb. 3: 1-6 prove this? What do these words applied antitypically to Him teach? What is meekness? What did God find Moses to be? To write what did God inspire him? Why? What in this matter has our Lord always shown Himself to be? In His pre-human condition? In His human condition? In His present Divine condition? In the future to all eternity? From what standpoints is He worthy of the highest place under God?

(12) What, among other things, is set forth in v. 2? In v. 4? How did God begin to act in this matter? How was the charge given? How long did He allow the wrong to go on? What proves this? How does God act antitypically with a public sin? Type and antitype, what does such contradiction occasion? What does it stir up? In what has it resulted? How does God manipulate such events? How does God give the antitypical command to the three parties to appear before the Church?

(13) In connection with what kind of siftings do we find these events especially? Wherein can it be seen to the best advantage? Who in the Epiphany have acted like Miriam? Of what is their contradicting the Epiphany messenger a factual example? What does God do with them, if they continue a long while their contradicting course? What happens in this connection with antitypical Aaron, contradicting more mildly? How many of such actors are so treated? What are some examples of these? What did Parousia conditions exemplify in this matter? For the most part when were they reserved for public examples of antitypical Miriam? What examples show that God has done this thing very suddenly? Like what was it in each case?

(14) What are we in this connection to do with such siftings and the Second Death siftings? What kind of siftings were the Reaping siftings mainly? In which of these especially do we find the antitypical Miriam feature

appearing? How did it there appear? How may we characterize antitypical Miriam's and Aaron's course as to Second Death siftings? How does this compare with the same classes in the Epiphany siftings? In what other shakings do antitypical Miriam and Aaron appear? Especially where? What are two examples in the slight shaking of 1914 on the 1914 date for the Church's deliverance? What corresponds with the tabernacle in more or less local shakings? In general siftings? What are we not to understand from the above on Second Death siftings and the Epiphany? What Bible examples prove such to take place in the Epiphany?

(15) Which pertinent steps of the Lord are described in v. 5? What is the first of these? By this what are we not, and what are we to understand? Through whom did He very likely "come down"? What bearing has Acts 7: 38 on this? Through whom less probably did He do this? What bearing do Acts 7: 53 and Gal. 3: 19 probably have on this phase of the matter? Why do We say that this agent was most likely the Logos? What is the Scriptural evidence proving this strong probability? Through whom was it done in the antitype, especially in the Parousia and Epiphany? Why so? What is the antitypical difference between the cloudy and the fiery pillars? Why, ordinarily, would the *cloudy* pillar be used in the type when the antitype refers to all four periods, as in the present case? As excluding what should not the reference to the *cloudy* pillar be understood? What is meant by God's coming down in the pillar, type and antitype? On the occasion of our study? In such cases what does the Lord always do? What is the antitype of the cloudy pillar entering the picture?

(16) What is typed by God's standing at the door of the tabernacle? How does He do this? How does He reveal the character of contraditors' deeds? How does He usually do this? What example to illustrate this is given? What have the Levites and some Priests done to this truth as it has been unfolding? In the meantime what has the Lord been doing? In so doing what types has He been fulfilling? How does He call antitypical Miriam and Aaron to stand forth separate from antitypical Moses speaking through the star-members? What types their coming into such separateness?

(17) What does God show in vs. 6-8? What does v. 6 show? As God was about to show this what did He require of Miriam and Aaron? Why? How is this done antitypically? On this what does God require of antitypical Miriam and Aaron? How has He done this? How many privileges does v. 6 set forth as those of ordinary prophets in Israel? What are they? What does the statement of v. 6 on visions and dreams imply? What is a prophetic vision? What is the most noted example of a vision in the Bible?

(18) What is a prophetic dream? What is a noted example of such? What exists as to visions and dreams antitypically? What passage bears on this subject? By what contrast? How does the distinction compare with a certain type of the Ancient and Youthful Worthies? In this type Millennially whom do the Kohathites type? The Gershonites? What do the tabernacle articles borne by the Kohathites type Millennially? Those borne by the Gershonites? How in general did the articles borne by the Kohathites differ from those borne by the Gershonites? What thoughts are thus implied to be in the antitypes? In general how may the antitype be brought out? What force, then, do the distinguishing words bear in Joel 2: 28? In what other way does the idea of *deeper* and *less deep* truths lie in the words *dream* and *vision*?

(19) What does this distinction not precisely tell us? What first reason suggests this? Second reason? What does this second reason prove? What are these visions and dreams? How do they exist in the Bible? What kind of a book does this make the Bible? What does God in v. 6 promise the non-star-membered general elders in the Church? What are the less deep of these? The more deep? What does our Lord promise on this subject in Matt. 13: 52? What has He, accordingly, promised the general elders, including the non-star-members, and some local elders? When in general did this promise have a fulfillment? In particular? Wherein are many of such fulfillments recorded?

(20) What are we not to understand from the special promise of v. 6? Nor from the omissions on this head in vs. 7, 8? What first fact proves this? What second fact? What third fact? What kind of a difference is there in the privileges of the star-members and the non-star-members

as to mouthpieceship? What fourth fact proves this? Why does it prove this? What duty of these non-star-members as to the officiating star-member on new truths is a fifth fact proving this? Why is this duty imposed upon them?

(21) What was above stated as to The Tower on this subject? What other instances have occurred? What will be here given? What apparent, but not real exceptions to the rule as to this privilege being seemingly mainly limited to general elders have occurred? What do the fulfilled facts seem to prove of the scribes of Matt. 13: 52 as to most of those who never arose above local elders? How was this promise fulfilled in Bro. Barton in connection with Is. 18: 1, 2, 7? In what two places can this line of thought be found? What did he show in this article? What was the antitypical character of what he saw and wrote out? In what kind of language is Is. 18: 1, 2, 7 clothed? Into what dark saying was Bro. Barton privileged to see, as an antitypical dream? Where was this antitypical dream published? What did he therein show?

(22) What other (two) brothers had such antitypical dreams and visions? What became the occasion thereof? How did it affect Bro. Russell? Who principally and who assistantly studied deeply this error in a deeper investigation of the Chronology as given in Vol. II? In what did this result firstly? Secondly? How are these facts typed in 2 Sam. 21: 15-17? What else did their (especially John Edgar's) investigations lead them to see? Wherein have all of these findings been published? Where were many of them previously published? What was Bro. Morton Edgar's part compared with his brother's in these matters? What do these facts prove? How should we view their work, *The Great Pyramid Passages*? What error advocated in the second edition has Bro. Morton Edgar repudiated? How did this error creep into that volume? With what limitation does the Society's president still hold to the millions proposition? Who are his millions now? The existence of what spiritual class does he now deny? What is the hope that he sets before his millions, his Great Company?

(23) What antitypical vision was Walter Bundy given? What was never done with it? What of it will be given here? According to his view, what is represented

by the parable's woman? The ten pieces of silver? What did not, and what did happen to nine of them? What happened to one of them? What is represented by the woman's house? Her sweeping the house? Her searching for the lost coin? Its finding? Her joy? Her inviting her neighbors to rejoice with her over finding her coin? What does the idea of restitution imply as to the restitution class? How is it designated in the parable? What debate was held April 19, 1909? Under what circumstances? What parts of a dream were made clear to another brother, April 20, 1909? What part of it was made clear in June, 1914? In 1917? To whom in 1915 was the penny and its twofold distribution made clear? To whom did the length of the day and its hours not first occur? What was done with the understanding of this parable? What did the Lord give to the same brother as an antitypical dream the next year? On what was it based? What was done with this matter, especially with the fifth sifting? Wherein and when was it published? What dark saying was also made clear to the same brother? Who endorsed it?

(24) What is given in pars. 21-23? Whom else did the Lord so treat, though they are not particularized in these pars.? What else would be in place? When did they, as a matter of fact, receive them? Who was the first of these? What was this antitypical dream? How do the involved passages prove his thought? What did he do with the antitypical dream? Where and when was it published? In what time of his experience was it given to him? What can profitably be done with his letter? What other brother in a similar period of his experience was given some antitypical visions and dreams? In what book? What was the most important of these? What did he do with it? What was not done with his letter? Who in a private conversation with the writer expressed approval of it? In what aspects do the seven bowls not represent the Seven Volumes? Only as what? As what are these volumes Divinely approved? How do these remarks apply to Vol. VII? As what is it not Divinely approved? What dark saying in Rev. 20: 10; 14: 10, 11, did the Lord likewise open to him? Who approved of it? Where is it detailed in the language of another? What vision was opened to a local elder on Elijah?

(25) What strikes the mind as to the interpretation above given to Num. 12: 1-6? What does Heb. 3: 1-6, compared with Num. 12: 7, prove as to Moses in this chapter? The expression, Apostle . . . of our profession? What things warrant our regarding Miriam here as a type of certain leading Great Company members? Aaron here as a type of certain leading Little Flock brethren? Zipporah here as a type of more or less obscure Little Flock brethren? What do facts prove of our Lord's being treated as typed in vs. 1, 2? In what activity in v. 2?

(26) What do facts prove as to Jehovah's doing to the two involved acts of pride? What do facts prove as to Jesus' meekness toward God? What do the facts prove as to God's drawing the three involved antitypes into public notice? Why so? What set of facts proves the antitypes of v. 5 as given above? What truth has God factually caused to be proclaimed as to the privileges of the non-star-membered general elders and some local elders? What are the two final facts as to the pertinent Parousia and Epiphany teachings and as to the Lord's giving such new teachings to such general elders and some local elders? What conclusion may we therefore draw as to the suggested antitypes of Num. 12 so far studied? What results from these qualities as to the character of these suggested antitypes? As we go on in our study of this chapter, what will we find to be the character of the rest of our exposition of Num. 12?

(27) What did God set forth in v. 6? What will He not do beyond these limits? To what, according to v. 7, did God not limit Moses? What does v. 7 not mean? What does it mean? In what other ways did God reveal Himself to Moses? What does this mean antitypically? What does it not mean antitypically? Why do we know this of Jesus personally? What does this fact and the contrast between v. 6 and vs. 7 and 8 prove? What fact as to St. Paul and our Pastor proves this also? What words prove it?

(28) In Num. 12 in what relations is our Lord typed? And that acting in whom? What kind of a meaning does this fact give the words, "Who is faithful in all My house," that they would not otherwise have? Under what circumstances would these words not have this

meaning? In what sense is He included in these words? What does the viewpoint of this chapter imply as to His faithfulness in His relation to the star-members? Why? What kind of a faithfulness is that of the star-members not in itself and relatively to His? What kind is it? What does this passage, from the standpoint of this chapter, teach of the pertinent 49 brothers? Of what 13 of them is this directly stated? How is this less clearly proven of the other 36? What is not meant by this? What is? What does Heb. 3: 2, 6 say and prove of the antitypical house of v. 7? What conclusion follows from this? What do we conclude from this conclusion? How do the cited passages prove this? How do vs. 7 and 8 prove this?

(29) What do the vision and dream privileges of the star-members prepare us to see? Where are these set forth typically? What three privileges were accorded Moses by God, according to v. 8? To whom were they exclusively limited? To whom were they not extended? What will a consideration of these privileges antitypically help us to see? What is necessary in order for us to see the antitypical meaning of the words, "I will speak with him mouth to mouth"? In what two ways has Jesus been God's mouth? What is this thought as to the Logos? As to Christ? How do the cited Scriptures prove that Christ is God's mouth? Accordingly, what did God usually do through Him as to the Old Testament? Always as to the New Testament? What, secondarily, is God's mouth? Why? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What is meant by the first use of the word mouth in v. 8? To whose mouth does the second use of that word in v. 8 refer? What was Jesus' mouth to the world up to 1917? Since 1917? What has been Jesus' mouth to the General Church? What part of His mouth to the world up to 1917 have they been? How is this proved in the seven letters of Rev. 2, 3? How is this implied in Rev. 1: 16, 20? In Aholiab? How do Eph. 2: 20; 3: 5; 4: 11 apply here?

(30) What are we now prepared to see? What does it mean? What two things are meant by the first part of this answer? Why is this true? What is a summary of this thought? What is meant by God's speaking through the Bible, His mouth, to Jesus' mouth? What does this mean? In other words, what does this mean?
Who are

excluded from this privilege? How do the non-star-membered servants of the Truth get their "things new"? What would their attempting to talk "mouth to mouth" with God be? Why can they not speak "mouth to mouth" with God? Why can Jesus' mouth so do? What is this as to them?

(31) What is a widely held view? Among whom? How do they thus treat the Bible? And how not? Why should the Bible not be treated as a text book? What is a text book? How does, e.g., an arithmetic illustrate this thought? Like what is the Bible not arranged? What is nowhere found in the Bible? Rather, how does it treat its materials? What subjects will serve to prove this? How are their thoughts found in the Bible? What does this peculiarity of the Bible make it to the non-star-helped student? How is it, compared with a thousand Chinese puzzles made into one? Why is this comparison suggested? How is this characteristic of the Bible mentioned? From this discussion, what may we conclude?

(32) From what two sources is this proved? What first fact proves it? Second fact? Third fact? Fourth fact? Fifth fact? What do these five facts prove of the claim, that the Bible is so plain that the wayfaring man though a fool shall not err therein? By what means other than facts can the same thing be proved? How is this proved by 1 Cor. 13: 12? 1 Cor. 2: 7? Matt. 13: 35? Is. 28: 10-13? For what two reasons, according to vs. 9, 10, 13, is the Bible so constructed? How does Rom. 11: 9, 10 prove it? Why, in general, is the Bible so constructed? Why for the Church? For the world, or unbelief class? What do these considerations prove of God's pertinent works? What two conclusions should we draw from this discussion?

(33) Why should the Bible not be studied as a textbook? If so used, what will be the result? Why? From the fact that text-bookism is harmful, what conclusion should we not draw? What two Bible considerations prove that it should be studied? How do the cited passages prove this? As what, according to these passages, should the Bible be regarded and studied? As what should it be studied? What is meant by studying it as a book of texts? In what two ways did the Bereans study it? What three things are present in the Divinely approved Berean study of the Bible? Why is this the correct method? What is

the first thing necessary in Bible study? In what two ways may this be done? How does the second way operate? In what three ways? By what is the main contact usually maintained?

(34) In what periods can these three ways be recognized? What have the main points of such contact been during these periods? As what are their writings to be used? In what do their writings abound? To what are their writings to be subjected? How should their and other star-members' writings be studied? With what object in view? What kind is such study? What fruit will it yield? What conclusion should be drawn from these considerations? What other reasons can be given against text-bookism? To whom only is direct Bible study a blessing? Why? What will follow from text-bookism to all others? How should they study the Bible? Through text-bookism who have arisen in the Church? What experiences prove it? For what, at present, does this account?

(35) What is necessary for students of the Bible to do? How? What will result, if it is not so done? What six qualities constitute all readiness of mind? How do the cited passages prove this? Why is humility necessary for fruitful Bible study? Meekness? Hunger? Honesty? Goodness? Reverence? What do these give one initially? Progressively? Perseveringly? Why, do people lose the Truth? What will the retention of these qualities enable one to do?

(36) What will some Truth people and almost all Protestants do as to this view of Bible study? On what will they insist? What does the Bible do as to these two opposing views? Why does it condemn their view? What was God's foreknowledge as to speculation during the Parousia and the Epiphany? What did it lead Him to do? Where is this warning given? What was the typical and chronological setting of this event? What does St. Paul's reference to it (Heb. 12: 18-29) prove of it? How is this also typically shown? What features of the typical connection prove that it covers the Epiphany? How long, in fact, will the seventh trumpet blow? What conclusion should we draw as to the time for the events antitypical of Ex. 19: 21-25? To what do the bounds set by Moses correspond? What does God's charge of v. 21 type? What does the Latin word *speculare*, from which our

word *speculate* is derived, mean? What is meant by religious speculation? In what do we recognize the antitypical charge? How has this warning been given?

(37) What does v. 21 further show? What in the antitype does it not, and what does it mean? How is this illustrated in Mr. Darwin's case, as of one in the Camp? How does it work in those in the Court—the justified? With those in the Holy—Priests? With Great Company members? Youthful Worthies? What in this respect do vs. 21, 22, 24 show? Who especially are urged in v. 22 to separate themselves from gazing? To what does this correspond?

(38) What does Moses' statement (v. 23) on the bounds type? What does the truthfulness of the typical and antitypical statements not prevent? What, therefore, did God command (v. 24) in both type and antitype? Who, according to v. 24, might approach God? What does Moses here type? Whom does Aaron type? Why? What is typed by Moses' coming up to God? What difference in Moses' and Aaron's approach is indicated? What does this type?

(39) How have the Parousia and Epiphany messengers approached God in this subordinate way? What three things suggest the answer? What privilege is here shown these two brothers (and all other star-members), denied all other brethren? Why is this not done? Why is it done? How have they done it for others? As what have they been used all through the Age? By whom? How do their advantages and disadvantages correspond? How should they not, and how should they be regarded and treated? Why? How have they not felt? How have they felt and acted? How have the faithful responded to this? What will some say of the Epiphany messenger's writing, among others, of himself as above? What answer should be given to this charge? How does he feel about it?

(40) What results from the star-members' being Jesus' eye, hand and mouth? Why is this? What makes this true? What does their office show as to Luke 10: 16? What does this office not make of them? What Scripture proves this? Why has the Lord promoted them to this office? What has faithfulness to Truth and righteousness made them? How are they toward the faithful? What

have they given these? What have they always recognized, negatively and positively? What has been their highest ambition? In what has this resulted, as to the Lord?

(41) In what words is the second unique privilege of Christ in the star-members set forth? With what do they stand in contrast? How do they show that God spoke to Moses? What do these words teach antitypically? How will He not speak to Him in them? What does this mean, positively and negatively? What, in this matter, do nominal-church teachers claim? What are some examples of such teachings? What sense do they give to the word *mystery*? Who is its author? How does the Bible use it? How do 1 Cor. 13: 2; Eph. 3: 3, 4; Matt. 13: 11 and Luke 8: 10 present this matter? How do the Scriptures cited in the rest of this paragraph present it? Show this as to Rom. 11: 25-32; 1 Cor. 15: 51; Eph. 5: 32; Col. 1: 26, 27; 2: 2, 3; 4: 3, 4; 2 Thes. 2: 7; 1 Tim. 3: 16; Rev. 1: 20; Rev. 17: 5, 7. What conclusion is to be drawn from these uses of the word *mystery*, as to nominal-church mysteries? What is the Bible view of its mysteries?

(42) What sense, negatively and positively, does our discussion of the understandableness of Bible mysteries give to the words, "With him I will speak . . . even plainly, not enigmatically"? In what is this illustrated? How is this seen in Arius? Zwingli? Marsiglio? Servetus? Hubmaier? That Servant? The Epiphany teachings? With what do they contrast favorably? What should we do with a teacher who would teach us incomprehensible things? As what? In what contrast do Truth and error stand in this particular? What, then, is the thought of the words under study?

(43) In what words is the third unique privilege set forth? What was the typical privilege? To what kind of servants of the Lord was this not vouchsafed? In what capacity did Aaron have a similar privilege? What is meant by these words antitypically, negatively and positively? How do the cited passages apply here? How does Jesus in the star-members see Jehovah's image? In contrast with the privileges of non-star-membered servants of the Truth, what third privilege is never accorded them?

To whom is it exclusively limited? To what would others' attempting this inevitably lead? How many of the star-members have had this privilege? By using this privilege what have they gotten? In whom is our Lord especially seen as using this privilege? What is an illustration of this in St. Paul? In our Pastor? What are some of the Epiphany messenger's privileges in this particular?

(44) What did God show in vs. 6-8? What did God thereupon do? What does this type? What does God's question, type and antitype, imply? What would becoming reverence have prevented in type and antitype? What resulted from this lack of reverence? In whom was this lack more prominent? What warning do their course and the Lord's rebuke of them give?

(45) What do vs. 2-8 express sufficiently? What does v. 9 express? What, accordingly, is a terrible thing? How does experiencing God's approval and His disapproval contrast? In what particular especially? What is typed by the words, "And He departed"? By what is this thought emphasized? What does this antitype mean? What emphasized thing occurred in the type? How is it shown? What is not indicated in Miriam's leprosy? What parts of her body would ordinarily be seen? What does the word *behold* here imply on this point? Why is this true? What does the fact that her leprosy is used to type Great Company uncleanness prove, negatively and positively? How is this proved in the citations given thereon? What is implied in the expression, "Aaron turned to Miriam," as to the immediate past? Had he done so previously, what might have resulted? What does turning his attention to her enable him to see?

(46) When did the events of the last three clauses of v. 10 have a minor fulfillment? What cases prove it? How do the cited passages prove this? What pertinent things were not known between the Jewish Harvest and the Epiphany? Who alone knew them? Why was this? What conclusion is to be drawn therefrom? What fact bears this out? What, in contrast with the Apostolic days, is no longer necessary for recognition of Great Company brethren—antitypical spotted lepers—as such? What has the Lord on this point made known to us? What are these symptoms, type and antitype? To see and point these out,

what alone is now necessary? What follows from the fact that there was no such illumination between the Jewish Harvest and the Epiphany? Of what verses was there a fulfillment throughout the Age? When particularly? To what does the special antitypical application of Aaron's turning to Miriam belong? What is represented by Aaron's turning to Miriam? With what difference do the members of antitypical Aaron do this? When will the non-Epiphany-enlightened Priests comprehend the real condition? What has antitypical Aaron seen all through the Age? Without what?

(47) How did the sight of leprous-spotted Miriam affect Aaron? What has been still more horrifying? From what two standpoints? What must have been the feelings of Timothy and Gaius at the Great Company uncleanness of Alexander, etc.? Though not recognized as Great Company uncleanness, whose evils must have horrified the antitypical Aaron between the Jewish Harvest and the Epiphany? What Parousia uncleanness so affected the then antitypical Aaron? Who are some examples having then such uncleanness? Despite what how did their uncleanness affect us? When is the special time of such horror? Despite what does the Epiphany Aaron feel such horror? Of whom of this class has this been true?

(48) Of whom is it emphatically true? As to the Society adherents? As to whom else? In what generalities? Despite what? What do they recognize? What Priests not now parts of antitypical Aaron have during the Epiphany felt it? How did antitypical Miriam's uncleanness affect the Editor? Why was this? What did it move him to do? What view and attitude of his made him feel severe shocks because of their uncleanness? How did this affect him as to H.J. Shearn and Wm. Crawford? What considerations added thereto?

(49) In what kind of a condition was antitypical Miriam? What could be seen all through the Age? As what was it not recognized? With what exception? What is the contrast with the pertinent Epiphany conditions? How has it been manifesting itself in all cases? Who is the classic example of this? What characteristics does 2 Tim. 3: 1-9 show, as belonging to the Levite leaders? What is the character of such characteristics? In whom are these characteristics especially exemplified? With

what differences in these individuals? What, even, have some of them been proven to be? What is to be said of their partisan followers? Who can now be seen as such? How does her uncleanness affect angels and saints?

(50) What did typical Aaron recognize from Miriam's plight? What does this type? What brother's experience shows this? What are the leading features of that experience? How was he brought to see the evil of his course? How does the case of Bro. John Edgar show this? How was he brought to a recognition of the wrong? Whose case is contrasted with his?

(51) Who else had a similar experience in the Parousia? When did our Pastor begin to doubt the Church's leaving the world by Oct., 1914? Before whom did he guardedly state these doubts? When and how did he first intimate it to the brethren in general? How did this affect the writer? How did this matter come up during his pilgrim visit at Washington? How and what did he answer? What was done with his answer? When and in what did our Pastor come out plainly on the subject? How did his plainly stated view affect the writer? Why? How would the plain discussion in the May, 1914, Tower, if made in Dec. 1913, have affected his Washington answer? In the meantime what was done to the notes on his answer? What was it effecting in not a few? What other effect on him did the clear statement in the May, 1914, Tower have? Why?

(52) To what did this lead him? For what did he pray? What came to him thereafter? How did he meet these tests? How long after the May, 1914, Tower appeared was he troubled over the question? When, where and how did the crisis of the trial come? What was said to him on the notes? How did these remarks at once affect him? Why? What did they move him to do to those who made them? Why? Of what did they make him fearful? What, in consequence, did he tell the Lord in prayer and ask Him? How did the Lord answer that prayer? By what? What did he not wish to do with the new thought? What was accordingly done? What two things did he tell the Pastor? What point in the discussion did he specially stress? What did he then tell on the incident of the day before? What point did he then present as the first ray of light that seemed to favor the changed view? When

and where did the Pastor express to him agreement on this point? How did this affect him?

(53) Whose pertinent course is contrasted with that of the writer? To what was he not moved by the clear expression of the changed view in the May, 1914, Tower? Instead, what did he do? What dogmatic stand did he express 3½ years later? At the end of Sept., 1914, what did he do? Where? What were some of his reported declarations at that convention and a little later? What has time shown on the subject? And will yet likely show? After the separation in the Society, what use did he make of the writer's pertinent activity? How did he misrepresent the writing of a certain letter? What is the true contrast between the pertinent course of the two? Who else showed the same spirit?

(54) What did the writer tell our Pastor that he desired to counteract? Of his own initiative what did he suggest as a way of doing it? When was the letter written and when and where did it appear? What was stated above as to a thing new given the writer in 1909? How and when was the rest of that parable made clear to him as things new? With what exception? When did the first one of the rest of the things new become clear to him? What two things should here be noted? As what are the experiences of Bros. Barton, John Edgar and the writer given? Those of J. Hemery, A.H. MacMillan, etc.? What can the writer not recall? What would be profitable for Epiphany-enlightened leaders? What will Priestly leaders among the Levite groups later realize? In what acts described in v. 11 did Miriam take no part? Why was this, type and antitype?

(55) In what two graces does Aaron appear in vs. 11, 12? For what did he pray? What contrast is suggested in Aaron's use of the term, "my lord," as to Moses? What does it prove? What is the antitype? What illustrates it? What petitions has antitypical Aaron offered for antitypical Miriam? What two things are suggested in Aaron's second petition, in v. 12, as to the Second Deathers? Why is this suggestion true? How does the described expulsion ordinarily occur? What proves that the expulsion of the Second Deathers as a class is referred to here? For what has antitypical Aaron prayed and will pray in this connection? What danger makes such a prayer necessary? How

is this shown in Ps. 107: 10? What effect has had, has and will have this knowledge of this danger on antitypical Aaron? What makes antitypical Aaron all the more earnest in this prayer? Who now illustrate such encouragement? What will this influence them to do, when they recognize the true state of affairs?

(56) What was Moses' response to Aaron's petition? What does the fact of his praying for Miriam prove? Despite what? What was the character of Moses' prayer, even as it is stated in the A. V.? What is still more emphatic on this point? What is the literal translation of Moses' prayer? How does it compare with Aaron's prayer? What does it show? What does Moses' prayer type? How do we know that the antitypical prayer was very earnest? When was the typical prayer offered in time relation to Miriam's repentance and healing? What does this type? What does the antitypical prayer imply?

(57) Whom does God not forgive? Why not? What proves His readiness to forgive? What do God and Christ show, even before repentance? How long has this willingness shown itself? If this were not so, what would God not have done? What bearing has Rom. 5: 8, 6 on this subject? Toward whom also does God exercise this great grace? With what future results? What, accordingly, is typed in vs. 14, 15? What two things moved God to make the arrangement antitypical of vs. 14, 15? How did God regard Jesus' prayer in the star-members? What did it move Him to do? What should this move us to do? Why? How may we cooperate with Him in this matter? For what are we now ready?

(58) What does God first do as to this arrangement? By what? What is the comparison? Among what peoples is spitting in the face never indulged in? Except in what cases? Among what peoples is it regularly indulged in? Why? From what standpoint does the Bible present this matter? How is a father's spitting in a daughter's face there regarded? What kind of an ignominy would it be? In what would it result? For how long? How does God use this custom? How is this justification Scripturally based? How does it apply to the case at hand? Why was it done for seven days in the illustration? What was the daughter to feel during the seven days? How would God

act toward Miriam accordingly? To whom did God reveal this procedure with Miriam?

(59) Where has the antitypical spitting been explained, when done by God through His people? From certain standpoints what have God's people been for Him? How do Rev. 3: 16; John 9: 6 apply here? What are the secretions of them as God's mouth? How must they at times use this Word? What does God thereby do? What have the revolutionisms of the Great Company, backed by evil qualities, provoked? In what has this resulted? How is this spitting done? As what has God spit into antitypical Miriam's face? In what two ways has it been done? In what ways when done verbally? How is it done verbally? By the printed or written page? To whom does God do it through The Present Truth? The Herald of the Epiphany? Since when has this work been going on? In what? How has it progressed? Through what movement has it been primarily done? Secondarily? Through whom is it done to the nominal-church Levites? How may we summarize as to the agent of the spitting?

(60) How long was the sense of shame to be borne by a daughter into whose face her father spat? What did God, accordingly, declare of Miriam? In the antitype of Miriam? What does this mean? What would thereafter happen? In other words, what does God here show? What other type refers to the same thing? Wherein do the antitypes agree? Differ? What difference does the wilderness experience of Azazel's Goat show? That of antitypical Miriam outside the Camp? What shows the difference? What is God's will in this matter as to antitypical Miriam? How should we not allow the objections to, and criticisms of our pertinent course to affect us? Against whom are their objections and criticisms really made? What are His purposes in his pertinent dealings with antitypical Miriam? What would result if this process were not operated on the Great Company? In what motives should we co-operate with God in this matter? How should we co-operate with and under our Head in the work of Num. 12: 14, 15 and Lev. 16: 20-22? If this be done in this spirit, what will be the result?

(61) What is a difference between antitypical Miriam and the Great Company? What does Miriam not type? What does she type? How in time order is antitypical

Miriam dealt with? To what do they go in the wilderness? What do they experience there? How is this shown by the six forms of leprosy? What is a correct characterization of this experience? What comparison pictures their experience to a finality? Until what must this be their experience? What will their condition then be? What will they then do? By what will God deliver them? From what? How do Ps. 107: 12-14 here apply? What will they then do, according to Ps. 107: 15? What should be our attitude toward that day? What should our faith and hope be as to it? Despite what? What should we do in this faith and hope? Why? What will then be restored that is now broken?

(62) What is the second sentence of v. 15? Its character as to meaning and antitype? What do Israel's wilderness journeys type? What is typed by Israel's not journeying until Miriam's return to the camp? By Miriam's being with Israel during the next journey? What will the work be during the journey? In what two parts? What is not to be overlooked as to translation here? What does the translation *gathered* suggest? How do we not use the word *gathered*? Of what do we use it? What does this word imply as to Miriam? What is the antitype?

(63) What two reasons favor our conclusion that Miriam went along when Israel journeyed to Paran? How do the cited references show this? What is typed by Miriam's being in the camp awhile before the march to Paran? What is typed by the journey to Paran? Where did the episode described in Num. 12 occur? What does *Hazeroth* mean and type? With what were the Epiphany experiences connected with antitypical Miriam associated? What facts prove this? What was associated therewith for the Priests? Of what other two periods was this true? With what difference? What will change in the Priests' trials later? Why? What two things show this? What change in the Levites will effect this? What is also shown as to the Great Company divisions by the camping at Hazeroth awhile after Miriam's cleansing? Why are they to remain? Though begun at antitypical Hazeroth, until when will the cleansing work go on? Why this? What thought is glorious? What effect should its nearness have upon us? Why?

CHAPTER III.

THE TWELVE SPIES—TYPE AND ANTITYPE.

Num. 13; 14; Deut. 1: 19-46.

THE SPIES. COMMISSIONED. SPYING THE LAND. THE REPORT. THE RECOMMENDATIONS THE EFFECTS. SENTENCE TO FORTY YEARS' WANDERING. EFFORT TO ENTER THE LAND.

OUR STUDY of Numbers brings us to Num. 13 and 14, which we will now take up, and in connection with these chapters we will study the parallel statements of Deut. 1: 19-46. These chapters treat of the twelve spies in their individuals, their commission, their searching of the land, their report, their recommendations, their effect on the people, Moses, Aaron, Joshua, Caleb and God, God's sentence of 40 years' wandering upon the people and their disastrous effort disobediently to enter the land. Our Pastor (Tower Reprints, 3064: 5) tells us that Fleshly Israel at the time of the First Advent and during the Gospel-Age fulfilled *in considerable measure* its antitype. Thus he held that there was also a measure of its antitype that Fleshly Israel did not fulfill, and that is, because in their wilderness journey to Canaan they typed Spiritual Israel in its journey to the Kingdom, a thought which was often brought out by him, *e.g.*, Tower Reprints, 3060: 9, and which he based on Heb. 3 and 4. Accordingly, there was a small antitype and a large antitype of these chapters, the latter on Spiritual Israel at the time of the First Advent. Again, since the Harvests are parallel, we see in addition to the application of the story to Fleshly and Spiritual Israel at the First Advent an application of it to Fleshly and Spiritual Israel in the Gospel-Age Harvest. And the connecting point between the applications to Fleshly and to Spiritual Israel in the Jewish Harvest is this

Out of each of the twelve tribes of Fleshly Israel the Lord drew the Israelites indeed and made them parts of the twelve tribes of Spiritual Israel, whose justified associates became Levites of the Gospel Age and whose non-justified associates became members of the respective nominal tribe of the Spiritual tribe with which they were associated until representatives of these classes during the Gospel Age merged into their pertinent denominations among the twelve denominations as the antitypical nominal twelve tribes of the Gospel Age, as we have already shown.

(2) Viewing the matter from the typical application of this story to antitypical Spiritual Israel in the Jewish Harvest, we would construe the type for the Jewish Harvest as follows: The twelve fleshly tribes represent all who professed faith in Christ during the Jewish Harvest—the consecrated, the justified and the unjustified. The bulk of them having been Jews and some devout Gentiles more or less interested in Judaism, they were in their bulk viewed as the twelve tribes of Israel marching toward the Gospel-Age Canaan, the sphere of the Truth and of the Spirit of the Truth, their entrance into which was to have its beginning early in the Jewish Harvest. Out of these twelve tribes the Lord during the Jewish Harvest chose the antitypical twelve spies, who at the time of their selection as such and until the report had been made were Little Flock members, particularly those among them who were "scribes instructed unto the kingdom of God" (Matt. 13: 52). These explored at Jesus' command the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit during the Jewish Harvest and from time to time during those 40 years brought back their pertinent findings, the 40 days of the spying here representing the 40 years of the Jewish Harvest. We are not to understand that no reports of such findings were made until 69 A.D., for facts prove that such reports were made throughout the 40 years. Rather, we are to understand that the

end of the 40 days represents the limit of the time for such reports to be made, somewhat after the way we understand that the 40 days of Goliath's challenging do not mean that no attacks were made on Evolution until 1914, but that they then entered into the final attack by that Servant. Accordingly, the facts prove that the Apostles, Prophets and abler Teachers brought such reports from time to time during the Jewish Harvest, e.g., the New Testament writings, except John's writings, which were produced at least 20 years after 69 A.D., were reports of Apostles' and Prophets spy-fmdings.

(3) After the time of making such reports a change took place in the standing of ten of the antitypical spies (Num. 14: 37). All reported in harmony with one another (Num. 13: 26-29) until it came to antitypical Caleb, the Little Flock exhorting the people to prompt consecration and its prompt fulfilment, when ten groups among the spies made a slanderous report by misrepresenting the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit and by exaggerating the strength of the spiritual enemies and the difficulties of overcoming (vs. 31-33), and thereby discouraged the people from entering and taking the Christian inheritance (the prospective sphere of the Truth and its Spirit) from its enemies who inhabited it. For this they lost their crowns, and this was proved by their becoming plague-stricken by some error. Joshua and Caleb encouraging the people to go up in the strength of the Lord represent our Lord and the true Church, particularly its leaders, during the Jewish Harvest, encouraging the people to consecrate and carry out their consecration—the invasion and conquest of that which should become the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit. The Israelites in general represent other crown-losers, the justified and unjustified of that time, who became discouraged, then murmured and rebelled against our Lord (Moses) and the faithful Priesthood (Aaron), commanding

That doctrines contrary to those presented by the true spies be used as symbolic stones in refutation of the true spies (commanded to stone Joshua and Caleb, Num. 14: 10). God by the truths that He gave through the true Church (His glory appeared on the tabernacle) called a halt to this course of the unworthy, and then sentenced them, personally and in those following them, to wander during the Gospel Age up to 1874 in the symbolic wilderness, unable to get to antitypical Canaan, the sphere of the Gospel-Age harvest Truth and Spirit of the Truth. Their efforts to enter that sphere before such wilderness wandering was over resulted in disastrous defeats, of which the Gospel Age, in error and evil triumphing, is full of examples. Thus briefly have we sketched the antitype of Num. 13 and 14 in relation to Spiritual Israel in the Harvest of the Jewish Age, because it is not our design here to give details thereon; rather we here design to give details on the antitypes of these two chapters as they belong to the Gospel Harvest, since these are the antitypes that concern us more directly.

(4) The 40 years' journeyings of Israel in the wilderness, therefore, type mainly the journeyings of the Christian Church toward the Harvest of the Gospel Age, according to St. Paul's explanation in Heb. 3 and 4, though they also type Fleshly Israel's Gospel-Age wanderings toward 1874. And, according to the parallel, there is a second application for them: their antitypical twelve spy classes of this Harvest have brought them a report on Israel's return to God's favor and Palestine, two of them reporting favorably and ten of them unfavorably, followed by the antitypical murmuring and condemnation to wander during the Epiphany in the wilderness again, and afterwards enter and conquer their antitypical Canaan—the sphere of Truth and its Spirit in the Millennium. This phase of the antitype we will also not discuss further, since it is our purpose to discuss here in some detail Spiritual

Israel's second application of the story of Num. 13 and 14, that of the Gospel Harvest. We repeat it: The fact that Num. 13 and 14, according to Heb. 3 and 4, apply to Spiritual Israel in the Harvest of the Jewish Age, which proves, according to the parallel Harvests, that they also apply to Spiritual Israel in the Gospel Harvest, moves us to trace the antitype of the second application of these two chapters to Spiritual Israel, *i.e.*, the application of the story to Spiritual Israel in the Gospel Harvest. Our readers will recall that we have often told them that in the Epiphany we are living over the Gospel Age on a small scale, and hence are living in a miniature Gospel Age. While telling them this, we never gave them any Scripture on which we base this thought. The main Scripture on which we base it is the Gospel Harvest application of Num. 13 and 14 with the consequent wanderings to Spiritual Israel; for, as we will herein show, according to the second application, the Gospel Harvest is the second antitype of the story of Num. 13 and 14; and Israel's wanderings find their second antitype in the second application in Spiritual Israel's wandering in the Epiphany; for as the wanderings following the Jewish Harvest on the part of Spiritual Israel were those of the Gospel Age, so the Epiphany wanderings following the Gospel Harvest as the parallel of the Jewish Harvest on the part of Spiritual Israel are the parallel of those of the Gospel Age on a small scale. Hence in the Epiphany we are living over the Gospel Age on a small scale, which accounts for our speaking of the miniature Gospel Age, with its little Babylon, its little Protestant churches, its little Catholic Church, its little pope, etc.

(5) Remembering that we are limiting the study of our texts from Numbers and Deuteronomy to the Gospel Harvest application to Spiritual Israel, we understand that the request of the people (Deut. 1: 22) that Moses send out spies to search out the

land, corresponds to Spiritual Israel's asking, by their needs and words, our Lord to raise up students of the Word to study out the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit (Canaan). and thus enable them to know and act in harmony with that Truth and its Spirit. Apparently this request preceded the charge of God to Moses (Num. 13: 1) to send out the twelve spies, even as the felt needs and words of Spiritual Israel for the antitypical information as it approached the Parousia were requests to God for the antitypical information before God charged the sending out of the antitypical spies to get it. God's response is seen in the pertinent charge (v. 1); and our Lord was pleased with the request and charge (Deut. 1: 23). As we have already learned, Canaan types the sphere of the Truth and of the Spirit of the Truth. Primarily this is the Bible; but as the Bible truths and their Spirit come increasingly into the minds of God's people their minds become increasingly the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit. As before Israel's entrance into Canaan enemies and inimical cities infested it, so before Spiritual Israelites enter antitypical Canaan, it, as the prospective sphere of the Truth and its Spirit, is filled with various evils, *i.e.*, these infest the natural minds of God's people, which, accordingly, become the battlefield of the Truth and its Spirit against these enemies, even as after Israel invaded Canaan it became the battleground of its inhabitants and cities against Israel. The New Creature invades the natural mind and increasingly pervades the increasingly subdued heart and mind. And as Moses sent out the twelve spies (vs. 3-16; Deut. 1: 23), so our Lord sent out their antitypes in the Parousia. The charge was, literally, "Send *for thee*" (v. 2), implying that the spies were to help the typical and antitypical Moses in the matter on hand.

- (6) Their selection, one from each tribe, represents the fact that a set of new-creaturely Scripture students

from each of the twelve denominations of Christendom, which we have hitherto sufficiently named and described, were to be chosen as spies. The fact that not all Israelites became these spies, but that twelve individuals became such, and that each of these twelve spies was to be a ruler (literally, a prince) in his tribe, types the fact that not even all new creatures were to be the antitypical spies, but certain selected ones were to be such, and that these selected ones were to be Little Flock members, a group of such leaders being in each denomination. The fact that the ten who brought up a slander against the land died of plague before the Lord types the fact that their antitypes had ceased to be Little Flock members, evidenced by their being made sifflings (died of the plague, 14: 37). Accordingly, we are to understand that at the time of sending out the antitypical spies, all of them were crown-retainers. This is further confirmed by the fact that none of the typical spies were among the princes who brought the offerings of Num. 7 and led the tribes in Num. 10, whom we know type the twelve groups of crown-lost leaders, one group for each denomination. Hence the selection of twelve others was not due to the death of these offering princes and to the former twelve becoming their successors; for the sending out of the spies occurred just about two months after the Israelites left Sinai (Num. 10: 11; 13: 20), within which time these twelve offering princes assuredly did not die. Thus at the sending out of the antitypical spies every member of each of the twelve groups was a Little Flock member; and they constituted all the Little Flock "scribes" (Matt. 13: 52) in each of the twelve denominations of Christendom. But just after making the report a change takes place. Thereafter Joshua types our Lord. This is foreshadowed in the change of name given Joshua (v. 16). At the same time Caleb stood for all the Little Flock,

particularly for their leaders, in the Parousia Truth, the other antitypical spies becoming crown-losers.

(7) Moses' sending the spies out by the commandment. [literally, at the mouth] of the Lord (v. 3) types our Lord's sending out the Little Flock "scribes" in all the denominations as antitypical spies, according to God's Word, the Bible. The involved part of the Bible is that of our study—Num. 13; 14; Deut. 1: 19-46. Our Lord, from the Father's clarifying this type to Him, saw that it was God's word to Him to send them out to search the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit. Perhaps God also charged Him directly to this effect. In either case, or in both cases, it would be God's charge to Him. As the typical spies were sent out from the wilderness of Paran (*cavernous*; v. 3), in which Kadesh-barnea (*holy desert of wandering*; Deut. 1: 19), their place of departure, was located, so the antitypical spies were sent out in the Parousia part of the Millennium, as in a time of a consecrated wilderness condition. Kadesh-barnea is also called Enmishpat (*fountain of judgment*; Gen. 14: 7), indicative of the testings in connection with the ransom and the sin-offering doctrines, which took place at antitypical Kadesh (Num. 20: 1-13), as the chief doctrinal tests of the Parousia. As it was emphasized, by repetition (all these men were heads of the children of Israel, v. 3), that the twelve spies were leaders in their respective tribes, so in the antitype it was emphasized that the antitypical spies were the leading students of the Bible in their respective denominations, who were at the same time Little Flock members. It will be noted that neither the tribe of Levi nor Aaron's family is included. This is to show that Little Flock members are typed by the spies. Thus as Moses sent out the twelve spies to search out typical Canaan, so our Lord sent out from the twelve denominations the Little Flock "scribes" to search out the sphere of the Truth and of the Spirit of the Truth.

In their searching some of the members of each one of the twelve groups of antitypical spies came into the Truth movement, while others remained in their respective denominations, becoming enemies of the Truth.

(8) Let us here, as at the appropriate place, pause awhile and consider the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit—antitypical Canaan. It embraces Bible and Bible-pertinent knowledge and its Spirit in all their ramifications. In Vol. VIII, Chap. II we showed the main forms of such knowledge, when we described the work of the Gospel-Age Kohathites. But the Gospel-Age Kohathites did not penetrate so deeply into these matters of Bible knowledge and Spirit as did the twelve Parousia spies, and that for several reasons: they were not new creatures, as were the antitypical spies; many features of such knowledge were not due until the Parousia; and the antitypical spies could discern such features of the Truth and of the Spirit of the Truth as the unconsecrated natural man could not see. In Vol. VIII, Chap. II we mentioned some as Gospel-Age Kohathites whom further light shows not to have been such, but who were new creatures, some ministering before, and some during the Parousia. We will, among others, mention hereinafter the main new creature spy-members whom we there mistakenly set forth as Gospel-Age Kohathites. While on this subject we might remark that while the Gospel-Age Kohathites did such work as came under the heads of learned works along linguistic, exegetical, historical and systematic work on Bible matters, they were not the only ones who did such work, for crown-lost leaders and other crown-losers did such work, *e.g.*, Chrysostom, Augustine, Chemnitz, Calvin, Socinus, Menno Simon, Jeremiah Taylor, Alex. Campbell, etc., wrote, variously, commentaries, or on apologetics, doctrine and ethics, as well as on historical religious subjects. Yea, almost all Little Flock leaders did such work: *e.g.*, Luther, Melanchthon, Tyndale, Ulphilas and Alfred the

Great did Bible translation work, and the first two of these produced many interpretational, apologetic, doctrinal and ethical works. Hence we are not to think that it was the exclusive function of the Gospel-Age Kohathites to do linguistic, exegetical, historical and systematic work on Bible lines. In most of these departments of Bible knowledge Priests have done best of all, e.g., our Pastor.

(9) That the Parousia was the time of all times for the most searching investigations and the most fruitful results in the sphere of Bible knowledge and of the Bible Spirit, is evident from an examination of pen products of that and previous times. Never was there a time in which more and abler new creatures worked on such lines of thought; never was there a time in which such produced so many books on such lines of thought; and never was there a time when the results of such investigations were so rich and excellent. Such new creatures worked on every phase of the four branches of Biblical learning—linguistic, exegetical, historical and systematic. We will particularize: The best editions of the Hebrew Scriptures ever to appear were then produced. The best of these is Ginsburg's Hebrew Old Testament and the next best is Kittel's Hebrew Old Testament, the former specializing on the variant Hebrew readings and the latter on the variant readings of the ancient versions. So, too, the best editions—recensions—of the Greek New Testament ever to appear came out during that time. Here we may particularize five recensions: Westcott and Hort, Weiss, Souter, Nestle and Von Soden, the first two named working 28 years on their recension and the last named 18 years, cooperated with by 45 specialists in this department of Biblical knowledge, resulting in his producing by far the greatest recension of the New Testament. Also Gregory and (Ezra) Abbott did well on this subject.

(10) During this time the greatest activity in

Hebrew and Greek lexicons for the Bible took place, resulting in the production of such fine Hebrew lexicons as Brown's, Buhl's, Davies', Siegfried and Stade's and Koenig's, and of such fine Greek New Testament lexicons as Thayer's, Preuschen's, Kremer's and Abbott-Smith's. Moulton and Milligan's Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament Illustrated By The Papyri, etc., was prepared and appeared in part at this time. Splendid Hebrew grammars, like the various editions of Kautzsch's Gesenius and of Stade's and Koenig's grammars, were prepared and published during the Parousia, as also fine Greek grammars for the New Testament, like various editions of Winer, Blass, Moulton and Robertson, were written at this time. During this time Ginsburg prepared his Massorah which is also a Hebrew concordance to the Old Testament, and Rabbi Mandelkern prepared the best Hebrew concordance in existence, but he was very largely assisted by Christian scholars; and hence his work may be regarded as largely a Christian product; for it is, among others, based on the two Hebrew concordances prepared by two Hebrew converts, Fuerst and Davidson, and it received important revisions, by Christian scholars during the Parousia. During this time Hatch's and Redpath's Concordance to the Septuagint appeared, the best in its field. Then, too, appeared the three best Greek New Testament concordances; Bruder, Moulton and Geden, and Schmoller. In English during this period Drs. Young's and Strong's concordances were prepared, the latter giving every word in the A.V., R.V. and A.R.V. everywhere that it occurs. Walker's Concordance also appeared then. So, too, during the Parousia our finest translations appeared, *e.g.*, the R.V., A.R.V., Drs. Young, Rotherham, Moffatt, etc. Splendid translations of the Bible appeared during the Parousia in other languages than English, notably in German and French. Thus the very best and most numerous linguistic helps to the

Bible have appeared during the Parousia, as a part of the antitypical spies' work for our Lord.

(11) The same applies to the branches of Bible knowledge belonging to exegetical helps—introduction, interpretation and harmonetics. In the department of introduction, which treats of the canon, text, books and circulation of the Bible, mainly from the standpoint of a history of these, are the great works of Green and Buhl on the canon and text of the Old Testament, of Zahn, Charteris, Lightfoot, Sanday, Abbott and Westcott on the canon of the New Testament in its parts or whole, of Zahn and Westcott on the books of the New Testament, of Weiss on the canon, text, books and circulation of the New Testament, of Salmon on the canon and books of the New Testament and of Harmon on the canon, text, books and circulation of the entire Bible. These are the greatest of introductory works. We pass over higher-critical introductionist works here as not having come from the antitypical spies, as we also pass by their pertinent works on other branches of Bible Knowledge and Spirit. In the realm of interpretation, as the second branch of exegetical knowledge, the greatest works of all times appeared in the Parousia as the products of the pertinent spies. Thus Keil and Delitzsch, in their later editions prepared in this period, give the ablest commentary on the Old Testament; and Zahn and Weiss and their co-laborers wrote the two ablest commentaries on the New Testament. The various scholars who prepared the Expositors' Commentary and Geikie wrote commentaries on the whole Bible. Most of the volumes of the Speakers' Commentary were written in this period. The Expositor's Greek Testament, written in this period by various scholars, and Weiss' Shorter Commentary on the New Testament contain some good work of antitypical spies. Then, men like Green on Genesis, Douglas on Isaiah, Spurgeon on the Psalms, Westcott on John, Hebrews and

1, 2 and 3 John, Lightfoot on Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon and in his post-humous unfinished works on other Pauline epistles, Ramsey on Galatians, Godet on Luke, John, Romans and Corinthians, Luthardt on John, Philipi on Romans, as antitypical spies brought back valuable information on interpretational lines. Schaff's revision of Lange's commentary on the whole Bible, originally prepared by a number of German scholars and translated into English, falls into this period and brings back from the spying of antitypical Canaan valuable finds. Some of the works mentioned above were produced before 1874, but their later revisions fall in the Parousia, and from the standpoint of such revised editions are referred to above as the works of editions cited as antitypical spies' work.

(12) Antitypical spies have done good work in the harmonetical branch of exegetical knowledge, called harmonetics, which embraces: harmonies of Old and New Testament histories, reference or parallel passages and Bible indexes. Little and Crockett have produced fine harmonies of Old Testament histories. Riddle, Broadus, Clark, Robertson, Stevens and Burton did the same kind of work for the New Testament histories. Interwoven accounts of the Old Testament parallel histories are given by Little, and the same is done for those of the New Testament parallel histories by Pittenger, while Clark and Burton have made harmonies of the Acts with the Epistles. Then, Riddle, Kramer and Huck furnished harmonies of the Gospels in Greek. Many editions of the Bible appearing during the Parousia contained good sets of reference passages. Johns has furnished a New Testament with references not simply cited, but quoted in full, with the Gospels printed in parallel columns, thus also a harmony of the Gospels. Baxters published a similar work covering the whole Bible, without the harmony of the Gospels. They published it under the title, *A Commentary Wholly Biblical*, but do not give the date,

which we rather opine was before 1874, but are not sure. But the largest compilation of reference or parallel passages, 500,000 of them, is contained in a book entitled, The Treasury of Scriptural Knowledge, which is a compilation of many collections of reference passages, interspersed here and there with notes. Then, several fine indexes of Bible subjects appeared at this time, the most elaborate being that of Butler and that of Monser, who was assisted by eleven able Bible scholars. Almost all Bibles containing teachers' helps have such indexes, though on a smaller scale. The American Tract Society and Thomas Nelson have published rather elaborate Bible indexes. Thus the antitypical spies have brought back from their searching of antitypical Canaan much useful harmonetical Bible knowledge and, of course, its Spirit.

(13) In the third general branch of Biblical knowledge, the historical, there was a very lively activity during the Parousia, as an expression of the antitypical spies' searching. The first department of this branch of Bible knowledge covers the ground of Bible history and biography and Church history and biography (the third and fourth being Biblical knowledge, because in their main features they give the antitypes of much of the Bible history and biography). In Bible history Kurtz, Edersheim, Blaikie, Ramsey, Smith, Schuerer, etc., have brought back from their search of antitypical Canaan much valuable knowledge. Under the general editorship of J.S. Exell, 17 volumes of biography on the main Biblical characters, written by ten able authors and containing much profitable knowledge, were published under the general title, Men of the Bible. But it is especially in New Testament biography that wonderful finds by the antitypical spies were made. At least 150 lives of Christ appeared during the Parousia, chief among which are those by Weiss, Edersheim, Farrar, Geikie, Andrews, Smith and Clarke. The following fine lives of St. Paul

appeared during this period: Conybeare and Howson, Farrar, Ramsey, Lewin, Pfleiderer and Smith. MacDonald has written a good life of St. John; Renolds likewise a good life of John the Baptist. Schaff and Farrar have brought out much that is fine on the whole of the New Testament notables, and Ramsey, Lechler and Weizsaecker on the chief actors and events in the Acts of the Apostles. In Church history much good material was discovered by the antitypical spies: Kurtz, Moeller, Hase, Geyer, Hurst, Trench, Ayer, Sheldon, Newman, Dwyer, Fisher, Lea, Nippold, Schaff (father and son), the Krueger, the Fulton, the Briggs and Salmond and the Creighton series of books on various epochs of Church history. Likewise in Church biography many fine nuggets of information on various servants of God were then discovered. We will mention here some biographies of star-members: McCabe's Abelard, Hausrath's Arnold of Brescia, Emerton's Marsiglio, Lechler's Wyclif, (David) Schaff's Huss, Miller's Wessel, Villari's Savonarola, Koestlin's Luther, Jackson's Zwingli, Vedder's Hubmaier, Willis' Servetus, Pollard's Cranmer, Dexter's Browne, Penney's Fox, Curnock's Wesley and White's Miller. Other fine biographies appeared then.

(14) The second branch of Biblical historical knowledge is chronology. As there was a correct one in the hands of God's people during the Miller movement, *i.e.*, before the Parousia, the only uses that antitypical Moses could have made of the antitypical spies as to chronology was for them to discover corroborations of pertinent and connected matters. And various of such corroborations were then brought to light, particularly by such of the spies as were in the Truth, *e.g.*, Bro. Russell and the five brothers who antityped the Gabriel of Dan. 9. Yet others who did not come into the Truth did some things on this line of thought, *e.g.*, Piazzi Smyth, Rawlinson, Beecher, Hippisley, etc. Archeology is the third branch of Biblical historical

knowledge. More fruitful and useful have been the archeological finds of the antitypical spies who have brought to light many Biblical and Church antiquities revelatory of Biblical countries, customs, conditions, occupations, trades, social, business, religious, civil and political arrangements, etc. Very much of this information was gotten by excavating the sites of buried cities and towns. The chief workers in Biblical archeology during the Parousia were Lenormant, Naville, Maspero, Schrader, (George) Smith, Sayce, Petrie, Deissmann, Hommel, Pinches, Coborn, Smith, Cheetham, Stubbs, Plumptre, Wace, Schaff, Besant, Riehm, VanLennep, Barton, Hilprecht, Clay, Bissell, Keil, Kyle, Ramsey, Jeremias, Edersheim, Conder, Harper and a host of others. Likewise the geography of Bible and Christian lands, as the fourth branch of Biblical historical knowledge, has been diligently explored by antitypical spies, of whom the following are some of the main ones: Conder, Ramsey, Bliss, Dawson, Stewart, Hoskins, Merrill, Trumbell, Thompson, Bovet, Schumacher, McAllister and a host of others, who worked mainly in Palestine. Some of those mentioned under archeology did good geographical work in other Bible lands than Palestine. Thus we see the antitypical spies investigated questions of Biblical and Church history, using the word history in its widest sense, *i.e.*, to include events; institutions, movements, persons, chronology, antiquities and geography of Bible and Christian lands as such.

(15) The fourth branch of the sphere of Truth and its Spirit that antitypical spies searched is that of systematic Bible knowledge and its Spirit, embracing apologetics, dogmatics (doctrine) and ethics. It has been a time of special apologetical activity because of the atheistic, agnostic, materialistic, pantheistic, deistic, evolutionistic, higher-critical and heretical attacks on the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit. Apologists, like Bruce, Dean, Harrison, Luthardt, Fisher, Rishell,

Shields, Redford and the numerous writers of the Present Day Tracts, etc., have investigated the general field of apologetics and have brought back many fine arguments in defense of the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit and in refutation of anti-Biblical theories. Apologists, like Dawson, O'Neil, Calderwood, MacColl, Hall, Wright, De Pressense, McCosh, Romaines, Bateson, Mendel, etc., defended the Bible idea of creation as against evolution, having in their investigations of the pertinent subjects found many valuable arguments. Apologists, like Urquhart, Green, Bartlett, Bissell, Cook, McGarvey, Reich, Finn, Robertson, Orr, Cave, Douglas, Sayce, Rawlinson, the fourteen authors of the book, *The Law of Moses*, who include the preceding two, Wiener, Moeller, Koenig, Zahn, Sanday, Westcott and many others, through their investigations have found many fine lines of thought against higher criticism. Historical evidences of the Truth and its Spirit were ably examined by Zahn, Sanday, Bowman, Westcott, Koenig, Sayce, Rawlinson and many others.

(16) In the domain of dogmatics the antitypical spies that remained in their respective denominations did good spy work in their respective denomination's stewardship doctrine. Their other efforts were mainly erroneous. The following are the principal representatives of such spies: Philipi, Hodge, Miley, Pope, Shedd, Strong, Edersheim, Riehm, Koenig, Weiss, Pfleiderer, Oehler, the last two writing on Biblical theology, an analysis of the Biblical thoughts, and the third from the last writing on it as well as on doctrine as such, Weiss, Koenig, Zahn and Westcott, often mentioned above, were perhaps the most many-sided and fruitful of the antitypical spies not in the Truth. In Christian ethics there was a great activity in the Parousia, during which ethicists like Martinsen, Janet, Porter, Harless, Weidener, Smyth, Henderson, Peabody and many others, did good work. Nominal church apologetical and ethical spies used much more

Truth and decidedly less error than its doctrinal spies. Among the large number of contributors to the various Bible and theological dictionaries and encyclopedias produced during the Parousia were many antitypical spy members, in fact many hundreds of them, who wrote for those works on almost every branch of the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit. But the greatest and most fruitful of any individual member of the antitypical spies was that Servant, who furnished excellent matter on almost every branch of the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit. Among them he was supreme in interpretational, chronological, apologetical, doctrinal and ethical findings. Though not a Greek or Hebrew scholar, his definitions of certain Greek and Hebrew words are better than those of the greatest lexicographers, *e.g.*, *ruach*, *nephesh*, *elohim*, *Yahveh*, *adon*, *shaphat*, *mishphat*, *pneuma*, *psuche*, *anastasis*, *krino*, *krisis*, *krima*, *gennao*, *parousia*, *epiphania*, *apokapypsis*, etc. Good, too, were his corrections of mistranslations. In fact all of the Truth brothers who were among the "scribes" of Matt. 13: 52 were parts of antitypical Caleb when the report was made. We thus have very briefly, in paragraphs 8-16 described the various ways in which the antitypical spies searched antitypical Canaan.

(17) In pointing out above the work of the antitypical spies we did so from the standpoint of the various branches of the knowledge belonging to the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit. We did not do it from the standpoint of the denominations to which the antitypical spies belonged, *i.e.*, we pointed out the main spy members in the pertinent branches of Christian knowledge, regardless of their denominational affiliations: But we are to understand that the abler crown-retaining new creatures in every denomination participated in this work, even as Num. 13: 4-15 indicates. We have not, except in the cases of four special Romanists and the Quaker Penney, mentioned the names of any

representatives of the Roman and Greek Catholic Church and of the fanatical sects. This does not mean that they have not participated therein, but that for the most part they were not the most eminent in the lines of thought presented above. The best pertinent work of Romanists was done in France, especially as represented in the massive French theological encyclopedia. Particularly the following parts of it belong to our subject: Bible Dictionary (4 vols.), Biblical Greek and Hebrew and other sacred languages Dictionary (4 vols.), dictionaries of Bible and Church history in its widest sense, distributed under various of its departments (48 vols.), dictionaries of systematic theology (27 vols.). There are 85 other volumes belonging to this gigantic work of 168 volumes, each of which is a quarto of over 1,000 pages. Much of the matter of the pertinent 83 volumes is good spy work. Some German Romanists did some good spy work, especially in an encyclopedic, apologetical and archeological way. Next to the fanatical sects the Greek Catholic spies did the least spy work of any of the denominational spies, though men like Byrennios did some good work therein. The spies of the Lutheran, Calvinistic and Episcopal Churches, in the order named, did the most and ablest of such work, except the work of the eventual Caleb, which is the ablest of all, not, however, from the standpoint of scholarship, but from that of the Truth and its Spirit.

(18) Having treated in general of vs. 3-16, we will now take up the rest of the chapter. The change (v.16) of Oshea's (*deliverance*) name to Jehoshua (ordinarily written Joshua, —*Jehovah is salvation, or saves*) types the fact that Joshua from typing the Little Flock spies of the Lutheran Church would be changed into typing our Lord. It was our Lord who sent out the antitypical spies (Moses sent, etc., v. 17). Our Lord by God's Word, Spirit and providence aroused in them the determination to do the pertinent

studying (spying). Thereby He charged them to surmount all the obstacles that Satan's kingdom (the mountain, v. 17, the one immediately north of Kadesh-barnea, Deut. 1: 24) would place in their way of entering the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit for its thorough investigation. The translation "southward" is false, for the word (*negeb*) here means *south country*, which is the name given to the southern part of Canaan. The location of the mountain north of Kadesh-barnea is on its face a clear proof of the erroneous translation, as also the ascent from the south mentioned in v. 22 and the course given in v. 21 disprove it. To enter Canaan from its southern end types the investigation of the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit on the curse in Christendom nearest the viewpoint of the antitypical spies as belonging to the nominal churches, which in antitype would imply diverse branches of study. They were to study the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit to learn just what they are (see the land, etc., v. 18). They were also to study the evils of sin, of error, of selfishness and of worldliness that infested the minds and hearts of God's people (and the people . . . therein). They were to note particularly whether these evils in the natural mind and heart were strong or weak, few or many (strong . . . many), and then report on them.

(19) Particularly our Lord charged them to investigate the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit from the standpoint of its spiritual qualities (whether these were good or bad, v. 19), which, of course, they found to be good. He likewise charged them to search out the fortresses of evil (the cities; 2 Cor. 10: 4, 5), and to note particularly whether these fortresses of evil were weak (tents) or strong (strongholds). They were to investigate the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit to the intent of finding out whether it was fertile or barren (fat or lean, v. 20) as to developing the fruits of the Spirit, as well as to find out whether it

had great ones as its leaders (wood, *i.e.*, trees, which represent great ones, as of God's people or as of the world). Our Lord exhorted the antitypical spies to be courageous in the face of any danger confronting them in their spying activities. He also charged them to bring of the fruits developed in the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit. What these were we will show when interpreting v. 26. The time of His starting to send out the antitypical spies was that of the reaping's beginning (time of the first ripe grapes). This we construe in part from the fact that the periods of 29-69 and 1874-1914 are set forth from the standpoint of various figures, *i.e.*, the harvest, fishing (Matt. 13: 24-30, 37-43, 47-50), gathering ripe grapes (Cant. 2: 13; 7: 12; Is. 24: 13; Deut. 24: 19-21), etc. It is also construed from the fact that it was immediately after our Lord's baptism (Oct., 29 A.D.) that He, the first member of the Jewish Harvest's Caleb, and then later its Joshua, beheld the first spiritual things seen (Matt. 3: 16), and from the fact that it was in Oct., 1874, that our Pastor spied out the first Gospel Harvest Truth, the invisibility of our Lord in His Second Advent. Thus the facts of the case prove our views of the spies' time of starting.

(20) In executing this charge of our Lord the Parousia spies investigated every phase of the sphere of the Truth then due and of its Spirit, even as the typical spies searched out the whole of Canaan, from the place where its extreme southern part bordered on the wilderness of Zin (*thorn*, the condition of the curse in Christendom) to the place where its extreme northern part bordered on Rehob (*breadth*, heathenism) and the entrance [a mountain valley or pass running from the Mediterranean Sea to Hamath] to Hamath (*fortress*, Parousia infidelity, v. 21). How thoroughly they did this antitypical searching we can see in part from the writings referred to in paragraphs 8-17. There was not a nook or corner in the sphere of the

Truth and its Spirit then due that they did not search out in detail. Their investigations covered the ground from the curse in Christendom to that in heathenism and infidelity, and covered all that lay outside of these, *i.e.*, the Truth and its Spirit, as well as the infesting evils, including the alliance (Hebron, *friendship*—alliance, v. 22) between the devil (Ahiman, *brother of a gift*—Satan as Lucifer was a brother of the Logos, whom God gave us as our Savior, the Gift of gifts), the world (Sheshai, *clothed in white*, or *whitish*—the world seeks to palm off itself as righteous; self-justification is a prominent fault of the world in its alluring appeals to God's people) and the flesh (Talmai, furrowy,—the flesh *is much rent by the plow of depravity*). Very much, especially along linguistic, exegetical, historical, doctrinal and ethical lines, has been investigated in the devil, the world and the flesh, each individually and in their unholy alliance. This alliance was formed during "the world that then was" (the antediluvian order of affairs), which was a complete period (seven years) before "the present evil world" (Egypt, *fortress*) was established as Satan's empire (Zoan, *emporium*, where the goods of evil are the merchandise). These three—the devil, the world and the flesh, singly and in alliance—certainly are the children of evil (Anak, *giant*), and we have so found them.

(21) In their spying they certainly advanced to the study of the Truth on the new will, the New Creature (the brook of Eschol, *cluster*, v. 23; Deut. 1: 24, 25), and on this subject by their study (spied, cut down) they gathered together an immense amount of truths on the graces (cluster of grapes; John 15: 2, 4, 5, 8). Without any doubt some of the finest of the spy work was on this subject. Here the lexicographers, concordance-makers, translators, interpreters, index-makers, sacred historians, dogmaticians and especially ethicists, did much good spying. Especially Bro. Russell and certain of the pilgrims wrought thereon fruitfully.

They, the Truth part of the spies and the nominal-church part of the spies (between two), administered (bare) their pertinent work by means of the Bible (staff). This collection of graces consisted of the higher and lower primary, the secondary and the tertiary graces, especially the ingredients of charity joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness and self-control, as described in Gal. 5: 22, 23, and additionally the non-charity graces: patience, fortitude, piety and brotherly love, as given in 2 Pet. 1: 5-7. These the spies described as they exist in God, Christ and new creatures especially, though they also described vestiges of these as they exist in the natural man. They also searched out and described in great detail the fruits of Christ's redemptive work (pomegranates; Ex. 39: 24, 25; Cant. 4: 3, 13; 6: 7, 11; 7: 12; 8: 2), which are instruction, justification, sanctification, deliverance, for the four elect classes, restitution for fallen men and restoration for penitent fallen angels, the eternal annihilation of all evil and the everlasting establishment of justice and love everywhere. They also searched out and described the joys of the saved of all classes (figs, whose sweetness, like that of honey, suggests these joys—especially the joys at the prospect of the first resurrection, glorification and restitution). These the spies, especially the Truth spies, brought back from their spying work, as the most important finds in the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit. Please note the repetition of the matter of Eschol and the cluster of grapes (v. 24), as emphasizing the fact of the commanding importance of the graces. Yet from certain quarters we hear strictures made against character development as an evil thing

(22) Having spied out in its various parts the full sphere of the Truth and its Spirit, so far as they were due to be seen during the Parousia, the spies returned at the end of forty years (after forty days, v. 25) from their spying work, which, accordingly, covered

the period of 1874 to 1914, *i.e.*, the Parousia. How do we know that the spying ceased in 1914? Not only because that was the end of the Parousia, as numerous Bible passages and facts prove, to which we referred in giving our 63 proofs for the Spirit-begettals' ceasing in 1914 and the sealing in the forehead in 1916 (*Studies*, Vol. III, 387-404; Vol. VII, Chap. V), but because of the facts of the case, particularly the World War, whose distractions put an end for awhile to making *new and continued* investigations in the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit. Let theological literature be searched during this time and the absence for several years of such investigations will be noted. How could war-rent Germany, France and England, the chief countries of Europe where the spying was done, afford their scholars the leisure and quiet for such work? Their scholars, particularly those in Germany and France, up to 72 years of age were drafted into the army, *e.g.*, Gregory of Berlin, one of the ablest New Testament text critics, was killed while acting as a sentinel in a fortress. The vast bulk of American theological scholars likewise were too distracted to do further investigation after the war broke out, and this distraction was increased as America drifted toward, and became involved in the war. Little publishing work could be done on such works, which had to be written by October, 1914, because of lack of printers. Thus the great activity of spying and reporting that marked the 40 years from 1874 to 1914 ceased shortly after the outbreak of the war in Europe.

(23) Nor are we to understand that no reporting was done in the antitype until after October, 1914; for the facts of the case contradict such a thought; for all of the writings that we mentioned in paragraphs 8-17 were either first produced or received important revisions, additions or rewriting during the Parousia time. And let us repeat the remark: We have mentioned a mere fraction, the most important fraction, of the spy

pen-products of that period. *E.g.*, All our Pastor's writings appeared before October, 1914, except Tower articles and sermons, which for a large part were not newly written, but worked over or reprinted; and those containing new thoughts furnished certain foundations for the Epiphany, and hence were Epiphany, not Parousia truths, *e.g.*, on Elijah and Elisha, on announcing manifested Great Company members as such, etc. But what do the facts of the case prove as to the time of giving the antitypical spy reports? They prove that these reports were made by the lectures given and the publications appearing from time to time throughout the entire period. In other words, the reporting was done then from time to time during those forty years, just as the parallel reporting of the Jewish Harvest was done from time to time during its forty years. We saw a parallel phenomenon in the challenging of antitypical Goliath during the Parousia and yet antitypical David was refuting him throughout the Parousia, while the type by placing the fight at the end of the forty days thereby indicates the limit when the last feature of the antitypical attack would be made. Hence we are to understand that the antitypical spies' report was given in its final installments at the end of the Parousia; and thus the forty days in the type are not intended, as likewise they were not in the parallel cases of the Jewish Harvest and of David and Goliath, to point out the beginning, but the end of the antitypical report, which in the antitype was being made in various installments during the Parousia's entire time.

- (24) The antitypical spies reported to Jesus (Moses, v. 26; Deut. 1: 25), to Aaron (the Priesthood) and to the rest of God's people in and outside of the nominal church (all the congregation). They did this by their pertinent lectures before varying sized audiences and by their publications in books, booklets, magazines, pamphlets, tracts, papers, etc. This was done in the first part of the Millennium (Paran),

which began with the Parousia, and that while the people were in the presence of the step of consecration (Kadesh). To these they delivered, as the facts prove, in the above forms their findings (brought word back unto them, etc.). Their lectures and writings certainly contained the answers to the questions typed by the questions contained in vs. 18-20. Especially did they expound to and before these the fruits of the Spirit, in their kinds, parts and relations, the fruits of Christ's redemptive work and the joys of the Lord's people in their inheritance (shewed them the fruit). The repetition of the statement (told him, Moses, v. 27), that the spies gave their report to Moses, emphasizes the thought that he sent them, and that they reported especially to him, typing the emphasis on the thought that Jesus sent the antitypical spies, and that they made their report especially to Him. The act of giving these lectures and publishing these pen-products was the telling to the Lord that they had carried out His charge (we came unto the land whither thou sentest us). Their findings in their very nature proved very emphatically that the sphere of the Truth was one of rich abundance of spiritual nourishment (surely it floweth with milk) and of rich abundance of joy, both for the present and the future (honey; a good land which the Lord our God doth give us; v. 27; Deut. 1: 25). Then in those lectures and writings they displayed to the admiring sight of all professed Christians the wondrous fruits of the Spirit, the fruits of Christ's redemptive work and the sweet hope for the Church and the World (this is the fruit of it).

(25) Whereas vs. 26 and 27 and Deut. 1: 25 contain the typical report as to the land, vs. 28 and 29 contain the typical report as to the inhabitants and cities of the land. We are not to forget that the report as given in vs. 26-29 was strictly true; only after Caleb sought to encourage the people to go up at once and possess the land did the ten spies misrepresent and slander it.

Antitypically, the report covered in vs. 26-29 was also true; misrepresentations and slanders came after the report from the antitypical twelve spies had been given. We will now look at the particulars typed in vs. 28 and 29. Remembering that the peoples of Canaan represent the various evils that infest the fallen natural mind, we are prepared for the understanding of the antitypes of these two verses. These evils in all their particulars are strong (the people be strong that dwell in the land, v. 28). Indeed they are: Who in the battles of the Spirit against these evils has not found them strong and conquerable only by fasting (self-denial) and prayer? The strongholds of these evils (the cities), especially the stronger ones of these, are mightily fortified by pertinent institutions, customs, habits, etc. (walled, and very great). This part of the report is certainly true. And what makes matters worse is that the devil, the world and the flesh (sons of Anak) are there present (there) to fight against the efforts of the New Creature to subdue these strong evils, particularly the strongly fortified ones.

(26) Sin in its many forms, like idolatry, faithlessness to God, unbelief, disobedience, hatred, adultery, theft, perjury, covetousness, etc. (*Amalekites, valley dwellers*, v. 29), is ready to resist us at our entrance into the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit (dwell in the south). Ruling selfishness in its forms acting on self (*Hittites, fear*), like love for the good opinion of self and of others, of ease, of life, of self-defense, of aggression, of safety, of concealing disadvantageous things, of gaining and retaining, of food and drink, etc.; and in its forms acting on the world (*Jebusites, trodden down*), like love for the opposite sex, spouse, children, parents, friends, home and native land, oppose attaining the heights (dwell in the mountains) of Christian character. So, too, does error (the Amorites, *mountaineers*) in its many forms, as seen in heathenism, infidelity, Mohammedanism, Judaism and

churchianity; also worldliness (Canaanites, *merchants*), the spirit of the world seeking through the wills of others to control our wills, seeking to draw us down to their level, which is rebellion against God (dwell by the sea), or even lower than rebellion against God, *i.e.*, utter apostacy (by the coast of Jordan, which from the sea of Merom onward increasingly descends below sea level). Certainly, they reported well when they described sin in its many forms, selfishness in the manifoldness of its two forms, error in its multiplied forms and worldliness in its diverse forms. They surely reported truly when they said that the Christian warfare is against these inhabitants that infest our natural hearts and minds, and must be displaced therefrom by the New Creature in its ever enlarging of its sphere of the Truth and its Spirit in our minds.

(27) The Little Flock from here on typed by Caleb, who, being of the tribe of Judah, before the events of v. 30 typed the spies of the Presbyterian or Reformed (Calvinistic) Church during the time of the delivery of the above-described antitypical report, noting in the people more or less dissatisfaction against our Lord (not "before," but "concerning" Moses, see Young's Translation, v. 30), sought to calm (stilled) the people against the spirit of fear infused by the antitypical report and of resentment against our Lord. This fear held the people back from consecration, as those of us who witnessed it during the Parousia know. The Little Flock did not attempt in combating this spirit to minimize the enemies that infest antitypical Canaan, which they truly, like the spies, set forth; but they stressed the ability of God's faithful people to conquer these enemies, since God by an oath (Gen. 22: 16, 17) promised that He would enable them so to do. The Little Flock urged promptness and decision in the making and carrying out of consecration (Let us go up at once). It set forth the thought that the faithful consecrated were well able to

conquer all the enemies that infest our Canaan (we are well able to overcome it). In making this thought clear, it stressed the thoughts that in God's Word is all the enlightenment, energy and weapons for the conquest, that in God's Spirit are all the faculties and powers necessary for the conquest, and that in the Lord's providence are all the plans, strategies, reinforcements and reliefs necessary to make the conquest. Thus by consecration made and carried out our Canaan can be dispossessed of its present inhabitants and occupied as the eternal dwelling place of God's faithful people. Certainly, the Parousia Little Flock did so preach consecration and its sure victory for the faithful to nominal and real Christians. And in so doing they antityped Caleb in v. 30.

(28) Now interference with the Little Flock's encouragement is made by the antitypical ten spies, who, from here on, represent those among the spies who, in their pertinent acts, lost their crowns, manifested later by their becoming plague-stricken. These claimed that God's people did not have the power to overcome their inherent evils, alleging that the latter were stronger than they (We are not able . . . stronger than we, v. 31). They were misled on this matter by a confusion and misunderstanding of justification by faith and sanctification by works, yea, by an ignorance of the distinction between justification by faith and an obtaining of the high calling by works and faith, as to what each gives its recipients. To them justification by faith implies that its recipients have in it a passport to heaven, guaranteeing them an instantaneous entrance thereto at death, whereas justification restores *reckonedly* what Adam lost, the earthly Paradise and the condition of sinless righteousness and perfection of the whole man, counts him as perfected at the Millennium's end. But the high calling, based upon faith-justification and supported by it throughout our Christian warfare, is won by the good works of consecration

faithfully carried out, and without such works developed unto crystallized Christ-likeness no one enters the Kingdom (Heb. 12: 14; Matt. 16: 24). Those having the erroneous view of faith-justification entertained in the nominal church and set forth above, also usually hold the erroneous doctrine of total depravity; and, of course, to such the antitype of the ten spies' language, "We are not able to go up against the people; for they are stronger than we," seems to be gospel truth; whereas the total depravity doctrine, its basis, is false, so also is the conclusion that they base on it false—that justification by faith entitles one to inherit the Kingdom, which it certainly does not do.

(29) By reason of our inherited depravity, which, though affecting evilly all of our faculties and qualities, is not total, we, of course, cannot justify ourselves. We are justified by God's grace through Christ's merit reckoning us perfect and accepted by faith. But after being so justified and then later Spirit-begotten, supported by God's grace, Christ's High-Priestly ministry and the operation of God's Spirit, we can by our faithful consecration qualify by works and faith for the Divine nature and joint-heirship with Christ in the Kingdom. This requires the defeat of our enemies who infest our Canaan; and unless we defeat them we will not attain the Divine nature and joint-heirship with Christ in the Kingdom. The antitypical ten spies, usually holding their false doctrines on total depravity and on faith-justification entitling its recipients to the Kingdom honor and joint-heirship with Christ, of course fought the Little Flock's Parousia preaching on consecration made and faithfully kept entitling one to joint-heirship with Christ in heaven, alleging that this doctrine contradicted their alleged Truth on total depravity and faith-justification. Hence they fought heatedly against the possibility of our overcoming various forms of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness, alleging our inability (total depravity) thereto and their greater strength than our alleged total depravity allows

us to have. Their combative ness led them into gross falsehoods and exaggerations—in a word, slander (mistranslated, evil report) of the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit. Their first falsehood was that the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit, viewed as we look upon it as being in the consecrated condition, was a lean, starving and famine-stricken condition (a land that eateth up the inhabitants thereof, v. 32). Thus they falsely set forth "Millennial Dawnism" in their controversial sermons, conversations and writings. The isolation, (usual) poverty, littleness in man's view, fewness, tribulations, persecutions and siftings of the Truth people they took as proofs that the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit was a symbolic starvation country.

(30) The second falsehood that they brought up against the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit was that *all* of the forms of sin, selfishness, error and worldliness were stronger, greater and hardier than God's faithful people (all the people . . . men of great stature). This falsehood was based on their error of total depravity. None of these forms of evil were such, though doubtless some of them were strong, great and hardy, but others were weak, small and delicate in varying degrees. That they misrepresented the facts on this subject is manifest from the fact that there were many overcomers in the Parousia, a feature of the Gospel-Age antitype of Joshua's conquest of Canaan. In the type a third falsehood was told, *i.e.*, that Anak's sons (v. 33) were the same kind of giants as the offspring of the fallen angels (Gen. 6: 4), in fact were the descendants of those giants (*nephilim* [fallen ones]; this Hebrew word occurs only in Gen. 6: 4 and Num. 13: 33, and is translated giants in both places. Other Hebrew words are translated giant but do not refer to the descendants of the angels and daughters of men, who alone are referred to as the *nephilim*). Since those giants that perished in the Flood type the various combinations of governments, capital, church and labor as oppressors of the people

(D 359: 1; 364: 4; 369: 3), this falsehood seems to imply the falsehood that the devil, the world and the flesh were more or less identical with these combinations. Then they grossly exaggerated the strength of these and the weaknesses of the Lord's people (we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight). What they should have said is, "By God's grace, Christ's help and the Spirit's endowments we are powerful and they are weak, and by contrast we are great and they are small, both in their and our sight." Thus not saying this, but its opposite, they slandered by untruths and exaggerations the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit. We who lived in the Parousia and shared in its Truth privileges know that our nominal-church new-creaturely assailants misrepresented and exaggerated the conditions. Among such misrepresenters and exaggerators were the Mooreheads, Eatons, Whites, Blackstones, Biederwolfs, Torreys, Greys, Sundays, Gaebleins, Haldemans, Hillises, etc., of the Parousia. In fact, all of the members of the ten antitypical spies were more or less guilty of such misrepresentations and exaggerations; and their unholy course and its consequences ought to make us wary of such; and also of their soul-mates, the present uncleansed Epiphany Levites; for their gross misrepresentations and exaggerations against the Epiphany Truth, its work and its workers are like those of the ten antitypical spies.

(31) The misrepresentation of the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit, of which the antitypical ten spies were guilty (Num. 13: 31-33), had a most discouraging effect on the nominal people of God, as to their prompt and energetic consecration, and on many of the consecrated as to their carrying it out (v. 1; Deut. 1: 26). The spirit of fear so seized upon them as to make them forget the good things reported by the antitypical twelve spies, and to forget the exhortations and encouragements of the Truth people as to their ability through God's grace, Christ's ministry and the

Spirit's power promptly to enter and to conquer the antitypical land. On the contrary, they allowed the spirit of fear to fasten their minds on the misrepresentations of the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit, as the all-engrossing and overpowering thing in their thoughts and affections, and thus mourned over the situation as offering a fair prospect impossible to realize. Therefore they resented the thought of invading and conquering for themselves the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit, as expounded by the Little Flock, fearing that they would be unable to achieve it. Hence they mourned over the thought of their supposed sure defeat (wept). This mourning persisted during the time of their error on the subject (that night). Enraged against the Truth and its Spirit, they began to fight it on all sides, which was a factual murmuring (v. 2; Deut. 1: 27, 28) against our Lord as the Divinely appointed Executive, Mouthpiece and Leader and the World's High Priest (Moses and Aaron, v. 2). So much were they in their unbelief and fear disappointed that they wished that they had not turned from sin to righteousness, but had remained in the condemned condition until death (had died in . . Egypt), or had died soon after consecration (died in this wilderness), accordingly as they were of the unconsecrated or consecrated class, all (all the children of Israel; the whole congregation) doing this, except our Lord and the Little Flock, His faithful followers.

(32) By their words and acts of unbelief and fear they actually faulted God (why hath the Lord, v. 3; Deut. 1: 27), blaming Him, as though He had betrayed them unto destruction through sin, error, selfishness and worldliness (fall by the sword), and their churches (wives) and converts (children) unto captivity (a prey), thus blaming Him as frustrating all their hopes, ambitions and prospects of an easy conquest of antitypical Canaan. Under such circumstances they considered in their hearts, first the question as to whether they had not better go back to the old life of

sin, error, selfishness and worldliness in Satan's empire (return to Egypt). Then, after such thoughts had taken lodgement in their hearts, they began by their acts to exhort one another to choose a leader to bring them back to harmony with Satan's empire (said . . . a captain . . . to Egypt, v. 4). Whether they realized it or not, that is exactly what their attitude and acts meant in God's sight. Some, of course, went to greater extremes than others; and some, the persistent crown-losers and the measurably unfaithful Youthful Worthies, did this in an attenuated manner. The main ways in which they did this was in the threefold stages—as the slain in the sanctuary, in the court and in the city—in each of the five siftings. They did it in greater or lesser degrees of taking up with various forms of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness. Among Truth people the sifting leaders were thought of by the siftlings as the captain. For the Nominal Protestant Church as a whole, the Federation of Churches, was thought of as the captain. For those that took up with anti-Christian movements the leaders of such movements were thought of as the captain. However, as in the type no captain was actually chosen to lead them back to Egypt, so in the antitype only complete apostates actually left the antitypical Camp; hence no captain was actually chosen in the antitypical Camp, Court or Holy to lead those back to Satan's empire in a way in which they were not already in it as parts of it. Many went in more private ways, as individuals, apart from siftings, back to the ways of the evils above-mentioned, and thus forsook the Lord.

(33) The turning of all, except the Little Flock (the faithful Youthful Worthies being ignored in this type), some more, some less, against the Parousia Truth and its Spirit into more or less of the reverse of these, deeply chagrined our Lord as Executive, Mouthpiece and Leader (Moses) and the World's High Priest (Aaron) and led to Their humiliating Themselves as such before all Christendom (fell upon their faces

before the whole assembly of the congregation, v. 5). How They did this is typed by Joshua and Caleb rending their garments (v. 6) and entreating the people to the contrary (vs. 6-9). Our Lord did it by His humble efforts to turn the people back from their murmuring through His using the Little Flock, especially in its leaders, humbly and sorrowfully to bear (rent their garments) with the people's murmursoness as they sought to bring them into a right attitude toward the Truth and its Spirit. This is also shown in Deut. 1: 29-31. All of the harvesters can testify that they suffered deep grief (rent their garments) at the unbelief and fear as to entering and conquering the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit on the part of the nominal people of God and many so-called Truth people. In them our Lord, as antitypical Joshua, and they, as antitypical Caleb, symbolically rent their symbolic garments—grieved. How earnestly did these praise the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit as nourishing and happifying (flowing with milk and honey, v. 8; the land . . . exceeding good, v. 7) in their contacts with such unbelieving and fearful ones. This they said from the assurance of personal and accurately acquired knowledge (we passed through to search it). They assured such unbelieving and fearful ones that all that was necessary to their obtaining it was their having the Lord's good pleasure (if the Lord delight in us, v. 8). This good pleasure, on the basis of their faith justification, they assured these unbelieving and fearful ones they could obtain by putting aside their unbelief and fear (rebel not . . . neither fear, v. 9) and by making and carrying out their consecration (fear them not). They did not detach themselves from, but took the place of being parts of these people (will bring *us*, . . . will give *us* not, bring *you* . . . will give *you*, v. 8).

(34) Earnestly did the Little Flock plead with all the unbelieving and fearful not to rebel against the Lord (rebel not, v. 9), which is done by rejecting His Truth and its Spirit, and not to fear the spiritual enemies

that infest the natural mind, but to go on in courageous consecration. They assured such that these spiritual enemies were spoil within our power to take, if we but trust the Lord (bread for us, v. 9), that in the presence of the Captain of our Salvation they have no real defense (their defense is departed from them). They further, as the best thing, assured them that the Lord is on the side of the antitypical Israelites, to strengthen; enlighten, guard, lead, defend and support them in the warfare, regardless of how hard the devil, the world and the flesh would seek to support the fortresses of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness in and about us (the Lord is with us). Let us look back, beloved, at our experiences during the Parousia in dealing with the fearful and unbelieving ones, and, if we were then faithful, we will surely be able to recall many experiences in which we were privileged to act out our part in antitypical Caleb's pertinent exhortations and encouragements and expostulations as to the fearful and unbelieving; and when so doing we were showing forth our antitypical Joshua's participation with us in this good work.

(35) The pertinent activities of our Lord and the Parousia Little Flock met no kindly reception from the Truth apostates and the members of the nominal church; for all of these cried out that their doctrines as symbolic stones should be used as refutative of our Lord's and the Little Flock's pertinent teachings (all . . . bade stone them, v. 10). And on all sides Truth apostates, crown-losers, the nominal church, especially the members of the ten antitypical spies, the tentatively justified clergy and laity and the unjustified hangers-on (all the congregation) attacked our Lord, the Truth and the Little Flock with their errors, which, being such, did not refute the Lord, the Truth and the Little Flock. Hence no stoning was done in the type, since that would have typed an actual refutation. The refutations of these attacks by our Lord, the Truth and the Little Flock are typed by the statement of v 10:

"The glory of the Lord appeared on [not *in*, as in the A.V., since *the people* could not have seen it, if it had appeared *in* the tabernacle] the tabernacle of the congregation before all the children of Israel." By the glory of God the perfection of God's character is meant in the antitype (Is. 60: 1, 2), while in the type a light of great splendor is meant by that expression. How did this glory appear on the antitypical Tabernacle, Jesus and the Church? We answer: In every controversy between the Truth and error during the Parousia, the Truth that rested upon Christ and the Church, and that was by them held up before Truth apostates and the whole nominal church caused the wisdom, justice, love and power of God, each in itself and each in its blending with the others to be displayed in their splendor, and that splendor was seen more or less clearly by all the antitypical Israelites.

