

THE EPIPHANY'S ELECT



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 IV

THE EPIPHANY'S ELECT

20,000 Edition

"The Lord Jesus Christ . . . Shall Judge The Living . . .
during His Epiphany" (2 Tim. 4: 1). "Your Young Men
Shall See Visions" (Joel 2: 28).

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, TRAVINGILING 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.

ALL BIBLE STUDENTS are familiar with the fact that Jesus' Second Advent progresses through three stages, indicated by the Greek words Parousia, Epiphaneia, or Apocalypsis, and Basileia. They are not all aware of the fact that about two years before that Servant's death, we passed out of the Parousia (presence) stage into the Epiphaneia (manifestation) or Apocalypsis (revelation) stage, which henceforth we will call by its English form, Epiphany. To the open-minded, faithful child of God there is available much light to evidence this. As the Parousia brought the Lord's people much light on the Church and the world from the standpoint of God's Word and Plan; so, based upon, harmonized with and elaborated out of such light, the Epiphany is adding a great deal of bright shining to what God's children previously had, and is giving details that for good reasons could not have been seen before, and that are most interesting and soul-satisfying to the meek.

As far as God's children are concerned, these details unmistakably refer more to the Great Company than to the Little Flock, though the knowledge of them is naturally more for the Little Flock than for the Great Company; and of course will be received by the former some time sooner than by the latter, who are the first of the Epiphany's elect classes. Then, some of the Epiphany light refers to those unbegotten consecrated ones whom we call "Youthful Worthies," who are the second of the Epiphany's elect classes, and whom God will give an inheritance with the Ancient Worthies after they have been faithful unto death. There is even some light referring to those justified ones who will continue in their faith in the Ransom, in their hatred for iniquity and in their love for righteousness. Some added light on the Second Death class is also now shining. As respects the nominal people of God—political, ecclesiastical and aristocratic—the Epiphany is also adding its light with increasing splendor, as it is on those represented by Hazael and Jehu.—1 Kings 19: 16, 17.

Not only do the special activities of these various groups occur in the Epiphany period, and not only do the Epiphany works of The Christ from beyond the veil most

clearly expose the nature and quality of their activities, but also by shedding special light on the Scriptural types, symbols and prophecies referring to these classes and their Epiphany activities, the Lord is bringing to the attention of His meek people, especially to the Little Flock, fuller Scriptural meanings of the details of these classes and their activities as regards Epiphany conditions and stations.

Some of this Epiphany light the Lord has been pleased to make known to us—not by inspiration, nor by any specially great talents, which are disclaimed, but by blessing with illumination the reverent study of the Scriptures and current events in and outside the Church in the light of the Bible, and by bringing us into providential contact with many of these events, especially as they concern the consecrated. Usually this illumination has come after, and seemingly as a reward for, faithfully defending the interests of the Little Flock against the ambitious usurpations and usurpatory attempts of certain leaders in the Truth. We do not think the Lord has given us this knowledge for our exclusive enjoyment, but for the enjoyment of all the Lord's people, as they are able to receive it. Therefore, as the Lord seems to indicate what is meat in due season, and provides us with the necessary financial sinews, we will from time to time in print publish it for the use of God's hungry children. In this book, divided into several topics, a portion of this increasing Epiphany light as it concerns its elect classes, is laid before the Lord's people. Our purpose is only to help, not to injure, to suggest and not to force Scriptural lines of thought, which may the Lord be pleased to bless to all. In order to clearness and thereby to our readers' greater blessing, in some places we have given a summary on certain matters first, and then later given details thereon. We trust that this method will not be considered as tiresome repetition (Phil. 3: 1).

Your Brother and Servant,

PAUL S. L. JOHNSON.

Philadelphia, Pa., U. S. A.,
January 14, 1938.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. THE BIBLE EPIPHANY.

THE MEANING OF THE WORDS, *EPIPHAINO*, *EPIPHANEIA*, *APOKALYPSIS* AND *PAROUSIA*. FIRST GREAT COMPANY ACTIVITIES, OCT., 16, 17, 1916. PURPOSES OF THE EPIPHANY PERIOD TOWARD THE WORLD. SEPARATION OF THE LITTLE FLOCK AND THE GREAT COMPANY. THE LORD JESUS' MANIFESTING HIMSELF TO THE GREAT COMPANY AS SUCH. TEN PROOFS THAT WE ARE IN TIME EPIPHANY. EXAMINATION OF THE DAWN'S PERTINENT ERRORS AND MISREPRESENTATIONS. DURATION OF THE EPIPHANY. THE DAYS OF LUKE 17: 22, 26, ETC. THE EPIPHANY AND THE TIME OF TROUBLE IDENTICAL. BIBLICAL PROOF THEREOF. CORROBORATIVE EXPLANATIONS OF THAT SERVANT. THE CHURCH'S EPIPHANY WORK: TOWARD ITSELF; TOWARD THE YOUTHFUL WORTHIES; TOWARD THE GREAT COMPANY; TOWARD THE WORLD. BEREAN QUESTIONS 7

CHAPTER II. GENERALITIES OF THE GREAT COMPANY

A SUMMARY ON THE GREAT COMPANY'S GENERALITIES. SOME DETAILS ON THE GREAT COMPANY'S GENERALITIES. PURIFICATION OF THE TRUTH AND ITS SERVANTS (LEV. 12). THE MOTHER OF A SON. THE MOTHER OF A DAUGHTER. SOME LESSONS. JULIAN T. GRAY'S VIEW. HUGO KARLEN'S VIEW. SOME QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE GREAT COMPANY. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 87

CHAPTER III. AZAZEL'S GOAT.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS. THE HIGH PRIEST'S LAST WORK IN THE FLESH TOWARD HUMANS. CONFESSING THE SINS OVER AZAZEL'S GOAT. LOOSING THE GOAT. LEADING THE GOAT TO THE GATE. MEMBERS OF THE HIGH PRIEST UNTIL MANIFESTED AS LEVITES. WITHDRAWING PRIESTLY FELLOWSHIP AND DELIVERING TO THE FIT MAN. LEADING THE GOAT TO THE WILDERNESS. ABANDONING IT TO AZAZEL. IN AZAZEL'S HANDS. WITHDRAWAL OF PRIESTLY FELLOWSHIP. JUDGING BEFORE AND AFTER THE TIME. MISREPRESENTATIONS. AZAZEL'S GOAT IN THE NOMINAL CHURCH. JOHN'S REBUKE. BEREAN QUESTIONS. . . 153

CHAPTER IV.
LEPROSY—TYPE AND ANTITYPE.

LEPROSY'S TWO TYPICAL SIGNIFICANCES. BRINGING THE LEPER TO THE PRIEST. SYMPTOMS OF LEPROSY. JUDGING. SIX FORMS OF LEPROSY. FIRST FORM, TYPICAL OF SIN. SECOND FORM, TYPICAL OF SELFISHNESS. THIRD FORM, TYPICAL OF WORLDLINESS. FOURTH FORM, TYPICAL OF ERROR. GENERAL PRINCIPLES APPLICABLE TO ALL FOUR FORMS. FIFTH FORM, TYPICAL OF POWER-GRASPING AND LORDING. SIXTH FORM, TYPICAL OF SECTARIANISM. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 243

CHAPTER V.
THE YOUTHFUL WORTHIES.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS. SEVEN LINES OF BIBLICAL PROOF OF THE EXISTENCE OF YOUTHFUL WORTHIES. THEIR PRESENT WORK. THEIR REWARDS, MILLENNIAL AND POST-MILLENNIAL. THE ARTICLE, "WORTHIES—ANCIENT AND MODERN;" REVIEWED. AN ANALYSIS OF THE ARTICLE. POINTS OF AGREEMENT. BASIC ERROR OF THE ARTICLE UNDER REVIEW. HALF-TRUTHS EXPOSED. TENTATIVE JUSTIFICATION SCRIPTURAL. MISLEADING OMISSIONS. SOPHISTRY ON THE TIME AFTER CHRIST'S RESURRECTION REFUTED. A SUMMARY. OTHER HALF-TRUTHS EXPOSED. FOG ON THE COVENANTS DISSIPATED. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 317

CHAPTER VI.
RUTH—TYPE AND ANTITYPE.

LEAVING THE TRUTH PEOPLE FOR THE NOMINAL CHURCH AND THE RETURN WITH A NEW CLASS IN GOD'S PLAN. GLEANING FROM 1881 TO 1916. YOUTHFUL WORTHIES' ACTIVITIES AND JESUS' FAVORS TO THEM FROM DECEMBER, 1918, TO JULY, 1919. JESUS SUCCESSFULLY UNDERTAKES FOR THE YOUTHFUL WORTHIES FROM JULY, 1919, TO 1921. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 369

CHAPTER VII.
QUESTIONS ON THE YOUTHFUL WORTHIES.

PERTINENT QUESTIONS TAKEN FROM THE PRESENT TRUTH, NO. 26. PERTINENT QUESTIONS TAKEN FROM THE PRESENT TRUTH, NO. 105. PERTINENT QUESTIONS TAKEN FROM MISCELLANEOUS NOS. OF THE PRESENT TRUTH. 405

CHAPTER I. THE BIBLE EPIPHANY.

THE MEANING OF THE WORDS, *EPIPHAINO*, *EPIPHANEIA*, *APOKALYPSIS* AND *PAROUSIA*. FIRST GREAT COMPANY ACTIVITIES, OCT., 16, 17, 1916. PURPOSES OF THE EPIPHANY PERIOD TOWARD THE WORLD. SEPARATION OF THE LITTLE FLOCK AND THE GREAT COMPANY. THE LORD JESUS' MANIFESTING HIMSELF TO THE GREAT COMPANY AS SUCH. TEN PROOFS THAT WE ARE IN THE EPIPHANY. EXAMINATION OF DAWN'S PERTINENT ERRORS AND MISREPRESENTATIONS. DURATION OF THE EPIPHANY, THE DAYS OF LUKE 17: 22, 26, ETC. THE EPIPHANY AND THE TIME OF TROUBLE IDENTICAL. BIBLICAL PROOF THEREOF. CORROBORATIVE EXPLANATIONS OF THAT SERVANT. THE CHURCH'S EPIPHANY WORK: TOWARD ITSELF; TOWARD THE YOUTHFUL WORTHIES; TOWARD THE GREAT COMPANY; TOWARD THE WORLD. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

IN THIS chapter we desire first of all to investigate the Biblical use of the word Epiphany and some of its related thoughts. While we note the fact that the word Epiphany, though frequently used in English, does not occur in the English Bible, we should recognize that the word *epiphaneia*, from which it is derived, does occur in the Greek of the New Testament. In all, it is found in six passages, which we herewith cite: 2 Thes. 2: 8; 1 Tim. 6: 14; 2 Tim. 1: 10; 4: 1, 8; and Tit. 2: 13. In arriving at an understanding of its meaning the consideration of a few things will prove helpful: (1) the word *epiphaino*, from which *epiphaneia* is derived; (2) the meaning of its basic part, *phaino*; (3) the meaning of the preposition *epi*, with which *phaino* is compounded; (4) the force added to the word *phaino* by this preposition; (5) all the occurrences of *epiphaneia* in the Bible; (6) its various uses in the Scriptures; and (7) the general trend of Scriptural thought connected with the word.