(36) The course of the people in unbelief of God and in fear of the devil, the world and the flesh, as to their power to manipulate sin, error, selfishness and worldliness against them, culminating in their rejection of the Parousia teachings of our Lord and His Church, even to the extent of seeking to subvert these by false teachings, ended God's longsuffering with them; for their course provoked Him (provoke Me, v. 11; Deut. 1: 34); and He strongly disapproved of it by the two questions of v. 11 : "How long will this people *provoke* Me?" and, "How long will it be ere they *believe* Me?" God had longsufferingly borne with their unbelief and fear from the Jewish Harvest throughout the Gospel-Age and into this Harvest, even until the time of the events antitypical of those in Num. 14: 1-10. And now further longsuffering on His part would cease to be a virtue; hence He would no longer exercise it to the full as formerly. Had God not shown His Gospel-Age people the many wonders and signs which He did throughout the Age and in the Parousia (for all the signs . . . showed), He would have continued His longsuffering with them. But their course was one of

sinning against much light, which forbade Him longer to exercise full longsuffering toward them. There were two courses open before God as to how to deal with this situation: (1) entirely to cut off the fearful and unbelieving and substitute another people for them (smite . . . disinherit them . . . make of thee a greater nation and mightier); or (2) to keep them as His people, but subject them to severe punishments. The former was to Him the preferable course, hence He mentions it first; but to please our Lord in His intercession for them (vs. 13-19), God accepted the to Him less preferable course (I have pardoned according to thy word, v. 20). The threatened pestilence (v. 12) seems to type an accentuation of one or more of the five siftings, probably the no-ransomism and infidelism siftings, to such a degree giving liberty to Satan, the great sifter, as would result in all, except antitypical Joshua and Caleb, renouncing the Ransom and the Bible and thus reducing them to utter heathen; and then from Christ God would raise up a new people greater and mightier than those, apart from the Little Flock, developed during the Gospel-Age.

(37) In vs. 13-19 our Lord's resourcefulness and effectiveness as an Intercessor are most strikingly typed. What antitypical Moses meant in the antitype by deliverance from Egypt can be understood when we remember (1) that during the Gospel-Age there has been a reckoned deliverance from antitypical Egypt going on, and (2) that during the Epiphany there will be an actual deliverance therefrom. It is to the former of these that the deliverance of v. 12 refers; for the deliverance here referred to must be one prior to that effected in the Epiphany, since the antitype of Moses' statement in v. 13 was made in the Parousia, and hence refers to one that had been operating from before the Parousia. This deliverance refers to faith justification. There has also been during the Gospel-Age, for the consecrated, an actual deliverance from the power of darkness (Col. 1: 13) in antitypical

Egypt, a deliverance to which even the crown-losers, after the destruction of their fleshly minds at Azazel's hands, have attained; but it is to the reckoned one that reference is made in v. 13. Of course, if God had allowed the justified and the unclean crown-losers to be reduced to utter heathen, the unjustified nominal people and the heathen, from whose midst God had delivered these (broughtest up this people, v. 13), could have charged, after learning of it (shall hear it), that God allowed Satan to reduce these to utter heathen, because He was not able to bring them to actual salvation (not able to bring this people into the land, v. 16). Such antitypical Egyptians would have told (tell . . . the inhabitants of the land, v. 14) the various evils that infest antitypical Canaan of this supposed inability, not by word, but by their inveigling such returning "heathen" into all sorts of evil, *i.e.*, by subjecting them in defeat to the evils that infest antitypical Canaan. These evils, viewed from their antitypical Egypt and wilderness standpoints, had experienced (heard) certain defeats at the hands of antitypical Israel. These defeats these had experienced as due: (1) to God's having favored antitypical Israel (Thou . . . among this people, Deut. 1: 29, 30); (2) to God's having revealed Himself clearly to antitypical Israel (Thou . . . seen face to face, Deut. 1: 30); (3) to God's Spirit and providence having been exercised on behalf of antitypical Israel (Thy cloud standeth over them, Deut. 1: 31); (4) to God's giving them during the Harvests the New Testament truths especially (Thou goest before them by day time in a pillar o f cloud, Deut. 1: 33); and (5) to God's giving them during the interim between the Harvests the Old Testament teachings especially (in a pillar of fire by night, Deut. 1: 33), though not exclusively so.

(38) If God had thus reduced all the Parousia crown-losers, the tentatively justified and the mere hangers-on to pure heathen (kill all this people as one man, v. 15), the evils infesting antitypical Canaan by

their acts of triumphing over such would be boasting that they were stronger than God (not able to bring this people into the land, v. 16), despite the fact that these evils had experienced defeats (heard the fame of Thee, v. 15) from antitypical Israel in antitypical Egypt and in the antitypical wilderness. Thus by act they could boast of God's alleged inability, despite His oath-bound promise (will speak, saying . . . into the land which He sware unto them). Our Lord, therefore, prayed (I beseech Thee, v. 17) that God would exercise His power (let the power . . . be great) to deliver and bring to victory His people for His glory's sake, despite the unworthiness of the involved antitypical Israelites. He grounds His intercessory prayer upon God's gracious character (longsuffering, great mercy, forgiving, v. 18) and promises (according as Thou hast spoken, saying, v. 17). But He did not ask God to violate His justice by His forgiveness, but to temper it with such longsuffering, mercy and forgiveness as were in harmony with the demands of justice (by no means clearing . . . visiting the iniquity). Thus our Lord's intercession did not imply that He prayed that the Parousia wicked people of God be freed from punishment, rather that their weakness and ignorance be forgiven and that their wilfulness be punished, the punishment to be inflicted until the wilfulness would be entirely striped out of the sinners (unto the third and fourth generation). Thus He seized on the principles of Truth, righteousness and mercy, in their varied applications to the case in hand, as the basis of His intercession for these Parousia sinners against God's Word. Please note His earnestness in the intercession, as well as its fairness and kindness (Pardon, I beseech Thee, v. 19). How complimentarily, as a wise Intercessor, does He address the Aggrieved One (according to the *greatness* of Thy mercy—literally, kindness)! He ended His prayer by showing that He is not praying for a new course on God's part, who had hitherto been exercising His forgiveness

toward antitypical Israel from the time of their first exercising repentance and faith even unto and during their undergoing sanctification (hast forgiven . . . until now). Surely, our Lord is a faithful and merciful Intercessor (Heb. 2: 17, 18), as the entire typical prayer shows. Of His intercession we should gladly and quickly avail ourselves in every time of need; and His faithfulness as an intercessor will help us.

(39) Our Lord's intercession was successful. Had it not been made, God would have executed His preference as stated in v. 12; but it prevailed unto sparing the guilty from a complete cutting off from God's favor. That it prevailed unto averting a complete cutting off from God's favor, is evident from God's answer (the Lord said, I have pardoned [forgiven] according to Thy word, v. 20). That the forgiveness was only of that degree of guilt which deserved a complete cutting off from God's favor, is evident, not only from the fact that God punished them only short of a complete cutting off from His favor, but also from the fact that His answer proves that the forgiveness was only partial (I have forgiven *according to Thy word*). Our Lord did not ask for a complete forgiveness, but only for such a forgiveness as would prevent their entire cutting off from God's grace. For the forgiveness was according to Christ's intercession; and He interceded only against such a cutting off (vs. 13-16) and expressly asked that the forgiveness be one of power, i.e., efficacy (v. 17), in harmony with *not clearing* [entirely] *the guilty*, but *visiting their iniquity on them and their descendants to the third and fourth generation* (v. 18). V. 19 also shows that the forgiveness did not leave the antitypical nation free from condign punishment (as Thou hast forgiven this people, from Egypt even until now).

(40) Hitherto God had forgiven antitypical Israel's sins of weakness and ignorance, even from the time of their repentance and faith at the beginning of the Age onward into the Parousia; but their wilfulness or

partial wilfulness He certainly punished, even as He had done with Fleshly Israel from Egypt unto Kadesh-barnea; for the latter's wilfulness He repeatedly punished (Num. 11: 1-3, 4-6, 10, 33, 34; Ex. 32: 1-14, 25-35). Hence at our Lord's prayer the Lord forgave antitypical Israel in the Parousia enough to allow them to remain as such, but inflicted severe punishment upon them by making them undergo some Parousia and much Epiphany punishment. Thus we see the forgiveness was according to our Lord's intercession: only that much of grace was exercised as was not against justice. In other words, our Lord interceded with God for antitypical Israel in harmony with God's wisdom, justice and love, and not contrary to His wisdom and justice in an effort to make love override these. Not only does God so deal with the unjustified, justified, Youthful Worthies and Great Company, but also with the Little Flock, whose measurable wilfulness He stripes out. In speaking above of God's forgiving the unjustified we are not to be understood as implying that He gave them justification by faith, in which case they would no more be unjustified, but that He forgave them to the degree that they could still remain the unjustified camp and thus not lose all favor.

(41) The greatest objection that the antitypical ten spies, the other (nominal-church) crown-losers, justified and unjustified ones had to the sphere of the Truth was the doctrine of probation for the unsaved dead in the Millennium—restitution to be offered to all. Their slogan against this teaching was: *a second chance!* To them that objection seemed to be the end of all controversy on that subject. And this objection is the occasion of God's confirming this doctrine by an oath (as truly as I live, v. 21) This assurance God gave by the Truth witness during the Parousia on this subject, backed by numerous Scriptures, particularly the Oath-bound Covenant, which is especially alluded to in the oath of v. 21; for the restoration of the obedient to human perfection and holiness and the turning

of the earth into a Paradise for them is what is meant by the expression, "all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." This teaching is a proof that the scene in Num. 13 and 14 had its antitype in the Jewish and Gospel Harvests; for it was during these times that restitution was purely taught; for shortly after the Jewish Harvest this doctrine was lost and was not clearly discovered again until the Parousia, though just shortly before the Parousia some light began to come on it, as we will see in the chapter on David's First Appearance.

(42) That antitypical Israel's sins were not entirely forgiven is shown typically in vs. 22-25. God charges them with the guilt of sinning presumptuously (tempted Me, v. 22), and that despite their having seen His character and works (seen My glory and My miracles) displayed against Satan's order of affairs (Egypt) and in their condition of isolation therefrom (wilderness), from the beginning of the Gospel Age. The ten times' (these ten times) tempting of God refers to their provoking God in each one of the ten denominational groups of Christendom, as pictured forth by Jacob's ten sons (see Chapter 1), exclusive of Joseph and Benjamin; for the course of these ten denominational groups, beginning with the Greek Catholic Church and ending with the Adventist Church, was very evil as to rejecting and persecuting the true Church and as to sins against doctrine, organization, discipline and practice, which, of course, provoked God. But, one may ask, why does God blame the Parousia ten tribes for these Gospel-Age provocations of these denominations? We answer: (1) These continued during the Parousia in the same evils as these denominations committed during the Gospel Age; and (2) they knew of these evils and in committing them made themselves share in the guilt heaped up by the pertinent Gospel-Age sins of these denominations. Hence God in the Parousia could justly accuse them as guilty of the Gospel-Age sins of their respective denominations, on

the same principles as He exacted of the generation of Jesus' time the sins committed against His Truth and His faithful people from Abel to Zacharias (Matt. 23: 35). The charge is concentrated in these words: Have seen My glory and My miracles . . . and have not harkened to My voice. In other words, God accuses the antitypical Israelites of sinning against light and knowledge, which proves wilfulness to have permeated their sins. Hence, Christ's merit not canceling wilful sins, they were not forgiven, but had to be expiated.

(43) Hence God solemnly (surely, v. 23) affirmed that such would not enter into the inheritance granted and sworn to the faithful Little Flock, the heavenly Canaan (shall not see the land, Deut. 1: 35). But this passage solemnly affirms more than this: it solemnly affirms that they will not even see it, *i.e.*, perceive the rewards of the faithful Little Flock. Accordingly, to the truths on the high calling, particularly to those on its rewards, they in some cases became blind and in the others were left in their blindness. The last clause of v. 23 should be rendered as follows: Even all who provoked Me shall not see it. This clause defines who these blinded and blind ones were, and why they would not inherit the high calling rewards. By their unbelief, fear and disobedience they could not enter in (Heb. 3: 4). This clause serves to define the wrong-doers and by repetition of the word "see" emphasizes the two things implied in it—not enter nor perceive the heavenly inheritance. v. 24 assures us who of the Parousia antitypical Israel would enter the heavenly Canaan—antitypical Caleb, the faithful Little Flock (Deut. 1: 26). The reasons for this are also stated in v. 24: (1) they have a spirit other than the rest of antitypical Israelites; and (2) they have fully followed God. That spirit was the Divine disposition developed and crystallized; and that full following of God consisted of deadness to self and the world and aliveness to God unto death, whereby they practiced self-denial and world-denial, study, spread and practice of the

Truth in character development, watchfulness, prayer and a faithful endurance of the incidental experiences. Antitypical Caleb's seed (his seed) consists of all who imitate his course of faithfulness. Here they are the Little Flock from the standpoint of being developed by their faithful brethren, while antitypical Caleb is the Little Flock from the standpoint of their developing their Little Flock brethren, as servants of the Truth.

(44) It will be noted that nothing is here said of Joshua as entering the land. This is well left unsaid, because our Lord, whom Joshua types, from the standpoint of both Harvests' fulfillments was already in heavenly Canaan. It will also be noted that God promises to bring the Little Flock into heavenly Canaan (I will bring him into the land). This God promised through the Parousia preaching on the Sarah Covenant. Antitypical Caleb went into heavenly Canaan (where into he went) in the sense that by faith he explored it, *i.e.*, searched out its teachings and spirit, and by hope he looked forward to inheriting its glories. Nigh in spirit and act to the provoking antitypical Israel were the spirit and acts of sinners (Amalekites) and the worldly (Canaanites; the Amalekites and the Canaanites dwelt in the valley); for the first mentioned did sin; and they did practice worldliness in their provoking the Lord. Now comes the sentence—one to a wandering in the wilderness (Tomorrow . . . to the wilderness, v. 25, Deut. 1: 40). The first failure to enter in led to the long Gospel-Age wandering; and the second failure to enter in has led to the Epiphany wandering; and only the antitypical Caleb of the Parousia generation enters the heavenly Canaan, all others of that generation failing so to do, as typed by the death of all of the Israelitish men of 20 years and upward. And what a wilderness experience has been ours during the first 24 years and more of the Epiphany! The "tomorrow" of v. 25 for us represents the period following the Parousia, even the Epiphany, even as the tomorrow of the Jewish Harvest was the interim

between the Harvests. Yea, the wandering in both cases is "by the way of the Red Sea" (Deut. 1: 40)—near the condition of the curse of both the Adamic and the second death, as this sea types both.

(45) That our Heavenly Father was provoked by the Parousia murmuring is set forth typically in vs. 26-37. This provocation He first expressed to our Lord as His Executive, Mouthpiece and Leader (Moses, v. 26) and to the World's High Priest (Aaron) for antitypical Israel. He indicates that He will no longer bear with the iniquity of antitypical Israel (How long . . . evil congregation? v. 27). He had directed a highly disapproving attention to their murmurings, which, while in word were expressed against the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit, were in deed and in truth directed against Jehovah Himself (they murmur against Me). Now God charges our Lord, as His appointed Executive, Mouthpiece, Leader and High Priest for antitypical Israel, to tell them in all solemnity (as truly as I live, v. 28) that He would do to them (so will I) as they had wished and said (Would God we had died in the wilderness, v. 2) in the dissatisfied hearing of God (spoken in My ears). They would fall from their standing before the Lord outside of antitypical Canaan (fall in the wilderness, v. 29), either in one of the general siftings (plagues, as typed in Num. 16: 46-49; 21: 5-9; 25: 3-9; see 1 Cor. 10: 5-14), or in their individual sins (Num. 27: 1-3). Those who would thus fall were the ones who had reached a developed condition for their standing before the Lord (twenty years old and upward). This would include everyone of the developed ones not in the Little Flock (whole number, . . . murmured against Me). There would be no doubt as to its turning out as God said (doubtless ye shall not come into the land, v. 30; Deut. 1: 34, 35), despite the fact of the Oath-bound Covenant (which I swear to make you dwell therein). They having fallen out from the conditional Seed, not being any longer of it, because of their unfaithfulness

(for the Seed consists of the faithful alone), and the oath-bound promise being given to the Seed alone, despite their having had a conditional share in that promise, it is taken from them, because of their losing seedship (v. 29; Deut. 1: 36-38). The only ones that enter are antitypical Caleb (*dog*, the Little Flock has appeared contentious and unclean to the nominal people of God), the son of Jephunneh (*he shall be turned*, i.e., to the Divine nature), and antitypical Joshua (*Deliverer*), the son of Nun (fish, our Lord was once of an earthly nature). The mention of Joshua here, as distinct from its omission from v. 24, and that as the son of Nun (*fish*), applies to Jesus as a prophecy for the Jewish Harvest, to assure Him *while in the flesh* that He would overcome, and as history to Him in the Parousia, while the application to Caleb is for both Harvests.

(46) The immature ones (those recently begotten, especially, though not exclusively, those begotten in the eleventh hour: Feb., 1908, to June, 1911) would, as a rule, win out in the high calling (your little ones, v. 31; Deut. 1: 39). Many of the older Parousia new creatures and others not new creatures feared for these that they would not be able to fight well enough to overcome the enemies that infested antitypical Canaan, and thus would fall a prey to these enemies (ye said should be a prey, Deut. 1: 39). They complained very much against the standard for overcoming that the Little Flock (Caleb; Num. 13: 30) set forth. All except the Parousia Little Flock (the faithful Youthful Worthies everywhere in this chapter being ignored in the picture), especially the antitypical ten spies, complained that this standard was too high, and would crush and defeat the beginners in the way (little ones; literally, infants). These very babes and sucklings (Ps. 8: 2) God declared, by our Lord through the ministry of the Little Flock, speaking as our Lord's Parousia mouthpiece (v. 39), would be the ones whom God would make overcomers (they shall know the

land, v. 31) and who would inherit heavenly Canaan, which God, by our Lord speaking through the Parousia Little Flock, declared all except the latter had despised—in the sense of rejecting, through unbelief, fear and murmuring—the opportunity of winning it. As we look back to the Parousia times we will recall that more than once the rejected ones in and out of the Truth were rebuked for despising the Parousia Little Flock as weak And good for nothing for the conquest of heavenly Canaan, in contrast with the despisers. These rejectors of the Truth and its ways of entire consecration, made and carried out, were by God, through Christ speaking in the Little Flock, told that, because of their unbelief, fear and murmuring, they would die (your carcasses . . . shall fall in the wilderness, v. 32) from their standing before the Lord: the despising new creatures dying from the high calling and dropping into the Great Company, the despising Youthful Worthies dying as such and falling back into the justified class, the tentatively justified ones dying as such and falling back into the world of the camp, and the despising campers dying as such and becoming heathen—wholly cut off from God's people.

(47) The Parousia sentence was that these murmurers would give the immature ones (little ones) the evil heredity of wandering the antitypical 40 years of the Epiphany in the wilderness (shall wander . . . 40 years, v. 33; Deut. 1: 40). We have already wandered in this Epiphany wilderness, condition of isolation, over half of this period and have found it to be a most trialsome experience. How thirsty, weary and footsore have we been therein! What symbolic wastes of desert sand, symbolic storms and clouds, symbolic sun heat and cold have we therein experienced! How often have our hearts turned back in yearning to the good old days of the Parousia! In these experiences we are suffering for the wickedness of the unfaithful in the Parousia (bear your whoredoms). Yet it is the Divine will that these little ones do this wandering,

and continue it until all the Parousia murmurers, unbelievers and cowards become manifest as fallen from their Parousia standing enjoyed before they sinned against the Lord (until your carcasses be wasted in the wilderness). And are we not now witnesses of these fallings? Among the Truth people we see it in the Great Company manifestations through revolutionisms against the Truth and its arrangements, in Youthful Worthies falling back among the justified, and in tentatively justified ones just nibbling at the Truth and then falling away to the world, and in the campers falling into the condition of actual heathen. Yea, this falling away (carcasses falling in the wilderness) began during the Parousia, manifested both in the siftings and in a more private way in daily life apart from siftings. And did we not in the Parousia, and do we not now in the Epiphany witness these fallings of the symbolic carcasses, the dead who died from their Parousia standings before the Lord? The six sifting classes as they have slaughtered in the sanctuary, in the courts and in the city, have caused these carcasses to be thickly strewn everywhere and often in heaps. In more private ways we see this in the fallings about us in everyday life. The resultant havoc in doctrine, organization, discipline and practice is appalling! Contrast the indifference to religion and the overspreading of secularism everywhere in Christendom in our times with the early Parousia and the fallen carcasses now become apparent most impressively. This will continue until all the unbelieving fearful and murmurers become manifest as fallen carcasses.

(48) In Bible symbols 40 days and 40 years are often used to represent trialsome periods for God's people. This we can see from the typical uses of the 40 years in the wilderness, the typical uses of the 40 years in the reigns of Saul, David and Solomon, the 40 years of the Jewish, Gospel and Millennial Harvests, and the 40 years of the Epiphany—all trialsome periods. The many 40 typical days typing some

of these 40-year periods in their trialsomeness give us the same thought. Vs. 33 and 34 bring this thought to mind and also give us a key helpful in opening many time prophecies in which a day is used to represent a year. In both Harvests there was a 40-years' searching of the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit, followed by a symbolic 40-years' wandering of 40 symbolic years, the interim between the Harvests being the first of these, lasting 1845 years, and the Epiphany being the second of these. The question arises, Why was the first of these wandering periods 1845 years and the second not one of 1845 years, seeing both were antitypes of the 40 years' wandering in the literal wilderness? Why is the second period one of 40 years? The following answers seem to be satisfactory so far as the first question is concerned: (1) The parallel dispensations, the Jubilee, the Times of the Gentiles, the 6,000 years of evil, the 1335 days of Daniel and the Pyramid required the first antitypical wilderness to last 1845 years. (2) To have made the second one last 1845 years would have put the Millennium too far into the future. (3) It would have destroyed the time symmetries of the plan. (4) It would have given us many generations after the first and second phases of our Lord's Second Advent were completed before its third phase would set in for Kingdom purposes.

(49) As to the second question the following answers seem sufficient: (1) The intensification of the Epiphany trials in contrast with those in the interim between the Harvests is sufficient to bring about the full falling of the symbolic carcasses in the Epiphany wilderness. (2) In the Epiphany we have been living over the interim between the Harvests on a small scale. (3) The five siftings that marked the interim (the same in kind as the five siftings of each Harvest) are all being enacted in the Epiphany on three small scales: (a) in the smallest miniature Gospel Age (a day of it standing for a year in the Gospel Age proper), (b) in the smaller miniature Gospel Age (a year in its standing

for a century in the Gospel Age proper), and (c) the small miniature Gospel Age (25 months in it standing for a century in the Gospel Age proper). For each of these three cases the Gospel Age proper begins with the birth of our Lord. And in each of these three miniatures we have the five siftings (the large revolutionism sifting divided into five smaller revolutionism siftings) corresponding to the five Gospel-Age interim siftings, the latter as distinct from the five of each Harvest, all of which siftings following the same five general lines. These three reasons satisfactorily explain why the second antitypical wilderness wandering is not so long in duration as the first. Thus, in the second wilderness wandering—that of the Epiphany—the wandering is on the scale of a year for each of the 40 years of the Parousia searching out of the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit. In the Hebrew of v. 34 the expression for, "each day for a year," is repeated: "a day for a year, a day for a year." Do we have in this repetition a hint that there would be two periods of wandering respectively following the two periods of searching out the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit? We think not, since two spyings of the land would then have to apply to the type; for the repeated expression undoubtedly primarily refers to the type. Rather, we would understand the repetition to make both the typical and the antitypical sentence as to time emphatic. Truly, we in the Epiphany have experienced God's breaking off (literal translation for the A.V. mistranslation, "My breach of promise") from giving us our inheritance by 1914 as we had expected. This experience has been one of much sorrow; for the Epiphany experiences have been largely those of sorrow, while the Parousia experiences were largely those of joy. Beloved, have we not "known" [experienced] this—the sorrows of God's breaking off from giving us our inheritance in 1914 and consequently causing us to live over the Gospel Age from three standpoints, as so many wilderness experiences,

during the Epiphany? Thus have we and the fallen ones been bearing their iniquity (your children . . . ye bear your iniquities), amid distressing experiences.

(50) In v. 35 the Lord repeats the sentence without adding its length. He does this to emphasize His typical and antitypical earnestness and determination. "I, the Lord, have said," is the A.V.'s rendering of v. 35's first clause. Dr. Young's translation seems better: "I am Jehovah; I have spoken." This translation distinctly adds emphasis to the typical and antitypical sentence. The A.V. gives the thought, though not the literal translation of the next clause: "I will surely do it." We see that He did it in the type. We see that He did it in the first antitype to both Fleshly and Spiritual Israel; and now we see by experience and observation that He is now doing it in the second antitype to both Fleshly and Spiritual Israel. The Parousia congregation, with the exception of the Little Flock, was an evil congregation (v. 35), the faithful Youthful Worthies here as everywhere else being ignored in this picture. It certainly did gather together against the Lord as He spoke by our Lord through the Church in the Parousia. Hence it, except the persistent Little Flock, must be consumed—it must die in the sense above pointed out—by the time the Epiphany is over—in the antitypical wilderness. Then, God caused His Word to be spoken during the Parousia by Christ through the Little Flock as respects the ten antitypical spies, who in their rejection of the Parousia Truth and its Spirit brought a slander against it, many of them writing against it, some of them entering into formal debates against, and all of them speaking and preaching against more or less of its phases (v. 36). Their high privileges as antitypical spies made them all the more responsible as to themselves and as to antitypical Israel. Despite the responsibility, they turned the bulk of the people against the Truth and its Spirit, causing them to murmur against that goodly land (made all the congregation to murmur against Him). These would,

during the wilderness condition, beginning in the Parousia and reaching into the Epiphany, fall from their standing in the Little Flock, and become manifest as Great Company members, by their revolutionisms against the Truth, its Spirit and its arrangements in their ministries in religious matters (died by the plague before the Lord, v. 37). It will be noted that in v. 37 a repetition of the charge brought against the ten spies in v. 36 is made. Certainly in the antitype there was an emphasis placed on this sentence by its repetition, which emphasis was made in the Parousia and repeated in the Epiphany. Note, e.g., how often some Parousia spy-members are spoken of as having died from the high calling. The antitypical plague is in all cases error connected with the six great siftings—five in the Parousia and one in the Epiphany. And it was in and by these that the antitypical ten spies symbolically died. The two spies antitypical of Joshua (our Lord) and Caleb (the persevering Little Flock) survived this plague unscathed (v. 38).

(51) After getting the messages of vs. 20-25 and 26-38 from Jehovah, our Lord made them known unto the people of the classes to whom they referred (v. 39). Whether God told our Lord these things directly, or indirectly by opening His mind to understand vs. 20-25 and 26-38, or in both ways, we are not informed; nor is it necessary that we be curious on the subject. Enough it is for us to know that, whether directly or indirectly, God made it known to Him. This is only another among many instances proving that our Lord, since His resurrection, ascension and glorification, is still dependent upon the Father for knowledge. Certain it is that Jesus did not tell these things to the involved classes directly, but used the Church, more particularly its leaders, and most particularly the Parousia messenger mainly and the Epiphany messenger subordinately, to tell these things to the people. The declaration of these things began, and that in a small way, in the Parousia, during the first sifting (1878-1881).

It grew in volume as the antitypical ten spies enlarged their attacks and slanders on the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit. It increased more as others than the antitypical ten spies, especially the non-spying clergy, attacked and slandered the promised antitypical land. It abounded as the laity increasingly joined in these slanderous attacks, and was made to reach a climactic end in the Epiphany work toward Azazel's Goat in the Truth and in the nominal church.

(52) At first sight it seems not harmonious with the picture to put some of the telling of the antitype of these messages into the Epiphany, which is the special wilderness wandering time of the second application, and, as it were, not to place all of it into the Parousia, the special time of such telling. But the facts of the case are decisive in the matter. And we harmonize this as follows: The 40 years of each period, as a rule, was the respective time for its particular feature, but just as in each of the five siftings of the Parousia certain ones died from their standing to a lower standing before the Lord, which proved that they were already in their wilderness wandering, so during the Epiphany some have begun their murmuring and then did their antitypical dying, e.g., many crown-losers (all having lost their crowns by Sept. 16, 1914) took no exceptions to the Truth and its Spirit until in the Epiphany, and when these exceptions were taken they fell from the Priesthood into the Great Company. The same in principle is true of some of the Youthful Worthies, tentatively justified and mere campers. Following their murmuring in the Epiphany the antitypical messages were delivered to such. As there was an ever-increasing going forth of these messages, so was there an ever-increasing mourning (and the people mourned greatly) as they became understood by the fallen ones. This, too, began in the Parousia in the first sifting and increased until it will reach its climax in the mourning of the Great Company, reprobate Youthful Worthies, tentatively justified and campers when they recognize

their real standing later on in the Epiphany. But all of the fallen ones in their sentenced and fallen condition have had or will have other features of sorrow in the antitypical mourning, which includes in addition to sorrow more or less of fears, conscience upbraiding, chagrin and the discouragements and despairs as to their standings experienced during the Parousia by many of the classes just mentioned as coming to the climax of their mourning when fully manifested and convinced of their fall later in the Epiphany, for this mourning includes every kind of sorrow, fear, restraint, discouragement, etc., experienced by these fallen ones, at the time of the sentence and in their wandering times. Surely this is woeful indeed!

(53) The scene described in vs. 40-45, though in small ways shadowed forth by some of the fallen ones' Parousia course, finds its antitype during the Epiphany. It started September 21, 1914, with the trench warfare, whereby some nations sought to make the Divine Right prevail and other nations sought to make Democracy and the world safe for Democracy prevail, all hoping thus to enter into their ideas of the promised land. With their ideas practically the whole world joined, including capital and the nominal church. Then it started among the Truth Levites in England in the Fall of 1915 and spread from them to the other Levites (including the unclean Youthful Worthies) worldwide. All of these started out in their own way, unsanctioned and unfavored by God, to realize their *own* notions as to gaining their supposed promised land. Practically all worldly and religious movements of the Epiphany, seeking to attain the alleged ideals of their alleged promised land, are expressions of the antitype of the people's endeavors and words of v. 40. Yea, "they rose up early in the morning" (the beginning of the Epiphany, v. 40). They mounted Satan's empire, even to its top (into the top of the mountain). They made themselves conspicuous in these deeds

(Behold us,—literal translation; not, Lo, we are here; Deut. 1: 41). In all the involved classes of fallen ones they were determined to force through their ideas of attaining the promised land (we will go up unto the place). They are and have been sure that the Lord wills that they execute their own plans (which the Lord hath promised). They pursue this course, even though they recognize their previous wrongs (though [not *for*] we have sinned). All the, while they embark on realizing, apart from the Lord's sanction and favor, their notions of the promised land, our Lord Jesus through the Church remonstrates with them (Moses said, Wherefore now do ye transgress the commandment of the Lord, v. 41). These protests were sounded out against the World War and its purposes by the Church, especially by Bro. Russell, the pilgrims, colporteurs with Vol. IV, the Volunteers, and the conscientious objectors, and against the Truth Levites and nominal-church Levites by the Epiphany Priesthood, all of whom disapproved of the involved courses. Similar protests have gone forth from these against other movements in state, church, capital, aristocracy, labor and private life, undertaken to realize various notions of conquering their alleged promised lands. In all cases the Lord's Priesthood, as antitypical Moses' mouthpiece, forecast disaster instead of prosperity for these undertakings (it shall not prosper).

(54) Their cry to the fallen ones, intent on carrying out their own notions of reaching their alleged promised land, was, "Go not up, for the Lord is not among you" (v. 42), *i.e.*, God does not sanction nor favor your endeavors, hence will not prosper your undertakings; therefore desist therefrom (Deut. 1: 42). Furthermore, they warned these presumptuous ones that they should not go up lest they be smitten by their enemies (smitten before your enemies, . . . the Amalekites [sins], the Canaanites [worldlinesses], vs. 42, 43, and the Amorites [errors], Deut. 1: 42, 44). The sword (v. 43) of sin, worldliness and error would

smite all who would presume to follow their own notions in this matter, because they were sinning in turning away from the Lord, who would not prosper them in a sinful course (v. 43). The antitypical sword of sin, worldliness and error, differs from the Amalekites (sins), Canaanites (worldlinesses), and Amorites (errors), as follows: the sword of each of these is the tempting arguments offered by each of these classes of evils to succumb to these evils, while the evils themselves wield these arguments. And when one yields to these arguments he falls by the swords of these evils. But despite these remonstrances, in state, church, capital, aristocracy, labor and private life and among Truth and nominal-church Levites, these daring ones presumed (they presumed, v. 44; Deut. 1: 43) to overcome Satan's empire, as each group viewed it (go up unto the hill top). But God's plan as due (the ark of the covenant) and our Lord (Moses) did not lead them; they remained in and with the Priesthood (departed not out of the camp, *i.e.*, out of the tabernacle). The result of this presumption was and is an utter defeat (*Hormah—destruction*, v. 45) for the presumptuous; for they were defeated and are being defeated by sins (Amalekites), worldlinesses (Canaanites) and errors (Amorites, Deut. 1: 44). These sting the one who fondles them, even as a host of pursuing bees sting their victim, hurting and poisoning him. Everywhere we look in state, church, capital, aristocracy, labor, private life and Levitism, we witness these terrible defeats on the fallen, but presumptuous ones at the hands of sin, worldliness and error, even as their course is one of selfishness, which makes one amenable to such defeats. And the end is not yet: for during the remainder of the Epiphany such defeats will be the lot of the presumptuous. And no matter how greatly they grieve when they learn of their fallen condition, they will not be able to induce the Lord to change His mind into restoring them to their former standing before Him (Deut. 1: 45; Heb. 12: 16, 17).

(1) What parts of the Bible will we study in this chapter? Of what do they treat? In what respects? What was one of the antitypical applications of this story made by our Pastor? What other application did he give the story? On what Scripture did he base the second application? How may these two antitypes in the Jewish Harvest be contrasted? What Biblical consideration warrants such contrasted antitypes in the Gospel Harvest? What is the connecting point in the double application of the Jewish Harvest? Into what did the real and nominal church of the early Gospel Age merge as the Gospel Age advanced?

(2) How would we construe the larger antitype in the Jewish Harvest? What justified this viewpoint? How were they viewed? When did the march toward antitypical Canaan have its beginning? What is antitypical Canaan? Who were drawn out of these antitypical twelve tribes? When? To what class did they belong? Especially which ones of them? How does Matt. 13: 52 prove this? What at Jesus' command did these do? What do the 40 days of spying type? What are we not from these 40 days to conclude? Why not? How are we to understand this? What case parallels this? What do Jewish Harvest facts prove on this point? What example proves this?

(3) What took place when the antitypical report had been delivered? How was the report proper given? What occurred thereafter? What effect did this have in the Jewish Harvest? What resulted with ten of the antitypical spy classes? What proves this? What is typed by Joshua's and Caleb's encouraging the people to go up against Canaan's inhabitants? Whom do the Israelites represent for that Harvest? What is represented by their discouragement? Murmuring? Rebellion? Desire to stone Joshua and Caleb? God's glory appearing? Its effect? His decision? The Israelites' efforts to enter the land before the completion of the 40 years? How have not, and how have these matters been presented above? Why this answer for each course?

(4) What is the main antitype of Israel's 40 years' wandering? Its secondary antitype? The secondary antitype's second set of spies? Their report? Their murmuring? Their second wilderness wandering? What will we not do further with this phase of matters? Why not? Why are we warranted in making a second main application

to Spiritual Israel of the events of Num. 13 and 14? What statement has often appeared in our writings? What has never been shown on this matter? On what Scriptural application, among others, has this thought been based? How do we draw the conclusion based on this application? What is the reasoning that proves it? What is the conclusion? For what does this account?

(5) What are we to keep in mind during this study? What is typed by the people requesting that spies search out the land? Why was the antitypical request made? What did the typical request precede? What does this type? What were God's and Jesus' response to the request? What does Canaan type? What is it primarily? Secondarily? How so? What is typed by Canaan's being infested with inhabitants and cities inimical to Israel? What results from this? How is this typed? What is typed by Moses' sending out the twelve spies? What is implied in type and antitype in v. 2 by the Hebrew words "for thee," omitted in the A. V.?

(6) What is represented by their selection, one from each tribe? What is typed by the fact that not all Israel, but only twelve individuals as princes, one from each tribe, were chosen as spies? What is typed by the fact that ten of them, bringing up a slander against the land, died of plague? What does this prove? What fact further confirms this thought? Why? What conclusion is to be drawn from these facts? What occurred just after the report was made? What was this change as to Joshua, Caleb, the other ten?

(7) What is typed by Moses' sending out the twelve spies *at the mouth of the Lord*? What is the involved part of the Bible? How was this made known to our Lord? How additionally may the charge have been made? Whose charge would it in any case have been? What is typed by the spies' being sent out from Kadesh-barnea in Paran? What is Kadesh-barnea also called? Why? What proves this? Why is the fact of the spies being leaders repeated, type and antitype? What is typed by there being no mention made of a spy coming from the tribe of Levi or the house of Aaron? What is a summary of the teaching of this paragraph? Into what did some of the members

of the twelve antitypical spies come? Where did the others remain?

(8) For what is here the appropriate place? What is embraced under the expression, the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit? Where and under what type were the main forms of this knowledge set forth? What was the difference between the antitypical spies and the antitypical Kohathites as to their insight into such knowledge? Why this difference? What mistake was formerly made on some as being Gospel-Age Kohathites? What will serve to correct this mistake? What is further said as a safeguard against another natural mistake? What kind of crown-losers also wrote on such branches of knowledge? Who were some of them? What in this respect did Little Flock leaders do? Who are some of these and what was some of their pertinent work? Accordingly, what is not to be regarded as the work of the Gospel-Age Kohathites alone? What class has done the finest work in these four departments of work? *E.g.*, who?

(9) What proves that the Parousia was marked by the most searching investigations and most fruitful results as to the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit? In what three ways does this appear? In how many and what branches of Bible knowledge did they work? How is this proved as to recensions of the Hebrew Scriptures? How do Ginsburg's and Kittel's Old Testament recensions differ? How is this proved as to recensions of the Greek New Testament? How long did Westcott and Hort work on their recension? Von Soden? What is the character of his recension? Who else did good work on this subject?

(10) What was then done as to Biblical Hebrew and Greek lexicons? How many extra fine Hebrew lexicons appeared then? Greek lexicons? Hebrew and Greek grammars? Hebrew concordances? What may be said of Rabbi Mandelkern's concordance? How many superfine concordances to the Greek New Testament? The Greek Old Testament? The English Bible? English Bible translations? How may we sum up the quality and quantity of linguistic Bible helps of this time?

(11) Of what other branch of Bible knowledge may a similar remark be made? What are its three divisions? Of what subjects and from what standpoint does introduction treat? How many are the finest of these works on the canon of the Old and the New Testaments? On

the books of the New Testament? On the canon, text, books and circulation of the New Testament? On the canon and books of the New Testament? On the canon, text, books and circulation of the whole Bible? What is their character? What do we here do with higher-critical books? What is the second branch of exegetical knowledge? What is the character of Parousiac commentaries? What is the ablest on the Old Testament? The New Testament? How many commentaries on the whole Bible are mentioned? How many other commentaries on the whole New Testament are mentioned? How many writers prepared the best commentaries on separate Bible books? What is said of Schaff's revision and translation of Lange's Bible Commentary?

(12) What is the third branch of exegetical knowledge? What are its three kinds? How many harmonies of Old Testament histories are mentioned? New Testament histories? Interwoven accounts? Interweavings of Acts and the Epistles? Of Greek Gospel harmonies? Wherein do we find reference passages? What has Johns furnished? Baxters? What may be said of this? What is here said of The Treasury of Scriptural Knowledge? What are the two chief Bible indexes of this period? In editions of what kind of Bibles are such indexes found? What two other Bible indexes are mentioned? How may we sum up this paragraph?

(13) What is the third general branch of Bible knowledge? What existed as to it during the Parousia? What is the first department of this branch of knowledge? Why do we call Church history and biography Bible knowledge? How many were the main workers in Bible history? What did they produce? What appeared under the general editorship of J. S. Exell? In what field of Bible biography was the best work done? At least how many lives of Christ appeared during the Parousia? What are some of the ablest? What are some of the ablest Parousia lives of St. Paul? What other New Testament biographies have we? What can be said of the number of writers of Church history? Of writers on its epochs? Of Church biographers, especially biographers of star-members?

(14) What is the second department of Biblical historical knowledge? Why was not much spying on chronology done during the Parousia? What kind of beneficial

spying was then done thereon? Who especially did profitable spying on chronology in this time? Who else did some good work on chronology during the Parousia? Of what does Biblical and Church archeology treat? What kind of work has been done in this line? How was much of this information gotten? Who were some of the chief Parousia archeologists? What is the fourth department of Biblical historical knowledge? How did it fare during the Parousia? Who were some of the leaders in this branch of work? What have the last two paragraphs shown to be a fact on pertinent historical matters? In what sense do we use the word *history* in this connection?

(15) What is the fourth sphere of Bible knowledge and its Spirit? What are its three branches? Why has this period been one of especial apologetical activity? Who are some of the main investigators in the field of general apologetics? Opponents of evolution? Of higher criticism? Who were especially fruitful in the field of historical proofs of the Bible's veracity?

(16) What were mainly the limits in good work on the part of the dogmatician spies? Wherein is their work usually erroneous? Who were some of the main representatives of the doctrinal spies? What is said of Weiss, Zahn, Koenig and Westcott? Who were some of the main representatives of the ethical spies? How did they compare with the doctrinal spies as to Truth and error? What kind of books treat in one work of many branches of knowledge belonging to the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit? What were many of their contributors? Who was the greatest and most fruitful of all individual spies? What did he furnish? In what six particular branches was he supreme? Despite his not being a Hebrew and Greek scholar, what was the character of some of his definitions of Hebrew and Greek words? His correction of mistranslations? Who else were among the antitypical spies? What have we done briefly in paragraphs 8 to 16?

(17) From what standpoint did we point out the work of the antitypical spies? And not from what standpoint? Despite this, what are we to understand as to participation in the spy work? With but five exceptions, spy members of what three denominations did we not mention? What does this not mean? Why were such not mentioned above? Where and in what work was the best

Romanist spy work done? Describe this set of encyclopedias somewhat? What other Romanists did some good spying? What can be said of the Greek Catholic spies? What denominational spies, and in what order, did the best and ablest spy work? With what exception? How?

(18) What kind of treatment have we given vs. 3-16? What is typed by the change of Joshua's name? Who sent out the antitypical spies? How did He do it? What is typed by surmounting the mountain just north of Kadesh-barnea? How are we to understand, and not to understand the word *negeb*, mistranslated *southward* in the A. V.? Why? What is typed by the spies' entering Canaan from its southern end? What is typed by their seeing what the land is? By their seeing the people that dwell therein generally? Particularly, as to their mentioned qualities?

(19) From what particular standpoints were they to study the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit? What else did He charge them to search out? What about them in particular? From what other standpoints were they to search out the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit? What is typed by Canaan's wood or trees? To what did our Lord exhort the antitypical spies? What did He charge them to bring back with them? In connection with what will the antitypical fruits be explained? What is typed by the spies' going out at the time of the first ripe grapes? How do we come to this conclusion? How do the facts of the beginnings of the Jewish and Gospel Harvests corroborate this?

(20) In what way did the Parousia spies execute their commission? What is typed by searching the land from the wilderness of Zin to Rehob and the entrance to Hamath? By what can we recognize the thoroughness of the antitypical search? Where did it start? What is meant and typed by Hebron, Ahiman, Sheshai, Talmi and Anak, and the first three giants living at Hebron? By Hebron's being seven years older than Zoan of Egypt?

(21) In their Truth study to what did the spies advance? How is this typed? What did they gather by this study? What was the quality of this work? Who especially took part therein? Who more especially? What is typed by carrying the cluster of grapes on a staff between two? What was the antitypical cluster of grapes? More especially which, according to Gal. 5: 22, 23 and 2 Pet. 1: 5-7?

As whose graces did the spies describe these? What is typed by the spies' getting the pomegranates? The figs? Who especially brought back the antitypical clusters, pomegranates and figs? What is typed by the repetition of the allusion to the brook of Eschol and the cluster of grapes? With what does this stand in contrast?

(22) After the antitypical spying, what was done by the antitypical spies? How long was this work continued? From what two general reasons do we know this? By doing what can we see this to be true? How did the World War put an end to the spying and reporting? What do we conclude from these facts?

(23) Against what natural mistake should we be on guard? Why is this a mistake? What was the period of writing the works mentioned in pars. 8-17? What remark is here repeated? When were our Pastor's main works produced and published? What may be said of his Towers and sermons after 1914? Of what did his new finds consist, and to what did they belong? What do the facts prove as to the time of giving the antitypical reports? What is a somewhat parallel wording? How are we to understand the report at the end of the forty days?

(24) To whom did the antitypical spies report? How is this typed? How did they do it? When did they do it? How is this typed? What proves this to have been done in those ways? What did these lectures and publications contain? What does the repetition of the statement that the spies reported to Moses type? How did they report matters to our Lord? What did their findings prove emphatically of the spheres of the Truth and its Spirit? How is this typed? What else did their writings display?

(25) What is the contrast between vs. 26, 27; Deut. 1: 25 and vs. 28, 29? What was the character of the reports therein contained? Only after what did the ten spies misrepresent and exaggerate things? How did these matters stand with the antitypical spies? What do the peoples of Canaan type? What does remembering the antitypical fact help us to understand? What quality of these evils was truly reported? How is this typed? What do our experiences prove on this point? What are typed by the walled cities? What are the antitypical walls? What is the quality of this part of the antitypical report? What makes matters worse for us? How is this typed?

(26) What do the Amalekites type, in themselves and

in their location? What are some of its forms? What do the Hittites type, in themselves and in their location? What are some of its forms? What do the Jebusites type, in themselves and in their location? What are some of its forms? What do the Amorites type, in themselves and in their location? What do the Canaanites type, in themselves and in their location? In what respects did the antitypical spies report well? Truly?

(27) From v. 30 onward whom did Caleb type? Before this? What did the Little Flock note in the people during the delivery of the report? What did it thereupon do? By what is this typed? What does fear hinder? What did the Little Flock not attempt? Why not? How is this typed? What did it stress? Why? What did it urge? How are these things typed? What is typed by the second part of Caleb's speech? By what three considerations did the Little Flock prove these thoughts true to the people? Accordingly, how can our Canaan be dispossessed of our enemies and be occupied by us? What did the Little Flock certainly do in this matter? How is this typed by Caleb?

(28) What did the spies, type and antitype, now do? What did they claim? What led to the ten antitypical spies' contradicting antitypical Caleb? What was their confusion as to faith-justification and the high calling? What is the truth as to their relations and contrasts? What other doctrine contributed to their misrepresenting the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit? How are their positions to be refuted?

(29) What does our natural depravity prevent our doing for ourselves? Hence how are we justified? What empowers the justified Spirit-begotten people of God? Unto what? What did the false doctrines of the ten antitypical spies prompt them to do? In justification of their course, what did they allege? How and what did they fight? On what grounds? Into what were they led by their combativeness? What was their first falsehood? How is this typed? What did they thereby misrepresent? What things in the Truth people did they mistake as proofs of their misrepresentations of the antitypical land?

(30) What was their second falsehood? By what was this falsehood typed? On what was the antitypical falsehood based? What is the refutation of the involved falsehood? What fact proves their pertinent teaching to be false? What typical fact? What was the third typical

falsehood? What did the antediluvian giants type? What did this third antitypical falsehood imply? What did they grossly exaggerate? How is this typed? What should they have said? As a result of their omissions and commissions, what did they do to the antitypical land? What pertinent knowledge do those of us who shared the Parousia privileges have? Who were some of these mis-representers and exaggeators? In fact, who all were guilty of these two evils? What should make us wary of such? Of whom else should we be wary? Why?

(31) What effect did the misrepresentations of the antitypical ten spies have? What quality in the people produced this effect? What did it make them forget? What did this fear cause them to do? What did this effect make them do? How is this typed? What did they resent? What did they fear? How long did their mourning persist? How is this typed? What did their rage prompt them to do? Even to what extreme did their unbelief and fear move them? How is this typed? How universal was this condition?

(32) Whom did they consequently blame? For what? How is this typed? What did they consider in their hearts? To what did such thoughts influence them? By what did they do this? How is this typed? What varying degrees as to this were present in the people? What were the main ways in which they agitated for making a captain to return them to symbolic Egypt? In what three spheres? What were some of the sought captains? How is this typed? What was not selected, though sought? How is this typed? In what other ways was it sought to go back to symbolic Egypt?

(33) What effect did the people's course have on our Lord? As what? How is this typed? How did He do this? How is this typed? What did our Lord and the Church seek to do to the people? How is this typed? Where else is this also typed? Who can testify to their grief? In whom was this grief? How did they praise the antitypical land? How is this typed? How did they assert this? How is this typed? What was necessary for the antitypical conquest, according to the Church's assurance? How is this typed? What would be against their success in the war? How is this typed? To what two classes did they give this assurance? How did they place

themselves in relation to the people? How is this typed?

(34) Against what did the Little Flock plead? How is this typed? How was the rebellion possible? How did they assure the people of victory? How is this typed? What would insure their enemies' defeat? How is this typed? What is the best thing in their assurance of victory? How is this typed? What did this assurance promise? Despite what? What will a view of our Parousia experiences on this head show us? What antitype did we thereby fulfil? Whose activity also do we see in this?

(35) What kind of a reception did our Lord's and the Church's pertinent activities meet? Why? What kind of persons attacked them? How is this typed? Why was no stoning done, type and antitype? What types the Truth refutations made by our Lord and the Church? What considerations prove this? How did this glory appear on Christ and the Church?

(36) Why were the people unbelieving and fearful? In what did this culminate? How did this affect God? By what two questions did He indicate it? How is this typed? How and how long had God borne with them? Why did He cease from such forbearing? To what degree did He, and did He not forbear? What induced Him to modify His forbearance? How is this typed? What two courses were open to Him in the premises? How is this typed? Which did He prefer? What induced Him to yield His preference? What seems to be the threatened pestilence? What would it have effected? How is this typed?

(37) What is typed in vs. 13-19? How many kinds of deliverance from antitypical Egypt are there? What are they? Where does each belong? Why is the first kind here meant? Additionally, what kind of a deliverance has operated during the entire Age, and will to its end? What would the antitypical camp and the heathen have charged had God executed His first alternative? How would these antitypical Egyptians have told this to the evils infesting antitypical Canaan? What had these evils already experienced? From their being considered in what aspects? To what five things were these defeats due?

(38) Had God realized the first alternative, what boast would the evils have enacted? Despite what fact? Despite what even, would they have enacted this boasting? For

what did our Lord, therefore, pray? How is this typed? On what did He ground His prayer? How is this typed? What did He not ask God to set aside? How did He ask Him to exercise it? How is this typed? For what, accordingly, did He not pray? For what did He pray? How are these things typed? Upon what did He, accordingly, seize? How is this typed? What is His character as an Intercessor? How is this typed? How did He end His intercession? What kind of an Intercessor is our Lord? How is this typed? To what should this lead us?

(39) What did our Lord's intercession achieve? Only to what degree did it prevail? To what did it not prevail? What proves this answer? What two things prove that the forgiveness was of that only which would have completely cut off antitypical Israel from all favor? For what did our Lord not ask? For what did He ask? What proves this? What does v. 19 show on this point? How are these facts typed?

(40) How had God hitherto forgiven His people? What was not forgiven them? What proves this in type and antitype? What conclusion do we draw from these things? When were the punishments inflicted? What do these considerations enable us to see? How may it be stated in other words? Toward whom does this principle show itself in operation as to wilfulness's? How are we, and how are we not to understand the above-mentioned forgiveness of the unjustified?

(41) What is the greatest objection of non-Truth people to the sphere of the Truth? How do they express it? To what did this objection give God an occasion? How did God give the pertinent assurance? To what does the oath of v. 21 allude? Why does it prove restitution? Of what is this teaching a proof? Why so?

(42) Wherein is it typically shown that antitypical Israel's sins were not fully forgiven? With guilt of what sin does, God charge them? Despite what? What is meant by the tenfold provocation? What were the main sins leading to this provocation? For what two reasons does God justly blame the Parousia ten tribes of the guilt of the ten denominational groups from their beginnings? Wherein do we see Him acting on the same principle?

In what is the charge concentrated? In other words, of what does He accuse them? What does this prove? What results, as to Christ's intercession and the punishment?

(43) What does God solemnly affirm? What else does the pertinent passage affirm? What resulted? How should the last clause of v. 23 be rendered? So rendered, what does it teach? Why could they not enter in? How is this shown in Heb. 3 and 4? What assurance does v. 24 give? Why this for antitypical Caleb? What did that spirit produce? What did fully following God include? Who are meant by antitypical Caleb's seed? How differentiate between the Little Flock as mother and as seed?

(44) How are we to explain the omission of mention of antitypical Joshua in this verse? What did God therein promise? Through whom and what did He utter this promise in the Parousia? In what sense did antitypical Caleb go into the land? Who dwelt nigh unto antitypical Israel during the Parousia murmuring? What is meant by this? To what was antitypical Israel sentenced? To what did the two mentioned failures lead? Who succeeds and who fails to enter antitypical Canaan? How are the latter typed? What does the "tomorrow" of v. 25 represent? What is typed by the wandering by the way of the Red Sea?

(45) What is set forth typically in vs. 26-37? To whom did He first express it? What does it indicate? What had He directed to the antitypical murmuring? Against what two things was it expressed? What in all solemnity did God charge Jesus to tell antitypical Israel in the Parousia? What would happen to them? In what two ways did the falls occur? How do the cited passages respectively prove these two ways of falling? Who would thus fall? How is this typed? Who are included in this fall? How is this typed? Of what is there no doubt? Despite what fact? How can the oath-bound promise made to them be harmonized with His swearing not to bring them into the land? Who only enter the land? How does the meaning of the name of Caleb's father prove antitypically that the promise was made to him while in the flesh? The meaning of the name of Joshua's father

prove antitypically that the promise was made to our Lord while He was in the flesh?

(46) Who especially of the Parousia called ones win antitypical Canaan? How is this typed? What did the older ones fear of these? How is this typed? What did they do as to the standard of overcoming? How is this typed? Who especially did this? In what respects? In direct contradiction, what did God say thereon? How is this typed? How did the fallen ones feel toward the sphere of the Truth and of its Spirit? How is this typed? Through whom did God declare this of them? How is this typed? What is meant by their despising it? What will a review of the Parousia bring to mind as to this matter? What were they told by God? By and through whom? In what classes? How are the matters of the last three questions typed?

(47) What did the immature ones inherit as a result of the sentence? How is this typed? How long has the Epiphany wandering gone on? How has it been found to be? What have these hard experiences aroused in our hearts? For what sins are these evils suffered? How is this typed? How long, according to the Divine Will, are these evils to be suffered? How is this typed? Of what are we witnesses? What are some of the classes involved in the fallings? When did they begin? In what were they manifested? Who witnessed and witness these fallings? When? Where? In what ways does the resultant havoc appear? What contrast will make the fallings clear?

(48) What do 40 days and 40 years symbolize Biblically? What are some proofs of this? What two things do vs. 33 and 34 teach? What was there in both Harvests? By what were they followed? What was the first of these? The second? Why was the first period one of 1845 years and the second not one of 1845 years, and yet both antitypes of the 40 years in the literal wilderness?

(49) Why was the second period one of 40 years? On what three scales are the five Gospel-Age siftings being re-enacted? With what does the Gospel-Age proper begin for these three miniatures? What do we have in each of these three miniatures? How are they harmonized with the thought of the sixth, the revolutionism, sifting? What have these three sets of five siftings in common? What do these three reasons satisfactorily explain? What

are alike as to the duration in the Parousia and in the Epiphany? What is done in the Hebrew with the expression translated, "each day for a year?" What does this not mean? Why not? What does it mean? What have we experienced in the Epiphany? How is this typed? What had we expected for 1914? What is the character of this experience? The Parousia experience? What have been largely our experiences in the Epiphany? What in these experiences have we been bearing?

(50) What does God repeat in v. 35? What does He add thereto? Why so in both cases? What are the A.V.'s and Dr. Young's renderings for the first clause of v. 35? What does Dr. Young's translation add to the sentence above that of the A.V.? What should be said of the A.V.'s rendering of v. 35's second clause? What do we see as to the type? As to both fulfillments of the first set of antitypes? Of the second set of antitypes? Excepting the eventual Little Flock, what was the character of the whole Parousia congregation? What did it do against the Lord? In connection with what? Except the faithful, what must it undergo by the end of the Epiphany? Where? What did God next do in the Parousia? In what ways did the antitypical ten spies bring a slander upon the Truth and its Spirit? What made them all the more responsible? As to whom? Despite their high privileges, what evil things did they accomplish? What would happen to them? When? By what? What do we find in v. 37? What is the antitype of this? How did the antitypical ten spies die? What was in all cases the antitypical plague? With what was it connected? What did it effect in the antitypical ten spies? Who passed safely through the plague?

(51) What did Jesus do with the messages of vs. 20-25, 26-38? Of what is there no certainty on these messages? What should we not be on the subject? How is this typed? What should suffice us? What does this instance, among many, prove? How did Jesus not, and how did He tell these things to the involved classes? In what degrees of uses of these? How did this telling begin, proceed and come to a climax?

(52) What at first sight seems inconsistent with the picture? Why so? What decides the matter? How is it harmonized? What examples clarify this point? At their

manifestation what occurred? What similarity is there between the going forth of the antitypical message and the antitypical mourning? How did it begin and proceed? In what will it reach its climax? What features other than sorrow has the antitypical mourning had? When will this reach a climax?

(53) Despite what, when will occur the antitype of the scene in vs. 40-45? When did it start? Wherein? Who join in this? When and where did it start among Truth Levites? Spread? What is characteristic of all of these starters? How do practically all worldly and religious movements of the Epiphany stand related to this purpose? Of what are these the antitype? How are these things typed? What is the antitype of the people's rising up early in the morning? Of mounting the hill? Their saying, Behold us? On what were they determined? How is this typed? Of what were they over-confident? How is this typed? Despite what did they pursue this course? How is this typed? While they were so engaged, who remonstrated? Through whom? How is this typed? Against what and whom were protests, sounded out? By whom? Against what else have similar protests gone out? Why? In what relations? What did the Priesthood in all cases forecast? How were these things typed?

(54) What was their outcry? To whom? What reason did they give? How were these things typed? With what warning did they caution the presumptuous? How was this typed? What were the enemies, type and antitype? With what would they be smitten? Why? How is this typed? What is the difference between the antitypical sword and the antitypical Amalekites, Canaanites and Amorites? Despite this warning, what was done? In what spheres? How is this typed? What and who did not cooperate therein? How is this typed? What was the result of this presumption? How was it typed? By what was and is the defeat inflicted? How is this typed? Wherein are such defeats experienced? How is this typed? What other enemy, not typed as such here, animated their whole course? How is this typed? What is yet during the Epiphany to be expected? What will the people's resultant grief, on learning their fallen condition, not avail to change?

CHAPTER IV.

THE GOSPEL-AGE HARVEST IN TYPE AND ANTITYPE.

Num. 31: 1-54.

A SPIRITUAL CAMPAIGN. ITS ANTECEDENTS. ITS BATTLE. ITS VICTORY. THE DISPOSAL OF UNWORTHY AND WORTHY CAPTIVES. OF ANIMAL PREY. OF OTHER SPOIL.

WE ARE now approaching the anniversary of our Pastor's going beyond the veil, October 31. The coming one [1938] will be the twenty-second, and as before the Epiphany friends will celebrate it by special services, Oct. 31, in addition to engaging in an extra effort along the lines of antitypical Gideon's Second Battle, in lecture, colporteur, sharp shooting and volunteer work, from Oct. 16 to Nov. 7, the period between our Pastor's leaving Bethel the last time and his burial, which occurred just after 6 P.M., Nov. 6th, *i.e.*, according to God's reckoning, Nov. 7. This chapter will serve as an annual memorial article for him. That it will be appropriate as such is evident from two facts:

- (1) A certain phase of his part in the reaping work is set forth under the type of Phinehas' carrying the two trumpets on which he blew the alarm in the war described in vs. 1-24; and (2) under the Lord he supervised the warfare described in these verses. Accordingly, the friends may look upon this and others of this book's chapters as annual memorial articles for him.
- (2) In Num. 31 we have a typical history of the Parousia and Epiphany, set forth under the imagery of a war, in its antecedents, nature and results. In vs. 1-24, 48-54, the Parousia work is described under the military figure, wherein the chosen warriors of Israel won a most unique victory, destroying every one of the opposing soldiers without the loss of a single Israelitish soldier, taking a great number of captives and a large amount of booty, all of which they brought home with

them out of the war. Vs. 25-47 give a typical description of the Epiphany work of dividing God's people into the Little Flock and Great Company, under the military figure, wherein the captives and booty were divided into two parts, consigned equally to the warriors and the congregation of Israel. Even the Parousia siftings and its cleansings from the filthiness of the flesh and spirit are described, as well as the activities of the pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims, the first and second of these features being described in vs. 13-24 and the third in vs. 48-54. The fact that this story occurs in the Law, regardless of whether we take that term to mean the five books of Moses (Gal. 4: 21), or to mean the Law Covenant arrangements (Heb. 10: 1), the fact that certain of the Law arrangements enter into the story (vs. 6, 19-24) and the fact that the story is connected with Israel's journey from Egypt to Canaan, one and all prove it to be typical. That it is typical of something at the end of the Gospel Age is evident on its surface from three facts: (1) the reference (v. 2) to the fact that after this war Moses would die; (2) the reference to Phinehas (v. 6), the eldest son of the high priest; and (3) the fact that Israel at the time was encamped in the last station of its wilderness journey, *i.e.*, just before it entered Canaan.

(3) These three facts, as proving the time setting of the antitype to be at the end of the Gospel Age, deserve closer study. How does the death of Moses (v. 2) forecast as coming soon after this war prove that Num. 31 types things at the end of this Age? As follows: In this story and in fact throughout the book of Numbers, except in the story of smiting the rock twice (Num. 20: 7-13), wherein he represents the Parousia Ransom and Church-sin-offering deniers, Moses represents our Lord as the Divinely appointed Leader, Executive and Mouthpiece for God toward antitypical Israel. Moses' death at the end of Israel's wilderness journey cannot represent our Lord's dying at

the end of this Age, since from His resurrection onward He is immortal (Rom. 6: 9; 1 Tim. 6: 16). The antitype of a high priest's death gives us the clue to the antitype of Moses' death. The high priest's death types for the Church's High Priest our Lord's ceasing to function in His Gospel-Age office as High Priest to the Church, preparatory to His entering into the exercise of His Millennial-Age functions as Head of the World's High Priest. Accordingly, Moses' death types our Lord's ceasing to function in His Gospel-Age office as the Divinely appointed Leader, Executive and Mouthpiece for God toward the Gospel-Age Israel, preparatory to His functioning as such toward the Millennial Israel. But the first of these two features our Lord gives up at the extreme end of the Gospel-Age; and His last general work of this kind to the Gospel-Age Israel is the work of the Harvest, understood as covering the Parousia and the Epiphany, *i.e.*, in the wide sense of that term, and not in its narrow sense, the reaping. Hence the death of Moses as shortly following the war of Num. 31 proves that the time of that war types the time of the Harvest—the Parousia and the Epiphany. The pertinent activity of Phinehas (v.6) as the chief under-priest at such a time and event would prove typically the corresponding activity of our Pastor as the chief Under-priest on earth, which also proves that the antitype of Num. 31 belongs to the Harvest of the Gospel Age. Israel's last encampment of its wilderness journey at that time and its being near the Jordan and just before Israel's crossing it into Canaan fittingly type the extreme end of the Age, the Harvest (Matt. 13: 39). Accordingly, these three considerations prove that the antitype of Num. 31 belongs to the end of the Gospel Age.

(4) We are now ready to expound the chapter—type and antitype. Since Moses types our Lord as the Divinely appointed Leader, Executive and Mouthpiece for God toward the Gospel-Age Israel, and since in

v. 1 God charges Moses as His appointed leader, executive and mouthpiece toward the Jewish-Age Israel, God in v. 1 must type the Heavenly Father giving directions, etc., to Jesus at the end of this Age. The charge of v. 2 as it reads in the A. V. ("Avenge the children of Israel of the Midianites") is evidently an unhappy translation, for in the antitype it would have commanded Jesus to charge us to do what God forbids us to do, take revenge (Rom. 12: 19-21). While the Hebrew word *nakam* has as one of its meanings, to *avenge*, another of its meanings, *to vindicate*, evidently fits better here. Here antitypically the charge was given by God to our Lord to see to it that Spiritual Israel be vindicated during the Harvest. The appropriateness of this is apparent from the fact that throughout the Dark Ages and even in the Reformation Period the Lord's faithful people have been greatly and misrepresented and vilified as blasphemers against the Lord, His Word and His Church, and as rebels against the civil powers, whereas they stood for the little of Truth that then was due and against the errors, wrong organization and practices of the nominal church, especially against its unholy alliance with the state. The great theologians of the Dark Ages, like Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus, etc., and the great statesmen of that period with their lawyers, seemed to prove the Faithful to be blasphemous heretics and wilful rebels. This caused the latter to be branded as heretics with the excommunication of the "Church" and as rebels with the ban of the kingdoms and the Holy Roman Empire. Thus they were apparently overcome by these theologians and lawyers in argument and were by almost everybody so regarded and treated. Hence they were grossly misrepresented and vilified. It is against these misrepresentations and vilifications that God desired His people to be vindicated, and hence in v. 2 antitypically charges our Lord with the work of seeing it done.

(5) Moses' (v. 3) telling the people this types our Lord's telling the Gospel-Age Israel in the end of the Age through the Church as His mouthpiece the antitypical charge. As in the type not all Fleshly Israel was commanded to arm themselves for the contemplated war, but only certain select warriors from among them were to arm themselves for the war ("Arm *some* of yourselves," v. 3), so not all of the antitypical Israelites were charged to arm themselves for the antitypical war, but only certain select warriors (the Little Flock) from among them were so charged. The antitypical charge was carried out in several acts: (1) in the candidates for war coming into the Parousia Truth and its Spirit and (2) in their training themselves to use the Truth and its Spirit for defensive and offensive warfare against the controversialists for error and against the Truth (Midian—*strife*). This charge was carried out, therefore, in pantomime; and it was given by our Lord through such servants of the Truth as brought by their teachings and exhortations the pertinent ones into the Truth and its Spirit and encouraged them afterwards to put on the whole armor of God (Eph. 6: 10-18; 2 Cor. 6: 7; 10: 3-5; Rom. 13: 12; 1 Thes. 5: 8). As implied above, the Midianite warriors represent controversialists who defend error and attack Truth. Those under study (vs. 2, 3, 7-11) were mainly but not exclusively the nominal-church controversialists; since they also included all the sifters (slaughter weapon men) of the Parousia, those among the Truth and the Nominal people of God, as well as those apart from these, e.g., unbelieving, spiritistic, etc., controversialists. The Little Flock so armed and trained were in the Parousia to go forth to war for Truth and righteousness against the antitypical Midianite warriors ("let them go against the Midianites").

(6) The object of the typical warfare is given as follows: "Let them . . . avenge the Lord of Midian" (v. 3). The same remark as was made on the Hebrew

word *nakam* above (v. 2) applies here to the word translated *avenge*, except that here the verb *avenge* is a free translation of a verb and noun literally to be rendered, *to give, or render, vindication*, the noun for *vindication* here being *nikmat*, derived from *nakam*. Accordingly, the clause should be rendered, "Let them . . . render the Lord's vindication on Midian." In the type the vindication of the Lord was for the evil done Him at Peor (Num. 25: 1-18; 31: 16). We are not to understand that there is a contradiction between vs. 2 and 3 in the charge to vindicate Israel and in the charge to vindicate the Lord; for the harmony between the two statements is to be found in the interrelation of God and His people, since the Midianites sinned against both God and Israel in the matter of Baal Peor; hence both were to be vindicated in the proposed war. These same considerations apply to God and antitypical Israel. Both of them were sinned against by antitypical Midian. Above we saw how this was done against antitypical Israel. We now proceed to show how this was done against God. The defenders of the creeds and the attackers of the Truth in the nominal church have vilified, blasphemed, traduced, slandered, vituperated and misrepresented God in His person, character, plan and works, by their false teachings, organizations, and practices. Through the nominal church doctrines of the trinity, human immortality, eternal torment, the consciousness of the dead, the bliss of the righteous dead, the misery of the unrighteous dead, no future probation, post-Millennialism, the object and manner of Christ's Second Advent, the resurrection, the judgment day and the eternal state of the saved and lost, the union of church and state, the organization of various of the denominations and many of their usages and practices, the nominal church controversialists have greatly vilified, blasphemed, traduced, slandered, vituperated and misrepresented God's person, character, plan and works. The

sifters among the Truth people have done more or less of these things through their forms of no-ransomism infidelity, combinationism, reformism and contradictionism. So, too, have aggressive atheists, materialists, evolutionists, agnostics, pantheists, secularists, rationalists, deists, higher critics and polytheists, done more or less of these things to God. And all of such antitypical Midianites have done these things in opposition to the stand that God's people have taken on them in the exposition and defense of God's person, character, plan and works, as due for them to see these, and therein have vilified, blasphemed, traduced, slandered, vituperated and misrepresented God and His people.

(7) And certainly the Parousia time was a time in which God and His people were vindicated. The widespread attacks on the errors of these three classes of controversialists, the far-flung successful exposition and defense of God's Word and the world-wide refutation of all attacks upon it from all sources, during the Parousia effected these two vindications. Thus God's people throughout the Age as they stood for what of Truth was in their time due were vindicated as the exponent of the Truth, while the expounders and defenders of error and the attackers of the Truth were refuted and set forth as errorists. And the magnificent presentation of the Truth in the Parousia on God's person, character, plan and works was a wonderful vindication of God in these four respects. The vindication was, of course, a spiritual one, spiritual as to its weapons, disposition, methods and manner. Thus it was a vindication conformable to God and His people. The Society in following its president is now setting forth a vindication that is unworthy of God and of His people, in that it is done in large part with false weapons, bad spirit, faulty methods and inappropriate manner. It is also an evil vindication, since in bloodthirstiness it calls for the killing of almost the entire human race in Armageddon as the act of vindication.

itself, while God's people's vindication is alleged to be their not dying in Armageddon! Such is the counterfeit vindication that the little pope of little Babylon teaches for the real one that occurred during the Parousia. In comparison, the counterfeit is as the darkness of the Arctic circle, while the true vindication is as the brightness of balmy May in the temperate zone.

(8) The thousand (vs. 4, 5) delivered for the war from each of the twelve secular tribes (the sacred tribe of Levi was exempt from participation in Israel's wars), constituted a select army of 12,000, while the census given in Num. 26 shows that there were in Israel at that time over 600,000 warriors. This suggests the thought that these 12,000 warriors represent the faithful Little Flock in the flesh during the Parousia. This thought is corroborated by several considerations: (1) According to v. 49 not one of these 12,000 fell in the war with the Midianites, which is in line with the thought that none of the Faithful fall in the antitypical war (Ps. 91: 7; Mal. 3: 2). (2) According to v. 7 they slew all the Midianite warriors, who presumably outnumbered them, which is in line with the thought that the Faithful overthrew the Parousia enemies of the Truth, who are more numerous than they (Is. 54: 17; Luke 21: 15). (3) The number 12 and its multiples stand in symbolic passages for the faithful Little Flock and Little Flock matters, e.g., the 12 antitypical tribes, 12,000 in each tribe (Rev. 7: 4-8), the 144,000 (Rev. 7: 4; 14: 1), the 12,000 furlongs and the 144 cubits (Rev. 21: 16, 17), the 12 gates, 12 angels, 12 apostles, 12 stones, 12 pearls and the 12 fruits yielded in each one of the 12 months (Rev. 21: 12, 14, 19, 20, 21; 22: 2). And (4) the facts of the antitype which will later be brought out fully corroborate this thought. The fact that there were 12,000 soldiers chosen for the typical war, and not 144,000, is in line with the thought that the Parousia yielded not all, but a part of the Little Flock. Nor

does it seem reasonable to take the 12,000 typical warriors to type just that many antitypical warriors as constituting the number of the Parousia Little Flock. In great likelihood more than 12,000 of the Little Flock were developed during the Parousia. Rather, we believe that the 12,000 typical warriors were used because that number, as a multiple of 12, serves well to show that the faithful Parousia Little Flock is meant in the antitype. Jesus gave the charge of v. 4 in pantomime, *i.e.*, by calling out of the twelve denominations through the Harvest work the Little Flock there, the comparatively few coming into the Little Flock from the field, the world, being ignored in this picture. V. 5 was fulfilled antitypically in that there came out of the nominal church the Little Flock members in it, and were thereafter fitted to become its warriors.

(9) V. 6 tells of Moses' sending forth to the war with Midian these 12,000 warriors and Phinehas, who was the eldest son of the high priest Eleazar, and who bore in his hand as the holy instruments the two silver trumpets (Num. 10: 1-10). The word *ve*, rendered *and* in the last clause of v. 6, should have been rendered *even*, one of the three meanings of that word, because the only instruments of the tabernacle designed for war uses were the two silver trumpets, which were blown by the priests alone (Num. 10: 9). Let us keep in mind that the work of the Parousia is set forth not only in literal statements, but also from the standpoint of a variety of figures, *e.g.*, the harvest (Matt. 13: 24-33, 37-43; Rev. 14: 14-17), fishing (Matt. 4: 19; 13: 47-50), a war (Rev. 19: 11-21), etc. Each of these figures brings out a different viewpoint of the Parousia work. Our study presents the matter from the standpoint of the war figure. Moses' sending forth the 12,000 represents our Lord's sending forth His Parousia Faithful to war for Truth and righteousness against the error and unrighteousness of antitypical Midian. Moses' sending forth Phinehas, the

chief under-priest, with the soldiers to the war, as the chief commander, which his possession of the trumpets made him, types our Lord's sending forth Brother Russell, the chief Under-priest in the flesh with the rest of the Parousia Faithful, as the chief commander, which his possession of the antitypical trumpets made him. We have already shown from Num. 10: 1-10 that the two great Gospel-Age messages: (1) the reckoned and actual human salvation, and (2) the Divine salvation, are the two antitypical trumpets. (Vol. VIII, Chap. X.) We have also shown there that Num. 10: 8. proves that it was more especially the prerogative of the mouthpiece Priests to blow these trumpets and that alarms were to be blown in time of war. These thoughts enable us better to understand that Phinehas' bearing these trumpets in his hands types our Pastor's ministering with the messages of the two great salutations. And Phinehas' taking these with him to the war, combined with the charge that they should be blown by the priests in war times (Num. 10: 9), and the fact that the Hebrew word translated *to blow* in v. 6 means *blow an alarm*, proves that our Pastor is here typed from the standpoint of his controversial activities during the Parousia war.

(10) Symbolic war is waged in three ways: (1) a setting forth of the Truth constructively as contrasted with error; (2) a defense of the Truth against the attacks of error; and (3) an attack on error. When we examine our Pastor's writings or call to mind his sermons, lectures, conversations, debates and answers to questions, we find that they abound in these three forms of warfare. He almost never touched upon a subject on which special error was taught unless, before he had finished with it, he engaged in controversy on it in one or two or three of the forms of fighting error set forth in the first sentence of this paragraph. Sometimes the controversial element was more, sometimes less prominent in his writings and speech; but it was almost

always present whenever a controversial subject was under discussion. This can be seen in his Studies, Towers, sermons, tracts, magazine and newspaper articles, booklets and letters. And those who conversed with him on controversial subjects or who heard him on such subjects in sermons, lectures, debates, conversations, and question meetings, will recall that this statement is a fact. Hence a large part of his ministry was devoted to controversy with the three sets of antitypical Midianites mentioned above. It is this warring feature of his ministry that is typed by Phinehas' bearing in his hands the two silver trumpets for alarm-blowning purposes. While the following as such is not directly pictured in the type, it is nevertheless a fact that for the most part our controversial weapons during the Parousia warfare were gotten almost exclusively from what we gathered from his writings and oral teachings. It is because of his great prominence as a controversialist and of his leading the Faithful in their controversies against the antitypical Midianites that he is typed as an individual by Phinehas in the story of Num. 31. This fact occasions our calling this chapter an annual memorial article for him. God bless his memory, among other things as it appears in the fights for Truth and righteousness that he waged and helped others to wage, as well as in leading them therein.

(11) V. 7 briefly describes the fighting of this war. This is perhaps the most remarkable war ever waged; for in it every warrior on the one side was slain ("slew all the males") and on the other side not even one soldier fell (v. 49). That the Midianites were a numerous nation is evident from the fact that, despite the losses of this war in slain and prisoners, less than 100 years later their warriors constituted the majority of the host of 135,000 invaders of Canaan, in Gideon's day (Judges 6: 1-7; 8: 10). From the latter fact we can see that all the males of v. 7 mean all the Midianitish warriors, not the other males of the nation,

another part of whom—boys—were later slain (v. 17). But these warriors must have been more numerous than the 12,000 Israelites. The antitype suggests the same thought; for the three classes of Truth opponents and error exponents of the Parousia were very much more numerous than the Parousia Little Flock. The only way that we can account for every soldier of the more numerous and not one of the less numerous side falling is that God wrought a miracle in this war, doubtless using angels to paralyze the Midianites with fear and weakness in order to furnish a type that would picture forth the planned antitype. What is typed by this war? The controversies between the Little Flock (hence not between all Truth people; for some of these fell in the Parousia, while none of the antitypical 12,000 fell) on the one side and the three classes of erroneous Parousia controversialists on the other side. The slaying of the Midianites types the refutation of the erroneous Parousia controversialists, not of course a literal slaying, as no such a thing occurred on either side during the Parousia. All the Midianitish soldiers being slain types the fact that in every conflict that the faithful Parousia brethren entered they refuted their adversaries, which God Himself promised as their portion (Is. 54: 17; Luke 21: 15). The Israelites' warring, *as the Lord commanded Moses*, implies two things in the type and antitype: (1) The war was carried out in obedience to the Lord; and (2) was carried out in His Spirit. These two facts are another proof that in this picture the Parousia Little Flock is typed by the 12,000.

(12) When we look back at the Parousia controversies, we see that the above-suggested antitypes are true. Certainly, of all times of the Gospel Age the Parousia was a time of controversy. Not only is this seen in the attacks made on the Truth and the Bible in that time by the three classes of antitypical Midianite warriors; and not only is this seen in our Pastor's part

in the controversies of that time; but it is also seen in the parts taken in those controversies by other Little Flock members, especially by the pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims typed by the captains of thousands and captains of hundreds (vs. 14, 48-54). The pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims in their lectures, sermons, answers to questions, conversations, lecture reports in the newspapers, debates and letters, gave evidence of the controversial element as present in their ministry. The elders in their lessons, answers to questions, letters and conversations, manifested the controversial side as being in evidence in their ministry. The unofficial parts of the faithful Little Flock exemplified in their conversations and letters the same feature in their ministries. The colporteurs did the same more or less in their canvass and related conversations, and self-evidently in their sale of books and booklets. The volunteers incident to their work distributed controversial literature. So did the faithful brethren who engaged in other branches of the work, like the faithful Bible House workers, extension workers, photo-drama workers, newspaper workers, sharpshooters, etc. On all sides these controversies were carried on. The zeal of both sides in this warfare occasioned it, particularly that of the faithful Little Flock. All Parousia Little Flock members can recall more or less arguments along the lines of Truth and error into which they were drawn with attackers of Truth or defenders of error in the Parousia. Yes, it was a time of symbolic warfare in which the defenders of error and the attackers of Truth went down into defeat, and in which every Little Flock member was victorious.

(13) Beside all the rest of the slain warriors the 12,000 slew the five kings of Midian (v. 8): Evi (*luster*), Rekem (*variformed; variegated*), Zur (*combination*), Hur (*noble*) and Reba (*four-sided*), and Balaam (*swallower of the people or glutton*) the son of Beor (*torch*). We understand the five kings of Midian to

type the same as the five Parousia slaughter-weapon men. These evidently were chief error-advocates of the Parousia. Not only the facts of the case are in line with this thought, but the meanings of their names also suggest it. Evi, as meaning *luster*, is in line with what St. Paul (1 Cor. 10: 6) and Moses (Num. 11: 4, 34) say of them. Rekem, as meaning *variformed*, or *variegated*, suggests the many sub-groups in each of the three sets of the infidelistic sifters (those in the sanctuary, those in the courts and those in the city or camp), *e.g.*, those in the city or camp consist of atheists, agnostics, materialists, evolutionists, pantheists, secularists, rationalists, deists, higher critics and polytheists. Surely the infidelistic sifters in their third subdivision were variformed, variegated. There were more parties to this than to any other of the sifting classes. Zur, as meaning *combination*, *i.e.*, things pressed together into one whole, at once suggests the sifters who stood for combinationism. Hur, as meaning *noble*, suggests the nobility of the reformers' objects in seeking to set aside evil conditions and in seeking to inaugurate good ones among mankind. Reba, as meaning *four-sided*, suggests the four-sided attack they made on the Truth; for they attacked various phases of the Truth on the four subjects: Mediator, Covenants, Sin-offerings and the Ransom. And Balaam (*swallower of the people, glutton*) the son of Beor (*torch*), types the clergy as being more or less of Truth teachers (*torch*) who in their lording consumed the people and in their greediness swallowed (appropriated to themselves) all the rewards of unrighteousness, like riches, honor, power, influence and ease, that they could get (2 Pet. 2: 15; Jude 11). The antitypical 12,000 slew these in the sense that by the Truth (the sword, v. 8) they refuted their errors and convicted them of wrong-doing. All of the remaining faithful Parousia Little Flock members will recall that this was then fulfilled by them in their many controversies.

(14) In v. 9 it will be noted that the word *all* in the first clause is in italics, which means that it is interpolated. The interpolation is an unhappy one. If the statement were true, and if the thought that the A. V. suggests in v. 7 of all males were true, the whole nation as such would have perished, since the captive boys were all slain and all women not slain (vs. 17, 18) were incorporated into Israel. The many Midianites with whom Gideon had to cope prove that the whole nation as such did not perish. The literal translation of v. 9 is: "The sons of Israel took captive women and children of Midian and they made spoil of all their cattle, of all their sheep and of all their goods." In other words, while they slew all the warriors of Midian and took all their moveable property as spoil and captured many of their women and children, the civilian men and some of the women and children escaped, which is proved by the fact that a large host of Midianites invaded Canaan in the times of Gideon. Who were the captured antitypical Midianitish women and children? The Midianitish women were more or less developed errorists who did not continue to fight or who never fought for the errors of the Parousia times, while the Midianitish children were undeveloped errorists who passed through the same experiences. How in the antitype were Midianitish women and children made captives? By being convinced through the Little Flock's refutations of antitypical Midian's errors of their erroneousness and by being convinced through the Little Flock's Truth presentations that these were genuinely Scriptural. In other words, by such antitypical Midianites being delivered from error and being brought into the Truth by the Little Flock's Truth presentations they were made the antitypical captives of the antitypical 12,000.

(15) The antitypical Midianitish captive women and children were a mixed multitude. Some were new creatures, which is true of all the antitypes of the virgins

among them, and which was true of part of the rest of the antitypical women captives, while the rest of them never had been new creatures. The antitypical Midianitish captive boys were also mixed, some being new creatures, others not. By the sheep we understand the humanity of the new creatures to be typed and by the cattle there was typed the fact that their humanity was justified, even as these animals in the tabernacle were used to represent these things. In Bible symbols asses are in general used to represent Truth teachings, as can be seen from the ass that Balaam rode, representing the Truth teachings that bore his antitype (Num. 21: 21-33; 2 Pet. 2: 16), as can be seen from the fact that our Lord's being true to the Truth is symbolized by Shiloh binding the ass' colt to the choice vine (Gen. 49: 11), and by our Lord's riding into Jerusalem upon an ass and its colt (Matt. 21: 5, 7; John 12: 15) as typing His coming in kingly power into Christendom, riding on the doctrines of the Ransom and the Second Advent, in 1878, more especially as these were set forth in the tract, Manner and Object of Our Lord's Return, and the book, *The Three Worlds*. Many other references in the types and symbols corroborate this thought. The 12,000 capturing the asses would type the Parousia Little Flock appropriating to themselves the truths that are in Babylon's creeds, *e.g.*, the twelve stewardship doctrines, etc. The asses here would also type the truths that the Little Flock in the Parousia appropriated from other nominal church writings. And the other goods that the 12,000 captured would type the various Levitical writings which the antitypical 12,000 have appropriated to themselves and from which they have gotten various linguistic, interpretational, historical and systematic helps on Biblical matters. The inanimate things, "the goods," that the 12,000 and their officers captured seem to type two other things: the graces, *e.g.*, as appears from the antitypes of the jewels and garments that the Israelites got by asking from

the Egyptians, and certain Truth presentations like discourses, writings, lessons and conversation material, as will be seen when we examine vs. 50-54. The efforts of the antitypical 12,000 as they sought to show forth the Lord's Spirit in their controversies with antitypical Midianites gave them these graces and Truths as spoils of battle. Certainly in the campaign waged during the Parousia the Little Flock took the above-described captives, prey and spoil; and by taking such booty they left the antitypical Midianites that escaped death and captivity diminished in numbers and impoverished of wealth in teaching and graces.

(16) V. 10 tells us that Israel burned all their cities and goodly castles. Thus they devastated the land of Midian, which further impoverished the escaped of the nation. In Biblical symbols a city represents a religious government, as can be seen from the instances of Babylon (Rev. 17: 5, 18), New Jerusalem (Rev. 21: 2, 10—22: 3) and the five cities of symbolic Egypt, the five denominations that in Europe are united with state (Is. 19: 18). To burn with fire these symbolic cities would mean by the Truth to destroy them as alleged Divinely authorized religious governments, *i.e.*, completely expose the falsehood of their claims to be God's Church. Castles or palaces, as fortresses, in Bible symbols represent chief teachings as the strong dwelling places of believers in them (Ps. 48: 3, 13; 78: 69; 122: 7). Antitypical Midian's goodly castles were her various main erroneous teachings. In the nominal church part of antitypical Midian such castles or fortresses were the doctrines of the trinity, human immortality, the consciousness of the dead, the dead being in bliss or torment, eternal torment, probation limited to this life, post-Millennialism, doomsday, etc. Others' errors, like the five siftings' errors, are others of these goodly castles. For Israel's 12,000 to burn by fire typical Midian's goodly castles would type the Parousia Little Flock utterly destroying as tenable teachings, by

the Word of God as a symbolic fire, which it is in relation to error (2 Kings 1: 10-14), the above-mentioned and other errors, in which, as in fortresses or castles, the antitypical Midianites were entrenched. We know, some of us from participation, some of us from observation and some of us from information, that such a symbolic destruction took place through the Parousia Little Flock's warfare. Thus were God and God's Gospel-Age Israel vindicated by the Little Flock's Parousia campaign against the errorists, and thereby was the Parousia warfare on error and errorists ended, even as the typical 12,000 by their campaign against Midian vindicated God and Israel as against Midian and brought to an end their campaign.

(17) In vs. 11, 12, what was done with the captives and spoil is set forth. By the prey the living things captured seem to be meant (vs. 11, 12, 26, 27; in v. 12 the expression, "*and* the prey," after the word, "captives," should be rendered, "*even* the prey"); and by the spoil the inanimate things captured seem to be meant (vs. 11, 12, 53). The taking of these, mentioned in v. 11, seems to mean, not their initial capture, which is described in v. 9, but the better securing of them preparatory to bringing them to Israel's camp. Antitypically this would mean the Little Flock's getting a firmer hold on their symbolic prey and spoil. This was done by their more thoroughly indoctrinating the captives, as to their new-creaturely and human privileges, by their getting a better hold on the truths that they took away from the antitypical Midianites, and by their getting a stronger development of the captured graces and special teaching features that their engaging in this warfare gave them. The typical Israelitish army bringing the prey and spoil (v. 12) to Moses types the Parousia Little Flock bringing the persons that they won for the Truth, the truths that they took away from the creeds and Levite writings, the Levite works themselves and the graces and their discourses, writings, lessons and

conversation material, to Jesus as booty won especially for Him as the Divinely appointed Leader, Executive and Mouthpiece for God to antitypical Israel.

(18) The Israelites' bringing these to Eleazar types the Parousia Little Flock's bring similar things to Jesus as their High Priest. The 12,000 Israelites' bringing the prey and spoil to the congregation types the Parousia Little Flock's bringing similar things among God's Parousia people, *e.g.*, whenever any of us won someone for the Truth we brought him as soon as we could among the brethren; and happy indeed were we to be privileged so to do. The Israelites' bringing these to the camp at the plains of Moab types the fact that the antitype was performed while God's Gospel-Age people were at their last wilderness station, wherein they dwelt in territory, the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit, that once was in possession of the Roman Catholic Church, which usually Moab types, while usually Ammon types Protestantism. The reason that the last Parousia camp was located in the former, Roman Catholic, territory, is that Romanism is a complete counterfeit of the Truth and its Spirit, whereas Protestantism is not; hence in getting the Truth and its Spirit as its Parousia and Epiphany camping place, the Little Flock wrested these spheres out of the hands of Romanism, *i.e.*, turned these into the genuine by the needed changes from the counterfeit to the true. The expression, "which was beside the Jericho Jordan," types the fact that the Church's last Gospel-Age station was outside but near the nominal church (Jericho) when about to leave this earth for the Kingdom by death (Jordan), a thing that was not true of any pre-harvest stage of the Church.

(19) Moses, Eleazar and all the princes of the congregation (v. 13) going forth to meet the returning army types our Lord Jesus, as the Divinely appointed Leader, Executive and Mouthpiece for God to antitypical Israel (Moses), Himself as the Church's High

Priest (Eleazar) and all the leaders among God's people (all the princes), welcoming the Little Flock as from each stage of the war its individual members would return with their prey and spoil. While in the type such a return was done once for all, in the antitype each time some prey or spoil was won these were brought in among the Lord's people. All of us know, whether by experience, observation or information, that such welcoming occurred as one by one at various times the Little Flock brethren brought back prey and spoil gained in their warfare with antitypical Midian. The welcoming of the 12,000 *without the camp* represents that the antitype was performed while the victors were yet in the flesh and thus in more or less disharmony and unpopularity with the camp condition. Moses' and Eleazar's share in such welcoming finds a somewhat parallel act with the same general antitypical meaning in Melchizedek's going forth to meet Abraham returning from slaughtering the four (not five) kings (Gen. 14: 18; Heb. 7: 1, 2), the four kings representing the sifters of the third, fourth, fifth and sixth siftings, the no-ransomistic and infidelistic sifters not being represented in this picture, because antitypical Lot (the Great Company) was not captured by any phase of no-ransomism and infidelism, but he was captured by more or less attenuated phases of the other four sifting errors, e.g., the sons of antitypical Korah, who antitype certain Kohathite Levites (Num. 26: 9-11), were captured by the fifth set of sifters. But according to v. 14, Moses was angry at the captains of thousands and of hundreds, while the reverse of anger, pleasure, is implied in the attitude of Melchizedek. But this would not imply a contradiction in the antitype. Both antitypes were factual, one bringing out Jesus' pleasure in the victors for the good they did, the other implying His displeasure for certain evils that they did, as a further study of the types and antitypes will prove. This is only another illustration of the fact that

everything on a given subject is given in any one Scripture, rather "here a little, there a little," is the way the Bible gives its thoughts on each of its topics.