(2) We remark on the first point, that the word *epiphaneia* is not derived from a simple, but a compound

word—*epiphaino*—which is formed by uniting the preposition *epi*, meaning on, over, at, etc., with the verb *phaino*, meaning to shine, to manifest. *Epiphaino* derives its basic meaning from the verb *phaino*, and the preposition *epi* intensifies the meaning of *phaino* in the compound word, so that *epiphaino* means to shine brightly, to manifest clearly. These remarks help us to arrive at a definition of the word *epiphaneia*, which, in harmony with Greek dictionaries, we may give primarily as bright shining, clear manifestation. As a rule it refers to making an obscure or unseen thing very apparent to the physical or to the mental eyes. As we study its occurrences in the New Testament, we will be able clearly to see this. We precede the study of the six passages in which the Greek word *epiphaneia* occurs by the quotation and a brief explanation of the four passages in which *epiphaino*, its root word, is found in the New Testament, italicizing the English words that translate it: "The day spring [sunrising, in the margin, *i.e.*, Christ] from on High hath visited us, *to give light* [to give the bright shining of the Sun of Truth] to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace" (Luke 1: 78, 79). Here manifestly Jesus (John 1: 9; 8: 12; 9: 5) is referred to as the One who clearly manifests the Lord's ways to sinners and to faithful saints. "And when neither sun nor stars in many days *appeared*, and no small tempest lay on us, all hope that we should be saved was then taken away" (Acts 27: 20). Here the bright shining of the heavenly bodies is referred to as unseen. "The grace [favor] of God that bringeth salvation for all men hath *appeared* TEACHING us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly" (Tit. 2: 11, 12). Here the thought seems to be that the Gospel Message, which is an expression of God's favor, has been clearly manifested as salutary for all mankind, and, as such

bright light, teaches especially God's people to live holy lives. "After that the kindness and love of God our Savior toward man *appeared*" (Tit. 3: 4). Here the Gospel is referred to as causing the kindness and love of God toward man to shine brightly before us. In all four of the above passages it is apparent that our definition of *epiphaino* given above is correct; it means to shine brightly, to manifest clearly.

(3) A careful and reverent study of the six passages in which the word *epiphaneia* is found will reveal the fact that the New Testament uses it in two different ways: (1) the act of manifesting persons, principles and things, previously obscure or hidden, by the Truth shining with special brightness; and (2) that period of our Lord's second stay on earth in which the Truth will shine in special brightness, manifesting persons, principles and things hitherto hidden or obscure (1 Cor. 4: 5). In the order of their clearness we present with brief comments first the four passages in which *epiphaneia*, whose English equivalents in the respective passages we italicize, is used to mean "the act of manifesting persons, principles and things, previously obscure or hidden by the Truth shining with special brightness." "Who [God] hath saved us and called us with an holy calling . . . according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but [which] is now made manifest by the *appearing* of our Savior Jesus Christ, who hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel" (2 Tim. 1: 9, 10). In this passage the Plan and favors that God prepared before the world began for His people are spoken of as being clearly revealed by the *epiphaneia*, the bright-shining, the clear teaching, of Jesus respecting persons, principles and things. Among the things clearly manifested by Jesus through the Gospel God's Truth, St. Paul mentions life and immortality. This passage is very clear as proving our

first explanation of the New Testament use of the word *epiphaneia*. It will be noted that in this passage the *epiphaneia*, the clear manifestation, was in connection with the Jewish Harvest.

(4) "Looking for the blessed hope [of seeing and being with and like our Lord, Col. 3: 4; 1 John 3: 2] and the appearing of the glory of the great God and of our Savior Jesus Christ." (Tit.2: 13, A.R.V.) By the expression, the glory of our great God and of our Savior Jesus Christ, we are not to understand, as some think, a dazzling natural light, but the brightness of their perfect characters shining resplendent in supreme Wisdom, Power, Justice and Love (Is. 6: 3; Ps. 72: 19; Num. 14: 21; Rev. 4: 8; 5: 12, 13; 15: 3, 4). This passage says that the Lord's children are expecting two things in connection with our Lord's second stay on earth: (1) the realization of their hopes of seeing and being with and like Him, and (2) a clear manifestation of the resplendent character of God and of Christ Jesus throughout the earth, even as Heaven is now full of their glory. Thus a manifestation of the glorious characters of God and of Christ Jesus by the Truth shining with special clearness is referred to in this passage. And this, according to the passage under consideration, is to accompany Jesus' second stay on earth. Accordingly, the passage refers to His entire Second Advent period. "Then shall that Wicked [one, the Antichrist] be revealed [manifested], whom the Lord [Jesus] shall consume by the spirit [power] of His mouth [the Bible, the Truth (John 17: 17), is the Lord's mouth, that through which He speaks], and [whom the Lord Jesus] shall destroy with the *brightness* of His Coming" [His second presence on this earth] (2 Thes. 2: 8). This passage shows us that the glorious and powerful Truth of God will shine so brightly that through its manifestation of the Papacy, in its teachings, character and effects, the Lord will accomplish at His Second Advent the annihilation

of the Antichrist, the Papacy, the Romanist hierarchy as such, and, of course, not its adherents. "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the Righteous Judge, shall give me at that day [the Judgment Day]; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His *appearing*" (2 Tim. 4: 8). This passage undoubtedly refers to our Lord's second stay on this earth, on the Last Day, when He will reward all God's servants (Rev. 11: 18), who with yearning, love and delight have looked forward to that Day, and when rewarding His faithful followers He will manifest Himself in His glory by the brightness of His Word and works. Our brief examination of the four passages foregoing has resulted in our learning that the word *epiphaneia* means the act of manifesting persons, principles and things, by the Truth shining with special brightness.

(5) However, this word is used in two other passages in which it occurs in a slightly different sense, namely as the *period of time* during our Lord's Second Presence in which He will manifest persons, principles and things by the Truth shining with special brightness, even as a consideration of the two pertinent verses will show: "Keep this commandment without spot, unrebutable, until the *appearing* of our Lord Jesus Christ, which [appearing] *in its own seasons* He will show [make known], He who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords." (1 Tim. 6: 15.) St. Paul here could not have meant to give this injunction to Timothy as an individual, in this passage, because Timothy died at least 18 centuries before the Epiphany was due to set in. As Jesus frequently addressed His followers throughout the Gospel Age in the Apostles, their representatives, so here St. Paul seems in Timothy to address the Lord's people generally, especially the Truth servants, encouraging them to be faithful, until that period of

our Lord's Return which He here calls His, *appearing*, Epiphany (Col. 3: 4, 1 John 3: 2), which this passage shows He will manifest in its separate time periods when, as King of Kings and Lord of Lords, He takes to Himself His great power and prepares to reign in Millennial glory over the earth (Rev. 11: 15-18; 19: 6-16; 20: 4-6). This passage clearly proves the word to mean a period of time during our Lord's Second Advent, as the following will show:

This period we call by the anglicized form of the word under consideration—Epiphany. We will quote 1 Tim. 6: 15 from the I.V.: "Keep the commandment . . . until our Lord Jesus Christ's Epiphany, which [Epiphany] *in its own seasons* He will show, He who [the relative, not interrogative, pronoun] is, etc." In this verse the Epiphany is spoken of as having various seasons, epochs. Hence it must be a period. The Epiphany as a period has a number of seasons: (1) It is divided into the second four of the eight large wonderful days. (2) The eight small wonderful days, 1917-1925, have fallen entirely within the Epiphany. (3) As a whole it is divided into a small Gospel Age. (4) A part of it forms a smaller Gospel Age. (5) In the Epiphany's earlier part it had a still smaller Gospel Age, for each consecutive day of which there was a corresponding year in the Gospel Age; and in these three Miniatures' days or years similar events occurred as occurred in the corresponding years or centuries of the Gospel Age. (6) During these Miniatures the five siftings corresponding to the five Gospel-Age siftings occurred, manifesting the Levites. And (7) the two lappings of two years and one month, the Parousia lapping that long into the Epiphany at the latter's beginning, and the Epiphany, at its end lapping into the Basileia for the same time. Certainly these things, most of which have already been fulfilled, and some of which are in processes of fulfillment, the rest belonging to the yet remaining part of the Epiphany

prove the word *epiphaneia* to mean a period also. Other Epiphany periods could be mentioned, but these are enough for our present purpose.

(6) "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick [living] and the dead at [during] His *appearing* and Kingdom" (2 Tim. 4: 1). The Scriptures assure us that Jesus with His Elect Bride will judge the dead during the thousand years' Reign. The quick, the living, [fallen angels and new creatures] therefore, will be judged, according to this passage, during His appearing, Epiphany; hence it is a period of time connected with our Lord's Second Advent. The I.V. offers the following translation of 2 Tim. 4: 1: "Jesus Christ, the one [who] shall judge [the] living and [the] dead, both during His Epiphany and Kingdom." It also offers an alternative translation of the last part of the words above: both *as to* His Epiphany and Kingdom. The construction of the pertinent words is preferably, according to this version, the accusative of time-duration; hence the rendering: both *during* His Epiphany and Kingdom. These are the second and third periods of our Lord's Second Advent. The other possible construction is the accusative of specification; hence the secondary translation: both *as to* His Epiphany and Kingdom. But if the second translation should be preferred by anyone, the disputer of the Epiphany as a period is not at all thereby helped; for it implies that the Epiphany and the Kingdom are periods, because the judging would be as to the conduct of the pertinent ones during their period of trial, which in the first class is the Epiphany and in the second class is the Kingdom. To us the I.V.'s preferable translation seems to be the better, because of its clearness and factualness, which will become clear from the text itself, as well as from parallel passages. By the dead of this verse, we understand Adam's condemned children to be meant, regardless of whether they are in

the dying process or in the death state. (Matt. 8: 22; 2 Cor. 5: 14.) These are to have their judgment—trial for life—during the Millennium, as this verse teaches. (Ps. 72: 1-19; 22: 27-29; Rom. 14: 9; 1 Cor. 15: 23-26; 6: 2; John 5: 25-29; Is. 29: 18, 24; 45: 22, 23; Phil. 2: 9-11; Rev. 1: 6; 5: 10; 20: 4, 6; Matt. 19: 28; 20: 21; Luke 2: 34; 22: 29, 30; Ob. 17, 21; Rev. 14: 1.) Accordingly, the quick will have a judgment during the Epiphany. Who are the quick? Those never under death sentence—the fallen angels and the new creatures, none of whom, as such, have ever been under death sentences. From other Scriptures we gather that the judging process is a separating of the proven good from the proven evil, under trial. (Matt. 25: 31-33.) Those who have eyes to see understand how ever since 1917 the Little Flock and Great Company (all new creatures) are being judged in the sense of being separated following a testing period; and the same thing is, according to this passage, taking place between the penitent and the impenitent fallen angels, the latter to be cut off from the Millennial trial, which the penitent angels will have for their final proving for life. This verse, therefore, teaches that the Epiphany is a period and, as such, is the second period of the Lord's Second Presence.