(20) Though the record (v. 14) does not show it, Moses very likely expressed the pleasure that as a patriotic Israelite he felt over the glorious victory won and the prey and spoil taken. But the Lord did not design to express this phase of Moses' feeling, since He designed through Moses in this place to show that our Lord, as Leader and Executive, was displeased with things not done aright in the Parousia warfare. This anger was directed against the officers of the host, the captains of thousands and the captains of hundreds. These officers type the pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims. The twelve pilgrims who were the most active and efficient toward the public, *i.e.*, in public meetings, are the antitypes of the twelve captains over thousands. At present we are unable positively to identify all twelve of these, but we are, from the captains that David placed monthly over the monthly 24,000, able with certainty to identify seven of them (1 Chro. 27: 1-15). Jashobeam (v. 2; 11: 11) types our Pastor as a pilgrim, not as that Servant, who was the captain over the first thousand; Eleazar the Dodaian (v. 4; 11: 12) types another brother, who was the captain over the second thousand; Benaiah (vs. 5, 6; 11: 22) types J.F. Rutherford, who was the captain over the third thousand. It will be noticed that Shammah (2 Sam. 23: 11), who types Bro. Barton, was not among the captains of a monthly 24,000. This was doubtless due to the fact that he was not specially prominent in the public work. Abishai, type of Bro. John Edgar, who did not do much public work, is likewise not mentioned among the captains of a monthly 24,000. While we are not yet able to identify them with their typical mighty men in the lists of David's mighty men (2 Sam. 23: 8-31; 1 Chro. 11: 11-47), we conclude from the uses that Bro. Russell made of

them in the public work, that Bros. Hemery, MacMillan, Sturgeon and Raymond quite certainly, and Bros. Sexton, Bundy and Rockwell less certainly, are the antitypes of seven other captains of the monthly 24,000 in 1 Chro. 27: 1-15, as well as of the other seven captains of seven of the thousands of our study. We are still less certain of the other two. Perhaps they were Bros. Lundborg of Sweden and Koetitz of Germany. The rest of the 132 captains, 120, represent the rest of the pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims. The Lord was wroth with these as they were returning from the campaign of the war; because they had preserved the lives, not of some, but of *all* the women that they had captured (vs. 14, 15). Moses considered that those who through Balaam's counsel had enticed the Israelites at Baal-peor to sin, and who had, accordingly, brought a plague upon Israel, should have been slain by the captains' orders before the return (v. 16; see Chap. VII).

(21) The following facts will make this episode of our study clear in the antitype. The 12,000, capturing and preserving the non-virgins and boys (v. 17), brought as captives to the camp such as did not deserve to be brought there. In this they type how the antitypical 12,000 won for the Truth people more than they should have won, some that did not deserve to be associated with the Truth people—some that were never consecrated, as all of us know, some whose consecration had been unfaithfully kept, the non-virgins, and some (the boys) who, while accepting some of the Truth, fought for some of antitypical Midian's errors. The antitypical soldiers were too anxious to win numbers, as suggested by the type, and thus were not particular enough to indoctrinate thoroughly on consecration those whom they attracted with the Truth and to require of them that they meet that high standard, which, if those attracted were not willing to meet, should have prompted the soldiers to keep them away from the association of Truth people. The Lord Jesus

held the leaders mainly accountable for this neglect, for they should have influenced the others not to "capture" such unfit ones and bring them in among the Lord's Truth people. Hence He was especially displeased with the leaders for their over anxiety to win numbers and for their neglect to restrain the others from the same course. The killing (v. 17) of the non-virgins and boys types the cutting off of their antitypes from among the Lord's people, which usually occurred through the refutatory teachings and acts of the leaders and others during the siftings large and small, though it often occurred in the cases of individuals apart from siftings. The charge to preserve alive (v. 18) the virgins, who type the truly consecrated (Rev. 14: 1-5; Matt. 25: 1-12; Ps. 45: 14, 15; Cant. 6: 8, 9; Prov. 31: 29), as well as the charge to slay the non-virgins and boys, was given by our Lord in both cases through the pertinent Truth teachings and providences. The antitypical virgins were preserved alive for God's people by the loving care and thorough teachings that they received at the hands of the brethren. In both the cuttings off and the preservings it was the leaders who were most active, and whose course toward both realized the Divine intention as to them.

(22) We now proceed with our study of Num. 31, beginning with v. 19. From v. 15 to v. 20 Moses is the speaker, and as such types here our Lord as God's appointed Executive, Mouthpiece and Leader for antitypical Israel during the Gospel-Age Harvest. As in vs. 19, 20, Moses gave directions for the cleansing of the typical warriors and captives, so our Lord during the reaping time gave the antitypical instructions for the cleansing of the antitypical warriors and their captives. The charge (v. 19) that these remain outside the camp of Israel indicates that these were unclean and that their antitypes would be unclean. Remaining without the camp seven days types the antitypes' remaining outside of the antitypical camp (here the Kingdom) until

their *full* cleansing has been effected. The camp here evidently does not mean the assembly of God's people yet in the flesh; for the antitypical captains and captives were during the reaping time in, and parts of that assembly. Killing a *soul* (so the Hebrew) types active Adamic weaknesses against our consecration, *i.e.*, selfishness and worldliness, and touching the slain types the contamination of the depravity inherited from Adam. In both of these senses we must cleanse ourselves from the domination of the Adamic disposition, if we are to enter the Kingdom as overcomers. The cleansing on the third day types the cleansing that we receive in justification, *i.e.*, from sin, which is accomplished by our suppressing it to the extent of our ability. This fight commenced at our tentative justification and will continue until death.

(23) The third-day cleansing suggests that which belongs to justification, as follows: Abraham was the first person to whom tentative justification, with its implications of righteous living to the extent of ability, was offered *in anticipation of his coming into the Abrahamic Covenant relations with God*. Abraham received this cleansing during the third 1,000-year day of human history. Hence the third-day cleansing is the one pertinent to the justified condition. Of course, the cleansing here meant is not that from the penalty of the Adamic sin, which is effected by Jesus' merit alone *through faith*; but is that from the power of the Adamic sin, which is effected by the co-operation of Jesus and the believer *by works*. The seventh-day cleansing types the overcoming of natural selfishness and worldliness pertinent to the consecration condition. We know from experience that we undergo both of these forms of cleansing. Did Jesus as the antitype of Moses' giving the directions for the typical cleansings give the directions for the antitypical cleansings? We answer, yes. Throughout the reaping period exhortations went out from Him to all Truth people, the leaders and the led,

to cleanse themselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit and from all forms of selfishness and worldliness. He spoke these through the Volumes, especially Vols. 1, 5 and 6, particularly the last, through Tabernacle Shadows, the Towers, the Hymns and Poems of Dawn, the Sermons, the pilgrims' talks, the elders' lessons and the pertinent conversations of the Lord's people. Thus the pertinent facts prove that the antitypes of v. 19 were fulfilled during the time of our Pastor's ministry, the Parousia.

(24) The details as to what were to be cleansed are given in v. 20—garments, things of skin, works of goats' hair and every wooden thing, as well as the persons themselves. Garments type qualities of the new creaturely heart and official powers (Col. 3: 12; Ex. 28: 2, 40). The leaders and the led were to cleanse their new-creaturely heart qualities and their office powers from all contamination from natural, as distinct from sinful selfishness and worldliness. The allusion to the things of skin covers the same thoughts as those typed by the curtains of the tabernacle of rams' skins dyed red and of badgers' skins. The former curtains represent our covering of Christ's merit and the latter our appearance as despicable to the world. To cleanse the things of skin, therefore, types two things: to cleanse away any spots on our robes and to put aside faultful qualities that would make the Lord's people have a bad appearance to the world. The curtain of goats' hair covering the tabernacle represents our justified humanity. To cleanse every work of goats' hair would therefore type our cleansing our good human qualities, covered as they are by our Lord's righteousness, from human faults that attach to them. Wood in the tabernacle represents corruptible humanity. We have faults in our humanity that are not attached to our natural good qualities but are their opposites. These are represented by the things of wood in v. 20. Hence to cleanse the things of wood types our ridding ourselves

of such faults. The exhortation to cleanse themselves types Jesus' exhortation to the New Creatures to overcome their new-creaturely lacks by developing them, the New Creature being typed by the linen curtain. Thus the five typical things that were cleansed type five distinct things that are cleansed in the antitype.

(25) In vs. 21-24 Eleazar as high priest gives some instruction on the cleansing work. The distinction between Moses' and Eleazar's giving the pertinent instruction is the following: Moses gave it as the Divinely appointed executive, mouthpiece and leader for Israel, while Eleazar gave it as the high priest reconciling the warriors and their captives with the good will of God, making them pleased with the Divine will. In the antitype four functions of our Lord's work in connection with our cleansing ourselves are typed by Moses' and Eleazar's pertinent activities. As Executive Jesus gives us the experiences needed for our cleansing; as Mouthpiece, the teachings needed for our cleansing; as Leader, the direction of our course needed for our cleansing, while as High Priest He does the reconciling work *in us*, makes us pleased with the good will of God. Experience proves that during the reaping time, as called for in this type, Jesus officially functioned toward the leaders and the led in these four ways. Eleazar's telling (v. 21) the warriors that he was explaining to them the things that God commanded through Moses, types the fact that our Lord as High Priest in the reaping time told us that He was expounding to the antitypical warriors the things that as God's appointed Executive, Mouthpiece and Leader for antitypical Israel He had received from God as God's pertinent will for such cleansings as are described above. The expression, ordinance of the law, types the thought of the teachings of God's Word (Ps. 1: 2; 119: 18, 97, 113, 142, 163, 165). Experience proves that in His work of making us pleased with the good will of God, the second feature of His reconciling (High-Priestly) work,

Jesus as High Priest during the Parousia explained the pertinent teachings of God's Word, as having been given Him as the Divinely appointed Executive, Mouthpiece and Leader for antitypical Israel for that time.

(26) It will be noted that there is a twofold method of cleansing set forth in vs. 22, 23. The metals, because they could withstand fire, were to be cleansed by a different process from that used with materials that could not withstand fire. The former—the gold, silver, copper, iron, tin and lead—were to be made clean by being made to pass through the fire and by the sprinkling of the water of separation, and the latter by being made to pass through the water and by sprinkling with the water of separation. The distinction in the typical process of cleansing these two kinds of implements was, of course, to bring out an important distinction in the things that must undergo the antitypical cleansing. Both Scriptures and experience show that we are cleansed from some of our faults by submission to the influence of the Word alone (Ps. 119: 9; John 15: 3; Is. 4: 4; 1 Cor. 5: 7; 6: 11; Eph. 5: 26). And this is typed by the cleansing done by washing in water and by sprinkling with the water of separation. Scriptures and experience also show that we are cleansed from others of our faults by submission to the influences of the Word and providences, disciplines of the Lord (Ps. 94: 12; 119: 67; Hos. 5: 15; Rom. 5: 3; 1 Cor. 3: 12-15; 2 Cor. 4: 17; Heb. 12: 4-14; Jas. 1: 4, 12; 1 Pet. 1: 7; 4: 14). This form of cleansing is typed by the way the metals were cleansed. The distinction between the antitypical washing with water and sprinkling with the water of separation is this: The former is a cleansing made by any part of the Word apart from the antitypes of the Ancient Worthies' experiences, while the latter is the cleansing effected by the antitypes of the Ancient Worthies' experiences. When the cleansing is effected by the Word alone it is accomplished by the new will laying such faithful hold on the

pertinent truths and obediently holding them so firmly on the faults as to cast them out entirely. This occurs, however, only in the cases in which these faults are more or less surface, not deep-seated, faults. Where deep-seated faults exist the cleansing is not accomplished by such a process alone, though it must cooperate with the other process. In such cases disciplinary experiences must be added to the first process, and amid such disciplines one must submit himself obediently to the influence of the pertinent parts of the Word. Such a course amid such disciplines will result in the cleansing. In some cases this second process works comparatively quick results, in others slow results, depending partly on the degree of faithfulness exercised and partly on the hold the faults have. In some cases it lasts for years and in many to the end of life. We know by the Bible and experience the above described methods of the antitypical cleansing. We also know that antitypical of Eleazar's pointing out their types our Lord during the Parousia, the reaping time, pointed out their antitypes through the writings of our Pastor, the discourses of the pilgrims, oral, printed and abbreviated in notes, the talks and lessons of elders and the conversations, exhortations and testimonies of the brethren.

(27) Eleazar's directions given in v. 24 also find their antitypes in Jesus' High-Priestly directions given during the Parousia. The antitypical "clothes" are the Faithfuls' graces and official powers. As the uncleanness of the typical clothes required their being washed in water, so did the antitypical garments have to be washed in the antitypical water from uncleanness of the flesh and spirit. Any fault attaching to our graces must be washed out with the water of the Word; and any uncleanness of the flesh and spirit attaching to our official powers as priests, regardless of whether as such we had an office in the local or general Church or not, must be washed out by the water of the Word, which the

type shows occurred during the Parousia. If this was not done we cannot enter the Kingdom. If it was done, and we remain Priests, we will enter the Kingdom—come into the camp (v. 24). The washing of the clothes on the seventh day types the fact that the antitypical washing related to us in our consecration aspects as distinct from our justification aspects. The antitype of v. 24 so understood found its factual fulfillment in the many exhortations that our High Priest as such caused to be given us through that Servant's writings, through the pilgrim's discourses, the elders' teachings and the other brethren's conversations, exhortations and testimonies.

(28) This is a good place to make a general remark on Num. 31: 1-24—the factualness of its antitypical fulfillment when understood as applying to the Parousia considered from the standpoint of a military campaign. In the second paragraph of this chapter we stated that Num. 31: 1-24, 48-54, gave us a type of the Parousia under the figure of a military-campaign. Our study of Num. 31: 1-24 proves that the pertinent part of this statement is true; for we have found for every detail of these 24 verses factual antitypes. The presented antitypes are not stretched, whittled, tortured, but most naturally are in harmony with known Biblical teachings elsewhere given, and convey the thoughts suggested by their types. It will also be noted that all the main movements and activities of the Parousia as they come under the figure of a military campaign are brought out clearly: the pertinent time feature (v. 2), the reasons for the antitypical war (vs. 2, 3), the antitypical preparation, numbers and mustering of the warriors with their commander (vs. 4-6), the antitypical fighting (vs. 7, 8), the antitypical spoils and destructions of the war (vs. 9, 10), the return of the antitypical victors with their captives (vs. 11, 12), the antitypical Executive, Mouthpiece, Leader and High-Priest and leading brethren meeting the returning host and their captives

(v. 13), our Lord's displeasure in the pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims for attracting unworthy ones (vs. 14-16), His requiring through the Parousia controversies the unworthy to be cut off from among the Lord's people (v. 17) and the retention among them of the worthy (v. 18), His exhorting to purification from faults connected with their justification and sanctification regarded from certain standpoints (vs. 19, 20), His indicating the two ways by which the cleansing occurs and the reason for the difference between them (vs. 20-23), and the things that need cleansing in the consecrated condition (v. 24). Everyone conversant with the Parousia viewed from the standpoint of a campaign of war recognizes that in the above-mentioned particulars there is complete harmony between the type and the main Parousia happenings from a military viewpoint as antitype. Facts prove the correctness of the suggested antitype; and more facts to the same effect will appear when the antitypes of vs. 48-54 are presented. Therefore we may with confidence say that the right antitypes for the pertinent verses have been suggested.

(29) As stated in paragraph (2) vs. 25-47 will be found to give us the main Epiphany events under the picture of the division of the spoil as representing the division of the Lord's people into the Little Flock and the Great Company. We now proceed to the study of vs. 25-47. As the Source of the Truth and of the carrying out of God's plan, entrusting their stewardship to Jesus as His appointed Executive, Mouthpiece and Leader for antitypical Israel, God is typed by His action in v. 25: "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying." God's commanding Moses, and through him Eleazar and the chief fathers of the congregation, to number (take the sum of) the prey, both of humans and beasts, types His charging Jesus as God's Executive, Mouthpiece and Leader for antitypical Israel, and through Him as such antitypical Eleazar and the chief fathers of the

congregation, to describe the antitypical prey. Whenever in Biblical types and symbols a numbering of persons or things is required or done it signifies that the antitypes are required to be described or are described. This is manifest from Ps. 48: 12—"Walk about Zion. . . tell the towers thereof." The word "tell" in old English meant *count, number*, which also is the meaning of the Hebrew word saphar, here used. Zion, of course, is the Church. The charge to walk about her, if addressed to new creatures, means a mental, not a physical journey. It means, therefore, to meditate on her. Her walls are her powers, which are the Truth and the Truth arrangements. Her towers are her main truths, *e.g.*, the ten main Biblical doctrines. To number her towers, accordingly, means to describe her main doctrines. Thus to number in Biblical symbols represents to describe, to explain, to show what the pertinent things are, in the understanding of the expounder.

(30) Accordingly, the charge of v. 26 antitypically is that there should be given a description of the spoil taken during the reaping time. This spoil consisted of antitypical virgins (*of man*), the consecrated new creatures, and of things connected with their and others' justified humanity (*of beast*). Accordingly, a description of these was charged by the Lord Moses' counting the spoil types our Lord, as the Divinely appointed Executive, Mouthpiece and Leader of antitypical Israel, giving a description of the antitypical spoil, the antitypical virgins and things pertaining to their and others' justification. Eleazar's counting the spoil types not only Jesus, but Jesus, the Head, and the Church, the Body, as the World's High-Priest, giving a description of the antitypical spoil, the new creatures and things connected with their and others' justification; for in matters pertinent to dealing with the Great Company in its separation from the Little Flock, the World's, and not simply the Church's High-Priest functions, as

per the day of atonement type, which so far as the Great Company's sufferings are concerned, is for the world's wilful sin, and so far as the Church's co-suffering with Jesus is concerned, is for the world's Adamic sin. It is because of the twofold nature of the world's sins that in the antitype the World's High-Priest, and not simply the Church's High-Priest, functions toward the Great Company as Azazel's Goat. The chief fathers of the congregation counting the spoil types the crown-lost leaders of the Epiphany among the Truth people giving a description of the antitypical virgins and the things pertinent to their and others' justification. This fact further corroborates the fact that Eleazar here represents the World's High-Priest; otherwise the Little Flock would have no share in this description, while the Great Company leaders would.

(31) Jesus as Executive, Mouthpiece and Leader has given this description with the pertinent works, first from Sept. 20, 1914, to Oct. 30, 1916, through that Servant, and thereafter through the Epiphany messenger. Accordingly, our Pastor during those over two years had so much to say and do pertinent to the Little Flock and Great Company in their mutual relations and prospectively in their separation. And since that time the Epiphany messenger has been active in teaching and acting in the same respects. Jesus and the Church as High-Priest have given this description in so far as it relates to their work of bringing the Great Company brethren into increasing oneness with the Lord: (1) along the lines of dealing with Azazel's Goat, which is a preliminary to bringing its members into such a oneness, and (2) along the lines of dealing with the antitypical Levites in their cleansing and consecration, which work is mainly future. Just as we saw that in the Gospel-Age picture the chiefs of the congregation were the crown-lost leaders of the Gospel Age, so during the miniature Gospel Ages of the Epiphany their crown-lost leaders are the antitypical chiefs of the

congregation. These, too, offer a description of what they think are the antitypical spoil: the new creatures and things pertinent to their and others' justification. But their description, like that of the crown-lost leaders of the Gospel Age, is more or less faulty, particularly as to their claims that their ledlings are the Little Flock. Their description in due time will be corrected. Facts that we have observed since 1914 prove that the things suggested above as the antitypes of the counting of the spoil of Israel's war with the Midianites have been occurring, which corroborates our understanding as true.

(32) In vs. 24-47 the special Epiphany work of separating the Little Flock and the Great Company is typically set forth. This is indicated by dividing the spoil into two parts or halves, giving one part to the warriors and the other part to the congregation (v. 27). (1) Not only is this separation shown by the fact that all the virgins, typical of the new creatures, were divided into two companies, which we know antitypically are the Little Flock and the Great Company, but also from several other facts: (2) The one part was given to the warriors, who represent the Little Flock, as standing for it. (3) To show that such virgins represent the Little Flock, representatives of these (one of each 500) were given to Eleazar as a heave-offering (v. 29), showing that in the antitype these represent the entire Little Flock as a heave-offering, since these virgins in the type stand as representatives of the whole half-number of the virgins. (4) Then, so far as the other half of the virgins are concerned, their being given to the congregation shows that they stand representatively for the Great Company, who serve, not toward God and the altar, as the Little Flock do (Ezek. 44: 15, 16), but toward the people (Ezek. 44: 10-14). (5) Again, the one out of fifty that was given from the people's part to the Levites (v. 30) indicates that since such were representatives of the whole half given to the congregation, that entire half represents the Great

Company. (6) Further, the fact that the same relative proportion as was given to the altar from the warrior's part and as was given to the Levites from the congregation's part, obtains, as was the proportion given to the priests from the Levites' tithes (Num. 18: 26-28); for from the tithes of the people's offering to the Levites one-tenth was given the priests, thus giving the Levites ten times the amount given the priests, just as one out of fifty is ten times as much as one out of five hundred. As in v. 29 Eleazar types the Christ, Head and Body, so in Num. 18: 28 Aaron stands for the Christ, Head and Body. (7) Moreover, the symbolic meanings of the numbers of the two halves of the spoil prove the same lines of thought. This point we will give in some detail a little further on in our discussion. We would remark in passing that the equal halves into which the spoil was divided do not signify an equal number in the two antitypical companies, any more than the equal number of the wise and foolish virgins of Matt. 25: 1-12 do.

(33) Since half of the virgins represent the Little Flock as New Creatures and the other half the Great Company as New Creatures, what is represented by the cattle and the sheep? We answer: the sheep represent the humanity of these new creatures from the standpoint of tentative justification and the cattle represent the humanity of these new creatures from the standpoint of vitalized justification. What, then, do the asses represent? Such true teachings and books containing true teachings as the Little Flock won as spoil from the antitypical Midianites. That asses represent true teachings and books containing such teachings, is evident from the antitype of our Lord's riding into Jerusalem upon an ass and its colt, and of the kings of Israel riding upon asses rather than on horses, which when contrasted with asses represent false teachings; though when there is no such contrast they represent a teaching, regardless of whether it is true or false. The

facts of the antitype will make this manifest: Everything in the creeds is not false. In addition to the twelve stewardship doctrines that we in the Parousia took away from the antitypical Midianites, we captured other true teachings from their creeds, spotted, however, with errors associated with them, *e.g.*, certain of God's attributes of being and character and certain ethical, hortatory and prophetic teachings. These in part are typed by the asses that Israel captured from the Midianites. Again, there are various books that contained more or less truths, covered indeed, that we captured from the antitypical Midianites during the Parousia, *e.g.*, (1) various Greek and Hebrew Bible recensions, editions, translations, Greek and Hebrew dictionaries, concordances and grammars; (2) Bible commentaries, introductions, harmonies, indexes; (3) Bible and Church histories, biographies, chronologies, geographies, antiquities; (4) doctrinal, ethical and apologetical works, Bible encyclopedias and dictionaries, giving more or less of the four above-named lines of helps. All of these amid many errors contain nuggets of symbolic gold and silver. Both the Little Flock and the Great Company have such spoil while divided from one another. Accordingly, we see that what was suggested as the antitypical spoil of man and beast has actually been taken during the Parousia and is now in the Epiphany being divided according to the Word and facts.

(34) Above we mentioned the fact that the symbolic meaning of certain Biblical numbers related to the figures occurring in both divisions of the spoil proves that the numbers given the warriors and heaved by them through Eleazar and the numbers given the congregation and by them given to the Levites demonstrate the view of the antitypical division as we have explained it to be correct. All of us are familiar with the fact that the number 7 and its multiples stand for things Divine and therefore, among other things, for God. We are

also familiar with the fact that the number 12 and its multiples stand for the Little Flock and Little Flock matters, which we showed in the preceding installment of this article. We are also familiar with the fact that the number 10 and its multiples stand for natures lower than the Divine, hence, among others, for the Great Company. Thus the 10,000 of Ps. 91: 7 and Deut. 32: 30 are the Great Company. With the symbolic meanings of these numbers let us do some figuring with the numbers given in connection with the twofold division of the spoil mentioned in vs. 32-46. We will do some dividing by 7, 12 and 10 of the total separate units of the booty.

(35) There were taken

675,000	sheep (v. 32)
72,000	beeves (v. 33)
61,000	asses (v. 34)
32,000	virgins (v. 35)
7) <u>840,000</u>	total units of spoil
12) <u>120,000</u>	
10) <u>10,000</u>	
10) <u>1,000</u>	
10) <u>100</u>	
10) <u>10</u>	
	1

What does the symbolism of these divisors teach? This: God (7) in separating the Little Flock (12) and the Great Company (10) divided the latter into three (10, 10, 10) general divisions, corresponding to the three Levitical groups: Gershonites (10), Merarites (10) and Kohathites (10), leaving none of either class in the other, (1) not being a number of either. This corresponds to the lines of thought as to both elect classes.

(36) A half of the total units of the booty was given the warriors. A half of 840,000 is 420,000, which we will divide by 7, 12 and 10, dividing by 7 first, then by

12 before dividing by 10, since this set of figures stands for the part typing the Little Flock.

$$\begin{array}{r} 7) \underline{420,000} \\ 12) \underline{60,000} \\ 10) \underline{5,000} \\ 10) \underline{500} \\ 10) \underline{50} \\ \quad \quad \quad 5 \end{array}$$

What does the symbolism of these divisors teach? This: God (7) in separating the Little Flock (12) from the Great Company in its three groups (10, 10, 10) left not one (5 is not equal to, nor a multiple of, 10) Great Company member in the Little Flock. This fits the condition as respects the Little Flock.

(37) The other half of the spoil, that given to the congregation, also totals 420,000 units. Since this concerns the Great Company we will divide by our three pertinent figures in the order of 7, 10 and 12.

$$\begin{array}{r} 7) \underline{420,000} \\ 10) \underline{60,000} \\ 10) \underline{6,000} \\ 10) \underline{600} \\ 12) \underline{60} \\ \quad \quad \quad 5 \end{array}$$

What does the symbolism of these divisors teach? This: God (7) in separating the three (10, 10, 10) Great Company groups from the Little Flock (12) left among them no Little Flock member (5 is neither equal to, nor a multiple of, 12). This fits the case as to the Great Company.

(38) According to vs. 37-40, the Lord's tribute of the units, typing Little Flock matters were

675 sheep (v. 37)
72 beeves (v. 38)
61 asses (v. 59)
<u>32</u> virgins (v. 40)
840 total

This total we will divide by 7 and 12 and 10, in the order given, because they concern Little Flock matters.

$$\begin{array}{r} 7) 840 \\ 12) 120 \\ 10) 10 \\ \hline 1 \end{array}$$

What does the symbolism of these divisors mean? This: God (7) in separating the Little Flock (12) from the Great Company (10) left no Great Company member (1 not being 10 or a multiple of it) in it. This fits the facts as to the Little Flock.

(39) The Levites, getting ten times as many units of each kind as the priests (vs. 28, 30), got

$$\begin{array}{l} 6,750 \text{ sheep} \\ 720 \text{ beeves} \\ 610 \text{ assess} \\ \hline 320 \text{ virgins} \\ 8,400 \text{ total units} \end{array}$$

This total as being related to the Great Company we will divide by 7, 10 and 12, in the order named, thus:

$$\begin{array}{r} 7) 8,400 \\ 10) 1,200 \\ 10) 120 \\ 12) 12 \\ \hline 1 \end{array}$$

What does the symbolism of these divisors mean? God (7) in separating the Great Company (10) from the Little Flock (12) put the Great Company (10) into such a condition as left no Little Flock member (1 is not equal to, nor a multiple of, 12) in it. This fits the facts as to the Great Company, as we know them to be.

(40) As 420,000 units were given to the warriors and 840 of these were given to the priesthood, the units left in the warriors' hands were 419,160 ($420,000 - 840 = 419,160$). This last number is significant, as can be seen from dividing it by 7, 12 and

10, in the order given, since it concerns Little Flock matters. Thus:

$$\begin{array}{r} 7) \underline{419,160} \\ 12) \underline{59,880} \\ 10) \underline{4,990} \\ \quad\quad\quad 499 \end{array}$$

What does the symbolism of these divisors mean?

This: God (7) in separating the Little Flock (12) from the Great Company (10) left no Great Company member (499 is not equal to, nor a multiple of, 10) in it.

This fits the facts as to the Little Flock.

(41) As 420,000 units were also given to the congregation, from which it gave the Levites 8,400, this left in the hands of the congregation 411,600 units ($420,000 - 8,400 = 411,600$). This last number is significant, as can be seen from dividing it by 7, 10 and 12, in the order given, since it relates to Great Company matters. Thus:

$$\begin{array}{r} 7) \underline{411,600} \\ 10) \underline{58,800} \\ 12) \underline{5,880} \\ 10) \underline{490} \\ \quad\quad\quad 49 \end{array}$$

What is the symbolism of these divisors? This: God (7) in separating the Great Company (10) from the Little Flock (12) put the Great Company (10) into such a condition as left no Little Flock member (49 is not equal to, nor a multiple of, 12) in it. Since 49, the last quotient of this reckoning, is the square of 7 ($7 \times 7 = 49$), it suggests to our minds that God (7) by this work manifested Himself as infinitely perfect ($7 \times 7 = 49$). It will also be noted that above we have worked out 7 different problems, in which the antitypical numbering was symbolized. One of these seven covered both classes and three covered one, and three covered the other class. This seven-foldness again is symbolic, declaring that God was the actor in it all.

(42) This raises the question, Could these symbolic meanings of the divisors of the various sums be a matter of accident? Merely to ask the question suggests the impossibility of the theory of accident as an explanation of such a phenomenon; for from the standpoint of probability the case against an accident is as one against a set of figures of inconceivable quantity; since the matter is one of greatly compounded probability, as the following will show: if we were to limit the probability as to 7 as equal to the probability of any one of the digits between 1 and 7, though we would be as justified to make the probability lie between the digit 1 and any number as much higher than 7 as the involved dividend is, since it would be as probable for any such number to be the divisor to be used as 7. The same remark would apply to the numbers 12 and 10, each taken separately, first with the former as the first divisor, then with the latter being the first divisor. Then these results would have to be compounded with one another. Then this compound result would have to be compounded with the compound result of the second problem's probability. Then this result would have to be compounded with the compound probability of the third problem, and so on until it has gone through all seven of them. The final product would be as one to an inconceivably large number, which, of course, would reduce the theory of an accident to the proportions of the utmost absurdity. Hence this matter is unexplainable on the theory of accident.

(43) How did it, then, occur that these figures teach these meanings? We answer: God is the greatest of mathematicians; and He, seeing what thoughts He desired to symbolize by the seven involved problems, ordered matters so that there would be only so many units in each form of the seven problems—not one more, not one less—and thus secured the desired number of units in each one of the seven problems. To work out such a compounded problem would be beyond

the ability of a mind short of omniscient. Hence this matter under study proves God's omniscience and the inspiration of the entire story, as well as of the whole Bible, of which this story is a part. Doubtless God used angels to see to it that the exact number of units in each of the four kinds of spoil was captured. We saw as to the fact that every Midianitish warrior was slain (v. 7), and will see as to the fact that no Israelite warrior was slain (v. 49), that the angels must have intervened against the Midianites and for the Israelites, so in securing the exact number of units in each of the four kinds of spoil they must at God's direction have seen to it that the exact number of the four involved kinds of units were represented in the spoil. In other words, the battle itself resulted as it did by a miracle, and the total amount of the four kinds of spoil and the number of each kind came as a result of a miracle. A third consideration is involved in this matter: The Epiphany teachings alone of the teachings held among the various groups of the Lord's people claim that the Epiphany work is one involving among other things, the separation between the Little Flock and the Great Company; and here is a type that facts prove divides the Harvest into its two periods, assigning its gathering part to the Parousia and its separating part to the Epiphany, which proves that the Epiphany movement is the Priestly one at this time. Well might we say, "How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord, is laid for your faith in His excellent Word!"

(44) It will be noted that v. 31 states that Moses and Eleazar made the divisions as God commanded. While they and the chief fathers of the congregation were commanded to take the sum, count the spoil, which all of them did in the type, whose antitype we have already explained, yet only Moses and Eleazar were commanded to make the various involved divisions. The chief fathers did not do this. Why not? Because in the antitype the crown-lost leaders of the groups, during,

the Epiphany being Azazel led, could not participate intelligently in such a work. They are so confused that they are incapable of cooperating in such a separation. The fact that they claim that their divisions are Little Flock movements and in many cases claim that the Priestly movement is a second death movement proves that they could not supervise the division. Aaron's dealing with Azazel's goat is in harmony with the same thought. That our Lord as the Divinely appointed Executive, Mouthpiece and Leader of antitypical Israel, as Moses' antitype, and that the World's High Priest, Head and Body, as Reconciler, antitypical of Eleazar (see also Aaron dealing with Azazel's goat), supervise this division of the two classes, is evident from the nature of their official functions. Accordingly, the facts of the fulfillment are in harmony with the type. Accordingly, the Epiphany Under-priests may rejoicingly take the sneers, taunts and upbraiding of the Levites that they are dividing the Lord's people; for they truly cooperate with and under their Head in such work, as properly belonging to their Epiphany service. Thus our study of vs. 1-24 proves that they type the main Parousia works, under the figure of Israel's war with Midian; so our study of vs. 25-47 proves that they type the main Epiphany works, under the figure of dividing the spoils of that war. Certainly this study should be most refreshing to our faith, hope, love, and obedience! The Lord be praised therefore.

(45) There is a final episode connected with this war, given in vs. 48-54, that which refers to the captains' report and offerings. The facts of the case prove that this episode types certain Parousia matters involving the pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims. Above we showed that the captains of thousands type the twelve leading pilgrims in their capacity of working toward the public, and that the captains of the hundreds type the rest of the pilgrims and the auxiliary pilgrims in their capacity of working toward the public. Doubtless

the Lord did not cause the episode to occur and then be recorded immediately after the events and record of vs. 1-24, because He desired the more important Parousia and Epiphany matters to be typed in closer connection with one another than the insertion of this episode between them would allow. Hence He followed the logical, rather than the chronological order in the antitype of this matter, though the types followed in the order given. The captains are set forth in vs. 48, 49, as giving their report to Moses, typing the pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims reporting the antitypical matter to Jesus as God's appointed Executive, Mouthpiece and Leader for antitypical Israel. The report was that they had counted the warriors (v. 49) and that not one of Israel's twelve thousand warriors had fallen. This types the fact that the antitypical captains by *describing* in their teachings the antitypical 12,000, the Little Flock, in the Parousia time, reported that not one of them had been refuted (symbolically slain). Let us note well how the antitypical counting was done. It consisted of an accurate description of the faithful Little Flock. A part of such a description would be teaching that they fought in the Lord's Spirit the good fight of the Truth to its complete vindication as against the opposing error, and that in that fight they were victors over sin, selfishness and worldliness, and thus over error. Thus none of them fell. In the type, as already suggested, this was due to a miracle; and certainly in the antitype it was a miracle of grace that these overcame.

(46) We are told (v. 50) that the captains brought an oblation to the Lord. In the type this consisted of gold jewels—chains and bracelets, rings, earrings, and tablets [perfume boxes]. If we can determine what the Parousia pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims brought to the Lord that others did not bring to Him, we will recognize what the captains' oblation types, since none but these brought such an oblation (v. 53). These were

the discourses of the Parousia general elders delivered before the General Church. Only these pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims brought such at that time. Hence we understand that the jewels of gold brought by the captains type these discourses. It will be noted that the jewels of gold were of five different kinds; chains [necklaces], bracelets, rings, earrings and perfume boxes. These type the five different kinds of discourses that the pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims brought to the Lord. Chains or necklaces represent the ornaments of the new will. In the Bible the neck is used to represent the will. Hence a stubborn-willed person is Scripturally spoken of as stiffnecked (Ps. 75: 5; Prov. 29: 1; Acts 7: 51). A will renewed into oneness with the Lord's will is set forth as a neck decked with figurative chains or necklaces, which are its ornaments (Prov. 1: 9; 3: 3, 22; 6: 20, 21; Cant. 1: 10; 4: 4; 7: 4). Accordingly, the necklaces of v. 50 represent the discourses on the new will and its ornaments, prepared and delivered by the Parousia pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims before the General Church. The bracelets that the captains brought represent the Parousia pilgrims' and auxiliary pilgrims' discourses on service and conduct. The following considerations will clarify this: Bracelets in Palestine were worn on the wrists and ankles. In Biblical symbols the hands represent service (Rev. 13: 16; 14: 9; 20: 4); and the feet represent conduct (Ps. 116: 8; 119: 59, 101, 105; Prov. 1: 16; 4: 26). Since bracelets were in Palestine hands and feet ornaments, they would represent good services for the Lord, the Truth and the brethren, when worn on the wrists, and good conduct when worn on the ankles. Hence the discourses of the Parousia pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims before the General Church on matters of service and conduct are represented by the bracelets that the captains offered.

(47) In Bible symbols rings represent new-creatureship as God's pentecostal blessing to His Gospel-Age

consecrated (Luke 15: 22, see comment; Ex. 35: 22, where, except the necklace, the same jewels as are mentioned in v. 50 are enumerated). Accordingly, we understand these rings to represent the Parousia pilgrims' and auxiliary pilgrims' discourses before the General Church on the New Creature, which, having many aspects, furnished them with a wide range of subjects for discussion. Earrings are ornaments of the ears. Ears in Bible symbols represent understanding, especially of the things of faith (Matt. 11: 15; 13: 15, 16; Luke 4: 21; 9: 44). Accordingly, we understand earrings to represent the ornament of a believing understanding, and thus the faith. Hence the captains bringing the earrings as an oblation for the Lord type the Parousia pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims bringing for the Lord's service their discourses on the matters of the Truth before the General Church. Here again a great variety of subjects were open to their use, and they made use of them. The last ornament mentioned in the A. V. of v. 50 is *tablets*. The Hebrew word here translated *tablets* [old English for *pendants*] is *chumaz, perfume box*. When we consider the antitype we think that the rendering *perfume boxes* makes the needed sense. In Bible symbols perfume represents that which is very acceptable and appreciable—the graces. (Ex. 30: 35, 37; 35: 8, 15, 28; Cant. 3: 6; 2 Cor. 2: 15—Diaglott; Eph. 5: 2). The perfume arising from the incense represents the graces, especially the higher primary graces. These perfume boxes, therefore, represent the Parousia pilgrims' and auxiliary pilgrims' discourses before the General Church on the graces. On the graces as sweet perfume to the Lord and all having His Spirit, there is much material, and this the antitypical captains laid hold of for many discourses. Without any doubt the pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims did offer as oblations for the Lord discourses on the new will, on service and conduct, on the New Creature, on the things of faith and their understanding and on

the graces. Thus our understanding is in harmony with the Bible, reason and facts. Hence we believe that it is the true one.

(48) At the end of v. 50 the statement is made that the captains were bringing the oblation to make an atonement for their souls. As the speech of the captains hitherto examined, like almost all other typical speeches, was fulfilled antitypically in pantomime, so this part of it was fulfilled in pantomime. On first thought the statement seems strange, that the Parousia pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims were by preparing and delivering their discourses (capturing the jewels and offering them) making an atonement for themselves before the Lord; for does not our Lord's merit atone for all our Adamic imperfections? Assuredly so. But this seeming strangeness fades away when we remember that to make atonement or reconciliation involves two works: (1) making God pleased with everything in us, and (2) making us pleased with everything in God; for in reconciliation each party at variance must be made pleased with the other. It is the work of Jesus alone, and that through His merit, to make atonement in the first sense of the word—to satisfy God with everything in us; for it was for this that He died and rose again (Rom. 4: 25; 2 Cor. 5: 18, 19, 21). But atonement in its second part is not the work of Jesus alone, though ministerially He takes the initial step in each of its acts to effect it. We must co-operate with Him in effecting it, by a faithful use of God's Spirit, Word and providences, ridding ourselves of every thing of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness in us that hinders our becoming pleased with everything in God, and by developing everything of justice, Truth, love and heavenly-mindedness that is pleased with everything in God. It is the part of this second work of atonement or reconciliation, effected through our Lord's ministry in and by the Parousia pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims, that is in v. 50 typed by the captains through

their oblations making an atonement for their souls (themselves) before the Lord.

(49) How was this done? A few examples will clarify this process for all cases. We will refer first to a pertinent experience of our Pastor wherein he overcame an overweening fear for the sheep, and wherein he did not sufficiently trust the Lord's Word that no man could take His sheep out of His hands (John 10: 28). This experience of our Pastor was connected with the antitype of Jashobeam's breaking through the ranks of the Philistine host at Bethlehem and getting water from the well at its gate for David (1 Chro. 11: 11, 18). When Mr. Barbour, in attempted justification of his no-ransomism, gave in his magazine a plausible, but sophistical interpretation of the sin-offerings of Lev. 16, conscious that his and Mr. Barbour's magazines were going into practically the same hands, our Pastor feared greatly for the true sheep, that the error on the subject might lead them into a fatal denial of the ransom. This fear reached an extreme height. What our Pastor did in this connection we will give in Chap. VI, where it will fit better than here. It was this fear in our Pastor for the Flock that gave the demons the approach to him whereby they greatly plagued him. And he strenuously fought them in their attacks on him through this fear, until he so thoroughly overcame them that by the time he got to the antitypical well and dipped out the pertinent portion, the Truth on the sin-offerings, typed in Lev. 16, his fear was overcome. Instead of hastening to spread this message before the Church, he saw that the Truth therein contained was so great as to justify his first calling together in a conference the leading brethren in the Truth, who spent eight days in earnest study of the involved matters, and at the end of that time were all convinced that it was true. Then he preached on the subject before the Allegheny Church. Then, perhaps three or four months after first coming to the understanding

of Lev. 16, he prepared for, and published in the Feb., 1880, Tower the first article on the tabernacle after he came to see the Truth on Lev. 16. In the March, 1880, Tower appeared the first article on Lev. 16, after the pertinent experience. His inordinate fear was overcome. He had the fulness of peace in the assurance that no man was able to take the sheep out of the good Shepherd's hand. In this great struggle that he had with demons who tried to block his way to the antitypical well, he made an atonement for his soul before the Lord, *i.e.*, he brought himself into harmony with the Lord in the faith that the good Shepherd is to be trusted by each under-shepherd, as keeping His sheep safely. It was at the end of this experience of victory over fear that the Lord gave him the second and chief function of his office of that Servant, charge of the storehouse, he having had since the Spring of 1876 its first function, charge of the household. For the proper functioning of this office it was indispensable for him to come into factual harmony with the Lord's arrangement that the good Shepherd had *the* responsibility for the sheep and would be faithful and efficient in discharging that responsibility, otherwise he would have been constantly busybodying with our Lord's work.

(50) We will now give Bro. Barton's pertinent experience as the antitype of Shammah, David's third most powerful captain (2 Sam. 23: 11, 16), getting his water from that well. Bro. Barton's pertinent weakness was that of fault-finding wherein he was not concerned—he took umbrage at the course of Bro. Russell with A. E. Williamson in 1908 and 1909, when the latter in his attempting to oust the former from the leadership of the work publicly attacked him, was dismissed first from private-secretaryship and later from the pilgrim work, and then later for his continued sifting work was written against by Bro. Russell. In his pertinent course Bro. Russell was thoroughly justified; but Bro. Barton felt that Bro. Russell had not

tried hard enough to recover A. E. Williamson, and therefore took umbrage at his pertinent course. The demons worked on this weakness of Bro. Barton; but he struggled hard against them and gained the victory in the battle: he came to see that his course was one of fault-finding and busybodying and put it aside. After that he gained access to the well and brought out of it the truth that between 1874 and 1878 Jesus by personal encounters with Satan bound him, preparatory to spoiling his house—the demons in their empire over earth (Z '10, 315, 316). But this battle of his had to be fought in order to make an atonement before the Lord—make himself pleased with God's way of ordering the Harvest's management through that Servant.

(51) The antitype of Eleazar (2 Sam. 23: 9, 16) is another brother, who had the weakness of not being properly adjusted in his relations to that Servant as the primary dispenser of the meat in due season. *E.g.*, when brethren would ask him questions on Scriptures that had not been explained by that Servant, instead of declining to answer, on the ground that the Lord had not yet made the matter clear through that Servant, he would venture his own understanding, all the while, however, believing that, not he, but our Pastor was that Servant. In 1910 the Lord brought him face to face with the condition. The question assumed this form: As a teacher of the General Church in relation to that Servant's functions as the Lord's special mouthpiece, what course should he pursue, to avoid, on the one hand, the bowing down and drinking prone in the worship of the messenger, and, on the other hand, giving thoughts to the brethren on Scriptures not first interpreted by that Servant; for he had previously come to see that the latter course was not a right one, as he also had seen that it was wrong to worship the messenger. On this question he had a long-drawn-out internal debate in which the keenest kinds of sophistries,

first from one extreme, then from the other extreme, then from not such distant extremes, were presented to his mind. It was by all odds the sharpest debate, either internal or external, that he ever had. By the Lord's grace he was enabled to beat back every attack made on him in the debate; all the time his will on the matter was laid down in the Lord's hand. Finally he emerged as victor in the battle when he came to see, and subjected himself to the thought, that our Pastor's office functions as that Servant forebade that he should give the brethren any *new* doctrinal, typical or prophetic thoughts until he had first presented them to that Servant and gotten his approval thereon, and that if they were matters of any importance he should not give them out until after that Servant had first given them to the Church. Thus through this struggle he learned the principles that should govern his office work as a general elder in his relations to that Servant's office prerogatives. Thus he made the atonement for his soul before the Lord, *i.e.*, became pleased with the Lord in His arrangements as to the office prerogatives of that Servant and his relations to them. Immediately thereafter he arrived at the well and dipped from it, on the basis of 1 Cor. 10: 1-14, the Truth on the five harvest siftings in themselves and in their relation to the five harvest calls, and then brought it in writing to that Servant, who in Z '13, 198-200, poured out an outline of the pertinent Truth as a drink-offering before the Lord. As at his well experience the Lord gave our Pastor the final function of the office of that Servant, so He seems in connection with this well experience to have set this brother apart for the office of the Epiphany messenger; for much of the Epiphany Truth is based on what he got at the well, even as much of the Parousia Truth was based on what Bro. Russell got at his visit at that well. So does the Lord prepare His servants.

(52) Nor are we to think that the privilege of getting

something new or old out of the storehouse was limited to the three above-described brothers, who are here mentioned merely as striking examples of this kind of an experience. Our Lord assures us that every scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven would be privileged so to do (Matt. 13: 52). In their case the new thing should always have been submitted to that Servant for approval and disposal before it was by them handed out to the household, on the principle that if any servant would find anything in the storehouse of which the steward had no knowledge he should bring it to him and let it be disposed of according to the steward's directions, and not, without his knowledge, approval and disposal, put it on the table for the household's fare. Nor does Matt. 13: 52 limit this privilege to the pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims. Many of the elders (see Chap. II) have had the privilege of getting something new out of the storehouse. We may be sure that in all cases they did not get "things new" out of the storehouse until they had made an atonement for their souls before the Lord, *i.e.*, ridded themselves of certain faults, and thus brought themselves into being pleased with certain things in the Lord, with which they were not formerly in accord. That this was in all cases done by the Parousia pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims in connection with their taking things new and old from the storehouse and their working them up into discourses that they delivered before the General Church, we may be certain, since that is the thing typed of them in v. 50. Thus the Lord required as a preliminary to their getting things new and old out of the storehouse and working them up into discourses, that they make such a kind of an atonement before the Lord, rid themselves of some evil and become pleased with its opposite. Each Parousia pilgrim and auxiliary pilgrim who will make a study of his pertinent experiences will find that it so happened to him. And it was just like the dear Lord in His desire for their profit in

sanctification to put such a requirement on them and help them get blessings as they were loyal.

(53) We are assured in v. 51 that Moses and Eleazar received the jewels of gold at the hands of the captains. This types that the antitypical Moses, as the Divinely appointed Executive, Mouthpiece and Leader, and the antitypical Eleazar, as the Church's High Priest (for this was a Parousia matter), received these discourses for the Divine service and used them there for the good of the Church. According to v. 52 the Lord's tribute was a heave-offering, which would type the fact that these discourses were offered to God to exalt Him in the estimation of the hearers, ascribing praise to His holy name. It will be noted that the shekel weight, 1650, of the jewels is not a multiple of 7; hence they are not to be understood as a work of God. It is not a multiple of 12; hence they are not a work of the Little Flock. While it is a multiple of 10, the quotient, 1,675, not being such a multiple, they are not a work of the Great Company. The facts also prove this; for these discourses were the work of 132 brothers, who are therefore neither the Little Flock, which is in this type represented by 12,000, nor the Great Company, since the Great Company would consist of more brethren yet than 132. Possibly the shekel weight, 16,750, is given to indicate the number of the pertinent discourses that were prepared and delivered by the Parousia pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims. The statement of v. 53, that the men of war had taken spoil every one for himself, types the fact that the brethren apart from the Parousia pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims did not prepare and deliver discourses for the General Church, which the pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims did, as is implied in the expression, "before the Lord," in v.50. Their lessons or discourses or conversations, etc., were of a more private character—"for [or by] themselves," not before the General Church.

(54) Moses and Eleazar (v. 54) taking the jewels of the captains and bringing them into the tabernacle of the congregation for a memorial for the children of Israel before the Lord, types our Lord as the Divinely appointed Executive, Mouthpiece and Leader (Moses) and Church's High Priest (Eleazar) making such discourses memorials in the interests of antitypical Israel in public service as to things related to God (before the Lord). How was this done? By seeing to it that these discourses were in whole or part reduced to writing when as such they were publicly preserved in the Church as memorials. Some of these appeared as articles in the Tower, as sermons or lectures in the Convention Reports, whose official names are Souvenirs, so-called because of being memorials of the conventions; some of them appeared as sermons in various papers; some of them appeared as newspaper reports of lectures; some of them appeared as printed booklets (*e.g.*, Bro. Barton's Discourses, Pastor Russell's Sermons) and some of them appeared as more or less elaborated notes or more or less complete stenographic reports. Thus in one form or another they were given permanency as memorials in the Church. Their chief merit as monuments is that they are so many memorials of the victories of the Parousia pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims over their own sins, errors, selfishness and worldliness. Could they speak of these victories they would give testimonies of delivering grace that would make one of the finest sets of testimonies in the world. But it is enough for the Church that it has them as memorials of such victories of delivering grace! And here we bring to a close our study of Num. 31, which has greatly refreshed our faith in the Lord's Parousia and Epiphany works, typed under the figure of a military campaign and its results.

(1) Whose death anniversary comes October 31? Which one is it? What will we do with it? What else will we do connected with it? During what period? Why

during that period? For what will this chapter of this book serve? Why? How may this chapter of this book be regarded?

(2) What does Num. 31 contain? Under what imagery? In what respects is this imagery set forth? What is set forth in Num. 31: 1-24, 48-54? Under what picture? What features of the war are set forth therein? What is set forth in vs. 25-47? In what of its features? Under what figure? What else of the Parousia are set forth in vs. 13-24? In vs. 48-54? What follows from the fact that the involved story is recorded in the Law? Regardless of what senses that may be given to the word *Law*? How do Gal. 4: 21, Heb. 10: 1 prove this? What second fact, set forth in vs. 6, 19, 24, proves the story to be typical? What third fact? What first fact proves that it types things in the end of the Age? What second fact? What third fact?

(3) What do these three facts deserve? How does Moses' death coming soon after this war prove that Num. 31 types things occurring at the end of the Age? What fact forms the antecedent of this thought? What is the only exception to this fact in Numbers? What does Moses in this exception type? What cannot be typed by Moses' death at the end of Israel's wilderness journey? Why not? How do the cited passages prove this? What gives us the clue to this? What is typed for the Church's High Priest by the death of Israel's high priest? What would this suggest as to the antitype of Moses' death as the Divinely appointed leader, executive and mouthpiece? When does our Lord give up these functions? What is the last general feature of His Gospel-Age work? What two periods does the harvest work cover? In what sense of the word? In what sense is this not so? What conclusion results from the foregoing? What would the pertinent activity of Phinehas at such a time prove? Why? What would Israel's last wilderness-journey encampment in itself and at such a time and place prove? Why? What, therefore, do these three facts prove?

(4) What two facts prove that Jehovah's charging Jesus is typed by God's charging Moses in v. 1? As what was Moses given the typical charge? As what was Jesus given the antitypical charge? Why in each case? What

unhappy translation occurs in v. 2? What proves the translation to be unhappy? Among others, what two translations does the Hebrew word *nakam* have? Which fits better in v. 2? What charge is therein antitypically given our Lord? Why was such a charge appropriate? As what were they so vilified and misrepresented? What brought these evil charges on them? Especially what? Who were the leading Dark-Age theologians? What did they and certain statesmen and lawyers seem to prove against the Faithful? To what did this lead? How did they appear at the hands of theologians and lawyers? What resulted? Why did God give the charge of v. 2?

(5) What is typed by Moses' telling this charge to the people? Through whom did Jesus give the pertinent charge? Not how many were given the charge to arm themselves for the war? Who were? What proves these answers? What does this prove as to the antitype? In what two ways was the antitypical charge carried out? In what form was it carried out? Through whom did our Lord give it? What things did they do in giving it? What do the Midianitish warriors represent? Of whom did they mainly consist? Subordinately consist? Of what two classes did these consist? What were the Faithful to do?

(6) What in v. 3 is given as the object of the war? What remark already made on the Hebrew word *nakam* also belongs here? With what modification? How, accordingly, should the clause be rendered? Why in the type was vindication to be rendered? How do the cited passages prove this? What are we not to understand to exist between the twofold way of giving the charges of vs. 2 and 3? How are they to be harmonized? Whom else do these considerations involve? Why was God in the antitype to be vindicated? How was God in His person, character, plan and works treated by the creed defenders and Truth attackers? By what doctrines was this done? By what other things was this done? Who did these things in the nominal church? What second class have more or less done this? Through what? What third class did more or less of this? Against whom have these three classes of controversialists done this? For what did the Faithful stand? What did these controversialists do to God and His people by their controversies?

(7) What, among other things, did the Parousia witness? In what three ways was this done? Who were, in the first place, thereby vindicated? Who else was in the Parousia vindicated? Doing what things vindicated Him? What kind of a vindication was this? In what respects was it so? What kind of a character did this quality give the vindication? Unworthy of whom is the vindication that the Society's president is leading his followers to advocate? In what respects? Why additionally is it an evil vindication? In what two ways does it fall short, compared with the Parousia's real vindication?

(8) What tribe was exempt from bearing arms in Israel? How many did each of the other tribes deliver for the war? How large was this army? Of whom did it consist? From how many soldiers were they selected? What does such a selection suggest? By how many considerations is this corroborated? What is the first? The second? The third? What particulars are given under the third consideration? How do the cited passages prove this? What is suggested by the fact that 12,000, not 144,000, soldiers were selected? What is not, and what is implied by the number 12,000 as respects the Parousia? How did Jesus give the charge of v. 4? By what did He do it? By what was v. 5 fulfilled?

(9) What does v. 6 tell? What were the holy instruments? What translation proves it? What facts prove it? In what kind of ways is the work of the Parousia symbolically set forth? How many are these? What are they? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What does each of these figures bring out? Which of these figures does our study bring to our attention? What does Moses' sending out the 12,000 type? His sending out Phinehas, the chief under-priest, as commander? What has been shown from Num. 10: 1-10? What has been shown from Num. 10: 8? From Num. 10: 9? To what will these thoughts prove helpful in this connection? What types prove that our Pastor is by them set forth in his capacity as a controversialist during the Parousia?

(10) In how many ways is symbolic war waged? What are these? How was this exemplified by our Pastor in writing and speech? What was his custom in this respect? How did he vary this controversial feature? When was

it always present? In what of his writings is this manifest? In what kind of his oral expressions is this manifest? What does this prove of a part of his activities? How was this warring feature typed in our study? What did he furnish the antitypical 12,000, not indicated in the type? Why does Phinehas type him in these activities? What does this fact occasion as to this chapter? In the prayer, "God bless his memory," what is also involved?

(11) What does v. 7 describe? How? What singular quality did this war have? For what two reasons was this so? What kind of a nation as to population was Midian? What fact proves this? What does this fact make us conclude as to who are meant by all the males in v. 7? What other fact is in line with this? How did the Midianite and Israelite warriors compare as to numbers? How does the antitype suggest this? Why? On what basis alone can we account for all falling on one side and none on the other? Through whose instrumentality was this done? In what way was it probably done? Why was it done? What is typed by this war? Whose part only is typed by the 12,000? What proves this? What is typed by the slaying of the Midianites? And what not? What is typed by all the Midianite warriors being slain? What has God promised in this respect? How do the cited passages prove this? What two things are implied in the type and antitype by the Israelites' warring as the Lord commanded? What do these two things in the antitype prove?

(12) What does a retrospect of the Parousia controversies show as to the suggested antitype? How did it compare as to controversy with other parts of the Gospel Age? In the activities of what four sets of persons is this manifest? Who typed the last of these four sets of persons? How did the pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims take part in this warfare? The elders? The unofficial parts of the Little Flock? The colporteurs? The volunteers? The Bible House family? The extension workers? Photo drama workers? Newspaper workers? Sharpshooters? Where were these controversies carried on? What animated both sides to the conflict, particularly the Little Flock? What can all recall? What kind of a time from the standpoint of our study was the Parousia? What was the result of these controversies for their participants?

(13) What six persons additionally did the Israelites slay in the Midianitish war? What do their names mean? What does *Beor* mean? Whom do the five kings type? What two reasons prove the answer? How in each case is the meaning of his name in line with this? In what sense did the antitypical 12,000 slay these? Who will recall the fulfillments of v. 8?

(14) What is to be noted as to the word *all* in the first clause of v. 9? What do italics in the A. V. mean? What two reasons prove the interpolation here unhappy? What is the literal translation of v. 9? What does this imply as to the warriors and movable property and some women and children and as to civilian men and other women and children? How is this thought proven true? Who were the captured antitypical Midianitish women and children? How in the antitype were these made captives? What two things does this imply?

(15) Of what did the antitypical Midianitish women consist? The boys? What do the captive sheep type? Beeves? What in general do asses symbolize? What examples prove this? How do the cited passages prove this? What corroborates this thought? What do the asses of our study type in the first place? In the second place? What, in the first place, would the captured goods—inanimate objects—type? What four classes of helps did the 12,000 get from these? What two other classes of things did the 12,000 get as antitypical goods? What is true of the Little Flock's Parousia prey and spoil? In what condition did this leave the uncaptured Midianites?

(16) What does v. 10 tell us? What does this imply as to the land and the uncaptured Midianites? What does a city in Bible symbols represent? What three examples prove this? How do the cited passages prove this? What is typed by burning the Midianitish cities by fire? What do castles or palaces in Bible symbols represent? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What in general were antitypical Midian's goodly castles? What were they in particular in the nominal church's part of antitypical Midian? Whose else errors were part of such castles? What is typed by the 12,000 burning by fire Midian's castles? What is the Truth in relation to error? How does the cited passage prove this? In what three ways

do we know this to have happened? In what did this typical and antitypical war result as to God and Israel?

(17) What is set forth in vs. 11, 12? What is meant by the prey? How is this proven by the cited passages? What is meant by the spoil? How is this proven by the cited passages? What is not, and what is meant by the taking of these in v. 11? What in general does this type? In what three ways was this done? What is typed by the 12,000 bringing the prey and spoil to Moses?

(18) What is typed by their bringing these to Eleazar? To the congregation? What example is an illustration of such bringing to the congregation? What two things are typed by the 12,000 bringing these to the camp at the plains of Moab? What do Moab and Ammon usually type? Why is antitypical Israel's last encampment in former Roman Catholic, and not Protestant territory? What is typed by the camp's being at the Jericho Jordan?

(19) What is typed by Moses going forth to meet the returning army? Eleazar? All the princes of the congregation? What in the fulfillment is not indicated in the type? By what do all of us varyingly know that such welcoming occurred? What is typed by welcoming them without the camp? What parallels Moses' and Eleazar's giving such a welcome? How are the antitypical welcomes related? What is the difference as to the number of typical kings defeated in each case? Why this difference? What typical example proves this? What difference is indicated in the after attitude of welcomers—type and antitype? What would this not imply? Why not? What Scriptural principle underlies these two different attitudes?

(20) Why, despite the record's silence, did Moses doubtless express pleasure at the victory? Why was this not recorded of Moses? What rather was recorded? Why? Against whom was this anger directed? Who were their antitypes? Whom do the twelve most active and effective of these antitype? Whom of the antitypical twelve are we at present not able positively to identify? What enables us to identify three of them with certainty? Four others with a good degree of certainty? Three others with a fair degree of certainty? The remaining two with less certainty? Whom do the other 120 officers

type? With what are we unable to identify nine of them? Why was Jesus displeased with the captains?

(21) What did the non-virgins and boys not deserve? What was to blame for bringing them to the camp? What does this type? Whom do the non-virgins type? The boys? What evil desire was in the antitypical soldiers? By what was this suggested? What did this evil desire lead the antitypical soldiers to neglect? What should they have done with those not meeting these conditions? Whom did the Lord Jesus hold mainly responsible for this neglect? Why was this just? Against whom did these facts arouse His anger mainly? What is typed by the killing of the non-virgins and boys? Through whom did it usually occur? Amid what circumstances did it usually occur? Exceptionally? Whom do the virgins type? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? By whom was the charge given to preserve these and cut off the non-virgins and boys? How? How was it executed toward the virgins? By whom were these charges executed? What was realized thereby?

(22) What will next be expounded? What verses of Num. 31 give a speech of Moses? In giving such a speech what does he type as to our Lord? What do his directions in vs. 19, 20 type? What is implied by the charge of v. 19, to remain without the camp? What does it type? What is typed by their remaining without the camp *seven days*? What does the camp here not type? Why? What is typed by killing a soul? By touching the slain? What must be done in these respects if we are to enter the Kingdom? What is typed by the third-day cleansing? When did this fight begin? When will it end?

(23) What considerations connect the third-day cleansing with that of justification? From what does this not cleanse us? Why not? From what does it cleanse us? How is it effected? What does the seventh-day cleansing type? In these respects who do we know by experience? How did Jesus fulfill the antitype of Moses' directions as to the cleansing? Through what means did he speak these exhortations? What do the pertinent facts prove?

(24) What is given in v. 20? What do garments symbolize? What did the charge as to cleansing the garments type? Like what curtains in typical thought are the

allusions to the things of skin? What is typed by the tabernacle curtains of rams' skins dyed red? By the badger skins? What is typed by cleansing the things of skin? What does the tabernacle curtain of goats' hair type? What is typed by the cleansing of every work of goats' hair? What does the wood in the tabernacle type? What is typed by the cleansing of the things of wood? What is typed by Moses' exhortation to the warriors to cleanse themselves? What in general is typed by the exhortation to cleanse the five things mentioned in v. 20?

(25) What does Eleazar give in vs. 21-24? What is the distinction between Moses' and Eleazar's giving pertinent instructions? Antitypically, what four functions of our Lord's work are thereby indicated? How does Jesus fulfill the first of these? The second? The third? The fourth? What does experience show on these four works of Jesus? What is typed by Eleazar's statement in v. 21? What is typed by the expression, ordinance of the law, in v. 21? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What does experience teach us in this respect?

(26) How many methods of cleansing are set forth in vs. 22, 23? What are they? On what was each one respectively to be applied? Why was this typical distinction made? Antitypically thereof what do Scriptures and experience teach is one of the methods of cleansing? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? By what method is this typed? What other method do Scriptures and experience show is used? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? By what is this method typed? What is the distinction between the antitypical washing with water and sprinkling with the water of separation? How is the cleansing by the antitypical water alone effected? In what cases only does this method suffice? For what is it alone not sufficient? What is necessary to remove these? What must one do to secure their removal? What variety in duration in securing the desired results prevails? Why this in each case? How long does it last in some cases? In some even until what? By what means do we know these things? What do we know as antitypical of Eleazar's pointing out the types? Through what did He do this?

(27) In what do Eleazar's directions given in v. 24 find

their antitypes? What are the antitypical clothes? What does their cleansing mean? What must be done as to such garments? In what two respects? At what time does this type show the antitype occurred? What results from the failure to do this? From success therein maintained? What is typed by washing the clothes on the seventh day? How was the antitype of v. 24 fulfilled?

(28) What remark is appropriate here? What remark was made in paragraph (2) on Num. 31: 1-24, 48-54? What does our study of vs. 1-24 prove on this point? Why so? What is not, and what is, the character of the suggested antitypes? What things of the Parousia are brought out clearly in the type? What antitypical feature is brought out in v. 2? In vs. 2, 3? Vs. 4-6? Vs. 7, 8? Vs. 9, 10? Vs. 11, 12? V. 13? Vs. 14-16? V. 17? V. 18? Vs. 19, 20? Vs. 20-23? V. 24? What will everyone conversant with the pertinent matters recognize? What do the pertinent facts prove? Where will more facts be found to the same effect? What conclusion may be well drawn from this study?

(29) What as to vs. 25-47 was stated in the second paragraph of the chapter now under consideration? Who is the source of the Truth and of carrying out God's plan? To whose stewardship did He entrust them? How is this typically shown? What is typed by His commanding Moses, and through him Eleazar and the chief fathers of the congregation, to count the prey? What is symbolized by numbering or counting, in the Bible? What Scripture proves this? Explain the details of Ps. 48: 12 so as to prove this. What conclusion do we draw from this passage?

(30) What, accordingly, is the charge antitypical of the one in v. 26? Of what did the antitypical spoil consist? What was charged as to it by the Lord? What does Moses' counting the spoil type? Eleazar's counting it? Why do we say that the Head and Body is typed by Eleazar here? What is typed by the chief fathers of the congregation counting the spoil? What further confirmation is given by this fact?

(31) As antitypical of Moses, how did Jesus begin to give this description? When? Since then how has He been giving it? For what will the start of this description account? For what will its continuance account? How

do the Head and Body as the World's High Priest do this numbering? What comparison between crown-lost leaders helps to clarify matters on this point? What do the Epiphany crown-lost leaders offer? What is its character? What in due time will be done to it? What do the observed facts since 1914 prove? What does this corroborate?

(32) What is typically set forth in vs. 27-47? How is it indicated? What two other facts corroborate this? What two other facts prove it as to the Little Flock? What two other similar facts prove it as to the Great Company? From the standpoint of comparative proportion, what other fact proves it as to both classes? Quote and explain Num. 18: 26-28 as the proof on this last point. How do Eleazar and Aaron figure in this comparison? What further point proves this? What will be done with this point later? What point is in harmony with this?

(33) What is represented by the cattle and sheep? What do the asses represent? What first fact proves that asses represent these things? What second fact? When asses and horses are used contrastedly in the symbols, what does each represent? When not contrasted? What will the antitypical facts prove as to the asses? What in the creeds is especially true? What other things therein are true? In general, what is the character of the creeds? What types the truths in the creeds? What else do these asses type? What are examples of these under four heads? What give more or less of these four heads combinedly? Amid errors what do these contain? What two classes, according to the type, have gotten such symbolic asses? What, accordingly, do the pertinent facts show?

(34) What statement was made above? For what does the number 7 and its multiples stand? The number 12 and its multiples? Where was this shown? For what does the number 10 and its multiples stand? Quote and explain the cited passages as proofs. What use is to be made of these symbolic numerics?

(35) How many sheep were captured? Beeves? Asses? Virgins? What is the total of these? What is the division? What is the symbolism of the divisions made as to this total? To what does this symbolic language correspond?

(36) How much of the total units was given the warriors? What was its number? In what order should 7, 12 and 10 be divided into it? Why this order with this part of the spoil? What is the division? What does the symbolism of these divisors here teach? What does this fit?

(37) What was the total of the spoil units given the congregation? In what order are 7, 10 and 12 to be divided into it? Why? What is the division? What does the symbolism of these divisors here teach? What does this fit?

(38) What, according to vs. 37-40, were the units of the Lord's tribute, and their total? In what order are 7, 12 and 10 divided into the total? Why? What does the symbolism of these divisors here teach? Why? What does this fit?

(39) How many units, compared to the Lord's tribute, were given to the Levites? What were the units of each kind and the total? In what order will 7, 10 and 12 be divided into this total? Why? What does the symbolism of these divisors here teach? What does this fit?

(40) How much of the warriors' total units remained in their hands? What is peculiar about this remainder? In what order are 7, 12 and 10 divided into it? Why? What does the symbolism of these divisors here teach? What does this fit?

(41) How many units of the spoil remained in the congregation's hands? What is peculiar about this remainder? In what order are 7, 10 and 12 divided into it? What does the symbolism of these divisors here teach? What does this fit? What is to be said of the remainder, 49? How many problems have been worked out above? Of what is this number symbolic?

(42) What question does this raise? What answer should this question receive? Why? How will the probability be counted? How might it justifiably be counted? To what other numbers does this remark apply? What would have to be done with the results of all of them? What would then have to be done with this result compounded with the similarly compounded result of the second problem? With this compounded result and the similarly compounded result of the third problem? Etc?

What would the final result be? To what would this reduce the claim of accident? What is the result of this?

(43) How did it occur that these figures teach these meanings? What quality only could work out so involved a matter? What does the matter under study prove? Through what agency did God work these results? What other two things in the story of Num. 31 suggest miraculous intervention of angels? What third thing in this account suggests the miraculous? How may the results, therefore, be summarized? What third consideration is involved in this matter? How is it proven? What does this prove? What might we well say?

(44) What does v. 31 say? What is commanded Moses, Eleazar and the chief fathers of the congregation? Despite this, who only were commanded to make the divisions of the spoil? Who did not participate therein? Why not? What other two facts prove their unfitness therefore? What proves that our Lord as antitype of Moses, and the World's High Priest, Head and Body, as antitype of Eleazar, supervise the division of the antitypical spoil? Between what two things, accordingly, is there harmony? What may, therefore, the Epiphany Under-priests do? Despite what? Why? What did our study of vs. 1-24 prove? What does our study of vs. 25-47 prove? What effect should this study have?

(45) What is recorded in vs. 48-54? What do the facts of the case prove? Whom do the twelve captains of thousands type? The 120 captains of hundreds type? Why did the Lord not allow this episode to occur and to be recorded before the events of vs. 25-47? What order did He therein follow in the antitype? And not what order? What order was followed in the type? What according to vs. 48 and 49, did the captains do? What does this type? What was the report, type and antitype? How in general was the antitypical report made? How in particular was it made? What was the character of the typical and antitypical preservation?

(46) What did the captains bring to the Lord? Of what did it consist? What will enable us to see the antitypes? What were the antitypes? Of how many kinds were the typical jewels? In a general way, what do these five kinds of jewels type? What do necklaces type?

What two Biblical facts prove this? How does each Scripture of the two sets of passages cited prove this? What do the necklaces here type? What do the bracelets type? What will clarify this? What do the hands symbolize? How do the cited passages prove this? What do the feet symbolize? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? On what were bracelets worn in Palestine? What do they represent when worn on the wrists or hands? On the ankles or feet? What, accordingly, did the captains' bracelet oblation represent?

(47) In Bible symbols what do rings represent? How do the cited passages prove this? What, accordingly, did the ring oblation of v. 50 represent? Why did the antitypical captains prepare many discourses on the New Creature? In Bible symbols what do ears represent? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What do earrings, accordingly, symbolize? Why? What did the captains' earring oblation represent? Why did the antitypical captains have many discourses on matters of faith? What was the last kind of jewels mentioned in the A. V. of v. 50? What is the modern word for *tablets*? What is the Hebrew word so translated? How is it rendered in the R. V. of Is. 3: 20? What does the antitype suggest as the right translation? What does perfume in Bible symbols represent? How do the cited passages prove this? What does incense perfume represent? What, accordingly, do these perfume boxes represent? How did the antitypical captains come to prepare so many discourses on the graces? Of what fact is there no doubt? With what is the explanation on the captains' oblation in harmony? What quality, accordingly, does it have?

(48) What is stated at the end of v. 50? How, in common with almost all other typical speeches, was the captains' speech antityped? What statement at first seems strange? Why? How does this strangeness fade away? What are the two parts of the atonement? Whose work solely is it to make atonement in the first sense? Why? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? Whose work alone is not the atonement in its second part? Whose work is it initially? Whose combined work is it thereafter? How do we do our part in it? Which of these two parts in the atonement work is typed in v. 50?

(49) How was this done? To whose experience is reference first made as an illustration of the process? What qualities of his were overcome in the experience? With what was it connected? What was the occasion of the antitype? What fact made our Pastor especially apprehensive? Where has this experience been given in some detail? Who took advantage of his fear? What did they do? What did he in turn do? Where did he arrive by the time he beat down their attacks? What did he do there? What did his victory make him abstain from doing immediately? Instead, what did he first do? What did this conference do? What did he then do? What thereafter? How long after seeing the light on the subject? In what two Towers was this first done? What did his victory give him? What did his great struggle effect? What does this mean? What did the Lord give him after the victory? When did he get the first function of his office as that Servant? Why was it necessary for him to win the pertinent victory? What would otherwise have occurred?

(50) Whose pertinent experience will next be given? Whose antitype was he in it? What was the pertinent fault? Under what circumstances did it work? Whose course in this matter was justified? How did Bro. Barton feel about it? Who worked on his pertinent weakness? What did he do against them? What followed immediately? What was the truth that he brought forth from the antotypical well? Why did he have to fight this battle?

(51) What was the fault of Eleazar's (2 Sam. 23: 9, 16) antitype? How did this fault show itself? What did the Lord do on this matter in 1910? How did the question present itself? Why in this form? What occurred in his mind on this question? What was the character of the debate? What was he enabled to do? What was his will's attitude therein? In what did his victory consist? What did he learn through this struggle? What was this in reality? What happened immediately thereafter? What did he do with it? What did that Servant do with it? What at the well experience did the Lord give that Servant? What did the Lord seem to do at the well experience with the pertinent brother? Why is this true in each case?

(52) What conclusion is not to be drawn from these three cases? As what only should they serve? What does Jesus say on it? How should these "scribes" have acted as to the "things new"? On what principles? To whom does Matt. 13: 52 not limit this privilege? Of what may we be sure in general? In particular? Why? What was required of them by the Lord in this particular? What will, on study, each Parousia pilgrim and auxiliary pilgrim find on this subject? How was this just like the Lord?

(53) Of what does v. 51 assure us? What does this fact type? Why does Eleazar here type the Church's High Priest? What, according to v. 52, was the character of the Lord's tribute? What would it as such type? Of what is the shekel weight, 16,750, not a multiple? What results therefrom? Of what else is it not a multiple? What results therefrom? What two reasons prove that the shekel weight does not designate Great Company matters? What does this number possibly indicate? What is typed by the fact that the men of war (the captains excepted) took spoil everyone for or by himself? What further expression shows that the antitype concerns general elders? For whom were the lessons of others?

(54) What is typed by Moses and Eleazar bringing the jewels into the tabernacle for a memorial for the Israelites before the Lord? How was the antitype done? As what did these appear? What resulted therefrom? What is their chief merit? What should therein suffice the Church? What has this study effected? In what? How was this typed?

Soldiers of Christ, arise,
And put your armor on,
Strong in the strength which God supplies
Through His eternal Son.

That having all things done,
And all your conflicts past,
Ye may o'ercome, through Christ alone,
And stand entire at last.

CHAPTER V. IN MEMORIAM.

ACTIVITIES OF PASTOR RUSSELL. THAT SERVANT. HIS MEMORY
STILL FRAGRANT. WILL HIS WORK ENDURE? GOD BLESS HIS
MEMORY! THE EPIPHANY PROVES HIM THAT SERVANT. HIS
WILL.

AS THE anniversary of our Pastor's passing beyond the veil, October 31 will always be a date of special sacredness to God's saints. Eight years ago [written in 1924] the whole Church was shocked by the news of his departure. Loath were we to believe it true, until the evidence became unanswerable; and then we realized our great loss, but his great gain. So greatly did we love him, and so greatly did he enter into our experiences, that his going away left a void in our lives. His memory is fragrant and blest to us. Connected with it are some of the greatest joys and privileges of our lives. He will ever occupy in our hearts the large place that his holy character, unselfish service and faithful sufferings have won for him. That his memory may still continue fragrant and blest to us let us together briefly review the activities, achievements and attainments of this eminent saint of God. He certainly was a SCHOLAR in the true sense of that term. Those who require a university diploma as indispensable evidence of learning will deny him the merit of scholarship. However, there are not a few cases of scholars that were self-made, gaining their knowledge apart from the schools of the learned world. Among such our Pastor won a high place. Apart from English he was not a linguist, though he learned how to use well for his Biblical work the gains of the best scholarship in Greek and Hebrew. He was deeply versed in history, as his writings attest. So thoroughly did he understand business that able financiers eagerly sought his advice. His writings show that he was at home in the perplexing questions of industry, economics,

sociology, capital and labor. The realms of philosophy were deeply explored by him, and he was an expert in theoretical and practical psychology and phrenology. Few have understood the workings of the human intellect and heart so well as he. Human anatomy and physiology were open books to him. His knowledge of these sciences, combined with that of medicine, made him a physician; and though he had no medical diploma, he attained better results in the healing art than the average physician. However, his real eminence in learning was in the domain of theology, in which he was without a peer since the days of the Apostles. His knowledge of the Bible was phenomenal; and when other theologians will have been discarded, he will be recognized as a standing authority in this the greatest of all sciences.

Naturally such a scholar would be a writer. Very few human beings have written more than he. His correspondence alone was sufficient for the life work of an industrious and talented man. When it is remembered that some years over 300,000 letters and postals were written to him, and that he supervised the answers to this huge mail, and attended to no small share of it himself, we can realize something of the amount of his correspondence and the time and labor involved. As an author he produced six unrivaled books on the Bible whose combined circulation during his life aggregated 10,000,000 copies. As a bookleteer he published a number of booklets of great value, one of which, on Hell, has been circulated more widely than any other booklet ever written. He produced over 200 tracts, some of which attained a circulation of over 50,000,000 copies. His sermons, appearing regularly every week for thirteen years, were published part of that time simultaneously in over 2,000 newspapers, having a combined circulation of over 15,000,000 copies. He edited a semi-monthly religious magazine with a circulation of about 45,000 copies. His Scenario of the "Photo-Drama

of Creation" has had a wide circulation, as is also the case with his Angelophone record lectures. His articles on the International Sunday School Lessons have reached many Sunday School teachers in a special publication, as well as in his semi-monthly magazine and in hundreds of newspapers. He was a regular contributor to several magazines, and, apart from his regular weekly sermon, was a frequent contributor of special articles to newspapers, some of which also carried reports of his frequent lectures.

Nor was his work as a lecturer on a small scale. Most well-known lecturers have only a few lectures that they use year in and year out. Not so with him. He lectured on hundreds of subjects which were of compelling interest, as well as of recognized difficulty. His lectures were direct, clear, simple, logical and convincing. His powers of exposition and proof were of the first order, and were so well in hand as to appeal to the learned and unlearned alike, an unequaled proof of genius. Wherever he was announced to speak, the largest and best auditoriums were crowded, and frequently thousands and usually hundreds were turned away, unable to gain entrance. He did not depend on the tricks of oratory to win his hearers. He appealed to their heads and hearts in that simple and direct manner which wins the hearer without oratorical fireworks. He was the most cosmopolitan lecturer that ever lived, having addressed audiences in this capacity in almost every country on earth, traveling between 1,000,000 and 2,000,000 miles to meet his appointments.

As a preacher he was even more widely known than as a lecturer. Wherever he worked as a lecturer he addressed more private audiences as a preacher. This acquired for him the title, "The Ubiquitous Preacher." It can be more correctly said of him than of any other preacher that the World was his parish. His spoken sermons were published in the newspapers, reaching millions of readers weekly. These sermons appeared

in many languages; and before he died his pen products had been published in some forty languages. As a preacher he appealed to the hearts of his hearers through their heads; and his ability to strike home to the hearts and heads of his hearers through suitable Bible verse or illustration the thoughts that he was seeking to impress was marvelous. His genuine and unaffected love for God and man gave a power to his utterances that drove them home, where mere eloquence and oratory would have been effectless. His sermons, therefore, always elevated head and heart.

He was the most notable of pastors. His clearness of insight into the problems of his day, his knowledge of human nature, his intuition of the condition and needs of the individual, his single-hearted consecration to God and devotion to the interests of His people, his large sympathy, benevolence and hope as respects others, his grip on the purpose of his ministry, and his knowledge of the spiritual dangers of his times and of the safeguards needed by those in danger, made him a real pastor, a genuine shepherd of God's sheep. As many as 1200 different churches at one time claimed him as their pastor. He had "the care of all the churches." As a pastoral advisor he was expert; as a pastoral comforter he was inspiriting; as a pastoral corrector he was tactful and fruitful; and as a pastoral leader he was unobtrusive, yet all-persuasive and effective. These qualities made him a part of the very life of those whose pastor he was, and bound him to them by ties that death itself has not severed. This is why the tens of thousands that chose him as their pastor have, up to the present, eight years [now twenty-two years] after his death, chosen no successor to him.

No review of him would be complete without treating of his activities as a reformer. He was every inch a reformer and stood in the front rank of the reformers of all Ages. Error never had an antagonist more to

be dreaded than he, who with thoroughness of disproof of error's claims combined tact, sympathy, gentleness and charity that left no personal sting after his onslaughts. If he hated error greatly, he loved the errorist more greatly, and always sought to help him, while overthrowing his wrong theories. The superstitions connected with the penalty of sin and the state of the dead were the especial objects of his attacks; and he never let an opportunity of attacking them pass by unused. The superstitious and the infidel alike felt the logic of his attacks; and the devout student of the Word found in him a champion who knew how to vindicate the truthfulness of the Bible and to refute the errors of the superstitious, and the unbeliefs of the infidel. His insistence on a faith harmonious with Scripture, Reason and Fact was an inspiration to the Bible believer and a terror to the creedist and infidel. His forty-five years of continued attacks on the strongholds of error and superstition largely undermined them for real students of the Word. But his work as a reformer was more than destructive of error and superstition. It left not his hearers victims of unbelief. On the contrary, he unfolded a harmonious, reasonable and Scriptural view of the Bible that evidences the inspiration of the Scriptures. Thus he gave others a sound and reasonable basis for their faith in "The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture," while destroying caricatures of Scriptural teachings handed down by the superstition of the Dark Ages. Consequently those who looked to him as their leader in reform were not left with stately ruins as the sum total of his and their labors. Rather, beside and instead of the ruins of the Temple of Error he erected the Sanctuary of Truth as a refuge against all the storms of doubt, superstition and unbelief. And in this fact his real worth as a reformer is recognizable.

He was great as an executive. A phrenologist once seeing his picture, but not knowing whose it was,

remarked that he was either a merchant prince or the president of a Theological Seminary! Already in his teens his executive abilities made him the owner and director of a large business which was soon increased until it occupied four large stores in various cities. As a business man he acquired experiences that fitted him for his future work. His executive abilities were such as enabled him to grasp the details as well as the generalities of his many enterprises. He was profitably interested in dozens of enterprises aside from his great religious work, to which he gladly devoted the profits of his secular business. Aside from his purely secular business interests his religious activities required high and varied executive ability. He not only produced the vast literature of his movement, but he directed its publication and distribution. Hence he saw to the publication and circulation of his books, booklets, tracts, sermons, lectures, scenarios, Sunday School lessons, magazines, lecture records and magazine articles, assisted, of course, by an able staff of co-laborers. He organized and directed seven branch offices in foreign countries. He supervised a Biblical correspondence school. At least two hours daily he gave to directing a Theological School in the Bethel home. For twenty-two years he controlled a Lecture Bureau that for several years had a staff of over 300 lecturers. He managed for thirty years a propaganda work that at times had 1000 colporteurs in its service. He directed for twenty-five years a tractarian movement in which at times nearly 10,000 individuals took part. For three years he directed the preparation and for two and a half years managed the exhibition of the "Photo-Drama of Creation" in hundreds of cities, and in many countries, before over 15,000,000 people. He was the guiding spirit in over 1500 churches, and at the headquarters of his work daily presided as the head of the family over his co-laborers who, for many years averaging 175 members, lived together as a family. In this

capacity he took cognizance of all sorts of details in storehouse, kitchen, laundry, dining room, living rooms, hospital, library, study, drawing room and parlor.

Had he been eminent in any one of the seven capacities in which we have viewed him (and we could profitably view him from others, so many-sided was this remarkable man), he would properly be considered a great man. But to have been eminent in all of them, and to have been in some of them without a peer, prove him to have been a *genius of the first order*. History will yet give him a place among the very greatest of men. While dealing with him it is necessary in doing him justice to use superlatives. If we were to reduce his qualities to two, we know of no others to use more truly and fittingly to characterize him than those used of him by Him whose steward he was: "FAITHFUL AND WISE." His life was a great success to himself and a great blessing to others; his death was a great loss to others and a great gain to him; and his memory has been and is a benediction and an inspiration to the Church, and in due time will be to the world. "*God bless his memory!*"

It is fitting that we who prize his ministry as especially Divinely arranged and directed should consider him as "that Servant," according to Matt. 24: 45-47 and Luke 12: 42-46. There is even at this late date more or less confusion among some of the Truth people as to who or what is meant by the expression, "that Servant." According to several views the expression, "that Servant," refers to a class. Some claim that, understood as a class, the expression, "that Servant," means the teachers in the Church; others claim that it means the Little Flock; and more latterly still, others—the Tower editors and their disciples—claim that it means the Society, by which we must understand either the Society's directors, organized with their agents, or the shareholders, or both combined. This latter thought we have refuted in detail in Vol. VI. In Z '96, 47, and

in D 613, 614, our dear Pastor modestly gave the proofs that the expression, "that Servant," refers to an individual, *i.e.*, to himself. With this view all well instructed Truth people agreed, until lately the Society leaders, to make their usurped powers more secure, spread the opinion that the Society, a business corporation, is "that Servant." Accordingly, the Tower editors and their followers must be reckoned among those who teach that "that Servant" is not an individual, but is a class.

The Scriptures (Matt. 24: 45-47; Luke 12: 42-46) clearly refute such claims, teaching that the expression "that Servant" means an individual. In both passages "that Servant" is clearly distinguished from the Church, because he is spoken of as being made "ruler over His [the Lord's] household"; hence he cannot be the household, the Church. Again, the fact that he is spoken of as giving them "meat in due season" distinguishes him from the "household," the Church. Furthermore, his being called the "steward" proves that all of the servants of the household cannot be meant, for the steward is the special representative of the householder, having in charge all the latter's goods during his time of office, and as such has also all the other servants in his charge. (In our Lord's day individuals, not classes, were stewards). Moreover, he is expressly distinguished in Luke 12: 45 from all the other servants, in that he is forbidden "to beat the menservants and maidens," *i.e.*, all the other servants of the Church. Hence the expression "that Servant" cannot mean the servants of the Church as a class, because in this passage he is clearly distinguished from them. Therefore, in view of the fact that these two Scriptures distinguish him from the Church as a whole and from all of the other servants of the Truth, we should conclude that he must be an individual.

Furthermore, the facts of the harvest history prove that an individual, our sainted Pastor, is meant by that

expression. For the Harvest, understood as the reaping and gleaning period, is passed. During that time not a class, *i.e.*, neither the Church, nor all servants of the Truth, nor the Society, had the entire Storehouse in their charge, nor gave the meat in due season, nor ruled the harvest work; but "that Servant" alone did these things. Hence he alone fulfilled the prophecy. Nor could it have been reasonably done otherwise. How could the entire Church have had the entire Storehouse in its charge? or have given itself the meat in due season? or have ruled the work? How could all of the servants of the Truth have had these privileges? And have not the divisions in the Church, caused by various power-grasping leaders, proven the unreasonableness of the attempt to rule the Church by all the leaders? Moreover, how could a "*dummy* corporation" with "*dummy* directors" have ruled the household, given the meat in due season and had charge of all the goods? From these considerations we see the absurdity of the teaching of those who claim that the expression, "that Servant," means a class. Truly, during the reaping and gleaning time our Pastor had charge of all the goods, and gave the meat in due season. Practically every feature of the harvest message was first seen by him, and was then first taught by him to the Church. This he did in his teaching and preaching, through his books, booklets, tracts, magazines and other publications. So, too, every branch of the harvest work was in its general aspects under his charge. Thus he directed the pilgrim, colporteur, volunteer, newspaper, extension, pastoral, photo-drama, publicity, Tabernacle and Bethel work. Only those who are ignorant of the facts, or who "to draw away disciples after themselves" or for some other reprehensible reason misrepresent the facts, would deny the facts stated in this paragraph. And these facts unanswerably prove that the privileges and work outlined in Matt. 24: 45-47

and Luke 12: 42-44 were fulfilled in our Pastor alone. He alone was "that Servant."

And, true to these passages, he was appointed to this office after our Lord's Return, as a reward for being found faithfully administering the food to the household *when the Lord came*, which was before the Society existed, and which proves that the Society cannot be "that Servant." So, too, in his office work he was both faithful and wise; and therefore he was blessed by the Lord according to these Scriptures with a continuance in his office. In calling him faithful our Lord prophesied that he would be loyal to the end. So responsible and trialsome was his office that the Lord deemed it wise to give him, as a special caution, the words of Luke 12: 45, 46—not to deny His Second Presence, not to mistreat the servants who were put into his charge, nor selfishly to feed himself to the neglect of the household, nor to imbibe error. If he should fail to heed these warnings, God said that he would be cut off from the Little Flock, as well as lose his stewardship, as an unfaithful servant. Nor were these merely idle warnings; for so responsible was his office that, if he should have proven untrue, he could have committed untold evil, even as "that evil servant" by his unfaithfulness has wrought unutterable evil in the Church. But "that faithful and wise servant" heeded the Lord's admonitions, and proved true in the exercise of his office to the end; and through his very faithfulness he was privileged to fulfill official obligations and privileges that gave him a wider and more fruitful field of service than any other servant of God ever had on this earth, our Lord alone excepted. Therefore, well may we thank God for every remembrance of Him, and pray daily, God bless his memory!

Our beloved Pastor's ministry in life toward us was one of the rich blessings that the Lord has bestowed upon us, and in death his writings and the memory of his holy character, unselfish ministry and faithful

sufferings on behalf of the Lord, the Truth and the brethren continue to bless us. Surely, if we were bereaved of what he was and still is to us, much of great value now and hereafter would be lost to us. Very few persons who have lived have left so rich a legacy to others as "that faithful and wise Servant" left to the Church; and the sweet incense of his offering abides with us as a sacred memory, a good example and a strong inspiration. Surely we have abundant reason to praise and thank God for every memory of him, and well may we daily pray, "God bless his memory!" We are sure that all Epiphany-enlightened ecclesias will be glad to hold memorial services for him on the anniversaries of his passing beyond the veil, and that on those days isolated Epiphany-enlightened saints will spend some time in private memorial services for him.

But while he means much to the faithful, it is indeed sad to note how some who make loud professions of loyalty to his teachings and memory, and who, because the use of his name brings them advantage, employ it as a charm with which to bewitch others, vie with one another in the work of casting off various of his teachings. The P.B.I., for a while lauding him as "that Servant," at the same time endorsed a chronology which he as "that Servant" after mature study very properly rejected; and they dignify that chronology (rejected by him, ninety-seven years ago proven false, and during the 1908-1911 sifting used by the sifters against our Scriptural chronology) as advancing light on the path of the just not due in his day to be understood, but since "discovered" as "new Truth" by them! The Society, for years claiming to have been his successor as "that Servant," has been casting aside many features of his Charter, Will, arrangements and teachings. Every Levitical movement praises him in one breath, and undergoes nausea at some of his teachings and arrangements in the next breath. The Olsonites, rejecting all of his prophetic teachings, have vitiated

fundamental doctrines taught by him. One of the Swedish pilgrims in his periodical teaches that our Pastor lost his crown. Another Swedish pilgrim in still another periodical denies that he was "that Servant," claiming that the title "that Servant" means a class—the teaching brethren in the Church from Pentecost to our Lord's Return. This pilgrim's arguments we will briefly review at this time, believing that we have previously refuted every other form of teaching that denies to our Pastor the exclusive privilege of being "that Servant," and have proven above that the expression "that Servant" means an individual, and not a class.

The first argument that this brother presents is that the Diaglott translation proves that the office of "that Servant" was exercised before our Lord's Return: "Happy that servant whom his Master *at His arrival* shall find so employed," *i.e.*, giving the meat in due season (Matt. 24: 46). Had the brother who makes this criticism an accurate knowledge of Greek, or, having it, had he used it in studying the Greek text of this verse, he would not have based his argument upon the italicized phrase above. The Aorist participle, *elthon*, which expresses non-continued past action, should not have been rendered "at his arrival"; rather it should have been translated "after coming." The verse in question should therefore be rendered as follows: "Blessed that servant whom his Lord, after coming, shall find so doing." As the Aorist participle *elthon* denotes a non-repeated past action, so the present participle, *poionta*, denotes a present continued action in the time of the activity of the verb on which it is dependent. Hence the passage shows that *after*, not *at*, our Lord's arrival He would find a certain servant continuing to give the meat as due. The following facts will elucidate this. About Sept. 12, 1874, our Lord returned. About Sept. 21, 1874, our Pastor came to understand, and then immediately afterwards began

to teach, the invisibility of the Second Advent as the first feature of the harvest Truth (C 88, par. 4; Z '16, 171, pars. 2, 3). From then on he continued faithfully to teach the Truth as due, including the fact of the Lord's Return (Z '16, 171, pars. 10-13), the awakening of the sleeping saints (Z '16, 172, pars. 5-8), etc., until in 1879 the Lord made him "that Servant," at the time that He gave him the light on the Tabernacle. Thus the facts are in harmony with the literal translation of the passage: (1) our Lord came, (2) our Pastor for nearly four years continued faithfully to give the meat (the Lord found him "so doing" during those years), and then (3) the Lord promoted him to be "that Servant." Thus, instead of this verse teaching that the office of "that Servant" would be exercised before our Lord's Return, it teaches the reverse—that only *after* the Lord's Return and after the faithful servant's continuance in giving the meat for some time was he promoted to be "that Servant."

The brother's second argument is that *after* our Lord's Return, "that Servant" was rewarded for his faithfulness manifested *before* the Lord's Return, with being put over all the Master's goods. Hence he argues that he represents the faithful servants from Pentecost onward. This argument is false, because it is based upon the false premise of the first argument, *i.e.*, that "that Servant" was exercising this office before our Lord's arrival. Having above shown that its basis—his first argument—is false, this argument falls with his first argument to the ground.

The brother's third point is that "that Servant" was warned not to say in his heart, "My Lord delays to come." From this the brother argues that this warning could be applicable only before the Lord's Return, and, therefore, he argues, this proves that "that Servant's" office was exercised before our Lord's Return. Our answer to this argument is the following: Not before, but only after our Lord's Second Advent could one be

blamed for saying, "My Lord delays to come," *i.e.*, be blamed for denying that the Second Advent had set in. Before our Lord's Return it would have been proper to deny that His Second Advent had set in. But if one should once have known that the Lord's Second Advent had set in, and then later have given up that belief, then he would have said a condemnable thing, if he asserted that the Lord was delaying His Second Advent, *i.e.*, that it had not yet set in, but that it was a future event. The Lord knew that all sorts of arguments would be brought against the chronology to disprove the thought that the Second Advent had set in. Knowing that such a view would lead to giving up the harvest work, He cautioned "that Servant" not to give way to these arguments, and as a result give up faith in the Second Advent as having set in; for if he should deny this point of his faith, it would imply that his heart ("shall say in his *heart*") had become wrong; and it would surely move him to give up the harvest work, and thus would make him unfaithful to his office. The caution not to deny the Lord's Return as having set in not only does not prove that the office of "that Servant" was exercised before our Lord's Return, but positively disproves such a thought, by proving that such a condemnable denial on the part of the incumbent of that Servant's office could come only after the Lord's Return had set in.

The brother's fourth argument is that that Servant's unfaithfulness *could* only have preceded the Lord's Return, because the Lord threatens that if "that Servant" should prove unfaithful, his Lord would in an unexpected day and at an unknown hour *come* and cut him off. It will be noticed that the brother uses the expression, "will come" (Luke 12: 46), as signifying the setting in of the Lord's Second Advent. By the expression, "will come," in this sentence our Lord did not mean His Second Advent as setting in, any more than He meant His Second Advent as setting in when He

said to the Ephesus and Pergamos phases of the Church, which passed away hundreds of years before our Lord's Return: "Repent, . . . or else *I will come* unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick." "Repent, or else *I will come* upon thee quickly, and will fight against thee with the sword of My mouth" (Rev. 2: 5, 16). Other occurrences of such a use of the word "come" as applied to acts of our Lord other than His Second Advent setting in are found in Rev. 3: 3; 16: 15, etc. In such connections the word "come" implies that one in a hostile manner enters into an activity against another. It does not mean what the word "come" ordinarily means, *i.e.*, to arrive at a place, or in the presence of a person, after a journey. Accordingly, we interpret the words of Luke 12: 46 to mean that unknown and unexpected by "that Servant" the Lord would enter into a hostile activity against him, if he should prove unfaithful, and by that hostile activity would deprive him of his office as well as of his membership in the Lord's Body, *i.e.*, after the Lord's coming and subsequent to the time when He would appoint the faithful and wise servant to the office of "that Servant."

How shallow are the four arguments that this brother offers to us for his theory whereby he seeks to deprive our dear Pastor of the honor that the Lord gave him, and that the Bible (Num. 25: 6-13; Matt. 20: 5; 1 Cor. 10: 8; P '19, 142, par. 3—143, par. 3) shows would be made known as his at the exact time that it was made known as his! Why do some brethren, either by their teachings or by their acts, continually seek to take from dear Bro. Russell the honors that the Lord has given him? Is it not that they might be undermining him in the estimation of some of the brethren all the more enhance themselves in the estimation of those same brethren, and thus gain them as their followers? This the Lord assures us is the motive of

errorists among the Lord's people, which experience frequently confirms (Acts 20: 30).

All of us recall how our Society brethren claimed that our Pastor was, from beyond the veil, functioning in his office as "that Servant," using the Society as the channel of his office work. Our Pastor, himself, on the contrary, has told us that the functions of that office were to be used by its incumbent in this life only, and that if "that Servant" should prove faithful until death, the office of "that Servant" would cease to exist at the time of his death (Z' 04, 126, par.1). Doubtless there is method in the Adversary's attacks on our Pastor as "that Servant." Those who by express profession deny that he was "that Servant," and those who by the repudiation of express teachings of his by their course deny that he was "that Servant," are alike guilty of undermining his influence in order "to draw away disciples after them." The most Satanic of all uses made of his position as "that Servant" was that of the Society leaders, whose claim that from beyond the veil our Pastor, as "that Servant," was directing their work, makes him responsible for all their false teachings and unbiblical practices. What an unholy use of his dearly-bought influence in the Church to further their deceptive schemes! For "all deceivableness of iniquity" it can be equaled by only one other claim made—that claim of the papacy that St. Peter from heaven directs the official acts and teachings of the popes, his pretended successors. Indeed, the papacy's teaching on this point is in the Great Papacy the counterpart of the Society leaders' teaching in Little Papacy on the point that is here under discussion.

Seeing the Adversary's purpose in these attacks, let us in God and Christ all the more appreciate and hold to our Pastor as "that Servant." Let us by the associations of his hallowed memory seek more and more to glorify the Lord. This will make "that Servant" still

be fruitful in our lives! "By it he being dead [according to the flesh] yet speaketh!"

His memory deserves to be kept fragrant among us; and it can be so kept best of all by a faithful use of the Truth that he ministered to us, and by a loyal copying of his holy example. Such a course on our part will conduce to his memory being continually blessed to us and to others, and is the best kind of celebration of his life and death. The anniversary memorial service for him will also conduce to this end, and therefore may well be kept. We suggest that such services consist partly of prayer, praise, and testimony along the line of the benefits derived by us from our Pastor's ministry, and partly of an address or of several addresses on various phases of his life, work and character. Past experiences have proven the profitableness of such celebrations, and those to be observed will doubtless carry with them the same lesson. May God bless his memory to us through such services!

Will our Pastor's work endure? The thought may lie close at hand that it must, of course, endure. But, humanly speaking, the question naturally arises, because the bulk of those who have claimed him as their Pastor are rapidly drifting away from his teachings and practices. If we look at the P.B.I., we find them undermining confidence in his having been "that Servant," in his view of the organization of the Church, in many of his prophetic views, and in almost all of his chronological thoughts, including those connected with 1914 as the full end of the Times of the Gentiles and of the reaping, thereby brushing aside large parts of Vols. II and III, including the Pyramid chapter in Vol. III. If we look at the Sturgeonites and Olsonites, we find them adrift on his chronology, prophetic views and many doctrines. If we look at the Society, we find that they have gradually and cunningly set aside his Six Volumes and his booklets, yea, all his literature, in the interest of their errors and erroneous literature.

They have given up the Pastoral work, the Angelophone, the Photo-Drama and Volunteer work, and have entirely ceased colporteuring his books. His work and his methods of conducting the work cannot longer be recognized in the work that the Society is doing; and in important doctrinal, chronological and prophetic respects they have perverted his teachings. Under another name they have introduced Sunday Schools into their classes, thus perverting the organization and mission of the Church. As they represent the largest body of those who claim allegiance to our Pastor's teachings and practices, and as the bulk of the rest of those who make like professions are, like them, deviating in important respects from his teachings and practices, the question that is being discussed has, humanly speaking, considerable pertinency. In fact there is only one body of Truth people that does hold strictly to his teachings and practices and their Scriptural unfoldings—the Epiphany-enlightened saints.

If we were to answer our question from the standpoint of human experience and probability, we should have to admit that the trend of the teachings and practices among the vast bulk of the Truth people is in the direction of abandoning his work and nullifying his accomplishments. That this will not actually be accomplished we are Scripturally convinced; but undoubtedly human reason, in the light of the vast and varied revolutionisms of the past twenty-two years among Truth people, would suggest that our Pastor's work will not stand. If the forces which have operated with such marked external success in revolutionizing his teachings and practices during these twenty-two years should continue so to operate for a dozen more years, no man's power, humanly speaking, could prevent the professed Truth people from being perverted in their teachings and practices to such an extent as to give them no more relation to our Pastor's work than the Roman Church sustains to the work of the

Church. In view of the Society's gross revolutionisms against his works, one of the most amazing things to fathom is the mental attitude of many Society adherents who believe that the Society is faithfully carrying out our Pastor's teachings, policies and arrangements. Of course, such an undiscerning attitude would point to a complete apostasy from our Pastor's work, if it should continue.

But, beloved brethren, despite the unfavorable retrospect, aspect and near prospect, we have the full assurance of faith that the work of our Pastor will not perish from the earth! In due time his teachings will emerge unscathed from the burning that will devour the Levitical errors. His methods of doing the Lord's work will be reestablished and will successfully carry forward the Lord's cause after the fire shall have burned up the Levitical revolutionistic methods of doing Truth Work; and after the bad Levite leaders will come out of the fire discredited because of their revolutionism, and abased because of their self-exaltation, our dear Pastor's teachings and practices will shine with all the greater splendor because of their successful effects contrasted with the failures of the Levitical perversions! Faith, being fully assured of this outcome, can quietly await the Lord's good time for the fulfillment of its confidence; "for the zeal of the Lord will accomplish it," "in due time."

Will our Pastor's work endure? Temporarily it has suffered and will for a short time continue to suffer a partial eclipse—it may even for awhile become a total eclipse—but as surely as the Truth is powerful and will in the end prevail, so surely the work that Jehovah gave antitypical Eleazar, our Pastor, to do (Num. 3: 32; 4: 16) will be realized, and thus will endure. In the meantime, it is the privilege of the Epiphany-enlightened saints to support his work and to protest against Levitical deviations from, and perversions of it whenever, wherever and however they can. And,

surely, they will gladly avail themselves of such opportunities, and thus seek to make his—really God's—work endure.

Among other promises that the Lord has given the righteous, is one which pledges that they shall be in everlasting remembrance, *i.e.*, that they will be held in sacred, hallowed and loving memory for their faithfulness (Ps. 112: 6). While this promise pertains to the Ancient Worthies especially, it is applicable in a general way to all of the righteous. In the Scriptures, certain righteous ones are specified whose very mention by name in the Bible, is a guarantee that they will be everlastingly remembered; for as long as the eternal Word lasts, so long will such persons, *e.g.*, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Joshua, David, Elijah, John the Baptist, Jesus, Paul, Peter, John, etc., be held in hallowed, sacred and loving memory. So, too, certain righteous ones are specified by name in Church History, whose very mention there as antitypes of certain ones in the Scriptures, is a guarantee that they will be held in everlasting remembrance. As long as the eternal Word is understood in the pertinent antitypes, so long will such persons as Marsiglio, Wyclif, Huss, Wessel and our dear Pastor be held in hallowed, sacred and loving memory. Yea, of all extra-Biblical characters, we believe that our dear Pastor will be held in most hallowed, sacred and loving remembrance. Perhaps next to our Lord, he will be esteemed, loved and honored above all others who have lived on earth. We say this not with the least angel-worship in our heart, but because in the prophecies and types of the Scriptures, apart from our Lord, he is more honorably pointed out than any other member of the Church; and because, apart from our Lord, to him were committed greater privileges, and by him were performed greater works on God's behalf than were committed to, or performed by, any other servant of God. Let us not be ashamed to esteem, love and honor one whom Jehovah

has no signally esteemed, loved and honored, and now more than ever so esteems, loves and honors.

The words, God bless his memory, are a prayer with reference to our Pastor. This prayer the writer has offered up daily ever since our Pastor's funeral. He has been blessed by the offering of this prayer; and we trust that others have in the same act been similarly blessed. But some may ask, Why offer such a prayer? And why should our Pastor's memory be blessed? We might give several answers to this question. In the first place, God has promised (Ps. 112: 6) to bless the memory of such persons; and it is evidently proper, good and useful so to do; or God would not have made this promise. It is proper, because the memory of such persons is worthy of being kept alive; because it does those good who keep it alive; and because it continues the good influence of such a person. God's having made the promise for such reasons, we may well ask Him to bless our Pastor's memory. Again, our Pastor's character is one for whose memory one may properly pray a blessing. The Lord, Himself, vouches for the faithfulness and wisdom of his character (Matt. 24: 45-47; Luke 12: 42-44). Those of us who knew him, know that our Lord's forecast of his character was fulfilled in his life. He was faithful in great and small things. He was wise in his words, methods, plans, arrangements and works. He was full of the faith, hope and knowledge that make one wise. He was an example of the self-control and patience that make one strong. He practiced that piety and brotherly love that make one just; and he was a living expression of that charity that makes one loving. Beautifully did he exemplify humility, meekness, longsuffering and forbearance. His courage, industry, self-forgetfulness, liberality, amiability and frugality were most striking. He was as nearly a model Christian as Adamic imperfection has permitted any of Adam's fallen children to be. Such a character held in remembrance must prove to

be a means of honor to God and helpfulness to man, especially to the New Creation. Therefore it would be proper to pray God to bless his memory.

Again, it is proper that we pray God to bless his memory because of the office that he filled. The office that he held as "that Servant," in our judgment, apart from that of our Lord, was the most responsible and far-reaching ever held by a human being. That office made him the Lord's special representative, and as such it made him in the most remarkable time of all history, Christ's special eye, mouth and hand. As the Lord's special eye, it was, generally speaking, his function to see the things first of all that the Lord desired the Church to see. As the Lord's special mouth, it was his responsibility to declare the Lord's message, after being apprized of it himself, to others with reference to God, Christ, the Spirit, creation, man, good and evil principles, persons and things, the fall into, and punishment for, sin, the permission of evil, the ransom, high calling, restitution, justification, consecration, the hereafter, covenants, prophecies, histories and types of God's Word. As Christ's special hand, it was his duty to superintend and do whatever work the Lord called on him to superintend and do toward the Church, Great Company, Youthful Worthies, Israel and Christendom. Certainly, his office as the Lord's special eye, mouth and hand, was one fraught with such possibilities for the Parousia and the Epiphany as to warrant our praying God to bless his memory.

So, too, the work that he has done is of such a kind as warrants our praying that God bless his memory. As the Lord's special eye, it was not only his office to see the things that the Lord wanted seen for the advancement of His cause; but he actually did the work of seeing them. He thus watched the Word unfolding as due, in its doctrines, precepts, promises, exhortations, prophecies, histories and types, the signs of the times fulfilling, and the providences leading in work toward

the Church, the Great Company, the Youthful Worthies, Israel, Christendom and heathendom. This, in itself, was a work of no small compass. As the Lord's mouth, he declared the full counsel of the Lord as to all things due to be understood in the Parousia, as well as gave general teachings pertinent to the other times and seasons of God's Plan. This he did by word of mouth in private conversation, in the pulpit and on the platform, in letters, books, tracts, newspapers, booklets, magazines and in his journals. As the Lord's hand, he actually superintended the reaping and gleaning of the wheat to a successful conclusion, the gathering of goodly numbers of the Great Company and Youthful Worthies, the infusing of life into languishing Zionism, the binding of the kings and princes of Christendom, and the executing of the judgments written, as well as indirectly superintending the gathering and binding of the tares. Additional to superintending these great works, he personally participated in every one of them, and was more effective therein than any other individual. Such a worker deserves that we desire that God bless his memory.

Our prayer that God bless his memory should not end in words merely. It should be translated into acts. Therefore, whoever offers this prayer in sincerity will desire to do his part in realizing this blessing on our Pastor's memory. How may we, therefore, co-operate with the Lord in furthering the blessed influence of his memory? In the first place, we can do so by imitating, and by encouraging others to imitate his character. By sympathetically contemplating his character, as it displayed itself in his life and work, we will hold in our minds and hearts the thoughts of noble traits of character, well developed, strengthened, balanced and crystallized. Such thoughts sympathetically entertained will impress their own qualities upon our hearts, and with the exertion of will-power will impress them on our own characters by the imitation of them produced

through such sympathetic contemplation. Likewise, we may wisely commend his noble character, as it expressed itself in his life and works, to other sympathetic souls; and we will thus encourage them to imitate his qualities. Such a course is one of the best ways of co-operation with the Lord in furthering, the influence of his memory.

Another fruitful way to co-operate with the Lord in furthering the blessed influence of his memory is to spread a proper estimate of his office in ourselves and in others. So to do, we must first of all properly esteem it for ourselves. Properly to esteem his office, we should recognize it at its true worth—consider it, under our Lord, the highest office given to anyone in the Church; for no other one individual was ever before made by our Lord His highest special eye, mouth and hand, and that in a work so unique, responsible and far-reaching. The twelve Apostles, not individually, but collectively, were given a somewhat similar office, which had one characteristic—infallibility in declaring the Lord's mind as to faith and practice—that his office did not have; but his office was more responsible and extensive. Apart from our Lord's office, his office was the greatest ever exercised on this earth by one individual; and we will do well so to regard it, and therefore to esteem it very highly, and to commend it to the esteem of other sympathetic souls. It would be unwise to set it forth in its reality before unsympathetic souls. Proper esteem for his office will make us, under the Lord, very appreciative of him, and will make us exercise toward that office a becoming humility, meekness and support. While it will keep us from "the worship of angels," it will certainly help us to retain our balance in Truth and Grace at this time when the thousand are falling at our side and the ten thousand at our right hand, and in their fall are grossly disregarding the proper attitude toward his office. Such a proper esteem of his office will help us gain, retain

and practice the Truth that his office enabled him to bring to us. It will also help us to assist others to gain, retain and practice the same Truth: And his memory inuring to such good results will be blessed, indeed. Let us, therefore, co-operate with the Lord in securing such a result.

Then, too, we may co-operate with Him to further the blessed influence of our Pastor's memory by esteeming for ourselves and by helping others to esteem his work. Not only should we rightly esteem his office and help others to do the same; but we should also rightly esteem his work and help others thereto. Rightly to esteem his work implies our taking God's view of it. How honorable, effective, faithful and wise was that work in its reaping and gleaning the Church, gathering many of the Great Company and of the Youthful Worthies, encouraging despondent Israel, comforting the mourning, binding tares, kings and princes and executing judgment! How wonderful it was from the standpoint of a Teacher, Pastor, Advisor, Lecturer, Author, Preacher, Editor, Theologian and Executive! To esteem him as such and to encourage others to esteem him as such will make his memory a blessing; for it will continue in our own and in others' lives the effects of his works done in the above-mentioned capacities.

Finally, we may show that the prayer, God bless his memory, is an honestly-meant one in our lives, by cooperating with the Lord in furthering the blessed influence of his memory by perpetuating his work. This implies that we continue to regard him as our helper by faithfully studying and practicing his teachings, spirit and works and commanding them to others for their study and practice. This implies that we cherish and live in harmony with these teachings and practices, defend them against all attacks, and do our part in spreading them as well as encouraging others to do likewise. Our so doing will enable us to co-operate with God in the answer to this prayer.

On this last point, that of perpetuating his work, we desire to make a practical suggestion because of its pertinency to the Epiphany-enlightened saints as to a part of their special work, in which they continue a phase of service, taken part in by him with especial proficiency. As an opponent of Babylon's errors, his chief exploits consisted of his attacks on the doctrines of eternal torment and the consciousness of the dead. In these two particulars he is typed by Jashobeam, David's mightiest hero, who, in slaying 800 men at one time, typed our Pastor in his work against eternal torment, and in slaying 300 men at another time typed our Pastor in his work against the consciousness of the dead (2 Sam. 23: 8; 1 Chro. 11: 11; Jashobeam is, in the former passage, called Adino). In a peculiar sense the Epiphany-enlightened saints in antitypical Gideon's Second Battle have the privilege of battling against the two king errors of Babylon, against which errors our Pastor was at his best as an opponent of Babylonian error, and thus they, above all others, have the privilege of continuing to work along lines in which he took so able a part. Indeed, in the book, *Life-Death-Hereafter*, in the Hell and Spiritism booklets and in the five tracts of his which we have republished in the *Volunteer Heralds*, Nos. 1-4, he has furnished us with our chief ammunition in antitypical Gideon's Second Battle.

One of the best ways in which we can continue one phase of his work, and thus co-operate with the Lord in fulfilling the prayer, God bless his memory, is vigorously to prosecute antitypical Gideon's Second Battle, which, of late, has been but indifferently waged. Oct. 16 is the anniversary of his leaving Bethel alive for the last time, *i.e.*, virtually ceased directing the work at Headquarters; Oct. 30 is the anniversary of his reporting, as the representative member of the man with the writer's inkhorn, the completion of the Parousia work; Oct. 31 is the anniversary of his death;

Nov. 5 is the anniversary of his New York funeral service; Nov. 6 is the anniversary of his Pittsburgh funeral service; and his burial beginning just before 6 P.M. and ending after 6 P.M., which second period was Nov. 7, in God's way of reckoning time, Nov. 6-7 is the anniversary of his burial. How very appropriate that, holding in abeyance the John and Elijah work during this time, we devote the time covered by these events—from Oct. 16 to Nov. 7—to a specially concentrated attack on the doctrines of eternal torment and the consciousness of the dead, in antitypical Gideon's Second Battle! Certainly, it would be a most appropriate way of making his memory as the foremost warrior of antitypical David against these two king errors a blessing to the glory of God and our Gideon!

Accordingly, this anniversary period may well be celebrated by such an attack in antitypical Gideon's Second Battle. Will we not, dear fellow-soldiers of the faithful three hundred, so adjust our earthly affairs as to enable us to give as much time as possible to this Battle during the above-mentioned period? Generally speaking, the sisters could use several hours of the afternoons and the brothers the evenings of that period for sharpshooting with the pertinent literature. If the territory has not already been divided and districts assigned to all participants by the one in charge of the local Gideon Work where there are classes, this may be done; and thus all desiring a share in this good work may have it. And on the Sundays of this period special efforts may well be made to volunteer Protestant churches with such pertinent Volunteer Heralds as have not yet been distributed there. Will we not, dear brethren, one and all, do our utmost so to celebrate our dear Pastor's anniversary, as a most fitting way of increasing the blessing of his memory to the glory of God and of Christ in freeing others from the above-mentioned errors, in the attacking of which our beloved Jashobeam freed so many, including almost all

of us? Will we not take this matter to the Lord in whole-hearted consecration and prayer? Will we not discuss and favor this matter in the classes immediately, so that the necessary preliminary steps may be taken in time to enable all to enter upon this attack Oct. 16? Who is on the Lord's side in this matter? May we all answer, "Here am I, send me!" As a means of encouraging one another we may give in the meetings of the involved Wednesdays of Oct. 16-Nov. 7 our testimonies especially along the lines of our experiences in the work of that time. Gideonites, forward under the glorious and all-conquering banner of our Leader, antitypical Gideon! In the attack "quit you like men," and the enemy will flee panic-stricken, leaving in our hands both the field of battle and their two kings, antitypical Zebah and Zalmunna! Forward, then, Gideonites, with the battle cry, "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon!"

According to Matt. 24: 45-47 and Luke 12: 43-46, some individual was to be invested with an office on account of holding which he would be called "that Servant." According to these passages, this office would be filled after our Lord was to have returned, but before the Church would leave this earth. Its functions, as stated in these verses, were to be twofold: (1) giving the meat in due season and (2) overseeing the work of the Church. Time and sign prophecies prove that our Lord returned in 1874. After His coming He found our Pastor faithfully ministering as much truth as he had; and after certain tests He honored him in the Spring of 1876 with executive charge of the work and in the Fall of 1879 with special mouthpieceship—the two functions of the office of "that Servant." And all the while that he ministered as such (from 1876 to 1916), he exercised the functions of that office. He did under our Lord have executive charge of the work of the Church at large, and he was the special agent through whom the Lord gave the Parousia Truth.

Thus his having exercised the official functions of "that Servant," and that during the Parousia, proves him to have been "that Servant." The fulfillment of the prophecies of the two above-noted passages in him, prove him to have been "that Servant." Thus the Parousia proves him "that Servant."

But the Epiphany gives us many evidences that he was that Servant; and it is the purpose of this section of this chapter to prove this proposition. (1) The forecasts, (2) foundations and (3) binding power of his teachings in themselves and as to the Epiphany; (4) the Epiphany truths, and (5) his arrangements as to the Epiphany work prove it. First, we will set forth the proofs from the forecasts, foundations and binding powers of his teachings in themselves and as to the Epiphany and to Epiphany truths—truths pertaining to the Little Flock, to the Little Flock and Great Company, to the Great Company, to the Youthful Worthies, to the Jews, to the Conservatives and to the Radicals. The proof holds in the following way: If it can be shown that the things which he taught would take place in the Epiphany are now taking place, it would follow that he was given such knowledge of future things as only one in charge of the storehouse could have had. First, he undeniably taught (Vol. IV, Chap. I) that there would be an Epiphany period following the Parousia, and that it would be contemporaneous with the Time of Trouble. He taught this many years before the Epiphany and the Time of Trouble came—long before they were, humanly speaking, to be expected, e.g., in the booklet, Our Lord's Return. Yea, long beforehand, he even gave 1914 as the year in which the Epiphany would begin. He taught that during that period special manifestation of persons, principles and acts would be made. No one else, except through him, had previous knowledge of these things. They have all come to pass, and prove that he must

have had the storehouse in charge in a peculiar sense—as its special steward.

This is likewise manifest from what he taught with reference to the Little Flock. Among other things, he taught that Jesus and the Little Flock, as the antitypical Gideon and three hundred, would engage in two conflicts with errorists during the Time of Trouble, *i.e.*, during the Epiphany. And these antitypical battles surely have been having their fulfillment during the Epiphany: the first battle from 1914 to 1916, and the second beginning in 1920 and yet continuing. Another truth pertinent to the Little Flock in the Epiphany was taught by him and is fulfilling: its final work toward, and suffering from, Christendom—antitypical John's rebuke, imprisonment and beheading. We are living witnesses of, as well as participants in, John's rebuke and imprisonment; and from their fulfillment we are satisfied that the beheading will yet come. The Epiphany truths have taught the facts of fulfillment as Scripturally marked. These two prophecies fulfilling in the Epiphany pertinent to the Little Flock seal him as that Servant.

His forecasting of Epiphany events involving both the Little Flock and the Great Company, seeing that these events are fulfilling, proves him to have been that Servant. How clearly he forecast the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha, and that on account of disagreement on matters of policy as distinct from matters of doctrine, also the second smiting of Jordan by antitypical Elisha after that separation! The Epiphany Truth points out in the events the fulfillment of this forecast. He also showed that in the extreme end of the Age—the Epiphany—the antitypical Priests and Levites would be separated, according to the tabernacle picture. The Epiphany Truth shows us in the divisions of the Lord's people the fulfillment of this tabernacle picture. In his teaching that Aaron's white robe represents the covering of the Church, and that

Aaron's putting it off represents the Church passing out of the world, when considered with reference to Aaron's leading forth Azazel's goat while still clothed in sacrificial garments, he impliedly taught that while the Church would still be in the flesh, and after its last member had been offered to God by Jesus, the Great Company, as Azazel's antitypical Goat, would be dealt with. The Epiphany Truth reveals the fulfillment of this before our eyes. But our Pastor taught that all of these things would take place after the reaping—the Parousia—was over; hence would take place in the Epiphany. But to have been able from the Word to have forecast all these marvels implies that he was the steward who had charge of the storehouse to give the seasonal meat, *i.e.*, that he was that Servant. He was God's eye, hand and mouth.

His teachings on what would happen to the Great Company during the Epiphany confirms the thought that he was that Servant. He taught that the sins of Christendom would be confessed over them, that they would be driven out of the Holy as New Creatures into the Court, and that in their humanity they would be led out of the Court into the fit man's hands, taken to the wilderness by the latter and there let go, and then fall into Azazel's hands for buffeting experiences. These things are fulfilling toward the Truth section of Azazel's Goat, and part of them toward its nominal church section, now in the Epiphany. He further showed that, driven out of the Holy, as Levites they would not see clearly the truths seen in the Holy. This is also fulfilling now in the Epiphany; and these things are being made plain through the Epiphany Truth. Hence the Epiphany Truth, giving the proof of the truthfulness of his forecasts, proves that he was that Servant. He was God's eye, hand and mouth.

In a less emphatic sense he forecast the Youthful Worthy movement; for he taught that consecrations without the Spirit-begettal would take place during the

ministry of the Great Company. He did not use the term, Youthful Worthies; but he did speak of those who are meant by that term. We see about us such a class now forming. The Epiphany Truth has brought out various details with reference to this class; and his teachings now passing into visual fulfillment in their development as a class, he must have been "that Servant" in giving us the forecast; for such a forecast implies that its maker was the one who had full charge of the storehouse—was that Servant.

He likewise forecast that during the Time of Trouble, which he considered synonymous with the Epiphany, the Jews would in Palestine greatly increase in numbers, wealth, influence, possession of the land and development in national respects. This increase in these respects we now see going on before us, and they are additionally a mighty forecast of what will yet take place in the remaining time of the Epiphany. For him to have made such a forecast, which the Epiphany increasingly witnesses as fulfilling, proves that he had charge of the storehouse of Truth, and therefore functioned in this respect as that Servant.

He likewise taught that during the Time of Trouble—the Epiphany—the conservative groups of Society would unite in defense of their order of affairs as against the radicals. This we see taking place on a world-wide scale. The governments are gathering together in leagues and alliances as never before. The churches are federating and uniting as never before. The capitalists are uniting as never before. Moreover, these three conservative groups are supporting one another; for they feel that their spirit and purposes are kindred, and will stand or fall together before the onslaughts of the radicals. On the other hand, he forecast that the radicals would get together, but in two groups: a less radical and a more radical group. This we see fulfilling in the less radical labor parties and in the more radical labor parties—antitypical Jehu and

antitypical Hazael. Both of these groups are radical in the estimation of the conservatives. He taught that the less radical group will bring about the Revolution, and the more radical, the Anarchy. While we have not yet progressed to these stages, still in the formation of these groups, we see the seeds from which will spring the plants of Revolution and Anarchy. Thus in these respects we see during the Epiphany his forecasts fulfilling; and the Epiphany truths have simply elaborated his forecasts, and when fulfilled, have shown how they came to pass. His forecasts as to Epiphany happenings, clarified by the Epiphany Truth so far as they have been due to be fulfilled, are in the light of the Epiphany truths proofs that he was that Servant.

From a second standpoint, our Pastor's relations to the Epiphany truths prove that he was that Servant, *i.e.*, the fact that his teachings have been foundational to the Epiphany truths. He was not only privileged to build the entire structure of the Parousia Truth, but he was also privileged to do the excavation work for the Epiphany Truth and lay its foundations, that upon these foundations the Epiphany truths, not clearly seen, or not seen at all in his time, could be substantially built. These foundations are certain matters pertaining to the Little Flock, the Great Company, the Youthful Worthies, the tentatively justified, the Jews, the conservatives and the radicals. Under the preceding part of our first proof we called attention to these things as forecasts. Here we call attention to them as foundations of the Epiphany Truth; for the Epiphany Truth is built foursquare upon what he taught us with reference to these classes, not only in certain Parousia aspects, but also in certain Epiphany aspects. Built upon this foundation, the Epiphany Truth, with all its strength to establish Truth and refute error, has stood firm and unbreakable amid attacks, and crushing to error when attacking the latter. To have laid a foundation so substantial that it admits of such a weighty

and imperishable superstructure, is a strong evidence of the fact that he was that Servant.

Another aspect of his teachings as to certain Epiphany truths and relations that proves that he is that Servant, is the fact that his teachings cannot in the Epiphany be repudiated or be supplanted by other teachings, without manifesting the perpetrators of such things as Great Company members. This, of course, proves that he in, a most particular sense, represented God as a mouthpiece, and that, therefore, to repudiate his teachings or to put others in their place is equivalent to repudiating God's teachings, or to put others in their place. Many of those who once held his teachings and who regarded him as that Servant, have presumed to repudiate his teachings, or to put others in their place; but this has always resulted in God's repudiating them as Little Flock members and manifesting them as Great Company members. Why should this be only in the case of his teachings and not in the case of those of others before the Epiphany? Can it be explained on any other ground than that he was God's special mouthpiece and that, therefore, his teachings are God's teachings, and that, therefore, to rebel against them is to rebel against God (Ps. 107: 10, 11)? This is the only ground on which such a course on God's part could be explained, and, therefore, we present it as an Epiphany-Truth proof that our Pastor was that Servant.

So far we have shown how the Epiphany and the Epiphany truths witness to our Pastor's being that Servant. Now we briefly show how the Epiphany work proves the same thing. The Lord gave, through him, the methods and arrangements according to which the Epiphany work of the Levites was to be done. This is especially true with respect to the Levitical work that is to be done by corporations. This being true, we should expect the Divine blessing to rest upon their work to the extent that in a proper spirit they do it

according to these arrangements and methods. We should also expect the Divine disapproval to rest upon their work to the extent that they neglect, ignore, pervert or set aside these arrangements and methods, or substitute others in their stead. All would grant the reasonableness of these two things, if they accept the thought that God gave these methods and arrangements through him. One would also grant that the same would be the case if Little Flock members should observe or neglect, ignore, pervert or set aside the arrangements and methods that God gave through him for its work, or substitute others in their stead. What do we find actually to be the case? Those Little Flock and Great Company members who regard these methods and arrangements in their work are blessed therein. Those Little Flock members who ignore, neglect, pervert or set aside these methods and arrangements, or substitute others in their stead, are dropped out of the Little Flock as manifested Levites; and those Levites who ignore, neglect, pervert or set aside the methods and arrangements for Levite work, or substitute others in their stead, make failures of their efforts and receive priestly opposition, fit-man experiences and Azazelian buffeting. What does this prove? It undoubtedly proves that God sanctions the pertinent methods and arrangements given through our Pastor, as Divinely obligatory; and this proves that our Pastor acted as that Servant in giving them—that his office as the ruler over the household (one of the two functions of that Servant's office) is recognized, sanctioned and vindicated by God.

The above considerations are Epiphany-Truth proofs that our Pastor was that Servant, and as such we should heartily recognize, accept and pertinently subject ourselves to him in the Lord. We believe that we can best do this by faithfully studying, spreading and practicing his teachings. This should be done at all times. But in harmony with a custom of several years'

standing among Epiphany-enlightened saints, we believe that especially, but, of course, not exclusively, the period covered by the date of his final leaving of Bethel and the date of burial, Oct. 16-Nov. 7, might well be taken for the spread of his teachings along the lines of Gideon's Second Battle. We desire to encourage the dear ones to this end. We also think that it will prove helpful to us better to study, spread and practice his teaching, if we annually celebrate with a fitting service in our ecclesias and, where there are no ecclesias, in private, the date of his passing beyond the vail—Oct. 31. Let us, beloved, do these things not as worshipers of messengers, but as children of our Father, who has so greatly used and honored that Servant, and that, among other things, so greatly to our blessing. And may God bless us therein and bless the memory of our beloved Pastor—that faithful and wise Servant!

Not seldom we have been asked to publish our Pastor's last will and testament. These requests have raised the question in our mind as to the advisability of publishing this will. Appropriate does it seem to us so to do. Therefore we hereunder give it, and trust that its re-reading will prove instructive and edifying to all of our dear readers. We would also suggest that it be read as a part of the program of some of our Pastor's memorial celebrations.

Having at various times during past years donated to the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society all of my personal possessions except a small personal bank account of approximately two hundred dollars, in the Exchange National Bank of Pittsburgh, which will properly be paid over to my wife, if she survives me, I have merely love and Christian good wishes to leave to all of the dear members of the Bible House Family—and all other dear colaborers in the harvest work—yea, for all of the household of faith in every place who call upon the name of the Lord Jesus as their Redeemer.

However, in view of the fact that in donating the journal, Zion's Watch Tower, the Old Theology Quarterly and the copyrights of the Millennial Dawn Scripture Studies Books and various other booklets, hymn books, etc., to the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, I did so with the explicit understanding that I should have full control of all the interests of these publications during my life time, and that after my decease they should be conducted according to my wishes. I now herewith set forth the said wishes—my will respecting the same—as follows:

I direct that the entire editorial charge of Zion's Watch Tower shall be in the hands of a committee of five brethren, whom I exhort to great carefulness and fidelity to the Truth. All articles appearing in the columns of Zion's Watch Tower shall have the unqualified approval of at least three of the committee of five, and I urge that if any matter approved by three be known or supposed to be contrary to the views of one or both of the other members of the committee, such articles shall be held over for thought, prayer and discussion for three months before being published—that so far as possible the unity of the faith and the bonds of peace may be maintained in the Editorial management of the journal.

The names of the Editorial Committee (with such changes as may from time to time occur) shall all be published in each number of the journal—but it shall not in any manner be indicated by whom the various articles appearing in the journal are written. It will be sufficient that the fact be recognized that the articles are approved by the majority of the committee.

As the Society is already pledged to me that it will publish no other periodicals, it shall also be required that the Editorial Committee shall write for or be connected with no other publications in any manner or degree. My object in these requirements is to safeguard the committee and the journal from any spirit of ambition

or pride or headship, and that the Truth may be recognized and appreciated for its own worth, and that the Lord may more particularly be recognized as the Head of the Church and the fountain of Truth.

Copies of my Sunday discourses published in the daily newspapers covering a period of several years have been preserved and may be used as editorial matter for The Watch Tower or not, as the committee may think best, but my name shall not be attached nor any indication whatever given respecting the authorship.

Those named below as members of the Editorial Committee (subject to their acceptance) are supposed by me to be thoroughly loyal to the doctrines of the Scriptures—especially so to the doctrine of the Ransom—that there is no acceptance with God and no salvation to eternal life except through faith in Christ and obedience to His Word and its Spirit. If any of the designated ones shall at any time find themselves out of harmony with this provision they will be violating their consciences and hence committing sin, if they continue to remain members of this Editorial Committee—knowing that so to do would be contrary to the spirit and intention of this provision.

The Editorial Committee is self-perpetuating, in that should one of these members die or resign, it will be the duty of the remainder to elect his successor, that the journal may never have an issue without a full Editorial Committee of five. I enjoin upon the committee named great caution in respect to the election of others to their number—that purity of life, clearness in the Truth, zeal for God, love for the brethren and faithfulness to the Redeemer shall be prominent characteristics of the one elected. In addition to the five named for the committee I have named five others from whom I prefer that selection should be made for any vacancies in the Editorial Committee, before going outside for a general selection—unless in the interim

between the making of this Will and the time of my death, something should occur which would seem to indicate these as less desirable or others more desirable for filling the vacancies mentioned. The names of the Editorial Committee are as follows:

William E. Page,
William E. Van Amburgh,
Henry Clay Rockwell,
E.W. Brenneisen,
F.H. Robison.

The names of the five whom I suggest as possibly amongst the most suitable from which to fill vacancies in the Editorial Committee are as follows: A.E. Burgess, Robert Hirsh, Isaac Hoskins, Geo. H. Fisher (Scranton), J.F. Rutherford, Dr. John Edgar.

The following announcement shall appear in each issue of The Watch Tower, followed by the names of the Editorial Committee:

This journal is published under the supervision of an Editorial Committee, at least three of whom must have read and have approved as Truth each and every article appearing in these columns. The names of the Committee now serving are: (names to follow).

As for compensation, I think it wise to maintain the Society's course of the past in respect to salaries—that none be paid; that merely reasonable expenses be allowed to those who serve the Society or its work in any manner. In harmony with the course of the Society, I suggest that the provision for the Editorial Committee, or the three that shall be actively engaged, shall consist of not more than a provision for their food and shelter and ten dollars per month, with such a moderate allowance for wife or children or others dependent upon them for support as the Society's Board of Directors shall consider proper, just, reasonable—that no provision be made for the laying up of money. I desire that the Old Theology Quarterly continue

to appear as at present, so far as the opportunities for distribution and the laws of the land will permit, and that its issues shall consist of reprints from the old issues of The Watch Tower or extracts from my discourses, but that no name shall appear in connection with the matter unless the same is required by law.

It is my wish that the same rules apply to the German, the French, the Italian, the Danish and the Swedish or any other foreign publications controlled or supported by the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society.

I will that a copy of this paper be sent to each one whose name has appeared above as of the Editorial Committee or the list from whom others of that committee may be chosen to fill vacancies and also to each member of the Board of Directors of the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society. This shall be done immediately on my death being reported, so that within a week, if possible, the persons named as of the Editorial Committee may be heard from, their communications being addressed to the Vice-President of the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society—whoever may be holding that office at that time. The answers of those appointed shall be to the point, indicating their acceptance or rejection of the provisions and terms specified. A reasonable time shall be allowed for any one mentioned who may be absent from the city or from the country. Meantime, the remainder of the committee of at least three shall proceed to act in their capacity as editors. It shall be the duty of the officers of the Society to provide the necessary arrangements for these members of the Editorial Committee and to assist them in their duties in every possible manner, in compliance with the engagements made with me bearing on this matter.

I have already donated to the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society all my voting shares therein, putting the same in the hands of five Trustees, as follows: Sr.

E. Louise Hamilton, Sr. Almeta M. Nation Robison, Sr. J. G. Herr, Sr. C. Tomlins, Sr. Alice G. James.

These Trustees shall serve for life. In event of deaths or resignations successors shall be chosen by the Watch Tower Society Directors and Editorial Committee and the remaining Trustees after prayer for Divine guidance.

I now provide for the impeachment and dismissal from the Editorial Committee of any member thereof found to be unworthy the position by reason of either doctrinal or moral laches, as follows:

At least three of the Board must unite in bringing the impeachment charges, and the Board of Judgment in the matter shall consist of the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society's trustees and the five trustees controlling my voting shares and the Editorial Committee, excepting the accused. Of these sixteen members at least thirteen must favor the impeachment and dismissal in order to effect the same.

I desire to be buried in the plot of ground owned by our Society, in the Rosemont United Cemetery, and all the details of arrangements respecting the funeral service I leave in the care of my sister, Mrs. M. M. Land, and her daughters, Alice and May, or such of them as may survive me, with the assistance and advice and co-operation of the brethren, as they may request the same. Instead of an ordinary funeral discourse, I request that they arrange to have a number of the brethren, accustomed to public speaking, make a few remarks each, that the service be very simple and inexpensive and that it be conducted in the Bible House Chapel or any other place that may be considered equally appropriate or more so.

To the dear "Bethel" family, collectively and individually, I leave my best wishes, in hoping for them of the Lord His blessing, which maketh rich and addeth no sorrow. The same I extend in a still broader sweep to all the family of the Lord in every place—

especially to those rejoicing in the Harvest Truth. I entreat you all that you continue to progress and to grow in grace, in knowledge, and, above all, in love, the great fruit of the Spirit in its various diversified forms. I exhort to meekness, not only with the world, but with one another; to patience with one another and with all men, to gentleness with all, to brotherly kindness, to godliness, to purity. I remind you that all these things are necessary for us, necessary that we may attain the promised Kingdom, and that the Apostle has assured us that if we do these things we shall never fail, but that "so an entrance shall be ministered unto us abundantly into the everlasting Kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ."

It is my wish that this, my last Will and Testament, be published in the issue of The Watch Tower following my death.

My hope for myself, as for all the dear Israel of God, is that soon we shall meet to part no more, in the First Resurrection, in the Master's presence, where there is fullness of joy forevermore. We shall be satisfied when we awake in His likeness—

"Changed from glory unto glory."

[Signed] CHARLES TAZE RUSSELL.

Published and declared in the presence of the Witnesses whose names are attached:

Mae F. Land,
M. Almeta Nation,
Laura M. Whitehouse.

Done at Allegheny, Pa., June twenty-nine, nineteen hundred and seven.

Long, long be my heart with such memories filled,
Like the vase in which roses have once been distilled;
You may break, you may shatter the vase, if you will,
But the scent of the roses will cling to it still.

CHAPTER VI.
SOME SHORTER TYPES OF THE
PAROUSIA MESSENGER.

JASHOBEAM. ELEAZAR'S CHARGE AND BEATEN PLATES.
PHINEHAS. PHURAH.

DAVID [beloved] is typically used in a variety of significances. Primarily, in the Psalms, he represents our Lord Jesus as Jehovah's Beloved (Matt. 3: 16; Eph. 1: 6), warring holy warfare on behalf of Jehovah, the Truth and Jehovah's people, and administering the matters of God's embryo or militant kingdom. Secondarily, in the Psalms, he is used to type the entire Christ class as Jehovah's Beloved warring holy warfare for Jehovah, the Truth and Jehovah's people and administering the affairs of God's embryo or militant kingdom (Is. 55: 3). And, thirdly, in the Psalms, he is used to type the Church alone (Rom. 1: 7; Col. 3: 12; 2 Thes. 2: 13). The things said in the pertinent Psalms prove this. He is used in the histories to type that Servant as executive and warrior. We understand our Pastor in his warrior pilgrim activities to be the antitype of Jashobeam, David's mightiest warrior (2 Sam. 23: 8, 13-17; 1 Chro. 11: 11, 15-19).

(2) It is reasonable to assume, since David was a typical character, that all who dealt with him were also typical characters. Hence we understand that Jashobeam, who furthered him more than any other individual warrior, was a typical character. His doing his mighty works in the harvest time and while David was in Adullam (Adullam, vengeance or justice of the people is the Hebrew equivalent of Laodicea, 2 Sam. 23: 13) implies that his antitype would be the greatest warrior of the reaping and Laodicean period; and this, of course, immediately identifies him typically with our beloved Pastor, who undoubtedly was the greatest

individual warrior for Truth and against error in the harvest and Laodicean period. Moreover, the descriptive terms applied to Jashobeam serve further to identify him as a type of our Pastor. In 2 Sam. 23: 8 he is called the Tachmonite and in 1 Chro. 11: 11 he is called the Hachmonite, literally, the son of the Hachmonite. These terms, derived from the same Hebrew root, mean the wise one in allusion to the quality of wisdom expressly applied by our Lord prophetically to that Servant (Matt. 24: 45-47; Luke 12: 42-45). In 2 Sam. 23: 8 he is spoken of as sitting in the seat, which is an allusion to that Servant's office power of rulership over the Lord's household as Jesus' special representative. The term occurring in both passages, "chief among the captains," shows Jashobeam as the highest of the warriors of David, typical of how in the end of this Age that Servant would be the ranking one of all the Church's warriors. He is wrongly called an Eznite in the A.V., for the proper reading is, his spear, *i.e.*, the spear of Jashobeam. Again, by another mistranslation, Jashobeam [the people will return, *i.e.*, from the curse to restitution] is in 2 Sam. 23: 8 called Adino. This term means he swung it, *i.e.*, his spear, and should have been so translated. These two corrections in translation would make this verse contain, and that rightly, no interpolated sentence. This rendering harmonizes this verse with its semi parallel passage, 1 Chro. 11: 11. We might therefore render 2 Sam. 23: 8 as follows: These are the fames [famous ones] of the warriors which belonged to David—the wise one who sat in the seat [as] chief of the three [chiefs]. He swung it, his spear, against eight hundred [whom] he slew at one time.

(3) It will be noted that in the Samuel passage eight hundred and in the Chronicles passage three hundred are spoken of as being slain by Jashobeam. Both statements are to be taken as facts, as the antitype indicates. We understand spears to type refutative teachings

put forth in writings *when the military figure* is used. In the priest figure the same teachings are symbolized by bowls, as has been shown in Chap. II. If we consult the facts of the case at hand we will readily conclude that our Pastor's chief individual literary battle was against eternal torment and that his next greatest individual literary battle was against the doctrine of the consciousness of the dead. The havoc that he wrought through his writings on eternal torment sectarians is typed by Jashobeam's slaying the eight hundred Philistines with his spear at one time, while the havoc that he wrought through his writings on sectarians who taught the consciousness of the dead is typed by Jashobeam slaying the three hundred Philistines with his spear at one time. It will be noted that Abishai also slew three hundred (2 Sam. 23: 18, 19; 1 Chro. 11: 20, 21) with a spear. He represents, we believe, our beloved and sainted Brother John Edgar, and his spear types the latter's booklet on "Where Are the Dead," which thoroughly refutes the teachers of the consciousness of the dead. It was from this work of Bro. Edgar that we were in part enabled to see that Jashobeam's lifting up his spear against the *three* hundred types our Pastor's literary activity against the consciousness of the dead as distinct from his literary fight against eternal torment, a thing that by association we were thus enabled to see was represented by Jashobeam's slaying by his spear the eight hundred Philistines.

(4) When we look at the titles of our Pastor's controversial writings on eternal torment and the consciousness of the dead and peruse their contents we will readily see that on these two subjects he wrought more havoc on the sectarians [antitypical Philistines] than on any other subjects defended by them. His chief writings on these subjects are the following: The two booklets on Hell and Spiritism, a large section in Studies, Vol. V, Chap. XII, treating on the soul and

Hell, the tract on the "Wages of Sin Is Death—Not Eternal Torment," the B. S. M.'s on "Thieves in Paradise," "The Rich Man in Hell," "In the Belly of Hell," "Immortal Worms and Unquenchable Fires," "The Lake of Fire," "What Is the Soul?" "Do you Believe in the Resurrection of the Dead?" "Preaching to the Spirits in Prison," "The Great Parable of the Sheep and Goats," "To Hell and Back," "Life, Death and Hereafter," "The Great Hereafter," "Heaven, Hell and Purgatory," "Where Are the Dead?" etc., etc. Additionally, his public addresses on all suitable occasions smote hip and thigh with the sword of the Spirit these two great errors of the antitypical Philistines, though this phase of his work is not shown in the two pictures now under study; *for the spear* types controversial writings, not lectures. Surely his labors on these subjects have been great and effective, and certainly they make our fight against antitypical Zebah and Zalmunna much easier in the way of attaining the capture of the king errors of antitypical Midianites.

(5) Ever since 1910 we have understood Jashobeam in his two exploits outlined in 2 Sam. 23: 8 and 1 Chro. 11: 11 as typing our Pastor heroically and successfully warring against the great errors of eternal torment and the consciousness of the dead. The typical achievements under consideration are among the greatest deeds of military valor set forth in sacred or profane history. Only certain of Samson's exploits exceed them; but in Samson's case we are expressly taught that miraculous powers from God gave him his powers, while such is not the record as to Jashobeam, though he likely was supernaturally strengthened in these exploits. The constant battling of our Pastor against the fortresses of eternal torment and the consciousness of the dead made great rents in their walls and paved the way to the easy victory we are gaining over antitypical Zebah and Zalmunna, in which his pertinent writings form our chief literary arsenal for

this fight. It is our knowledge of his prominence in these conflicts that has prompted us for the past few years to suggest that in a fitting manner we may celebrate the period from his last leaving Bethel to his burial—Oct. 16 to Nov. 7, by making a special effort in antitypical Gideon's Second Battle. It is not at all our thought that only in that time should we wage this battle, though some seem by their acts to think so. Rather, we think that during that period we should make a *special* effort therein, and generally throughout the year seek and use opportunities to engage therein. Certainly, the exploits of our beloved Jashobeam in these two respects are a clarion call to us to engage generally throughout the year in antitypical Gideon's Second Battle, and particularly during the time of our special annual effort—Oct. 16 to Nov. 7. Certainly, under God and Christ such an annual special effort is a fitting tribute to the memory of our incomparable Jashobeam, and as such let us engage therein heartily and faithfully.

(6) Above we showed that Jashobeam, David's Mightiest Warrior, in killing first 800 and then 300 with a spear, typed our Pastor's literary work against the defenders of the eternal torment doctrine and the consciousness of the dead doctrine, respectively. The third great deed of Jashobeam we now proceed to discuss in its typical and antitypical significance. We will give in parallel columns the two accounts of Jashobeam's third deed as recorded in 2 Sam. and in 1 Chro:

2 Sam. 23: 13-17

(13) And three of the thirty chief went down, and came to David in the harvest time unto the cave of Adullam; and the troop of the Philistines were encamped in the valley of Rephaim. (14) And David was then in the hold,

1 Chro. 11: 15-19

(15) And three of the thirty chief went down, to the rock to David into the cave of Adullam; and the host of the Philistines were encamped in the valley of the Rephaim. (16) And David was then in the hold,

and the garrison of the Philistines was then in Bethlehem.

(15) And David longed, and said, Oh that one would give me water to drink of the well of Bethlehem, which is by the gate!

(16) And the three mighty men break through the host of the Philistines, and drew water out of the well of Bethlehem, that was by the gate, and took it, and brought it to David; but he would not drink thereof, but poured it out unto the Lord.

(17) And he said, Be it far from me, O Lord, that I should do this: shall I drink the blood of the men that went in jeopardy of their lives?

Therefore he would not drink of it. These things did the three mighty men.

and the garrison of the Philistines was then in Bethlehem.

(17) And David longed, and said, Oh that one would give me water to drink of the well of Bethlehem, which is by the gate!

(18) And the three break through the host of the Philistines, and drew water out of the well of Bethlehem, that was by the gate, and took it, and brought it to David; but he would not drink thereof, but poured it out unto the Lord, and said, (19) My God forbid it me, that I should do this: shall I drink the blood of these men that have put their lives in jeopardy? for with the jeopardy of their lives they brought it. Therefore he would not drink it. These things did the three mighty men.

(7) The three chiefs of David's thirty mighty men were Jashobeam, Eleazar and Shammah (2 Sam. 23: 8, 9, 11; 1 Chro. 11: 11, 12). Our interest in this study centers in Jashobeam; and therefore we will pass by the other two in silence. The rock (1 Chro. 11: 15) types the Christ, Head and Body (1 Cor. 10: 4; *the* Christ in the Greek), also typed by the rock that Moses and Aaron smote twice (Num. 20: 2-13). David [Beloved] here types Bro. Russell as that Servant, not as a pilgrim, as which he is here typed by Jashobeam in the reaping time, "harvest" (2 Sam. 23: 13). This is further confirmed by the fact that David was in the cave of Adullam (the Hebrew equivalent of Laodicea, *i.e.*, justice or vengeance of the people), which types the Laodicean condition of that Servant as one in

which he was hidden from the understanding of the world (Is. 26: 20). David's being then in the hold (2 Sam. 23: 14; 1 Chro. 11: 16)—apparently a fortified place in the cave of Adullam—types him as dwelling in God as his refuge and fortress (Ps. 91: 1, 2). The Philistines [villagers—sectarians] here, so far as Jashobeam's relation to them is concerned, type the no-ransomistic sifters in 1878 and 1879 who were moving heaven and earth to get rid of the Truth on the corresponding price and the satisfaction of justice by a sacrifice. The word Rephaim means giants and types the fallen angels; while the valley of Rephaim seems to type the sphere of the fallen angels' activities. Therein certainly the no-ransomistic sifters were encamped in an unholy alliance with the demons and in wicked cooperation with them in warfare against the Ransom and Sin-offering. In such a warfare Bro. Russell, as antitypical David, found safety in Jehovah his refuge, fortress and dwelling place (Ps. 91: 2, 9, 10). Bethlehem [house of bread] represents Bible teachings as food for heart and mind. The Philistine garrison at Bethlehem represents Mr. Barbour and his confederate no-ransomistic teachers invading, holding and misusing their office on Bible teaching in an effort to corrupt the Truth on the ransom and the satisfaction of justice by the Sin-offering. Jashobeam's coming to David under the circumstances described in the passages under consideration represents our Pastor *as a pilgrim* coming in 1878 and 1879 to our Pastor as that Servant, as a helper under the antitypical conditions just described.

(8) The well at the gate of Bethlehem represents the Bible—the depository of the Truth—from which the Truth teachers—antitypical Bethlehemites—are privileged to dip and bring to others to drink. David's longing for a drink of water from that well, as related to Jashobeam, represents the longing of that Servant for the Truth on the details of the ransom and of the satisfaction of justice connected with the controversy on the

ransom, which was begun by Mr. Barbour in the Spring of 1878. Mr. Barbour's deeply laid sophistries made this longing all the greater, especially his perversion of Lev. 16, to rid it of the idea of the satisfaction of justice by the Sin-offering. As David's longing for the water prompted Jashobeam to break through the camp of the Philistines and get the water from the well for David; so the longing of that Servant for the pertinent Scriptural Truth prompted our Pastor in a struggle of about a year and a half to break through all the arguments of the no-ransomers and the opposition of demons in order to get what proved to be the truth on the two sin-offerings of Lev. 16 as typing the two antitypical Sin-offerings—the humanity of Jesus and that of the Church used in the antitypical atonement, the Church's share therein having been lost sight of since shortly after the Jewish Harvest. David's refusal to drink the water gotten under such dangerous conditions types the natural reluctance of that Servant at first to accept the doctrine of the Church's sharing in the Sin-offering, which to him seemed dangerous to its bringer, as a pilgrim, for it was as a pilgrim that he came into the pertinent controversy. David's pouring out the water as a drink-offering proves that later such hesitating reluctance on Bro. Russell's part was overcome, and types the fact that he thereafter preached it as a truth of the Lord—poured it out as an antitypical drink-offering to the Lord.

(9) It will surely interest our readers to learn the historical facts, lasting a period of nearly a year and a half, connected with the antitype of Jashobeam's third exploit, especially the last phase of that antitype. While on a visit at the Bible House in Allegheny in the Fall of 1903 during the Russell-Eaton Debates, we asked our Pastor how he had come to his understanding of the Lord's Word; and in response to our question he gave us an account, lasting six hours and spread over two evenings, of his growth in the Truth from his

seventeenth to his thirtieth year; and in this lengthy narrative, among other things, he gave us an account of the facts antitypical of Jashobeam's third exploit, without either of us at that time understanding that those events were the antitype of that exploit. We will give a condensed statement of these facts: When the expectations of the brethren to experience their taking away from the earth in fleshy bodies on Nisan 16, 1878, were not fulfilled, Mr. Barbour, who had first for 1873, then for 1874, and then later for 1878, dogmatically prophesied the Church's so-called "rapture," concluded that if he did not by a figurative explosion divert the Church's attention from his failures at predicting, he would lose his influence as a Biblical interpreter; and he furnished in the Spring of 1878 the diverting explosion by a renunciation of the ransom—the corresponding price—in his periodical, *The Herald of the Morning*, of which Bros. Russell and Paton were assistant editors. The two assistant editors repeatedly published in this periodical answers defending the ransom; and *The Herald of the Morning* became for about a year a house divided against itself. Our Pastor in the Spring of 1879, seeing that Mr. Barbour was going further into darkness, and was proving irreclaimable, decided to sever his relations with him and his periodical, and to publish *The Tower*, whose first number appeared in July, 1879. Very shortly thereafter he lectured (pilgrim work) in New England from charts on certain features of Lev. 16 to prove the corresponding price, without however understanding its details, particularly the distinction between the antitypes of the bullock, Lord's goat and Azazel's goat. Mr. Barbour, hearing of his lectures on Lev. 16, and alluding to his haberdashery business, sarcastically remarked: "What! That *shirt seller* explaining the tabernacle! *He* does not understand the tabernacle. *I* will show you what the tabernacle, and particularly what Lev. 16 mean, and how they are free from the ransom thought." In

the early Fall of 1879 appeared Mr. Barbour's exposition of Lev. 16 denying the corresponding price as being taught in this chapter and giving such a subtile and plausible exposition of the chapter in an anti-ransom sense as to deceive, if possible, the very elect.

(10) Since the Tower and the Herald were going to the same list of addresses, Bro. Russell became greatly perturbed at the subtility and plausibility of Mr. Barbour's views on Lev. 16; for over a year had he been longing for clearness on the details, including Lev. 16, connected with the ransom controversy [David's longing for the water]; and the subtility and plausibility of the article in question made him greatly fear for the safety of the sheep, as well as long to satisfy their craving for the pertinent Truth details. He told us that never in his life had he experienced such worry (struggles with the demons—Rephaim), which was so great as to drive sleep from his eyes. He saw at once that Mr. Barbour's explanation of Lev. 16 must be wrong; for it was pivoted on the denial of the Bible's central Truth; but he did not have a satisfactory explanation of the antitypes of the bullock, Lord's goat and Azazel's goat to set forth in opposition to the erroneous explanations of them advanced by Mr. Barbour; and he knew that it would not do simply to deny Mr. Barbour's explanations without offering satisfactory ones in their place. Hence he feared that the article in question would work havoc among the sheep. This sent him to the Lord in a prayer that pled for the proper understanding of Lev. 16, giving as the reason for the petition that since the error on the subject had now in the Harvest appeared, evidently the time was due for the Truth thereon to become clear, and that promised to minister the Truth on the subject to the brethren faithfully, if the Lord would deign to make it clear to him.

(11) He sent word to the foreman of his Pittsburgh store that he would not come that day, and for him to

conduct the business as usual in his absence. Thereafter he offered the abovementioned prayer. Then, knowing that Hebrews discusses more than any other Biblical book the tabernacle types, he spent the whole day in its study and in prayer; but late that night his mind was as blank on the subject as it was early that morning. The whole of the next day until late at night he spent in the same way, but without gaining any clearness on the subject. The third day he renewed his study of Hebrews, when about noon he came to Heb. 13: 10-16, and noticed that these verses treated of two sets of tables, altars, high priests and sacrifices, one set belonging to the Jewish and the other to the Gospel Age. He further noticed that v. 11 was a clear allusion to Lev. 16 as to the two sin-offerings of the atonement day, as to the high priest's activities with their blood, and as to their bodies being burned outside the camp. He further noticed that in v. 12 the Apostle refers, as a conclusion from the type, to Jesus' suffering without the gate as the antitype of the bullock's being burned without the camp; and that in v. 13 the Apostle refers, as a conclusion from the type, to the Church going forth to the Lord without the camp bearing His reproach, *i.e.*, the same kind of sufferings as His—Sin-offering sufferings. Immediately he saw that St. Paul was explaining that the bullock typed Jesus as a Sin-offering, and that the Lord's goat typed the Church as a Sin-offering. Filled with joy at the thought that his prayers and studies had been blessed with an answer by the Lord, he jumped up, exclaiming to his wife: "I have it! I have it!" Conservatively she answered, "Do not be too sure!" Going over the verses again he reaffirmed his conviction and proved it to her and to his complete satisfaction.

(12) His worries left him at once; and the sweetest peace imaginable filled his heart; for now he had the Apostle's own inspired explanation of the main features of Lev. 16, which parallel passages clarified still

more to his mind. What should he do with his newfound treasure? The feverish hurry that he before felt left him; and instead of publishing his findings immediately, or letting the brethren in general know of them, he called a conference of leading brethren and during an eight day discussion imparted to them what in summary he later wrote out as Tabernacle Shadows. He told the conference his experience of anxiety, his struggles with demons, his prayers and his studies, as he strove to break through what proved to be the camp of the antitypical Philistines fighting against the ransom under demonic instigation. The leading brethren were, except Mr. Paton, convinced of the Truth of this matter; and they began to preach it to others, while Mr. Paton, seemingly envious that the Lord had favored Bro. Russell instead of himself with this large amount of advancing Truth, became disgruntled, and that increasingly, until about two years later—in the Fall of 1881—he renounced in the infidelism sifting the ransom, advocating a perversion of the ransom and the error of Universalism very much like what Concordant Versionism now teaches.

(13) After the conference with the leading brethren Bro. Russell preached on the subject before the Allegheny ecclesia, where first also reluctance to accept it was shown, later a hearty acceptance with a spreading of this truth set in. In the February, 1880, Tower (See Tower Reprints, pp. 72, 73) appeared the first article with the clarified light on the tabernacle under the title The Law Shadows. Almost always during the Harvest was there at first a reluctance on the part of the faithful to accept the thought that the Church shared in the privilege of being a part of the Sin-offering; but this reluctance always gave way in them to a hearty acceptance of this high calling privilege and the subsequent presenting of it to others.

(14) Our Pastor told us that the Lord doubtless kept him waiting for three days before his prayers and

studies bore fruit the better to prepare him to receive and administer the stewardship of such great and wide embracing truths as are contained in Tabernacle Shadows. Without his then knowing of it, he was as that Servant at that time given the charge of the storehouse; and the Truth on the tabernacle, particularly on Lev. 16, was the first part of the meat in due season that he as such brought forth therefrom. And loyally did he keep the promise that he made in his prayer—to minister the Truth on Lev. 16 faithfully to the brethren, if the Lord would deign to make it plain to him! Surely it was a goodly portion of symbolic water that he dipped out of the well at antitypical Bethlehem's gate! And certainly his year and a half's battle in connection therewith, culminating in his getting the Truth on Lev. 16, was the greatest conflict of all engaged in by antitypical David's Mightiest Warrior! And how inexpressibly richly blessed was its booty to the whole Church! Well may we in gratitude and appreciation cry out, God bless His memory!

(15) We take pleasure in furnishing the brethren with an exposition of a Scriptural description on another phase of our Pastor's work, wherein especially the teaching and executive character of his official work as a Priest is brought to our attention. In Chap. II we called attention to the fact that Eleazar, Aaron's son, represents for the Jewish Harvest the twelve Apostles and for the Gospel Harvest Bro. Russell. It is what Jesus said to the Apostles, as to their official powers (Matt. 18: 18), and what He said of our Pastor, as to his official powers (Matt. 24: 45-47; Luke 12: 43-46), that convinces us that what is said of Eleazar in Num. 4: 16 types the powers ascribed to the Apostles in Matt. 18: 18 and to our Pastor in Matt. 24: 45-47 and Luke 12: 43-46. The latter fact will appear as we apply the typical statements of Num. 4: 16 to the activities and powers of our Pastor as an executive and teacher. Here we will not expound this

passage as applying to the Twelve, as the Eleazar of the Jewish Harvest, since it is not pertinent to our subject; but will expound this passage of our Pastor, the Eleazar of the Gospel Harvest.

(16) In Num. 4: 16 seven executive and teaching functions of his are brought to our attention. The first of these is typified by Eleazar's having charge of the oil for the lampstand. Among other things, oil represents the spirit of understanding (Matt. 25: 3, 4, 8-10). The thing understood, of course, is the Truth. For Eleazar to have had charge of the oil for the lampstand would, therefore, type the thoughts: that it would be a privilege of our Pastor as teacher to understand the Truth not only for himself, but also for the brethren as enlighteners of one another, that he would shed this light on the teaching brethren, and that as an executive he would arrange for that understanding of the Truth to be made clear to the brethren in their capacity of enlightening the Church and to put into their hands helps that would enable them to learn and teach these truths. This teaching work he did by oral and written instructions and by providing Berean lessons on the pertinent literature, helpful in teaching these truths; and this executive work he did by publishing and distributing books, etc., that explained these truths, and by arranging for meetings and other class order wherein these truths might be taught. Certainly he did every one of these things and in so doing acted as teacher and executive in antitype of Eleazar's having charge of the oil for the lampstand.

(17) The second function ascribed in our text to Eleazar was his charge of the sweet incense. As Tabernacle Shadows shows (pp. 56, par. 2 and 62, par. 2), the unburnt sweet incense represents the actually perfect choice human powers of Jesus and the reckonedly perfect choice human powers of the Church, offered in sacrifice during the Gospel Age. Jesus' incense having long before been offered, our Pastor's charge could not

have included anything executive as to His actually perfect choice human powers in their being offered up from Jordan to Calvary. But it was a function of his to teach the pertinent facts on our Lord's human perfections offered by Him on the antitypical golden Altar. This he did, as his oral and written teachings prove. As executive he, of course, arranged for such teachings to reach the living brethren without acting as an executive toward them in their being offered up. He likewise taught orally and in writings all the pertinent matters respecting the reckonedly perfect human powers of the Church offered up before his time, though he as executive arranged for such teachings to reach the living brethren. But as to the Church of his day, he acted directly both as the teacher and executive with respect to its sweet incense. His teaching function in this respect he fulfilled by explaining justification by faith as reckoning perfection to our human all through Jesus' imputed merit, consecration as our consequent privilege and reasonable service, and the various things implied in, related to, and flowing from the sacrifice of our human all even unto death. Thus he discharged the teaching function of his charge with respect to the antitypical sweet incense. As executive he discharged his pertinent function by arranging for forms of service adapted to the exercise of the brethren's choice human powers—their various human abilities, influence, positions, reputations, time, strength, health, means, etc. Thus, the various forms of service—pilgrim, colporteur, volunteer, bereaved, sharpshooter, photodrama, Bible House, etc., work severally gave opportunities for the use of the brethren's divers talents, influence, positions, reputation, time, strength, etc. His use of the money that they entrusted to his administration in publishing and circulating literature, supporting various agencies of the work, providing advertisements for the public meetings and other expenses connected with meetings, securing space in newspapers

and magazines and meeting expenses for correspondence and other features of the work, is another illustration of his acting as an executive as to his charge of the antitypical sweet incense; for thereby the brethren's incense was offered.

(18) The third charge of Eleazar as our text sets it forth concerned the continual meat-offering, or according to a better translation, the meal-offering. See A.R.V. When, as in our text, the drink-offering is not mentioned, it is to be understood as included in the meal-offering. The meat- or meal-offering, as we have seen, represents that phase of our sacrifices which shows with what they occupy themselves, *i.e.*, the setting forth of the Truth, like lecturing on and preaching the Truth by the pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims, preaching and teaching the Truth by elders, colporteuring and lending the Truth literature by colporteurs, sharpshooters, etc., volunteering the Truth by volunteers and bereaved workers, publishing the Truth in newspapers and magazines, as well as circulating them, answering Truth questions, giving individuals oral testimonies conversationally on the Truth, furthering the photodrama work, serving as members of the Bible House and Bethel, doing the office and home work associated with the spread of the Truth, and supporting and encouraging others in the above forms of spreading the Truth. In discharging the teaching function of this phase of his office our Pastor had to write the Truth literature and teach the Truth to the above-described kinds of workers orally as well as with the printed page, by lectures, sermons, question meetings, conversation and letter writing. As executive he discharged this phase of his office by arranging for the various above-described forms of service whereby the Truth was spread, as well as by appointing the various persons to their pertinent forms of service in Truth spreading, doing this in some cases directly, *e.g.*, pilgrims, colporteurs, etc., in others indirectly through

others, e.g., elders, volunteers, volunteer captains, by pruning out unfit persons among these workers and by arranging for them to have all the needed helps in the way of literature, fields of service, finances, encouragement, counsel, etc. The fulfilled facts prove that he executed both of his powers in this phase of his work.

(19) Eleazar's fourth duty as described in our text was to care for the anointing oil. The anointing oil types the Holy Spirit from the standpoint of its qualifying us for the Christ class service. The ingredients of the antitypical anointing oil as qualifiers for service are succinctly described in Is. 11: 2. The contents of this description may be stated as follows: the qualities of wisdom, justice, love and power each developed individually, each developed in balance with the others and in this balance all of them controlling all our other qualities (2 Peter 1: 5-8), fit us for our ministry as the Christ. As the Gospel-harvest Eleazar our Pastor's charge in this respect as teacher was to instruct the Church as to the nature of the anointing, of the anointed class, of their duties, privileges in knowledge, service, development and sufferings, and of their prospects. This he abundantly did in the Volumes and Towers especially, as well as by his oral ministry. Everything that he taught on the development of the graces as to their uses in service belonged to his teaching charge as respects the antitypical anointing oil. His teachings on the quickening, development, strengthening and balance of the Spirit, so far as they concerned qualification for service, also belong under this head. His charge as executive on this head required him to supervise the work of appointing qualified persons to the various forms of service. He did this directly in the case of pilgrims, colporteurs, photodrama workers, Bible House and Bethel workers, managers of the foreign branches and newspaper workers. He did this indirectly in the case of elders, deacons, volunteer captains, volunteers, sharpshooters and photodrama

ushers, by advising as to their qualifications and against accepting and continuing the disqualified in the pertinent service. He also exercised this function of his office as executive directly and indirectly by keeping, and advising against keeping persons from entering services for which they were not qualified and by dismissing, or advising dismissing from such services those who later proved themselves as having become unfit therefore. On this, his fourth official function, the facts prove that he fulfilled the type in his work as that Servant, as he did in other respects.

(20) The fifth charge of Eleazar was the Tabernacle itself, *i.e.*, the whole structure, while it was standing, was under his superintendency. The tabernacle, of course, in its holy and most holy, types the Church militant and triumphant, as new creatures, and in its court, the humanity of the new creatures and the household of faith. For the Gospel-harvest Eleazar this would mean that our pastor had in a teaching and executive way charge of the new creatures during the reaping and gleaning time, yea, until Oct. 30, 1916, when in the toga scene he resigned his office as having been completely fulfilled. It would likewise mean that he had the teaching and executive charge of their justified humanity undergoing sacrifice, as represented by the court, as well as that he was the proper one to teach, and to point out the work of the tentatively justified during that period. He fulfilled his charge of the antitypical Holy by teaching and directing the Church as God's habitation in its mission as such. His charge of the antitypical Most Holy during the Parousia was to teach with respect to it the Truth then due to be known by the Church this side of the veil, and to act on this side of the veil as the executive hand of God and the Christ beyond the veil; but during the Millennium this charge will imply his teaching and directing the glorified Church as Jesus' special representative in its Millennial work. Each of the twelve Apostles

will act under his direction as a teacher and a director of one of the twelve tribes of Spiritual Israel and through them of the twelve tribes of Millennial Israel—the world. Thus the twelve brethren who were the Jewish Harvest Eleazar will be on twelve thrones judging [directing; ruling] the twelve tribes of [Spiritual and Millennial] Israel (Luke 22: 30), in his charge as Jesus' special representative. Thus this type teaches that our Pastor will be the one on our Lord's right in the Kingdom. Thus we see that both antitypical Eleazar will be in charge of the Most Holy, each of the Apostles, under our Lord, over a tribe of it, and the Parousia Messenger, under Him, over the whole of it, including the twelve Apostles.

(21) The sixth charge of Eleazar was the holy furniture. This is implied in part by the expression, "and all that is therein," and by what is meant by the expression translated, "in the sanctuary." We understand the translation of the last two phrases of our text, as the explanation of the preceding phrase, "and all that therein is," to be the following: in respect to the holy [furniture] and in respect to its vessels. The word *kodesh* here cannot be the holy or most holy, for these are implied in the term *tabernacle* previously used. The term, *its vessels*, is implied in part by, as it is also a part of the apposition to the expression, "and all that therein is." What was the rest of that which was among "all that therein" was? The holy furniture, of course. Hence we see that the last two phrases of v. 16 are appositional to the expression, "all that therein is," and therefore is explanatory of it. Hence the furniture's vessels being meant by the last phrase, the furniture must be meant by the next last phrase. Therefore Eleazar's sixth charge was the holy furniture—the two altars, the laver, the lampstand, the table and the ark. Therefore, the antitypical Eleazar's (our Pastor's) charge was their antitypes. The antitypical Brazen Altar being the Christ's humanity in its work

of comforting, encouraging, strengthening, correcting and restraining, as each case may require, the humanity of the anointed brethren as it was and is being sacrificed, our Pastor's charge as to this Altar was as teacher to teach the brethren their privileges as to using their human all in such a way as to comfort, encourage, strengthen, correct, warn and restrain the humanity of one another as each case required, while it was being sacrificed for the Lord's cause. This he often did in his oral and written teachings, as well as by his example. His charge of this Altar as executive was exercised in supervising such comforting, strengthening, encouraging, correcting, warning and restraining work, which he did by encouraging and directing the brethren in the use of their human all in this way and by hindering a contrary course on their part. His teaching charge of the antitypical Golden Altar, the New Creatures in their capacity of encouraging, comforting, strengthening, correcting, warning and restraining the sacrificing and suffering New Creatures (Heb. 10: 32-39), was exercised by his explaining, proving, illustrating, etc., the privileges of the brethren to use their new-creaturely powers, etc., encourage, strengthen, correct, warn and restrain, as each case required, their new-creaturely brethren amid their sacrificial sufferings; while his executive charge of the antitypical Golden Altar was fulfilled by his encouraging the new creatures to, and directing them in such work.

(22) As we have seen, the laver types the Bible—God's inspired Word. Its base and shaft type the Old Testament as the foundation of the New Testament and its bowl types the New Testament as the superstructure of the Old Testament. The water in the bowl types the truths of the Bible in their cleansing respects. Our Pastor's executive charge of the antitypical Laver, therefore, means that the Bible was placed in his care in order that he might preserve it, commend it and make it influential and see to it that

it was used for its Divinely intended purpose of furnishing the proper doctrinal, refutative, correctional and ethical teachings, and to direct the use of pertinent Scriptures to this purpose. This charge implied that, under the Lord, he was the one who should direct the time, occasion, work and agents of using the Bible in the above-indicated ways. His teaching charge of the antitypical Laver implied that he was to declare the doctrine of the Scripture, as well as its various teachings in doctrinal, refutational, correctional and ethical respects. Certainly his work of executive and teacher proves that he carried out these two functions of his office in this respect. While on this point we desire to apply this teaching to an error that has circulated among some of the Lord's people, that there are other books, *e.g.*, Pseudepigraphs like the book of Enoch, the Old Testament Apocrypha, etc., that are inspired writings, *i.e.*, are a part of the Bible. If they were, then our Pastor, who had charge of the antitypical Laver, would have accepted them as such, and would have acted as executive and teacher of them; for the Lord would have given them to him for this purpose, and as the wise and faithful steward he would have wisely and faithfully performed his teaching and executive functions toward them. But the Lord never gave them to him as such; he never accepted them as such; and he never fulfilled either of his two functions as antitypical Eleazar toward them. This is, to Truth people, a complete proof that they are not part of God's inspired Revelation.

(23) The lampstand represents the New Creatures as enlighteners of one another. It teaches them the Truth. Our Pastor acted out his office as teacher with respect to the antitypical Lampstand in that he explained the nature, character, privileges, duties, etc., of the Church as enlightener of the brethren, as well as taught the Church what and how to do in enlightening the brethren. As executive he fulfilled his office toward

the antitypical Lampstand by encouraging New Creatures to enlighten one another, putting into their hands the instrumentalities whereby they did this enlightening work, and by directing them in the application of the means, methods and ways of giving such enlightenment. The table of shewbread types the New Creatures in their capacity of strengthening one another with the bread of life unto every good word and work, *i.e.*, unto the graces of the Spirit and the service of the Truth, for their journey to the antitypical Holy of Holies. Our Pastor's charge of this table would, therefore, imply that as teacher he would instruct New Creatures on the privileges, duties, spirit, manner, means and methods connected with their strengthening one another in every good word and work. His writings and oral teachings were replete with such instructions and thus they prove that he fulfilled this function of his teaching office. As executive he fulfilled his charge of the antitypical Table by making arrangements for his pertinent, oral and written instructions to reach the brethren in their capacity of strengthening one another in every good word and work, by making such pilgrim, elder, etc., arrangements whereby this could be done and furthered and by arranging for meetings, conventions, etc., wherein it could be done and furthered.

(24) The chest part of the ark types the Christ class beyond the veil and the mercy seat, cherubim and the radiated light of the shekinah represent God's four chief attributes and the shekinah itself represents Him in His person. Our Pastor's teaching charge with respect to the chest of the ark was his work of making the pertinent explanations, proofs and illustrations necessary to clarify to the Church this side of the veil the Christ beyond the veil. His executive charge as to it was to do the things that belonged to his being the special representative of the Christ class, particularly of its Head, in matters this side of the veil, *i.e.*, to be

the hand on this side of the veil of the Christ class on the other side of the veil. So, too, his teaching charge with respect to the top of the ark, that which represents God and His attributes, was to explain Him and them with concordant proofs and illustrations; while his executive charge as to these was to be God's hand this side of the veil to carry out the pertinent work.

(25) The seventh and final charge of Eleazar was the vessels of the tabernacle. It was his sixth and seventh charge that made him have charge of the Kohathites in their service of the tabernacle (Num. 3: 32). This was carrying the furniture and vessels after they were covered by the priests. So the charge of the Kohathites was not an eighth charge of Eleazar, but was implied with his sixth and seventh charges. From a comparison of Num. 3: 32 [*"the chief of the Levites"*] are evidently the Kohathites, who were higher ("the chief") in honor of service than the Merarites and Gershonites] and of Num. 4: 28, 33, we conclude that our Pastor was also particularly charged with the oversight of the Parousia, Epiphany and Millennial Kohathites' work. He discharged this work toward the Parousia and Epiphany Kohathites by his giving the proper teachings as to the antitypical Altars, Laver, Lampstand, Table, Ark and the Vessels, *i.e.*, Bible passages (censers), doctrines (cups), refutations (bowls), corrections (chargers, platters) and ethics (spoons); while as executive he arranged that these teachings reached them. Thereby he in part also discharged his office toward the Millennial Kohathites—the Ancient Worthies. The rest of it he will do in the Millennium. We proved (Vol. VIII, Chap. II) that the censers type Bible passages; the chargers, platters, the corrective teachings; the cups, the doctrinal teachings; the bowls, the refutative teachings, and the spoons, the ethical teachings that the antitypical Priesthood would use in its ministries. Our Pastor's executive charge of the Bible passages that should be used by the Priesthood

implied that he was the one through whom the Lord gave the decision as to which passages were to be presented as due on the pertinent subjects, as well as to furnish suitable vehicles—articles, books, discourses, etc., wherein they would be explained—and manage the distribution of these to the Priesthood; while his teaching charge in this respect was to explain, prove and illustrate the contents of such passages for the use of the sacrificing Priesthood. His teaching charge as to the corrective, doctrinal, refutational and ethical teachings was to expound, prove, illustrate, etc., such teachings; while his executive charge as to these was to arrange for the ways, means, methods, agents and conditions for such teaching to be administered to and by the ministering Priesthood. His written and oral instructions and his administrative acts abundantly prove that he fulfilled both parts of his seventh charge, and that faithfully.

(26) In the above we have tersely set forth the seven ways (as typed in Num. 4: 16) in which the two functions—teaching and executive—of the office of that Servant, as described in Luke 12: 42-45 and Matt. 24: 45-47, were fulfilled in his ministry. Beyond all contradiction, he did these seven things in a teaching and executive way. Therefore he is the Gospel-harvest Eleazar. No other individual at the end of the Age did them, and that in these two ways. Hence he alone was that Servant and the Gospel-harvest antitype of Eleazar. Therefore that Servant was not a class, as also the figure of a steward over the other servants of a household proves. Hence those brethren who deny that he was exclusively that Servant contradict fulfilled prophecy and, therefore, must be blind on that subject and are in that blindness because of unfaithfulness or immaturity (2 Pet. 1: 9; Heb. 5: 11-14); while to deny it after once having seen it is a certain evidence of unfaithfulness, and leaves its deniers open to being blown about by every wind of doctrine, as facts amply prove.

Our regarding him as the Gospel-harvest Eleazar is not to be construed as exalting him to the belittlement of our Lord. Rather, it is in harmony with our Lord's preeminence that He have a special representative. That a king speaks and acts through a prime minister by no means belittles a king. Rather, it honors him as such and is to be expected of him. So, too, our Lord's using our Pastor as His special eye, mouth and hand, does not belittle, but honors Him. As a Spirit Being invisible to man, it was, of course, necessary and practical that He should have had such a special representative. Undoubtedly the type of Eleazar, as set forth in our text, shows that someone different from our Lord (antitypical Aaron) would have the seven charges set forth in this text. Hence he would, for the end of the Age, be some individual this side of the veil; for whenever Eleazar and Ithamar are expressly named in relation to the end of the Age, they always type two individuals, not two classes, which Priests cannot be.

(27) The close thought relation between Num. 4: 16, on the one hand, and Matt. 24: 45-47 and Luke 12: 42-45, on the other hand, suggests the interesting conclusion that our Lord, knowing that the two Harvests were parallel, quite likely got from Num. 4: 16 the thought that there would be a "that Servant" with pertinent powers in the Gospel Harvest and therefore gave the prophetic delineation of him contained in Matt. 24: 35-37 and Luke 12: 42-45. We, of course, would not deny that He could have gotten this thought by direct Divine inspiration or from some other types, like 2 Sam. 23: 8; Num. 16: 37-40 and 25: 7-13, or from some prophecies, like Is: 21: 5-10 and Hab. 2: 1, 2. But each of these passages singly, and all of them combinedly, lack the fullness of the ideas on this line of thought given in Num. 4: 16, while our text parallels very closely the thoughts given in Matt. 24 and Luke 12 on this subject. Therefore, very likely it was to our

Lord the main, if not the exclusive, source of the prophecies given in Matt. 24 and Luke 12.

(28) A practical reflection we may profitably draw from this study, *i.e.*, to exercise a meek—teachable and leadable—attitude of mind and heart toward the teachings and arrangements given through that Servant. This does not mean that he was infallible; for he was not, even as his words and some of his teachings prove; nor that his teachings should be accepted with blank and unquestioning minds; for this would be an unpriestly attitude; but it does mean that we should approach his teachings as those coming from the Divinely authorized special eye and mouth of the Lord to the Church in the Parousia, as also foundational for the Epiphany; and that we should approach his arrangements as those of the Divinely ordained executive for the Lord for the Parousia, as also foundational for the Epiphany. This attitude would safeguard us against revolutionism, keep us in the Parousia Truth and make us receptive to the Epiphany Truth. Moreover, it would also enable us to accept the position that his teachings on the truths needed for the Church's development, as they were left in 1914, are throughout true. It would not mean that every detail of his teachings on matters of developing the Great Company by 1914 was true; for the Great Company developing truths are not to be free from error entirely until 1954—the mother of a daughter was not entirely purified until the 80th day; but on this feature of thought it must be held that by the time of his death, Oct. 31, 1916, all the foundations of the Great Company truths had been laid, though here and there small adjustments in the foundations must thereafter be made. Properly to adjust ourselves to his teachings and arrangements would keep us from the Levitical and other errors of this Epiphany and would keep us in the right attitude toward the Priests' Epiphany teachings and work. A brief casting of the eyes of our

understanding about us will give us conclusive evidence as to the truthfulness of these statements. Therefore, dear brethren, let us rightly and heartily hold to him as that Servant, the Gospel-harvest Eleazar, who will also be the Millennial Eleazar, the one at our Lord's right hand forevermore.