(7) We understand that the *epiphaneia*, in the first sense of the word (*bright shining*, manifesting principles, persons and things), has the same primary meaning as the word *apokalypsis* (*revelation*) primarily has. This is evident, we understand, because they do the same thing: the *epiphaneia*, as an action, *reveals* persons, principles and things, as they are. Thus the Lord now *epiphanizes* or *apokalypsizes* Jehovah, Himself, the Church, the Great Company, the Truth, the hidden things of darkness, the counsels of hearts—in a word, brings all pertinent persons, principles and things to bright light in their real character, in so far as this is necessary at the present stage of God's Plan. Hence

the *epiphaneia*, the *apokalypsis*, of our Lord means, not Jesus making Himself visible, nor simply Jesus' making Himself known, but His making every other person and every principle and everything clearly known that is to be made clearly known in the end of the Age. *Apokalypsis*, like *epiphaneia*, also means the Epiphany period (1 Cor. 1: 7; 2 Thes. 1: 7; 1 Pet. 1: 7, 13; 4: 13). Accordingly, epiphanizing and apokalypsizing, and the Epiphany and the Apocalypse, being respectively identical, we can see that the special time of such epiphanizing, apokalypsizing, is the time of trouble—the time from 1914 onward for a considerable number of years yet. The following Scriptures prove this thought: Luke 17: 29, 30 [Sodom's destruction typing Christendom's (Rev. 11: 8)]; Matt. 26: 64 [the troubles of ecclesiasticism are symbolically set forth here as the clouds of heaven]; 2 Thes. 1: 7, 8. These passages in their order refer respectively to the war, revolution and anarchy of the Time of Trouble. Hence we see that the Epiphany is the special Apocalypse time and is the same as the Time of Trouble. The same thoughts are expressed in Mal. 3: 2, 3; 1 Cor. 3: 12-15 and Matt. 7: 24-27, from the standpoint as to how the Time of Trouble, as the Epiphany, will epiphanize the Little Flock and the Great Company. The gradualness of this epiphanizing, this revealing (apokalypsizing), is indicated in the *seasons* of the Epiphany (1 Tim. 6: 14, 15), in the fact that by the time it is completed the whole Church will be with the Lord (Col. 3: 4; 2 Thes. 1: 7; 1 Pet. 1: 7, 13; 4: 13), and in the judging process of 2 Tim. 4: 1 during the Epiphany. Accordingly, the words *epiphaneia* and *apokalypsis*, in the sense of an action, and in the sense of a period, are synonymous. We here remark that there has been a gradual epiphanizing, revealing, ever since 1874 to the Church; but, so far as the world and the Great Company are concerned, this has gradually been going on since the tribulation began—1914, and will increase and finally come to a

climax at the end of the Epiphany—the end of the Time of Trouble. This is the reason why the Time of Trouble is emphatically the Epiphany, the Apocalypse, for it clearly with more distinctness than the preceding period, manifests pertinent persons, principles and things.

(8) Our discussion of 1 Tim. 6: 14, 15; 2 Tim. 4: 1, therefore, shows that the word *epiphaneia*, from which we derive our English word Epiphany, also means a period of time connected with our Lord's Return that will be accompanied with a flooding of the earth with His all-exposing Truth, to set in after His arrival, and before He and His Bride begin their Millennial Reign. Accordingly, we see that both of our definitions for the word *epiphaneia* are correct: (1) the *act* of manifesting persons, principles and things by the Truth shining with special brightness and (2) the *period of time* connected with our Lord's Return in which there will be a special manifestation of persons, principles and things by the Truth shining with special brightness. The above study of the word *epiphaneia* gives us as a result the facts that out of its six occurrences in the New Testament one is used in connections showing that it refers to activities of our Lord's during the Jewish Harvest; and the other five to activities and times connected with His Second Advent. These thoughts on the meaning of the word Epiphany will prove helpful for our better understanding of its other more important phases.

(9) Better to understand the Epiphany of our Lord's second stay on earth, the study of an associated word will be helpful. *i.e.*, the Greek word *parousia*. All Greek dictionaries and Greek scholars are united in the thought that the word *parousia* means presence, as, for example, can be seen by the marginal notes in the E.R.V. and the A.R.V., wherever the word is not rendered *presence* in the text. 1 Cor. 15: 23; Matt. 24: 3, 27, 37, 39 are cases to the point. In connection with such passages the reader will see the note, "Greek,

presence." Our A.V. sometimes properly renders the word by "presence," as can be seen in 2 Cor. 10: 10 and Phil. 2: 12. The word *parousia* does not mean *coming*, as of one's being on the way, but a stay at a place after one's arrival there. It is quite generally accepted as the best thought of the ripest Biblical scholarship of our day that the first part of our Lord's stay on earth after His return from Heaven is a secret and invisible one, the world at first not being at all aware of it, only His prospective Bride knowing of it, through the light of the Bible and the signs of the times. (1 Thes. 5: 1-5.) Note carefully how in these verses we are shown that the period of Jesus' Second Presence will have come stealthily upon the unsuspecting world, while God's faithful people will not be in ignorance of His presence. This is even as our Lord Jesus told us (Matt. 24: 37-39), when comparing the period of His secret Second Presence to the period of Noah's presence before the Flood. As then they ate and drank, married and were given in marriage, and knew not the character of the times in which they were living, despite the fact that they were repeatedly described to them by Noah, "the preacher of righteousness," until the Flood came, so will be the Parousia, the period of our Lord's secret stay on earth after His return. People will engage in the ordinary affairs of every day life, and not know the character of that time of His presence, *parousia*, despite the fact of its repeated announcement to them. In the nearly parallel statement in Luke 17: 26 the matter is very clearly shown: "And as it was *in the days* of Noah, so shall it be also *in the days* of the Son of Man," etc. Thus these Scriptures assure us that the first stage of our Lord's second stay on earth will be secret, because invisible, so far as mankind in general is concerned.

(10) This stage of our Lord's Second Presence in the earth is repeatedly designated the *Parousia*, in the original Greek of the New Testament. The Epiphany,

as a period of our Lord's Second Presence, follows the Parousia, its first stage. While the word *parousia* is used in the Scriptures to designate the first stage of our Lord's Second Presence, as, in addition to the above considerations, we can see from the following passages, where in the Greek the word *parousia* is used: Matt. 24: 3, 37, 39; 2 Thes. 2: 1; James 5: 7, 8; 2 Pet. 3: 4; nevertheless, since this word means *presence*, it also is used to include, with the Parousia, also the Epiphany stage of the Lord's Second Presence, as is manifest from the following passages: 1 Thes. 3: 13; 4: 15; 5: 23; 2 Thes. 2: 8, 9. Yea, it is also used to designate the entire thousand years of His Second Presence, His Millennial Reign on earth, as we may see in the passages which we now cite: Matt. 24: 27; 1 Cor. 15: 23; 2 Pet. 1: 16; 1 John 2: 28. Under the above three sets of passages we have cited all the New Testament Scriptures in which the word *parousia* occurs in connection with our Lord's second stay on earth. Its meaning—presence—makes it applicable to any one and all of these three stages of His second stay on earth.

(11) From the descriptions given us in Matt. 24: 23-41 and Luke 17: 20-37, we conclude that in the first stage, the *Parousia*, of our Lord's Return He will be especially active in two things: (1) in gathering His Elect Bride into closer fellowship with Himself through His Spirit and Word, preparatory to her deliverance from the earth and her glorification with Him (Ps. 50: 5; Col. 3: 4); and (2) in preparing for the Great Tribulation (Matt. 24: 21, 22; Dan. 12: 1; Luke 17: 26-32; 21: 25, 26; Rev. 19: 11-21), during which a less faithful, an overcharged class, called the Great Company, will be delivered (Mal. 3: 2, 3 ; Matt. 7: 26, 27 ; 1 Cor. 3: 12-15 ; Rev. 7: 14). According to our Lord's statement (Luke 17: 26-30), the Epiphany, the time of the revelation of the Son of Man, occurs during this Great Tribulation. The ablest Bible students

of our day are more and more coming to the conclusion that we are now in the Great Tribulation, and that we have been in it ever since the outbreak of the World War in 1914, with its accompanying famines and pestilences. This they construe from the prophecies, the signs of the times, and the world troubles on all hands. We agree with this view, and therefore believe that we are now in the Epiphany, and that shortly in the clouds of trouble that involve our social earth, and that darken our ecclesiastical heavens, the presence of the Son of Man will be recognized by the world of mankind (Matt. 24: 30; Luke 21: 25-28; Rev. 1: 7). If we are among God's watching people, we will recognize this before others see it; and thus the Day will not overtake us unawares.

(12) The third phase, or stage, of our Lord's second stay on earth is, of course, the Kingdom, called in Greek the *Basileia* (2 Tim. 4: 1). The Kingdom of God was the theme of Jesus and the Apostles in the New Testament, and of Moses and the Prophets in the Old Testament. Over 120 passages in the New Testament alone refer to the Kingdom in express terms, either in its present militant or preparatory stage, or in its glorious or reigning stage during the Thousand Years. Numerous other passages refer to it without using the express term "the Kingdom." We cite just a few passages for the study of our readers, (1) with reference to its present militant, or preparatory, stage: Matt. 3: 2, 17; 13: 24, 31, 33, 41; 16: 19; 25: 1; Mark 12: 34; Col. 1: 13; and (2) with reference to its glorious, or reigning, stage: Matt. 6: 10, 33; 8: 11; 19: 23, 24; Mark 14: 25; Luke 1: 33; 12: 32; 13: 28, 29; 17 20, 21; 19: 1, 12, 15; John 18: 36; Acts 14: 22; 1 Cor. 15: 24-26, 50; 2 Tim. 4: 1; Heb. 1: 8; Rev. 1: 6; 5: 10 (see E. and A.R.V.'s for the last two citations); 11: 15. According to these passages our Lord and His faithful followers, while in the flesh, are God's Kingdom in embryo; while when reigning over

the earth they will be God's Kingdom in glory and power. These three stages of Christ's stay on earth, the Parousia, the Epiphany, or Apokalypsis, and the Basileia—the Kingdom—are very important for us to keep in mind, if we would see clearly on the subject of Christ's Second Advent. In a word, the Parousia is preparatory for both the Epiphany and the Basileia, the Kingdom, and the Epiphany carries forward the results of the Parousia, and introduces the Basileia, the Kingdom.

(13) As periods the Parousia and the Epiphany lapped into one another, somewhat after the manner in which, from 1874 until the last spirit-begotten person leaves this earth, the Gospel and Millennial Ages lap into one another. With the beginning of the first smiting of the Jordan the Parousia and the Epiphany began to lap into one another; and by October 16, 1916, the Parousia was at a full end. One may ask, Why do we fix on this date as the full end of the Parousia? We answer: for two reasons: (1) On that day our Pastor left Bethel for the last time, and actually relinquished his hold at headquarters and never took it up again. (2) On that day the leaders of the Levites in America and England began *as such* to take a firm stand against one another. At Bethel on that day our dear Pastor spent several hours seeking to reconcile, on the one hand, J.F.Rutherford and A. H. MacMillan, and H. L. Rockwell on the other hand, with one another. As subsequent events abundantly prove, a reconciliation was not effected. Rather they prove that the former were the leaders of the transitional Merarite Levites, and that the latter was the leader of the transitional Gershonite Levites. On the same day in England Jesse Hemery and six elders supporting him became irreconcilably opposed to H. J. Shearn and the ten elders supporting him in his efforts to set aside our Pastor's controllership in Tabernacle affairs and the assistant pastorate of Jesse Hemery in the Tabernacle

by fixedly setting themselves against H. J. Shearn's proposals sent to them by the eleven in their final letter to them on the subject. Subsequent events abundantly prove that Jesse Hemery is the leader of the transitional British Merarites, and that H. J. Shearn is the leader of the transitional British Gershonites. The next day, October 17, 1916, our Pastor sought to reconcile Menta Sturgeon and H. Holmes at Detroit. Subsequent events prove that no reconciliation occurred and that Menta Sturgeon was the leader of the transitional Kohathite Levites. Among all these Levite leaders the difficulty was due to their *seeking leadership against one another—unholy ambition in grasping for power*. October 16 and 17, 1916, seem to be the dates on which the Levitical leaders did what brought them to the fore as such; therefore, with the first of these dates we believe the Parousia as a period ended, and from then on we have been in the Epiphany without there being any more a lapping of the two periods under consideration into one another.

(14) While the word Epiphany, when meaning a manifestation of persons, principles or things, may be used to characterize acts of the Gospel and Millennial Ages as well as of other periods, in the sense of the second period of our Lord's Second Advent it is limited to the time between the Parousia and the Basileia. It is used to designate the period of *the great tribulation*, the Time of Trouble. Remembering that the *epiphaneia* and the *apokalypsis* are one and the same time and that this period is for the benefit of the world and the Great Company, *i.e.*, that the Lord Jesus in this period manifests His presence to them in their interests—we can readily see that the Scriptures teach that the Epiphany, as a period, is the Time of Trouble. Luke 17: 28-30 is a passage to the point. Sodom represents Christendom and Lot represents the Great Company (Rev. 11: 8; 2 Pet. 2: 11). The fire and brimstone here represent the complete destruction

of Christendom (Jude 7), which will take place in the great tribulation (Rev. 16: 18-20; 19: 20). Jesus' remark in verse 30 that the antitype of the raining of fire and brimstone upon Sodom will take place *in the day* in which the Son of man will be *revealed* proves that He will be revealed, *i.e.*, manifested, in the Time of Trouble. Therefore the Epiphany as a period is the period of the great tribulation, and began with the trench warfare on the Western battle line September 21, 1914, in the World War, which is the first part of the great tribulation; for it was only with the nations settling down to trench warfare, which occurred September 21, 1914, the first day of the seventh lunar month, that the weakening of the nations began as the first part of the destruction of Christendom. Therefore, we are now living in the Epiphany, and it will yet last for quite a number of years.

(15) The Epiphany as a period is not especially intended in the interests of the Church in the flesh. The Parousia was especially intended for the Church; for it was during that time that the feet members of the prospective Bride were all richly blessed through the Reaping Truth with the knowledge of the Lord's presence as her Bridegroom, Reaper and King, and with the privilege of blessing one another with the special Harvest truths. This does not mean that the Church will have no work nor privileges during the Epiphany; for during this time she receives great privileges and does some great works; but rather it means that this period is set aside to bring certain blessings to others, in ministering which the Little Flock has a part. But the truths that she receives and the works that she does during the Epiphany are decidedly inferior to those of the Parousia, and they are to the intent that she may be a blessing to the Great Company as such, and for helping the Youthful Worthies to be prepared to receive their King and His Kingdom.

(16) This brings us to a consideration of our Lord's.

special Epiphany work in which the Little Flock is privileged to take part. During this time our Lord does a special work toward the world, the Great Company, and the Youthful Worthies. Part of this work He has already done; the rest remains to be done. As far as the world is concerned His Epiphany work is twofold: (1) His separation of the world into its two classes, the Conservatives and the Radicals; and (2) His revelation of Himself to the world as present in His Second Advent as the Overthrower of Satan's Empire and as the Establisher of God's Kingdom. ("Our Lord's Return," pp. 16-21; 41-44.) As far as the Church is concerned Our Lord's Epiphany work is also twofold: (1) Separation of the Church into its two classes, the Little Flock and the Great Company, and (2) revelation of Himself to the Great Company as such as present in His Second Advent in the capacity of their Cleanser and Deliverer. As far as the Youthful Worthies are concerned it is for their development for the Kingdom. Please see our Pastor's booklet, "Our Lord's Return," pp. 37-40.

(17) A closer examination of His Epiphany work toward the world and the Great Company should prove a blessing to us; therefore we offer some details on both features of His Epiphany work, reserving for later treatment His Epiphany work toward the Youthful Worthies. Above we stated that one of His Epiphany works toward the world was His separating it into its two classes, the Conservatives and the Radicals. This work began with *the first smiting of Jordan* in the Fall of 1914, and progressed through the second smiting of Jordan, beginning in the Fall of 1917. *The separation of these classes is now worldwide.* All of us are familiar with the fact that the war, through endangering the existence of the various nations, actually but temporarily cemented the radicals and the conservatives into one class in every country involved in the war. But by the first smiting of Jordan (which

made an exposure of the evil deeds of those claiming to exercise power by Divine right, and which gave the proof that those claiming to exercise such power were responsible for the war and its disastrous effects) men gradually began to be divided into the two social groups, the Radicals and the Conservatives. The effect of the second smiting of Jordan was the widening of this breach. As a result of these two smitings men everywhere in every country on earth are divided into the Radicals and the Conservatives. THERE CAN BE NO DISPUTING THE FACT THAT THIS DIVISION IS EVIDENCED ON ALL HANDS! The conflict between these two classes is shaking the social fabric everywhere. Every newspaper gives us fresh evidence of the fact that this division has occurred THIS FACT, THEREFORE, DEMONSTRATES THAT JORDAN HAS RECEIVED BOTH SMITINGS! Let us repeat the thought that the worldwide conflicts between these two classes prove that Jordan has received both of its foretold and expected smitings.

(18) Both of these smitings occurred before the war ended; and there has been no smiting of Jordan since the end of the war. Beyond all contradiction the purpose of smiting the Jordan was to effect the division of the peoples. Their being divided now, Jordan must have been smitten; and hence there is no necessity of a future smiting of Jordan. In view of the indisputable fact that the peoples are now divided, we desire to ask Menta Sturgeon and Carl Olson and their supporters and the P.B.I. and their supporters, Why do they advocate a future first smiting of Jordan? IF THE PEOPLES ARE DIVIDED, WHY SMITE THEM FOR THE PURPOSE OF DIVIDING THEM? In view of the facts of the case should not these brethren better conclude that the smiting of Jordan that they advocate must be a different one from either of the two typed by Elijah's and Elisha's smiting of Jordan; and that they are consequently mistaken on the subject? Or will they keep on with their error, further deluding themselves and their

followers, and with them awakening to all the greater chagrin and disappointments? We trust not.

(19) We conclude from the above discussion that the first part of our Lord's Epiphany work toward the world, the division of the peoples, has set in. Such division of the peoples is intended by Him to pave the way for the acme of the wrath, the earthquake and fire, through which the second purpose of His Epiphany work will be accomplished, *i.e.*, the manifestation of Himself in the Second Advent to the world as the Overthrower of Satan's Empire and the Establisher of God's Kingdom. Already, amid the first smiting of Jordan the war was referred to before the world by the Elijah class as an evidence of the Lord's Return to the earth and of his overthrowing Satan's Empire. The signs of the times that were referred to, the characteristics of the war that were pointed out and the Biblical prophecies that were cited and explained as applying to these things by the Elijah class, convinced some of the world that the Lord was present as the Overthrower of Satan's Empire. However, the war feature of the tribulation was not sufficiently impressive nor thorough to work this conviction in the minds of the whole world, nor even in the minds of a large part of the world. The symbolic earthquake and fire will be necessary to make all recognize this fact; and the world is rapidly drifting towards Armageddon, though we expect matters to be patched up in a way that will stay it off for yet a while. But it will surely come, and in the end, by its sore troubles and its destruction of the present order, will manifest to the world the Lord present in His Second Advent, as the Destroyer of Satan's Empire and the Establisher of God's Kingdom for mankind's deliverance.

(20) A Scripture (2 Thes. 1: 7, 8) familiar to all of us proves this point: "Our Lord Jesus shall be revealed [manifested as the Destroyer of Satan's Empire] from heaven [in His Second Advent] with His

mighty messengers [the agents of wrath which in the war were the mighty armies with their destructive agencies, and the famines and pestilences, which in the revolution will be the loyal and revolting armies and famines and pestilences, and which in the anarchy will be the contending law-abiding and lawless elements among mankind, and famines and pestilences] in flaming fire [not in the sky, but in the direful tribulations of the world's supreme trouble will He be manifest as present overthrowing Satan's Empire] taking vengeance [exacting retribution] on them that know not God [the Second Death class in the Nominal Church] and that obey not [the Second Death class in the Truth] the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." Chastened and humbled by the unparalleled tribulation, and giving a meek consideration to the Lord's Message explaining the nature and purpose of the trouble, they will recognize the wrath poured out upon them as incidental to the overthrow of Satan's Empire, and as necessary to introduce God's Kingdom and to prepare them to hail obediently, hopefully and joyfully the Lord's Anointed as their King. This being accomplished the Lord will have completed His second Epiphany work toward the world. Thus viewed, the two Epiphany works of our Lord toward the world—the separation of the Radicals and the Conservatives, and the manifestation of Himself to them through the tribulation as the Overthrower of Satan's Empire and the Establisher of God's Kingdom—are blessings for the world, even though they seem otherwise.