(29) We now proceed to study Eleazar as a type of our Pastor, as he is set forth in Num. 16: 36-40. The main subject matter of these verses antitypically is not entirely new, since we have under the fifth sifting (Calls—Siftings—Slaughter Weapons; Vol. V, Chap. II) briefly expounded it. Here we will give more details. The setting of the story being given in the abovementioned chapter, it will not be necessary to go into detail thereon. Suffice it to say that from Feb., 1908, to June, 1911, we had the fifth harvest call, sifting and slaughter weapon working contemporaneously. Among the Truth people the sifting was initiated through objections to the vow, which proved to be the antitypical fringe on the corners of antitypical Israelites' symbolic garments—graces. Korah types the 1908-1911 sifters among the Truth people and the associated 250 Levites represent that many groups of crown-losers in the nominal church. During that period, in gross contradiction of, and in usurpatory competition with the true Priesthood—Head and Body—the apostate new creatures in and out of the Truth antityped Korah and his band in offering incense as against Aaron. As fire from the Lord (v. 35) destroyed Korah and his band, so destruction went out from the Lord to the New Creatures of antitypical Korah and his band.

(30) At that time among Truth people the controversy was over the Sin-offerings, Mediator and Covenants. The Ransom was drawn somewhat into the controversy, not because of either side denying the corresponding-price, but because the sifters misrepresented our view of the Sin-offerings, as though we taught that the Church's share in the Sin-offering made

the Church produce a part of the Ransom merit, alleging that we necessarily thereby taught that Jesus alone did not produce the entire Ransom merit. Not a few were deceived into believing the sifting leaders' misrepresentations on these two points, and fought us as though we really taught as we were misrepresented to teach. Such deceived ones fought an error, which, however, we did not hold. Those who deceived them—antitypical Korah—knew better, but were conscienceless enough to spread the deception to draw disciples after themselves, and thereby perished as New Creatures. But the new creatures deceived by them, fighting a real error, though beating the air so far as the Priesthood's pertinent teachings were concerned, did not die as New Creatures, typed by the preservation of Korah's sons (Num. 26: 11), though by becoming sons of antitypical Korah they lost their crowns, and are now one of the 60 groups of Epiphany Levites. Antitypical Korah's and his band's censers were the Scripture passages that they used against our understanding of the Sin-offerings, Mediator and Covenants. Aaron got the fire for his censer from the altar of burnt offerings, while the others evidently used strange fire. The coals of the altar type true teachings and their heat types the fiery trials that result for the offerer from ministering such teachings (Is. 6: 57; 1 Pet. 4: 12-14). The incense, as spices, type Jesus' actually perfect human powers and our reckonedly perfect human powers; and, as perfume arising from the service, it represented the graces, especially faith, love, longsuffering, forbearance and patience. The strange fire of Korah and his band type the false doctrines that their antitypes put into the Bible passages that they used. The heat coming from this strange fire types the trials their offering brought to them. Their incense, as spices, type their choice justified human powers; and the perfume from the incense represents their graces. But as they progressed, their human powers lost their justification

and the scent of their incense became increasingly foul, as disgraces, they dying as New Creatures before the eleventh hour ended.

(31) The charge to Eleazar to take up the censers types God's command to our Pastor, given through antitypical Moses, Jesus, as God's Executive, to discuss the passages that the sifters used. They certainly used—rather, misused—many passages. *E.g.*, a certain Mr. Read, of the Pittsburgh Ecclesia, sent us, in Feb., 1909, about a dozen single-spaced, typewritten pages, 8½" by 11", of which perhaps a half of the space was occupied by Bible passages, alleged to teach the sifters' view of the *burning* questions at issue. The same is true of the articles appearing in Mr. Henninges' New Covenant Advocate, of Mr. McPhail's large booklet, Sin-offering, Mediator and Covenants, as well as of the numerous pamphlets and tracts that others produced during that sifting. These passages our Pastor certainly took up and discussed in detail. The charge to scatter the fire—the burning coals of strange fire—types God's charge to our Pastor to refute and destroy the sifters' errors on the Sin-offerings, Mediator and Covenants, as well as to overthrow the misrepresentation of our teachings as implying that Jesus produced part, and the Church the rest of the Ransom merit. Eleazar's scattering the fire types our Pastor's refuting the involved errors and misrepresentation. Bro. Russell did as thorough a job of this work as he perhaps ever did of any work. Beginning with the Jan. 1, 1909, Tower and running well into the 1911 Towers, in practically every number articles refutatory of the sifters' errors and discussing in detail the involved passages, appeared. In most of these Towers the bulk of the space was devoted to these burning questions. The taking of the censers out of the burning—burning coals of strange fire—represents how our Pastor separated the involved Scriptures from the errors that they were quoted to prove, by showing that they implied no

such senses as the sifters attributed to them. His main articles on these questions have been gathered together in a small book, entitled, "What Pastor Russell Taught."

(32) Twice are these censers spoken of as being *hallowed*, in the A. V. of our text (vs. 37, 38). In both places we believe there is a mistranslation. In each verse the verb *kadash* is active in the Hebrew, but is rendered as a passive in the A. V. The words translated, "for they are hallowed," in v. 37, should be connected with the first part of v. 38, and the translation should read as follows: "but let them hallow the censers of these sinners against their own souls [Second Deathers]; and let them make them beaten plates for a covering of the altar; for they shall offer them before the Lord and hallow them and let them be a sign to the children of Israel." The A. V. beclouds the meaning; for it makes Korah's and his band's misusing the censers the hallowing of them! It was Eleazar's and his assistants' work that hallowed them after they were defiled by Korah and his band. Antitypically, the correct translation shows that it was the cleansing of these passages from the sifters' errors and expounding them truthfully that made them holy in that they thus, free from erroneous interpretations, gave holy thoughts of Truth on the subjects at controversy between the combatants of 1908-1911. In addition to v. 35 proving the sifters to be in the Second Death, v. 38 proves it, by the expression, "these sinners against their own souls." It will be noticed that not only Eleazar was charged to hallow, offer and make the censers *beaten* [better translation than *broad*] plates for a covering of the altar, but others were charged to assist him therein—let *them* hallow . . . and offer . . . and make them into beaten plates. The same thing is stated in v. 39, where the fulfillment of the charge is stated—*they* made them beaten plates [literally, they beat them into plates] for a covering of the

altar ("for they shall offer them before the Lord and hallow them"). According to this, others assisted our Pastor in making such beaten plates for a covering of the altar, though the connection shows that his part therein by far overshadowed theirs.

(33) Before going further into this feature, it would be well to note what is typed by making beaten plates for a covering of the altar. The brazen altar types the actually perfect humanity of Jesus and the reckonedly perfect humanity of the Church, in their capacity of supporting, strengthening, helping the humanity of the Christ class, as it is being sacrificed—the altar held up the sacrifice as it was being consumed. Accordingly, beating the censers into plates for a covering of the brazen altar would type the exposition of the involved passages in such a way as to construct from them doctrines that would defend the Sin-offering sacrifice of Jesus and the Church. Early in the controversy it was recognized that the key to all the questions involved in debate was the Church's share in the Sin-offering. If this point could be proven, of course, as a matter of self-evidence, it would follow that the Mediator was a composite one, which the sifters denied, and that the New Covenant was operative exclusively Millennially and post-Millennially, which the sifters also denied. Accordingly, the Sin-offerings were the crux of the controversy and were so emphasized by those who stood for the two Sin-offerings; and this is brought out in the type by the Divine charge to beat the censers, used by the Levites, into plates as a covering of the altar, *i.e.*, the passages were to be given such an interpretation and setting as would defend the Sin-offerings as being the humanity of Jesus and the Church, the antitypical Altar.

(34) The hallowing of the censers, of course, types the cleansing of the passages from the defilements of error put into them by the sifters and so setting them forth as to show them to contain the Truth. Their

offering these to the Lord types their devotion of them to the Lord in His service. As the text indicates, such hallowing of the censers and beating of them into plates for a covering of the altar, while being especially Eleazar's work, was not exclusively his. This is proven by the words, "let *them* hallow," "let *them* make" and "*they* offered," "*they* hallowed," and "*they* made." Our Pastor, as antitypical Eleazar, did by far the most of the involved work. Bro. Barton, by his sermon on God's Covenants (1909 Convention Report, 143), as the antitype of Shammah, David's third mightiest warrior, defending against, and delivering the field full of lentils, from the Philistines, was one of those who antitypically helped offer and hallow these passages and make them defend the two Sin-offerings (2 Sam. 23: 11, 12). Another brother, as the antitype of Eleazar, the son of Dodo, David's second mightiest warrior, working in close cooperation with that Servant, as the antitype of David, was also active in the offering, hallowing and beating of these plates (1 Chro. 11: 12-14). (David's two wars where he most disastrously defeated the Philistines type the two greatest controversies of the reaping time—the Ransom controversy and the Sin-offerings controversy). This brother's encounter with M.L. McPhail before part of the Chicago Church on the same subjects is set forth under another type in 1 Chro. 20 : 6, 7. Bro. MacMillan's controversy with, and defeat of, A. E. Williamson before the Altoona, Pa., Church on the same questions, is set forth in 1 Chro. 20: 4. Bro. Crawford's controversy by a tract with E. C. Henninges' view as put forth in The New Covenant Advocate, is set forth in 2 Sam. 21: 19. While these four assisting brothers are thus expressly pointed out, Bro. Russell's part in this matter far out-shadowed theirs, as indicated by his special mention in our text, while they are not there named. Still others, not expressly set forth as such in the Bible, so far as we know, also assisted in this work.

We believe that, everything considered, Bro. Russell appeared at his best as a controversialist in the 19081911 sifting, and at the same time produced perhaps the most able and voluminous writings of his career on controversial matters, though he had to struggle harder internally when, as antitypical Jashobeam, he broke through the ranks of demons and sifters in his endeavor to get the Truth on the Sin-offerings in 1879, and though he wrought more havoc, as antitypical Jashobeam, in the controversy on eternal torment and the consciousness of the dead. His prowess as that Servant in the capacity of a brave and efficient *warrior* in the controversy of 1908-1911 (our present study sets him forth as a *Priest*—the chief Under-priest at the time) is represented by the prowess of David, with whom Eleazar, the Dodoite, was associated in the fight at Pasdammim [field of bloods, *i.e.*, sphere of the Sin-offerings], when both of them drove away a large band of Philistines (1 Chro. 11: 13, 14).

(35) Vs. 38 and 40 antitypically show that the true teachings of the Sin-offerings, Mediator and Covenants were to be a sign (evidence) and a memorial (a reminder) to the Lord's people of the fact that only appointed members of the Priesthood should offer incense (present teachings before the Church), to the intent that no nonmember of the Priesthood should endeavor to set forth new teachings. These could properly be set forth, as a rule, only by the special mouthpiece Priest in office at the time, and exceptionally by other Truth servants, in fulfillment of the Lord's word pertinent to them, when He said that every scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven (thoroughly competent and authorized teacher) would bring forth from the storehouse things new and old (Matt. 13: 52). Others attempting to do so, whether Priest or Non-priest, would be speculating and thus be bringing forth error to their and others' ruin (Ex. 19: 21-25). This raises the question, How should the "scribes instructed

unto the kingdom of heaven" do when they get a new truth or think they get one? We reply, Let them do as we did in Bro. Russell's day: Present it to the mouthpiece Priest for examination; and only if he approves give it out to others. This course we found safe in his day; and others will also find it safe now, when the utmost danger exists, if a contrary course is entered upon. This "sign and memorial" are now being grossly violated by the Levites, who in not a few cases rashly and without the proper authorization as teachers obtrude their notions either on a local church or on the general Church. The present sifting leaders are fearful examples of violating this sign and reminder. Hence they have been spreading "the pestilence that walketh in darkness," now so disastrously infecting the hearts and minds of the majority of the Lord's people. Surely now "ten thousand foes arise."

(36) When we consider how finely that Servant, as the antitype of Eleazar, of Num. 16: 36-40, conducted himself amid the involved controversy, in which he was not only personally attacked with much bitterness and misrepresentations, but in which his views were also attacked with keener subtlety than in any other sifting of the reaping time, we learn to appreciate and love him more and more; for he was certainly, from many standpoints, put into the furnace of affliction in that sifting, from which he emerged much refined and purified. And his loyalty therein was rewarded by the Lord's greatly extending the scope and fruitfulness of his already widespread and fertile ministry. Yea, we thank God for every remembrance of him! God bless his memory!

(37) We now will set forth our Pastor's work against the combinationists, whose activities constituted the sifting of the sixth hour call (Matt. 20: 5). This sifting is typically set forth in Num. 25, as the Apostle Paul tells us (1 Cor. 10: 8; Vol. V, Chap. II). Localities mentioned in the Bible are usually typical, as some

of our previous studies have shown, *e.g.*, Mt. Sinai, Mt. Zion, Mt. Pisgah, Bethlehem, Bethany, Jerusalem, Jericho, Samaria, Jezreel, etc. Accordingly, we are by the general typical setting of Num. 25 to conclude that Shittim is typical. The word means *acacia trees*. Trees are symbolic of great ones, either good (Is. 61: 3), or bad (Rev. 7: 13). The acacia trees, we gather from this connection, represent the great ones of Christendom in church, state and capital. Israel's abiding in Shittim we would therefore understand to mean God's people, real and nominal, having contacts and experiences with such great ones. And while the bulk of God's nominal people and some of His real people had such contacts and experiences they became more or less guilty of combinationism (the people began to commit fornication with the daughters of Moab and Midian).

(38) By combinationism we mean an illicit union of God's people with evil persons, principles, things and practices. The consecrated practice combinationism when they mix their principles and practices with great or little Babylon's erroneous principles and practices, *e.g.*, introducing clericalistic principles and practices among the consecrated, uniting with them in their studies, services and characteristics. The justified practice combinationism when they mix their principles and practices with those of the camp. The camp practice combinationism when they cooperate with non-Christian religious movements. Then all of these can combine with one another and with non-Christian persons, etc. Examples of combinationism are evident in the union of church and state, of denominations with denominations, of Levite movements with Levite movements, of Christian people with religio-secret-societies, of churchianity with Judaism, Mohammedanism, and heathenism. From the standpoint of the Gospel Harvest, Israel's fornication while encamped at Shittim types such combinationistic acts between June, 1891,

and October, 1894; for during those years, especially in connection with the Parliament of Religions at the Chicago World's Fair in 1893, by its preparations, proceedings and aftermath, did many antitypical Israelites commit symbolic fornication. Among Truth people this was done in the sense of seeking to introduce among them not a few of Babylon's practices on the part of Messrs. Zech, Adamson, Bryan and Rogers. These led the third sifting of the Harvest among Truth people, while Drs. Barrows, Bonney, etc., led the movement to make one religion of all religions, one of whose activities was the assembling of the Chicago Parliament of Religions of 1893. The formation of the Federal Council of the Brotherhood of Andrew and Philip in 1893, as an interdenominational body, by the Rev. Rufus W. Miller, and of the Open and Institutional Church League in March, 1894, championed by Drs. Thompson and Sanford, directly, within 12 years, led to the formation of the National Federation of Churches in 1905, while the Open and Institutional Church League by 1895, ten years before the national organization was formed, had succeeded in forming the first local federation of churches in New York City. These facts show us how through the symbolic fornication from June, 1891, to Oct., 1904, combinationism had its beginnings and has since progressed. These movements in the main are typed by the Israelitish men fornicating with the daughters of Moab and Midian.

(39) Since the daughters of Moab type various false doctrines that constitute the theories and practices of combinationism—unionism—their calling on the men of Israel to sacrifice to their gods (v. 2) types the appeals of these unionistic doctrines and practices on the Lord's people, real and nominal, to work for combinationism. Among these false doctrines are the following: all [professed] Christian people are one; all denominations combined are the Church; Christ in

John 17 prayed for the unity of these; these by federation should work to fulfill His prayer; their differences are nonessential matters; they should be ignored and their agreements emphasized; it makes no difference what one believes, if only he is sincere; forget faith and be busy in good works. These false doctrines invited antitypical Israel to offer sacrifices to the creed of combinationism [their gods]. The Israelites eating at the sacrificial feasts type apostate consecrated, justified and worldly ones accepting such false theories; and the former bowing down to the false gods type the latter serving by their influence, talents, means, etc., the interests of combinationism. Israel's being bound (v. 3) to Baal-peor [*lord of the penis*, in whose worship Moabitish women prostituted themselves] types the apostate antitypical Israelites being combined in an illicit union—symbolic fornication. As in the type God was angry (v. 3) at Israel, so in the antitype He became highly indignant at antitypical Israel's symbolic fornication, as was most meet.

(40) Of course, the leaders of Israel [leaders of the people—v. 4] were more guilty than the ordinary Israelites whom they misled, just as the leaders in combinationism's various forms were more guilty than the multitudes that they misled. Hence in both type and antitype these were by God given over to the worse punishment. To be hanged in Biblical symbols means that one is actually or allegedly proven to be an evildoer. Our Lord's hanging on the cross was demanded by the Sanhedrin as an alleged proof that He was an evildoer; even as is suggested by the act of exposing one very publicly, in the light of the sun, as is done in the kind of hanging here commanded. God's charge therefore to Moses to hang for the Lord before the sun the leaders of the sinning people, types His charge to Jesus to demonstrate very publicly as a service (before the Lord) to God that the leaders of the combinationists were evildoers. Our Lord did this partly

through some of His people, like Prof. Wilkinson, of Chicago University; Joseph Cook, a Boston lecturer; Rev. Devine, of New York; Count Bernstorff, of Germany, and Mr. Grant, a Canadian, who in Babylon protested against their leaders taking part in such combinationism as being condemned in the Bible; but He did it mainly through the Truth people, particularly through our Pastor. That the leaders of combinationism were especially publicly proven to be evildoers can be seen in Z '93, 323-349 and in Vol. IV, 157-268, where the following leaders are mentioned by name and are very publicly proven guilty of combinationism in matters pertinent to the Divine service ["before the Lord"]: Dr. J.H. Barrows, chief organizer of the Parliament of Religions; Mr. W.T. Stead, editor of the "Review of Reviews"; Rev. Theo. E. Steward, of the Brotherhood of Christian Unity; C.C. Bonney, originator of the Association for Promotion of Religious Unity and President of the Parliament of Religions; Rev. T. Chalmers, of the Disciple Church; Dr. Chas. A. Briggs, higher-critical theological professor; Rev. Theodore Munger; Dr. Rexford, prominent Universalist; Dr. Lyman Abbot, Beecher's successor; Lady Somerset (English noblewoman), Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Universalist; Romanist Bishop Keane, Prof. Henry Drummond, author of "The Natural Law in the Spiritual World"; Dr. Candlin, missionary to China; Dr. Bristol, Methodist minister; Rev. Augusta Chapin, Rev. King, Methodist Church; Cardinal Gibbons, Chancellor Vincent, Chautauqua Literary Circle; Dr. T.J. Conarty, Romanist educator; Rev. S.F. Scovel, Presbyterian; Rev. F.H. Hopkins, Episcopalian, etc. By the refutation of their errors and practices and their being very publicly [against the sun] proven to be wrongdoers in matters pertinent to the Divine service [before the Lord], God's wrath was measurably appeased (v. 4).

(41) The charge that Moses gave to the judges of

Israel to kill every man within their jurisdictions who was joined to Baal-peor (v. 5) types our Lord's charge given to Bro. Russell and the pilgrims to refute the errorists with whom they came into contact who held the teachings of combinationism. How Bro. Russell did his part can be seen especially in the Tower of Nov. 1, 15, 1893, and in Chap. VI of Studies, Vol. IV treating of Babylon's Confusion—Ecclesiastical. In this work he was also joined by the pilgrims through the pertinent refutative teachings of their discourses and conversations. Bro. Russell's part in it, which was decidedly far larger than that of all the pilgrims combined, is particularly described typically in vs. 6-15. And it is because of his pertinent work being typed in these verses that we have chosen Num. 25 as the basis of this part of our chapter. The man of the children of Israel (v. 6) who caused a Midianitish woman to come near to his brethren types the class, representatives of which were mentioned in the preceding paragraph, which introduced among their fellow Christians the greatest error of combinationism's errors, to the effect that it makes no difference to God what one believes, if only he is sincere in it. This error sweeps away, as it were at one stroke of a broom, the distinctive claim of the Bible as between Christianity and all other religions, that it alone is true, and to the extent that the others differ from it they are false. This peculiar claim of true Christianity is pivoted on the fact that Christ alone is made of God Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification and Deliverance to those who would approach God, and that apart from Him is no salvation or approach to God (Matt. 1: 21; John 1: 9; 4: 14; 6: 27, 33, 35, 53; 8: 12; 10: 7-9; 14: 6; 17: 2; Acts 4: 12; Rom. 5: 18, 19; 1 Cor. 3: 11; 2 Cor. 5: 19; Eph. 1: 10; 2: 13, 18; Heb. 2: 3; Rev. 5: 3, 4). This, of course, is contradicted by that part of combinationism's errors which claims that it makes no difference to God what one believes, if only he is sincere; for this

error implies that a sincere Jew, Mohammedan or heathen is as acceptable to God now and in the hereafter as is a true Christian, which means that Christ is not the only Savior; rather His claims to be the only Savior prove Him a deceiver, according to this error.

(42) This man's bringing the Midianitish woman to his brethren publicly [in the sight of Moses, etc.—v. 6.] types the great publicity which the leaders of the combinationists gave to this most un-Christian error. As the sins of the Israelitish men at Baal-peor distressed Moses and all loyal Israelites, causing them to weep before the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, so the great sin of combinationism pained Jesus and all loyal Christians in their relation to the Divine service. Phinehas (*mouth of brass*, i.e., strong mouth) was the oldest living son of the high priest Eleazar; therefore typically he sustained to Eleazar as the then high priest the same relation that the latter had held toward the former high priest Aaron, while he was his oldest living son, i.e., for the Gospel-harvest Phinehas types our Pastor as the chief Under-priest on earth, and in this scene Phinehas (*brazen mouth*) types our Pastor from the standpoint of the strength of the latter's pertinent utterances, teachings (Jer. 1: 18; 15: 20). Phinehas perceiving the wicked act and purpose of the Israelitish man and arising from among the mourning congregation types our Pastor perceiving the unholy course and purpose of the combinationistic leaders, and arising from among the mourners over combinationism to take practical measures against it. Phinehas taking a javelin—a small spear that is thrust at an antagonist—types our Pastor taking his article in the double Tower of Nov. 1, 15, 1893, into hand (powerfully), preparatory to thrusting it at the combinationistic leaders, for their taking part in the Chicago Parliament of Religions, where the antitypical fornication had especially taken place. Phinehas following the man into his tent types our Pastor pursuing after the combinationistic

leaders into their innermost theories, which were their dwelling place. Phinehas thrusting both through with the javelin, apparently while they were in the act of fornication, types our Pastor by the abovementioned article, completely refuting the combinationistic leaders and the particular error, that it makes no difference to God what one believes, if only he is sincere. Phinehas thrusting the javelin through the woman's belly (literally, *genital organ*) types our Pastor refuting the pertinent error and its unholy generative powers. Above we enumerated a list of the errors that support the particular one under consideration. All of these as the unholy generative powers of this one error were refuted thoroughly by our Pastor's pertinent article. As in Israel Phinehas' deed stayed the plague, so our Pastor's article stayed the pestilential effects of the involved error. First this effect was felt among Truth people and gradually it spread in such effect toward antitypical Israelites outside the Truth movement.

(43) Our Pastor's attacks on combinationism in the Nov. 1, 15, 1893, Tower, as it was manifest in the Parliament of Religions; and in the booklet, *A Conspiracy Exposed*, and the Extra Tower of June 11, 1894, as it was manifest among the Truth people by the conspirators, were marked examples of exalted courage. Practically all Christendom either sanctioned, or was silent as to disapproval of, the Parliament of Religions. The idea became increasingly popular. Those advocating interdenominational union or federation in almost every case favored the purposes of the Parliament of Religions. Its protagonists put the stigma of bigots and old fogies upon those who in any way showed disapproval. Church and secular papers were jubilant over that Parliament. Even the few who disapproved of it, whose leaders were mentioned above, did it with more or less timidity and misgivings. Who would dare attack so popular and widely supported a movement? —was the challenge of its promoters. Our

Lord's special representative, the chief Under-priest on earth at that time, that Servant, by God's grace would do it, and that with a courage that hesitated not a moment, nor refrained from speaking the Truth unvarnished and unambiguous! He certainly did not handle the combinationists with kid gloves; rather he figuratively pounded them with brazen knuckles, just as we should expect of antitypical Phinehas (*brazen mouth*). These remarks also characterize his intrepidity and courage in handling the Truth combinationists, Messrs. Zech, Adamson, Rogers and Bryan, in his booklet, *A Conspiracy Exposed*, and in the Extra Tower of June 11, 1894. Like their kindred-minded Levite leaders in the sixth sifting, these conspirators made the air blue with their shrieks against his supposed "uncharitable criticism," "bitter slander" and "judging." But he, undismayed, continued the attack until they were driven completely out from among Truth people, among other things, announcing in the Tower Extra of June 11, 1894, that the four above-named sifters were Second Deathers and that he had withdrawn all fellowship from them.

(44) The number of those who perished by the plague for the sin at Baal-peor (24,000—v. 9) being greater than that of those who perished at any other of Israel's wilderness plagues, types the fact that combinationism smote with a symbolic plague—a frenzy of delusion (Ps. 91: 5; 2 Thes. 2: 9-12)—more victims than any of the other harvest-sifting plagues did. God's appreciation of Phinehas' zeal for Him in staying the plague by killing the Israelitish man and the Midianitish woman (vs. 10, 11) types God's appreciation of our Pastor's pertinent zeal for Him in staying the combinationism plague by thoroughly refuting the combinationistic leaders and their main error. Among the Truth people the plague was stayed by our Pastor's booklet entitled, *A Conspiracy Exposed*, combined with a later publication (Z '94, 163-208) which gave further

exposures of that conspiracy (that of Messrs. Zech, Adamson, Rogers and Bryan), and which, in addition to those exposures, contained a great number of letters of brethren, expressing their sympathy with our Pastor, and further exposing and denouncing the conspirators. We conclude from God's statement (v. 11) that had Phinehas not acted as he did, the plague would have completely destroyed Israel—that had not our Pastor stayed the plague, it would have contaminated all antitypical Israel.

(45) As God rewarded Phinehas with His covenant of peace, *i.e.*, His promise of prosperity (v. 12), so God rewarded our Pastor with His pledge of prosperity in His Priesthood; and certainly the latter's ministry from that time forward increased in prosperity by leaps and bounds. Up to that time the harvest work was comparatively small. From then onward it abounded more and more until his death, a day before which he could truly state, as to his part in the reapers' report, that he had carried out the Lord's charge committed to him (Ezek. 9: 11). In what way Phinehas would have God's promise of prosperity is indicated in v. 13. It was to be in the form of an age-lasting covenant of the priesthood for himself and his sons, prosperously conducted by them. Antitypically, this means that God announced in Spiritual Israel that Bro. Russell and all Priests loyal with him (the sons of antitypical Phinehas) would have a continuing and fruitful priesthood. How was this announcement made? We reply that shortly after our Pastor had refuted combinationism as manifest in the Parliament of Religions and as represented by the Truth conspirators (combinationists), God made known for the first time that "that Servant" of Matt. 24: 45-47 and Luke 12: 42-44 was not a class, as had previously been held, but was an individual—Bro. Russell. In calling him wise—efficient—God indicated the prosperity of his work, and in calling him faithful God indicated

that he would be a Priest unto the end; for one is not faithful unless he is loyal unto death. This public announcement in the case of the type and antitype was a reward of zeal for the Lord and for bringing the people into atonement with the Lord on the subject at hand ("zealous for his God, and made an atonement for the children of Israel"—v. 13).

(46) Sr. Russell was very zealous in defending her husband against the slanderous attacks of the conspirators and thereby defended the Truth cause against them (Z '94, 167-174); and the Lord therefore rewarded her somewhat after the manner in which He exceptionally used other women (Acts 21: 9), with the privilege of being His mouthpiece in announcing the antitypical reward, *i.e.*, of making known to the Lord's people that Bro. Russell as an individual servant of God was that Servant. This was first made known to her in the late summer of 1894. She first told it to Bro. Russell, who for a long time sought to refute the thought, until finally he was unable longer to oppose it, since the arguments in its favor are unanswerable. After talking of it to various individuals, after awhile he published the thought, first in a Tower article—Z '96, 47, and then later in Vol. IV, 613, 614. Thus, neither Jesus nor he considered it wrong for themselves to "see themselves in the Scriptures." We are not from the above to construe that our Pastor was first made that Servant after his battles with the combinationists in 1893 and 1894; for at the time, in 1879, that he struggled for 3 days with demons and demonized men, over the sin-offerings (antitypical Jashobeam battling with the antitypical Philistines in the vale of demons, while seeking the water from the well of antitypical Bethlehem), he was made that Servant as interpreter of the Word, though since the Spring of 1876 he was such as executive, he serving as such for years without his or anyone else knowing that he was such. The reward given him in 1894 was the acquainting of

him and of the Church with the fact, whereby his influence was very greatly enlarged, and thereby his fruitfulness as a Truth servant was greatly increased, even until he had faithfully completed his fruitful ministry.

(47) Zimri (*sung*), the Israelitish man who was slain with the Midianitish woman, as suggested by his name, types the combinationistic leaders from the standpoint of their being praised, *sung*, by their dupes; and certainly such leaders were highly praised by the deceived combinationists. That Zimri represents leaders is evident from the fact that he is called a prince of a chief house of his tribe. The combinationists' being tested and found wanting is typically implied in the name of Zimri's father, *Salu* (*weighed*). *Cozbi*, the name of the slain Midianitish woman, means *liar*, and thus she fittingly types the lying doctrine, that it makes no difference what one believes, if only he is sincere. Her father's name, *Zur*, means *rock*, and refers to the thought of the combinationists that "in union [combinationism] there is strength." It will be noted that Zur is mentioned (Num. 31: 8) as one of the five Midianitish kings slain. The story of Num. 31 is a picture of the Harvest from the standpoint of its refuting error, especially in the five siftings. The five slain kings of Midian type the five sifting errors. Zur, it will be noticed, is the third mentioned, and he types the third harvest-sifting error—combinationism, one of whose daughters is antitypical Cozbi. His being slain types the refutation of combinationism. God's charge to Moses to vex the Midianites (vs. 16-18) types God's charge to Christ to war against errorists. In the Harvest this was antityped. For details please see Chap. IV.

(48) The generalities of the antitype of Judg. 7: 9-15 we have set forth in Vol. V, Chap. IV, which may profitably be reviewed. In that chapter, in harmony with both its subject and the treatment that this Scripture

gives of the matter, our Lord's part is stressed. Here we will stress our Pastor's part, which, of course, was subordinate to our Lord's part, in the scouting expedition engaged in by him with our Lord, as typed in Judg. 7: 9-15. We will not here give the generalities set forth in the abovementioned chapter, but will at once discuss our subject as proposed above. It will be remembered that we gave *bough* as the meaning of the word *Phurah*, or *Purah*. This is the definition that a number of lexicographers give for the word, which is formed from the verb *paar*, or *phaar*. It is true that this word has as one of its meanings, *to branch*, from which the noun *Phurah* (*bough*) is derived; but it also has as one of its meanings, *to expound*; and from this definition the word *Phurah*, or *Purah*, means *expounder, interpreter*. Though in Vol. V, Chap. IV, we gave the definition *bough* to *Phurah*, we now think, in view of the fact that one of our Pastor's two special works was to expound the Lord's Word ("give the meat in due season"), that the definition, *expounder, explainer, interpreter*, is the one meant in Judg. 7: 915. A scout's special office is by investigation to gain information on the enemy for the army that he represents. And this was the case with the typical and antitypical Phurah, as the facts prove.

(49) The antitypical enemy under review were the Parousia errorists (Midianites), sinners (Amalekites), and self-seekers and worldlings (Children of the East), among God's nominal people. Jehovah, of course, knew, yea, foreknew, their doings; but He desired our Lord and our Pastor as real spiritual scouts to investigate their doings and the conditions that their doings revealed, in order to report these to the army that they represented. Hence Jehovah sent these out on the scouting tour antitypical of that of Gideon and Phurah. On this tour our Pastor acted as an eye for our Lord Jesus, *i.e.*, our Lord Jesus for the Church looked at these things through our Pastor as His

eye that in turn through him as His mouth He might report them to the antitypical Gideonites. The report of the things observed during this scouting tour, generally speaking, was given by the Lord through the pen of our Pastor in the Tower articles entitled, *Views From The Watch Tower*, which appeared in most of its issues. Some of them were also given in *Studies*, Vols. II-IV, and some of them in tracts and B.S.M.'s. These *Views From The Watch Tower* are not only referred to in our text, but other Scriptures also refer to our Pastor's activities therein, e.g., Is. 21: 5-10; Hab. 2: 1, 2. While all of them did not expressly refer to the fallen conditions of the nominal church, all of them did imply, either directly or indirectly, these fallen conditions, the signs of good things indirectly implying these conditions in Babylon and the signs of evil things directly implying them. Hence all of the signs of the times were observed by our Lord and our Pastor during their 40 years' scouting tour in Christendom. The main things that our Pastor saw during this tour we will now briefly set forth under the two heads—secular signs and religious signs.

(50) One of the secular signs seen by him was the great increase of travel. This, as forecast in Dan. 12: 4, he sketched in various details of progress in its vehicles: steamboats, submarines, railroad trains, trolleys, autos, buses, airships, airplanes, etc., and showed how almost everybody travels more or less. Closely related to this sign is that of the increase of knowledge (Dan. 12: 4), on which he gave details as another sign of the times. This increase in knowledge was along general encyclopediac lines, embracing great details on the greatest variety of topics, and comprehending the spheres of theoretical and practical subjects. Especially did it exhibit itself in inventions of useful appliances and destructive implements and agencies. He pointed out frequently how these two signs were closely related to the overthrow of the present order.

and the introduction of the new order. Very closely related to the foregoing signs was another on which he reported very many details that he observed throughout Christendom—the exposure of evils in all phases of society. He brought out details on the vices and crimes of Christendom, as proving its effeteness. He bared the conditions of poverty with their attendant tendencies of suffering, crime and disease. The slums and sweatshops came in for their exposure. He pointed out the abuses of the educational world, with its infidelity, higher criticism and materialistic philosophy. Statecraft in Christendom met with his exposures of its hunger for land, market and riches, its protection of the privileged classes as against the masses, its corruption of lawmakers, executives and judges, its election frauds, spoils system, boss rule, graft and land frauds, its squandering of state funds, its imposing of oppressive taxation, its statesmen using office for personal gain, its militarism and navalism, its dishonest diplomacy, its selfish, vengeful and plundering wars, its breaking of solemn treaties for national advantage, its oppression of the weak, its making might right, its national fears, envies, hatreds, rivalries and grudges, its selfish and unjust policies, etc. These signs presaged ruin to Christendom in state, to which he frequently called attention.

(51) Many, too, were his exposures, as signs of the times, of Christendom's financial, commercial and industrial world. On this line he exposed its stock gambling, stock watering, stock manipulation and stock frauds, its legal delays, technicalities, evasions and partialities, its price fixing and profiteering, its monopolizing the products of nature, its destroying competition, its dishonest and ruthless competition, its substitution of inferior for superior materials, its adulterations, its subsidizing of the press, its landlordism, the dishonesty of many of its bank and trust officials and of much of their bookkeeping, its bribery and special privileges,

its tax dodging and frauds, its frequent clearing of the rich, and almost unfailing punishment of the poor criminals caught in the toils of the law, its unauthorized use of trust funds, its insurance scandals, its railroad crookedness, its trusts' abuses, its destructive battles of financial giants, its buying of elections, its manufacture of panics and wars, its fattening on wars while imposing unsupportable burdens on the people, its reckless use of money in luxury and wrong, its bequeathing of vast estates and titles frequently to incompetents, its frequent disregard of the needs of the submerged, its pride, ostentation, cruelty and heartlessness of its money and pleasure madness. These signs presage Christendom's financial ruin and were set forth by him as such. He frequently quoted from the Scriptures to show that the exposures of Christendom's evils forecast its destruction in the Time of Trouble (1 Thes. 5: 14; 2 Pet. 3: 10; Rev. 16: 15; 1 Cor. 4: 5; Ps. 50: 1-22; 82: 15, etc.).

(52) Among other signs indicating Christendom's speedy overthrow, he called attention to its appalling calamities in the form of great famines, pestilences, earthquakes, volcanoes, tidal waves, tornadoes, hurricanes, wars, revolutions, etc., showing that while many of them were stripings for wrong, they presaged Christendom's overthrow, as many of them were connected with climatic changes introductory of Millennial conditions, which, of course, implied Christendom's overthrow. With special emphasis and pleasure did he point out as a sign of Christendom's near destruction and of the Kingdom's near establishment Israel's return to God's favor, as evidenced by the gradual removing of blindness from their eyes and prejudice from their hearts as respects Jesus Christ and as evidenced by their gradual return to their land. He showed that powerful inducements—religious, patriotic, persecuting, rational, agricultural, financial, political and legal—were making their return to Palestine

desirable. He cited the political, financial, organizational and agitational conditions that made their return to their home land feasible. Repeatedly he reported companies and individuals of them returning to Zion, and showed that this was a prophetic sign (Jer.16: 14-16; Ezek. 37: 21, 22, 25; Amos 9: 14, 15; etc.). Another sign of the times that he stressed was the gigantic war preparations of Christendom. Herein he stressed the large armies, navies, submarine and air fleets of Christendom. He stressed the immense dreadnaughts and destructive explosives, cannons, torpedoes, gases, bombs and pestilential germs. He emphasized their forts and fortresses, their military training, conscription and army camps, their enlisting inventive genius to create new destructive weapons and ammunitions and their reducing war to scientific destruction. He found these things forecast in Joel 3: 9-11 and showed how they forecast the World War as the first stage in Christendom's destruction, which forecast was fulfilled.

(53) Another set of somewhat related secular signs that our Pastor, as antitypical Phurah, observed on his scouting tour and brought in report to us were those associated with social strife, leading to great unrest. Prominent among these were those events connected with the conflict between capital and labor. At times it is a conflict of words; at times it is a conflict of blows. On capital's part, at times, he showed how it seeks to impose lower wages, longer hours, poorer working conditions, organized capitalists dealing with labor, yet rejecting union labor and its representatives. On labor's part he showed that it seeks to raise wages, shorten hours, improve working conditions, form unions, secure recognition of unions and its official representatives, unionize shops, etc., secure collective bargaining and settlement of individual grievances. He showed how in the worst forms of these conflicts capital resorted to lockouts, securing injunctions,

hiring strike breakers, using a police and militia of its own and fomenting pitched battles between these and labor; while he showed how that on labor's part it has resorted to strikes, picketing, manhandling strike breakers, boycotts, riots and pitched battles. He showed how to capital's aid as a rule state and church have rallied, with the result that society has been divided into two classes: the conservatives, consisting of capital, state and church, and the radicals, consisting of farmers, trade unionists, socialists, communists and anarchists. Antitypical Phurah referred, among others, to such passages as Jas. 5: 15 and Amos 8: 37 as forecasting this conflict, and he pointed out that this conflict presaged Christendom's fall. Partly involved in this sign of the times is another broader one—the bundling of the tares, which, on the basis of Matt. 13: 29, 30, 40, 41 and Rev. 14: 17-20, he showed, likewise presages the overthrow of Christendom. He pointed out the secular bundling process in the trusts and corporations of the business and financial world, in the trade unions, farmers' granges, etc., and socialist, communist, and anarchist organizations of the labor world, in the secret societies, insurance societies and clubs of the social world, in the teachers' and professors' organizations of the educational world, in the political parties and international alliances of the political world, and in the society uplift movements and benevolent organizations of the reform world. These he likewise pointed out as presaging Christendom's ruin.

(54) As belonging to the same group as the two foregoing signs, antitypical Phurah watched and pointed out the general unrest among all classes and conditions of men in Christendom, finding this condition forecast in Luke 21: 25. He showed how in the world of the statesmen and politicians unrest, uncertainty and perplexity were general. He also recognized and reported this as being true in the business world of manufacture, commerce and finance. The

unrest in the labor world with its varied agitations, dissatisfactions, revolts and conflicts, varying in trade unionism, grangerism, socialism, communism and anarchism, he watched and reported. The great unrest in the reform world and in the sociological and educational worlds were also observed by him and reported. The unrest in family life, seen in troubles between husbands and wives, parents and children and near and far relations, also came under his observation and received its appropriate report. On all hands he witnessed the unrest of the Parousia times and pointed out that this sign was directly connected with the preparation of the elements for the Time of Trouble. And, finally, among the secular signs of the times he observed the fact that thinking people in general recognized the presence of an unmanageable crisis in human affairs. Studying various crises in human history, he recognized the presence in his day of similar, but more magnified conditions than those that marked such crises. *E.g.*, the unmanageable crisis that introduced the French Revolution he found exhibited conditions similar to, but on a smaller scale than those which he saw about him; for he noted that just before the French Revolution religion was disparaged, authority was disobeyed, strife marked the relations of capital and labor, class hatred abounded, bread riots occurred, deep-seated dissatisfaction prevailed, great social inequalities were in vogue, agitations for radical changes were carried on, safety in flight was sought by close observers of the trend of things, reformers offered their panaceas and optimists saw everything evolving to better conditions. These very things that indicated the crisis leading up to the storm of the French Revolution, which broke with devastating effect, he saw on all hands, but in greatly magnified forms. He therefore reported these and showed that they foreshadowed the Time of Trouble. Such passages as Luke 21: 26; Is. 29: 14; etc., he recognized as forecasting

this crisis. Thus he saw many secular signs presaging the coming trouble and faithfully reported the matter as ruinous to the antitypical Midianites, Amalekites and Children of the East, as all of us know.

(55) But in antitypical Phurah's scouting tour with antitypical Gideon he also saw many religious signs of the times, all of which likewise presaged ruin for the antitypical Midianites, Amalekites and Children of the East. One of these was the Gospel witness having been by 1861 given to all nations, as a precursor of the end of the Age, the Parousia (Matt. 24: 14), observing which, he reported it to the antitypical Gideonites. As a thing showing Babylon's fallen condition he observed and reported to the Faithful the wide spread of error. This he observed in the formation of new sects, sectlets and cults of many kinds, in the rapid advance of super-naturalistic sects, such as Spiritism, Christian Science, fanatical movements, faith-curtism, and in the advocacy of materialism, atheism, agnosticism, pantheism, deism, rationalism, evolution, higher criticism and in the spread of various Hindoo and other heathen cults in Christendom. Having seen these he made faithful report thereon, even as he saw these alluded to in Matt. 24: 24. Widespread wickedness was another sign of the times that he witnessed and reported. In its Godward form such wickedness was covered in the preceding point. Manward he saw and reported it as he witnessed the evils in the family life and sex relations. In social life he saw and reported it in the cheapening of human life and its destruction by public wars and private crime, in the putting of property rights above human rights, in the dishonesties of finance, business and industry, in the corruptions of public life, in the slanders and reputation-slaying and in the deceitfulness and hypocrisy of private and public life, and in the money and pleasure madness of our

times. As a sign of the times he recognized it as taught in Matt. 24: 12; 2 Tim. 3: 13.

(56) Other signs he observed that showed the fallen condition of the nominal church. Among these was the predicted mocking at our Lord's secret invisible presence. No conscientious and fairly intelligent nominal church member would deny that the Bible teaches our Lord's return, but that He was to return invisibly and secretly was unknown to them. Hence when it was announced as having set in that manner, the predicted scoffing took place: "Where is the promise of His presence?" By such scoffing they fulfilled the predicted scoffing, and this was reported by antitypical Phurah after he observed it. Again, the great falling away from Christian faith and practice among clergy and laity, as set forth in 2 Tim. 3: 19, he diligently watched and faithfully reported to the Church. He pointed out that the clergy were by facts being proven to be self-lovers, money-lovers, popularity-lovers, pleasure-lovers, unbelievers, dishonest, moral cowards and other things mentioned in the passage just cited. He observed and pointed out the laity as being generally ignorant of the Bible, zealous, worldly, inimical to Truth and friendly to error and largely held in the churches by things appealing to their fleshly mind. Furthermore, he pointed out the federating of the churches as forecast in Is. 8: 9-11; Rev. 6: 14. This he traced in its embryo state in the uniting of the various sects of each denomination, then the denominations' flirting with one another, and finally the forming of an incorporated federation, which he recognized as getting life in 1908, when the house of bishops and the house of deputies, representing the Episcopal Church, gave a blanket, as distinct from an individual, ordination to the ministers of the Federation, by sanctioning their appearance in Episcopal pulpits, which act gave life to the image. These things he spied out for, and reported to the Church.

(57) Then he observed and reported some movements that were good for the true Church, but that foreboded evil to the nominal church. One of these was the general expectation of the nearness of the Kingdom on the part of all the consecrated. This he saw as a fulfillment of Matt. 25: 1-12; for not only the wise virgins, who have been favored with the Truth, were, as he pointed out, in such expectation, but also the foolish virgins, who were not in the Truth, also expected it. And this sign he faithfully observed and reported to the Church. The clarifying of the Truth and its becoming due on an ever-widening scale he diligently observed and reported. He based this sign on passages like Dan. 12: 10; Is. 60: 1, 2; 52: 6, 7; Luke 12: 37; 1 Cor. 10: 11. On this point he did not only act as a scout, but as the agent through whom the Truth was expounded. Again, he watched and reported the harvest work as going on. He found it forecast in such passages as: Ps. 50: 5; Matt. 13: 29, 30, 41-43; Rev. 14: 14-20. He called our attention to the meaning of that work, described its message, pointed out its reapers, explained its methods and indicated its results. Thus he did faithful scouting work thereon and reported what he saw to the Church. He also closely observed the testing of the consecrated as a sign of the times (Mal. 3: 1-4; Matt. 7: 24-27; 1 Cor. 3: 12-15). He pointed out what this testing was, through what it was accomplished, how it worked and how it affected the consecrated. All of this class of signs foreboded good to the true Church and by that very fact foreboded ill to the nominal church. Then, connected with these testings of the consecrated, were the siftings which separated the unfaithful from the faithful. He diligently observed these and pointed out their number, means, victims, errors and results. He found these referred to in passages like 2 Tim. 3: 1-9; 1 Cor. 10: 5-14, etc. Other matters like Antichrist's increased exposure and the later experiences of

antitypical Elijah he observed and reported. He made faithful use of his privileges of going down to the camp of the antitypical Midianites, Amalekites and Children of the East with antitypical Gideon, and also of returning with Him and reporting the observations of his scouting tour to the Faithful on secular and religious matters.

(58) Many of these matters were also observed by the foolish virgins in the nominal church, as typed by the dream that the Midianite in the outskirts of the camp had (v. 13). They saw that these events and conditions foreboded ill for the nominal church, as pictured forth by the overthrowing of the Midianite tent in the dream. They saw that in some manner the Lord was connected with the means used in the overthrow of the antitypical Midianitish tent. But the meaning of these events was not clear to them. They therefore asked their foolish-virgin teachers, who expounded these matters as showing that our Lord was at work to overthrow the nominal church, her teachings and practices, even as the Midianite explained to his fellow the dream (v. 14). These things our Pastor also observed and reported with the thought, encouraging to the brethren, that what they saw clearly their foolish-virgin brethren were seeing in a measure, and that this was a reason for encouragement, since it showed that even in the ranks of the enemy the fear of antitypical Gideon and His little army had entered. Hence our study shows that in our dear Pastor's pertinent acts we find a splendid fulfillment of the Phurah type, as proven by the facts of the case.

(1) What three things does David in the Psalms type? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What does he type in the histories? Why are details thereon not given? As a warrior pilgrim by whom is he typed?

(2) Why is it reasonable to assume that all who dealt with David were types? What results from this as to Jashobeam? What other consideration corroborates this? What five terms applied to him strengthen this thought?

What two mistranslations mar the thought of 2 Sam. 23: 8? Corrected how does it stand related to 1 Chro. 11: 11? What is the proper translation?

(3) How do the pertinent Samuel and Chronicles passages differ from one another? What proves both to be true? What do spears type? What is the parallel in the priest figure? What do facts prove to be the greatest and next greatest symbolic battle of our Pastor? What does Jashobeam's slaying 800 Philistines type? His slaying 300 Philistines? Who else slew 300 Philistines with his spear? What does he type? What two things did this fact help to clarify?

(4) What will show that our Pastor's writings wrought havoc with the doctrines of eternal torment and the consciousness of the dead? What are the titles of some of his pertinent writings? How otherwise did he smite these two errors? Why is this work not shown in our texts? What did his pertinent activities do for us?

(5) Since when were these types understood? What is the character of the typical deeds? Whose exploits only surpass them? What is the difference as to the two? What effects did our Pastor's pertinent battlings against these errors have? What did the knowledge of this influence the writer to suggest? What is not, and what is the thought as to participation in this service? How do our Pastor's pertinent exploits serve? For what is such an annual special service fitting?

(6) What is now to be discussed? How are the two accounts presented? As indicated by the blank spaces in the parallel accounts, how do these accounts differ?

(7) Who were the three chiefs of David's mighty men? In whom in this study does our interest center? What does the rock here type? How do the cited passages show this? Whom does David here type? What confirms this? What is typed by David's being in the cave of Adullam? By his being in the hold? How does Ps. 91: 1, 2 suggest this? What do the Philistines in relation to Jashobeam type? What does *Rephaim* mean? What is typed by the valley of Rephaim? What was the relation between the demons and the noransomers? In the pertinent warfare where did Bro. Russell find safety? What does *Bethlehem* mean and type? Whom does the Philistine

garrison at Bethlehem type? What does Jashobeam's coming to David type?

(8) What does Bethlehem's well represent? David's longing to drink from it, as related to Jashobeam? What made the antitypical longing greater? What is typed by Jashobeam's breaking through the Philistines' ranks to get the water? By David's refusing to drink the water? His pouring it out as a drink-offering to the Lord?

(9) What in this connection will interest the readers? How came this experience to be related to the writer? What did Mr. Barbour in 1878 do to preserve his influence? Why did he deem this necessary? What was the diverting explosion? Wherein was it set off? What resulted in the magazine? What did our Pastor do in the Spring of 1879? What did he shortly thereafter do? What was Mr. Barbour's reaction? What appeared in the early Fall of 1879? What was its character?

(10) What was the effect of this article on our Pastor? Why? Of what was this the antitype? For what did he fear? How did this fear affect him? What did he at once see? Why? What did he not have? Of what was he conscious? What was the effect of these things on him? To whom did he go? For what? What reason did he give for the petition? What pertinent promise did he make?

(11) What word did he send to his Pittsburgh foreman? What did he then do? What did he then do with the book of Hebrews? Why? What was the result by late that night? What did he do the whole of the next day? With what results? What struck his attention at noon of the third day? What did he note about v. 11? About v. 12? About v. 13? What did he immediately see? How did this discovery affect him? What did he do as to his wife's caution?

(12) What resulted? Why? What did parallel passages do? What course did he pursue? What did he tell the conference? Except Mr. Paton, what did the leading brethren do about it? What did Mr. Paton do about it? Why? What did he do two years later?

(13) What did Bro. Russell do after the conference? With what effect? When and where was the subject first

treated in print? What marked the attitude of the friends during the Harvest on this subject?

(14) What did our Pastor say was the reason of the three days' delay in the answer to his prayer? Without being aware of it, what was in these experiences given to him? As such what was the first meat that he brought out of the storehouse? What did he do with the promise made in his prayer? How? What kind of a portion did he then dip out of the well? What kind was the pertinent battle? What did it do to the Church? To what should gratitude and appreciation move us?

(15) How should we not, and how should we observe the annual Memorial services of our Pastor? What is not repeated in this chapter as to his Memorial? What is the general character of this chapter? What two phases of his work as a Priest are emphasized in this chapter? What has already been done in this volume as to Eleazar's typical relations? What conclusion does a comparison of Num. 4: 16 and Matt. 18: 18 warrant? And Matt. 24: 45-47 and Luke 12: 43-46? Wherfrom does this latter thought appear? What application will we here not elaborate? What one will we elaborate?

(16) What were the two modes of our Pastor's activity as the Gospel-harvest Eleazar? In how many duties did these two work? What was Eleazar's first duty as given in our text? What does the oil represent? What did its antitype imply? What did this imply of our Pastor? What one of the brethren's ministering capacities did his teaching and executive functions on this point concern? How did he exercise his teaching function on this point? His executive function? What do pertinent facts prove?

(17) What was Eleazar's second charge according to our text? What does the unburnt incense type in Jesus? In the Church? What kind of a charge could our Pastor not have had as to Jesus' incense? Why not? What kind of an executive charge could he have toward it? What kind of a charge did he have in this respect? What proves that he performed this charge? What work did he, and what work did he not perform toward the incense of the Church before his days? Toward what part of the Church in this charge did he act fully as teacher

and executive? In what ways did he therein act as teacher? What are the main things represented by the unburnt incense? How did he act therein as executive?

(18) What was Eleazar's third charge according to our text? What does the meat or meal-offering type? Under what circumstances did it include the drink-offering? In what forms and by what agents was the Truth as the meal-offering set forth? How did our Pastor perform the teaching part of this charge? The executive part of this charge? What do the facts prove as to this charge?

(19) What was Eleazar's fourth duty according to our text? What does the anointing oil type? Where are the ingredients of this antitypical oil set forth? How may this antitypical oil be stated? As teacher what was our Pastor to do as to this charge? How did he perform it? In what ways did he do this? What features of character development did this teaching include? As executive what was our Pastor to do as to this charge? How did he do this directly? Indirectly? How negatively did he as executive act in this charge, both directly and indirectly? What do facts prove as to this charge?

(20) What was Eleazar's fifth charge? What did this imply? What does the tabernacle type? In its holy? In its most holy? In its court? What would this antitypically mean for the Gospel Harvests? When and by what act did he cease to function as the Gospel-harvest Eleazar? What would it mean for him as to the justified humanity of the sacrificers and of Levites? What did his Parousia teaching and executive charge imply as to the Holy? As to the Most Holy? What does this imply of him when he is beyond the vail? What will be his and the Apostles' positions? How will he and they be related in these positions?

(21) What was Eleazar's sixth charge? By what two expressions is this proved? How is this proved by the grammatical construction of the last three parts of verse 16? What, therefore, was Eleazar's sixth charge? What follows from this as to our Pastor's sixth charge? What is the antitype of the brazen altar? In what activities? What is the difference between the antitypical Brazen Altar and the sacrifice on it? What was our Pastor's teaching charge as to this Altar? In what three ways

did he perform this? How was his charge as to this Altar exercised by him, positively and negatively, as an executive? What did the golden altar represent? What did the priest offering the incense represent? How did our Pastor as teacher exercise his charge of the antitypical Golden Altar? How as executive?

(22) What does the laver type? Its base and shaft? Its bowl? What does its water type? What is meant by our Pastor's executive charge of the Bible? What did this charge require that he direct? What did his teaching charge of it imply? What do facts prove respecting these two activities of his toward it? How can his pertinent acts be used in disproof of the claims that the Pseudepigraphs like book of Enoch, and the Apocrypha are inspired? If they were inspired what would he have done with them? What three things on this head disprove their inspiration?

(23) What does the lampstand type? How did our Pastor discharge his teaching office as to the antitypical Lampstand? How did he fulfill his executive charge toward it? What does the table of shewbread type? What does this mean? What did our Pastor's teaching charge as to it imply? In what ways did he fulfill this charge? In what ways did he fulfill his executive charge toward it?

(24) What did the chest part of the ark type? What did its propitiatory, cherubim and the light radiating from the shekinah type? What did the shekinah type? What did our Pastor's teaching charge as to the chest of the ark require him to do? His executive charge of it? What did his teaching charge as to the rest of the ark require him to do? His executive charge of it?

(25) What was Eleazar's seventh and final charge? What did this imply as to his relations to the Kohathites? Why was such a relation not an eighth charge of Eleazar? What does a comparison of Num. 3: 32 and 4: 28, 33 prove of Eleazar's charge toward the Kohathites? How does it prove this? What does this imply as to his Gospel-harvest antitype in that Harvest and in the Millennium? How did the latter discharge his pertinent teaching and executive functions? What did the censers, chargers, cups, bowls and spoons type? How did our Pastor fulfill his executive charge toward the antitypical

cessors? His teaching charge? His teaching charge as to the antitypical chargers, cups, bowls and spoons? His executive charge toward them?

(26) What two office functions did our Pastor, according to Matt. 24: 45-47 and Luke 12: 42-46, have? In what seven respects did he exercise them as the Gospel-harvest Eleazar? What does his exercise of these two functions in these seven respects conclusively prove of him? What exclusiveness is thus proven of his office? What else proves this? What do deniers of this do with fulfilled prophecy? What must, therefore, be the condition of their symbolic eyes? What does such denial prove of those who once saw this truth? To what does such denial expose them? How should the proper view of him not be regarded? Why not? What illustrates this? Why did our Lord have to have some one in the Parousia as such a hand, eye and mouth? How does the Eleazar type show that our Lord would have such a special representative? What results from this?

(27) What interesting conclusion is suggested by the thought relation of Num: 4: 16 and Matt. 24: 45-47; Luke 12: 42-46? In what second way could He have gotten this thought? In what third and fourth ways could He have gotten it? Why is it more probable that He got it from Num. 4: 16?

(28) What practical reflection should we draw from this study? What two conclusions should not be drawn from this lesson? Why not? What does this reflection imply as to our approach to his teachings and arrangements? Against what evil would this safeguard us? To what good would it lead us? To what other good would it lead us? What would this not mean as to Great-Company-developing truths? Why not? How much of such truths had he given by Oct. 31, 1916? From what evil and into what good would such an attitude further lead us? What will attest the truthfulness of this thought? What exhortation springs out of this study? What should re-enforce it for each of us?

(29) What will be our next study? Where have its main items been presented? What briefly is the setting of this story? How was the fifth sifting started? Whom does Korah type? His 250 associated Levites? What did

these do during that sifting? What is typed by the fire destroying Korah and his band?

(30) Over what was the involved controversy? What was drawn into it? Why not? Why? What were the effects of these two misrepresentations? What actually did the deceived ones do? How did their deceivers stand and do therein? What were the results to the deceivers and the deceived? What are the New Creatures of these deceived ones now? How does Num. 26: 11 prove this? What did the deceivers' censers type? Whence came Aaron's and the deceivers' fire? What do coals from the altar type? Their heat? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What does the unburnt incense type? Its burning and resultant perfume? The strange fire of Korah and his band? Its heat? Their incense as spices and perfume? After awhile what did they type? Why?

(31) What is typed by Moses' charge to Eleazar to take up the censers? What did the sifters use, or misuse? What case illustrates this? What other two cases? What did our Pastor do with these passages? What is typed by the charge to scatter the fire? By Eleazar's scattering the fire? How did Bro. Russell respond to the antitypical charge? What is typed by Eleazar's taking up the censers out of the burning? What was done with his main pertinent articles?

(32) How often does the A. V. speak of these censers as being hallowed? What should be said on this and the proper translation? What is the proper translation of parts of v. 37 and the whole of v. 38? What two facts disprove the A. V.'s rendering of the pertinent word? What was the antitypical hallowing? Why is this true? Additional to the proof that v. 35 gives that the sifters were Second Deather, how does v. 38 prove it? Not only who, but who else were charged to hallow, offer and make the censers beaten plates? What does this type? In what two verses is the typical proof given? How? Accordingly, what did our Pastor receive from certain brothers? How did his and their work therein compare?

(33) What would be well before going further into this feature of our subject? What does the brazen altar type? In what capacity? How is this typed? What, accordingly, is typed by beating the censers into plates for a covering

of the altar? What was early in the controversy recognized? What would result from a proof of this point? What was the crux of the controversy? What was, accordingly, done with it? How is this emphasized in the type? What, again, was the antitype of beating the censers into plates for a covering of the altar?

(34) What does the hallowing of the censers type? Their offering to the Lord? According to the text, who chiefly, though not alone, acted therein? What does this type? How is it proved? What was Bro. Barton's part therein? How is this typed in 2 Sam. 23: 11, 12? What was another brother's part therein, as typed in 1 Chro. 11: 1214? What do David's two wars with the Philistines type? How is this other brother's encounter with M.A. McPhail before part of the Chicago Church typed in 1 Chro. 20: 6, 7? Bro. MacMillan's with A. E. Williamson before the Altoona Church in 1 Chro. 20: 4? Bro. Crawford's with E. C. Henninges in 1 Chro. 20: 5? Whose part far overshadowed the part of these four brothers? How is this shown? Who else, not expressly pointed out, shared in making the antitypical beaten plates? As a controversialist how does Bro. Russell appear in this controversy? Despite what in his anti-typing Jashobeam's feats? How is his prowess as that Servant in the 1908-1911 controversy in his capacity as a warrior typed in 1 Chro. 11: 13, 14? Who was associated with him therein? How does the meaning of the word *Pasdammin* show that the Sin-offerings controversy is typed in this passage?

(35) What do vs. 38, 40 type positively and negatively? Who only, as a rule, could properly set forth new truths? Exceptionally, who else could do so? How is this proven? What would be the character and result of others' attempting it? What question does this raise? How should it be answered? What should be said of this course? Of the contrary course? What is now being widely done with the antitypical "sign and memorial"? By whom? In what way? What in this connection may be said of the pertinent sifting leaders' course on this matter?

(36) How did our Pastor conduct himself in this controversy? Amid what circumstances? What effect on us as to him will a proper consideration of his involved course have? Why? With what was his loyalty therein

rewarded by the Lord? What may we do at every memory of him?

(37) How many years has it been since our Pastor went beyond the veil? What has been the author's custom for his anniversary? On what will our present study be based? What were the sixth-hour sifters? Where is this sifting typically set forth? What proves this? What use does the Bible make of its localities? What are some examples of these? What are we to conclude of Shittim from the typical setting of Num. 25? What does *Shittim* mean? Of what are trees symbolic? What do the acacia trees here symbolize? What is typed by Israel's abiding in Shittim? Of what did some of God's people become guilty at antitypical Shittim? What types this?

(38) What does combinationism mean? By what do the consecrated become guilty of it? Give some illustrations of this. By what do the justified become guilty of it? By what does the camp become guilty of it? How else may they become guilty of it? What are some further examples of combinationism? From the Gospel Harvest's standpoint what does Israel's fornication at Shittim type? In connection with what Parliament did this occur? How was this evil committed among Truth people? Who were the leaders of it among Truth people? What sifting did they lead? Who were the organizing leaders of a world religion movement? What was one of their products? What was a second combinationistic movement (in 1893)? What was a third combinationistic movement (in 1894)? Who were the respective leaders? To what did their activities lead in 12 years? To what did the Open and Institutional Church League lead by 1895? What do the foregoing facts prove? By what are these movements typed?

(39) What do the daughters of Moab in this story type? What does their calling upon the Israelitish men to sacrifice type? What are the main teachings that constitute the antitypical daughters of Moab? How did these doctrines invite the men of antitypical Israel to serve combinationism? What is typed by Israel's being joined to Baal-peor? What was the effect of this on God, type and antitype?

(40) In type and antitype who were the more guilty?

How did God accordingly deal with them? What does hanging type? What two illustrations suggest this thought? What is typed by God's charge to Moses to have the leaders hanged before Him against the sun? How did our Lord do this through some of His people who were in the nominal church? What are the names of some of the foremost of these? Through whom did He mainly do it? Through whom did He especially do it? Where especially were the leaders of combinationism typically hanged? What are the names of these leaders so hanged? What resulted from their hanging?

(41) What is typed by Moses' charging each of the judges to kill all the guilty in his jurisdiction? By what pen products did Bro. Russell especially do his part of such refuting? How did the pilgrims do their part therein? Where is Bro. Russell's part therein typically set forth? How does this fact stand related to the basis of our present study? Who are typed by the Israelite who brought the Midianitish woman before his brethren? What is typed by his bringing her before his brethren? What does she type? What does this error effect? How does the Bible set forth Christianity in relation to other religions? Upon what is this teaching pivoted? How do the cited Scriptures show this? How does this teaching stand related to the chief error of combinationism's errors? Why so? What does this error do with Christ's sole Saviorhood? With Him in His pertinent claims?

(42) What is typed by the Israelite's publicly bringing the Midianitish woman? What is typed by the sin of Baal-peor distressing Moses and the real Israelites? What does the name *Phinehas* mean? How do we get the thought that he types for the Gospel Harvest that Servant as the chief Underpriest on earth? From what standpoint does Phinehas (*brazen mouth*) type our Pastor? What is typed by his seeing the pertinent wrong and by his arising? What is typed by his taking a javelin? Where was the antitypical fornication especially committed? What is typed by Phinehas following the man into his tent? What is typed by Phinehas thrusting both through? During what act of theirs? What is typed by Phinehas thrusting her through her genitals? What did our Pastor's article do with these errors? What is typed

by Phinehas' deed staying the plague? How did the antitypical staying of the plague progress?

(43) In what three publications especially did our Pastor attack combinationism? Against what two manifestations of it were his attacks chiefly directed? Of what character were these attacks? What conditions made it so? With what kind of a courage did our Pastor attack combinationism? How did he handle it? How do these remarks stand related to his attacks on the 1894 conspirators? How did the conspirators disparage these attacks? Like whom did they thereby act? What effect did these charges have on him? What did he say and do as to the conspiring leaders?

(44) How many perished in the plague for the sin at Baal-peor? How does this number compare with those who perished in the other Israelitish plagues in the wilderness? What does this type? What is a symbolic plague? What did God express for Phinehas' act? What does this type? By what was the plague stayed among Truth people? Describe these two pen products further. Who were the sifting leaders among Truth people in connection with combinationism? What conclusion may we draw from the statement that Phinehas' zeal prevented all Israel's dying from plague?

(45) How was Phinehas, type and antitype, rewarded? What shows this reward in antitypical Phinehas' case? What report did he make the day before his death? What form of fulfilment did the promise of prosperity take in type and antitype? How and when was the pertinent announcement made? How are the prosperity and continuity of his ministry promised? What was the character of the public announcement, type and antitype?

(46) Who else fought the combinationists? How did God reward her therefore? What exceptional use did He thereby make of her? To whom did she first tell this? How did he at first react to it? Later? What did he then do about it privately? Publicly? Where are these public statements found? In what did Jesus and he not see any wrong? What are we not to conclude from the above? Why not? When and for what was he made that Servant? How long was its knowledge withheld from him? What is the difference between what was given him in 1879 and

in 1894 on this matter? What resulted from the publication of this office?

(47) What does the word *Zimri* mean? What is the antitypical significance of him and his name? What proves that he represents the combinationistic leaders? What name and relation types their test and failure? What does the word *Cozbi* mean? What does she, accordingly, type? What does the word *Zur* mean? What is its antitypical bearing? What is said of him in Num. 31: 8? Of what is the story of Num. 31 a type? What do the five slain Midianite kings type? In what order does *Zur* occur among them? Why is he the third? What does his fatherhood of *Cozbi* type? What is typed by his being slain? What is typed by God's charging Moses to vex the Midianites? Where was it fulfilled, type and antitype?

(48) Where have the generalities of our text been set forth? Whose part in the antitype is stressed in that chapter? For what is this study intended? What will it, accordingly, stress in the antitype of this type? What will be omitted here? What will be treated here? What meaning was given for the word *Phurah*, or *Purah*, in Vol. V, Chap. IV? Who give this definition? From what verb is this word derived? What two meanings, among others, does the verb *paar*, or *phaar*, have? Which of these two meanings is preferable here for the sense of the derived word *Phurah*, or *Purah*? Why? What is a scout's main work? How does this fit our Pastor's activities?

(49) Who were the antitypical enemy? What did Jehovah desire for our Lord and our Pastor as to these? What did this move Him to do? Of what was this the antitype? As what did our Pastor act on this tour? What does this mean? Why was he so used? Wherein were these reports specially given? Where else also? How are these related to our text? Quote and explain other pertinent Scriptures. How do these views apply to Babylon's fallen condition? How do even the signs of good apply to them? During what period were these observed? What does this article propose to do as to these? Under what two heads?

(50) What was one of these secular signs of the times? What are some of the vehicles of modern travel? In what does their possession result? What sign is closely related to the preceding one? Along what lines and varieties was this increase of knowledge? In what way did it especially

show itself? What did antitypical Phurah show to be the meaning of these two signs? To what third sign did he frequently refer? What did he do as to Christendom's vices? Poverty? Its poor living and working conditions? Its educational conditions? Its statecraft? What are some of the details of these? What did he give as the meaning of this sign?

(51) What did he do as to Christendom's business? In what three forms? What were some of the abuses that he pointed out? What did antitypical Phurah give as the meaning of this sign? Quote and explain the cited passages.

(52) What was the next sign? In what did it consist? What did these presage? What was the next sign to which he referred? In what two ways did he show favor to be returning to Israel? What motives did he cite for their return? What instrumentalities? What did he frequently report? Quote and explain the Scriptures that he applied to this sign. What other sign did he stress? What particulars did he give thereon? Quote and explain the Scripture that he used for this sign. What significance did he attach to it?

(53) What was the next sign that antitypical Phurah saw and brought to our attention? What great conflict was involved therein? What two forms did it assume? To what did capital resort in this fight? Labor? Who rallied to capital's side? What two social divisions resulted? Who were on each side? To what Scriptures did he refer for this sign? What do they mean? What sign was partly involved in the foregoing? Quote and explain the pertinent passage. What were the forms of this bundling among capitalists? Labor? The social world? Educational world? Political world? In the reform world? What did antitypical Phurah do about this secular sign of the times?

(54) What was the next sign that antitypical Phurah watched and reported? What Scripture led him to look for it? What did he show to exist in the political world? How was this? In the business world? How was this? In the labor world? How was this? In the reform world? In the sociological and educational worlds? In family life? What did antitypical Phurah do with this phenomenon? What final sign did he observe and report? What did this sign imply? In what degree? What were the things that marked the crisis of the French Revolution? What did they

forebode? How do they compare with those observed and reported by antitypical Phurah? What did they presage?

(55) What beside secular signs did antitypical Phurah observe and report? What did these presage? What was the first of these? What Scripture indicated it? What was the next sign indicating Babylon's fall that he observed and reported? What were the forms of its super-naturalistic manifestation? Infidelistic manifestation? Heathen manifestation? What did he do about them? What Scripture bears on this subject? What was the next unfavorable sign seen and reported by him? Wherein were its Godward forms manifest? Manward forms in family and sex life? Social life? Property respects? In matters of reputation? What Scriptures forecast this? How?

(56) What was the next sign seen and reported by antitypical Phurah? How was it made possible? What did its occurrence fulfill? What sign occurred in fulfillment of 2 Tim. 3: 1-9? In what ways did this sign indicate the falling away among the clergy? Among the laity? What sign did he see and report as involving all the Protestant churches? What Scriptures forecast this? How? How did he trace its start? Its full formation? Its receiving life?

(57) What other set of signs did he observe and report? What was the first of these? What Scripture forecast it? What was the next sign? Cite and explain the Scriptures on which he based this sign. What was his twofold relation to this sign? What was the next sign? Quote and explain the Scriptures on which it was based. What features of it did he watch and report? What was the next sign that he watched and reported? Quote and explain the pertinent Scriptures. What about it did he watch and report? What did this sign forebode to the nominal church? Why? What other sign did he watch and report? Quote and explain the pertinent Scripture. What other signs did he so treat?

(58) Who else observed these things? How was this typed? What did they see in these signs? To whom did they go for a clearer explanation? What was the explanation given? What did our Pastor do on this head? What effect did his report have on the Faithful? Why? What does our study prove by the facts that it adduces?

CHAPTER VII.
DANIEL—TYPE AND ANTITYPE.

DAN. 1—12.

HISTORICAL PARTS OF DANIEL. PROPHETICAL PARTS OF DANIEL.

AS FORMERLY stated, it is our intention to bring out the Scripturally forecast features of our Pastor's life and activities. And with this thought in mind we are in this chapter bringing out the pertinent features as typed in Daniel. That our Pastor knew that he was the antitype of Daniel is indicated by two paintings prepared for, but not used as, Photo-Drama slides, one on his interpreting the antitypical handwriting on the wall and one on Pastor Russell in the critics' den, which was reproduced in plate cut on the back of a Bible Students' Monthly and in the 1913 Convention Report. Daniel does not type our Pastor in all the latter's relations, but only in his relations to the world as a teacher on subjects pertinent to the world and on some of the relations of the Church to the world. Had it not been for many personal items that he gave us on himself, more particularly a detailed description of his religious development from his 17th to his 30th year, *i.e.*, from 1868 to 1881, in a six-hour recital elicited by our asking him in 1903 how he came to the understanding of the Bible set forth in his writings, we would be unable to expound a number of items in Daniel relating to him. Some of these items are not generally known, yet are so important that a record of them should be made. This will account for many of them that are to appear in this chapter, one of the series giving the Divinely forecast account of his life and work. Not in the spirit of an hero or angel worshiper, but in that of an appreciative biographer, do we write this book on that wise and faithful Servant. To save space we will, without quoting the passages, indicate those on

which we are commenting by giving the number of the involved verses.

(2) In Chapter I the account of Daniel's education for the position of a statesman in Babylon is set forth. Here Nebuchadnezzar types the nominal people of God. Ashpenaz (v. 3) types the chief leaders in the nominal church, such as supervised the subordinate teachers of the nominal church, and such as particularly supervised the educational arrangements of Christendom's prospective teachers. It was the desire of the nominal people of God (vs. 3, 4) that the most gifted and promising young men be selected for training as teachers of their views in symbolic Babylon. As Daniel (v. 6) was one of those chosen for such educational opportunities in literal Babylon, so was Bro. Russell chosen by those nominal Christians with whom he associated as a religiously and intellectually promising young man to teach in the nominal church. And as the king (v. 5) provided that such students be fed from the royal table, so the nominal people of God arranged that the future teachers and leaders in symbolic Babylon be nourished on the religious diet that they themselves ate. As Daniel determined not to defile himself with the Levitically unclean meats (v. 8) of the king's table, so Bro. Russell determined that he would not defile himself with symbolic Babylon's unclean doctrines. Since the story of how this happened is not generally known and should be preserved, we give it here in fair detail.

(3) Bro. Russell was born with a most exceptionally fine religious endowment. Before he was born his mother consecrated him to the Lord, and afterward gave him the most careful religious training within her ability. As he often said, he could not remember a time from childhood's first memories onward when he was not consecrated. Early he showed his zeal in seeking to save people from eternal torment, among other ways, by his writing at the age of 14 Scripture passages

on the sidewalks and walls of houses, urging people to repent and believe. In such evangelistic zeal, when 16 years old, he sought to convert an infidel acquaintance. The latter asked him if he believed God to be perfect in wisdom, justice, love and power. On his replying, "yes," his acquaintance asked him how such a God could have absolutely predestinated the vast majority of the race to eternal torment. The boy answered that he could not understand it. Up to this time he had not thought deeply on this feature of his (the Congregational) church's creed. Troubled by the question, he raised it in the circles of his church. Unable to get any satisfying answer, he expressed his doubts on the matter. The report spread in the church that he was on the way to becoming an infidel. The pastor and elders of the church appointed a special meeting to solve his questions. But instead, they only increased his doubts. They told him that the Bible taught the absolute predestination of the bulk of the race to eternal torment, quoting such passages as they thought so taught. They convinced him that the Bible taught that doctrine. He then said to them, "I believe God is perfect in wisdom, power, justice and love, and I will not believe anything contrary to His character to be a revelation from Him. Therefore I do not believe He gave the Bible as His revelation; for if He had given it as such, it would agree with His wisdom, power, justice and love." It was at this stage wherein he decided he would never believe as a revelation of God anything contradictory to His character, that he antityped Daniel (v. 8), determining not to defile himself with Levitically unclean meats; for he concluded that any doctrine contrary to God's character is false. It will be noted that the stand that Bro. Russell took on this matter of God's character as a test of revealed religion, when he was 16 years old, he retained until death ended his course.

- (4) His pastor and elders, as representatives of the highest church authorities (v. 9) thought highly of

him; and his determination to accept only what harmonized with God's character (pulse—v. 12) put them into considerable difficulty with the pertinent nominal people of God who would cut them off from their positions ("endanger my head to the king," v. 10), if they did not require of him to accept the Congregational creed in whole. But rather than lose so promising a young man, they conceded to him temporarily (ten days, v. 12) the privilege of subjecting all teachings to the rule of harmony with God's character. Accordingly, we find Bro. Russell as a youth of 16 a disbeliever, not actually, though ostensibly, in the Bible, but actually in the Calvinistic creed, which he was mistaught to be the right interpretation of the Bible. He was of too religious and logical a mind to be content without a revealed religion. He therefore set out to learn what the true religion was, and to this end decided to investigate all religions until he would find out the true one. So he began with that of the Chinese, whose idea of the creation is this: In the beginning all was water. Then a god with a handful of earth boarded a boat and threw this earth into the water, where it grew into our present earth. That was enough of the Chinese religion for him! Worse absurdities than this made him reject Hinduism and Buddhism. The fact that Mohammedanism was partly based on the Old and New Testaments impelled him to reject it. And because Judaism was based in part on the Old Testament, he rejected it. Thus his rejection of the non-Christian religions left him for a while stranded high and dry on the shores of unbelief, though all the while he devoutly held to God as perfect in wisdom, justice, love and power and trusted Him as such.

(5) But his religious disposition could not be content with no religion; and what to do troubled him. Finally he said to himself, I can at least believe so much of the Bible as is contained in the Golden Rule Godward and manward: Thou shalt love the Lord thy

God with all thy heart, with all thy mind, with all thy soul and with all thy strength; . . . and thy neighbor as thyself (Matt. 22: 37, 39). Furthermore, he concluded that Jesus' explanation of the law, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, as meaning: All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them (Matt. 7: 12), was correct. Thus he said, "I believe that much of the New Testament." This prompted him to look up the context of Matt. 7: 12, which he found to be a part of the Sermon on the Mount. He studied this in the light of God's character and recognized it to be in harmony therewith. Therefore he accepted it. This moved him to desire to study more of Jesus' teachings, which, accordingly, led him to study these as they are found elsewhere in the four Gospels. Always he found them in harmony with God's character. This moved him not only to accept all of Jesus' teachings in the Gospels as he understood them, but also greatly to appreciate Jesus as a teacher Divinely inspired. Such appreciation of Jesus' teachings prompted him to want to know more of His life, which moved him to a study of the Gospels historically, resulting in his recognizing Jesus as a perfect human being and the Son of God. But up to then he rejected the New Testament, except the Gospels.

(6) One day he noted the passage (John 16: 12-14) wherein Jesus said that the Spirit would reveal to the Apostles such truths as Jesus would yet give them, and which they were as yet unable to bear. He desired to know what those teachings were. Hence he began to study the Acts, the Epistles and Revelation; and as he understood them he recognized their harmony with God's character. Thus gradually, and that upon a right foundation, he came to believe that the New Testament was the revelation of the God of wisdom, power, justice and love, in whom he had always believed. But the Old Testament he continued to reject. The following things gradually led him to believe in the Old Testament:

He noticed that not only did Jesus and the Apostles quote from the Old Testament, but used such quotations to prove their doctrines. Hence he concluded that whatever they quoted from the Old Testament was true. On later thought he decided to study the connections from which these quotations were made; and these he found to be in harmony with the quotations themselves and God's character. Hence he accepted the teachings of these contexts. This led him to study the connections of these contexts, and thus more and more of the Old Testament became clear to him until his faith was confirmed in the prophetic writings and in the historical writings which were closely interwoven with the prophetic writings. Still he suspected the books of Moses, except those parts quoted by Jesus and the Apostles; because he mistakenly was led to think that Moses made himself a dictator to Israel and established a priesthood that tyrannized over the people. But deeper study convinced him of his mistakes on these points; and he came to see that the Mosaic legislation was the most benevolent, and freedom, equality and fraternity-inspiring legislation ever inaugurated. Accordingly, he accepted also the Pentateuch as Divinely inspired; and thus his faith accepted the whole Bible.

(7) He continued to study the Scriptures privately and in an independent Bible class at Allegheny, Pa.; and by 1872, four years after he started out in quest of the Divine revelation, he not only accepted the entire Bible as that revelation, but also the following points as its main teachings: the unity of God; the Divine sonship of Jesus; the Spirit as God's power and disposition; man's fall from perfection into sin; death as sin's penalty; the unconsciousness of the dead; the Ransom as guaranteeing an opportunity for the elect in this life and for the non-elect in the Millennium; the eternity of the physical universe; the destruction of the symbolic world at Christ's Second Advent; the

Second Advent for the restitution of all things; eternal life in heaven for the elect, and on earth for the saved non-elect; and eternal annihilation for the incorrigible. Without stating the matter as such, in writing Chapters I, II and III of Studies, Vol. I, he traced the steps where by he came out of infidelity into faith in the Bible as God's revelation. His four years of quest for the Divine revelation and its main contents are the antitypical ten days of vs. 12, 14, 15. As Daniel's face (v. 15) was fairer and fuller at the end of the ten days of pulse eating; so Bro. Russell's symbolic face (knowledge of the Truth, 2 Cor. 4: 6) was more beautiful and fuller in holiness than the symbolic faces of those trained in symbolic Babylon's teachings. The steward's (*Melzar means steward*) permitting Daniel to continue on pulse as a diet (v. 16) types how Bro. Russell's teachers in Babylon conceded to him the privilege of continuing to study the Bible in the light of God's character. Daniel's becoming proficient in knowledge and in dreams and visions (v. 17), types Bro. Russell's development in the Truth in the deep and surface things of the Bible, as sketched above.

(8) It was in 1875 that the antitype of Nebuchadnezzar's examining Daniel (vs. 18-20) began. From 1872 to 1875 Bro. Russell continued to increase in grace, knowledge and fruitfulness in service. It was in Oct., 1874, that he came to see that Jesus in His resurrection became a Spirit being, and that therefore He would not in His Second Advent come in flesh, but as a glorious Divine Spirit, and necessarily then would be invisible to human natural sight. He embodied these thoughts as well as those on the object of our Lord's return in a tract entitled, The Object and Manner of Our Lord's Return. The misteachings of the Adventists on the object and manner of our Lord's return had raised more or less doubts and questions in many minds, and this aroused Bro. Russell to write and spread that tract, which was circulated to the extent of

50,000 copies. Such doubts and questions calling for an answer antitype Nebuchadnezzar's asking (v. 18) for the graduates to be brought before him for examination. The young men coming in before him represent the various religious teachers coming forward before the nominal people of God to give their views on pertinent religious matters. Daniel's answers (vs. 19, 20) were antitypically given in Bro. Russell general teachings and particularly in the above-mentioned tract, and these were found ("none like Daniel," v. 19) better than those of the Christian workers trained in Babylon's teachings. Daniel's standing before the king (v. 19), *i.e.*, being made an official in Babylon, types Bro. Russell's subsequent position as a religious teacher before the nominal people of God, whose teachings, on all subjects inquired for by the nominal people of God, were found better (ten times—fully, completely, v. 20) than those of the learned and the prophets of Babylon.

(9) The second chapter of Daniel treats of Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the metallic image of a man with a golden head, silver shoulders and arms, brazen belly, iron thighs and legs, and feet and toes of a mixture of iron and clay, and of the stone which destroyed the image and then grew into a mountain, filling the entire earth. It is not our purpose in our study of Daniel—type and antitype—to point out the prophetic features of Daniel, since that is sufficiently done in Studies, Vols. I, II and III. Here we limit our attention to the typical features of this book. Nor will we rehearse the typical features. Rather, we will merely indicate them by the citing of the verses in which they occur, asking our readers to have the book of Daniel open at the pertinent part for the sake of reference. In interpreting Daniel's interpretation of the dream, our Pastor gave its prophetic teachings. At the same time, the entire story of Dan. 2 types something very interesting. Typically, this chapter sets forth the meaning of history under the rule of the nations during the

Times of the Gentiles and the prophesied role of God's Kingdom as the destroyer and successor of these. In this chapter, as in the preceding one, Nebuchadnezzar types the Gospel-Age nominal people of God, who, as such, have been in existence since the Jewish Harvest. His having the dream represents the nominal people of God having a proper view of the meaning of history as exemplified in the four universal Gentile powers and in their ten successor powers, and of the role of the prophesied Kingdom of God as their destroyer and successor; for the Apostles properly taught the early Christians that, as represented by the deterioration of the metals from gold to silver, from silver to brass, from brass to iron and from iron to a mixture of iron and clay, under Gentile rule the race and its governments would become more and more fallen—depraved—and that when depravity would reach its height the kingdoms of this world would be destroyed by God's Kingdom, which would stand forever. This, in brief, is the philosophy of human history under Gentile rule and the prophetic role of the Kingdom of God. And this view, taught by the Apostles, remained with the real and nominal people of God for several centuries.

(10) The papacy's teaching another theory of God's Kingdom in its time and other relations to the kingdoms of this world darkened the subject; for it taught that *it* was God's Kingdom commissioned to convert the world and rule over it for 1,000 years before Christ's return, whereas it was the clay mingled with the iron in the feet and toes. This view gradually caused the one given to the nominal people of God by the Apostles to be forgotten by them (the thing is gone from me, v. 5). For many centuries the true view was forgotten; and it was only beginning with the Illumination, 1748, that nominal Christians began to demand an explanation of the meaning of history from the clergy (Chaldeans), the professors (magi), the historians (astrologers) and the prophets (sorcerers)

of Christendom (v. 2). Their inability to tell what was the early view of Christians thereon, as well as its meaning, was typed by the inability of Nebuchadnezzar's wise men to tell the dream and its interpretation (vs. 4-11). The decree to slay the wise men of Babylon types the determination of the thinking members of the nominal church to set aside *as their teachers*, a symbolic killing, the wise men of Christendom. Arioch (vs. 14, 15) represents those who led the people in setting aside such teachers, *i.e.*, the free thinkers, higher critics, etc., who, beginning about 1785, worked to undermine popular confidence in Christendom's wise men as teachers. Undoubtedly, the prestige of such wise men was greatly decreased with ever-increasing numbers of nominal people of God from that time onward. Arioch's seeking Daniel (v. 13) represents that such free thinkers, higher critics, etc., sought to undermine Bro. Russell as a teacher in Christendom. Daniel's tact in dealing with Arioch (vs. 14, 15) types Bro. Russell's tact in dealing with free thinkers, etc. Arioch's telling Daniel the situation (v. 15) types the free thinkers, etc., telling the situation of the antitypical wise men to Bro. Russell.

(11) Daniel's going to the king and obtaining time to consider and answer the matter (v. 16) represents Bro. Russell's standing before the nominal people of God as a teacher of religion and promising, if allowed due time, to solve the matter at hand. Daniel's laying the matter before his three friends and asking their united prayers over the matter (vs. 17, 18) represents Bro. Russell's habit of asking suggestions from the brethren when in difficulty and asking their prayers for Divine enlightenment, *e.g.*, when he was perplexed over the meaning of the voice of the three signs (Z '07, 276, last par.). Members of the Bethel family will recall such things as occurring. This course he followed in the present instance. God's revealing this matter to Daniel (v. 19) types God's making known

to Bro. Russell the view of the early Christians on the meaning of history as exemplified in the Gentile rule and the prophesied role of God's Kingdom. Daniel's thanksgiving (vs. 19-23) types Bro. Russell's thanksgiving at this mercy of God. Daniel's desiring Arioch not to destroy Babylon's wise men (v. 24) represents Bro. Russell's refutation of the course of the free thinkers, etc., which was a hindrance to their object. Arioch's bringing Daniel to the king as one who would tell and interpret the dream (v. 25) types the free thinkers', etc., more or less praising Bro. Russell, whose kindly manner and logical teachings favorably impressed them. Nebuchadnezzar's asking Daniel if he could give and interpret the dream (v. 26) types the nominal people of God inquiring, *i.e.*, searching Bro. Russell's teachings for an answer to the matter on hand. Daniel's reminding Nebuchadnezzar that Babylon's wise men could not answer his questions (v. 27) types Bro. Russell's statements that Christendom's clergy, professors, learned ones, prophets and philosophers have been unable to answer the matter. Daniel's attributing the implied wisdom, not to himself, but to God (v. 28), types Bro. Russell's denying that he had his wisdom of himself, but that it was of God, who as due revealed the knowledge to him. Daniel's telling and interpreting the dream (vs. 28-45) types Bro. Russell's showing the view of the early Christians on the increasing depravity accompanying the rule of the Gentiles and on the role of God's Kingdom as the destroyer and successor of these. This view our Pastor gave in his writings, sermons and lectures. The king's honoring and promoting Daniel (vs. 46-48) type how increasingly the people of Christendom honored Bro. Russell and regarded him as above all other religious teachers of Christendom. Daniel's desiring promotion for his three friends (v. 49) types Bro. Russell's using his position to advance the Lord's people as teachers in Christendom. Daniel's sitting in the king's gate

(v.49) types the great and favorable publicity that Bro. Russell got especially from 1913 onward.

(12) In the events of Dan. 3, Daniel took no part. It has often occasioned wonder as to where Daniel was while Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego were undergoing the trial of the golden image and the fiery furnace. While the record is silent on this point, one thing is certain about it, *i.e.*, that Daniel was absent from the plain of Dura; for he certainly would have stood beside his three friends, had he been present. When we look at the antitype it becomes manifest that Daniel, who throughout his book types our Pastor, could not have been there; for had he been present it would have spoiled the antitype; for Bro. Russell died before either of the two fulfillments set in where he lived. Thus in the light of the antitype Daniel's absence during the events described in chapter 3 is entirely clear. Nevertheless, Daniel wrote this, as well as the rest of the book that bears his name. And what does his writing this chapter type? Bro. Russell's giving the two antitypes of this chapter, *e.g.*, one in Z '99, 168-172, and the other in Z '15, 259-261. Thus in giving these two antitypes of this chapter our Pastor antityped Daniel in writing it.