(21) As we saw in the case of the Lord's Epiphany work toward the world that there is first a separation of the world into its two classes, and then a manifestation of the Lord to the world; so in the Lord's Epiphany work toward the Great Company there is first a separation of the Great Company from the Little Flock, and then there is a manifestation of Himself to the Great Company *as such*. Let us examine a few

particulars of these Epiphany works of the Lord toward the Great Company.

(22) The first of these is the separation of the Little Flock and the Great Company. Viewed from the standpoint of the picture of Priests and Levites, this separation began January 14, 1917; but from the standpoint of the Elijah and Elisha picture, mouthpieceship toward Nominal Spiritual Israel, it began June 27, 1917. As the facts of the latter picture are more familiar to all of us, we will here discuss these. Without contradiction, apart from the leaders and a few of their supporters among the Elijah and Elisha classes, there was profound harmony among the Lord's people of both classes until the Summer of 1917. Without contradiction, early in the Summer of 1917 great disharmony set in among the Lord's people, dividing them right and left. Now the division is worldwide. From 7,000 to 10,000 Truth people had severed their relations with the Society. All must admit that then a greater division has set in among God's people than ever occurred in any of the other Harvest Siftings. THIS SEPARATION IS WITHOUT DOUBT THE DIVISION OF THE ANTITYPICAL ELIJAH AND ELISHA. We want to ask our dear P.B.I. brethren and their supporters, and Menta Sturgeon and Carl Olson and their supporters, in view of their teaching a future first smiting of Jordan, how they can harmonize the fact that the Bible teaches that there would be unbroken harmony between antitypical Elijah and Elisha from after their arrival at Jordan, October, 1914, until some time after Jordan's first smiting, with the fact that there has been the greatest disharmony and division among God's people *after* that date and *before their* future smiting of Jordan? Does this fact not unanswerably prove that their setting of things contradicts the Scriptures and facts? Let them reconcile the contradiction between the Scriptures and facts on the one hand and their future first smiting of Jordan on the other hand,

if they can. WE FEEL SATISFIED THAT THEY CANNOT, BECAUSE THEY ARE IN ERROR ON THIS POINT. Just as we showed before their disharmony with the Scriptures which teach that Jordan is smitten *that resultantly the peoples may be divided*, while they are teaching a smiting of Jordan *after* its world-wide division, so now we show their error in teaching a future *first* smiting of Jordan *after* the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha. Do not these brethren stand convicted before the whole Church as teachers of error, and as misunderstanders of the work that the Lord is now doing, and therefore as disqualified from teaching the brethren on these subjects? And for the same reason may we not reasonably fear that they are deluding others on other subjects also? Undeniably, the division of the peoples has been accomplished the world over; therefore both smitings of Jordan are over. Undeniably, Elijah and Elisha have been separated, therefore the first smiting of Jordan was completed before their separation. Hence we exhort these brethren, humbly to confess and forsake their error, and then the Lord will show them mercy, as persistence therein will doubtless increase their guilt and bring sadder results upon them and their followers.

(23) The Scriptures teach that the separation of the Great Company from the Little Flock is an Epiphany work. Not only is this implied in the separation of Elijah and Elisha occurring after their reaching and the former's smiting Jordan, beginning October, 1914, and in the sending away of the Scapegoat as a picture of a work connected with the separation, and in the fact that the Epiphany set in with the falling of the symbolic fire and brimstone (Luke 17: 29, 30), which began in the Fall of 1914, but also in our text (2 Tim. 4: 1). A judging work implies a separation and a sentence (Matt. 25: 31-47). Our text speaks of the quick, the living, and the dead receiving their judgment during the epiphaneia and the basileia. Who are the

dead referred to in the text? We answer, Adam's condemned race, whether under the dying process (Matt. 8: 21, 22; 2 Cor. 5: 14; John 5: 25) or in the death state (John 5: 28, 29). These will receive their judgment in the Millennium (John 5: 28, 29; Acts 17: 31). These will not receive their judgment in the Epiphany. Therefore, according to this text, the quick, the living, must receive their judgment during the Epiphany. Who are these quick, these living ones? We answer: They are (1) the fallen angels (Rom. 14: 9), who never were sentenced to death, and (2) the new creatures (2 Cor. 5: 15), who as such never were sentenced to death. Hence the Lord is now doubtless separating the penitent and the impenitent fallen angels, and will in due time sentence the former to a restoration of fellowship with God and the good angels, and will sentence the latter to death. According to this Scripture, the Lord is also in this Epiphany time separating the faithful new creatures, the Little Flock, and the measurably faithful new creatures, the Great Company, and then afterward He will pass sentence on each one of both classes.

(24) The work of separating the two classes of the Church is not yet complete. Just when it will be finished we do not know. We feel sure that there are yet many of the Priests bewildered among the Levites. The Lord, we may be sure, will in due time during the Epiphany separate every one of them from the Levites, as well as gather every Levite from every quarter of the Nominal Church, even as during the Parousia He gathered every Priest from every quarter of the Nominal Church. However, our Lord's Epiphany work of separating the Church into its two classes has progressed very extensively, and is so manifest that we have full assurance that we are in the Epiphany.

(25) The Priests as a class are separate and distinct from the Levites before our Lord manifests Himself to the Great Company *as such*, as their Cleanser

and Deliverer. While it is true that during the Parousia our Lord manifested His presence to some who are now in the Great Company, yet He did not do it to them as to members of that class; for such a work is purely epiphaniac and follows the separation of the Church into its two component parts.

(26) As the Lord will manifest Himself to the world by tribulation and by instruction; so will He also manifest Himself to the Great Company by tribulation and by instruction. The Epiphany truths respecting the Great Company and the Epiphany exposures of their wrongdoing are and will be the instructions whereby the manifestation will in part be effected. But so self-willed is this class that they will not learn by these instructions alone. The co-operation of corrective stripes will additionally have to set in; and by these two things the manifestation of the Lord as their Cleanser and Deliverer will be completed. Some of the Epiphany truths have already been set forth, as some of the Epiphany exposures have already been made. There is good reason for believing that more will have to be done along these lines before a sufficiency of such instruction will have been given to these dear brethren, with whom we most heartily sympathize. The Lord has also given some of the Epiphany tribulations to this class, but manifestly not enough yet. He loves them too much to withhold from them the needed help through His Word and Providence. In due time this will come in completeness. In harmony with our Pastor we believe that the experience of Joseph's brethren in Egypt pictures these things forth, and the picture of the feast in Joseph's house is now nearly fulfilled. Presently the pursuit and capture of Benjamin and his brothers will be completely antityped, and then a little later the manifestation will be made, even as Joseph manifested himself to his brethren. Then, as Joseph gave his brethren wagons, *i.e.*, chariots, etc., with which to bring Jacob, their wives,

little ones and all their possessions to Egypt, so will The Christ beyond the veil give the Great Company the organizations (making such changes therein as their revolutionism requires) necessary to do an immense work toward their brethren inside and outside of the Nominal Church, to fleshly Israel and the world of mankind. By the earthquake destroying the Nominal Church, the clergy, and all their hearty supporters (2 Kings 9: 30-37; 10: 18-28; Isa. 65: 11, 12; Jer. 25: 34-38), the people generally will have a hearing ear for the Great Company's message, who by their ministry will convert not only Israel (Cant. 5: 8—6: 1.), but millions of Gentiles (Rev. 19: 6). They will have an exceedingly fruitful ministry when they as Jesus' agents gather the people into the camp condition of the Epiphany (Num. 8: 9). However, to prosper in this work they must previously submit to the influence of the Epiphany Truth, the Epiphany exposures and the Epiphany washings (Num. 8: 7).

(27) We rejoice to know that this will be fulfilled in them. Then they will recognize their place and their relations to Jesus and the Church. Then they, with many of the world of mankind converted through their ministry, will cry out: "Let us rejoice and be glad and give honor to Him; for the marriage of the Lamb is come and His Wife hath made herself ready!" (Rev. 19: 7). Shortly afterwards, as the Bridesmaids, they will have a happy entrance into the King's palace and partake of the Wedding feast (Ps. 45: 14, 15; Rev. 19: 9), all as a result of Jesus' Epiphany work! "And he saith unto me, 'Write: Blessed are they that are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb.' And he saith unto me: 'These are the true sayings of God' " (Rev. 19: 9). "Great and marvelous are Thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are Thy ways, Thou King of the nations! Who shall not fear Thee, O Lord, and glorify Thy name; for Thou only art holy; for all nations shall come and worship before

Thee; for Thy righteous works are made manifest!" (Rev. 15: 3, 4).

(28) We have above shown from the Scriptures that the Greek word *epiphaneia* (and *apokalypsis*) has two meanings: (1) the manifestation of persons, principles and things by the Truth shining with special brightness (2 Tim. 1: 9, 10; 4: 8; 2 Thes. 2: 8; Tit. 2: 13; Our Lord's Return, pp. 44-46); and (2) the second period of our Lord's Second Presence, during which He makes a special manifestation of certain persons, principles and things by the Truth shining with special brightness. (2 Tim. 4: 1; 1 Tim. 6: 14, 15; Our Lord's Return, p. 39.) It will be recalled that the P.B.I. Editors in the first and only number of The Bible Standard, p. 4, and in the first number of the Herald of Christ's Kingdom, p. 4, in harmony with the Scriptures and our Pastor's writings, taught both senses of this word. It will also be recalled that these Editors in the Herald of 1920, p. 70, denied that the Epiphany is a period, claiming that it is only an activity, one-sidedly quoting what our Pastor said in the booklet, "Our Lord's Return," pp. 44-46, on the first meaning of the word, as though that was all he had to say on the significance of the term. That he held the second sense of the word also, in proof we quote from Our Lord's Return, p. 39, the following: "As we therefore softly whisper, 'Behold the Bridegroom!' it is not with any hope of arousing the world to faith in the Lord's presence, etc. They are unworthy to know, and would only misuse the knowledge now [during the Parousia]. By and by, in the Lord's due time, they shall know—*in the period* [italics ours] of the *Epiphaneia*, or *Apocalypsis* of the Son of Man. They will be awakened by the great crash of the day of trouble."

(29) And some, not all, of the Amram sifters treat with the same deceitful use our Pastor's writings on the subject. They allege that we contradict our Pastor's

writings to the effect that *epiphaneia* means the act of manifesting persons, principles and things by the Truth shining with special brightness, when we use the word to mean a period of time. For them there is even less excuse than for the Herald Editors, because they have had greater light on the subject than these Editors. Not only in our writings, but also in our oral presentations, we taught them both meanings of the word, with proofs from the Scriptures and corroborations from "that Servant's" writings. Yet they allege that we plainly contradict our Pastor's teachings on this subject. Before they attempt to teach on this or on any other subject, they would do well better to inform themselves thereon; otherwise they will be hastening the fulfillment of the Apostle's statement, "their folly shall be made known to all." Can it be possible that they carelessly overlooked our oral and written proofs on this subject? Perhaps. If so, the Lord will hold them responsible for what they could have learned, but what through neglect or inattention they failed to learn. We think the likelier explanation of their course in this matter is the following: Being now in Azazel's hands, their minds are filled with his suggestions, which they set forth as Truth, despite what they had previously learned. As our Pastor has repeatedly shown, there has been an epiphanizing of persons, principles and things from the beginning of our Lord's *Parousia*, hence years before the *Epiphaneia* as a period set in. (Our Lord's Return, pp. 44-46; 39.) Additionally, we believe on the basis of strong evidence that the *Epiphaneia* as a period has set in, and now desire to give both fulfilled *sign* prophecies and fulfilled *time* prophecies that prove this to be the case. First, we will give some of the main sign prophecies, then a few time prophecies that prove this proposition.

(30) In the quotation given above from Our Lord's Return, p. 39, our Pastor identifies the period of the Great Tribulation with the Epiphany period. And this

is evidently Scriptural. We know that the Great Tribulation began with the Great War, will proceed with the great Revolution, and will end with universal Anarchy, and is also accompanied throughout each of its three stages by famines and pestilences (1 Kings 19: 11, 12; Ezek. 14: 21). We know that it is by the Great Tribulation that the Lord will manifest Himself as present as their Deliverer to the Great Company and to the world (Matt. 7: 26, 27; Cant. 5: 5-7; Matt. 2: 5: 10-12; Luke 17: 29, 30; 2 Thes. 1: 7, 8; Matt. 26: 64; Rev. 1: 7). We further know that the manifestation time for these is the Epiphany period (1 Tim. 6: 14, 15; 2 Tim. 4: 1; Col. 3: 4; Tit. 2: 13). Hence the Time of Trouble and the Epiphany are one and the same period. But the Time of Trouble began with the World War (Joel 3: 9-14; Dan. 12: 1; Matt. 24: 20-22; Rev. 14: 19, 20). Therefore ever since 1914 we have been in the Epiphany. Thus the presence of the Time of Trouble proves that we are in the Epiphany period of our Lord's Second Presence. See also Question Book, page 97, par. 5.

(31) The fulfillment of a second sign prophecy proves that we are in that period of our Lord's Second Presence called the Epiphany, *i.e.*, the separation of the Church of the Firstborns into its two classes, the Little Flock and the Great Company. The Bible teaches that the dead, Adam's condemned race, would be judged, *i.e.*, separated (Matt. 25: 31, 32) into its two classes, during the Millennial Kingdom (2 Tim. 4: 1; Rev. 20: 12-15; Acts 17: 31). It also teaches that the living (the fallen angels and the new creatures, neither of which classes is under the death sentence, and therefore are the only living ones undergoing a judgment) will be judged, separated, during the Epiphany (2 Tim. 4: 1, where *epiphaneia* is translated *appearing*). If, therefore, we can prove that the Church of the Firstborns is now undergoing a separation into its two classes, it would follow that we are in

the Epiphany. This can readily be shown from the standpoint of the figures of Priests and Levites, of Elijah and Elisha, and of the High Priest and Azazel's Goat. Under the figure of the separation of Priests and Levites the Lord describes the Epiphany work in Mal. 3: 2, 3: "Who shall abide the day of His coming [the Parousia, amid which only those who would retain the Holy Spirit would endure its trials sufficiently to gain life at all; while all who lost it would not abide the Day of His Coming, His Parousia. In other words, the Parousia was to determine the difference between the consecrated who would retain the Holy Spirit and those who would lose it. Only the former would 'abide,' continue, during the Day of His Coming], and who shall stand [retain the High Calling, Rom. 5: 2; Rev. 6: 17] when He appeareth [during His appearing, Epiphany; accordingly, the special work of the Epiphany is to manifest who, while retaining the Holy Spirit, will remain standing in the High Calling and who, while retaining the Holy Spirit, will fall, lose the High Calling, becoming a Great Company member]; for He is like a refiner's fire [by trialsome experiences purging out selfishness and worldliness] and like fuller's soap [by chastisements and special teachings cleansing away sin and error]. And He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver [amid fiery trials He will develop the Truth and separate error from it in the minds of the brethren]; and He shall purify the sons of Levi [typically Levi's sons consisted of typical Priests and Levites; antitypically, Levi's sons consist of antitypical Priests—the Little Flock—and antitypical Levites—the Great Company—in the Epiphany, as these classes are in the following words evidently distinguished 'as gold and silver'] and purge them as *gold* and *silver*, that [to the intent that] they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness." In these verses we are shown under a figure the purifying of the Priests and Levites as the work that is to be done,

"when He appeareth," *i.e.*, in the Epiphany the Lord will deal separately with the antitypical Priests and Levites—the Little Flock and the Great Company. Hence the Epiphany is the time of their separation. We can see this separation going on, as we also can see how the Lord by fiery experiences is purifying and purging both classes. The Epiphany saints in part stand and for the rest will stand out separate and distinct from all other classes. None are so much despised and cast off as they. Against them all of the Levites, however much they are at variance with one another, stand united in opposition and denunciation, just as previously the nominal churches, however much divided against one another, were united in opposing the Harvest movement. This fact sets forth the Epiphany saints as the Priests, gathered as a class, though there are not a few of the Priests yet bewildered among the various groups of Levites. On the other hand, there are, as the type of the Levites suggests, three general groups, consisting of eight subdivisions, among the Truth people who oppose the Epiphany Truth: (1) Those opposers of the Epiphany Truth who as organizationists failed to get possession of any of our Pastor's organizations, the P.B.I. And the B. S. C. (Bible Students Committee of England); (2) those opposers of the Epiphany Truth who as organizationists either have gotten control of our Pastor's organizations, the Society adherents, or those who approved those organizations as "the channel," the Standfasts; and (3) those opposers of the Epiphany Truth who as anti-organizationists, though acting as separate groups, are independent of organizations, the Sturgeonites and Ritchieites (now not acting in concerted movements), and the Olsonites and Hirsho Kittingerites. And, surely, in the divisional movements whereby the breaking up of the Lord's people as one compact people occurred there were fiery experiences whereby the Priests and the Levites are being

manifested (Mal. 3: 2, 3; Matt. 7: 24-27; 1 Cor. 3: 11-15). Therefore the separation of the Lord's people into Priests and Levites proves that we are in the Epiphany—the time when He judges, separates, "the living" (2 Tim. 4: 1).

(32) This same conclusion, *i.e.*, that we are in the Epiphany, follows from the fulfillment of the type of Elijah's and Elisha's separation. Here the picture centers about the thought of transferring of the mantle, the power of controllership of the work toward Nominal Spiritual Israel, from the one class to the other. Therefore this picture does not show forth many divisions, but only one general division. And, true enough, those who had the right representatively to control as a majority, *i.e.*, the Board's majority, with their supporters, were separated from the others who had not the right to control the work toward the nominal people of God, but who by usurpation took over this control, as the other class through its representatives let it go. We have treated of this division as an Epiphany work in detail in Chap. II of Vol. III and Chap. IV of Vol. IV of The Epiphany Studies in the Scriptures, to which we refer our readers. This division proves from the standpoint of mouthpieceship to Nominal Spiritual Israel that we are in the Epiphany. The same division of the Little Flock and the Great Company is typed in the High Priest's leading Azazel's Goat from the door of the Tabernacle to the gate of the Court. We will give details on this in the next chapter, showing that every stage of this antitype has set in, and that this work is in an Epiphany work; for this is the day when every man's work is being tried by fire (1 Cor. 3: 11-15). Since the Epiphany work of separation between the two classes, apparent in the antitypical separation of Priests and Levites, of the World's High Priest and Azazel's Goat, and of Elijah and Elisha, is now going on, we must be in the Epiphany period.

(33) The fulfillment of a third sign prophecy, *i.e.*, the separation of human Society into the Radical and Conservative classes, proves that we are in the Epiphany. Before the World War there were considerable class feeling and conflict; but the dangers of the War healed these divisions in each country, until, through the exposures of the first and second smiting of Jordan, class consciousness and friction were not only effected anew, but were made very great; so that now there is imminent danger of the masses arising in revolution and anarchy against the classes the world over. Thus antitypical Jordan is divided. And this—the work just described—is an Epiphany work; for it began in 1914 after the World War began, which is the first part of the Tribulation Time—the Epiphany time. Hence the division of Society into the Conservative and Radical classes is a proof of our being in the Epiphany period.

(34) The activity of antitypical Jehu and Hazael proves that we are in the Epiphany. We have already shown in Volume III, Chapter VI, that Jehu represents the more conservative of the labor classes—those who will effect the great symbolic earthquake—and that Hazael types the more radical of the labor classes—those who have introduced syndicalism. We likewise have shown that antitypical Jehu before the symbolic earthquake would support the present governments, antitypical Jehoram of Israel, as against antitypical Hazael (2 Kings 8: 28, 29; 9: 14,15). These three parties, we understand, are referred to as the three divisions of the Great City (Rev. 16: 19). We find that labor organizations, like the American Federation of Labor and the European Social Democratic party, fight for the present order as against the I. W. W., the Syndicalists and Anarchists; but in due course they will be swept into revolution. Their existence as a party, and the existence of the I. W. W., the Syndicalists, etc., as a party, as well as the existence of a

governmental party, prove that we are in the time beyond the antitypical separation of Elisha from Elijah, and hence are in the Epiphany; for antitypical Jehu and Hazael act on Elisha's anointing them, after the latter's separation from antitypical Elijah.

(35) The manifestation of the Youthful Worthies is another proof that we are in the Epiphany. The Youthful Worthies could not have been manifested as a class until after Sept. 16, 1914, when the last member of Christ's Body was brought into the Body, for none consecrating since that time can be a new creature. Hence all consecrating since that time would be Youthful Worthies. The Gideon picture shows that it would be after antitypical Gideon and his three hundred had crossed Jordan (*Judges 7: 25—8: 1*), *i.e.*, after 1916, that the Youthful Worthies, typed by the men of Ephraim after Gideon's first battle, which was typical of the conflict between Truth and Error from the Fall of 1914 to that of 1916, would complain at not being of the High Calling, *i.e.*, not being given an opportunity of doing that which all participants of the High Calling did—smite Jordan, execute the judgment written, *i.e.*, engage in antitypical Gideon's first battle. These complaints have been heard increasingly for years, *i.e.*, ever since we announced that the door of entrance into the High Calling was closed. Since the manifestation of the Youthful Worthies, as shown by the Gideon type, is an Epiphany work, we must be in the Epiphany; for they are now becoming manifest.