(13) We now come to Dan. 4. In this chapter Nebuchadnezzar gives an account of a prophetic dream that he had, its interpretation by Daniel and its fulfillment. Daniel interpreted the dream only from the standpoint of its application to King Nebuchadnezzar. In Studies, Vol. II, in the chapter on the Times of the Gentiles, gives us the antitype of the dream; but while giving us the antitype of the dream, he did not give us the antitype of Daniel as interpreting the dream. It is unnecessary for us here to give the antitype of the dream itself, either as to the tree and the wild man or as to Nebuchadnezzar, since it is sufficiently given in Studies, Vol. II in the chapter on the Times of the Gentiles. We will now give the antitypes of

the chapter not given by our Pastor. As he shows, Nebuchadnezzar in this chapter represents the human family. In his first honorable position he represents the race before the fall. His sinning in pride represents the race's fall into sin. The sentence against him, that against the race. His being driven out from his associates, man's being cut off from fellowship with God and the good angels. His experiences before the seven times, man's experience of evil before the Times of the Gentiles set in. His experience during the seven times, the race's greater evils under the curse during the Times of the Gentiles. His coming back to his senses, man's restoration during the times of restitution. His coming back to his kingdom with added honors, the increased glories for the obedient of mankind in the Ages following the Millennium. His ascribing glory, honor and praise to God, restored man's praise of God forever. These are the generalities of the antitype. The specialities of those things not interpreted by our Pastor will now engage our attention.

(14) Nebuchadnezzar's dream (v. 5) represents the view that mankind in general has had: a past golden age, a present experience of evil and a coming golden age. This view has had representatives in all nations. Among heathen Plato and Virgil have set it forth rather remarkably. Nebuchadnezzar's asking for its interpretation from the magi, the astrologers, the Chaldeans and the soothsayers (vs. 6, 7), types mankind's inquiring, particularly in Christendom, of the learned, the historians, the clergy and the prophets, for an explanation of the vague views of a past and future golden age and a present experience with evil. The failure of Nebuchadnezzar's magi, astrologers, Chaldeans and soothsayers, to interpret his dream (v. 7), types the failure of the learned, the historians, the clergy and the prophets, particularly in Christendom, to interpret the antitype. Daniel's coming *at the last* (v. 8) types that at the *end of the Age* (Luke 12: 42;

Matt. 24: 45) would arise his antitype, Bro. Russell. Nebuchadnezzar's telling him the dream (vs. 8-18) types men telling our Pastor their indefinite views on a past and future golden age and a present experience with evil, and asking his thought thereon. Daniel's being troubled over the matter one hour (v. 19) types Bro. Russell's temporary perplexity until about 1880 over certain features of the antitype, particularly on the purpose of the experience with evil and its relation to the one following it with good. Daniel's assuring the king that the dream and its interpretation were such as his haters and enemies desired (v. 19) types Bro. Russell's teaching that only haters of the human family, *i.e.*, the devil and his followers among spirits and men, could have any pleasure in man's experience with evil. Daniel's interpretation of the dream types our Pastor's giving the following lines of thought: man's creation in the image and likeness of God and happy life in Eden; man's trial and fall through sin into death amid an ever degrading experience with evil, first in a milder form, then during the Times of the Gentiles in a severer form; his progressively elevating experience with righteousness; his final trial and the everlasting bliss of the obedient in honoring and serving God. Without any doubt our dear Pastor did give such an explanation of the antitypical dream, and in his writings, sermons and lectures, apart from explaining Dan. 4, he gave such thoughts on the Divine Plan with respect to the human family.

(15) Dan. 5 treats of Belshazzar's feast, the handwriting on the wall and its reading and interpretation. In one of the pictures used in the German Photo-Drama the antitype of the interpretation is given. Therein our Pastor is represented as giving the right interpretation, while the clergy, etc., are pictured forth as in confusion worse confounded thereover. In the following we will not give the story as contained in Dan. 5, but only the interpretation of the type. In

this chapter Belshazzar types the nominal people of God in state, church and capital, especially their leaders as a class. His 1,000 lords (v. 1) represent these leaders distributively as being many, *i.e.*, in their totality. His wives represent the main organizations of the nominal people of God, and his concubines their lesser organizations. The feast (v. 1) types the Parousia privileges and advantages that the nominal people of God appropriated to themselves, particularly such as they appropriated to themselves in the church unions of the Parousia. The golden and silver vessels (vs. 2, 3) type the Divine truths that had been taken captive in the Dark Ages with God's real people into symbolic Babylon. The sending of these vessels types the requirements that the teachings of God's Word be made subservient to Babylon's unclean uses. Putting Babylon's wine into these vessels types the corruption of the Divine truth with Babylon's errors. The banqueters' drinking there from types the antitypical Babylonians' partaking of a mixture of Truth and error in their Parousia feast. The fingers of a man's hand (v. 5) that wrote on the wall represent the exhibition of Divine power (hand) on symbolic Babylon's walls (her political, financial, ecclesiastical, social and labor powers). The king's seeing the part of the hand that wrote (v. 5) types the nominal people of God recognizing in part that it was a manifestation of Divine power that they witnessed. And such power was manifest in the signs of the times occurring in Babylon's political, financial, ecclesiastical, labor and social powers.

(16) The great perturbation of the king at the sight (v. 6) types Christendom's fears at the events which proved to be the signs of the times—"men's hearts failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming upon the earth" (Luke 21: 26). The king's demand that the wise men of Babylon be brought before him (v. 7) types the demand of the nominal people of God that the wise men of Christendom

be summoned to the fore on the subject at hand. His offer to give the purple robe, the golden chain and the third position in the kingdom to the one who would read and interpret the handwriting, represents Christendom's reward of making the true reader and interpreter the royally accepted (purple robe), Divinely authorized (golden chain on the neck) chief teacher in the religious (the third) department of symbolic Babylon. The failure of the astrologers, Chaldeans and soothsayers to read or interpret the handwriting types the failure of Christendom's learned men, clergy and prophets, to read and interpret the signs of the times. Belshazzar's increased fears and that of his lords (v. 9) types the increased perplexity of the nominal people of God, particularly of its leaders, at the events which proved to be signs of the times, when their trusted teachers were unable to decipher these; for the higher critics and evolutionists, the creedists and philosophers, the students of church, state, capital, labor and society and reformers, were all alike at sea in their attempts to read and explain the events as signs of the times, so contradictory of their theories. Their boasted learning, theories, cures and programs foundered on the rock of Truth embodied in these events as signs of the times.

(17) The queen (v. 10) types friendly readers of Pastor Russell's writings, who, while not consecrating and coming into the Truth, nevertheless regarded him as a wonderfully enlightened man of God (v. 11), whose true and reasonable solutions of the most difficult religious problems, particularly those antityped by the interpretations given by Daniel to Nebuchadnezzar's two dreams (vs. 11, 12), satisfied them that Pastor Russell could read and interpret the antitypical handwriting on the wall. These were attracted (v. 10) to the symbolic feast by the report of Christendom's, particularly her leaders', expressed perplexity over the involved events. Their suggestion that Pastor Russell

be sent for to solve the difficulty antitypes the queen's suggestion that Daniel be sent for to decipher the handwriting on the wall (v. 12). The sending for Daniel, implied in vs. 12, 13, types the summoning of Bro. Russell in his writings, sermons and lectures, to solve the difficulty. Daniel's being brought in before the king (v. 13) types Bro. Russell's being brought in before the nominal people of God, particularly their leaders, in the sense that his writings, sermons and lectures were introduced before these. The king's telling Daniel what he had heard of him (vs. 13-16) represents the thoughts of the nominal people of God with respect to him, as they took our Pastor's literature and words in hand to get his views on the pertinent events. In type and antitype inquiries were made (v. 13), compliments were passed on the one asked to explain (v. 14), the inability of the wise men to solve the difficulty was acknowledged (v. 15), the ability of the one asked was acknowledged (v. 16) and the above-mentioned reward was offered (v. 16). Daniel's first statement (v. 17), that the king keep his gifts or bestow his rewards on another types Bro. Russell's disinterestedness; for he gladly gave his service in the cause of Truth freely, declining to accept remuneration therefore. Daniel's willingness to read and interpret the handwriting (v. 17) types Bro. Russell's willingness to read and explain the peculiar events as signs of the times to the nominal people of God.

(18) But Daniel preceded his reading and interpretation of the writing by a penitential sermon to the king (vs. 18-23), which types our Pastor's reading a Daniel's allusions to Nebuchadnezzar's exaltation, sin, degradation, repentance and restoration (vs. 18-21), types our Pastor's various presentations on man's original perfection, his sin, his experience with evil with its consequent degradation, and man's future repentance and restoration as a warning to the Parousia

generation against its sinful course—a generation which knew all these things (v. 22), but which, despite such knowledge, exalted (v. 23), instead of humbling, itself, even to the degree of defiling God's Truth, each individually in general, and in particular through the leaders and their organizations (v. 23), and honored their creeds as god, but failed to glorify the true God. Certainly our Pastor's pertinent writings, sermons and lectures are replete with such teachings. As Daniel showed (v. 24) that God's sign was given in view of such sins on the part of Belshazzar, his lords, wives and concubines, so Bro. Russell showed that, among other reasons, it was in view of Christendom's sins that the pertinent events as signs of the times were sent by God. In both the type and the antitype it was most fitting that the pertinent sinfulness should have been pointed out before the typical and antitypical handwriting was read and interpreted. Then in each case came the reading and interpretation of the mystic handwriting on the wall.

(19) First Daniel read the writing (v. 25), which the Babylonian wise men could not even read. This represents that first our Pastor showed that the perplexing events, which as such Christendom's wise men could not clearly see, were *signs of the times* and must be seen as such. Then as Daniel explained the meaning of the words (vs. 26-28), so Bro. Russell explained the meaning of the signs. What is the antitype of Daniel's explaining that MENE (v. 26) means "God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it" (v. 26)? It is this: Our Pastor, in his writings, lectures and sermons, pointed out that God had limited the kingdoms of the world to a definite number of years—the seven times of the Gentiles, 2520 years—and that these times would end in 1914, which finished the period of the lease of power to Gentile kingdoms. Very significant in this connection is the fact that the numeric value of those words on the wall is exactly 2520—

Mene = 1000; Mene = 1000; Tekel = 20; Peres = 500, the gerah being the unit here meant (Num.3: 47). This—that the Gentile times were numbered—2520 years—and were coming to an end in 1914, is the first thing that the events as signs of the times indicated, for among other things they indicated that the kingdoms were tottering unto a fall; hence that their time of reigning was at an end. What is the antitype of the explanation of TEKEL?—"Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting" (v. 27)? Our Pastor's pointing out in his writings, e.g., in the Views From The Watch Tower and in Studies, Vol. IV, in his lectures and in his sermons, that Christendom political, financial, ecclesiastical, labor and social, was on trial before the bar of Divine Justice, charged in numerous specifications with failure to fulfill its real and alleged mission. All will recall with what thoroughness of proof from Scripture, reason and fact these details were given, especially in Studies, Vol. IV. These specifications with their proofs in the events were the weighing in the balances. This weighing demonstrated, in spite of the contentions of Christendom's advocates, that it was found lacking as a result of the trial. Justice in the one side of the scales tipped the side of the scale in which Christendom lay up against the beam, almost perpendicularly above the justice side of the scale. Truly, as a result of this weighing Christendom was found wanting. This was the second great thing that the events as signs of the times indicated.

(20) What is the antitype of the explanation of PERES of which UPHARSIN is a form (v. 25)—"Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians" (v. 28)? Our Pastor pointed out that the signs of the times indicated that Christendom was divided into two hostile camps: a conservative camp, consisting of church, state and capital, and a radical camp, consisting of farmers, trade unionists, socialists, communists and anarchists. Furthermore, he pointed

out that the ever-increasing friction between these two camps would burst out into a fire of destruction in Armageddon, which would destroy the conservative camp, obliterating the present forms of state, church and capital. Moreover, he pointed out that these signs indicated the imminence of God's Kingdom in its two phases (Medes and Persians), as the kingdom that would succeed the kingdoms of this world. Thus did he point out the three great things indicated in the signs of the times: (1) the end of the Gentile times; (2) Babylon's judgment going against her and (3) the overthrow of Satan's empire, to be succeeded by God's two-phased Kingdom. Without any doubt this is the interpretation of the signs of the times that our Pastor gave, which none of Babylon's wise men could give. They could not even read the events, *i.e.*, recognize them to be significant. And the events demonstrate especially since 1914 onward that his reading and interpreting were correct. Daniel clothed in the purple robe represents that Bro. Russell was royally received as the true reader and interpreter of the signs of the times. Daniel's having the chain of gold put about his neck types that Bro. Russell was accepted as the Divinely authorized reader and interpreter of the signs of the times. And Daniel's being accepted as the third (the religious) ruler in Babylon types that Bro. Russell was increasingly regarded as the greatest religious teacher in Christendom, the ecclesiastical division being during the Parousia considered in influence the third division of Christendom. Belshazzar's death (v. 30) types the nominal kingdom passing away in the trouble. Darius taking the kingdom represents our Lord taking the Kingdom.

(21) We now come to the sixth chapter of Daniel, which treats of Daniel in the lions' den. As with the matters of the preceding chapter so with those of this chapter, our Pastor in a half-page People's Pulpit picture used to advertise public meetings, which picture

can be seen in the 1913 convention report, indicated his thought that he was the one typed by Daniel in Dan. 6. In this chapter Darius represents our Lord, sometimes acting directly, and sometimes indirectly in His people. The kingdom (v. 1) here represents the Laodicean Church—the real and nominal church, as the nominal and real embryo Kingdom. The 120 princes (v. 1) type the leaders in the nominal church. The three presidents (v. 2) correspond to the three leaders of the three divisions of the Laodicean Church: the pope as leader of Catholicism, the head of the Federation of Churches as the leader of united Protestantism, and Bro. Russell as leader of the Truth people. Of these three (v. 2) Bro. Russell was chief, being the leader of the real people of God. The antitypical 120 as leaders of the nominal church were to render an account to these three leaders so that no damage accrue to the Lord Jesus. This arrangement had its start very early in the Parousia, reaching the Federation of Churches later. As Daniel was preferred by Darius above the other presidents and the 120 princes, because of his superior talents and character (v. 3), so antitypically Bro. Russell was preferred by our Lord for the same reasons above the pope, the Federation's head and the other leaders of the nominal church. The king's thinking to set Daniel over the whole kingdom (v. 3) represents our Lord's thinking to put Bro. Russell into that antitypical position, which, however, was never done. It has been said that envy is the tribute that inferiority gives to superiority. So was it in this case. As at first the two presidents and 120 princes sought to fault Daniel in his administration, but failed therein (v. 4), so did the pope, the Federation's head and the other leaders of the nominal church seek to do with our Pastor, but failed therein. As the former then decided that only on his religion could they get an advantage over Daniel (v. 3), so the latter decided that only on his religion could they entrap Bro. Russell.

(22) As the two presidents and 120 princes, etc., drew up a law forbidding anyone to make a petition to God or man for 30 days, except to the king (vs. 6, 7), so the leaders of Christendom and their representatives drew up progressively a decree that from 1881 to 1911 only the trinity, which in practice, though not in theory, usually means Jesus only, should be prayed to. It has always been the custom, though not the theory, to pray to Jesus almost exclusively in the nominal church. The nominal-church view of the Father as being enraged at the race and being intensely desirous of casting it into eternal torment, from which Jesus' intercession alone is thought to save them, has resulted in the practice that the Father is dreaded and is held afar from men, while Jesus is by them loved, trusted and sought in prayer. As a result, the custom, though not the theory, has arisen that in their prayers and affections most nominal-church members come to Jesus and not to the Father. Bro. Russell's anti-trinitarianism became the occasion for the votaries of the trinity stressing their doctrine to an extreme. The two presidents and the 120 princes, etc., coming to Darius to have the decree signed and sealed by the king, type the above-mentioned leaders coming to Jesus with their trinitarian agitation for His sanction. Jesus' permitting them to go on their course and allowing it to be prospered without attempting to hinder it, occasioned their getting the thought that He had sanctioned their purpose. With them silence, non-hindrance and success meant sanction! Of course, Jesus neither directly nor indirectly sanctioned such a thing. His dis-sanction of it is found in His giving the Truth on the subject through that Servant, especially in Studies, Vol. V.

(23) It should not strike us as unusual that Darius permitted himself to be worshiped. This was usual with ancient oriental monarchs, as it was the case in China until their empire was recently overthrown, and as it is still the case in Japan; for the heathen theory is

that their kings and emperors were of Divine begettal, hence were Divine and infallible, and as such should be worshiped. Hence the Persians and Medes so regarded their kings, and therefore considered their decrees infallible, and hence as unalterable—"the laws of the Medes and Persians alter not." As Daniel did not permit the erroneous decree to keep him back from worshiping the true God nor to make him do it in secret (v. 10), so Bro. Russell would not allow the Trinitarians to prevent him from worshiping, *i.e.*, serving God. The open window represents the non-secrecy, *i.e.*, the publicity, of the service. Its being open toward Jerusalem represents that our Pastor served God in the interests of the true Church. Daniel's doing this on his knees symbolizes Bro. Russell's spirit of consecration in his service of God, and doing it three times a day symbolizes that our Pastor did the antitypical service continually. As Daniel's enemies spied on him, so did our Pastor's enemies spy on him. As the former caught Daniel in the act (v. 11), so did our Pastor's enemies catch him in the act, as they thought. Their subtly securing the king's admission (v. 12) of the validity and unchangeability of the law types the crafty manner in which their antitypes sought to commit the Lord Jesus to a course that consistently, they thought, would force Him to realize their plot against our Pastor. Jesus by silence and the seeming prospering of their plot antitypes Darius' admission of the validity and unchangeability of the law, which they greatly desired.

- (24) In Biblical symbols a pit symbolizes a condition of slander. This appears from Joseph's being put into the pit, as typing: (1) Jesus, (2) the star-members of the Church and (3) the entire Church, being slandered by the nominal church leaders. It also appears from the type of Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada, slaying a lion in a pit, on a snowy day, wherein is pictured forth J.F. Rutherford, by his booklet issued

during the Time of Trouble (winter), A Battle in the Ecclesiastical Heavens, refuting the nominal church's slander against our Pastor (2 Sam. 23: 20). Hence to be put into a pit, which the lions' den was ("ere they came to the *bottom* of the den"; v. 24), means to be put into a condition of slander, the lions typing the slanders involved here. The plotters' informing Darius that Daniel was the decree-violator and the king-disregarder (v. 13) types the antitypical plotters' informing Jesus against Bro. Russell by the acts of their seeking slanderous stories against our Pastor. Darius' seeking to deliver Daniel from the lions' den (v. 14) types Jesus' by His Spirit, acting in the loyal Truth people, seeking to defend our Pastor against the slanderous course of his traducers. The insistence of the typical plotters (v. 15) types the persistence of their antitypes in their determination to slander our Pastor, despite the Spirit of Jesus in His people striving against it. Their claim of unchanging legality types the stress laid on the seeming providence of the Lord as sanctioning the purpose at hand and on its being an infallible, unchangeable thing. The king's yielding to the demands (v. 16) types Jesus' permitting the conspiracy to run its course and His seeming prospering of it. Daniel's being cast into the lions' den (v. 16) types Bro. Russell's being put into the condition of slander. The king's assuring Daniel that the God whom he served continually would deliver him (v. 16) types Jesus' assurance through His people that God would deliver our Pastor. The stone that was laid at the den's mouth (v. 17) types the providences that prevented Bro. Russell's escape from the condition of slander. It included adverse court decisions and a hostile press that would not allow vindication to be given him in its columns. The king's sealing the stone with his and his lords' signets (v. 17) types Jesus' allowing unhindered the experience to be our Pastor's.

(25) And certainly the slanderers were given full

play with their loose tongues. First of all, at the manipulation of nominal church leaders, the 1891-1894 sifters were allowed free course with their slanders against our Pastors' conduct of the work. These set him forth as a designing, cheating business man who sought to use religion and business to reap a harvest of wealth for himself at the cost of others. Secondly, at the manipulation of the nominal church leaders Bro. Russell's wife, after threatening to ruin him before the world (she became set against him because he would not allow her to dictate the contents of the Tower and the policies of the harvest work), brought suit for divorce against him, insinuating sexual improprieties against him, despite the fact that on the witness stand she was forced to admit that she did not have any ground for charging him with adultery, which charge her instigators spread broadcast against him as though made by her. Thirdly, they charged him with claiming to be a thorough Greek and Hebrew scholar, a claim he never made, and then got a court ruling that he was no Greek and Hebrew scholar, and then spread world-wide the slander that his alleged pretensions to Greek and Hebrew scholarship were by a court declared to be unfounded. Fourthly, through the misrepresentations of the 1908-1911 sifters his business transactions were represented world-wide as being permeated wholly with fraud and deceit, to the alleged impoverishment of his dupes and to his own enrichment. And, finally, in 1911, through the Brooklyn Eagle, they slandered him as selling at fabulous profits a wheat to which he was alleged to ascribe miraculous properties. Beside these major slanders, they added minor ones, as many as their minds, fertile in inventing falsehoods, imagined would seem plausible. These slanders were the lions, antitypical of those that glared, growled and crouched, as ready to leap, at Daniel. In both type and antitype the experience must have been heart and mind testing of the most extreme kind.

(26) The king's fasting, mourning and sleeplessness (v. 18) type the distress of Jesus in His faithful people, at the sad experiences of Bro. Russell in the antitypical lions' den. It seems that the 30 days of v. 12 types the 30 years' period from 1881, when the trinitarian doctrine started to be especially stressed, to 1911, when the last great slander—that on the miracle wheat—started. The early morning of v. 19 seems to type a time shortly after 1911, when the Lord Jesus arose to a stopping of the slanders against His faithful steward, typed by Darius hastening to the lions' den. Darius' asking Daniel whether his God had been able to deliver him (v. 20) types Jesus' Spirit in His people asking Bro. Russell whether God's grace was strong enough to sustain him in his sore trial. At the same time they feared for his maintaining his new-creaturely bearing amid the experience. Time and again the brethren during those long-drawn-out, slanderous experiences feared that he would become bitter, angry, hating, vindictive, unforgiving, revengeful, slanderous, etc., at the great injustices heaped upon him by his ecclesiastical enemies. These were the antitypes of Darius' fears. Daniel's first response (v. 21), "O king, live forever," types Bro. Russell's spirit as one that did not blame Jesus for permitting the slanders, but wished Him eternal prosperity. Next, Daniel's ascribing his preservation to the grace of God, ministered through an angel (v. 22), types Bro. Russell's ascribing, not to his own new-creaturely strength, but to God's goodness through His Spirit, Word and providence, his deliverance. Our Pastor's deliverance was not a physical one; it was one of his New Creature. It consisted in this, that God's grace was so faithfully used by him as to disarm the slanders from injuring his holy qualities of heart and mind. Instead of rancor, meekness; instead of anger, longsuffering; instead of hatred, forbearance; instead of implacability, forgiveness; instead of malice, sweetness; instead of revenge, well-

doing; instead of slander, blessing filled him. Hence his New Creature received no damage from the symbolic lions, as fierce, savage, malicious and violent as they were. Truly, they did not hurt him (v. 22). In both the type and the antitype, the reason was the same—"innocency" (v. 22). Daniel's consciousness that he did not wrong the king (v. 22) types Bro. Russell's consciousness that in putting God first and serving Him alone, he did Jesus no wrong, since he was also faithful to Jesus in all matters pertaining to Him.

(27) The king's rejoicing (v. 23) types that of Jesus both personally and in His people at Bro. Russell's spiritual victory. The charge to bring Daniel forth from the lions' den (v. 23) types Jesus' charge that the slanders cease, as the bringing of Daniel out of the lions' den types the deliverance of Bro. Russell from the condition of slander. From 1913 onward a great change of public sentiment and utterance set in as to our Pastor. A D.C. court's decision, valid therefore throughout the United States, except in Florida, against a publisher of a string of about thirty very prominent newspapers for his publishing these slanders, became the occasion of those papers publishing an apology, and as a penitential act these papers published Bro. Russell's sermons. This decision, shown to the other slandering editors, produced similar effects. Statesmen, educators and legislators vied with one another for the privilege of introducing him to audiences that filled to overflowing the largest auditoriums of America and other countries. Everywhere he was regarded as the greatest religious teacher of his times. At the Panama-Pacific Exposition its managers set aside a special Pastor Russell's Day as a part of the Exposition program, and the chairman of its board at a very largely attended meeting, after a laudatory address, presented him with a large bronze medal, on one side of which was embossed a figure of his face. Everywhere he went he was received with public manifestations

of favor and applause. Thus as Daniel's faith (v. 23) stopped the mouths of lions (Heb. 11: 33), so did our Pastor's faith stop the power of slanders from opening their mouths against him to his hurt. And as Daniel was given greater honors (v. 28), so was our Pastor—extending not only over the Parousia proper (Darius' time), but also into the third year of its lapping into the Epiphany (Cyrus' time).

(28) The king's commanding the designing presidents and princes, and their children and wives, to be thrown into the lions' den (v. 24) types Jesus' removing hindrances to slanders from opening their mouths against the leaders of the nominal church and their partisan supporters and organizations. The throwing of the former into the lions' den (v. 24) types the putting of them into the condition of slander; and thus in both cases was fulfilled the saying that he that diggeth a pit for his neighbor's feet shall himself fall therein. The lions' having the mastery over the two presidents and the 120 princes and their children and wives, types the slanders' mastering the leaders, their followers and their organizations. Their tearing these to pieces types how the characters of their victims were torn, in that anger, resentment, hatred, malice, vindictiveness, implacability, revenge and cursing, were aroused in them by the slanders. The tearing to pieces occurring before the victims fell even to the bottom of the den types the speed with which the pertinent characters were torn to pieces in their trial in the den of slander. Thus our Pastor's strength of character shines out in striking contrast with the weakness of their characters. Darius' decree types our Lord's proclamations of the supremacy of the Heavenly Father and of His benign reign forever and forever. This decree will forever manifest our Pastor's glorious victory in his sore trial: A part of that manifestation will be the making known that this antitypical Daniel has been found worthy to be the Lord's special representative

toward the Little Flock (Num. 4: 16) and the Ancient Worthies (Num. 3: 32) during the Millennium, as the individual Millennial Eleazar.

(29) As a line of distinction between Dan. 1—6 and Dan. 7—12, the following may be given: Dan. 1—6 is mainly historical and Dan. 7—12 is mainly prophetical. However there are a few prophetical matters in Dan. 1—6 and a few historical matters in Dan. 7—12. We must remember that it is not our design in this chapter to expound the book of Daniel prophetically, which our Pastor has done sufficiently, but to expound the book from the standpoint of type and antitype. This design will be adhered to in our explaining the second part of Daniel, as it was in our explaining its first part; and this is possible, because interspersed among the prophecies of its second part there are a number of historical facts and allusions. In Dan. 7 prophecy is mainly found, with but two historical allusions connected therewith; for this chapter contains the vision of the four beasts, which therein are expounded as representing the four universal empires of the Gentile times. Additionally, the horns, more particularly one of them, of the fourth beast come in for exposition. It also pictures forth the Ancient of days, and the One like the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven and with His associated saints, obtaining the Kingdom. Daniel's seeing this vision represents Bro. Russell's getting an indefinite idea of the course of history under the Gentile powers and of God's Kingdom to follow their overthrow as the result of God's judgment. This indefinite view he got partly from Scripture and partly from history. His indefinite view of these matters was not an understanding of them, even as Daniel's seeing the vision was not an understanding of it (vs. 15, 16). As Daniel asked and received the explanation of the vision from one who stood by (vs. 16-27), so Bro. Russell asked of, and received an explanation of the antitypical vision from Bro. N.H. Barbour, who later

denied the Ransom and became among the Truth people the first harvest-sifting leader. As Daniel was troubled over the vision and explanation (v. 28), so was Bro. Russell over the antitypes. Daniel's countenance being changed (v. 28) types the change of knowledge (2 Cor. 4: 6—face) that came to Bro. Russell on the pertinent subject. And Daniel's keeping the matter in his heart types Bro. Russell's abiding and loving interest in the subject.

(30) At this place there may well be introduced a record of the events connected with which the explanation of the antitypical vision was given. As we saw above, the misuse that the Adventists had made of prophetic time in forecasting the date of Jesus' allegedly fleshly Second Advent and its alleged annihilation of the physical universe had greatly prejudiced Bro. Russell against the use of prophetic chronology. Knowing that Jesus as a Divine Spirit would be invisible in His Second Advent, that the physical universe would last forever and that Jesus' Second Advent would annihilate the symbolic heavens and earth, preparatory to the establishing of His Kingdom to effect the restitution of all things, Bro. Russell laughed at their erroneous claims and ridiculed their unreasonable teachings. But he went further: he allowed their going into one extreme in the misuse of prophetic chronology to drive him into the other extreme of denying the use of prophetic chronology altogether. This, of course, was an error on his part. It was partly to combat the Adventist pertinent errors that he published and circulated his tract on The Object and Manner of our Lord's Second Advent. And he maintained his disbelief in, and ridiculing of prophetic chronology until into 1876, when the Lord helped him out of this error into the opposite Truth. This occurred as follows: In Jan., 1876, he received a magazine through the mails. Opening it, he saw from its frontispiece that it was an Adventist publication. Ridiculously he said to himself,

"I wonder what date they are now fixing for Christ's coming in flesh and annihilating the universe!" In this attitude he began to read an article in the magazine. He saw that its writer was beginning to get his eyes slightly open on the object and manner of our Lord's return. The article told of how its author, a Bro. Barbour, disappointed at Christ's not coming in the flesh and annihilating the universe in 1874, had carefully reviewed many times the chronology to see whether there were not some flaw therein, and, unable to find one, was greatly perplexed over the resultant situation.

(31) While in such perplexity he received a letter from a Bro. B. W. Keith, of Danville, N. Y., an Adventist subscriber to Bro. Barbour's Herald Of The Morning. The former's pre-and post-1874 experiences with the chronology were like those of Bro. Barbour. After telling of these in his letter, he went on to say that he had lately been studying Matt. 24 through the Diaglott, which, he noticed, translated the word *parousia* by the word *presence*, whereas it was in the A.V. rendered by the word *coming*. He further stated in his letter that Matt. 24: 38, 39, compared with Luke 17: 26, 27, seemed to teach that during the presence of the Son of Man people would, in ignorance thereof, go on in their customary way of living: eating, drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, etc. Then the letter asked Bro. Barbour whether, the chronology being proven to be flawless, our Lord had not since Oct., 1874, been invisibly present in His Second Advent (Reprints, 188, 6-10). Having in the article stated these matters, Bro. Barbour cautiously advanced the thought that probably our Lord was present invisibly in His Second Advent. As Bro. Russell read this article he for the first time saw that probably, after all, prophetic chronology had a place in revealed religion; for believing for over 15 months now that our Lord as a Divine Spirit would have to be invisible in His Second Advent, the question arose in his mind, How

apart from prophetic chronology, could we know that He was present? He could think of no other way of knowing it except through prophetic chronology. Hence for the first time he was willing with almost no prejudice to investigate as to whether prophetic chronology had a place in God's plan. Accordingly, he entered into a correspondence with Bro. Barbour over the matter, and arranged for a meeting to take place between them at Philadelphia, where for the period of the Centennial Exposition (May 10-Nov. 10, 1876) he had a store, in addition to two in Pittsburgh. His sending for Bro. Barbour was his first executive act as that Servant, according to the David type; for as David reigned 40½ years, so it was 40½ years from April 30, 1876, until the toga scene, Oct. 30, 1916.

(32) During the evenings of that summer these two studied the Bible together, since the store kept Bro. Russell busy during the day. Bro. Barbour enlightened Bro. Russell on the chronology and Daniel; and Bro. Russell enlightened him on the Ransom, the object and manner of our Lord's Second Advent, the eternity of the physical universe, the nature and destruction of the symbolic universe, the spirit existence of Christ since His resurrection, the Gospel Age as the time of the selection of the Church as Christ's Millennial Bride and Associate in blessing the non-elect, dead and alive, the nature of the Judgment Day, etc., etc. Thus it will be seen that Bro. Russell gave Bro. Barbour decidedly more Truth than the latter gave him. Moreover, what Bro. Barbour gave him he got from others, especially from Bro. William Miller and later Adventists, among whom was Bro. Keith, from whom he got the thought that Jesus was probably present invisibly since 1874. These facts help us to see the flimsiness of the claim that because Bro. Barbour showed our Pastor certain Truth on prophetic chronology and on Daniel he was the first one to hold the office of that Servant. When they met, Bro. Russell had decidedly more, and

more important Truth than Bro. Barbour, much of which he was the first to see in the end of the Age; and he gave Bro. Barbour more, and more important Truth than Bro. Barbour gave him. But even this fact did not prove Bro. Russell then to have been full-fledged as that Servant, a thing that he did not fully become until in 1879, during the struggle that he had on the matter of the sin-offerings, when they were made clear to him, though he in April, 1876, had the executive feature of that office (Chapter VI.). Of the two, Bro. Russell was decidedly more aggressive as a servant of the Lord even at that time, as witnessed by Bro. Barbour's readiness to give up, and his having to be encouraged and helped by Bro. Russell to go on with the work (Z '16, 171, pars. 11, 12). While this is true, our Pastor always felt grateful for the help that Bro. Barbour gave him on prophetic chronology and on Daniel's prophecies. We have here introduced these facts, because they are necessary to understand antitypically a number of facts in Dan. 7—12.

(33) In Dan. 8 we again meet a number of facts in Daniel's experiences that find their antitypes in some of Bro. Russell's experiences. We, for reasons already given, will not study this chapter prophetically, giving attention here only to its typical features. It will be noted that the vision of Dan. 8 does not deal with things connected with the Babylonian Empire. It commences with things connected with the Medo-Persian Empire (vs. 3, 4, 20). This fact proves that the 2300 days (v. 14), as well as their first 490 days (Dan. 9: 24), start during the time of the Medo-Persian Empire; for when the interpolated word "concerning" after the word "vision" in v. 13 is omitted, it will be seen that the question asks for the length of the time of the vision, as well as the duration of its most important parts. And the answer is given, until 2300 days. This fact unanswerably proves that the 2300 days are not literal days, that they began sometime during

the Medo-Persian Empire and that their beginning coincides with the beginning of the 490 days, or 70 weeks, *i.e.*, Oct. 455 B.C., when Nehemiah put Artaxerxes' command into execution; for the 490 days of Dan. 9: 24, coinciding with the first 490 of the 2300 days, "seal the vision and the prophet (demonstrate the truthfulness of the vision and prophet of the 2300 days by certain fulfillments in their first 490 days)" (Dan. 9: 24). Since there was no vision in Dan. 9, and since the 490 days cannot refer to Daniel's 1260, 1290 and 1335 days, regardless of whether we refer them to literal years or days, because the 490 days end in 36 A.D., and since there is no other vision of days in Daniel except that of the 2300 days, these 490 days must be "cut off," determined, from the 2300 days of the vision given in Dan. 8. Hence the vision and prophet that are referred to as sealed in Dan. 9: 24 by the fulfillment of the 490 days' prophecy must be the vision of Dan. 8 and Daniel as the agent of that prophecy. This, of course, destroys J.F.R.'s view of the 2300 days as being literal days and as being connected with his work. Daniel's being at the time of the vision in Shushan, the capital (here the meaning of the word is palace) of Elam (v. 2), types our Pastor's dwelling in his consecrated life with our Lord among His people in the early Parousia time. The River Ulai (v. 2-pure water) here types the Truth that our Pastor had received up to Jan., 1876. Daniel's seeing the vision (vs. 3-12) at Ulai types our Pastor's getting indistinct views of the relation of the Medo-Persian, the Grecian and the Romano-Papal Empires to God's people and plan, while he was standing by the Truth (Ulai).

(34) Daniel's hearing one saint speaking (v. 13) types Bro. Russell's hearing William Miller in his writings explain certain things referred to in this vision. The other saint (v. 13) types Bro. Barbour, whom Bro. Miller taught almost everything on prophetic time that Bro. Barbour knew. Daniel's hearing the second

saint ask the first the duration of the vision and its main features (v. 13), types Bro. Russell's coming to understand that Bro. Barbour inquired of Bro. Miller, by searching his writings, the duration of the antitypical vision, etc., and received therefrom the answer that it would last 2300 years, *i.e.*, up to the time of the cleansing of the sanctuary from its mass-connected defilements. The fact that the speaking saint (the first one) gave Daniel the answer (v. 14), and not the saint that asked him, types the fact that, while it was Bro. Barbour who seemingly explained the antitypical vision to Bro. Russell, it was in reality Bro. Miller who did it, inasmuch as the thoughts that Bro. Barbour expressed to him were such as he got from Bro. Miller. Daniel's seeking an explanation of the vision (v. 15) types Bro. Russell's seeking clearness on the indistinct ideas that he had on the subject matter typed by Daniel's vision in this chapter. The appearance of a man (v. 15) is the same as Gabriel of v. 16. In this chapter Gabriel types the brethren who made clear to Bro. Russell the antitypical vision, *i.e.*, Bros. Miller, Keith and Barbour. The man's voice (v. 16) was doubtless that of the Logos, who commandingly spoke out from between the banks of the Ulai and who here types our Lord in the Second Advent. Speaking out of the Parousia Truth, Jesus arranged for the pertinent teachings to be explained to Bro. Russell.

(35) Gabriel's coming near to Daniel (v. 17) types Bros. Miller, Keith and Barbour by their teachings drawing near to Bro. Russell to explain them. This began in the article in *The Herald Of The Morning* above described; for that involved article showed that its writer was getting his eyes open on the object and manner of our Lord's return (Z '16, 171, par. 4). Daniel's standing place (v. 17) types Bro. Russell's doctrinal standpoint at the time that copy of *The Herald Of The Morning* reached him. But as Daniel feared Gabriel's approach, so Bro. Russell feared

(distrusted) the approach of these three brothers in the first mention of prophetic time in that article. Daniel's falling on his face (v. 17) types Bro. Russell's spiritually abject position as a reviler and ridiculer of prophetic time; for the feelings of revulsion thereat filled his mind as he read the first part of that article wherein Bro. Barbour narrated his experience of disappointment in 1874 and his re-examination of the chronology. Gabriel's saying that the vision was intended for help in the time of the end types Bros. Miller, Keith and Barbour showing by the chronology in that article that the antitypical fulfillment was for the benefit of the Lord's people during the time of the end. Daniel's being in a deep sleep on the ground when Gabriel was amid the first part of his speech (v. 18) types Bro. Russell as being asleep on prophetic time and its involved prophecies, while he was in a ridiculing attitude on the subject, and while reading the first part of that article in which Bros. Miller, Keith and Barbour were speaking to him. Gabriel's touching Daniel (v. 18) types these three brothers' in the pertinent article (Bro. Miller by his use of time prophecy, and Bros. Barbour and Keith by the article itself) connecting it with the real object and manner of our Lord's return, though indefinitely seen, and thus arousing the interest of Bro. Russell in prophetic time. Gabriel's making Daniel stand upright (v. 18) represents these three brothers', by their thoughts expressed in that article, taking away Bro. Russell's prejudice against, and arousing his favorable attitude toward prophetic time. Gabriel's promising Daniel to make him know what would be in the end of the indignation (v. 19) types Bro. Barbour's promise, given in his correspondence with Bro. Russell, which led up to their meeting and studying together in Philadelphia, that he would expound the involved matters, particularly as they referred to the time of the end. The explanation that Gabriel gave (vs. 20-26) types the explanation

that Bro. Miller through Bro. Barbour, and Bro. Barbour himself, gave Bro. Russell of the involved matters. Daniel's being sick (v. 27) seems to type the consciousness of his own weakness and of the distress that Bro. Russell must have felt over his rejection and ridicule of prophetic time, after he came to see its real and proper use. Daniel's afterward arising and doing work for the king (Belshazzar) types Bro. Russell's later activity that proved beneficial to the nominal people of God. Daniel's astonishment at the vision types Bro. Russell's astonishment at its antitype. None understanding the vision types the fact that at the time Bro. Russell first came to see it and was in astonishment over it, none, of course apart from the involved brethren, at that time understood it in its latest unfoldings.

(36) Dan. 9 contains Daniel's confession of Israel's sins leading up to the Babylonian captivity and the desolations wrought on Jerusalem, his petition for forgiveness and for the restoration of the people, temple and city and Gabriel's revelation of the 70 weeks in answer to Daniel's prayer. Daniel's being in Babylon, though under Darius' rulership (vs. 1, 2), types Bro. Russell's being in Christendom, though Jesus was in His Parousia reign. Daniel's learning (v. 2) from books (Lev. 26: 31-35; Jer. 25: 11, 12; 29: 10) that Jerusalem's wastings in the royal and sacred houses would be 70 years, types Bro. Russell's learning from various Scriptures that the true Church as God's embryo Kingdom and Temple was to be wasted by symbolic Babylon during the bulk of the Gospel Age. As Daniel in the beginning of the 70th year found out that the time of the deliverance of the people and the restoration of the temple and the city was at hand, so did Bro. Russell find out that the time of the deliverance of Spiritual Israel and the erection of the Church as God's embryo Kingdom and Temple were about due. As such knowledge led Daniel to seek the Lord's face, to confess Israel's sins as the cause of their captivity

and Jerusalem's wastes, to justify God for his judgments on Israel and to plead for Israel's restoration and the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the temple, so did Bro. Russell seek for himself and all Spiritual Israelites God's favor, confess their sins as the cause for the wastes of the true Church as God's embryo Kingdom and Temple, justify God for sending the punishments and entreat Him to restore the Church as God's embryo Kingdom and Temple. And as God sent Gabriel to Daniel to give him the assurance of his prayer's answer in the prophecy of the 70 weeks, and their preceding and subsequent implications, so God sent antitypical Gabriel to Bro. Russell to give him the assurance of his prayer's answer in the antitypical 70 weeks' prophecy and preceding and subsequent implications.

(37) All of us know that the 70 weeks' prophecy (Dan. 9: 24-27) is involved in the parallel dispensations and in the harvest parallels, and that hence it is in the Gospel-Age and Gospel-harvest parallels that we find its antitype. Hence these 70 weeks type the period from 1391 to 1881. Moreover, as the troubles (vs. 26, 27) that desolated Israel at the end of the Jewish Age, even up to 73 A.D., are in this prophecy given as the result of the sins of Israel committed during the last week, and thus as subsequent implications of the 70 weeks, so the events involved in wrath upon Christendom following its sins of 1874-1881, even up to 1918, are involved in the parallel as subsequent implications of the antitypical 70 weeks. Still further, as the events involved in the answer to Daniel's prayer up to the beginning of the 70 weeks form with the 70 weeks God's answer to his prayer, these also belong to the parallel, as preceding implications of the 70 weeks, *i.e.*, the parallel from 536 B.C. to 455 B.C., or to put it more exactly, as the Edgar brothers put it, with Bro. Russell's approval, from 537 B.C. to 455 B.C., finds its parallel antitype from 1309 to 1391 A.D. as a preceding implication of the antitypical 70 weeks. Accordingly, a

series of events from 537 B.C. to 73 A.D. finds its antitype in the form of parallels from 1309 to 1918 A.D. And, finally, as the 70 weeks with their *preceding* and *subsequent associated* times and events are typical in the parallel dispensation and Jewish Harvest of times and events of the Gospel Age and its Harvest, so do we properly infer that Gabriel in giving the 70 weeks' prophecy and its preceding and subsequent associated times and events to the typical Daniel is also typical in this transaction, even as we have already found in Dan. 8 and will yet find in Dan. 10 to 12.

(38) Of whom is Gabriel in vs. 21-26 typical? We answer, evidently of those brothers—five in number—who gave Bro. Russell the parallels in times and events during the Gospel Age and its Harvest, corresponding to those of the Jewish Age and its Harvest. The first of these five brothers was Bro. Barbour, who gave Bro. Russell five of these parallel dates and events. The second was probably either Bro. Paton or Bro. Keith, but we have not yet been able to locate him with certainty. The third and fourth were Bros. John and Morton Edgar, who gave him the bulk of the parallels from 1309 to 1914. And the fifth was another brother who in Dec., 1903, pointed out to Bro. Russell that 69 A.D., not 70 A.D., ended the reaping time of the Jewish Age and that hence 1914, not 1910, which Bro. Russell then thought, would end even the garnering, would finish the reaping of the Gospel Harvest, even as he then (in 1903) thought that 1914 would end the wrath time, as the mistaken parallel of Jerusalem's destruction in 70 A.D. This fifth brother also pointed out to Bro. Russell that he was the parallel of the Apostles in time and events, indicated in the Acts of the Apostles, and finally pointed out to him in 1915 the details of the parallels involved in the siege of Jerusalem, the falls of Herodion, Macherus and Masada and the Alexandrian and Cyrenian massacres, events occurring between the Spring of 70 and the Summer of 73 A.D.,

the parallels finding their counterparts in the World War from April, 1915, to July, 1918. Gabriel's coming to Daniel swiftly (v. 21) types that speedy answers to Bro. Russell's prayers for pertinent light were given him by the Lord through the various members of antitypical Gabriel. Gabriel's coming to Daniel about the time of the evening oblation types these five brethren serving Bro. Russell during the reaping and gleaning time, the time of offering the last part of the Gospel-Age sacrifice. Gabriel's touching Daniel types these five brethren beginning to serve Bro. Russell in the pertinent matters. Gabriel's telling Daniel that he was going to make him skillful in understanding (v. 22), types, not the words, but the enlightening acts of these brethren as telling, without words, Bro. Russell that they were going to give him helps on the parallels.

(39) The speedy answer that God arranged to be given to Daniel's prayer (v. 23) types the quick answers to Bro. Russell's prayers for pertinent light that God arranged for him to receive. Three times Gabriel tells Daniel that he was greatly beloved (v. 23; Dan. 10: 11, 19). This types the assurances given to our Pastor that God greatly loved him. This is indicated in the name of *Eldad (Beloved of God)*, given him typically in his capacity as a pilgrim (Num. 11: 26, 27), as it is also indicated in the name *David (Beloved)*, given him typically as the ruler over the household. He was indeed beloved by God and the brethren. In the Fall of 1903 we said to him, "Bro. Russell, the brethren love you greatly; you are the most loved man on earth." Bro. Russell, whose humility eschewed praise, quickly replied, "Yes, and the most hated," and then added that to be so loved by the brethren "is a reward that the Lord gives me for serving the brethren." Gabriel (v. 23) encourages Daniel to understand and consider the vision, which is the one given in Dan. 8, as is also gathered from v. 21, there being no vision in Dan. 9. This proves that what

Gabriel here tells of the 70 weeks is involved in, and supplementary to the vision of the 2300 days. Again we remark, this unanswerably proves that the 2300 days are 2300 years, and thus disproves J.F.R.'s applying them as 2300 literal days connected with his movement. Gabriel's so encouraging Daniel types the five involved brothers' encouraging Bro. Russell to study what they were about to present to him.

(40) We will now set forth briefly the parallels in the time order as these five brothers brought them to our Pastor's attention. It was Bro. Barbour who first, in the Summer of 1876, brought the parallel dispensations to Bro. Russell's attention, giving him five of the parallels. He paralleled the preliminary too early First Advent movement with the preliminary too early Second Advent movement under William Miller from 1829 to 1843, when the brethren first expected Jesus' Second Advent. Then he paralleled Gabriel's announcement of Jesus' begettal and birth to Mary, Jan., 2 B.C., which was misunderstood to be that of the First Advent, with Bro. Miller's getting the thought in Jan., 1844, that the Second Advent would occur the coming Fall. Then Bro. Barbour paralleled the premature First Advent, Jesus' birth, Oct., 2 B.C., with the premature Second Advent, Oct., 1844. The reasons that first Oct., 1843, and then Oct., 1844, were the dates suggested by Bro. Miller for the Second Advent were: (1) that he was uncertain as to whether to begin the 1260 days with the Ostrogoths' being compelled to raise the siege of Rome, 538, or with the overthrow of the Ostrogothic kingdom in Italy in 539; and (2) that he began the 1290 and 1335 days thirty years earlier than the 1260 days. Fourthly, Bro. Barbour paralleled the real First Advent, Oct. 29 A.D., Jesus' anointing at Jordan—"Messiah (*anointed*), the Prince" (v. 25)—with the real Second Advent, 1874. Then, finally, Bro. Barbour gave the parallels of Jesus' resurrection, 33 A.D., and the Church's resurrection in

1878. A second brother, not yet certainly known to us, gave Bro. Russell the thought that, as until Oct., 36 A.D., special favor was limited to Israelites, but from then on it went out also to Gentiles, so until Oct., 1881, special favor was limited to Church members, but from then on would go out also to some outside the nominal Church.

(41) The next important and most detailed additions given to the parallels came through Bros. John and Morton Edgar, especially through the former. Some of these were first published in Z '05, 179, etc., and then in the 1906 Convention Reports, and about all of them in Vol. II of *The Great Pyramid Passages*. They gave Bro. Russell (and the Church) more on the parallels, including the Parallel Dispensations, than did any other part of antitypical Gabriel. The following are a few of the more important of these; the others can be gotten from the publications just referred to. They paralleled Zerubbabel's laying the temple's foundation in 537 B.C. with Marsiglio's laying down certain truths for the foundation for the Church in 1309 A.D.; Zerubbabel's renewing the work on the temple in 522 B.C. with Marsiglio's writing his famous book, *Defensor Pacis* (*Defender of the Peace*), which to this day is the strongest refutation of the papal theory of Church government, and is a remarkable setting forth of the Truth on Church government; Zerubbabel's four years' work in completing the temple, 522-518 B.C., with Marsiglio's four years' activity, 1324-1328 A.D., along the lines laid down in his *Defensor Pacis*. Next, they paralleled Ezra's reformatory work in Israel, begun in 468 B.C., with Wyclif's reformatory work, begun in 1378 A.D. This they followed with the paralleling of Nehemiah's building Jerusalem's walls, 455 B.C., with John Huss' strengthening the powers of the Church in 1391. These are only a few among many of the parallels that they brought out. Their charts, including those treating of the various

parallels, may be found in the Berean Bible, as well as in the writings above referred to. All these they brought to Bro. Russell, who approved of them.

(42) The fifth brother, beginning with the Fall of 1903, brought out a number of parallels. The first of these was in the form of a correction and of an addition. Earlier than 1904 the editions of Studies, Vol. II gave 70 as the Jewish reaping's end; but as this would have made the Jewish reaping last 41 years ($70 - 29 = 41$) this matter was corrected to dating its end as of 69 A.D. While all the figures thereon were not corrected in Studies, Vol. II, par. 2 was added to page 245, making the correction. This correction led to fixing Oct., 1914, as the parallel to 69 A.D., as the end of the reaping, whereas previously Bro. Russell held, on the basis of a paper measurement in the Pyramid, that the Church would leave the earth in 1910. However, a clear-cut distinction between the end of the reaping and the end of the garnering did not begin to set in until 1912, when Bro. Russell began to get his eyes open through this distinction to the fact that the Church would not leave the world by 1914. Additionally, the correction from 70 to 69 A.D. became the occasion for Bro. Russell's in 1904 seeing that the trouble would not end, but would begin in 1914 (Z '04, 197-199; 229, 230). In 1910 this fifth brother brought to Bro. Russell's attention the fact that he was the parallel of the Apostles, and that in the parallel Harvests their activities and his paralleled. Some of these parallels were brought out in Studies, Vol. III, 404-410; D.v., others of them will be brought out later, perhaps in another volume of this work on our Pastor. In Sept., 1915, this fifth brother brought to our Pastor a very large number (at least 25) of *wrath* parallels that occurred that year in the campaign of Von Makenzen against the Russians, which in its preparatory stages began in April, 1915, and as a campaign ended in Sept., 1915. At the same time he pointed out to

Bro. Russell five future parallel events, all of which were duly fulfilled, three of them in 1918. See Studies, Vol. II, 382-394. As to those of 1915, as paralleling those of 70 connected with the siege of Jerusalem: Taking the lunar dates and their connected events from Josephus as these were connected with the siege of Jerusalem, he found parallels, and that by anticipation, in the fightings on the eastern front in the Spring and Summer of 1915, exactly to a day lunar time, 1845 years after the parallel fightings at Jerusalem in 70 A.D. In these events the Romans and the Central Powers were parallels and the Jews and the Allies were parallels. Whenever the Romans received checks from the Jews in their Jerusalem siege the Central Powers received setbacks from the Allies exactly 1845 years later to a day lunar time; and whenever the Romans gained victories over the Jews the Central Powers gained victories over the Allies exactly 1845 years later to a day lunar time. All of the above-stated facts on the parallels prove that in the pertinent activities of the five above-mentioned brothers we find the antitypes of Gabriel's activities as set forth in Dan. 9: 21-27.

(43) We now come, in Dan. 10-12, to Daniel's last and greatest vision. As heretofore, we will pass by their prophetic parts and limit our attention to their typical parts, in harmony with the purpose of this chapter to set forth Daniel typically and antitypically. To understand the antitypes of Daniel's prostrations in Dan. 10, it is necessary for us to keep in mind Bro. Russell's early hostile attitude toward time prophecy. Daniel's three weeks' mourning (v. 2) types, we believe, the seven years' (1868-1875) distress of Bro. Russell through not appropriating to himself the joys coming from an understanding of prophetic time; for here the facts prove that three days stand for a year, since Daniel's abstinence from food during those three weeks (v. 3) types Bro. Russell's abstinence during the involved seven years from appropriating the Scriptural

teachings on prophetic time, especially as it relates to our Lord's Second Advent. Daniel's not anointing himself during these three weeks (v. 3) types Bro. Russell's not receiving the particular features of the graces developed by such prophetic time truths. We are not to infer this to mean that during those seven years our Pastor received no truths; for we have already seen that he received much new Truth during those times. Rather, as the connection shows, Daniel is here used to type him only in relation to prophetic time and prophecy connected with prophetic time. That he was during that time receiving certain secular truths is evident from the antitypical teachings of v. 4; for the river Hiddekel (*sharp, stern voice, or sound*), as a comparison of Dan. 12: 5-7 and C 64, par. 5—68, par. 1 shows, types the sharp, stern truths that came out of the serpent's mouth. Satan poured them out through men like Montesquieu, Helvetius, Voltaire, Rousseau, D'Alambert and Diderot, the Encyclopedia of the last two mentioned, for which all six and others wrote, and the individual publications of the first four, being the main literary expressions of these sharp stern truths. In their writings the rights of man, which were later forcibly expressed during the French Revolution, were maintained with super-human ability and eloquence, as the Divine right of kings, clergy and aristocracy were attacked with unanswerable power. Against the Romanist Church Voltaire cried out, "Crush the infamous wretch!" and Diderot shouted, "The world's deliverance can only come when the last king has been strangled with the entrails of the last priest!" Bro. Russell thoroughly believed and stood for the truths set forth by these six men; and this is typed by Daniel's standing beside the Hiddekel at the time the vision was vouchsafed him. Moreover, during those seven years, as shown above, he received many religious truths; but during that time he did not receive any prophetic time truths. Dan. 10: 4-19 shows typically

in what condition he was as he was about to receive and was beginning to receive them, which condition we showed above, apart from this type.

(44) Daniel's lifting up his eyes in this vision and beholding a certain man (v. 5) represents Bro. Russell's giving his attention in study to an antitypical "certain man." The "certain man" who appeared to Daniel seems to be Gabriel, though this is not expressly stated; yet, the latter's being used to give former revelations to Daniel, coupled with the fact that he is distinct from, and inferior to Michael (vs. 13, 21; Dan. 12: 1), seem to make this practically certain. This "certain man" types Jesus in this chapter, while Michael in this chapter types God, who is Christ's superior, even as Michael was Gabriel's superior (v. 13, margin). That Gabriel here types our Lord appears from the similarity of the symbolic description of Gabriel in vs. 5, 6, and that of our Lord in Rev. 1: 13-15. The linen garment (v. 5) represents our Lord's righteousness and priestly office. The loins girded with fine gold of Uphaz (a corruption of the word *Ophir*, meaning *fruitful, abundant*) symbolizes our Lord's preparedness to perform the Divine service fruitfully. His body (v. 6) being like beryl (a mistranslation of a word that means *chrysolite*) represents the clarity of the Truth that Jesus gives. His face being like lightning (v. 6) symbolizes the brightness of the Truth (2 Cor. 4: 6) that Jesus brings. His eyes being like lamps of fire (v. 6) symbolizes the brilliance of Jesus' insight into the Truth. His arms and feet being in color like polished brass (v. 6) represents that Jesus' ability to serve and his conduct, character, were crucially tested and perfected by sufferings. And the voice of his words being like the voice of a multitude (v. 6) symbolizes the fact that Jesus' messages are given through His people, who are many. Daniel's alone seeing the vision (v. 7) types Bro. Russell alone of his then associates seeing the particular truths

involved; for Bro. Russell's becoming interested in prophetic time had the effect of frightening away from him members of the Bible class to which he then (in 1876) belonged, they thinking that he was going wrong. They had even looked askance at his view of Jesus' being since His resurrection a Spirit, and that He was in His Second Advent to come invisibly; and when he added interest in prophetic time to these, fearing that he was going to an extreme into error they forsook him, as typed by Daniel's companions (v. 7) in fear fleeing from him.

(45) Daniel's being left alone (v. 8) types Bro. Russell, forsaken by his former associates, being compelled to be the only beholder of the antitypical vision and temporarily the only understander of its meaning. Daniel's being at the vision's beginning with no strength (v. 8) types Bro. Russell's being strengthless on prophetic time at the time the Lord took him in hand to reveal it to him. Daniel's comeliness (*hadar* here is the same word as is rendered *comeliness* in Is. 53: 2; *hauteur*) being turned into corruption—decay—types Bro. Russell's despising spirit toward prophetic time passing away. This had its beginning while he was reading the article in *The Herald Of The Morning* in Jan., 1876, as mentioned above. Daniel's retaining no strength (v. 8) types Bro. Russell's not retaining the strength that he thought he had had against prophetic time. Daniel's hearing Gabriel's voice (v. 9) at this stage of the vision represents Bro. Russell's reading the prophetic time teachings of the above-mentioned article. Daniel's being in a deep sleep (v. 9) types Bro. Russell's being in a deep sleep on prophetic time at the beginning of the reading of that article. Daniel's face being toward the ground at the time (v. 9) types the earthly-mindedness of Bro. Russell's pertinent view on prophetic time at that time. The hand that touched Daniel (v. 10) types Bro. Barbour's, by that article, being used by Jesus for arousing Bro.

Russell's interest in prophetic time. Daniel's being raised by that hand and being set on his knees and the palms of his hands (v. 10) types Bro. Russell's being given enough strength of faith toward prophetic time by Jesus through Bro. Barbour's article to take a half proper stand toward it. Gabriel's telling Daniel that he was greatly beloved (v. 11) represents Jesus giving Bro. Russell the assurance that he was greatly loved by God. Gabriel's encouraging Daniel to understand his words (v. 11) types Jesus' encouraging Bro. Russell to understand the time features and other prophetic features that were about to be revealed to him. Gabriel's encouraging Daniel to stand upright (v. 11) types Jesus' encouraging Bro. Russell to take a proper stand toward prophetic time as against the improper position (face toward the ground) that he had hitherto been maintaining toward it. Daniel's taking tremblingly an upright position (v. 11) types our Pastor, amid misgivings, taking a proper stand toward time prophecy, *i.e.*, taking a convincible interest in the subject—one open to conviction under sufficient proof—though this was tremblingly done, in the fear of being misled into mistakes, as he recognized that prophetic time had been erroneously used.

(46) Gabriel's further encouraging Daniel against fearfulness (v. 12) types Jesus' further encouraging our Pastor not to fear a proper use of prophetic time. Gabriel's telling Daniel that God had heard his heart's desire to know the Lord's ways from the beginning of his 21 days' fasting and prayer, and had then set forth Gabriel to instruct Daniel in the pertinent matters (v. 12) types the assurance that already in 1868, when Bro. Russell took the firm stand not to believe anything to be a part of the Divine revelation, if it contradicted God's character, God had taken a responsive attitude toward his prayer for Truth and had commissioned Jesus to come to his assistance. And as Gabriel had come forth (v. 12) to that end, so Jesus had come

forth to help Bro. Russell in the pertinent matter. The prince of the kingdom of Persia here (v. 13) types Satan. As this prince resisted Gabriel's coming to Daniel's assistance 21 days, so had Satan resisted Jesus' efforts to give Bro. Russell the needed help on prophetic time for the seven years: 1868-1875. This raises the question, How could Satan have resisted our Lord so long in this matter? This will become clear when we remember that the Lord does not give the Truth coercively and irresistibly to His servants, but personally, educationally and persuasively, as is befitting to be done to free moral agents. By what means could Satan so long resist Jesus' giving Bro. Russell the pertinent light? Especially through two things:

(1) Bro. Russell's deep-seated prejudice against time prophecy and (2) the mistakes that the Adventists had made in their use of time prophecy. As pointed out above, such mistakes were made as to the destruction of the universe in 1843, 1844, 1873 and 1874, as well as in making the forecasts for those years that Christ would come in the flesh. It was through these two things that Satan could for so many years resist our Lord's efforts to enlighten Bro. Russell on prophetic time. But Jesus, as a Master Tactician, made His approach gradually to the citadel of Bro. Russell's unbelief, taking by strategems its outposts, one after another, through gradually enlightening him on preparatory truths until by Jan., 1876, Bro. Russell had received enough of such preparatory truths as resulted in Jesus having in His possession every outpost of this symbolic citadel; and thus Jesus was ready to make the final assault, which He did during the first nine months of 1876, and which resulted in complete victory in the capture and razing of the citadel of unbelief in prophetic time in Bro. Russell's heart.

(47) The clause (v. 13), "Michael, one of the chief princes," should be rendered, "Michael, the first of the chief princes," as the margin, Young, etc., show. This

is evidently correct, for Michael was the Logos, our pre-human Lord, who was the chief and firstborn of all God's creatures (Col. 1: 15-17). Since here Gabriel types our Lord, Michael, Gabriel's superior, evidently here types God, who is the only being superior to our Lord in His pre-human- and post-human existences. Michael's being the only one supporting Gabriel (v. 13) types God as the only being who helped our Lord against Satan in Bro. Russell's favor at the time antitypical of the 21 days, *i.e.*, from 1868 to 1875. Gabriel's remaining with the king (the Syriac and Septuagint read *king* here) of Persia in resistance types our Lord's seven years' resistance of Satan's effort to keep Bro. Russell blind on prophetic time. Another reading that Ginsburg says is the correct one for the last clause of v. 13 is: "I left him (Michael) there with the king of Persia." This would seem to type that Jesus left off resisting Satan and left God to handle Satan with pertinent matter, while Jesus came to Bro. Russell's help. But such a thought does not seem to fit the antitypical setting; for Satan's resistance had already been overcome except in its last stage, which Jesus overcame during the first 9 months of 1876. As Gabriel assured Daniel (v. 14) that he had come forth to acquaint Daniel with what would happen to his (*i.e.*, God's real, not nominal) people in the latter (literally, last one of the) days (the Gospel Age, as the last day or Age of the second world, is meant) (Heb. 1: 2—Diaglott, A.R.V.), so Jesus assured Bro. Russell that He had to come to him to show him what happened to the Lord's people during that same Age and what would happen to them at its end. People who are ashamed turn their faces toward the ground and maintain silence. Thus Daniel felt a sense of shame coming over him and, accordingly, hung his head and was silent. It was a sense of shame at his unworthy attitude for years toward prophetic time that antitypically came over Bro. Russell after he had thought considerably over the contents

of the article that aroused for the first time his interest in prophetic time. Thus, so far, Dan. 10 describes antitypically Bro. Russell's experiences on prophetic time up to some time after he had read and studied the article in *The Herald Of The Morning* on the Second Advent probably being then present.

(48) V. 16 introduces another step in his progress on prophetic time. It will be recalled that we stated above that as a result of his study of the pertinent article Bro. Russell entered into correspondence with Bro. Barbour on Truth matters, particularly with reference to prophetic time in its relation to the Second Advent. It is to this episode that vs. 16, 17 refer typically; for it was through this correspondence that the Lord helped him, as is described typically in these verses. The one like unto the sons of men (v. 16) here types Bro. Barbour. It was his teachings through his correspondence with Bro. Russell that showed the latter that Bro. Barbour was, from his viewpoint of the Lord's presence, more and more coming into harmony with Bro. Russell's teachings on the object and manner of our Lord's return. And by so doing he touched (v. 16)—came into helpful harmony with Bro. Russell's verbal and written teachings—symbolic lips. And it was this thing, typed by the touching of Daniel's lips, whereby Daniel was made to speak (v. 16), that Bro. Russell was so far recovered from his sense of shame as to be able to speak out the truth on his feelings of sorrow and weakness (v. 16) due to his wrong position on prophetic time, even as in the type Daniel by the touch was enabled to speak forth his feelings of sorrow and weakness by reason of the vision. As Daniel felt and expressed (v. 17) his sense of weakness and unworthiness to the degree that he could hardly speak or breathe in the presence of Gabriel, so as our Pastor considered his pertinent course and the Lord's goodness in helping him out of his error, it

made him feel too weak and unworthy to speak to Jesus for his wrong position on prophetic time.

(49) But as for a third time one looking like a man touched Daniel and strengthened him (v. 18), so, as the third stage of the Lord's helping Bro. Russell on the pertinent subject, He arranged that during the Philadelphia studies of Bro. Russell and Bro. Barbour the latter should give the former, through a thorough exposition of prophetic time, the final help that straightened him out on that subject. Thus the three stages of progress that Bro. Russell made on this subject are typed in this chapter: the first stage in v. 10, which was the arousing of Bro. Russell's interest by the article on the subject in *The Herald Of The Morning*, Jan., 1876; the second stage in v. 16, being the increase of that interest, with concomitant knowledge through the correspondence of the two; and the third stage in v. 18, through the study of the implied subjects together in Philadelphia during the Summer of 1876. Gabriel's again encouraging him (v. 19) types our Lord's continuing to encourage Bro. Russell. By heredity our Pastor, lacking self-esteem, was dissatisfied with himself and had almost no self-reliance; and this is well typed by the answers that Daniel gives in vs. 16, 17. This fact, combined with the fact that he recognized that his position on prophetic time had been an erroneous one, naturally tended to discourage him, hence the need of the encouragement typed by that given Daniel in v. 19. As it must have greatly encouraged Daniel to be reassured by Gabriel that he was greatly loved by God; so, too, it must have been very refreshing to the discouraged heart of Bro. Russell at that time to receive the assurance from Jesus that God greatly loved him. Perhaps John 16: 27 and like Scriptures were brought to his attention.

(50) Refreshing must have been to him the encouragement typed by the words of v. 19: "Fear not! Peace be unto thee! Be strong; yea, be strong!"

Doubtless in addition to the Scriptures that our Lord brought to his attention, providential acts must have been combined with these words, whereby comfort was poured into Bro. Russell's heart. As Daniel was comforted and strengthened by the pertinent typical words (v. 19), so was Bro. Russell by their antitypes Scriptures and providences. Like a plant that is drooping for want of moisture and sunshine, and that is revived by receiving these, so his drooping heart was comforted and strengthened by these Divine assurances. And as Daniel gratefully recognized the help and was by it enabled to ask Gabriel to speak on, so Bro. Russell gratefully acknowledged the help and was strong enough to desire the Lord to go on with the manifestation of the Truth to him. Gabriel's asking Daniel whether he understood why he had come to Daniel (v. 20) seems to be intended to deepen in Daniel's mind the sense of the importance of the revelation about to be made. So, antitypically, the Lord sought to deepen in our Pastor's mind the sense of the importance to be attached to the Truth about to be communicated. It will be noted that from here on (v. 20 to Dan. 12: 5) Gabriel is the revealer of prophecy. We believe, antitypically, Jesus, and not others as in the cases of Dan. 8 and 9, is typed by Gabriel, to bring out by contrast the following thought: that whereas in those chapters all the antitypical light was given by the Lord through fellow servants only to Bro. Russell, in chapters 10-12 the Lord gave some of it to him through fellow servants and the rest of it through enlightening his mind directly without human instrumentality. Since, as it will be noted, Dan. 10: 20—12: 4 is prophecy unmixed with any type, we will pass these parts by as sufficiently explained in Studies, Vol. III and begin our typical study where the type again begins to work—Dan. 12: 5; for from there on the narrative more or less connected with prophecy is again resumed.

(51) In Dan. 12: 5, 6, Daniel sees two men, one on

each side of the river Hiddekel, one of these asking a man clothed in linen, standing over the waters of the river, how long the wondrous things would last. Thus four men (Daniel and three others) are brought to our view. Antitypically, Bro. Russell saw three men corresponding to three of these. Who was the one on the side of the antitypical river other than that on which the antitypical Daniel stood? To have stood on that side of the river of Truth that came out of the serpent's mouth, his pertinent activities must have been before 1748, when that Truth began to be poured forth, its beginning occurring through Montesquieu's book, *The Spirit Of The Law*, which appeared in 1748. The first man after the Reformation and before 1748 to make a careful examination in the spirit of inquiry (How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?) of prophetic time, was Bro. (Prof.) J.A. Bengel, of Germany, who was a thoroughly consecrated man. As a foremost Christian scholar of his day, he is especially noted for three very important works: (1) his critical text of the Greek New Testament, with critical apparatus (1734), which became the starting point of modern text-criticism, he being thus the father of modern critical recensionists of the Greek New Testament; (2) his commentary on the New Testament (1742), which is even today recognized as one of the best of the brief commentaries on the New Testament; and (3) his three prophetic time works: (a) John's Revelation Clarified (1740), (b) The Order of Times (1741) and (c) Cycle, or Discussion on the Great (Jubilee) Year (1745). It is the three works under (3) that concern our present discussion. In them Bro. Bengel earnestly sought, unaided by the studies of others (for he was the pioneer in this line of Bible study) to find out how long Antichrist would continue his reign of evil, and when the Millennium would begin. His investigations, the first of their kind and conducted just a few years *before* Montesquieu wrote

his book, *The Spirit Of The Law*, sought an answer to the question of the duration of Antichrist's reign and the time when Christ's reign would begin. Through his studies on prophetic time he raised the question of v. 5, "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?" His writings, lectures and sermons aroused much interest in these matters in Germany, and these writings were instrumental in arousing Bro. Wolf, Bro. William Miller's companion helper in Europe and Asia, to preach the Advent message between 1829 and 1844. Thus Bro. J.A. Bengel is the man whom our Pastor saw to have asked the question of v. 6 (C 84, par. 2) on the other bank of the river.

(52) Who was the man on his bank of the river, *i.e.*, on the same side as Bro. Russell occupied? We understand him to be Bro. Barbour. That the latter was not the one who raised the question is evident from the facts of the case: (1) It was asked before 1748, *i.e.*, before the river or flood was poured out; and (2) it was answered before Bro. Russell and Bro. Barbour stood on this side of the flood. The reason why Bro. Barbour is introduced into the scene is that it was through him that the answer of the one clothed in linen and standing above the flood was given to Bro. Russell. Who is the one clothed in linen, standing over the flood? We understand him to be Bro. William Miller, through whom for the first time the correct answer to the question raised by Bro. Bengel was given (v. 7), *i.e.*, that the period of the papal reign (v. 7) began in 539 and ended in 1799, and therefore would last the 1260 years between these two dates. His standing over the flood seems to type that as God's messenger he was in his teachings superior to, uninjured by, and a proper dispenser of the truths symbolized by the flood. The man's being clothed in linen represents Bro. Miller's justification and priesthood. His lifting up both hands to heaven represents the whole-hearted consecrated service that

he rendered with the Truth that God committed to his care: The chronology points out God's Kingdom as imminent for the destruction of evil and the establishment of righteousness in the earth. His swearing by God represents his solemn assertion of the pertinent Truth as Scripturally, *i.e.*, Divinely taught. Daniel's seeing the typical scene described in vs. 5-7 represents Bro. Russell's mentally seeing the antitypes just described.

(53) As Daniel did not understand various details related to Gabriel's explanations (v. 8), so in that stage of his studies, *i.e.*, with Bro. Barbour in the summer of 1876 at Philadelphia, Bro. Russell did not understand various details related to the former's explanations. These details he asked for; but as typed by Gabriel's answer to Daniel, that the matter asked for was not due for him to understand (v. 8), so the Lord gave Bro. Russell to understand that the details for which he asked were not yet due. It was very important, in order to avoid speculations harmful to himself and others, for Bro. Russell to learn the lesson that Truth cannot be understood until due, that any attempt to open the Truth before due is fruitless and harmful, like one's attempts to open a closed chestnut bur, and that when due the Truth opens through the Lord of itself without a human being's speculations, even as the frosts of fall open the chestnut bur, without man's busybodying efforts, to give without evil results its riches to a man on his simply picking out the ripe chestnuts. In v. 10 antitypically the Lord gave Bro. Russell a good lesson as to who would reject and who would accept his work of expounding the Truth. It would not be clear to the wicked, but as due it would be received by the wise (virgins), the faithful Little Flock. It was well for him to learn this lesson, lest he worry over the unbelief at, and rejection of his teachings on the part of some—the wicked would reject it; and no matter how tactfully and kindly he would present it, they would

reject it. By the wicked, of course, the unfaithful, the Second Deathers, are meant—those in the nominal church, and those once in the Truth. Furthermore, the fact that one would receive the Truth would be a proof that at that time he was one of the righteous and should be heartily received as such, no matter what he was in the flesh. These were two very important lessons, which also our Pastor learned, and to which he conformed himself.

(54) While Daniel was not given to understand undue details, he was given to understand certain time features, brought to his attention as described in vs. 11, 12. The connection between v. 10, on the one hand, and vs. 11, 12, on the other, shows that the wise would be given to understand in varying degrees, dependent on the two time periods in which they would live after the end of Antichrist's reign, *i.e.*, during the time of the end. If no punctuation is inserted between vs. 10 and 11, and the word *ve* (variously translated by *and*, *even*, or *also*) is rendered by the word *even*, and if the pertinent words are given in the following order, the sense will at once appear: The wise shall understand even 1290 days after the continual sacrifice is set aside (which setting aside is) even by the setting up of the abomination of desolation. According to this, the first period for the wise to understand would begin in 1829, at which date Bro. Miller after eleven years' study attained to clearness on prophetic time as related to the end of Antichrist's reign, *i.e.*, the 1260 days, ending in 1799. Then Daniel was given to see that a second and more blessed period of fuller understanding would begin with the wise at the end of 1335 years from the date of the setting aside of the continual sacrifice at the setting up of the abomination of desolation (v. 12). In Gabriel's making these facts known to Daniel he typed our Lord's giving Bro. Russell mainly through Bro. Miller's teachings expounded to him by

Bro. Barbour, the understanding of the time periods which would be during the time of the end, and at whose beginnings the wise were due to understand the unfolding Truth as due. Hence, antitypically, the Lord caused Bro. Russell to see that in 1829 (the end of the 1290 years) would begin the first of these periods, lasting to 1874, and that from that date onward, until the Church would leave the world, a brighter and more blessed period of enlightenment would come for the wise—the wise virgins. That the Lord gave this to our Pastor his writings, particularly his expositions of the days and weeks of Daniel, given especially in Studies, Vols. II and III, prove without any doubt.

(55) Gabriel's charge to Daniel (v. 13) to go his way to the end does not mean that Daniel was thereby encouraged to be faithful until the time of the end; but that he was to be faithful until the end of his life—he was thereby encouraged to go on in faithfulness unto death. Antitypically, the exhortation of our Lord to Bro. Russell was that he be faithful unto death. To Daniel the statement, "thou shalt rest," meant that he would after this life sleep in death until the time for the Ancient Worthies to return. To our Pastor this would seem to mean that he would have the rest of faith during the time that his humanity was reckonedly dead (Rom. 6: 3-11)—during the period of its sacrifice. Daniel's receiving the reward in the resurrection as a prince on earth in the Millennium is prophesied in the words, "thou shalt stand in thy lot," inheritance. The expression, "at the end of the days," does not mean the end of the 1260, 1290 or 1335 days, as is evidenced by the fact that these ends are in the distant past and Daniel has not yet returned. But as is suggested by the whole line of thought of this book, which treats mainly of the reign of sin, it means the end of the reign of sin, which is stopped by the beginning of the reign of righteousness, the establishment

of the Ancient Worthies as princes in the earth being the beginning of the reign of righteousness in the earth. For Bro. Russell this would mean that at the beginning of that reign he would have his full Millennial office as his reward.

(56) What this will be the following will explain: Above we showed that as the Millennial individual Eleazar he will, as Jesus' special representative, have charge of the entire Little Flock (Num. 4: 16) and all the Ancient Worthies (Num. 3: 32), *i.e.*, he will as the Lord's special representative have charge of the two phases of the Kingdom. As during the Gospel Age there have been two Eleazars—a composite one, the 12 Apostles, as the Jewish-harvest Eleazar, and an individual one, Bro. Russell, as the Gospel-harvest Eleazar, so will there be two Millennial Eleazars—a composite one, the 12 Apostles, and an individual one, Bro. Russell, both of these Eleazars to have charge of the Little Flock and the Ancient Worthies as the Kingdom's two phases, and as such they will have charge of the human family in so far as it will be given Priestly and Kohathite Levite help. But there will be this difference: Whereas the 12 Apostles will each one individually have charge of one of the tribes of Spiritual Israel (Rev. 7: 4-8) and of its pertinent number of representing Ancient Worthies, and through these two will have charge of a tribe of Millennial Israel—a twelfth division of the human family in so far as it will receive Priestly and Kohathite Levite help (Matt. 19: 28; Luke 22: 30); the individual Eleazar, as the Lord's special representative, will have charge of the whole Little Flock and all the Ancient Worthies and, through these two, of all 12 tribes of Millennial Israel, in so far as they will receive Priestly and Kohathite Levite help. Having such an office, it is self-evident that he is the one for whom the Father prepared the place at Jesus' right hand in the Kingdom (Matt. 20: 23). It is this fact that helps us to

understand why, next to Jesus, Bro. Russell's work is commendably mentioned in the prophecies and types of the Bible more than that of any other servant of God. Whole books, as well as many other parts of the Bible, complimentarily describe his work in prophecy or type, e.g., most of 1 and 2 Samuel, in describing David's life and works, all of Jeremiah and Daniel and all of The Acts of the Apostles, type his life and work. Most of the prophecies of the Bible, all of the Apostolic epistles and many of the ordinances of Moses in their harvest applications, find their *teaching* fulfillment in his writings. And seeing that the Large Jesus—the Parousia and Epiphany Church in its public mouthpieceship, considered in its capacity of being treated as such by the civil authorities—had been laid away in the tomb, it was fitting that the above thoughts on Daniel—Type and Antitype—were in the Spring and Summer of 1934 given orally and in the Fall given in print to the brethren, describing the Large Jesus' earthly Parousia leader in his ministry toward the world. God bless his memory!

(1) What has been our custom as to our Pastor's death anniversary? What is the intention in the study of this chapter on our Pastor? From what standpoint will this be done with this chapter? Who knew that he was Daniel's antitype? How is this proven? What in Pastor Russell does Daniel not type? Only in what respect is he his type? But for what would the Editor not be able to set forth many of the items of Daniel, type and antitype? What is true of some of these items? What should be made of their important ones? For what will this account? How is this book not written? How is it written? What will herein be done as a space-saver?

(2) What is set forth in Dan. 1? Whom does Nebuchadnezzar here type? Ashpenaz? What is typed by Nebuchadnezzar's selecting young men to be trained in statescraft? By Daniel's choice therefore? By the king's providing for the students food from the royal table? By Daniel's determination not to defile himself with the

Levitically unclean meats of the king's table? Why is the story of this antitype given here?

(3) With what kind of an endowment was Bro. Russell born? When did his mother consecrate him, and when train him? What particular could he not recall? Wherein was his zeal early shown? How on one occasion, when he was 16 years old, did this zeal show itself? What two questions did his infidel acquaintance ask him? How did he answer the first? The second? Of what had he not previously thought seriously? What did he do with the second question among his church associates? What report of him spread? To what did this lead? What was the result of the answer given him? What book did they claim taught the absolute predestination of the bulk of the race to eternal torment? Of what did they convince him? To what conclusion did this conviction lead him? How did he express his faith to them? How is this expression related to Daniel's purposing not to defile himself with the portion of the king's meat? How is this true? How long did Bro. Russell maintain his pertinent stand as to God's character being a true test as to revealed religion?

(4) How did his pastor and the elders think of him? How did his viewpoint affect them? Why? What moved them to favor him? What position did he attain when 16 years old? Why was he not content with unbelief in a revealed religion? To what did this move him? With which religion did he commence his search? What story of creation repelled him from the Chinese religion? Why did he reject Hinduism and Buddhism? Mohammedanism? Judaism? What was the effect of the preceding investigations on him temporarily?

(5) With what did his religious disposition not leave him content? What troubled him? What partial solution came to him? What explanation of the neighbor part of the Golden Rule satisfied him? In what did this primarily result? To what did this primarily lead him? Secondarily lead him? To what two things did these studies lead him? What were the results of these? What up to this time was his attitude toward the rest of the New Testament?

(6) What passage became the bridge for him from the

Gospels to the rest of the New Testament? How so? What was the result? To what did this result lead? How? What was the gain of his studies so far? Why? What did he continue to reject? What three things gradually confirmed his faith in the prophets? What was his attitude to the Pentateuch? Why did he take it? How did he overcome this prejudice? What was the result?

(7) What did he continue to do? How? What by 1872 was the general result of his investigations? The 12 particular results? Wherein did he, without mentioning the fact, trace the steps whereby he came out of infidelity into faith in the Bible as God's revelation? Of what are these four years' quest the antitype? What is typed by Daniel's face being fairer and fuller than those of the youths fed from the king's table? What is typed by the steward's permitting Daniel to continue on the pulse diet? What is typed by Daniel's proficiency as a student?

(8) When did the antitypical examination begin? What did Bro. Russell continue to do from 1872 to 1875? What truth became clear to him in October, 1874? To what other truth did this lead him? Wherein did he embody these thoughts? What other thought did he therein embody? What did he call the tract? Why did he write and circulate this tract? How large was its circulation? What is the antitype of Nebuchadnezzar's calling and examining the students? What is typed by the students coming before Nebuchadnezzar? Wherein were Daniel's answers antitypically given? How did these compare with the answers of others? What is typed by Daniel's standing before Nebuchadnezzar? By his answers to questions being ten times better than those given by the students who were nourished from the king's table?

(9) Of what does Dan. 2 treat? What is not our purpose in this article? Why not? What is our purpose? In doing this, what will we omit for space-saving reasons? What should the reader do as to this point? How did our Pastor give the prophetic features of the dream? What do the historical features of Dan. 2 give us additionally? What is the antitypical teaching of this entire chapter? What does Nebuchadnezzar type in this chapter? What is typed by his having the dream? Since when have there been nominal Christians? How did they come to

have this correct view? What is symbolized by the progressive deterioration of the metals in the image? During what was this to last? What would end it? How? Of what is this a brief summary? How long did this Apostles-taught view remain with the people of God?

(10) How did papacy, generally speaking, darken this subject? Particularly speaking, how did it do so? What was the papacy actually in the dream? What was the result on the nominal Christians? Until when did this last? During what period did they begin to antitype Nebuchadnezzar's desiring to know the dream and its interpretation? Who are the antitypical magi? Astrologers? Chaldeans? Soothsayers? What is typed by Nebuchadnezzar's asking these to tell the dream and its interpretation? What is typed by their inability to give the dream and its interpretation? What is typed by the decree to slay Babylon's wise men? By Arioch? By Arioch's starting to kill Babylon's wise men? What was the antitypical result? What is typed by Arioch's seeking Daniel? What is typed by Daniel's tact? By Arioch's telling Daniel of the wise men's situation?

(11) What is typed by Daniel's going to, and obtaining from the king time to consider and answer the matter? By his telling his three friends the situation and asking them to join with him in prayer on the subject? What thing will serve as an illustration of this course in Bro. Russell? Who will recall similar things? What is typed by God's revealing the matter to Daniel? By Daniel's thanksgiving? What is typed by Daniel's desiring Arioch not to continue to kill the wise men? By Arioch's bringing Daniel to the king? Why this in the antitype? What is typed by Nebuchadnezzar's asking Daniel if he could give and interpret the dream? By Daniel's reminding the king of the wise men's inability to answer him? By Daniel's attributing the implied wisdom, not to himself, but to God? By Daniel's telling and interpreting the dream? Wherein did Bro. Russell give the antitypical view? What is typed by the king's promoting Daniel? By Daniel's requesting promotion for his three friends? By his sitting in the king's gate? Especially from what time onward did the antitype set in?

(12) In what events did Daniel not take part? What

has this fact occasioned? Despite the record's silence on the subject, of what may we be certain as to Daniel? Why? What does the antitype prove on this point? Why so? Why is this reason true? What, accordingly, does the antitype make clear? What, among other parts of the book, did Daniel write? What does this type?

(13) What does Nebuchadnezzar do in Dan. 4? How only did Daniel interpret the dream? Where does our Pastor give the antitype of the dream? Of what did he therein not give the antitype? Why is it unnecessary to give the antitype of the dream or of Daniel's interpretation of it? What only will we here give? What does our Pastor give on the antitype? What will in this article engage our attention?

(14) What general view of mankind does the dream represent? Where do we find this view? What two heathen writers have remarkably described it? What is typed by Nebuchadnezzar's asking the wise men for the interpretation? By their failure? By Daniel's coming *at the last*? By Nebuchadnezzar's telling him his dream? By Daniel's being troubled thereon one hour? By Daniel's saying that the dream was favorable to the king's haters and enemies? By Daniel's interpreting the dream? Wherein did our Pastor give the antitypical meaning?

(15) Of what does Dan. 5 treat? Whereby did our Pastor show that he understood that in this chapter Daniel typed him? How so? What only will be given in the following? Whom does Belshazzar here type? His 1,000 lords? His wives? His concubines? The feast? The golden and silver vessels being in Babylon? The sending for them? Putting Babylon's unclean wine into them? The banqueters drinking the wine therefrom? The finger of a man's hand writing on the wall? The king's seeing it? Wherein was the Divine power manifested?

(16) What is typed by the king's perturbation? By the king's call for the wise men? By his offer of rewards to the interpreter? By his wise men's failure to read and interpret? By the king's and lords' increased fears? Why were symbolic Babylon's wise men unable to read and interpret the signs of the times?

(17) Who were typed by the queen? Why did they have confidence in Bro. Russell as a religious teacher?

How came they to be at the symbolic feast? What did they suggest as antitypical of the queen's suggestion? What is typed by the sending for Daniel? By Daniel's being brought to the king? By the king's telling Daniel of his having heard of his ability to interpret hard things? What was said in type and antitype? What is typed by Daniel's statement as to the promised rewards? By Daniel's readiness to read and interpret the handwriting?

(18) What is typed by Daniel's penitential sermon? By Daniel's allusions to Nebuchadnezzar? As what did these serve in type and antitype? What justified both the typical and antitypical rebuke? With what on this point were our Pastor's writings, sermons and lectures replete? What is typed by Daniel's showing that God's sign was given on account of Belshazzar's, his lords', his wives' and his concubines' sins? What was most fitting as to the sins of the types and antitypes before the reading and interpreting began? What followed in type and antitype?

(19) What is represented by first reading the writing in type and antitype? What is typed by Daniel's giving the interpretation? What is typed by Daniel's explanation of the meaning of MENE? By the kingdom being numbered? Finished? What number is given in the words' numeric value? What does this mean? What is the antitype of the explanation of TEKEL? In what two sets of publications was the antitypical explanation given? Where else? Where especially is this judging process explained? What did this symbolic weighing demonstrate as to Babylon? How was this figuratively shown? What was the result?

(20) What is the antitype of the explanation of PERES? Of what form is this the word? What, accordingly, did this sign first imply? What are the two parts of the division? What was implied in the ever-increasing friction between these two classes? In what would this result? What was the second thing implied in UPHARSIN? In the double successor kingdom of the type? Summarily, what were the three things antitypically implied in these three words? Who without any doubt gave these antitypical explanations? Who failed both to read and interpret them? What is typed by Daniel's being clothed in the purple robe? Receiving the

golden chain about his neck? Being made the third ruler in the kingdom? What is typed by Belshazzar's death that night? By Darius the Mede taking the kingdom?

(21) Of what does Dan. 6 treat? How did our Pastor indicate his thought of the antitype of it? What does Darius in this chapter represent? What does the kingdom here represent? The 120 princes? The three presidents? The 120 princes' rendering account to the three presidents? Why was this required? What was typed by Daniel's being preferred above the other two presidents? Why so in type and antitype? What is typed by Darius' thinking to put Daniel over the whole kingdom? What saying applies in the type and antitype here? What is typed by the two presidents' and 120 princes' trying to fault Daniel in his work and their inability to do so? By their deciding that only on religion could fault be found with Daniel?

(22) What is typed by their drawing up the law of vs. 6, 7? What in practice did such an antitypical law mean? What errors have produced this practice? How so? In what did this result? What became the occasion of our Pastor's enemies' stressing their theory to an extreme? What is typed by the two presidents and the 120 princes coming to Darius to have the decree signed and sealed? What is typed by Darius' signing and sealing it? How was this so with the antitypes? What was Jesus' actual course in the matter?

(23) What oriental theory makes Darius' permitting himself to be worshiped understandable? Where have remnants of this practice appeared in modern times? What effect did this theory produce on the laws of such kingdoms? For what will this account as to the laws of the Medes and Persians? What is typed by Daniel's not permitting the law to change his worshiping customs? By the open window? Its being open toward Jerusalem? By Daniel's doing this on his knees? By his doing this three times a day? By his enemies' spying on him? By their subtly securing the king's admission on the existence and unchangeability of the pertinent law? By Darius' admission?