(36) The manifestation of "that evil servant" is also another proof that we are in the Epiphany. The Scriptures prove that that Servant would have charge of the Lord's work and goods throughout the Reaping and Gleaning period (*Luke 12: 44*; *Ezek. 9: 11*). The Scriptures also show that after his ministry would be finished (*Matt. 24: 45-47*) "that evil servant" would take charge of the work (*Matt. 24: 48-51*). And true to the picture, after "that faithful and wise Servant"

had finished the work given him to do, J.F.R. by craft and force secured control of the work; and (1) by saying "in his heart, My Lord delayeth," *i.e.*, by sinning against the Lord by refusing to wait on Him; (2) by smiting his fellow-servants, *i.e.*, sinning against the brethren; (3) and by eating and drinking with the drunken, *i.e.*, by sinning against the Truth—in a word, by sinning against the Lord, the Brethren and the Truth—he has become manifest as "that evil servant." But his coming upon the stage of action as "that evil servant" being due after that Servant's work was complete, his activity is one that belongs to the Epiphany; and his manifestation, therefore, proves that we are in the Epiphany.

(37) Antitypical Gideon's Second Battle, which has been on since July 18, 1920, and which is connected with the manifestation of the Little Flock as such, separate and distinct from the Great Company in public work, is another proof that we are in the Epiphany. If the antitypical Gideon's first battle was a part of the Epiphany work, certainly His second battle is a part of that work. For this battle Scripturally follows the second smiting of Jordan (2 Kings 2: 14; Judges 7: 23, 24). The Great Company in the three Levitical groups and the Youthful Worthies in one group are typed in Judges 7: 23, 24, by the three groups and the one group respectively. Hence the battle which in this respect is now on is an Epiphany work. It is being fought against antitypical Zebah, Eternal Torment, and antitypical Zalmunna, the Consciousness of the Dead. It is therefore a proof that we are in the Epiphany period. Thus the fulfillment of the foregoing seven *sign* prophecies proves that we are in the Epiphany.

(38) There are additionally several *time* prophecies that prove the same line of thought. Of these we will give three. The day of 2 Kings 2: 3 as a time prophecy proves this thought. We recall that our dear Pastor

showed us that this scene at Bethel occurred in antitype in the Spring of 1878 (Z '16, 38, par. 4). We are also familiar with the thought that in the Scriptures 40 years are spoken of as a day (Ps. 95: 7-10). In 2 Kings 2: 3 we are told that within the antitypical day—40 years—the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha would take place; therefore 40 years from the Spring of 1878, when the antitypical sons of the prophets first told antitypical Elisha there would be a separation, bring us to the Spring of 1918. By that time the separation was to have taken place; and, true enough, the separation began in the early Summer of 1917, thus within the 40-years day typed in 2 Kings 2: 3. This separation as a class matter, was complete by Passover of 1918; and it being an Epiphany work we entered the Epiphany period before the Summer of 1917, when the separation began.

(39) That we are in the Epiphany period is proven by another time prophecy, *i.e.*, "the hour of temptation" (Rev. 3: 10). "The hour of temptation" began the evening of April 16, 1878, when the first harvest sifting began, and ended the evening of Dec. 6, 1919, $41\frac{2}{3}$ years, or one hour of a 1000-year day, afterward. It was intended to test all new creatures, especially determining whether they would end under good or under bad leadership classes. By the time it would end, it would have tested all new creatures sufficiently to put them into circumstances that would result in their manifestation in due time as of the Church, Great Company or Second Deathers. And as the Parousia did not yet decide matters as between the Little Flock and the Great Company, such a decision must go over into the Epiphany. Hence the fact that "the hour of temptation" reached into the Epiphany, and is now past, we have for some time been in the Epiphany.

(40) The Great Pyramid's testimony, in the distance from the foot of the large step, which symbolizes Sept. 24, 1846, measured through the step to the point

of intersection between the top of the step and the vertical line of 'the south wall of the Grand Gallery—a distance slightly over 70¾ Pyramid inches—proves again that we are in the Epiphany; for on the date thus indicated, June 27, 1917 (Chapter VII in Volume III of The Epiphany Studies In The Scriptures), the Elisha class in its representative began to become manifest as separate and distinct from the Elijah class in its representative, and during the following nine months, *i.e.*, up to Mar. 27, 1918, Passover Day, as indicated by the distance from this point of intersection to the projected floor line of the King's Chamber, the class as a whole stepped into, and acted in the open—became manifest. Hence this manifestation, as corroborated by the Pyramid, being an Epiphany work, we must be in the Epiphany. It will have been noticed that everyone of the ten proofs just given is connected with a manifestation, an *epiphaneia*; therefore accords well with the Epiphany. Elsewhere there are other evidences of the fact that we are in the Epiphany; but the above ten points abundantly prove our teaching on this point. We commend them to the study of our dear readers, and may the Lord bless their study to all of us. Such a blessing will imply a proper appreciation of the Epiphany Truth, Exposures and Work; and will enable us to see that the Lord desires Epiphany Truths presented, Epiphany Exposures made, and Epiphany Work done. Those who do not appreciate the Epiphany will stumble at its teachings, exposures and work, while the others will stand amid them, declaring "Righteous are Thy judgments, O Lord!" "Yea, they are entirely righteous."

(41) We desire to examine a Dawn error on our subject. In the April, 1937, issue of The Dawn there is a sophistical answer to a question on the Parousia, Epiphaneia and Apokalypsis. As this matter is more clearly treated in The Dawn of April, '35, 13, whose article just lately came to our knowledge, we prefer to

quote from it as follows: "Paul said that the Lord would destroy the antichrist with the 'brightness (*epiphaneia*) of His parousia.' This Greek word *epiphaneia* is properly translated brightness, or bright-shining. *Some* [especially Bro. Russell and ourself, italics ours] have erroneously supposed that this word refers to a second phase or later period of our Lord's presence—as if His *Parousia* would continue up to a certain time and then His *Epiphaneia* would begin. But we believe it to be self-evident that the word *parousia* applies to the entire thousand-year period of Christ's presence, while the word *epiphaneia* is descriptive of certain things to be accomplished during the *parousia*. On this point we quote with approval from the booklet published many years ago, entitled, 'Our Lord's Return,' as follows: 'Our Lord's *epiphaneia* (bright-shining) and His *apokalypsis* (unveiling) began shortly after His *parousia* began: the bright-shining of His presence is now visible to those who are walking 'in the light'—to those who 'are not in darkness with the world.' It is a mental illumination to the eyes of our understanding, and not to our natural eyes. The *epiphaneia* of the Lord is already affecting the world also; though not through the eyes of the understanding, for they have no eyes for such spiritual things; nevertheless, the bright-shining of our Lord's presence is influencing and affecting the whole course of the world, through an increase of knowledge."

(42) We reply to The Dawn's one-sided presentations of certain of our Pastor's thoughts on these two words and of its suppression of their other senses, as follows: The Bible, as our Pastor rightly held, in so far as our Lord's Second Advent is concerned, uses the word *parousia* in three senses: (1) in the sense of the 40 years of the reaping, *i.e.*, from 1874 until the Time of Trouble, 1914 (Matt. 24: 3, 27, 37, 39; 2 Thes. 2: 1); (2) in the sense of the 80 years from

1874 to 1954 (though our Pastor did not see that the Epiphany would last 40 years, it not being due in his time to see this), *i.e.*, to include the Parousia in the first sense and the Epiphany as a period, which he did so understand though not its duration (1 Thes. 2: 19; 3: 13; 4: 15; 5: 23; 2 Thes. 2: 8, 9; Jas. 5: 7, 8; 2 Pet. 3: 4, 12; 1 John 2: 28); and (3) in the sense of the entire 1000 years of His Second Advent (1 Cor. 15: 23; 2 Pet. 1: 16). The above are all the passages of the Bible that use the word *parousia* in connection with our Lord's Second Advent; and they prove that The Dawn has lost the Parousia Truth on the first and second senses of the word. Hence it repudiates the Bible teaching of the Epiphany as meaning a period, as the above quotation shows, implying that Pastor Russell did not so teach, and that he taught that the word Epiphany means only bright-shining, manifestation, *i.e.*, only in action. The Bible and Bro. Russell and we with them teach both senses of the word, though Bro. Russell did not understand that the Epiphany as a period would last 40 years, since the matter of its length was not due to be understood until the Epiphany. That the word means a period the Bible teaches in 1 Tim. 6: 14, 15 and 2 Tim. 4: 1. The very wording of 2 Tim. 4: 1 in the A.V.: will judge . . . *at* [during] His appearing [Epiphaneia] and Kingdom [Basileia], proves that the Epiphany, like the Kingdom, is a period. The I.V. shows this very clearly as to 1 Tim. 6: 14, 15: Keep the commandment without spot and blameless until our Lord Jesus Christ's Epiphany which [Epiphany] *in its own seasons* He will show—He who is the blessed and only Potentate, etc. That the word means *bright shining*, *i.e.*, clear manifestation of persons, principles and things, and that at any time, the Bible teaches in 2 Thes. 2: 8 [during the Parousia and Epiphaneia]; 2 Tim. 1: 10 [during the Jewish Harvest]; 2 Tim. 4: 8;

Tit. 2: 13 [during the Parousia, Epiphaneia and Basileia]. The reason why the period between the Parousia and the Basileia (Kingdom) is called the Epiphaneia is that during that period the Lord designed to make especial manifestations as to persons, principles and things. And certainly such an activity especially marks the period since 1914. The above six passages are the only ones in which the word *epiphaneia* occurs in the Greek New Testament; and they prove that our Pastor was right in teaching that the word means a period following the Parousia or Reaping period, as it also means bright-shining, manifestation of persons, principles and things. And they prove that The Dawn has repudiated another Parousia, as well as rejects an Epiphany Truth, —a sifting work.