(24) What does a pit in Biblical symbols mean? How is this exemplified in the cases of Joseph and Benaiah? What, accordingly, is typed by being put into a lion's

den, or pit? What is typed by the plotters' charging Daniel with disobeying the law and disregarding the king? By Darius' seeking to deliver Daniel? What is typed by the insistence of the typical plotters? By their claims of the unchanging legality of the laws? By the king's yielding? By Daniel's being cast into the lions' den? By the king's assuring Daniel that his God would deliver him? By the stone laid on the den's mouth? By the king's sealing the stone?

(25) What were the tongues of the slanderers given? What slanders were spread against Bro. Russell by the 1891-1894 sifters? By Mrs. Russell? Why did she turn against him? Who encouraged her? With what did a third class of slanderers falsely charge him? What did the 1908-1911 sifters charge falsely against him? What did the Brooklyn Eagle charge against him? What other kinds of slanders were set afloat against him? Of what were these slanders the antitypes? What must have been the character of the trial in type and antitype?

(26) What is typed by the king's fasting, mourning and sleeplessness? What do the 30 days' duration of the typical law seem to type? What seems to indicate the beginning and end of this period? What is typed by Darius' hastening to the lion's den? By his asking Daniel whether his God had been able to deliver him? How did the brethren feel during the long-drawn-out slanderous experiences? What did they fear? Of what was this the antitype? What is typed by Daniel's first answer? What types Bro. Russell's ascribing his deliverance, not to his own new-creaturely strength, but to God's grace? Of what did his deliverance not consist? Of what did it consist? What bad qualities were in this trial overcome by their opposite good qualities? What resulted negatively therefrom to his New Creature? What was the reason for the deliverance in type and antitype? What does Daniel's consciousness that he had done the king on harm type?

(27) What is typed by the king's rejoicing? By the charge to bring Daniel forth from the den? The bringing of Daniel therefrom? When did a change of public sentiment set in with reference to Bro. Russell? What was in part instrumental thereto? To what did this court decision first lead? Afterwards? Who vied with one

another to introduce him to his public audiences? What were the sizes of his public audiences? How was he everywhere regarded? How was he honored by the Panama-Pacific Exhibition directors? How was he everywhere received? What is typed by Daniel's faith stopping the mouths of lions? By Daniel's further promotions? What periods are typed by the rest of the days of Darius', and till the third year of Cyrus' reign?

(28) What is typed by Darius' commanding the plotters, their children and wives, to be thrown into the lions' den? By their being thrown into it? What Scripture had an exemplification in this? What is typed by the lions' having the mastery over these plotters, etc.? By their tearing them to pieces? Before their reaching the bottom of the pit? What does the difference in the way in which Daniel and these fared in the lions' den type? What is typed by Darius' decree following the experiences described in Dan. 6? What will this decree forever manifest? What will be a part of that manifestation? How is this proved? What do the cited passages prove of our Pastor's Millennial position?

(29) What is the difference in contents between Dan. 1—6 and Dan. 7—12? Despite what fact? What is not the design of this chapter? What is its design? How was, and will the design be adhered to? How is this possible? Of what does Dan. 7 mainly consist? How many non-prophetic things does it contain? Of what does it treat? What is typed by Daniel's seeing this vision? Where did Bro. Russell get this indefinite view? What in type and antitype was lacking as to the vision? What is typed by Daniel's asking for and getting an explanation of it from a bystander? What afterdeeds did the antitypical bystander commit? What is typed by Daniel's being troubled by the vision and its explanation? By Daniel's countenance being changed? Keeping the matter in his heart?

(30) What might be profitably introduced here? How did the Adventists abuse the prophetic time? What effect did this have on Bro. Russell? What teachings did he hold against the Adventists' view? From this vantage point, what did he do as to their teachings? Into what extreme did he permit their misuse of prophetic time to drive him? What was the character of his pertinent view?

What did he do against their pertinent errors? How long did he maintain his unbelief and ridicule of prophetic time? What did the Lord in 1876 do to him on this subject? In what form did this help come to him? How did he learn that it was an Adventist publication? What did this knowledge prompt him to do? What did he then do with the magazine? What did he see in the article's writer? What did the article tell of Bro. Barbour's investigations after the 1874 disappointment?

(31) Who wrote to him amid his perplexity? What was the thought on the word *Parousia* that he presented in his letter? On Matt. 24: 38, compared with Luke 17: 26, 27? What question did the letter ask? What thought did Bro. Barbour thereupon cautiously put forth in his article? What was the thought that the reading of the article aroused in Bro. Russell's mind? What made this thought seem probable to him? Of what other way of finding out the setting in of the Second Advent could he not think? What did this do with his prejudice against prophetic time? What did it make him willing to do? What two things did this induce him to do? Where and when was the meeting to be? Why then in Philadelphia? What was his first executive act as that Servant? How is this proved?

(32) What did these two do in Philadelphia? In what part of the day? Why then? On what did Bro. Barbour enlighten Bro. Russell? On what did Bro. Russell enlighten Bro. Barbour? Who gave the other decidedly the more help? Whence did Bro. Barbour get the thoughts that he gave to Bro. Russell? What error do these facts enable us to recognize? Comparatively and contrastedly, how were their respective views to be accounted? What did this fact not prove? When and in connection with what struggle did Bro. Russell fully become that Servant? When partially so? Which was the more aggressive as a servant of God? What shows this as against Bro. Barbour? What was Bro. Russell's attitude toward Bro. Barbour for his help? Why have these facts been given in this chapter?

(33) What is the character of the experiences set forth in Dan. 8? Whose typical experiences are there given? Of what antitype are they given? What features of

Dan. 8 will we not study? What features of it will we study? Of what nation does Dan. 8 not treat? With what nation's experiences does it begin? What does this fact prove? The removal of what interpolation proves this? What does this prove of the 2300 days? Of their beginning? With whose beginning were they contemporaneous? When and with what did the 490 days, or 70 weeks, begin? What considerations prove this? What results as to J.F.R.'s view of the 2300 days? What is typed by Daniel's then being in Shushan? What does Ulai mean and type? What is typed by Daniel's seeing the vision beside the Ulai?

(34) What is typed by Daniel's hearing one saint speak? Who is typed by the other saint? What is typed by Daniel's hearing the second saint ask the first saint the duration of the vision, etc., and receive an answer? What is typed by the first saint, and not the inquiring saint, answering Daniel? By Daniel's seeking an explanation of the vision? What was the appearance of a man? Whom does Gabriel in this chapter type? Whose was the man's voice between Ulai's banks? What is typed by his command?

(35) What is typed by Gabriel's coming near to Daniel? When did this begin? What is typed by Daniel's standing place? By his fearing Gabriel's approach? By Daniel's falling on his face? Why is this so? What is typed by Gabriel's saying that the vision was for profit in the time of the end? By Daniel's being in a deep sleep in the first part of Gabriel's speech? By Gabriel's touching him? By his making him stand upright? By his promise to make Daniel understand? By his explanation in vs. 20-26? By Daniel's sickness? By Daniel's serving the king? By his astonishment? By none understanding the vision?

(36) What four things does Dan. 9 contain? What is typed by Daniel's then being in Babylon under Darius' rulership? By his learning from books that Jerusalem's wastings in palace and temple would be 70 years? By his finding out the end of this state in the beginning of the 70th year? By such knowledge leading Daniel to acknowledge Israel's sins and God's justice in punishing them and to pray for the pertinent restoration? By God's assuring

Daniel through Gabriel of his prayer's answer in the prophecy of the 70 weeks?

(37) What are involved in the 70 weeks' prophecy? What period do the 70 weeks type? What shows that the trouble following the 70 weeks is also involved in the parallel? What is the antitype of this period? What shows that the period before the beginning of the 70 weeks up to the beginning of the answer of Daniel's prayer is also involved in the parallel? What is the exact date of the beginning of this period? What is the antitype of this period? Why do we infer that Gabriel in giving this prophecy is typical?

(38) Of whom is Gabriel here typical? Why? Who was the first of these five brothers? Who was probably the second of these five brothers? The third and fourth? What did they give to Bro. Russell? What did the fifth brother give to him as to 69 as against 70 A.D., and 1914 as against 1910? As to the Apostles and Bro. Russell? As to the wrath events from 1915 to 1918? What is typed by Gabriel's coming quickly to Daniel? By his coming to Daniel about the time of the evening oblation? By his touching Daniel? By his promising Daniel skill in understanding?

(39) What is typed by God's quick answer to Daniel's prayer? How many times did Gabriel tell Daniel that he was greatly beloved? What does this type? What other two types are in line with this? What did Bro. Russell say when told that he was the most loved man on earth? What did he add to this remark? What did Gabriel encourage Daniel to study? Which vision is thereby meant? What does this prove of the 70 weeks? Of the 2300 days? What theory is thereby overthrown? What is typed by Gabriel's encouraging Daniel to study the vision?

(40) What will we now study? Who first brought the parallels to Bro. Russell's attention? How many of them did he show him? What was the first of these? The second? The third? The fourth? Why did Bro. Miller falter as between the dates 1843 and 1844? What was the fifth of these? Who gave Bro. Russell the 36 A.D. and 1881 parallels? What were their parallel events?

(41) Through whom were the next important additions to the parallels brought to Bro. Russell? Who was

the main one of the two? In what three publications are these parallels found? How in magnitude did their work compare with that of their fellow members of antitypical Gabriel? What were their first parallel dates and events? Their second? Third? Fourth? Fifth? Where are their charts found? What did they do with them? What did he do with them?

(42) What did the fifth brother do as to certain parallels? What was the first of these? To what important corrections did this correction lead? When did a clear-cut distinction first begin to come between the end of the reaping and of the garnering of the Church? To what other correction did this correction lead? When and in what did this correction appear? What parallels were brought to Bro. Russell's attention in 1910? Where are some of them given? In 1915? About how many of them? How many other parallels were at the same time brought to his attention? Wherein did the 70 A.D. and 1915 parallels consist? How closely did these parallels work out? Who were the parallel parties in these 70-73 and 1915-1918 parallels? What does this investigation as to the activities of these five brothers prove of them?

(43) With what does our study now proceed? What in these chapters will we here omit? Why? What is necessary for an understanding of the antitypes of Daniel's prostrations in Dan. 10? What is typed by Daniel's three weeks' mourning? Fasting? Abstinence from anointing himself? What are we not from this to infer? Why not? What does the connection prove of the thought? What proves that during these seven years he was receiving other truths? What does the word *Hiddekel* mean? What does Hiddekel type? What proves this, apart from the word's meaning? Through what six men especially did Satan give these sharp, stern truths (*voice*, or *sound*)? Wherein were they expressed literally? What were the main truths enunciated by these six men? What characteristic expression did Voltaire use? Diderot? What was Bro. Russell's attitude toward these truths? By what is this typed? What other kind of truths did Bro. Russell receive during those seven years? What kind did he not then receive? What do vs. 4-19 show

of him typically? What was previously done in this chapter, without connecting it with this type?

(44) What does Daniel's fixing his eyes on a certain man (v. 5) type? Who does this certain man seem to be? Why? Whom does this certain man type? Whom does Michael in this chapter type? Why? What proves that here Gabriel types our Lord? What is typed by Gabriel's linen garment? By his loins girded with gold of Ophir (here displaced by Uphaz)? By his body being like chrysolite? By his face looking like lightning? By his eyes being like lamps of fire? By his arms and feet being like polished brass? By his voice being like a multitude's? By Daniel's alone seeing the vision? Why was this true in the antitype? At what even had his associates looked askance? What finally separated them from him?

(45) What is typed by Daniel's being left alone? By his being without strength at the vision's beginning? By his countenance being turned into corruption? When did its antitype begin? What is typed by Daniel's retaining no strength? By his hearing Gabriel's voice at the time? By his deep sleep? By his face being toward the ground? By the hand that touched Daniel? By his being thereby raised on all fours? By Gabriel's telling Daniel that he was greatly beloved? By his encouraging Daniel to understand his words? By his encouraging Daniel to stand upright? By Daniel's tremblingly standing upright?

(46) What is typed by Gabriel's further encouraging Daniel? By Gabriel's assuring Daniel that God had heard and acted upon his prayer from the outstart of his 21 days' fast? By Gabriel's coming forth to help Daniel? By the prince of Persia? By his resisting Gabriel's purpose 21 days? How could Satan have resisted Jesus' efforts to help Bro. Russell in this matter? By what facts was the resisting done? How did Jesus in this situation show Himself to be a Master Tactician in the preparatory stages of His work? In the final stage of it?

(47) How should the phrase, "Michael, one of the chief princes," be rendered? Why is this change to be made Scripturally? Whom does Michael here type? Why? What is typed by Michael's being Gabriel's only supporter? What is typed by Gabriel's remaining resistingly with the king of Persia? What reading does Ginsburg suggest?

What would it antitype? Why does it seem incorrect? By his assuring Daniel that he had come to instruct him as to his people in the last of the days? What do people do who are ashamed? What is typed by Daniel's looking down and keeping silent? What does Dan. 10 up to v. 15 describe? What does v. 16 introduce?

(48) What did the reading of the above-mentioned article move Bro. Russell to do? What is the relation of vs. 16 and 17 to this? Why so? Who is typed by the one like unto the sons of men? What did his teachings in his letters reveal to Bro. Russell? In what did this result? What were Bro. Russell's symbolic lips? What was typed by touching Daniel's lips and making him speak? By Daniel's feeling and speaking of his weakness?

(49) What is typed by touching Daniel for the third time? How was this arranged for at Philadelphia? How are the three stages of help received at this time by Bro. Russell typed? The first? The second? The third? What is typed by Gabriel's again encouraging Daniel? Why did Bro. Russell's natural disposition under the circumstances require such encouragement? Of what did the typical and antitypical encouragement consist? What Scripture was probably brought to Bro. Russell's mind?

(50) What words must have been refreshing in type and antitype? What other means did the Lord use to encourage Bro. Russell? What is typed by Daniel's being encouraged? By Daniel's grateful recognition of the help and his request that Gabriel speak on? Why did Gabriel ask Daniel whether he knew why he was coming to him? What is thereby typed? Who is the prophecy revealer from here on until Dan. 12: 5? Why is Gabriel as the type of Jesus the speaker in this section? Why is Dan. 10: 20—12: 4 not expounded in this chapter? With what will we continue our typical study?

(51) What are the contents of Dan. 12: 5, 6? How many men are brought therein to our view? What is the antitype of this? Who corresponds antitypically to the one on the other side of the flood? Before when must he have been active? Why? What was this man's name? What was his standing as a Christian? As a scholar? For what was he noted? What was his first great work and

when was it published? His second great work and its date of publication? His three prophetic time writings, as his third great work and the dates of their publication? Which of the foregoing works belong to the point under discussion? What questions did he try to find out? When in relation to the beginning of "the flood" did he ask these questions? How did he raise the antitypical question? What did he arouse? Whose interest was much later aroused by his writings? Where did this one spread the Second Advent work? Who, accordingly, was the man that our Pastor heard ask the question of v. 6?

(52) Who was the man on our Pastor's side of the river? What two facts prove that he was not the man on the other side of the flood? Why is Bro. Barbour introduced into this scene? Who is the linen-clothed man standing over the river? What did he do, according to v. 7? What is typed by his standing over the river? By his linen clothes? By his lifting up both hands? By his oath? By Daniel's seeing the scene of vs. 5-7?

(53) What is typed by Daniel's not understanding (v. 8)? By Daniel's question? By Gabriel's answer? Why was it important for Bro. Russell to learn that undue things cannot be understood? That when due, Truth would become clear? What illustration pictures both sides of this quality of Truth? What good lesson was given Bro. Russell in v. 10? Why should he learn this lesson? Who were the wicked of v. 10? The righteous? What good would it be for a servant of the Truth to recognize this principle as applicable to the righteous? What can be said of these two lessons as related to our Pastor?

(54) What was Daniel not given to understand? What was he given to understand? Where is this brought out? What does the connection between v. 10 and vs. 11, 12 show? What three changes of the A.V. will show this? According to vs. 10, 11, when did the first period for clarifying the Truth in the time of the end begin? By what was that year symbolized? What was Daniel thereafter given to see? What did Gabriel type in making these facts known to Daniel? Accordingly, what did the Lord cause Bro. Russell to see? What proves that he was given to see these things?

(55) What is not meant by Gabriel's charge, "Go thy way to the end"? What does it mean, typically and antitypically? What does the expression, "thou shalt rest," mean, typically and antitypically? What does the expression, "thou shalt stand in thy lot," mean, typically and antitypically? What does the expression, "at the end of the days," not mean? What does it mean antitypically?

(56) What will this reward be? How many Eleazars have there been during the Gospel Age? What kind of an Eleazar was the first? Who was he? What kind of an Eleazar was the second one? Who was he? How many of them will there be in the Millennium? Of what kinds will they be? Who will they be? What will the charge of each of them be? What will be the difference between their charges? What position does such an office prove that Bro. Russell will then have? How do the cited Scriptures prove the answers given to the foregoing questions? What does this fact help us to understand of Bro. Russell's being referred to in the Bible? What whole books give typical prophecies of him? How is he otherwise referred to in the Bible? Of what are his writings a *teaching* fulfillment? What about the Large Jesus made this study of Daniel—Type and Antitype, especially timely in 1934? What is a fitting prayer as to antitypical Daniel?

Imperial Persia bowed to his wise sway
 A hundred provinces his daily care;
 A queenly city with its gardens fair
 Smiled round him; but his heart was far away.
 Forsaking pomp and power "three times a day"
 For chamber lone, he seeks his solace there;
 Through windows opening westward floats his prayer
 Toward the dear distance where Jerusalem lay.
 So let me morn, noon, evening, steal aside;
 And shutting my heart's door to earth's vain pleasure
 And manifold solicitudes, find leisure
 The windows of my soul to open wide
 Toward that blest city and that heavenly treasure,
 Which past these visible horizons hide.

CHAPTER VIII.
ANTITYPICAL DAVID'S FIRST
APPEARANCE.
1 SAM. 16.

SAUL'S REJECTION. SAMUEL'S SEEKING AND FINDING A
SUCCESSOR. DAVID'S AND SAUL'S FIRST CONTACTS.

WITH this chapter we desire to begin a study of David as a type of our Pastor in the executive feature of his office as that Servant; and in it we desire to present David's first appearance, as given in 1 Sam. 16. As already pointed out, David in the Psalms types, sometimes our Lord, sometimes the Church and sometimes both our Lord and the Church; but in the histories, so far as we now see, while his experiences illustrate and often in a general way type things in the experiences of the Christ class, specifically he types our Pastor as the Lord's executive, a part of whose office as such was for him to fight the Lord's battles. Hence as executive he was ruler of the Lord's household and commander of His armies as a warrior. David's first appearance followed the Lord's full rejection of Saul. While in a general way Saul (*desired*) is typical of nominal Fleshly and Spiritual Israel, specifically he types the crown-lost leaders of the twelve denominations of Christendom. It will be sufficient for the purposes of this chapter to point out that these were rejected by the Lord as His leaders for the twelve denominations of Christendom for failure to overcome sin, though lopping off some of the branches of the tree of sin, and for attempting to offer forbidden things to the Lord, as typed by Saul's failing to kill Agag, king of the Amalekites (sins), and for sparing the choicest of their herds and flocks, alleging that he spared them for sacrifice. On the other hand, Samuel (*name of God*)

types in a general way the Little Flock, but specifically the Little Flock leaders—those who started Little Flock movements and who then retired from leadership before the sectarianizing works of the crown-lost leaders, though continuing active subordinately in such sectarian bodies. This was his course in all twelve Little Flock movements later perverted into denominations by the crown-lost leaders.

(2) Naturally, after the Lord's rejection of antitypical Saul for unfaithfulness in each of the twelve denominations, antitypical Samuel mourned for antitypical Saul. This was done after the pertinent act in each of the twelve denominations. Hence there were twelve of such rejections, some of them centuries apart, *e.g.*, that of the crown-lost leaders of the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches occurred hundreds of years before that of other crown-lost leaders, *e.g.*, of the Lutheran and other Protestant Churches, the last of such rejections setting in about 1846 with Seventh Day Adventist leaders, as the first set of Adventist leaders so treated. And after each of such rejections (v. 1) antitypical Samuel sorrowed for the rejected ones, *i.e.*, the Little Flock leaders in the denominations were distressed at the condition of the crown-lost leaders in these evils after their rejection by the Lord; for the Little Flock leaders were free from envy, loved these crown-lost leaders, and naturally felt distressed at their ever deeper fall into sin, error and tactical blunders. The Lord seemingly did not intimate to our Samuel that he cease such distress until after the last of the twelve rejections, when it became due to seek another leader for God's people, for such sorrow was not only not wrong, but is in harmony with the Lord's spirit that feels distress at others' spiritual disasters. Only then does mourning over the fall of others become wrong when the fall is into the Second Death class (Lev. 10: 6, 7). The consciousness that Saul's rejection was final made such

distress of no further practical use. When the time came to seek another leader for God's people, it was time for antitypical Samuel to cease such distress, as it would interfere with the work at hand.

(3) Then God charged antitypical Samuel to fill his mind (horn, v. 1) with the pertinent truths, *i.e.*, such as would fit the one to be anointed for the work that he was to do. Antitypical Samuel would find the chosen one (I have provided me, v. 1) among those of God's nominal and real people (Jesse, v. 1) who loved and studied the Bible (Bethlehem, *house of bread*, v. 1). We are, of course, not to understand that God spoke orally or inspirationally to antitypical Samuel, since He ceased such methods of communication with the completion of the Bible. Rather, whenever He is said to speak antitypically with people since the Bible's completion, we are to understand that it is by the principles of His Word, by His Spirit and by His providences. Such speaking with antitypical Samuel as is mentioned in v. 1 began in 1846 with William Miller, who, recognizing that the great leaders of the nominal church were rejected by the Lord, and recognizing that he was too old and worn much longer to be a leader, looked around for one Divinely chosen; for he knew that the true people of God must have a leader, and that the nominal-church leaders were no longer available. In these ways God made clear to his mind that another was to be sought therefore. But herein was the difficulty: If he and other members of antitypical Samuel should publicly seek such a leader (How can I go? v. 2) the crown-lost leaders would cause them to be excommunicated from the churches (he will kill me, v. 2). Against this contingency the Lord had a way of escape—giving antitypical Samuel a twofold work: (1) public, and (2) private. The public work was to consist of an evangelistic effort to convert sinners to righteousness (Take an heifer [not a bullock or goat, but an animal typing people having

tentatively reckoned human perfection, as the red heifer typed the Ancient Worthies, as indicating that the work was to lead to tentative justification], v. 2).

(4) From 1829 to 1844 Bro. Miller and other members of antitypical Samuel preached the chronology as indicating the Lord's return. Then came their disappointment in 1844, and naturally thereafter they could not preach time features to the public. The only thing under the circumstances open to them, if they were to appear among the nominal people of God, was to preach a message that the latter could endorse. And an appeal to repentance and faith was such a message. Not only the nominal, but also the real people of God could share in such a work at any time before 1874 (call Jesse to the sacrifice, v. 3). In connection with such a work God would bring antitypical Samuel into contact with antitypical David for the purpose of anointing him. The anointing itself would be done in connection with a private work (I will show thee what thou shalt do, v. 3). Accordingly, Bro. Miller and others started out in 1846 and onward in a double work: a public one, having as its design the turning of sinners to justification, and a private one, having as its purpose the seeking and anointing of a leader for God's people (Samuel did that which the Lord spake, v. 4), doing both among the nominal and real people of God, as Bible lovers and students (came to Bethlehem, v. 4). Thus the last years of Bro. Miller's life were devoted to the double work above mentioned. But the leaders among the nominal and real people of God, remembering the failure of Bro. Miller's 1844 expectations, feared him as perhaps seeking to do propaganda work of a kind similar to that which failed in 1844 (the elders trembled at his coming, v. 4); for the 1844 disappointment made time prophecy very unpopular; and its advocates seem deceivers; and naturally the leaders of the nominal and real people of God, many

of whom had supported Bro. Miller's pre-1844 work, feared such a work and such workers.

(5) Therefore with misgivings they inquired whether he was intent on doing a prosperous thing (Comest thou peaceably? v. 4). Their question was appropriate, because they knew that a renewal of a propaganda effort like the one that had failed would work injury to Bible lovers and students. Therefore Bro. Miller, etc., assured such that they were intent on prospering Truth and righteousness among God's nominal and real people by seeking to turn sinners to righteousness (I am come to sacrifice unto the Lord, v. 5). Thereupon they invited the leaders of the Bible loving and studying nominal and real people of God to join in with them in such evangelistic work by separating themselves (sanctify yourselves, v. 5) and dedicating themselves thereto (and come with me to the sacrifice, v. 5). These members of antitypical Samuel likewise secured the separation and dedication of the Bible loving and studying nominal and real people of God to this work (he sanctified Jesse . . . to the sacrifice, v. 5). And a work of this kind enlisted the support of such. This work was continued until well toward 1871. It, of course, required years to try out and reject the seven sons of antitypical Jesse and the time from 1846 to 1871 was none too long for such a work, for in each case it averaged less than four years, which was rather quick work. While Jesse represents the whole of God's Bible loving and studying nominal and real people of God, his sons represent the various classes among such. Thus he represents them as a whole and his sons represent them as distributed into their component classes or parts. This will appear from the facts of the case, as they will be unfolded.

(6) Thus the seven (v. 10) classes among God's Bible loving and studying nominal and real people participated in the evangelistic work initiated by antitypical Samuel. And they participated in a certain

natural order of precedence, as typed by the order based on age in the type. Antitypical Eliab naturally showed himself as the most prominent of all in such work. This will appear when we recognize that Eliab (v. 6) here types the same class of tentatively justified ones as the Gershonite Levites type, *i.e.*, the tentatively justified ones who seek to bring sinners to justification (antitypical Libnite Gershonites), and who seek to bring the tentatively justified ones to consecration (antitypical Shimite Gershonites). While in a general way these consist of all tentatively justified ones who engage in such work, specifically they consist mainly of the clergy, the local elders, Sunday School superintendents and teachers and other especially zealous lay workers, as shown in Vol. VIII, Chap. II. The more prominent part that these would naturally take in evangelistic work would naturally bring them, first of all, to the attention of antitypical Samuel (when they were come, he looked on Eliab [*my God is father*], v. 6). Their zeal, as well as the things brought out about them in v. 7, which will be discussed when we study v. 7, made antitypical Samuel conclude that these were the Lord's choice for leadership among God's people (the Lord's anointed is before Him, v. 6). But the Lord by the principles of His Word, by His Spirit and by His providences, doubtless connected with the course of antitypical Eliab in the evangelistic work, which proved his pride, arrogance and other faults (1 Sam. 17: 28), told antitypical Samuel that antitypical Eliab was not his choice (I have refused him, v. 7), despite the latter's knowledge (countenance) and talents (height of his stature). The Lord's judgments are not, like human judgments, based solely or mainly on outward appearance, such as great knowledge and talent, but mainly on heart characteristics. In so informing antitypical Samuel the Lord gave him both good instruction and a gentle rebuke. While the Lord does not despise knowledge and talent,

as some mistakenly think, but, if sanctified, uses them advantageously for His cause, yet He certainly does not put the main emphasis on them, which main emphasis He lays upon the characteristics of the heart, wherein antitypical Eliab came short, despite his knowledge and talents, which, if not accompanied by charity, merely puff up (1 Cor. 8: 1)

(7) The class that showed itself as next most prominent in helping antitypical Samuel in the pertinent evangelistic work consisted of tentatively justified editors and publishers who freely lent aid in advertising and commanding antitypical Samuel's evangelistic work and in seeking to secure the public's attendances thereat. These are here typed by Abinadab (*my father is noble [or wilful]*, v. 8), as they are otherwise typed by the Merarite Levites, the editors among them being typed by the Mahlite Merarites and the publishers among them being typed by the Mushite Merarites, as shown in Vol. VIII, Chap. II. Among such editors and publishers were some able mentally and financially and zealous in work; and as antitypical Jesse called these to help in the antitypical sacrifice, and as they responded, they must for awhile have made a favorable impression on antitypical Samuel; but this impression was after awhile dissipated by the pertinent principles of the Lord's Word, by the Lord's Spirit and by the Lord's providences, as by these antitypical Abinadab's unfitness for the office was by the Lord made known to antitypical Samuel, who, accordingly, desisted from further attempts with this class of helpers.

(8) Next God's Bible loving and studying nominal and real people brought forward antitypical Shammah (*wonder*, v. 5) as helpers in antitypical Samuel's evangelistic work. Shammah represents those tentatively justified believers who have done the scholarly Gospel-Age Levite work. Thus he corresponds to the Kohathite Levites, whose Gospel-Age antitypes, as shown in Vol. VIII, Chap. II, have done linguistic work on Greek

and Hebrew Bible recensions (antitypical Gershonite Amramite Kohathites), dictionaries, grammars, translations and concordances (antitypical Eliezerite Amramite Kohathites); interpretational work on Bible introductions (antitypical Zichrite Izeharite Kohathites), commentaries (antitypical Nephegite Izeharite Kohathites) and harmonetics (antitypical Korahite Izeharite Kohathites); historical work on Bible and Church history and biography (antitypical Jeriahite Hebronite Kohathites), on Bible chronology (antitypical Amariahite Hebronite Kohathites), on Bible archeology (antitypical Jahazielite Hebronite Kohathites), on Bible geography (antitypical Jekameamite Hebronite Kohathites); and systematic work on Bible apologetics (antitypical Zithrite Uzzielite Kohathites), on Bible doctrine (antitypical Elzaphanite Uzzielite Kohathites) and on Bible ethics (antitypical Mishaelite Uzzielite Kohathites). These were the scholars among the Gospel-Age Levites. Naturally they would be the last of the tentatively justified to take part in evangelistic work, as such work is quite far removed from their sphere of service, which, by its scholarly atmosphere, depth and details, is of all Gospel-Age Levite work, the least available for evangelistic work. Their aloofness, depth and subject matter soon demonstrated their inavailability for the leadership needed and sought. Hence by these indications the Lord showed antitypical Samuel that He had rejected antitypical Shammah; and with His rejection the rejection of the tentatively justified in their three groups was complete. Hence the leader sought for must be found among the consecrated. And the next four sons of Jesse (v. 10) represent classes among the consecrated.

(9) Who are represented by the first three of these four sons, *i.e.*, the fourth, fifth and sixth of Jesse's sons? Our answer is: the crown-losers among the consecrated from about 1858 to about 1868, *viewed anticipatorily as the Epiphany Levites*. That God does

call those things that are not as though they were, in view of what they shall be, is Scripturally taught (Rom. 4: 17). This is also manifest in the service of the consecration of the priesthood, in that Aaron was clothed in glory and beauty before his consecration (Lev. 8: 6-9, 12-15), which, as our Pastor shows (T 38, par.. 1), types that before the consecration of the World's High Priest God views Him, in view of what He will be in the Millennium, as being such before His consecration. This is also directly shown typically as to the crown-losers in Num. 16, where Korah (a Kohathite) and his 250 fellow-contradicting Levites type the crown-losers in the Truth (Korah) and in the nominal church (the 250 Levites) in the 1908-1911 sifting contradicting Jesus (Moses) and the Priesthood (Aaron) during that sifting, whereas the real Levites of that time were the tentatively justified, while the Great Company Levites are Epiphaniac; hence those 1908-1911 sifters, before they became Second Deathers (killed by fire from before the Lord—Num. 16: 35), must have been viewed anticipatorily as Epiphany Levites. Accordingly, we understand Jesse's fourth son to represent such crown-losers from about 1858 to about 1862 as were anticipatory Epiphany Gershonites and who as such cooperated with antitypical Samuel in his pertinent evangelistic work. These were rejected, partly because of being unfit and partly because of being many, while the Lord was seeking an individual as the coming leader.

(10) The fifth son of Jesse would, accordingly, type those crown-losers who, as consecrated editors and publishers, from about 1862 to about 1865 cooperated with antitypical Samuel in his pertinent evangelistic work, and who were anticipatorily viewed as Epiphany Merarites, while they were being tried out from about 1862 to about 1865. These were rejected for the same reason as the anticipatory Epiphany Gershonites. The sixth son of Jesse would, accordingly,

represent those crown-losers who, being linguistical, interpretational, historical and systematical scholars, from about 1865 to about 1868 cooperated with antitypical Samuel in his pertinent evangelistic work, and who were anticipatorily viewed as Epiphany Kohathites. These were likewise rejected because of failure to qualify for the place, as well as because of the fact that the office for whom an incumbent was sought was to be filled by an individual. The process of elimination that the antitypical candidates underwent had so far rejected six distinct classes from the choice. There was only one more class left among God's Bible loving and studying nominal and real people, and that was the Little Flock, which in the type under study is represented by Jesse's seventh son, and which, from about 1868 to about 1871 cooperated with antitypical Samuel in evangelistic work. Its rejection also proves that it was not sufficiently qualified to fill the office in question, as its rejection was also due to the fact that office could have only an individual as its holder. Hence any class was from the outstart sure to meet rejection, regardless of the fact that one of such classes was the Little Flock; for as loyal as the Little Flock is and has been, its members as a whole were not qualified for the position. Only one individual among them had the necessary qualifications for that place; and hence from the outstart God had him, and him alone, in mind for that place (I have provided me a king among his sons, v. 1), though all along antitypical Samuel was ignorant of this fact, hence his thinking in each case of the seven classes that the Lord's anointed was before Him. The Little Flock underwent the pertinent scrutiny from about 1868 to about 1871. The periods for the trial of the seven classes given above are only approximate and are based on the sequence of the seven sons in the type and on a seventh average of the antitypical time—1846-1871—allotted as a guess for each.

(11) All along from 1846 to 1871 antitypical Samuel was seeking a leader for the Lord's people; and he was sure that since the crown-lost leaders had been rejected from that place, the Lord must have someone else in mind to fill it. Hence by his heart's attitude and mental conviction, not by words, he still sought among the people of God for such a leader after the seven classes were rejected (Samuel said unto Jesse, Are here all thy children? v. 11). And such a leader had been undergoing preparation, partly by prenatal influence (in 1851 and 1852) that gave him the needed capacities of head and heart (for his parents consecrated him to the Lord before his birth and endowed him well), partly by a careful childhood training that made him in later years declare that he could not remember a time in which he was not in a consecrated attitude—always sought to do God's will—partly by a set purpose never to believe anything that contradicted God's character (in and to what experiences for two years, 1868 - 1870, with sectarian churchianity, infidelity, heathen and other non-Christian religions, etc., this principle led him, we described in Chap. VII), and partly by his recovery from almost despair of arriving at religious Truth, about 1870, through the ministry of Jonas Wendell, an Adventist preacher (Z '16, 170, pars. 9, 10), who convinced him that the Bible was God's revelation and that it taught neither human immortality nor eternal torment, and consequently no predestination of the bulk of the human family to eternal torture, as his former church's creed taught, because of which, convinced that the Bible taught those doctrines, he had rejected the Bible as a Divine revelation. Thus under the influence of Jonas Wendell's ministry he came to a mental attitude in which he was willing to investigate the Bible's claims to being a Divine revelation and accepted it as such. The members of antitypical Samuel who received the reply, There remaineth yet

the youngest (v. 11), were Bros. George Stetson and George Storrs (Reprints, 46, pars. 4, 10-13; 71, pars. 3-5, 14, 15; 623; 624), who had the privilege to anoint Bro. Russell as antitypical David between the years 1871 and 1874 (Z '16, 170, par. 13). These references might profitably be read.

(12) Jesse's reply antitypically implies that at that time Bro. Russell was acting as a spiritual shepherd of some of the Lord's sheep (he keepeth the sheep, v. 11). Hence this reply must have been made after Jonas Wendell had recovered him from his almost despair of finding a Divine revelation, for which he had been investigating for two weary years the dreary deserts of heathenism and Mohammedanism, which he found to be destitute of any oasis where a thirsty soul could quench its raging religious thirst. Given to see that the Bible was Divinely inspired, and that it taught not human immortality, eternal torment and the predestination of the bulk of the race thereto, but that, according to the Bible, death is the wages of sin, and that the race is doomed thereto, not by predestination, but by God's sentence on rebellious sinners, a heart so full of zeal, love for God, Truth and his fellows could not do otherwise than tell out the little of Truth that he had; and thus, beginning in 1870, he gathered about himself a Bible class whose members he sought to help in the ways of God, so far as he knew them. Thus he kept the sheep (v. 11). Some members of antitypical Jesse told Bros. Stetson and Storrs of him (sent and brought him, v. 12); and Bro. Storrs sent him his magazine, which was called, *The Bible Examiner*. Bro. Storrs had for years been preaching and writing in advocacy of the following teachings: Adam brought sin and death, not eternal torment, on the human family; Jesus Christ by God's grace gave Himself a ransom for all; all must therefore have an opportunity to gain blessing from the ransom; the elect, whose selection is not

arbitrary, but conditional on faith working by love unto overcoming, are given that opportunity in this life, during which they are prepared for joint-heirship with Christ in His Millennial reign; the non-elect will get that opportunity in the Millennium; and the finally incorrigible will be destroyed, not tortured, eternally.

(13) The effect upon Bro. Russell, as a reader and student of *The Bible Examiner*, filled as it was with such items, was most beneficial, but before describing this we must pause and examine the typical, description of Bro. Russell at this time, as given in v. 12. While the description of him in this verse is not literal, but symbolical, it will not be out of place here to say a few things of his physical condition. Pastor Russell never was a physically strong and healthful person. Indeed, at his birth it was for a long time doubtful whether he would live at all; yet in the main he was endowed with some fine physical characteristics. He stood five feet and eleven inches high when without shoes, and very erect. Moreover, his body was symmetrically built. His top head was unusually high, indicating an unusual religious endowment, as was also his forehead, revelatory of large intellectuality, while from ear to ear his head was quite wide, showing extraordinary executiveness. His eyebrows were very prominent, showing his fine perceptive powers; his nose was long, high, straight and pointed, manifesting sagacity. The unusually wide space between his eyes and above his nose indicated comprehension of form and details. His mouth was large and firm, with rather thin lips, showing communicativeness, chastity and firmness. His grayish eyes were large and wonderfully luminous; his cheeks were full and often rosy. The back of his head, where the social faculties and certain selfish faculties are located, was, as it were, cut off from top to bottom. This is one of the reasons why he wore his hair long, and why he turned it up at the bottom on the back of his head. His hands were average.

sized and soft, as soft as a woman's who does not work with her hands. His fingers were long and set off his gestures well, while he was addressing his audiences. His complexion was quite fair. He had one of the finest and most distinguished faces that ever graced a member of our fallen race. To look upon that face was a benediction. Strangers passing him on the street often would turn to get another look. He wore no mustache, but his beard, especially in his later years, when it was snow-white, gave him a benign and patriarchal mien. Thus, physically, his appearance was very attractive. His knowledge of medicine and of his body contributed in a good measure to his making so frail a body the instrument through which he was able to do so prodigious an amount of work as he did.

(14) Phrenologically also he was an extraordinary man. A phrenologist who did not know him, nor ever before had seen him, was once shown his picture. Studying that picture awhile, he remarked, "That is an unusually gifted man. He is either the president of a theological seminary or a merchant prince, I am not sure which." This phrenologist in his way pointed out the general gifts of the man—a deep student of the Word and an able executive. In fact he struck the two main characteristics of Pastor Russell's ministry—the interpreter of the Word who was in charge of the storehouse, and the Lord's steward administering the affairs of the Lord's house (Matt. 24: 45-47; Luke 12: 42-44). It would be of interest to our readers to know of his experience with Prof. Fowler, perhaps the ablest of all phrenologists. Pastor Russell's father, when the former was about 16 years of age, was very desirous to have Prof. Fowler examine Bro. Russell's head. The latter with characteristic humility declined to agree thereto, fearing that Prof. Fowler would seek to flatter him; and only then would he agree to it, if Prof. Fowler would promise to tell him what his lacks were and how to supply them, so as to insure success.

in his undertakings. Prof. Fowler gave him a careful examination and, true to his promise, told him of his lacks. Among other things, he told him he must cultivate self-confidence and continuity, remarking thereon to the following effect: Young man, you can do anything that you will wish to do, only you think you can accomplish almost nothing and therefore will give up trying. You must do two things to make a success of yourself. Believe that you can do anything that you desire to do, and never give up that thing until you have brought it to a successful conclusion. The two pertinent lacks were due to the way his back head was, as it were, cut off. In the Lord's Spirit he changed Prof. Fowler's advice to the following: You can do anything that God desires you to do, and be sure never to give up that thing until it is completed. Toward the end of his life, e.g., where he had been so deficient in the organ of continuity, a bump had developed a full half-inch above the surrounding faculties, an evidence in his skull of his diligence in cultivating continuity—which is the main element in Bible patience. The Lord had probably forced part of Bro. Russell's brain away from his back head in order to give him larger religious and intellectual organs and a larger amount of brains in his combative and executive faculties, thus better fitting him for his work.

(15) Now to the antitype of David's description as given in v. 12. He was ruddy, or brown, as some translations give it. Taking first the latter meaning, it would refer to David's being tanned by the sun. Hence the antitype would suggest that Bro. Russell was tried, tested, with special reference to the trials and temptations that he underwent between 1868 and 1871 when searching for a Divine revelation. For this thought the sun in its fierce heat, as symbolizing temptation, trial, is pertinent (Matt. 13: 5, 6, 20, 21; Luke 8: 13). Taking, secondly, the thought *ruddy*, it would represent Bro. Russell's being made symbolically rosy-cheeked

by the New Testament as a symbolical sun (Rev. 12: 1), *i.e.*, his views of things reflecting predominately New Testament, as distinct from predominately Old Testament things; for, as we pointed out in the preceding chapter, at the time when Bro. Russell's anointing was about to begin he was a full New Testament believer. Both thoughts are in harmony with the facts and the symbols; and hence we suggest both as the antitype of David's being ruddy or brown. Next we are told (v. 12) that David was of a beautiful countenance. In Bible symbols the face is used to represent knowledge (1 Cor. 13: 12; 2 Cor. 3: 18; Rev. 1: 16; 20: 11; Dan. 1: 15). Hence David's beautiful countenance types the symmetrical knowledge that by the time of his anointing Bro. Russell had gained. Above we have described some features of that knowledge. David was goodly to look to. This types the fine character that Bro. Russell had developed by the time that he was 19 years of age, *i.e.*, when his anointing began.

(16) God's charge (v. 12) to antitypical Samuel, acting in the persons of Bro. George Stetson and Bro. George Storrs, to anoint Bro. Russell (v. 12) was given them providentially, particularly to Bro. Storrs when he was asked and moved to send to Bro. Russell his magazine, *The Bible Examiner*. Having heard of Bro. Russell's experiences and needs, Bro. Storrs wrote in his magazine such articles as would especially supply those needs (took the horn . . . anointed him, v. 13). Thus Bro. Russell's anointing was performed by antitypical Samuel, acting in Bros. Stetson and Storrs, not so much orally, as by the printed page and by letter. It was done in the midst of Bro. Russell's brethren (v. 13), in the sense that the magazine and letters were read by other members of Bro. Russell's Bible class as well as by himself, and all the members took part in the discussion on the pertinent subjects; for, as shown above, the members of this Bible class were variously members of the seven above-described

classes of God's people. This Bible class studied the subjects mentioned above as discussed in *The Bible Examiner*; and, as Bro. Russell testifies (Z '16, 170, par. 11-171, par. 1), all of them grew in the knowledge of God's Word. But little did the members of this Bible class, including Bro. Russell, realize, what the Lord was causing to be done to Bro. Russell. Of course, all of them saw him growing in the knowledge that Bros. Stetson and Storrs were pouring out upon him; but they, as little as himself, realized that he was thus being qualified for the office of being the ruler over the Lord's household as Jesus' special representative; for that is what this anointing meant. We are to remember that David does not represent our Pastor in both of the functions of his office as that Servant; but only in one of them—as the Lord's executive in ruling as administrator and warrior-chief. Other types represent him as that Servant in his capacity of having charge of the storehouse to give the meat in due season, *e.g.*, Jeremiah, Daniel, the twelve Apostles, etc.

(17) And, verily, the Spirit of the Lord came upon him from that day forward (v. 13). This showed itself in his administering the stewardship of the Harvest, as well as directing the controversies of that time. His faithfulness and prudence as manifestations of the Lord's Spirit are seen in the arrangements that he made for the various branches of the work at the Bible House in Allegheny and later at Bethel in Brooklyn, at the branch offices in various countries, in the public and private features of the pilgrim work and in the colporteur, volunteer, magazine, newspaper, publishing, Photo-drama and Pastoral work, including all the pertinent business and financial features of the work. The sound judgment displayed in initiating, executing and guarding this work could have come from nothing else than the Lord's Spirit. Truly, from the anointing onward the Spirit of the Lord came upon him. And as for Bros. Stetson and Storrs, who

wrought with Bro. Russell better than they had realized, a few years after their anointing antitypical David they gave up in death their ministries, the latter keeping up his publishing work until extreme age (for he was 78 when he finished his part in the anointing) and outworn powers of body and mind forced him so to do, during which interval they dwelt in the high place (Ramah) of a well developed character (v. 13). They died in 1879, faithful overcomers—true members of antitypical Samuel. Bro. Russell gave touching notices of their last days in *The Tower Reprint* references given above; and additionally he quoted an article from Bro. Storrs' pen, also referred to above. We have confidence that these dear brothers, whom the Lord favored with the privilege of anointing antitypical David, are now with the Lord in glory.

(18) Coincidently with the anointing of Bro. Russell and the Spirit's abiding upon him, the Spirit (v. 14) departed from antitypical Saul. And as the Spirit of the Lord ever led Bro. Russell forward in every good word and work, so an evil spirit came upon antitypical Saul, ever plunging him into deeper errors, blunders and misdeeds. The evil spirit that came over Saul is said to have been an evil spirit from the Lord. Of course, a spirit being is not here meant, either in the type or the antitype. Rather an evil disposition, which in the first instance was in both cases a disposition of sadness, melancholy, arising from a sense of God's having withdrawn His special help. Nor are we to understand that God directly wrought such a disposition in either Saul. Rather, as indicated in a general way in case of reprobates, in 2 Thes. 2: 9-11, the Lord withdrew His former hindrances to Satan's machinations, and thus let the latter have free access to both Sauls, with the result that Satan cast melancholy over both of them. That this spirit was one of melancholy—depression—appears from the contrast to it wrought by David's playing, purposely arranged for

overcoming that unhappy state of mind (so Saul was refreshed, v. 23). Saul is antityped in 1 Sam. 16 by an individual member of antitypical Saul. This individual, we believe, the facts of the case prove to be Dr. Joseph Seiss, the pastor of the (Lutheran) Church of the Holy Communion, at Philadelphia, Pa. He was certainly a very able man, a gifted preacher and a finished writer of many books. Our readers have doubtless admired an excerpt quoted in Studies, Vol. III, 374, 375, from his book entitled, *A Miracle in Stone*.

(19) Though a member, minister and leader of the Lutheran Church, which in its Augsburg Confession and in its authoritative writers rejects the Millennium, he accepted the fact that the Bible teaches the pre-Millennial advent and Millennial reign of our Lord. In fact, it was Dr. Seiss' book on *The Last Times*, which advocated the pre-Millennial advent and Millennial reign of Christ, that convinced the writer of the truth of these two doctrines and thus began to shake the writer's faith in the Lutheran creed. Thus we confess a sense of indebtedness to him. But there were so many questions that Dr. Seiss' views left dark, e.g., the relation of these two doctrines to the Judgment Day as the Lutheran Church and he held it, as coming at the destruction of the universe, hence after the Millennium, according to his view, that our uncertainty on the subject left us too much in the dark to take any aggressive steps on the subjects. These obscurities were removed when we received the anointing antitypical of that of Medad (Num. 11: 26-29), and thus we were prepared to renounce the Lutheran creed, which we promptly did thereafter. While Dr. Seiss was a master of English composition and a very eloquent speaker and writer, he steadily went into greater and greater darkness. Among nominal church pre-Millennialists he is regarded as their greatest authority, but, among other works of his, in his three-volumed

work on Revelation he has involved them into the greatest pertinent absurdities. It is he who is responsible for giving the entire book a setting that places its entire fulfillment up to chapter 20 in the end of this Age; he has severed the 70th week from the 69 weeks (Dan. 9: 24-26) and put it in the end of this Age; he has set forth the man of sin as an individual who is to appear during his 70th week and in its first half conquer the world, build a literal temple in Jerusalem, install himself therein as a god, make the whole world worship him and then go to destruction at the end of his 70th week. He has done this with a surpassing eloquence that knocks the feet out from under the unwary and unstable. He is a most striking example of foolish virgins going into utter darkness.

(20) In Dr. Seiss the fulfillment of the Saul type given in vs. 14-23 took place. His unclear views on the pre-Millennial advent and Millennial reign of our Lord in relation to the Judgment Day and the (supposed.) destruction of the universe greatly troubled him. He could find no solution to his difficulties thereon and from this concluded that the Lord had forsaken him—a true conclusion so far as mouthpieceship and leadership for God's people is concerned. This greatly dejected him, a fact that his cohelpers noted (Behold now . . . troubleth thee, v. 15). Knowing the near cause to be that he could not solve his Scriptural difficulties, they suggested that a person be sought who could solve these, when his inability in this matter troubled him (v. 16). Such a person must be skilful in harmonizing the Scriptures (a cunning player on an harp, v. 16) and be able by his harmonizing the pertinent Scriptures to drive away Dr. Seiss' dejection by removing its (near) cause—his inability to get Scriptural harmony into the involved subjects (and thou shalt be well, v. 16). This proposition pleased Dr. Seiss (Provide me now a man, v. 17). These events occurred between 1875 and 1877, hence after Bro. Russell

had published his tract on The Object and Manner of Our Lord's Return. One of Dr. Seiss' helpers, having read this tract and noting how it beautifully harmonized the various questions that Dr. Seiss could not harmonize, suggested that Bro. Russell was the very man to render the needed help (Behold . . . a son of Jesse . . . is cunning in playing, v. 18), since he could bring harmony out of the Bible on the matters that needed to be harmonized for Dr. Seiss. He further recommended Bro. Russell as a skilful controversialist (a man of war) who had the ability both to defend his views from attacks and to refute the positions of his antagonists, as this appeared in the above-mentioned tract, as he was also fearless in controversy (a mighty valiant man). He also recommended him as a tactful person, with great ability at accomplishing the things that he attempted to do in his field of work (prudent in matters). He also highly recommended his character as being especially exemplary in the Christian graces (a comely person); and, finally, he assured Dr. Seiss that the Lord favored and prospered Bro. Russell's undertakings (the Lord is with him).

(21) On hearing this description of Bro. Russell, and learning that he was the leading spirit in an Allegheny Bible class, Dr. Seiss sent to the class, which, as above said, consisted of members from all seven classes of God's people (sent to Jesse, v. 19), and, not to Bro. Russell directly, asked it to send the latter to him. This course was doubtless done in courtesy to the class, inasmuch as the granting of his request would deprive the class for awhile at least of its teacher. He reminded the class, in a complimentary sense, of the shepherdly qualities of Bro. Russell, as he asked it to send the former to him (Send me . . . with the sheep, v. 19). We can readily imagine the fluttering of heart and the joy of spirit experienced by the members of that class when it learned that the great and renowned Dr. Seiss desired to get help from

their leader, as in the type Jesse and his sons doubtless felt joy and the sense of being honored in that his son and their brother had been chosen to help the king of Israel. The class suggested to Bro. Russell that he take along his tract on The Object and Manner of Our Lord's Return (an ass, v. 20), which consisted in part of deep and hard teachings (bread) and in part of surface and easy teachings (bottle of wine), also that he take along his consecrated humanity (kid), *i.e.*, in the sense that he make the visit in person and not by writing, and thus directly use up part of his humanity, which was a part of the Lord's antitypical Goat, in the interests of this cause. Into this plan Bro. Russell entered and went as the class suggested (sent them by David . . . unto Saul, v. 20). Thus he presented himself to Dr. Seiss in Philadelphia (came to Saul, v. 21) and stood ready to serve him (stood before him). As they were together Bro. Russell so richly manifested the graces of the Spirit, was so tactful and considerate and reticent in his speech, so considerate of Dr. Seiss' feelings and so modest in his manner of teaching, which he presented suggestively rather than dogmatically, that he completely won Dr. Seiss' heart (he loved him greatly, v. 21).

(22) In the Manna Comment for August 4 he cautions against dogmatism in the Lord's people, especially in their speaking with the great and learned, showing how many of them have ruined their influence by a too confident assertion of the Truth. We may be sure that he exemplified his caution in his dealings with Dr. Seiss, remembering his age, reputation, position and feelings, and being careful to show him the respect and deference due him. This was all the more creditable in Bro. Russell, inasmuch as most young men are more or less inclined to forget these matters and to act in defiance thereof. Bro. Russell's politeness, humility, modesty and deference were all noted by Dr. Seiss, who by these qualities recognized that

Bro. Russell was an uncommonly fine young man. He also doubtless noted that Bro. Russell did not have the learning of the schools; but at the same time he also noted that he had a most unusual grasp of the Scriptures and power in reasoning thereon. Hence it was but natural that he should have thought this young man of 23 to 25 years a find of unusual worth. And he showed his appreciation of Bro. Russell by making him his most trusted and powerful helper in controversial matters (became his armor-bearer), of which matters Dr. Seiss in his controversies with post- and anti-Millennialists had his hands more than full; for he recognized that Bro. Russell's views on the Lord's return answered completely every argument that Dr. Seiss' opponents brought against his Second Advent, Millennial and Judgment Day views. And for this reason he gladly made Bro. Russell his chief helper (armor-bearer) in such controversies.

(23) When Bro. Russell told us the story of his contacts with Dr. Seiss, he told us a matter that astonished us. He said that in one of Dr. Seiss' publications the latter stated that our Lord would be invisible in His Second Advent, and that, while explaining his own view, Bro. Russell reminded Dr. Seiss of this statement of his, when to Bro. Russell's surprise Dr. Seiss did not remember ever having entertained such a thought. He had the regular nominal church view of our Lord's rising from the dead in the flesh, and, of course, did not explain His invisibility in His Second Advent on the ground that spirit beings are invisible, as did our Pastor. Hence his reference to an invisible return of our Lord must have been a mere passing comment on such passages as Matt. 24: 37-39 and Luke 17: 26-30, without being based on a firm foundation, such as was Bro. Russell's thought. Commenting on Dr. Seiss' pertinent forgetfulness, Bro. Russell expressed astonishment that one once having such a thought could have forgotten it. But Dr. Seiss

was no less a careful listener to Bro. Russell's expositions than he was an attentive observer of his spirit and methods of conveying his thoughts; and, being a man of high refinement and education, he discerned Bro. Russell's transparent goodness of character, keenness of reasoning and depth and clarity of thinking. These things made him all the more desirous of retaining Bro. Russell in his immediate presence, or subject to his call; and, therefore, he asked the Allegheny Bible class to let Bro. Russell stay with him at Philadelphia, or at least to make him available at Dr. Seiss' call as a special helper (sent to Jesse . . . let David . . . stand before me, v. 22). He freely admitted to the class that Bro. Russell had won his heart and pleased him greatly (found favor in my sight). Such a request from such a man must have filled the hearts of the class with joy and commendable gratification, as the typical request must have done to Jesse.

(24) The effect of Bro. Russell's pertinent Scriptural interpretations is typed in v. 23. There were many points that Dr. Seiss' opponents brought against his view of Christ's pre-Millennial Advent and Millennial Reign which he from his doctrinal standpoint could not answer, and each time a different one of these objections was brought up he relapsed into melancholy (evil spirit from God came upon Saul, v. 23). But Bro. Russell, hearing of each point so urged against Dr. Seiss, and noting the latter's depression thereover, took the Bible (David took an harp) and from it refuted the objection and brought out the Bible harmony on the subject. Thus when they urged that according to the Bible (as they misunderstood it) at Christ's Second Advent the universe was to be annihilated, while Dr. Seiss put this event after the Millennium, Bro. Russell showed that the Bible did not teach the annihilation of the physical universe at all, but of the symbolic heavens and earth (the powers of spiritual control and society, based on sin, error, etc.) and that,

not at the end of the Millennium, but during the early part of Christ's return; and Dr. Seiss recognized the Bible harmony on the involved matters and his melancholy left him (was refreshed . . . and the evil spirit departed, v. 20). Again, when his opponents pressed against his view that the Judgment Day follows the Millennium, their and the Bible thought that the Day of Judgment follows immediately on Christ's return, he was unable to reply to them and became much depressed thereover. Noting this, Bro. Russell from the Bible proved that the Millennium and the Judgment Day are one and the same thing; he thus brought harmony into the matter that Dr. Seiss could not harmonize. The latter, recognizing this harmony, was delivered from his melancholy—depression of spirit.

(25) Again, when Dr. Seiss' opponents urged against his view of a visible and earthly reign of Christ and the Church over the earth the unreasonableness of such a view, and its contrariety to the manner of Christ's present reign over the Church and the universe, Dr. Seiss, unable to reply, became depressed; but Bro. Russell, taking the Bible, proved from it the invisibility of Christ in His Second Advent, the invisibility of the spiritual phase of the Kingdom and the visibility of the earthly phase of the Kingdom, and to that added the object of Jesus' return. Dr. Seiss recognized the harmony of the Bible on the pertinent subjects and was thus again relieved from the depression. He felt a sense of humiliation at his inability to answer his opponents, which a young man of 23 to 25, without a college or theological seminary education, was able to do. But Bro. Russell with that graciousness that comes from Christian love, humility and modesty assured him that this was not due to any ability of his, but to the Lord's grace making these things clear in the due time. Thus the Lord impressed upon Dr. Seiss the thought that Scriptural Truth comes "not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit,

saith the Lord." Thus also He impressed upon Bro. Russell the thought, "What hast thou that thou hast not received?" These are lessons for all of us to learn; and let us learn well the lessons just indicated, that it is not by human might, nor by human power, but by the Lord's Spirit that we can accomplish anything for the Lord, and that whatever of talents, attainments or Divine uses have fallen to our lot we are to remember that we have received them as a gracious gift from God, a fact that should preclude all boasting. In this we have a notable example in our beloved Pastor; for among his many and fine graces of the Spirit his humility and modesty were not the least. May we imitate his graces!

(1) Of what will this chapter treat as to our Pastor? As to David? What three things does David type in the Psalms? In the histories generally and specifically? In what capacity specifically? What did David's first appearance follow? In a general way, what does Saul type? In a specific way? What may be expected as to this specific way? What will suffice here to point out? What typed these two things? What does Samuel in a general way type? In a specific way? In what 12 spheres were these things enacted?

(2) What effect upon antitypical Samuel did antitypical Saul's rejection by the Lord have? How many times? Why so many? As to time, when did these rejections occur relatively to one another? When did the last of such rejections occur? What did antitypical Samuel do after each of such rejections? Why? Before what did not the Lord intimate to antitypical Samuel to desist from such mourning? Why not before? When only does mourning over the fallen become wrong? How does the cited passage prove this? What considerations made further distress over antitypical Saul useless?

(3) What is typed by God's charging Samuel to fill his horn with oil? Among whom, type and antitype, would the chosen one be found? Where, type and antitype? How did God not speak to antitypical Samuel the antitype of what He said in v. 1? Why not orally or inspirationally? How did He speak to him? When did the

antitypical speaking begin? To whom was it spoken first? How did God speak to him? What difficulty presented itself herein to antitypical Samuel? How did God suggest a way out of this difficulty? Of what was the public work to consist? How is this typed?

(4) What did Bro. Miller, etc., preach from 1829 to 1844? What occurred in 1844? What resulted? What only could they preach to the public as acceptable to church members? Who up to 1874 could properly share in such a work? How is this typed? In connection with such a work, what would God do? In connection with what would the antitypical anointing occur? How is this typed? What, accordingly, began in 1846? How is this typed? Among whom? How is this typed? How, accordingly, were Bro. Miller's last years passed? What effect did this have on the leaders among the people of God? How is this typed? Why did the leaders tremble?

(5) What did this fear lead them to do? How is this typed? Why was the antitypical question appropriate? What answer did Bro. Miller, etc., give? How is this typed? What did they then do? How is this typed? What else did they secure? How is this typed? Why did such enter this work? How long did this work continue? As to time, how long would it require to try out and reject the seven antitypical classes? How is this typed? For this work what time was not too long? Why not? What is relatively typed by Jesse and his sons? By contrast? From what will this appear?

(6) Who participated in the pertinent evangelistic work of antitypical Samuel? How is this typed? As to order, how did they participate? How is this typed? Who in the antitype showed himself as the most prominent? How is this typed? Whom does Eliab type? What group of Levites types the same class? What do their two families type in this connection? What are their antitypes' respective work? Of whom do they generally and specifically consist? How is this shown? What brought these naturally first into prominence? How did this bring them first to the notice of antitypical Samuel? How is this typed? What two things about them made antitypical Samuel think that antitypical Eliab was the Lord's choice? How is this typed? By what did the Lord

indicate otherwise? How is this typed? Connected with what qualities in antitypical Eliab was this done? Despite what two advantages? How is this typed? On what are God's judgments, unlike man's, not mainly, based? How is this typed? What two things did God's antitypical answer give antitypical Samuel? What is not God's attitude toward knowledge and talent? Why not? How does He stress them? On what does He put the main stress? How did antitypical Eliab measure up to these requirements? How is this typed?

(7) What class showed itself as second most prominent in antitypical Samuel's evangelistic work? How did they serve? Who types them? What Levite family types them? The editors? The publishers? Where is this detailedly shown? What were the talents of some of these? When called and responding, what impression did they make on antitypical Samuel? How was this impression changed? In what did it result? How was it typed?

(8) Whom did antitypical Jesse next bring forward? How is this typed? Whom does Shammah type? With what family of Levites does he correspond? What Gospel-Age work do the antitypical Amramite Kohathites do? Antitypical Gershomite Amramite Kohathites? Antitypical Eliezerite Amramite Kohathites? Antitypical Izeharite Kohathites? Antitypical Zichrite Izeharite Kohathites? Antitypical Nephegite Izeharite Kohathites? Antitypical Korahite Izeharite Kohathites? Antitypical Hebronite Kohathites? Antitypical Jeriahite Hebronite Kohathites? Antitypical Amariahite Hebronite Kohathites? Antitypical Jahzielite Hebronite Kohathites? Antitypical Jekameamite Hebronite Kohathites? Antitypical Uzzielite Kohathites? Antitypical Zithrite Uzzielite Kohathites? Antitypical Elzaphanite Uzzielite Kohathites? Antitypical Mishaelite Uzzielite Kohathites? Why should antitypical Shammah be the last of the tentatively justified to take part in the pertinent evangelistic work? What soon demonstrated their inavailability? How did God indicate this to antitypical Samuel? What did their rejection complete? What conclusion as to the whereabouts of the sought and chosen leader flows from the complete rejection of the three groups of the tentatively justified? Whom do the next four sons type?

(9) Who are represented by the first three of these four sons? During what years? How viewed? On what principle was this done so long before the Epiphany, when first the Great Company became Levites? How does Rom. 4: 17 prove this principle? How is this principle manifest in connection with Aaron before his consecration? By the 1908-1911 sifters as typed before the death of their types? What in this type does Korah represent? The 250 Levites? What do the involved facts, compared with the fact that the real Levites of that sifting time were the tentatively justified, prove? Whom, accordingly, does Jesse's fourth son type? What did they do to antitypical Samuel? Why were they rejected? How is this typed?

(10) Whom does Jesse's fifth son type? When did they cooperate with antitypical Samuel in the pertinent evangelistic work? As who were they anticipatorily viewed? Why were these rejected? How is this typed? Whom does Jesse's sixth son type? When did they cooperate with antitypical Samuel in his pertinent evangelistic work? How were they anticipatorily viewed? Why were these rejected? How is this typed? How many had the process of elimination so far rejected? What class alone was so far not tested for the place? Whom does Jesse's seventh son type? What does its rejection also prove? What from the outstart would be sure to be rejected? Why specifically was the Little Flock rejected? Who only among them had the necessary qualification? How is this typed? Of what fact all along was antitypical Samuel ignorant? What did this ignorance in each case influence him at first to think? When did the Little Flock undergo the pertinent scrutiny?

(11) How long was antitypical Samuel seeking a leader? Of what was he sure? How did he not, and how did he seek such a leader, even after the seven classes were rejected? How is this typed? What had been going on since 1851? First, prenatally? Secondly, in childhood and boyhood? Thirdly, by a certain conviction? Where are certain consequent experiences described? Fourthly, by what recovery and whose ministry? Of what did Jonas Wendell convince him? What had the pertinent errors done to him? To what attitude was he brought by Jonas Wendell's ministry? What members of

antitypical Samuel received the reply antitypical of the words, "There remaineth yet the youngest"? Where are references made to them in Vol. 1 of the Tower Reprints? Read these. What privilege and honor was given Bros. Stetson and Storrs? Where is this shown?

(12) What is implied antitypically in the reply of Jesse? When relatively must it, therefore, have been given? What had Bro. Russell been doing for two years previously? How did he find them? From what errors and into what truths had he been delivered? What did his heart's attitude lead him to do? In what did this result? What did he do to its members? What did some member of antitypical Jesse do to Bros. Stetson and George Storrs as to him? What did they, especially Bro. Storrs, then do to him? What was Bro. Storrs' magazine? What were some of the main teachings of Bro. Storrs expounded in his magazine?

(13) What were the effects of his reading and studying this magazine? Before describing this, what would here be beneficial? What character does the description of v. 12 not have? What does it have? Despite this, what will be here profitable? With what was he not naturally endowed? What was his condition at birth in this respect? What was his height? What were the main physical features of his head? What did each of these indicate? What were the main features of his face? What did these indicate? How was his back head shaped? What was the character of his hands and fingers? How may this appearance of his face be characterized? His beard? How may his physical man be described? What enabled him to do so much through so weak a body?

(14) What may be said of him phrenologically? What comment did a phrenologist who did not know him make on him as he viewed his picture? Upon what two of Bro. Russell's aptitudes did he touch by this remark? What was Bro. Russell's reaction to his father's suggestion that he be phrenologized by Prof. Fowler? On what condition did he finally consent to Prof. Fowler's reading his head? What advice did Prof. Fowler give him as to two of his lacks? What were his remarks thereon? To what were these two lacks due? How did Bro. Russell change Prof. Fowler's pertinent advice? How did his development of

continuity show itself in his back head? Why, probably, did the Lord, as it were, cut off his back head?

(15) How may the word translated *ruddy* be also translated? With the rendering *brown* in mind, what would the antitype be? How is this antitype reached Biblically? With the rendering *ruddy* in mind, what would the antitype be? How is this view reached Biblically? On what facts is it based? What may be said of both thoughts? To what should this lead? What is typed by David's being of a beautiful countenance? How do the cited verses prove that the face symbolizes knowledge? What were some of the features of Bro. Russell's knowledge? What is typed by David's being goodly to look to?

(16) By what was antitypical Samuel charged to anoint Bro. Russell? What types this? How did antitypical Samuel in the persons of Bros. Stetson and Storrs proceed with him? What moved them to do so? By what means was the antitypical anointing accomplished? How was this typed? What is the antitype of David's being anointed in the midst of his brethren? How was it so accomplished? What fact proves this to have been done? What did all the members of the Bible class do with the pertinent subjects? Despite what, of what were all concerned not aware? What did this anointing mean? What fact should here be kept in mind? How only did David type Bro. Russell? In his capacity of having charge of the storehouse by whom was he typed?

(17) What resulted from that anointing? In what, generally speaking, was this manifest? In what details were his faithfulness and prudence manifest as antitypical David? What could he have exercised only by the Lord's Spirit? What did Bros. Stetson and Storrs shortly after the anointing do? How was this typed? Of what as to them may we be assured?

(18) What was occurring coincidentally? How did these two contrary things show themselves? What are we not to understand Saul's evil spirit to be, type and antitype? What was it, in type and antitype? What are we not to understand as to the evil spirit coming from the Lord? How are we to understand it? What Scripture gives us a clue to the right thought? What was the procedure in the case of both Sauls? What proves that

this evil spirit was a depressed or melancholy disposition? What phenomenon that appears in the antitype of Saul in connection with David and Goliath appears in the antitype of Saul in I Sam. 16? Who, according to the facts of the case, is this individual in this antitype? What kind of a worker was he? From what one of his books is a quotation made in the Pyramid chapter of Studies, Vol. III?

(19) What was he as to the Lutheran Church? What Bible doctrine does this church reject? Despite this, what did he do with this doctrine and our Lord's pre-Millennial advent? For what is the Editor of *The Present Truth* indebted to Dr. Seiss? What confusion and unclarity was there in Dr. Seiss' pertinent views? What effect did his presentations have upon the Editor? By what were these obscurities clarified? To what did these clarifications lead him? Despite his great gifts, what happened to Dr. Seiss? How is he regarded by nominal church pre-Millennialists? What has he done to them in his three-volumed work on Revelation? What error has he taught as to the setting of the Revelation? Of the 70th week? Of the man of sin? How has he presented these errors? Of what is he a striking example?

(20) In whom as the antitype of Saul in vs. 14-23 did the fulfillment take place? What greatly troubled him? Why? What did he conclude therefrom? How far was this conclusion true? What was the effect on him? How is this typed? What effect did his condition have on his helpers? How is this typed? What advice did they give him? How is this typed? What characteristics did they recommend in the helper? How is this typed? What did they say this would effect? How is this typed? How did the proposition strike Dr. Seiss? How is this typed? When did these events happen relatively to the appearance of Bro. Russell's tract on, *The Object and Manner of Our Lord's Return*? Who contacted this tract? What did its harmonizing the difficulties of Dr. Seiss prompt him to do? What is the antitype of Saul's servant's saying, David is cunning in playing? A man of war? A mighty valiant man? Prudent in matters? A comely person? And the Lord is with him?

(21) What did Dr. Seiss thereupon do, and not do?

How is this typed? Why was the request sent to the class and not to Bro. Russell? How was this typed? What must the effect of the invitation have been upon the class? How is this typed? What did the class suggest that Bro. Russell take along? What is in this matter the antitype of the ass? The bread? The bottle of wine? The kid? How did Bro. Russell respond? How is this typed? How are his presenting himself to, and standing ready to serve Dr. Seiss typed? How did Bro. Russell act toward Dr. Seiss? In what did this result? How is this typed?

(22) What caution does Bro. Russell give in the Manna Comment for August 4? How did he act as to this suggestion in relation to Dr. Seiss? Why was this all the more creditable to Bro. Russell? What in Bro. Russell did Dr. Seiss note? What impression did this give him of Bro. Russell? What two other things did he note in Bro. Russell? What thought came naturally to him as to Bro. Russell's worth? How did he show his appreciation? How is this typed? Of what were Dr. Seiss' hands full? What did he recognize in Bro. Russell's Second Advent views as to his needs? For this help what did he gladly make Bro. Russell in his controversies? How is this typed?

(23) What astonishing thing did Bro. Russell tell the writer when he narrated to him his experiences with Dr. Seiss? How did Dr. Seiss surprise Bro. Russell therein? What was his view of our Lord's resurrection body? On what, therefore, could he not, as our Pastor did, have based the thought of an invisible return of our Lord? How are we to explain that he ever came to such a thought? When commenting to the writer on Dr. Seiss' pertinent forgetfulness, what did Bro. Russell express? How did Dr. Seiss listen to and observe Bro. Russell? What did he discern in Bro. Russell? What did these observations stir up in him? To what was he thereby moved? How is this typed? What did he freely admit? How is this typed? What was the effect of Dr. Seiss' request on the class? How is this typed?

(24) What is typed in v. 23? What could Dr. Seiss not do with many points that his opponents brought up against him? What effect did this fact have on him each

time such an objection was urged against him? How is this typed? Accordingly, what did Bro. Russell do? How is this typed? How did he show harmony in the Bible teaching on the Second Advent being pre-Millennial and the destruction of the heavens and earth? How did he disprove the error of the annihilation of the universe at Christ's Second Advent? How did this help Dr. Seiss? How is this typed? How did Bro. Russell refute the error on the judgment Day coming after the Millennium and fit the subject to the pre-Millennial Advent? How did the error effect Dr. Seiss? Its refutation by Bro. Russell?

(25) What error as to the visibility of the Kingdom did Dr. Seiss' opponents urge against his view? What effect did this argument have on Dr. Seiss, who from his view was unable to answer it? How did Bro. Russell meet this argument? How did this affect Dr. Seiss? How did the fact of his pertinent inability and Bro. Russell's ability to answer affect Dr. Seiss? How did Bro. Russell act in the premises? What did the Lord thereby impress on Dr. Seiss? What pertinent thing did the Lord impress upon Bro. Russell? For whom else are these lessons profitable? What in him should we learn to imitate?

Him from watching of the sheepfold,
 And from tending of the ewes,
 To be ruler of the people,
 Samuel's prophet-eye did choose.
 From the lion and the she-bear,
 When they leapt the wattled pen,
 To a fight with worse than lions,
 Tiger-hearted, bloody men.

To the struggle for a kingdom,
 To confusion of his foes,
 To the splendid cares of reigning,
 Him the God-sent prophet chose;
 Chose, nor waited long. A kingship
 Reigned in bosom of the boy;
 And his hand with kingly instinct
 Leapt to find a king's employ.

CHAPTER IX.
ANTITYPICAL DAVID AND GOLIATH.
1 Sam. 17.

GOLIATH'S ARMOR. HIS CHALLENGE. DAVID'S FITNESS.
ACCEPTANCE OF THE CHALLENGE. PRE-COMBAT REMARKS.
DAVID'S VICTORY. DAVID BEFORE SAUL.

AS WE KNOW, that Servant's office as such had two functions: executive (ruler over the household) and interpretive (to give the meat in due season). David does not represent him in the latter function, though when both of these functions mingle he does represent him in both, and that only because of their mingling. Such a mingling occurs when the executive acts as a warrior, because the warrior partakes of both functions. There is a mingling of these two functions in the antitype of David in his relation to Goliath, as the facts of the case will bring out. In 1 Sam. 17 the Philistines (villagers), as elsewhere, type sectarians. What kind of sectarians they type will be determined by the separate antitypes. In this chapter they type the infidel sectarians-Atheists, Agnostics, Materialists, Pantheists, Deists, Rationalists, Evolutionists, Higher Critics, unbelieving scientists not coming under any of the foregoing categories, etc. Elsewhere the Philistines represent other kinds of sectarians, *e.g.*, the sectarians of Great and Little Babylon, modernists, etc,

(2) In 1 Sam. 17 the men of Judah represent Truth people, the Israelites, Bible believers outside of the Truth, Saul, the crown-lost princes of the twelve denominations, as a whole or as represented by an individual, and the war, the conflict between the unbelievers and believers as to the Bible during the Parousia. Shochoh (*hedge*) of Judah (*praised*) types the limits that separate the Truth from the

border land of error. Azekah (*dug over*) types the fields of investigation as the sphere that has been critically examined by the investigations, especially scientific, of the Time of the End. The battle line, therefore, of the infidelistic hosts of the Parousia extended from the most infidelistic views (atheism) up to the limits of the Truth as they border on the sphere of error. Ephes (*field*)—dammim (*bloods*) types the sphere of the atonement as represented in the two Sin-offerings (*bloods*), the central point of infidel attack. The crown-lost princes (Saul) and the men of Israel (Bible believers outside the Truth) assembled (gathered together, v. 2) for the Bible as the Divine revelation, as a company of strong warriors (*elah, oak*), and thus prepared their defenses against, and attacks on unbelievers (Philistines). The infidels (Philistines) stood for the kingdom of error (mountain on the one side, v. 3) and the Israelites stood in a general way for the kingdom of Truth (mountain on the other side) in so far as it was opposed to the infidelistic errors. The valley between was the condition that separated the attackers from the defenders of the Bible. Thus in vs. 1-3 the typical hosts represent the two camps of opposing warriors in the Parousia as to the truthfulness of the Bible as the Divine revelation.

(3) Goliath (*conspicuous*, v. 4) of Gath (*winepress*), the champion of the Philistines, represents evolution, which during the Parousia was undoubtedly the outstanding champion of the infidel hosts. His immense height, 9 feet and 8 inches, according to the secular cubit, which doubtless is here meant, since he was a secular man, and since the sacred cubit (25 inches) would make him too tall, represents the great intellectual achievement powers of the leading evolutionists, like Darwin, Wallace, Spencer, Huxley, Haeckel, etc. Considered from the standpoint of intellectual power and practical achievement, Darwin

is considered one of the 25 greatest humans of all times. Goliath's armor types the defensive and aggressive arguments of evolution as very powerful. The helmet of brass types the strong intellectual (head, v. 5) defenses that this theory offered as, such, the head representing the theory itself. The coat of mail (v. 5) of brass (strength) represents evolution's defensive arguments for its vital features, like its arguments for the survival of the fittest, natural selection, etc. Its immense weight of brass (5,000 shekels = 2,500 ozs. avoirdupois = 145 lbs.) represents the immense strength and multiplicity of its arguments in defense of its vital features. The greaves (v. 6) of brass represent the strong arguments that evolution offered for its idea of development, progress. The target of brass between Goliath's shoulders represents evolution's strong defenses against its weaker points (back). His great spear (v. 7) represents evolution's controversial writings as numerous and strong. The spear's head seems to represent Mr. Darwin's two chief works on evolution, *The Origin of Species*, and *The Descent of Man*. The immense weight of his spear's head (600 shekels = 300 ozs. = 18.775 lbs.) represents the great intellectual power manifest in these two books. The shield types the main defenses of evolution; and the one who bore it represents the chief writers and debaters of evolution, those named above, etc. Additionally, as other places show (vs. 45, 51; 1 Sam. 21: 9), Goliath had a sword encased in a sheath, which typed evolution's controversial discourses. The weight of the helmet, greaves, target, spear, staff, shield and sword are not mentioned. Combined they likely outweighed his coat of mail, so that his entire armor likely weighed well over 300 lbs., typing the immense strength of evolution. The numbers given as to his height and the weight of parts of his armor are doubtless significant. The *six* cubits of his height indicate an *evil* use of the typed intellectual

powers and the span here types the limit of alleged perfect human capacity. Hence his height in numbers types that evolution's intellectual powers were used to the utmost limit of its advocates' alleged perfect capacity, and that for evil, *i.e.*, for error. So the involved number of shekels in the weight of Goliath's coat of mail, 5000 (5 X 10 X 10 X 10) shows that the alleged perfections of the three alleged spheres of evolution, the vegetable, brute and human worlds (10 X 10 X 10), while powerfully contended for, were erroneous, as the product of imperfect human ability (5), *i.e.*, evolution's defenses of its vital features in its three spheres were as powerful as imperfect men could make them. The 600 (6 X 10 X 10) shekels weight of the spear-head seems to represent the *evil* (6, here erroneous) use made of the alleged perfection of the two alleged spheres (10 X 10) of Darwinian evolution, brute and human, as Mr. Darwin viewed it in his two above-mentioned books, which limited evolution to animal life in brute and man alone.

(4) Goliath's challenge of any Israelitish champion to duel is recorded in vs. 8-10. We are not to understand that the antitypical challenge was verbal; for speeches in types are usually antityped by acts or attitudes, even as we say that acts and attitudes speak louder than words. Hence we understand that the attitude, propaganda and other activities of evolution's advocates were a challenge to Bible believers to enter into a controversy with it. Evolution as the strongest single infidel theory felt in its advocates that it was unnecessary in the conflict between infidels and Christians for the latter to fight all forms of unbelief (Why are *ye* come out, etc.? v. 8). Even if but one form of infidelity (I, a Philistine) could prevail against the ablest view of Christianity (choose you a man for you), the whole question as to whether Christianity is true or not could be determined (he . . . kill me . . .

your servants . . . I kill him . . . our servants, v. 9). Goliath's defiance (v. 10) types the despiteful attitude and activities that proud and overbearing evolution assumed in its advocates toward Christianity, which called louder and louder for a final debate between Christianity and evolution. The effect of Goliath's challenge on Saul and Israel's warriors is indicated in v. 11—great fear and dismay. Antitypically evolution's challenge had the effect of greatly frightening and dismaying the defenders of Christianity, who, while able, were not very familiar with facts refutative of evolution, their studies not being along the lines of nature to any considerable extent, while those of evolution's chief advocates were certainly very wide and deep therein. Hence the fear of Christian apologists as to evolution's challenge.

(5) In vs. 12-20 Israel's champion is introduced and described. The word David (*beloved*, v. 12) suggests that Bro. Russell was beloved by God (Eldad, *beloved by God*, Num. 11: 26, 27) and the brethren. His fruitfulness as an executive is indicated by the term Ephrathite (*a fruitful one*). His being a Bible student is implied in the word Bethlehem (*house of bread*, which the Bible is). His being among the Truth people is implied in the word Judah, and his being one of God's people is implied in the words "son of Jesse." The eight sons of Jesse represent seven groups and one individual among God's people. In Bible symbols age represents wisdom (Zech. 8: 4). Jesse's being counted for an old man in Saul's days (v. 12) types the fact that in the days of the crown-lost princes God's people were counted wise. The three oldest sons of Jesse (v. 13) correspond to the three groups of the Gospel-Age Levites. The oldest of these, Eliab (*my God is father*), types the Gospel-Age Gershonites, whose work has been to bring people to justification and consecration, and whose chief members have been the clergy. The next, Abinadad

(*my father is noble*), represents the Gospel-Age Merarites, the editors and publishers of Christian literature—Bibles, theological books, magazines and tracts. The third son, Shammah (*wonder*), represents the Gospel-Age Kohathites, the linguistic, interpretational, historical and systematic theologians, as lecturers and authors. The next three sons correspond in the order just given to the three groups of the crown-losers, the future Great Company, Levites, who are here viewed anticipatorily by God, who counts those things which be not as though they were, in view of what they will become (Rom. 4: 17), as in connection with the fifth Harvest sifting antitypical Korah and the 250 antitypical Levites are typed as crown-losers by Levites, *before the Epiphany*, when as such the Great Company is first dealt with as a class. The seventh son of Jesse types the Little Flock, and the eighth, David (v. 14), types that Servant as executive—the ruler over the household. The three eldest sons' following Saul in this war (vs. 13, 14) represents the fact that the three groups of Gospel-Age Levites fought under the crown-lost leaders for the Bible.

(6) In I Sam. 16: 18-23 David's characteristics and his earliest activities in connection with Saul represent Bro. Russell's characteristics from 1872 to 1874 and his activities from 1874 to 1876. In the first set of two years his characteristics connected with his growth (v. 18) in the Truth of the ransom and restitution and his using them to overthrow the doctrines of the trinity, human immortality, consciousness of the dead and eternal torment, were active. In vs. 21-23 his public propaganda activities from Oct., 1874, to April, 1876, especially those connected with his oral and written presentations on The Object and Manner of Our Lord's Return, are typed. I Sam. 17: 15 refers antitypically to the temporary ending of these in 1876 and to his giving his attention to matters pertinent

to the Little Flock, the latter especially from April, 1877, to June, 1881. During that time he sought out and fed the sheep (v. 15) of the Little Flock in Bible matters (Bethlehem), in the work of declaring the Bridegroom's presence (Matt. 25: 6). In David's case the return occurred sometime before his encounter with Goliath, perhaps just after the outbreak of the war with the Philistines. In Bro. Russell's case the return to antitypical Bethlehem set in during the first five-sixths of the year 1876, in his correspondence and later personal study of the chronology with Bro. Barbour. While the conflict with evolution had its first faint beginnings in Oct., 1874, it did not amount to much before the Summer of 1878, and it reached a critical point in the Fall of 1881. Hence it scarcely attracted our Pastor's attention before 1878-1881. The 40 days of v. 16 represent the 40 years of the reaping time, 1874-1914. In the type the fight occurred on the 40th day of Goliath's twofold daily challenge (v. 16). From this we are not to understand that the antitypical fight between Bro. Russell and evolution did not begin until 1914; for some of the early issues of the Watch Tower, which first appeared in July, 1879, contained attacks on evolution, and his main attack on it (*The Bible vs. the Evolution Theory*) occurred in the nineties of the last century. For several reasons the typical fight was set forth as occurring on the 40th day of Goliath's twofold daily challenge. It is presented as occurring on the 40th day so as to type the time of the final blow given by Bro. Russell to evolution. This occurred after the World War broke out, which he used with unanswerable power to prove that man has been deteriorating, not evolving. Then, again, the type of evolution being a man, his killing could not have been stretched out over a period of from 33 to 35 days, as Bro. Russell's refutation of evolution, the antitype of David's killing Goliath, was stretched

out over a period of from 33 to 35 years. Hence the typical fight gives the matter from the standpoint of a finished antitype—the end of the antitypical fight, not from the standpoint of the long-drawn-out antitypical fight. The challenge occurring morning and evening for the 40 days represents that in the Falls and Springs of those 40 years evolution was especially polemical.

(7) The antitypes of vs. 17-19 occurred in 1881. By the ephah of parched corn special articles in the Tower in 1881, printed as tracts and later issued in one Tower, calculated to interest people in the Truth, are typed. The ten loaves of bread represent the same as the ten strings of God's harp, the ten chief doctrines of the Bible, as set forth in the booklet published in 1881 and entitled, *Food For Thinking Christians*. And by the ten cheeses the same ten doctrines, set forth in a deeper way in *Tabernacle Shadows*, are typed. Bro. Russell's course was first to send out the Tower articles, which were really propaganda tracts, to interest Christian (justified [David's three eldest brethren]) people; then later to send them *Food For Thinking Christians*, and then, if their interest moved them to write to him, or if there were special leaders reachable (the captain of their thousand), to send them *Tabernacle Shadows*. Jesse encouraging David to take these three articles of food to his brethren and to the main leader of their thousand types God's people encouraging Bro. Russell to take the three antitypical articles of food to his justified brethren and to special leaders for them and others—to those engaged in the conflict for the Bible against infidel attacks. The charge of Jesse that David inquire for the welfare of his three brothers types the charge that God's people gave to Bro. Russell to interest himself in the welfare of the justified who were fighting for the Bible against infidel attacks. The charge of Jesse (v. 18) that David obtain his three brothers' pledge types the charge of God's people that Bro. Russell

seek to encourage those justified ones who were defenders of the Bible against infidel attacks to consecrate themselves to God as living sacrifices. The time of this charge in the antitype is fixed by the facts of the antitype as setting in in the Spring, Summer and Fall of 1881; for it was in that Fall that the abovementioned three writings were circulated. Moreover, it was in that Spring, Summer and Fall that the intensified fight between Bible believers and defenders and Bible disbelievers and attackers set in. Hence the facts of the antitypes show us the time setting of vs. 17-19. The fight was indeed one in which mighty men (Elah, v. 19) were engaged. We might mention as chief leaders in this fight for the Bible the names of Rupprecht, Koenig, Zahn, Weiss and Moeller of Germany; Robertson, Westcott, Orr, Urquhart and Finn of Britain; and Green, McCosh, Dawson and Cook of America.

(8) It was in Sept., 1881, (early in the morning, v. 20) that Bro. Russell began to circulate the above-mentioned Tower articles as tracts and Food For Thinking Christians. The sheep (v. 20) represent the Truth people. The keeper in whose charge the antitypical David left them (v. 20) while he gave his special attention to the public work consisted of the pilgrims and elders. Bro. Russell's doing what antitypical Jesse told him to do represents his circulating the three above-mentioned pieces of literature far and wide. This activity brought him to the place of the supplies (carriages, the things carried as provisions, v. 20—see margin), into the midst of the host of Bible defenders, and that at the time they were eagerly going forth to fight against the attackers of the Bible (shouted for the battle, v. 20). By 1881 both symbolic armies (v. 21) had drawn themselves up in line of battle against each other: Believers in God against atheists; Bible gnostics (knowers) against agnostics; believers in the world of spirit against materialists;

believers in a personal God against pantheists; theists (those believing that God is separate from, yet working in and with the world) against deists (those who believe that God is separate from the world, since creating it leaves it alone, as a tailor after making and selling a suit concerns himself no more with it); super-humanists against rationalists; believers in the Bible's inspiration against higher critics; special creationists against evolutionists; Biblical scientists against the hosts of infidelistic scientists. Thus were in 1881 the lines of conflict sharply drawn as between believers and unbelievers, and they continued so more or less for years later, even throughout the reaping time. David's leaving his carriage—the things that he carried, *i.e.*, the three above-mentioned articles of food—with the keeper of the army's supplies (v. 22) types Bro. Russell's committing the three pieces of literature abovementioned into the hands of the literature distributors volunteers, colporteurs, other Truth agencies and district messenger boys, who at church doors, as the worshipers left the churches after the Sunday morning services, distributed a large part of the circulated 1, 400,000 copies of *Food For Thinking Christians*. David's running (v. 22) into the army represents Bro. Russell's zeal to be among the defenders of the Bible. Amid these warriors he greeted his justified brethren there in a brotherly, loving manner, as a fellow soldier for the Truth of the Bible, even as David saluted his brethren in the type.

(9) As while David talked with his brothers, Goliath came forth as the champion of the Philistines to challenge any Israelitish warrior to a duel, so while Bro. Russell mingled among the justified and conversed with them, evolution strutted forth to challenge any Christian warrior to single combat. Its attitude and activities as seen in its chief proponents were both boastful and challengesome as before (v. 23). These boastful attitudes and activities in their challengesomeness

attracted Bro. Russell's attention (David heard them, v. 23). As before and for the same reasons, the Christian warriors drew back in fear (v. 24). We are not to understand that the whole Israelitish army fled; rather that those that were near Goliath drew back. The entire army undoubtedly stretched out over a line of several miles. So in the antitype we are not to understand that all Christian apologists fled from the antitypical Philistines; rather that this occurred only in the case of those who stood over against evolution. As the Israelitish warriors discussed Goliath, so Christian warriors discussed evolution: Have you studied and understood evolution (have you seen this man? v. 25)? Surely, it has put in its appearance to defy the defenders of the Bible (to defy Israel, v. 25). Whoever among us can refute evolution (killeth him, v. 25) will certainly obtain a great reward from our chief denominational leaders (the king, v. 25): "riches" of influence, reputation, position and authority our chiefs will give him; special powers (daughter) will be his from our chiefs; and to his brethren will special privileges (his father's house free in Israel, v. 25) among Bible believers be granted by our chiefs.

(10) Bro. Russell was both a humble and a reticent man. He certainly lacked self-push. These facts made him all the more sensitive to the fact that he and his faithful supporters were so unpopular among professed Christians. He felt the condition to be a severe handicap to his and their usefulness; and he naturally thought that if this handicap could be removed, he and they could do more effective work for the Lord among professed Christians. These feelings of his on these matters made him assume an attitude that impressed Bible defenders that he desired to know what reward would be given to one who would meet and defeat evolution and thus take away the reproach from Bible defenders heaped upon them by challengesome evolution. These are the things that antitype David's inquiry

in the first question of v. 26. Bro. Russell's confident attitude that the Truth wielded by him would refute the doctrine of the unconsecrated persons who defiantly championed evolution as against God's warriors (this uncircumcised Philistine, v. 26), is the antitype of David's second question in v. 26. As the people answered David in the same way as they spoke in v. 25, so the response that the Christian warriors gave to Bro. Russell's inquiring attitude (he did not perform the antitype by words, but by his attitude) contained the same thoughts as were given above (v. 25), as the antitype of the people's statement on the rewards that Saul would give to Goliath's conqueror. The discussion so far impresses the attentive hearer as a factual presentation of an antitype that certainly corresponds in detail with the facts of the type.

(11) The facts underlying the antitype of v. 28 are quite convincing that when we suggested that Eliab types the Gospel-Age Gershonites, those who have sought to bring people to justification and consecration, more particularly the clergy, we suggested a true antitype; for certainly the clergy's attitude toward Bro. Russell is truly portrayed in the attitude and words of Eliab, David's oldest brother. The clergy observed Bro. Russell's attitude on infidelity and particularly on evolution, as indicated typically in v. 26 (Eliab . . . heard, v. 28). His very presence among Bible defenders angered the clergy (anger was kindled, v. 28), who thought him more an infidel than a Bible believer and defender. Eliab's first question (Why camest thou down hither? v. 28) implies antitypically that Bro. Russell was, according to the clergy's view, an intruder among Bible defenders, away from whom he should immediately betake himself. His second question (With whom hast thou left those few sheep in the wilderness? v. 28) shows that the clergy despised him, his work and those whom he shepherded. They despised him as a so-called sheep thief, who allegedly stole their best

sheep. They therefore despised his work as that of unlawful proselyting of their sheep; and they despised his brethren as few and inconsequential. These symbolic sheep they recognized as not being in what was actually that great city, Babylon, but in the wilderness —a condition of isolation as to Babylon (Rev. 12: 6; 17: 3). They certainly accused him of pride and wickedness of heart, as Eliab did David (v. 28), and charged him with an evil and unjust curiosity such as would want to see them worsted at the hands of infidels (v. 28).

(12) David's answer (v. 29) was to the point; for he demanded to be told what he had done wrong, a thing that Eliab could not tell. As a patriotic Israelite whose father had sent him on an errand of love he had done nothing wrong in coming to the army. So Bro. Russell had done nothing wrong in appearing among the warriors for the Bible as a Divine Revelation, and the clergy who blamed him for appearing among such could point out no wrong in his so doing, though asked to do so after they had made their false accusation. David's other question (Is there not a cause—reason?) was also to the point; for surely the fact that the strife was one that involved every able-bodied patriotic Israelite justified his coming to the army. Similarly, our Pastor as a real defender of the Bible was justified in appearing among such when the Bible was so fiercely attacked as it was by the infidels. If he, the ablest of all Bible defenders, had no right to be there, who else did? Certainly, his answer silenced the opposing, envious clergy. David's turning from Eliab (v. 30) types our Pastor's turning away from the opposing and envious clergy to more responsive hearers. His attitude (spake) continued to be the same as that typed in v. 26, and the people's answer was the same as that typed in v. 26. David's assurance gave the people the thought that he would fight Goliath; and it became the talk of the camp (v. 31), until finally it reached Saul's ears;

and Saul then sent for David. So, too, Bro. Russell's claims that the Truth which he held from the Bible would overthrow evolution became the talk among Bible defenders, until it reached the ears of antitypical Saul, the crown-lost princes of Christendom's twelve denominations, who were in desperate straits to find a champion to meet antitypical Goliath, and who, accordingly, eagerly sought such a champion and sought to see Bro. Russell when they heard of his attitude on the subject.

(13) We will now rehearse the story that proved to be the antitype of the conversation between David and Saul, and that we heard from our Pastor's lips in one of the many private conversations with which he favored us; for usually when we were alone together we exchanged personal experiences. His story was as follows: He felt himself not able to present the Truth acceptably to the American people and therefore for years sought to find someone whom he considered able so to do. Finally, he decided that the fit person was Dr. Joseph Cook, of Boston, Mass., who was an exceedingly able lecturer and author in defense of the Bible and who was generally recognized as such an oracle on Bible matters as even theological professors looked to him for instruction. After Bro. Russell came to the conclusion that Dr. Cook, who undoubtedly was a part of antitypical Saul, was just the man for the work, the latter came to Pittsburgh to lecture. Armed with copies of *Food For Thinking Christians* and *Tabernacle Shadows*, Bro. Russell called on him, and that at the time when Dr. Cook was seeking to refute evolution and felt the need of help therein. Bro. Russell told him of his own experience, narrating how the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute predestination and reprobation had turned him into an infidel and how after several dreary years of investigating various religions he came back to the Bible and gradually there from drew forth a faith that enabled him to meet the arguments

of infidelity in general and of evolution in particular (v. 32); hence no Bible believer should be afraid of evolution's boasts (Let no man's heart fail because of him, v. 32). Dr. Cook listened to our Pastor's narrative attentively and from his conversation recognized that he was not a learned man as the world regards learned men. Hence he told him that he who was but a beginner in Christian learning could not cope with evolution, which was developed by some of the world's ablest scholars and debaters (v. 33). This led our Pastor to tell him that his views of the Bible had enabled him to refute (slew, vs. 34, 35) the papacy's (lion) doctrines and sectarian Protestant (bear) doctrines and deliver the Lord's people (lamb) from their mouth (mouth-pieces, vs. 34-36), where they had been as prey taken out of God's flock (took a lamb out of the flock, v. 34). His doctrines had enabled him to lay hold on the papacy's teachings (beard) when the papacy arose against him and utterly to refute them (slew him, v. 35).

(14) Not boastfully, but humbly and modestly did our Pastor state these things to the eagerly listening Dr. Cook, who well knew the inconsistencies of both Romanism and Protestantism. He further assured Dr. Cook that if his view of the Bible could overthrow the views of sectarian churchianity, which were elaborated, as a rule, by Spirit-begotten men (the crown-lost princes), and which were therefore by far more subtle than views elaborated by non-new-creatures, how much more could they refute the views of evolution, which were developed by unconsecrated men (this uncircumcised Philistine, v. 36), all the more so since it had in the harvest time dared to defy (v. 36) the defenders of the Bible, whom the Lord Himself was at this time victoriously leading (Ex. 32: 26-28; Josh. 10: 10-14; Is. 28: 21) against the Bible's attackers. Then Bro. Russell assured him (v. 37) that the Lord, who had delivered him victoriously in his battle with sectarian

Romanism and Protestantism, would certainly deliver him victoriously out of the power (hand, v. 37) of evolution (this Philistine). Convinced, Dr. Cook encouraged him to do his best and prayed the Lord's blessing on his effort (v. 37). But Dr. Cook thought Bro. Russell's equipment not sufficient for the encounter with evolution and therefore offered him some of his arguments, as these were contained in his numerous books (Saul armed David with his armor, but, Saul being nearly seven feet tall, it was entirely too large for David, and he therefore dispensed with it, vs. 38, 39). But Bro. Russell, as he studied these, felt them not adaptable to his use, and therefore dispensed with them. So far the story as we got it from Bro. Russell's own lips, and as it is the antitype of vs. 32-39.

(15) Though the rest of the story does not belong to the antitype under study, nevertheless, we will give it here as a matter of record. After the conversation above-outlined occurred, our Pastor offered Dr. Cook the above-mentioned two booklets, with the request that he read them and then give him his thoughts thereon. This Dr. Cook promised to do. Years later he again visited Pittsburgh to lecture; and again Bro. Russell called on him. On coming into Dr. Cook's presence Bro. Russell asked, "Do you remember me, Dr. Cook?" The latter, fastening upon him his large, magnetic eyes, that Bro. Russell declared seemed to look through him, said after a pause, "Oh, yes! You are the man with the New Theology." Then Bro. Russell asked him what he thought of those two booklets. He replied, "They contain some wonderful views, but are too advanced for the acceptance now of the American church people." We can learn several lessons from this story: (1) We often seek to do one thing for the Lord and He works something entirely different through our efforts. (2) The best of us are not qualified to select God's special servants, as such reject God's choice and choose otherwise. In this case, our

Pastor's choice of Dr. Cook was not God's choice for what really proved to be the office of that Servant. God Himself chose Bro. Russell thereto, and he certainly presented the Truth better to the public than even Dr. Cook could have done.

(16) We now return to our special study: David's taking his staff (v. 40) in his hand represents Bro. Russell's taking with power (hand) the Bible as his support in his conflict with evolution. The brook (v. 40) from which David took the five stones represents the Truth, while the five stones represent the following five Bible doctrines: (1) man's creation in perfection as the image and likeness of God; (2) man's fall into sin and ever-increasing degradation; (3) the ransom; (4) the high calling; and (5) restitution. The smoothness of the stones, caused by the water's running for a long time over them, represents the highly developed form that these doctrines took in Bro. Russell's mind as he continually applied the various Bible truths to them. The shepherd's bag (v. 40) represents the pastoral capacity that our Pastor had; and the scrip (v. 40) represents his mind, in which these truths were stored. A sling (v. 40) represents the question and answer method of argumentation. It was this method of argumentation that our Pastor chiefly used in his main writing against evolution, entitled, *The Bible Versus the Evolution Theory*. Having above defined the antitypes of spears and swords, we might here add that archers type those who in conversations use sharp sayings controversially against their opponents. Thus we see the antitypes of the four branches of service in King David's army. The sling being in David's hand (v. 40) represents his full control of the method of controversy by questions and answers. David's drawing near (v. 40) to Goliath represents our Pastor's advancing toward evolution for combat therewith. Evolution, in its writings, propaganda and effects (the Philistine came on and drew near, v. 41),

came closer and closer to Bro. Russell in his work. Especially was this the case through the main writers and lecturers of evolution, who were ever encroaching on the domains of the Truth by their activity (that bare the shield went before him, v. 41).

(17) As Goliath, looking around, espied little David (v. 42) coming against him as an opponent, so evolution in its advocates espied Bro. Russell as advancing against it as an opponent. As Goliath disdained David as an opponent unworthy of his metal, because of his youth and his ruddy and fair countenance, so evolution disdained Bro. Russell as unworthy of its metal, David's youth representing Bro. Russell's lacks in secular training and his mental immaturity, and his ruddy and fair countenance representing Bro. Russell's clearness in the Truth and gentle and kindly manner of controversy, so different from that of the usual controversialist. In Bible symbols a dog (v. 43) represents a sectarian, because as dogs unreasoningly will bark and snarl, snap and bite at anyone doing or attempting to do an injury to their masters, however richly their masters deserve the threats or infliction of stripes, so sectarians unreasoningly spring to the defense of their sect and its leaders, despite their wrongs. Christian sects all appeal to the Bible (misunderstood, of course) in defense of their wrong positions. These considerations will enable us to understand the antitype of Goliath's disdainful question, "Am I a dog, that thou comest to me with staves?" (v. 43), *i.e.*, You may meet with the Bible a Christian sectarian (dog), who claims to believe the Bible; but we evolutionists have progressed (evolved) beyond that mouldy book, now out of date and behind the times. "Do not come to me with the Bible as argument, as though I were a sectarian. You must meet me with arguments based on nature, reason and logic! That is how my chief defenders and exponents Darwin, Wallace, Huxley, Spencer, Haeckel, Crosby, etc., argue, who are so much

superior to you, Mr. Russell, in their use of reason, nature, logic and facts (he cursed [spoke evil to and of] him by his gods [mighty ones, Darwin, etc.]," v. 43). Then evolution, by its exponents, threatened Bro. Russell, if he would enter into combat with it (the Philistine said unto David, etc., v. 44), to leave him as symbolic carrion on the field of battle, *i.e.*, refute him so thoroughly that no one would respect him enough to bury him as a debater (I will give thy flesh, etc., v. 44). The antitypical speech was, of course, pantomimed.

(18) The speech of David, so full of fearlessness of Goliath's armor (thou comest to me with a sword, etc., v. 45), so full of faith in the Lord and the Lord's cause (vs. 45-47) and so full of devotion to the Lord's glory (that all the earth may know, etc.... that all this assembly may know, etc., vs. 46, 47), was antityped in pantomime. In his entering into the preparatory stages of his fight with evolution Bro. Russell feared not its controversial discourses (sword), its controversial writings (spear) and its defensive arguments (shield, v. 45). He had full faith that he stood in the conflict as the Lord's representative (I come to thee in the name of the Lord, v. 45) and as the champion of the living God's army, which evolution had defied (v. 45). Knowing that in the harvest time (this day) the Truth would triumph over all its opponents (Is. 54: 17), he knew, that he would emerge from the battle a victor by God's favor (the Lord will deliver thee into my hand, v. 46) and that he would strike it a stunning blow and take the whole theory (head, v. 46) of evolution out of its hands as his trophy, and would leave the carcass of all infidelity as carrion (to the fowls . . . to the wild beasts, v. 46), unfit for a decent burial. Not to his own praise would he do this, but that the whole human family might know that there is a mighty, yea, an almighty, one, who is on the side of antitypical Israel, and that He might be glorified as a result (a God in Israel, v. 46). Not only so, but both Christians and infidels

(this whole assembly, v. 47) would know that the Lord would not deliver by the ponderous controversial lectures and books (sword and spear, v. 47) of evolution; for this was a battle of the God of Truth against the god of error (Satan); hence the battle unto victory would be the Lord's and He would give the friends of the Bible the infidels as captives (give you into our hands, v. 47).

(19) V. 48 shows how both of the duelists approached one another, the ponderous giant walking rather leisurely and David running eagerly to the fray, toward the Philistine army. So, too, evolution in its ponderous writings and discourses rather leisurely approached our Pastor, who in turn, eager for the fray, hastened toward the army of infidels to meet evolution. David's putting his hand into his bag (v. 49) represents our Pastor powerfully laying hold on the contents of his mind for the purpose at hand. David's taking from the bag a stone represents our Pastor laying hold of the ransom doctrine as the strongest and most fit argument against evolution. David's slinging the stone represents our Pastor using the ransom argument by the question and answer method of debating. David's smiting the Philistine (v. 49) in the forehead represents our Pastor striking evolution with the ransom argument in the very crucial part of its theory, Goliath's head representing the theory itself and is forehead the main feature of the theory, *i.e.*, that the first man was but one step removed from a monkey. In the booklet, *The Bible Versus the Evolution Theory*, by questions and answers Bro. Russell used the ransom argument as follows: Divine Justice, which required an exact corresponding price for a debt, on the principle of "a life for a life, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a hand for a hand, a foot for a foot" (Deut. 19: 21), hence a perfect life for a perfect life, required the perfect body, life, right to life and life-rights of Jesus for the debt of the first man. Hence the first man could

not have been but a step above a monkey, but must have had a perfect human body, life, right to life and life-rights, else God's Justice would have unjustly exacted much more than an exact equivalent of the first man. But God's Justice never acts unjustly. Hence the first man must have been perfect in body, life, right to life and life-rights, since God justly required for him as a corresponding price the perfect human body, life, right to life and life-rights of Jesus.

(20) This argument struck evolution in its forehead—the main feature of its theory, man's descent from a monkey. As the blow of David's stone was so forceful as to sink into Goliath's forehead, thus irreparably injuring it, so Bro. Russell's question and answer method of argument on the ransom as against evolution struck its main feature so forceful a blow as irreparably to have wounded and consequently killed it. And as David's blow stunned and then killed Goliath so that he fell face forward upon the earth unconscious, so Bro. Russell's blow with the ransom, argument stunned and refuted evolution into unconsciousness whereby it fell disgraced (face forward and down) to the earth in utter defeat. V. 50 sums up the statements of v. 49 by way of emphasis through repetition, adding the statement that by the sling and stone David slew Goliath. Hence special emphasis should be laid on the manner—the question and answer method of argumentation—by which Bro. Russell defeated in complete refutation (slew, v. 50) evolution. The things that David did afterward (v. 51) were indignities added to the slaying and heaped upon a boastful but fallen foe deservedly. The statement (v. 50) that there was no sword in David's hand types the fact that Bro. Russell's utter refutation of evolution was not by a controversial discourse. It was by the question and answer method of reasoning. David's running and standing upon Goliath (v. 51) represents Bro. Russell's speedy and further triumph over evolution; for in ancient times one's

triumphing over a foe was symbolized by his tramping upon him, even as the Church's victory over its four institutional foes—the papacy (the lion), the Satan system (the adder), the Federation of Churches (the young lion) and the civil power (the dragon)—is described in Ps. 91: 13 as a treading upon, a trampling under feet. See also Gen. 3: 15 and Rom. 16: 20 (margin). He did this standing upon refuted evolution by his use against it of the other four doctrines mentioned above as the other four symbolic stones (truths).

(21) He used the first of these—man's creation in perfection as God's image and likeness—against evolution as follows: If man was created in God's image perfect, man must then have been in a higher state than his present one. Hence the first man was not but one step removed from a monkey, nor has man since the first man been evolving—progressing in gradual development—for he is now far removed from perfection physical, mental, moral and religious. He used the second of these five doctrines—man's fall into sin and degradation physical, mental, moral and religious—as follows: If the first man was one step removed from a monkey, and if he has been developing upward ever since, there could have been no fall into sin nor increasing degradation physical, mental, moral and religious. But human history is replete with evidences of man's increasing degradation. He used the fourth of the five involved doctrines—the high calling—against evolution as follows: The only exception to the rule of mankind's progressive degradation is the experience of the saints who overcome by God's grace the corruption (degradation) that is upon the world through lust (2 Pet. 1: 4). These, at the sacrifice—not evolution—of their humanity, are undergoing a development toward perfection mental, moral and religious, not, however, in the sense of evolution's survival of the fittest and natural selection, but by the operation of spiritual laws, to which God's grace enables saints to render obedience, which, of course, also is refutative of

evolution And, finally, he used the fifth—restitution—of the five above-mentioned truths (the five symbolic stones) against evolution as follows: The Bible holds out restitution as man's glorious hope for the future. If the original man was but one step removed from a monkey restitution would be, instead of a great favor, one of the greatest possible curses and evils for man; for it would make him become but one step removed from a monkey, if evolution on man's original state were true. But the Bible holds out restitution as the greatest possible blessing for mankind. Hence evolution must be false. Thus by the use of these four of the five involved doctrines Bro. Russell stood upon evolution in triumph.

(22) Goliath's sword types evolution's discourses in which it stressed its main arguments for man's supposed development. These were evidences of progress in knowledge, invention, works of mercy and utility, discovery, means of communication, etc., that marked the nineteenth century above all preceding ones. To these evolution pointed in its lectures (sword) as the most positive proof that mankind was evolving physically, mentally, morally and religiously. These very arguments Bro. Russell turned against evolution and thus took its theory away from it with its own discourse points (cut off Goliath's head with his own sword, v. 51). He showed that these inventions, etc., were not due to man's evolving, but to superhuman causes—Millennial fore gleams whereby God was preparing to overthrow Satan's empire and establish God's kingdom. He pointed out that these things proved, not an increase of man's capacity, but an increase of the use of diminished capacities and an increase of opportunity, that only a few of the race were great inventors, thinkers, reformers, etc., and that these did not impart such qualities to their offspring, as the history of great inventors, reformers and thinkers proves. If evolution were true, the offspring of Darwin, Wallace, Huxley, Spencer, Haeckel, Shakespeare, Milton, Luther, Lincoln,

etc., should have excelled them, which certainly is not the case; for the offspring of geniuses are almost invariably mediocre in caliber. He used the facts that, apart from the superhuman causes for the progress since 1799, when the day of the Lord's preparation set in, the accomplishments of the preceding centuries in architecture, poetry, prose, painting, sculpture, eloquence and inductive and deductive reasoning were superior to any examples of which the 19th and 20th centuries could boast. Thus with evolution's own main lecture arguments Bro. Russell cut off its head—took its theory away from it by its own points.

(23) As in the case of David's victory (v. 51) the Philistine host was disheartened and fled and the typical Israelites and Judahites were encouraged and pursued the fleeing Philistines, so all branches of infidelity, when they recognized that the champion of infidelity was overthrown by Bro. Russell, became disheartened and retreated from the field of debate, while the antitypical Israelites (defenders of the Bible outside the Truth) and the antitypical Judahites (defenders of the Bible in the Truth) were greatly encouraged and pursued in debate the retreating hosts of infidelity. In these debates the warriors for the Bible took the aggressive (shouted, etc.), crushed the infidel arguments and put their supporters to flight

(v.52). Ekron means *extinction* and Gath means *winepress*. Shaaraim means *two gates*. The pursuit was northward as far as Ekron, eastward as far as Gath and southward as far as Shaaraim. The thought in the antitype seems to be that the pursuit was to some unto extinction of their arguments (Ekron), to others to a crushing to their arguments (Gath, *winepress*, where grapes are crushed) and to still others to a double overthrow of their arguments (Shaaraim, *two gates*). The antitypical pursuit was manifest in the production of an immense number of anti-infidel books, lectures, debates, sermons and conversations. The fourteen above-mentioned authors—five from Germany, five from England

and four from America—are only a few of the outstanding pursuers of the hosts of infidels who were certainly either utterly defeated or crushed or doubly overthrown in the ensuing controversy. Certainly, as the second sifting shows, infidelity received an irremedial defeat at the hands of Christian apologists. Not only so, but all their points were taken away from them and turned on them in this fight, as the books and lectures on the pertinent subjects show (the children of Israel . . . spoiled their tents, v. 53). We are not to understand that David immediately took Goliath's head (v. 54) to Jerusalem; for it was not taken from the Jebusites until many years later. Rather we are to understand that he kept Goliath's head, perhaps embalmed or reduced to a bare set of bones until after Jerusalem was taken, when he deposited it there, perhaps with some other trophies of his numerous victories. Antitypically, Bro. Russell kept the theory of evolution in his power and deposited it among his trophies in his sphere of rulership. David's keeping Goliath's armor in his tent seems to represent that Bro. Russell kept the defensive and offensive weapons of evolution among his debating equipment for refutative uses from time to time. Let us remember that such refutative uses lasted until after the outbreak of the World War in 1914.

(24) The story of David and Goliath, so far as the chapter under study is concerned, ends with a triumphant presentation of Israel's champion to Israel's king by the commander-in-chief of Israel's army, Abner (*father of light*). Abner seems to represent the polemical theological professors, who certainly have been the controversial leaders of the Bible's defenders. The fourteen whom we mentioned before were such. Saul's question to Abner (v. 55), Whose son is this youth? types the inquiry of certain of the crown-lost princes, among them Dr. Cook, as to from what theological university Bro. Russell was a graduate. Abner's answer (v. 55) types the solemn assurance that the polemical

theological professors gave of the fact that none of them knew from what theological university he graduated, which implies that he was not such a graduate, though in the type so far studied this thought was not yet given. Saul's request that Abner should find out whose son the young champion was (v. 56) types the fact that the crown-lost princes desired, and therefore requested of the polemical theological professors, to find out from which theological university Bro. Russell was a graduate. David's returning from the slaughter of Goliath (v. 57) types Bro. Russell's return from the battle with evolution. While he was so doing the theological professors took him, not personally, but representatively, *i.e.*, as he was found in his writings, to the crown-lost princes, even as Abner took David to and before Saul (v. 57). The scene at the meeting of David and Saul was a memorable one. There stood the giant Saul, who was about seven feet tall, while David appears to have been only of an average height, five feet nine inches, perhaps. There stood little David looking up with greatly upturned head into Saul's inquiring and wondering eyes. And in David's hand, dangling by its hair, was the enormous head of Goliath, a most impressive though gruesome trophy of bravery and victory. In the antitype we are not to understand that there was a personal meeting between the crown-lost princes and Bro. Russell, mediated by the polemical theological professors. Rather, the last brought Bro. Russell's pertinent writings to the crown lost princes' attention and these from them recognized that the theory of evolution (Goliath's head) was in Bro. Russell's power.

(25) As Saul asked David, Whose son art thou? (v. 58), so the crown-lost princes asked Bro. Russell in his writings this question. As they studied his pertinent writings, especially his Bible versus the Evolution Theory, they got from them the thought antitypical of David's answer to Saul's question—I am the son of thy servant Jesse the Bethlehemite, *i.e.*, from his writings they got the answer that he was the graduate of

no theological school, but was a member of God's people, and that an undenominational Bible student—a Bethlehemite—a Bibleite; for in the School of Christ, in which the Bible is the book of texts, he found the Bible and the Bible alone to be the source and rule of doctrine, practice and organization for God's faithful people. What a fitting close in its humility and force to both the type and the antitype the answers of God's Beloved were!

(1) How many functions were there in the office of that Servant? What proves each of these? As what does David not represent that Servant? What exception is there to this rule? Why? In what event is there such a mingling? What proves this? Whom do the Philistines represent in general? What will determine the kind of sectarians meant? What kind of sectarians do they represent in 1 Sam. 17? What are the chief sects among infidels? What kind of sectarians do the Philistines represent elsewhere? For example whom?

(2) What do the men of Judah represent in 1 Sam. 17? The men of Israel? Saul? This war between Israel and the Philistines? What does Shochoh of Judah mean and type? Azekah? The battle line from Shochoh to Azekah? Ephes-dammim? Saul's and the men of Israel's being gathered together in the valley of Elah? The Philistines arrayed on one mountain? The Israelites on the other? The valley between? Summed up, what does v. 3 teach antitypically?

(3) What do the words Goliath and Gath mean? What did Goliath stand forth as, and represent? According to the secular cubit what was his height? Why does the secular and not the sacred cubit here apply? What is represented by his great height? How does Mr. Darwin rank among the world's great men? What does Goliath's armor represent? His helmet? His coat of mail? Its weight? Its greaves? His target? His spear? His spear's head? Its weight? His shield? The one who bore it? His sword? What likely outweighed his coat of mail? What was the probable weight of his whole armor? What did its weight type? What is typed by the numbers in Goliath's height? By the numbers in the weight of his coat of mail and his spear-head?

(4) What is the subject of vs. 8-10? How was the antitypical challenge not given? Why not? How was it given? How did evolution in its advocates feel, and not feel, as to the necessary extent of the pertinent discussion? Why so? What does Goliath's challenge type? What was the effect, type and antitype, of the challenge? Why did it have this effect in the antitype?

(5) What is the subject of vs. 12-20? What does the word *David* mean? What is typed by its meaning? What do the words Ephrathite, Bethlehem and Judah mean? What is typed by the meaning of Ephrathite? Of Bethlehem? Of Judah? What is implied antitypically by David's being a son of Jesse? In general, what is typed by the eight sons of Jesse? What does age represent in Bible figures? How does Zech. 8: 4 prove this? What is typed by Jesse being counted an old man in Saul's days? Whom do the three oldest sons of Jesse, generally speaking, type? What does the word Eliab mean? Whom does he type? What does the word Abinadab mean? Whom does he type? What does the word Shammah mean? Whom does he type? To whom do the fourth, fifth and sixth sons correspond? How do we get this thought as to the pre-Epiphanian crown-losers, despite the fact that there was no Great Company as such before the Epiphany? Whom does the seventh son of Jesse type? The eighth? What is typed by the three eldest following Saul?

(6) What is taught and then typed in 1 Sam. 16: 18-23? What is typed in v. 18 marked Bro. Russell from 1872 to 1874? What is typed in vs. 21-23 marked him from 1874 to 1876? To what does 1 Sam. 17: 15 antitypically refer? To what time especially? What did he then especially do? In David's case when did his return to Bethlehem occur? In Bro. Russell's case when did the return to antitypical Bethlehem occur? How was the progress of evolution's aggressiveness marked chronologically? When did it first attract our Pastor's attention? What do the 40 days of v. 16 type? On what day did the typical fight occur? How is this not to be understood antitypically? Why not? For what reasons is the typical fight referred to as occurring on the 40th day? How does the type, accordingly, present the picture? What is typed by the challenge being given morning and evening during the 40 days?

(7) When did the antitype of vs. 17-19 occur? What

is typed by the ephah of parched corn? By the ten loaves? By the ten cheeses? What was Bro. Russell's course as to these three pieces of literature? What is typed by Jesse encouraging David to take the food to his brethren? By his charging David to inquire for his brothers' welfare? By his charging David to take their pledge? What fixes the time of the antitypical charge? When was it? Why then? What other fact fixes this time? When, accordingly, did the antitype of vs. 17-19 set in? What kind of persons engaged in this fight? Name five of these in Germany, five of these in Britain and four of these in America.

(8) When did Bro. Russell in antitype of v. 20 begin to circulate the special Tower articles as tracts and Food For Thinking Christians? What are typed by the sheep of v. 20? The keeper of v. 20? David's doing what Jesse charged him to do? To what did this activity bring him? At what juncture? What had the two opposing hosts done by 1881? How did the separate divisions of the two armies face each other? In what did this result? How long? What is meant by David's carriage? What is typed by his leaving it with the keeper of the carriage? What did these do with it? What is represented by David's running into the army? By his greeting his brethren there?

(9) What is typed by Goliath's coming forth while David talked with his brothers? What was the character of evolution's attitude and activities? What is typed by David's hearing Goliath's challenge? What effect did this challenge have, type and antitype? How are the type and antitype not, and how are they to be understood? Why? What is typed by the Israelitish soldiers discussing Goliath? What was the contents of the discussion in type and antitype? What did they say, type and antitype, as to the reward of Goliath's slayer?

(10) What, among others, were two of Bro. Russell's qualities? What resulted therefrom? How did he regard the resultant condition? What did this lead him to think? What attitude did these feelings lead him to assume? How did that attitude impress Bible defenders? Of what are these considerations the antitype? What is the antitype of David's second question in v. 26? How comparatively did the people answer David? What is the antitype of this? How does the preceding discussion impress us?

(11) What is the character of the facts underlying the

suggested antitype of Eliab? Why so? What is typed by Eliab's hearing David's questions? How did Bro. Russell's presence among Bible defenders impress the clergy? Why? What is antitypically implied in Eliab's first question? In his second question? Why, among other reasons, did the clergy despise Bro. Russell? As what did they despise the symbolic sheep? What is the antitypical significance of the wilderness here? Of what did the clergy accuse Bro. Russell? How did they regard his purpose as to the battle?

(12) Why was David's answer to the point? Why had he done no wrong in coming to the army? What are the antitypes of these points? What was David's other question? Why was it to the point? What is the antitype of these things? What justified Bro. Russell's presence to the army? And that comparatively? What did the typical and antitypical answers do to the accuser? What is typed by David's turning away from Eliab to another? How did his attitude continue? And the people's answer? What thought did David's assurance give the people? What resulted therefrom? What is the antitype of these things? What was the condition of the typical and antitypical Saul? What resulted therefrom?

(13) What will here be related as the antitype of the conversation between David and Saul? From whom and under what circumstances did the writer hear this bit of history? What did these two brothers often tell each other in private? According to the story, what did Bro. Russell seek? On whom did he finally decide as the fitting person? Why? Of whom was Dr. Cook doubtless a part? After Bro. Russell decided on him, where did the latter go to lecture? With what did Bro. Russell call upon him? What was Dr. Cook then seeking? What experiences did Bro. Russell tell Dr. Cook? How did Bro. Russell (unconsciously) fulfill the antitype of v. 32? How did Dr. Cook listen to Bro. Russell's narrative? What conclusion did he draw therefrom? What did this lead him to remark? How did this antitype Saul's remarks of v. 33? What did this lead our Pastor to say? How did his answer antitype vs. 34-36?

(14) How did not and how did our Pastor tell these things? How was he heard by Dr. Cook? What other assurance did he give Dr. Cook? How did this antitype the statements of v. 36? Why so? What facts gave Bro.

Russell all the more assurance on this head? How do Ex. 32: 26-28; Josh. 10: 10-14 and Is. 28: 21 prove the fact that the harvest time was the time of the Lord's presence to overthrow all error? What assurance in antitype of v. 37 did Bro. Russell further give Dr. Cook? What is the antitype of Saul's charge and wish in v. 37? What is the antitype of Saul's arming David with his own armor? Of David's putting it off as unsuited to him?

(15) Though not a part of the antitype, why are the rest of the dealings of Bro. Russell and Dr. Cook with each other here given? What did Bro. Russell give Dr. Cook after the conversation above outlined as the antitype of vs. 32-39? With what request? What did Dr. Cook promise to do? What did he do years later? What did Bro. Russell again do to him? What did Bro. Russell ask him on their meeting again? How did Bro. Russell describe Dr. Cook's eyes? What did Dr. Cook then do and say? What did Bro. Russell ask him? What was Dr. Cook's reply? What is the first lesson that we can learn from this bit of history? The second? How is this second lesson shown in this experience? Whose choice was vindicated by the outcome?

(16) What is typed by David's taking his staff in his hand? What is typed by the brook of v. 40? What does each of the five stones that David selected represent? What does their smoothness represent? The shepherd's bag? The scrip? What does a sling represent in Bible symbols? In what did our Pastor chiefly use this method of debating? What do archers type? What are, therefore, the typical significances of the weapons of the four branches of David's army? What is typed by the sling being in David's hand? By David's drawing near Goliath? What is typed in v. 41 by Goliath's coming ever closer to David? How was this especially done?

(17) What is typed by Goliath's espying little David coming to fight him? By Goliath's disdaining David for his youth and his ruddy and fair countenance? What do dogs signify in Bible symbols? Why? To what do all professed Christian sects appeal as authority for their views? What will these considerations help us to understand in Goliath's question, Am I a dog, etc.? In the light of the foregoing, what does his question imply as to his opinion

of the Bible? What is typed by Goliath's cursing David by his gods? What threat did evolution make in antitype of Goliath's threat to David? How was the speech of Goliath antityped?

(18) What three qualities filled David's answer? How in general were they antityped? How in particular did each of these three qualities show itself in antitype?

(19) What does v. 48 show, type and antitype? What is typed by David's putting his hand into his bag? By his taking therefrom a stone? By David's smiting Goliath in the forehead as distinct from the other part of his head? How does Bro. Russell use the ransom argument in the booklet, *The Bible Versus the Evolution Theory*?

(20) What did this argument do to evolution? What is typed by David's stone sinking into Goliath's forehead? By its stunning and killing him? By his falling on his face to the earth? Why does v. 50 sum up the thoughts of v. 49? What does it add to the statements of v. 49? What does this imply as to the antitype? What is the nature of David's acts given in v. 51? What is typed by the statement of v. 50, that there was no sword in David's hand, but that he slew Goliath by a sling and a stone? What is typed by David's running and standing upon Goliath? What was the ancient way of symbolizing a victory over a foe? What four institutional foes of the Church are symbolized in Ps. 91: 13? What do these symbols severally represent? By what language is the Church's victory over these symbolized? How do Gen. 3: 15 and Rom. 16: 20 show this thought as to the victory over Satan? What do these passages help us to see as to the type of David's standing on Goliath? How did Bro. Russell do this symbolic standing on evolution?

(21) What is the first of these doctrines? How did he use it against evolution? What was the second of these? How did he use it against evolution? What was the fourth of these? How did he use it against evolution? What was the fifth of these? How did he use it against evolution? What did his so using these four doctrines enable him to do?

(22) What does Goliath's sword represent? What kind of an argument of evolution did its antitype give? Of what did this argument consist? What did evolution claim for these facts? What is the antitype of David's cutting

off Goliath's head with his own sword? How did Bro. Russell use the involved facts against evolution? What did he claim that they proved of man's capacity? Were there many great inventors, thinkers and reformers? What did these not do with their qualities as to their offspring? What effect did this have on the theory of evolution? What did he show as to former centuries' achievements, compared with those of the 19th and 20th centuries? In what did his use of these points result?

(23) What is the antitype of the dismay and flight of the Philistines at Goliath's death, and the encouragement and pursuit of the Israelites and Judahites? What, as a result, did the antitypical Israelites and Judahites do to the hosts of infidelity? What do the words Ekron, Shaaraim and Gath mean? What is typed by the discomfiture of the Philistines unto these three places? Wherein was the antitypical pursuit manifested? How did the fourteen men mentioned above compare with other antitypical Israelitish pursuers? What was the effect on the infidel hosts? What does the second sifting show on this point? What is the antitype of the Israelites' returning and spoiling the Philistines' tents? What are we not to understand as to David's taking Goliath's head to Jerusalem? Why not? What is the antitype of this? What is typed by David's keeping Goliath's armor in his tent? How long were such uses employed?

(24) With what episode does the story of David and Goliath end? What does the word *Abner* mean? Whom does he type? Who are examples of Abner? What is typed by Saul's question, Whose son is this youth? What is typed by Abner's answer? What is typed by Saul's charge that Abner inquire as to whose son David was? What is typed by David's returning from the slaughter of Goliath? How did the theological professors not introduce Bro. Russell to the crown-lost princes? How did they do so? Describe the scene of David before Saul. What is the antitype of these things?

(25) What is typed by Saul's asking David, Whose son art thou? How did antitypical Saul get the answer? What is typed by the answer, the son of Jesse? The Bethlehemite? What may be said of the typical and the antitypical David's answer?

I will sing the son of Jesse,
Whom the prophet's voice did call,
Not by haughty-hearted bearing,
Lofty looks and stature tall;

But by eyes of arrowy brightness,
And by locks of golden hue,
And by limbs of agile lightness,
Fair and comely to the view;

And by earnest demeanor,
And by heart that knew no fear,
And a quick-discerning spirit
When a danger might be near.

And he used them when the giant
Philistine of haughty Gath,
With a boastful, proud defiance,
Mailed and insolent, crossed his path.

Quailed the armies of the people,
Quailed King Saul upon his throne,
Quailed the marshalled heads of battle;
Strength in David lived alone.

And he took nor spear nor harness;
But with calm, composed look,
In his hand he took a sling,
Five smooth pebbles from the brook;

And he prayed the God of battles,
And amid the host alone
Prostrate laid the boastful champion
With a sling and with a stone.

Now his road was paved to greatness
On the right hand of the throne
High he sat beside his monarch
A warrior all alone.

CHAPTER X.
DAVID'S FIRST OPPOSITIONS FROM SAUL—
TYPE AND ANTITYPE.
1 Sam. 18—20.

THE CAUSE. THE FIRST FORMS. JONATHAN INTERCEDES FOR DAVID. FURTHER INJURIES. DAVID ESCAPES. FOUR FURTHER ATTEMPTED INJURIES. DAVID AND JONATHAN'S PERTINENT INTERVIEW. THEIR PARTING.

SO FAR we have studied David, type and antitype, as set forth in 1 Sam. 16 and 17; and herein we propose to study 1 Sam. 18, 19 and 20, praying the Lord to bless the study to all of us. Chap. 18 begins with a description of events following David's conversation with Saul after his slaying Goliath. We saw that the antitypical conversation was carried on by our Pastor's speaking through his pertinent writings and on antitypical Saul's part by their studying those writings. The main, but not exclusive, representative of antitypical Saul in this matter was Dr. Joseph Cook, who read pertinent writings of our Pastor before, during and after his world tour from Sept., 1880, to Dec., 1882. Dr. Joseph Seiss was another member of antitypical Saul who acted in certain features of the antitype of 1 Sam. 17. Besides these there were other members of antitypical Saul more or less active in the antitype of matters set forth in that chapter. These same brethren continued to act as antitypical Saul in chapters 18, 19 and 20, with Dr. Cook acting as the chief representative of antitypical Saul. The close connection between the end of chap. 17 and the beginning of chap. 18 would suggest this, even as the antitypical facts themselves prove it. So close is this connection that in the Hebrew 1 Sam. 17: 55—18: 5 together forms a paragraph, a thing that our chapter division here obscures in the A.V. The more thoroughly consecrated and Truth-loving of the crown-losers (Jonathan, *Jehovah gave*, v. 1) gave our Pastor (David)

especial appreciation and love for his refutation of evolution (soul of Jonathan . . . loved him). The crown-lost princes, not desiring to lose from their service so able a warrior against infidelity as our Pastor was, numbered him among their supporters in the pertinent warfare (Saul took him), desiring him no more to go back to the Truth people to serve, but to give his service in their warfare against infidelity (would let him go no more home to his father's house). Antitypical Jonathan and David became especially bound to each other in the best of bonds (made a covenant, v. 3). The former, recognizing the latter's superiority, gladly and fully subordinated themselves (stripped himself of his robe, v. 4) to antitypical David in their equipment (garments, *i.e.*, armor), discourses (sword), creed (bow) and service (girdle).

(2) Against every form of infidelity that the crown-lost princes desired him to oppose Bro. Russell fought (David went . . . Saul sent him, v. 5) and was victorious (prospered, see margin), as can be seen in pertinent Tower articles from the outstart onward. This made the crown-lost princes esteem him as an anti-infidelity warrior above all others of their warriors (Saul set [esteemed] him over [above] the [other] men of war). His pertinent course was pleasing to church members and fellow-warriors (accepted . . . people and . . . Saul's servants). Each time his writings against evolution added to his refutations of it, he was hailed with the acclamations of church members (when David was returning from the slaughter of the Philistine . . . women . . . of all cities of Israel, v. 6), heralding the victory (singing) and acting concordantly (dancing) with testimonies in their gatherings (tabrets [timbrels]) and conversations (three-stringed instruments, see margin). They acclaimed Bro. Russell in this matter as abler than the crown-lost princes (Saul . . . thousands; and David his ten thousands, v. 7). This was too much for the double-minded crown-lost

leaders to endure, since they had always been regarded as highest in ability and achievement in nominal-church circles; hence in envy they resented this esteem and praise for Bro. Russell (Saul was very wroth and . . . displeased . . . ascribed unto David ten thousands . . . me . . . thousands, v. 8). Their love for honor made them think that only in office were they being esteemed above Bro. Russell (can he have more but the kingdom?). Henceforth with envious eyes they regarded him (Saul eyed David from that day and forward, v. 9). Their envy, producing dejection (evil spirit . . . upon Saul, v. 10) on the next occasion (morrow), was with them even while they preached in the nominal church (prophesied in . . . the house). Bro. Russell sought to soothe them as formerly he had done to them, particularly Dr. Seiss, as shown in Chapter VIII (David played . . . as at other times); and he sought to do this through Tower articles and tracts on restitution for the non-elect in the Millennium. Against this they had articles (javelin) ready to publish against him (in Saul's hand).

(3) While several of the crown-lost leaders took part in the attack (Saul cast the javelin, v. 11), the chief actor therein was Dr. Cook, who will here be used as a representative of all of them, and who sought to refute Bro. Russell, without naming him, by whipping him over the back of Prof. Dorner, of the Berlin University. The latter in nominal-church circles was then a much more widely known man than was Bro. Russell, and was then advocating probation for the non-elect in an alleged intermediate state, *i.e.*, between death and the awakening of the dead. His back, as that of the most eminent intermediate-state-probation advocate, Dr. Cook selected as the one over which he would administer a beating to Bro. Russell. And in this act he performed his part in antitypical Saul's casting the antitypical javelin at antitypical David. This antitypical javelin is the prelude to the first

lecture of Dr. Cook's book entitled, Occident. In that prelude of 18 pages he made a savage attack on future probation as taught by Prof. Dorner. Dr. Cook thought that this attack would refute all advocates of future probation, thus also would prevail over Bro. Russell (I will smite David, even to the wall). But Bro. Russell foiled Dr. Cook's purpose by two turns of argument: (1) by proving that the intermediate state is one of unconsciousness, and that hence there could be no probation there; and (2) by proving that the Millennium will be the time for probation for the non-elect dead and living (David twice turned around from out of his presence, I. V.; see Dr. Young, also). Such an answer nonplussed Dr. Cook and his co-warriors; for it proved that his argument, so far as Bro. Russell's position was concerned, was a straw man. This caused him to fear our Pastor (Saul was afraid of David, v. 12), whose answers troubled him, and proved that Jehovah was with Bro. Russell, and had forsaken him (the Lord was with him, and was departed from Saul). This mental attitude in antitypical Saul moved them to withdraw their use of, and favor from, antitypical David, and made them seek to limit his activities to Truth people (Saul removed . . . and set him by himself leader of a thousand, v. 13, I. V.). Nevertheless, as the leader of such, Bro. Russell freely mingled with the public (went out and came in before the people), and prospered in all his undertakings (David prospered [see margin] in all his ways, v. 14) under the favor of the Lord (the Lord was with him). Observing this, the crown-lost princes increasingly feared him (v. 15). But both the nominal and the real people of God (Israel and Judah, v. 16) thought highly of him for his works (because . . . before them).

(4) Noting Bro. Russell's popularity, certain of the crown-lost princes sought to bring about his ruin at the hands of infidelity, and thus they would be spared the pains of undoing him (Let not mine . . . but the

hand of the Philistines be upon him, v. 17). They hoped that Bro. Russell would become involved in a controversy with infidels who would overpower him, and thus ruin him as a religious controversialist. Therefore, they proposed to give Bro. Russell one of their powers (my elder daughter, Merab [*increase*]), the power of holding public meetings under the support of all Protestant churches in various towns and cities as interdenominational evangelists do, on condition that he use such opportunities to fight infidelity, not, of course, to spread the harvest Truth, which by now these leaders were increasingly opposing. Thus in this limited sphere they were willing to offer him a measure of support and sanction (be thou valiant for me, and fight the Lord's battles). In this they acted as many a nominal-church preacher did during the reaping time when they expressed the desire that various brethren remain in, and help the churches, believing as they wished, only keeping the harvest Truth to themselves; but these leaders hoped that Bro. Russell would become overmatched therein. On receiving the offer Bro. Russell's humility asserted itself (who am I . . . that I . . . son-in-law to the king? v. 18), asserting that in person, powers and standing he was unequal to the office proposed. But the crown-lost princes begrudged him even this office so limited, and gave it to evangelists, like Moody, Whipple, Jones, Small, Torrey, and later, Sunday, Biederwolf, Gray, etc. (she was given unto Adriel [*flock of God*], the Meholathite [*dancer*], v. 19), who danced as the crown-lost princes piped. Antitypical Saul had another office power (Michal [*brook*], v. 20), that of addressing the membership of individual churches. This power was more inclined to suitableness for Bro. Russell (loved David), both because of his then development and the inclination of separate congregations, which welcomed him as a speaker in their midst. These made known to antitypical Saul their pertinent preference (they told

Saul), and they were willing to lend their support and sanction to it, on a condition and for a purpose similar to the former one (pleased him . . . will give him her . . . be a snare . . . the Philistines . . . against him . . . Saul said . . . thou . . . my son-in-law by the second, v. 21, I. V.). Then the crown-lost princes suggested to various pastors and principals of the flocks to encourage Bro. Russell to accept such a power and office (Saul commanded his servants, Commune with David . . . be the king's son-in-law, v. 22). As instructed, these pastors and principals of the flocks encouraged Bro. Russell to accept such powers (Saul's servants spake these words in the ears of David, v. 23), who again in humility hesitated to accept it (Seemeth it to you a light thing. . . I am a poor man, and lightly esteemed). This quality he always showed.

(5) These messengers reported to the crown-lost princes what and how Bro. Russell replied (v. 24). The crown-lost princes told these messengers to assure Bro. Russell that they desired not a human reward, but would instead be satisfied with the refutation of the infidelistic, *i.e.*, unconsecrated [uncircumcised] universalists, whom they regarded as nothing less than infidels (the king desireth not any dowry, but an hundred foreskins of the Philistines, v. 25). Having great difficulty in coping with such, the pertinent crown-lost princes felt sure and desired that such would refute Bro. Russell (Saul thought to make David fall by . . . Philistines). The messengers told Bro. Russell of this proposal (servants told David these words, v. 26). He accepted it (pleased David . . . the king's son-in-law). Therefore, before the time of exercising the office came (the days were not expired) Bro. Russell with his cooperating warriors among the Truth people (he and his men, v. 27) entered into a controversy with Mr. Paton and his co-warriors, who were no-ransomers (one hundred of the antitypical Philistines) and universalists (the second hundred of the antitypical Philistines)

and completely refuted them (slew of the Philistines two hundred men) and through their refuted unholy [uncircumcised] theories (foreskins) gave evidence that he had refuted the holders of both classes of infidels (gave them in full tale [count] to the king), thus claiming the right to exercise the office of a lecturer in local churches among the denominations (that he might be the king's son-in-law). The crown-lost princes then allowed and sanctioned his use of such power (Saul gave him Michal, his daughter, to wife). This victory of Bro. Russell's over the infidelistic sifters among Truth people all the more impressed the crown-lost leaders with the fact that the Lord favored Bro. Russell (Saul saw and knew that the Lord was with David, v. 28) and that the power of addressing various nominal-church congregations was very favorable to Bro. Russell (Michal . . . loved him). These facts, instead of pleasing the crown-lost princes in various of their members, aroused them to still more and lasting fear and suspicion of, and enmity toward Bro. Russell (Saul . . . more afraid . . . enemy continually, v. 29). It was in the third hour of the Harvest, June, 1881 to Oct., 1884, that the infidelism sifting was especially active in the Sanctuary, the Court and the City, and it was of such a sifting movement that the type of v. 30 treats when it says that the princes of the Philistines went forth. And in such campaigns of the infidelistic leaders (princes of the Philistines went forth, v. 30), Bro. Russell succeeded more against them (David prospered more) than all the other helpers of the crown-lost princes (than all the servants of Saul). This, of course, enhanced him in the estimation of anti-infidels (so that his name was much set by). And of it he was worthy.

- (6) Our study brings us now to 1 Sam. 19. Bro. Russell's successes against the infidelistic sifters, instead of pleasing the crown-lost princes, as it should have done, aroused their envy to symbolic murderous

proportions, moving them to advise the most consecrated and Truth-loving of the crown-losers and their supporting co-warriors to cut off Bro. Russell from all fellowship in nominal-church circles (Saul spake to Jonathan, his son, and to all his servants, that they should kill David, v. 1). This charge greatly pained antitypical Jonathan, who much appreciated Bro. Russell (Jonathan . . . delighted much in David, v. 2) and who told him of their superiors' orders (told David . . . father seeketh to kill thee). They counseled him to be on his guard and to retire for a while from activities in the churches until times would change (take heed . . . morning . . . in a secret place and hide thyself). They offered to take Bro. Russell's place of service supported by the crown-lost princes (go out and stand beside my father . . . where thou art, v. 3) and to speak favorably of him to them and then report to him the results (commune . . . of thee . . . will tell thee). These then praised Bro. Russell to the crown-lost princes (spake good of David unto Saul, v. 4). They expostulated with them not to sin against Bro. Russell by cutting him off from fellowship and service, since therein he did no wrong against, but did much good to the crown-lost leaders (sin against David . . . not sinned against thee . . . his works . . . thee-ward very good). Especially did they emphasize Bro. Russell's courage and skill in his successful refutation of evolution (life in his hands, and slew the Philistine, v. 5), which none of the crown-lost princes nor their co-warriors were able to do, by which the Lord wrought a signal victory for His people, thus showing that He favored Bro. Russell (Lord wrought a great salvation for all Israel), and which the crown-lost leaders witnessed with joy (sawest . . . didst rejoice). Why, then, they reasoned, should the crown-lost leaders sin against an innocent one, causelessly cutting him off from fellowship and service (Wherefore . . . sin

against innocent blood, to slay David without a cause)? The fine plea had its intended result. The crown-lost leaders relented and gave solemn assurance that Bro. Russell would not be cut off from fellowship and service in nominal-church circles (Saul harkened . . . the Lord liveth, he shall not be slain).

(7) True to their promise these most faithful and Truth-loving crown-losers informed Bro. Russell of what they had said to the crown-lost princes in his favor and of their resultant assurance (called David . . . showed him all, v. 7). Furthermore, they re-introduced him to the crown-lost leaders as one acceptable to them (brought David to Saul); and he was in their favor again as formerly (was in his presence [favor] as in times past). The no-ransomers, the no-substitutionists, began toward the end of 1883 again to set forth their views against the Bible teachings on that point (there was war again, v. 8), and Bro. Russell, the champion of the Ransom, again entered the lists in its defense and in refutation of the no-ransomers (David went out, and fought against the Philistines) and he certainly mightily overthrew them (slew them with a great slaughter). Among others, the article in Reprints 573-575 is a part of this slaughter, as the battle referred to in 1 Sam. 18: 27 finds its antitype in articles like those in Reprints 481-482 and 483. Under such onslaughts the no-ransomers fled from the field of battle (fled from him). The melancholy spirit that God's forsaking antitypical Saul brought upon him troubled him as he administered the matters of his office (evil [sad] spirit . . . upon Saul . . . as he sat in his house, v. 9). Again he had a writing on future probation ready to publish (javelin in his hand) and Bro. Russell as before used the Bible to bring out the sweet music of the Song of Moses, restitution, numerous examples of which can be found in the Towers from Jan., 1884, onward. Among other crown-lost leaders, Dr. Cook again took part in the antitype of the javelin-throwing

of v. 10. While a newspaper report of his attempting to beat Bro. Russell over Dr. Dorner's back (1 Sam. 18: 11) appeared in Boston papers of Jan. 9, 1883, what proved to be the antitypical javelin of v. 10, though given as the prelude to his lecture of Jan. 15, 1883, did not appear in print until in 1884, *i.e.*, when his book containing it, entitled, *Occident*, appeared. The former prelude was entitled, *New Departures in and from Orthodoxy*; the prelude now under consideration was entitled, *Does Death End Probation?* By this time, 1884, Dr. Cook was quite aroused against Bro. Russell's teaching on Restitution, and he aimed mainly at Bro. Russell, though, as delivered Jan. 15, 1883, and printed in 1884, this prelude ostensibly aimed at Dr. Dorner (Saul . . . smite David . . . wall . . . javelin, v. 10). Bro. Russell overcame its damaging effects as before (slipped away out of Saul's presence). This prelude as respects Bro. Russell failed of its purpose (smote . . . the wall); for Bro. Russell's pertinent teachings enabled him to evade (David fled) its force and to escape its effects (escaped that night).

(8) Connected with the prelude (entitled, *Probation at Death*) to Dr. Cook's lecture of Feb. 12, 1883, but not appearing in print until over a year later, we find the acts of the crown-lost princes and their messengers illustrated, as typed in vs. 11-17. Dr. Cook's attacks on Dr. Dorner in the above-mentioned two preludes not only drew fire from Bro. Russell, but also from certain professors of the Congregational Seminary at Amherst, Mass., notably from Dr. Smyth, at whom in the prelude of the Feb. 12th lecture Dr. Cook aimed, as well as at Bro. Russell. The type refers to its aim at Bro. Russell. By this time Dr. Cook had aroused a considerable number of his sympathizers (messengers, v. 11) to be in waiting to catch Bro. Russell in his words (watch him . . . slay him), especially in his future lecturing in various churches (morning). The exercise of this office brought with it a warning of

his danger (saying, If . . . not tonight . . . slain), which with the assistance of this office he escaped, by quietly retiring from such work (Michal let David down . . . escaped, v. 12). Bro. Russell's pertinent powers as lodged in his sympathizers in local churches defended him by representing his teachings (bed, v. 13) as nominal-church doctrines (Michal took an image), stressing his justification (goat's hair) teachings as the rest of his doctrines (pillow . . . bolster), and thus hid them from clear sight (covered . . . cloth). Dr. Cook's coworkers demanded the surrender of Bro. Russell by his nominal-church sympathizers (Saul sent messengers to take David, v. 14); but these made plausible excuses for him (she said, He is sick). But Dr. Cook, suspecting the excuses, incited them to the task again (Saul . . . see David, v. 15), charging them to bring Bro. Russell's teachings in his writings (bed) to him for refutation (bring . . . in the bed . . . slay him). These messengers could get no more of his teachings from his nominal-church sympathizers than those centering in justification, set forth by them as exactly like orthodoxy's pertinent teachings (image . . . goats' hair, v. 16). When Dr. Cook and other crown-lost leaders expostulated with those sympathetic with Bro. Russell's pertinent powers as attempting to deceive him and them, they used deception to shield themselves (Saul . . . Michal . . . deceived me so . . . enemy . . . escaped . . . said . . . I kill thee, v. 17).

(9) Thus Bro. Russell escaped the plots of the crown-lost leaders to undo him, and found safety and solace among some of the brethren who survived from the Philadelphia phase of the Church (Samuel, v. 18) in the heights of Christian character development (escaped, and came to Samuel to Ramah). Of course, Bro. Russell told these dear Philadelphia survivors of his experience with antitypical Saul, and these could from certain of their experiences with antitypical Saul sympathize with him (told him all that Saul had done

to him). Then these occupied themselves with feeding God's sheep (dwelt in Naioth [*pastures*]). The news of their activities and character development was soon brought to Dr. Cook and other crown-lost princes (it was told Saul . . . David is at Naioth in Ramah, v. 19). They sent messengers to take Bro. Russell captive (Saul sent messengers to take David, v. 20). Again we will illustrate this part of the crown-lost princes' activities through those of Dr. Cook. Dr. Smyth, of Amherst, replied to Dr. Cook's prelude of Feb. 12, 1883, by some questions, immediately submitted to Dr. Cook. This led to a further controversy between them, in which each replied to the other three times, Dr. Cook doing so Feb. 12, 19 and Mar. 12. These replies of Dr. Cook were published as an appendix to his book, Occident, in 1884, and only with their publication did they affect Bro. Russell. It is in connection with these three replies of Dr. Cook to Dr. Smyth that the antitypes of 1 Sam. 19: 20-24 occurred. These we will briefly trace. The messengers antitypical of those of v. 20 were those who were stirred up by Dr. Cook's reply of Feb. 12 to Dr. Smyth's questions. Apparently Bro. Russell's and Dr. Cook's first personal meeting at Pittsburgh, where the former handed the latter Food for Thinking Christians and Tabernacle Shadows, occurred between Dr. Cook's oral controversy in 1883 and its publication in 1884 in the book, Occident. This will account for Dr. Cook's continued beating of Bro. Russell over others' backs. He, therefore, by these three replies incited various ones to make three attempts to make Bro. Russell a captive, restrained by Dr. Cook's arguments. And these three attempts ended in the would-be captors' accepting more or less of the Truth teachings, and preaching them when they perceived that those who were presenting them were affiliated with, and led by antitypical Samuel, as the old-time Millennial advocates (vs. 20, 21).

(10) This led Dr. Cook and other crown-lost leaders

to make a closer investigation of the harvest Truth, activities and advocates (he went to Ramah) as these appeared in its ever-growing literature which was in the lookout of the Truth people (a great well in Sechu [*lookout*], v. 22). They asked for the views and activities of antitypical Samuel and Bro. Russell (Where are Samuel and David?). And they were told that these were dwelling in the heights of Christian character, and were tending God's sheep (at Naioth in Ramah). Thereupon they gave attention to these two things in these (went . . . Naioth in Ramah, v. 23), and they were so influenced as to preach the Millennial message, though, of course, not with probation for the dead then (Spirit . . . upon him . . . prophesied, until [but not at Naioth in Ramah, *i.e.*, did not give the full Millennial message] he came to Naioth in Ramah). While so doing, they divested themselves of their authority and prerogatives as crown-lost princes (stripped off his clothes, v. 24). They continued to preach as on the way to antitypical Samuel, *i.e.*, advocating the Millennium as blessing the then living only (prophesied . . . in like manner). This seems to be the last time that antitypical Saul met antitypical Samuel, even as in the type it was the last time that typical Saul saw typical Samuel (before Samuel). Thus before the few remaining members of the Samuel class of the Philadelphia epoch the crown-lost princes humbled themselves (lay down naked). And from that time onward antitypical Saul for a long time humbly preached, increasingly in his members, the pre-Millennial Second Advent of our Lord, the bulk of them in retraction of their former opposition thereto (all that day and all that night). This led to the saying on the part of many of their sympathizers, Are these leaders among the teachers of the pre-Millennial Advent of Jesus also (Wherefore they say, Is Saul also among the prophets)? We may well rejoice that these crown-lost princes, who are our brethren, though crown-losers, got even a partial

glimpse of the coming time of blessing and glory. And with fear and trembling at the possibility of a fall, we may humbly thank and praise God for the larger and happier views of that blessed period which Divine grace has vouchsafed little us, who are so much less able than these crown-lost princes.

(11) Next 1 Sam. 20 will engage our attention. Antitypical Saul's pursuit of our Pastor to his sphere of reaping and character activities, as just seen, made the latter turn his attention to justifying himself before his friends of the Jonathan class in the nominal church against the charges of heresy, tearing down the churches, etc., that antitypical Saul and the latter's messengers were hurling against him (David fled . . . came and said before Jonathan, v. 1). His rhetorical questions (What . . . what . . . what) imply that he denied practicing wrong works (done), teaching error (iniquity) and committing injustice (sin) against the crown-lost princes (thy father), who therefore were not justified in seeking to cut him off from fellowship and service in the churches (seeketh my life). The more faithful and Truth-loving crown-losers (he, v. 2) felt abhorrence at such a course on the crown-lost princes' part (God forbid; literally, a profanation) and assured Bro. Russell that he would not be cut off from such fellowship and service (thou shalt not die). Antitypical Jonathan felt that the crown-lost princes had such confidence in them as would move them to tell them whatever they planned to do (my father will do nothing . . . but . . . will shew it me). And seeing no reason for not having been told of such a plan, if it existed, they felt it was not entertained (why . . . hide . . . from me . . . not so). But Bro. Russell solemnly affirmed (David sware, v. 3) that the plan was entertained, and was by the crown-lost princes concealed from antitypical Jonathan, because the former knew of their favoring Bro. Russell (thy father . . . knoweth that I have found grace in thine eyes) and desired to spare their feelings

(Let not Jonathan know this, lest he be grieved), Again Bro. Russell solemnly assured antitypical Jonathan that he was on the verge of being cut off from the fellowship and service of his nominal-church sympathizers (as the Lord . . . thy soul liveth . . . a step between me and death). Thus Jonathan was convinced of the danger and offered to carry out Bro. Russell's desires in the situation (Whatsoever thy soul desireth, I will even do it for thee; literally, What thy soul saith, I will also do for thee, v. 4).

(12) On being assured by antitypical Jonathan that he was willing to fulfill his pertinent desires, Bro. Russell told them of a plan that would certainly manifest antitypical Saul's real designs. He suggested that shortly there would be special solemn occasions (tomorrow is the new moon, v. 5) at conferences, synods, assemblies, etc., where the crown-lost leaders and their chief supporters would feast, and where he should certainly be expected in attendance (I should not fail to sit . . . at meat; literally, I should surely sit with the king to eat). By his absenting himself from such and engaging in some secular matters until these feasts were passed (I hide myself in the field . . . third day at even), it could be ascertained whether he was missed and whether his being missed would not give occasion to a more free expression of opinion on him, favorably or unfavorably, on the part of the crown-lost leaders. To test out antitypical Saul all the more thoroughly Bro. Russell suggested that antitypical Jonathan tell antitypical Saul, if the latter missed him, that Bro. Russell was engaged in seasonal harvest work in cooperation with the Truth people and others (father . . . miss me, then say, David . . . asked . . . run to Bethlehem . . . yearly sacrifice . . . for . . . family, v. 6). If antitypical Saul would under such conditions speak well of Bro. Russell (If he say . . . well, v. 7), it would be favorable for Bro. Russell (peace); if he would be very angry at Bro. Russell's engaging in such

activities instead of his being at the feast, it would mean that his cutting off from fellowship and service had been sealed (very wroth . . . evil is determined). Under the circumstances it would be difficult to devise a better plan to bring to the light antitypical Saul's real intentions. Bro. Russell gave the covenanted friendship between him and antitypical Jonathan as the reason that Jonathan do him this desired favor (deal kindly with thy servant; for . . . thy servant into a covenant . . . with thee, v. 8). Bro. Russell assured these dear friends that if he were an evil-doer, he desired them to cut him off from fellowship and service; for why should they betray him to the crown-lost princes (if . . . iniquity, slay me thyself; for why . . . bring me to thy father)? These dear friends were far from desiring to see Bro. Russell so cut off (Far be it from thee; literally, [it would be] a profanation to thee, v. 9). They assured him that if they were certain that the crown-lost princes were so minded toward him, they would surely make it known to him (if I knew . . . evil were determined . . . tell thee).

(13) Antitypical Jonathan agreeing to sound out antitypical Saul and reveal the results as per Bro. Russell's suggestion, Bro. Russell inquired, "Who shall tell me?" (v. 10) of the results of the test? Then feeling sympathy with antitypical Jonathan, he solicitously asked, What if antitypical Saul should answer sharply (what if . . . roughly)? Instead of answering at once, antitypical Jonathan, likely fearing that they would be overheard, suggested that they continue the conversation under more private conditions (Jonathan said . . . go out into the field, v. 11). This was done (they went . . . field). Then antitypical Jonathan solemnly invoked a curse from God upon themselves if, learning at or after the feasts that antitypical Saul was well disposed toward Bro. Russell, they would not reveal it to him (Lord God . . . sounded my father . . . if good . . . and shew it thee . . . do so and much more

to Jonathan, vs. 12, 13). But if they found that antitypical Saul intended to do the evil to Bro. Russell, they would reveal it to him, and send him away in safety (please my father . . . evil . . . I will shew it thee, and send thee away . . . in peace). They expressed their hearty wishes for the Lord's favor upon him as the leader of God's people, even as that favor had been on antitypical Saul (the Lord be with thee, as . . . with my father). Then antitypical Jonathan desired that Bro. Russell not only continue to show them favors from the Lord: grace, mercy and Truth, throughout their earthly sojourn, that their New Creatures be preserved (while yet I live show me the kindness of the Lord, that I die not, v. 14), but also not cut off his kindness from those who will have and show antitypical Jonathan's spirit (not cut off thy kindness from my house, v. 15), not even when the Lord would make him victorious over all his enemies (when the Lord hath cut off the enemies . . . from . . . the earth). Then antitypical Jonathan promised to abide in the attitude that desires God to execute judgment against Bro. Russell's opponents, *i.e.*, to take his part against his enemies (made a covenant . . . Let the Lord require . . . of David's enemies, v. 16). Antitypical Jonathan's great love for Bro. Russell prompted them to ask that Bro. Russell repeat their pertinent solemn mutual promises (caused David to swear again loved him, v. 17). Antitypical Jonathan realized that Bro. Russell would not and could not partake with fellowship in the feasts of the crown-lost leaders in their various conventions (Jonathan said. . . Tomorrow is the new moon, and thou shalt be missed . . . thy seat will be empty, v. 18).

(14) Then antitypical Jonathan proceeded to suggest a course for Bro. Russell to pursue after such convention feasts would be over, since the plan had already been made as to what he was to do during the full time of these feasts, as we saw when commenting

on v. 5 (hast stayed three days, v. 19). Immediately after these conventions (quickly) Bro. Russell was to betake himself to the same activities, *i.e.*, more or less secular work, as those in which he was engaged when antitypical Jonathan had interceded with antitypical Saul for Bro. Russell (1 Sam. 19: 2; where thou didst hide thyself when the business was in hand), encouraging him that he should hold fast the Truth (stone) that supports one who must depart (*Ezel [parting]*) from Babylon. From this we infer that antitypical Jonathan had little hope that antitypical Saul would relent and become friendly toward Bro. Russell. Then antitypical Jonathan unfolded to Bro. Russell the various features of the sign that he would give him: (1) They would set forth three sharp truths (Ps. 45: 5): (*a*) that error, (*b*) wrong practices and (*c*) false hopes were increasingly prevailing in the churches as to leaving Babylon (shoot three arrows on the side thereof [of Ezel], v. 20), and would do it as though they had a definite thing in view (as . . . at a mark). (2) They would charge their immature helpers (*the*, not a, lad, v. 21) to lay hold on these sharp truths after studying them (Go, find the arrows). (3) If they told these immature ones that these truths lay between antitypical Jonathan's pertinent teaching position and the teaching position (stone, *Ezel*) of Bro. Russell against saints remaining in Babylon, antitypical Jonathan's being in favor of remaining in the nominal church, and that the immature ones should accept his sharp sayings, then this would mean that all was well between antitypical Saul and David, and that, therefore, Bro. Russell might come to antitypical Jonathan (arrows are on this side of thee [David], take them; then come . . . peace to thee, and no hurt). This antitypical Jonathan solemnly asserted (the Lord liveth). (4) If they told the immature ones (say unto the young man, v. 22) that the sharp truths went beyond his and into Bro. Russell's teaching position

on leaving Babylon, *i.e.*, were in favor of leaving Babylon and thus were in Bro. Russell's and beyond antitypical Jonathan's teaching position (beyond thee [David]), it would mean that antitypical Saul was intent on cutting Bro. Russell off from privileges and services in the nominal church, and this would require him of his own accord to give up such fellowship and service (go thy way; for the Lord hath sent thee away). After giving this token as to how the word would be given to Bro. Russell on antitypical Jonathan's sounding out antitypical Saul, antitypical Jonathan for a third time impressed upon David's mind their mutual agreement, which was to guarantee antitypical Jonathan and all like-spirited crown-losers coming later from such refutative attacks as Bro. Russell would make on enemies of the Truth, assuring Bro. Russell that the Lord would be its Umpire and Blessing or Avenger, as the case, might require (the matter . . . spoken of . . . the Lord be [is] between thee and me forever, v. 23). This reminder, as well as what is said in vs. 13-16, implies that antitypical Jonathan realized that Bro. Russell would become the Lord's executive instead of the crown-lost princes. As crown losers, antitypical Jonathan, as noble as they were, would naturally cast in their lot with antitypical Saul, and not with Bro. Russell and the Truth people, even as typical Jonathan cast in his lot with Saul, and not with David. This is pathetic.

(15) According to their understanding, Bro. Russell busied himself awhile in secular matters; and the crown-lost princes in the various denominations occupied themselves at the feasts connected with various conventions (David hid . . . new moon . . . king . . . eat meat, v. 24). Antitypical Saul took the place of chief prominence and influence, as was their custom (as at other times, upon a seat by the wall, v. 25). Antitypical Jonathan showed these respect (Jonathan arose); and the controversial theological professors

(Abner [*father of light*]) occupied the next most prominent places (sat by Saul's side); but Bro. Russell was there neither in person nor in his writings (David's place was empty). In the first part of these feasts the crown-lost princes, while missing Bro. Russell, said nothing thereon, but internally made excuse for him, that he was absent through some Adamic weakness overtaking him (Saul spake not . . . that day . . . thought . . . befallen . . . not clean, v. 26). Later in these feasts (on the morrow, v. 27) these crown-lost princes, noting Bro. Russell's continued absence (David's place was empty), inquired of antitypical Jonathan, as close friends of Bro. Russell, why the latter had not come to the first and last part of the feast (Wherefore cometh not . . . to meat . . . yesterday, nor today?). Thus the situation was furnished to tell antitypical Saul what Bro. Russell had suggested as the means of sounding but the crown-lost princes (vs. 28, 29; compare with v. 6). Thus his absence was ascribed to his being active in harvest work. This indeed was a tester for the crown-lost princes' attitude toward Bro. Russell; and it brought it into clear light: for it brought, first of all, an angry rebuke upon antitypical Jonathan as being under the influence [mothered] of the alleged perverse and rebellious teachings of Bro. Russell (Saul's anger . . . against Jonathan . . . said.. son of the perverse rebellious woman, v. 30). Then these princes publicly rebuked antitypical Jonathan as setting his choice upon Bro. Russell, which would bring them and the erroneousness of these teachings to public shame, in suffering refutation (I know . . . chosen the son of Jesse to thine own confusion [shame] . . . mother's nakedness). The crown-lost princes warned antitypical Jonathan, as the crown-prince, that Bro. Russell's continuance in fellowship and service among the churches prevented their full development and their future pre-eminence (as long as . . . liveth . . . thou shalt not be established, nor thy kingdom, v. 31). This

consideration prompted the crown-lost princes to require that Bro. Russell be brought in person or in his writings to the feast, there to be disfellowshipped and bereft of his office as lecturer in the churches after an alleged refutation (Wherefore . . . fetch him . . . he shall surely die). This hostility was final.

(16) This led antitypical Jonathan to expostulate with the crown-lost princes in a defense of Bro. Russell's innocence (Jonathan answered . . . Wherefore slain? what hath he done? v. 32). This was too much for the headstrong crown-lost princes. Therefore they released publications censuring those leaders who favored and furthered Bro. Russell and his teachings (Saul cast a javelin at him to smite him, v. 33). Among such publications one of Dr. Cook featured, in which he bewailed the support that various Christian scholars gave to future probation and their furthering of its advocates. Thus finally was antitypical Jonathan disillusioned as to antitypical Saul's intentions (whereby Jonathan knew . . . determined . . . to slay David). Antitypical Jonathan was greatly displeased (arose . . . in fierce anger, v. 34), refusing to share in the later feasts of the pertinent conventions (eat no meat the second day of the month). Two things grieved this class: (1) that it was determined to disfellowship Bro. Russell, and (2) that the crown-lost princes had put Bro. Russell to shame publicly as a false teacher and an evil-doer (grieved for David, because . . . done him shame). The time had now come to bring the pledged word to Bro. Russell (in the morning . . . at the appointed time, v. 35) and for these dear friends to part, no more to fellowship one another in this life (Jonathan went out . . . David). The only ones with antitypical Jonathan were certain immature supporters (a little lad with him). Antitypical Jonathan charged these immature ones to seek and find out the sharp truths that he was about to set forth (said . . . Run, find out now the arrows which I shoot, v. 36). While

these prepared to study these (as the lad ran), antitypical Jonathan issued these teachings at marks far beyond these immature ones (shot beyond him); for they implied that there should be a leaving of Babylon, as Bro. Russell taught, and that was beyond the immature ones' appreciation. And when these immature ones mentally reached this teaching (come to the place of the arrow, v. 37) antitypical Jonathan said that this teaching was beyond their comprehension (beyond thee), *i.e.*, they were of such as were not intended to follow that teaching. Antitypical Jonathan greatly hurried these immature ones, to remove them from the scene of such, to nominal-church members, too advanced teachings, as being too strong meat for them (cried . . . Make speed, haste, stay not, v. 38). This had the intended effect: such strong meat was assembled, but not partaken of by the immature ones (lad gathered the arrows, and came to his master).

(17) The immature sympathizers and supporters of antitypical Jonathan did not understand the real nature of the service that they were performing (the lad knew not any thing, v. 39), but unconsciously served the occasion of antitypical Jonathan's informing Bro. Russell of the actual state of affairs (Jonathan and David knew). Then antitypical Jonathan sent their immature supporters and sympathizers into the nominal church with their sharp sayings and general theory of things and the writings that contained it (artillery, *i.e.*, bow and quiver, v. 40), there to set these forth as they were in the eyes of nominal-church people (said . . . Go, carry them to the city). After these went on their way to perform their errand (as soon as the lad was gone, v. 41) Bro. Russell showed himself as standing upon New Testament grounds as those of the symbolic sun (arose out of a place toward the south), and very politely and deferentially approached his beloved brethren, whose crown-lost character-condition made them amenable to remaining out of the Truth movement

and in the nominal church (fell on his face . . . and bowed himself three times). They were very affectionately disposed to one another (kissed one another), and were deeply grieved at their parting from one another, which especially saddened them since they knew that it was to be to the end of their earthly journey (wept one with another; literally, each one bewept his friend). But Bro. Russell's grief was the greater, doubtless due to his knowing that these dearly beloved brethren were taking a backward, though easier step (David exceeded). As Bro. Russell was the departing one, it was fitting that words suitable to utter to a departing one were spoken to him by antitypical Jonathan, as Bro. Russell's greater grief more naturally disposed him to say little, and the lesser grief of the former made him more communicative.

(18) Antitypical Jonathan wished him prosperity (Jonathan said . . . Go in peace, v. 42). They emphasized their mutual agreement (we have sworn. . . in the name of the Lord) as the ground of their wishing Bro. Russell prosperity. They repeated, as the thing that gave binding force to their mutual agreement, that Jehovah was the Umpire and Blessing or Avenger of the agreement (the Lord is between). They also stressed the fact that the agreement was between them (me and thee) and between those that had the spirit of each party to the agreement (my seed and thy seed unto the Age). Both parties in the coming years kept the agreement; for antitypical Jonathan and all in the nominal church who had his spirit always thought kindly of, and defended Bro. Russell, refusing to fight his views and partake in the campaign of slander and opposition to Bro. Russell that became so general in the nominal church, in part typed by Saul's future course toward Bro. Russell. And on Bro. Russell's part and on the part of those who had his spirit in the Truth there was always a very charitable attitude and speech maintained toward antitypical Jonathan and

those of his spirit. Then, deeply moved, Bro. Russell tore himself away from these dear brethren; and they returned from fellowship and service with him to those of the nominal church (he [David] arose and departed; and Jonathan went into the city). The pathos of the typical and antitypical partings is indescribably feelingful. As we visualize and realize this antitypical scene of parting, our heart-strings are much strained; for, beloved brethren of the holy and royal Priesthood, did we not in the Parousia times have similar experiences when and after we left Babylon, where some with whom we had had goodly fellowship remained; and at the parting were not all much pained, and we more than they? And, like antitypical David, have we not made a lamentation over them at their defeat at the hands of the Modernists (1 Sam. 31: 1, 2; 2 Sam. 1: 17-27)? But we have consoled our saddened hearts with the hope that in the Kingdom there will be a blessed reunion never to end.

(1) How much of the David type have we so far studied? What chapters of 1 Sam. will be now studied? What should accompany this study? With what does chap. 18 begin? How was this conversation between antitypical David and Saul carried on? Who was the main, but not exclusive representative of antitypical Saul in this conversation? When did he read our Pastor's pertinent writings? Who else acted in the antitype of 1 Sam. 17? Who else? What did they continue to do? With whom acting as antitypical Saul's chief representative? What two considerations prove this? How is the closeness of the connection of 1 Sam. 17: 55—18: 5 indicated in the Hebrew? How is this obscured in the A.V.? Whom does Jonathan type? What did they give our Pastor? Why? How typed? What did the crown-lost princes not desire to lose in the warfare against infidelism? What did they, accordingly, do? How typed? What did they not desire? How typed? How did antitypical Jonathan and David become especially bound to each other? How typed? What did the former do? How typed? By what details was this done? How was each one typed?

(2) Against what did Bro. Russell fight? How typed?

With what result? How typed? What was the effect on the crown-lost princes? How typed? To whom was his pertinent course pleasing? How typed? What occurred after the circulation of each of his anti-evolution writings? How typed? What two things did church members do about it? How typed? How did they acclaim Bro. Russell in contrast with the crown-lost princes? How typed? How did this affect them? Why? How typed? How did their love of honor affect them? How typed? How did they henceforth regard Bro. Russell? How typed? What did their envy produce? How typed? Even when doing what? How typed? In these times of dejection what did Bro. Russell seek to do to him? How typed? With what did he seek to do this? Against this what did they have ready? How typed?

(3) Who, in general and in particular, took part in the attack? How typed? Over whose back did he administer a whipping to Bro. Russell? Why did he so use Dr. Dorner? Whom did he really mean to whip? How typed? What was the antitypical javelin? What did Dr. Cook do in that prelude? What did he think that this attack would do to all advocates of future probation? Including whom? How typed? By what two turns of argument did Bro. Russell foil this attack? How typed? What effect did this have on Dr. Cook and his co-warriors? Why? What effect did this have on him and them? How typed? What did it prove to antitypical Saul? How typed? What did this mental attitude in antitypical Saul prompt him to do? How typed? How did Bro. Russell act in the premises? How typed? With what fruitage? By whose favor? How typed? How did this affect antitypical Saul? How typed? The nominal and real people of God?

(4) What did crown-lost princes do anent Bro. Russell's popularity? How typed? What was their pertinent hope? What did this prompt them to do? How typed? Under what condition and not with what liberty? Why .not this liberty? What did they agree to do for him in this limited sphere of service? How typed? What parallel acts illustrate this? Why did the crown-lost leaders do this? How did Bro. Russell view the offer? How typed? What did they begrudge him even in this limited service? To whom did they give it? How typed? How

did these evangelists respond? What other power did antitypical Saul have? How typed? What attitude did the offer of this power have as to Bro. Russell? How typed? Why was it more suitable to him? What did such congregations make known to antitypical Saul? How typed? What was his response? Why? How typed? Thereupon what did the crown-lost princes suggest? How typed? What did these pastors and principals of the flocks then do? How typed? What did Bro. Russell's humility prompt him to do? How typed?

(5) What did these messengers do? How typed? What message was then put into their mouths? How typed? Of what did the crown-lost princes feel sure? Why? How typed? What did the messengers then do? How typed? What did Bro. Russell answer? How typed? What did he and co-operating Truth warriors then do? How typed? What were Mr. Paton and his co-warriors as the two hundred antitypical Philistines? What did Bro. Russell, etc., do to them? How typed? How did they prove their success? How typed? What did Bro. Russell thereupon claim? How typed? How did the crown-lost leaders respond? How typed? How did his victory impress the crown-lost princes? How typed? What other impression did they get? How typed? How did these facts not, and how did they affect them? How typed? When in the Harvest did these events occur? In what, under another picture, is this shown? Of what sifting movement did the type of v. 30 treat? By what statement? In what campaigns did Bro. Russell succeed against the antitypical Philistines? How comparatively? How typed? What did these successes effect for Bro. Russell?

(6) To what does our study now bring us? What effect should Bro. Russell's success have had upon the crown-lost princes? What effect did it have? What did it move them to charge? How typed? How did this charge affect antitypical Jonathan? Why? How typed? What did they do? How typed? What counsel did they give? How typed? What did they offer to do? How typed? What else did they offer to do? How typed? What did they promise? How typed? What did they then do before the crown-lost princes? How typed? On what matter did they exhort with them? What reasons did

they give for their expostulations? How typed? What especially did they emphasize? How typed? How did they describe Bro. Russell's great feat? How typed? As evidencing what, did they claim? How typed? What did they say of the crown-lost leaders' witness and attitude thereat? To what conclusion did they reason therefrom? How typed? What resulted from antitypical Jonathan's advocacy of David? How typed?

(7) What did antitypical Jonathan then do? How typed? What else did they do? How typed? With what result? How typed? What did the no-ransomers do toward the end of 1883? How typed? What did Bro. Russell then do? How typed? With what result? How typed? What is a part of this slaughter? Wherein does the battle of 1 Sam. 18: 27 find its antitype? How did the slaughter affect the no-ransomers? How typed? What troubled antitypical Saul as he functioned in his office? How typed? What did he have ready to publish? How typed? How did Bro. Russell seek to soothe him? How typed? Among others, who took part in the antitypical javelin-throwing of v. 10? How typed? What is the time difference of the appearance in print of the preludes of Dr. Cook's lectures of Jan. 8 and 15, 1883? In what did the second prelude appear? What were the titles of these two preludes? What did the second prove to be? By 1884 what was Dr. Cook's mental attitude toward Bro. Russell's teaching on Restitution? At whom was this antitypical javelin mainly aimed? Despite what? How are these things typed? How did Bro. Russell meet the attack? How typed? What was the effect as to Bro. Russell? How typed? What did his teachings enable him to do? How typed?

(8) Where do we find an example of the antitype of vs. 11-17? From whom did Dr. Cook's attacks on Dr. Dorner draw fire? From whom else? Why from all of these? To which of these does the type refer? By this time what had Dr. Cook aroused? How typed? For what object? How typed? What did Bro. Russell's exercise of his office bring with it? How typed? With what result? How typed? How and by whom was he defended? How typed? What was especially stressed? How typed? With what result? How typed? What did Dr. Cook's

co-workers demand? How typed? How were they foiled? How typed? What did Dr. Cook then do? How typed? What other charge did he give them? How typed? For what purpose? How typed? Of what could the messengers not get more? How typed? How did Bro. Russell's sympathizers quiet the accusations of the crown-lost leaders? How typed?

(9) What was the result to Bro. Russell? How typed? Where did he find safety and solace? How typed? In what? How typed? What did he tell antitypical Samuel? How typed? How could they sympathize with him? With what did they occupy themselves? How typed? To whom was news of this soon brought? How typed? What did they do? How typed? By what will these acts be illustrated? What did Dr. Smyth do to Dr. Cook's prelude to his lecture of Feb. 12, 1883? When? To what did this lead? When and in what were Dr. Cook's replies published? Only with what did they affect Bro. Russell? In connection with what did the antitypes of 1 Sam. 19: 20-24 occur? Who were the first set of messengers? How typed? During what period did Bro. Russell's and Dr. Cook's first personal meeting occur? What did the former give the latter at that time? For what will this account? What did Dr. Cook incite by his three replies? In what did each of the three attempts result? What conduced to this result? How are these things typed in vs. 20, 21?

(10) How did these things affect crown-lost princes? How typed? From what works? How typed? For what did they ask? How typed? How were they answered? How typed? What did they then do? How typed? With what effect? How typed? While so doing, what did they do? How typed? How did they continue to preach? How typed? What was the last meeting of Saul and Samuel, type and antitype? What did these do before antitypical Samuel? How typed? What did they continue to do? Many in retraction of what? How typed? To what saying did this lead? How typed? To what two things should this fact move us?

(11) What will we next study? What effect did antitypical Saul's pursuit of Bro. Russell have on the latter? How typed? What did his rhetorical questions imply? How typed? What did his innocence not do as to

antitypical Saul's intentions? How typed? How did antitypical Jonathan feel as to the pertinent course of the crown-lost leaders? How typed? Of what did they assure Bro. Russell? How typed? What further conviction did antitypical Jonathan have? How typed? Why could they not believe that the involved act was planned by the crown-lost leaders? How typed? What two things were contained in Bro. Russell's reply? How typed? What did he give as the reasons for their concealing their intention from antitypical Jonathan? How typed? What solemn affirmation did Bro. Russell then make? How typed? What effect did this have upon antitypical Jonathan? What promise did he make? How typed?

(12) After being assured of co-operation, what did Bro. Russell propose? What did he suggest as an occasion of operating the plan? Why was it such? How typed? What would his absenting himself provide? What was added to make the test more certain of success? How typed? What two possibilities and their results were pointed out? How typed? What characteristic did this plan have? What did Bro. Russell then suggest as involved in their pledged relationship? How typed? What did he then request of them, if he were an evil-doer? Rather than what? How typed? What was antitypical Jonathan's pertinent attitude? How typed? What assurance did they give Bro. Russell? How typed?

(13) What did Bro. Russell ask after antitypical Jonathan agreed to his proposition? How typed? What else did he solicitously ask? How typed? What did antitypical Jonathan thereupon suggest? How typed? What was then done? How typed? What did antitypical Jonathan under a solemnly invoked curse promise Bro. Russell? How typed? If the report was unfavorable, what did he promise? How typed? What wish did they express? How typed? What did antitypical Jonathan ask for themselves? How typed? What did they ask for those of the same spirit? How typed? Even under what conditions? How typed? What further did antitypical Jonathan promise? How typed? What did antitypical Jonathan's love prompt him to ask Bro. Russell to repeat? What did antitypical Jonathan realize? How typed?

(14) What did antitypical Jonathan then proceed to

suggest? How typed? What was Bro. Russell to do immediately after the conventions? How typed? To what did they encourage him? How typed? What may we infer from this? What were the four features of the sign that they would give him? How is each one typed? After giving this token, what for a third time did they do? How typed? Who did they say would be the Umpire and Blessing or Avenger of their pledges? How typed? What does this reminder suggest? As crown-losers what choice was to be expected of antitypical Jonathan? How typed?

(15) According to the understanding, with what did Bro. Russell and antitypical Jonathan busy themselves? How typed? What did antitypical Saul do at the feast? How typed? How did antitypical Jonathan conduct themselves there? How typed? Who was next to antitypical Saul in prominence? How typed? How was Bro. Russell not present? How typed? While noting his absence, what did antitypical Saul not do, and how did they account for his absence? How typed? What did they notice during the later parts of the feast? How typed? What did they thereupon ask antitypical Jonathan? How typed? What was thus furnished? How typed? What was the answer? How typed? What did this answer prove to be to the crown-lost leaders? How typed? How, in the first place, did it bring their attitude to light? How typed? In the second place? How typed? In the third place? How typed? In the fourth place? How typed?

(16) What did this fourfold manifestation move antitypical Jonathan to do? How typed? What was the effect on antitypical Saul? How typed? What was Dr. Cook's part therein? What was the first effect on antitypical Jonathan? How typed? The second effect? How typed? What two things grieved them? How typed? For what had the time come? How typed? Who only was with Jonathan then? How typed? What charge did antitypical Jonathan give them? How typed? What did Jonathan then do as these were studying his sharp sayings? How typed? What is implied in this teaching? What did antitypical Jonathan say when these mentally reached this teaching? How typed? What did antitypical Jonathan then do to the immature ones? Why? How typed? What effect did their statement have? How typed?

(17) What did the immature ones not understand? How typed? What did they unconsciously serve? How typed? What then did antitypical Jonathan do? How typed? With what commission? How typed? What did the immature ones do? How typed? What did Bro. Russell then do? How typed? What did he then do to antitypical Jonathan? How typed? How were they mutually disposed? How typed? How did they feel at parting? Why? How typed? Whose grief was the greater? How typed? Why did antitypical Jonathan prove the more communicative? How typed?

(18) What did antitypical Jonathan wish him? How typed? As what did they emphasize their agreement? How typed? What did they repeat? How typed? What two things did they stress? How typed? What did the parties of the agreement do in coming years? How did antitypical Jonathan do it? Bro. Russell and his faithful brethren? How did the separation take place? To what did Bro. Russell and antitypical Jonathan betake themselves? How typed? What quality marked the typical and antitypical parting? How can we enter into this experience? How did we, like Bro. Russell, do, over antitypical Jonathan, when such have been defeated by the Modernists? With what reflection may we comfort ourselves as to those dear ones whom we left behind in Babylon?

For a while he stood in greatness
Before King Saul upon his throne;
But as told in sacred story, this monarch
Loved to reign and rule alone.

Saul pursued the people's darling
With keen hatred's heavy stress,
From rock to rock, from cave to cave
Of the houseless wilderness.

Like a hunted thing he wandered,
From all bonds of fealty free,
Till the hour to honor David
Came in God's foreknown decree.