(43) The Dawn implies that our Pastor's booklet, Our Lord's Return—His Parousia and Epiphaneia or Apokalypsis—teaches that there is no 40 years period of the Parousia nor any Epiphany period taught in that booklet. It tried, with the usual trickery of practiced sophists in hiding parts of the involved things and stressing only one side of them, to make its readers think that our Pastor did not teach that the Epiphany is a period and that the Parousia means only the 1000 years of our Lord's second presence, and that it is not in any sense a 40-years period. The following quotations from that booklet prove that The Dawn misrepresented him on this subject: "Parousia is used in respect to the *earliest stage* [italics ours] of the Second Advent, while apokalypsis relates to the same advent later: —not that apokalypsis and epiphaneia relate to another or a third advent, but merely to a later feature [not features, since these two words both as an act and as a period are synonymous, L. R. p. 12] . . . The Watchers also notice that the Scriptures clearly indicate that *after* [italics ours] the Lord has done certain things during His presence (parousia) and unknown to the world, he will *later* [italics

ours] make a *manifestation of His presence*; a manifestation which will be discerned by all mankind; and the outward manifestation is designated His 'epiphaneia' (13, bottom) During the *period* [italics ours] of the parousia (presence) *preceding* [italics ours] the epiphaneia (shining forth) a certain work will be accomplished, unknown to the world, unknown to the nominal Church, known only to the Watchers (p. 14, par. 2) The days of the Son of Man are the days [a period of course] of His parousia, or presence, invisible and unknown to the world, known only to the Watchers and seen by them only with the eye of faith (16, par. 1) But why should our Lord be thus present? What will be His work during the *period* [italics ours] of presence preceding His epiphaneia or manifestation to the world? (par. 2) The parable of the wheat and the tares shows this *period* [italics ours] of the parousia (presence) *preceding* [italics ours] the epiphaneia (manifestation), and represents it [the Parousia] as the '*harvest time*' [italics ours] of this age (16, par. 3) The separation of the tares from the wheat, . . . precedes the work of cleansing the wheatfield of its symbolic tares by symbolic 'fire', and this entire harvest work is to take place during the *parousia* [hence a period preceding the Epiphany] (presence) of our Lord, before His *epiphaneia* (manifestation) (17, par. 1) The Truth will be the separating medium, and not until the separation [the reaping] is complete . . . will the 'fire,' great time of trouble [which, as he taught, was to begin and did begin with the World War] mentioned by the Prophet and by our Lord, burn and consume, symbolically, all the 'tares' (17, par. 2) Therefore, this reckoning [in the Parousia] with the Church . . . will *precede* [italics ours] our Lord's epiphaneia or apokalypsis (20, line 5) 'Every man's hand against his neighbor,' will be permitted to reap the whirlwind of its own selfishness in

anarchy. The epiphaneia of the new Ruler and of His reign of righteous retribution will then [during a period] gradually be discerned. The full revealment or apokalypsis will be at the close of the storm [thus the epiphaneia or apokalypsis, in the sense here used, as acts, stretched over a period of time, which is the Epiphany], when all hearts will be humbled (21, line 2) Lest we should get a misapprehension respecting this matter of discerning the Lord's parousia, we do well to take heed to the parable of the ten virgins, which evidently was given to throw special light upon this point (23, bottom) The parousia of our Lord was due to begin in October, 1874, and shows us the character of the work which we should expect would be in progress during the time [period] of His presence [parousia], *preceding* [italics ours] His open manifestation to the world, His epiphaneia, His apokalypsis (35, line 12) As therefore we softly whisper, 'Behold the Bridegroom,' it is not with any hope of arousing the world to faith in the Lord's presence, etc. By and by in the Lord's due time, they shall know—in the PERIOD [capitals ours] of the epiphaneia and apokalypsis of the Son of Man. They will be awokened by the great crash of the day of trouble (39, par. 1).

(44) The following is a quotation from The Tower on the subject: "The Bible distinctly differentiates between the Parousia of Christ and His Epiphaneia, at His Second Coming. The word Parousia signifies presence The word Epiphaneia signifies the revealing of one who is already present With the conclusion of the work of separating the wise virgins [from Babylon in the Parousia or Reaping time], . . . *then* [italics ours] will come Immanuel's Epiphaneia, revealing, showing forth. In other words, the revelation of Christ to the world will be *subsequent* [italics ours] to His revealment of Himself to the 'wise virgins' class" (Z '14, 252, pars. 6, 7).

(45) The following is a quotation from the Bible Students' Monthly, 1914, No. 1, p. 1, last two pars., p. 2, par. 1: "Our English word coming is used to translate several very different Greek words. One of these is Parousia, which means presence, and is used in referring to the *first stage* [italics ours] of the Lord's Second Advent. *Then, later on* [italics ours], will come the Epiphaneia; that is to say, the revelation, or manifestation, of the present One. This will not be a manifestation, in the flesh, but *in a great Time of Trouble* [a Period, italics ours] symbolically represented as fire, 'taking vengeance' (2 Thes. 1: 7-10). To my understanding, the Bible teaches that Jesus has been present in the world since 1874; . . . that the Epiphaneia, or manifestation to the world, will be due *in forty years from the time the Presence began* [italics ours]. For this reason they [Bible Students] are looking very interestedly to see what the *present year* [1914] may bring forth. And do we not see everywhere signs of unrest, a time of trouble brewing? It looks as though this year [1914] would mark the beginning of the 'flaming fire' of judgments [the Epiphany and the Time of Trouble are identical] upon the world which will mark the closing of this Age and the inauguration in the New Dispensation of Messiah's Kingdom, *when* [italics ours] 'justice shall be laid to the line and righteousness to the plummet,' and *when* [italics ours] ignorance, superstition and darkness which so long have hindered us will begin to be broken. The transition [which occurs during the Epiphany] may be painful, yet it will be blessed, marking the overthrow of Satan's empire and reign of sin and death and the inauguration of Messiah's Kingdom and its reign of righteousness and life eternal."

(46) Thus our fifteen quotations from our Pastor's writings prove that he held that the Bible teaches that the Epiphany, in the second sense of the word, is a period that follows the Reaping time, the Parousia, in

the first sense of the word, that the Parousia, in the first sense of the word, is a period of 40 years that precedes the period of the Epiphany, and that the Epiphany and the Time of Trouble are one and the same thing. Hence The Dawn is guilty of gross misrepresentation of our Pastor's pertinent teachings and of teaching harmful errors thereon.

(47) Many of the dear ones are asking questions on the duration of the Epiphany. These questions imply that the Epiphany is a period of time. This we have seen to be a Scriptural thought, as also our dear Pastor taught it (2 Tim. 4: 1; 1 Tim. 6: 14, 15). The Epiphany is a period of time that is subdivided into various seasons. This thought is apparent from the literal rendering of 1 Tim. 6: 14, 15: "Keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until our Lord Jesus Christ's Epiphany, *which in its seasons* He will show, He who is the blessed and only Potentate, King of kings and Lord of lords." How many of such seasons the Epiphany will still have additional to those mentioned above we do not yet know. The first, second and two parts of a third of them have already passed, and their work was the manifestation of the eight groups of Truth Levites under bad leadership. The question as to how many other seasons it will contain must also be left to the future for an answer, because the light on this subject as on other subjects will doubtless progress. The next Epiphany season will end with the manifestation of the good Levites. There will follow the last-mentioned one a period of great prosperity for the cleansed Levites' work for the Lord.

(48) It may be said, The Epiphany is in some passages called a day: "Even thus shall it be in the *day* when the Son of Man is *revealed*" (Luke 17: 30). "Every man's work shall be made manifest; for the *day* shall declare it" (1 Cor. 3: 13). "And it came to pass on the *day* that Moses had *fully* set up the tabernacle [Church] and had anointed it and sanctified

it . . . that the princes . . . brought six covered wagons [organizations, in the antitype] . . . and Moses . . . gave them to the Levites" (Num. 7: 1-3, 6). This transaction types the fact that in the Epiphany the Lord would give the Great Company six organizations, which in a sense has already occurred. The Parousia is also in some passages called a day: "But who may abide the *day* of His Coming [the Parousia]?" (Mal. 3: 2). "Ye shall desire to see *one* of the *days* of the Son of Man [the especial day of the Son of Man that the disciples desired to see was the day of His Coming, His Parousia] . . . So shall the Son of Man be in His *day* [the Parousia was His special day]" (Luke 17: 22, 24). Furthermore, the Bible in the same connection speaks of the Parousia and the Epiphany as days: "This know also that in the last *days* [the Parousia day and the Epiphany day] perilous times shall come [perilous because antitypical Jannes was to be active especially in the Parousia, and antitypical Jambres was to be active especially in the Epiphany]" (2 Tim. 3: 1, 8, 9). "Ye have heaped together treasures for the last *days* [the Parousia day and the Epiphany day, during which wealth would be especially accumulated]" (Jas. 5: 2). "Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last *days* scoffers . . . saying, Where is the promise of His presence [both during the Parousia day and during the Epiphany day these scoffers have been active]" (2 Pet. 3: 3, 4)? "As it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be also in the *days* of the Son of Man" (Luke 17: 26). According to these passages we see that the Parousia is called a day and the Epiphany is called a day; and that both together in the same connections are spoken of as "days," and as "the last days" of the Gospel Age. How will these facts, that each of them is called a day, and both days, help us to find out the duration of the Epiphany? We answer, We know from many passages that the Parousia day, considered apart from the

two years and one month of its lapping into the Epiphany—Sept. 16, 1914 to Oct. 16, 1916—is a day of forty years (in Volume VII we will give many proofs of this). Since in the same connection the Epiphany is called a day, notably Luke 17: 22-30, and thus proven equal to the Parousia in duration, we *infer* that the Epiphany is a period of forty years; and since the Parousia apart from its two years and one month of lapping into the Epiphany ended in 1914, we think it reasonable to look for the Epiphany to begin to end in 1954 with a probable lapping of two years and one month into the *Basileia*, Kingdom.

(49) This, however, would not necessarily imply that the Church will be here until 1954 or until 1956. On the contrary, we know that, with possibly one exception, the entire "Little Flock" will be delivered before the Epiphany is over (Col. 3: 4), though we do not know the exact date. We are, however, well assured, from the magnitude of the unfulfilled prophetic program preceding its deliverance, that the "Little Flock" will be here for many years; for certainly Anarchy is not to be expected for many years, though the Revolution might be here before long. If we keep in mind that the Epiphany will witness the manifestation of Christ, not only to the Great Company as its Cleanser and Deliverer, but also to the world as the Overthrower of Satan's Empire and the Establisher of God's Kingdom (2 Thes. 1: 7, 8; Col. 3: 4); and if we also keep in mind that the earthly phase of the Kingdom is first to be established among regathered and converted Israel before the Gentile nations will recognize its presence (Zech. 12: 7; 8: 20-22; 14: 16; Is. 2: 3), we can see that the Epiphany in its widest sense may cease before the Great Company, who precede the Ancient Worthies in the resurrection, will leave the earth. If, as seems probable, there will be the same length of time for the Epiphany to lap into the *Basileia* as there was for the Parousia to lap into

the Epiphany, we should expect that the *Basileia*, the Kingdom, would require some years more before its recognition by the Gentiles. It does seem reasonable that as forty-two years were used in especial service for the "Little Flock" after the Parousia set in, about forty-two years will probably be used in especial service for the Great Company after the Epiphany set in, with this difference, that while the first forty-two years finished the sealing of the Elect, the second forty-two years will in all likelihood finish the sealing of the Great Company, this probably to be followed soon by the return of the Ancient Worthies and the establishment of the Kingdom in Israel, and a little later its recognition to take place by the Gentiles, some years after the Fall of 1956, when the probable lapping of the Epiphany into the *Basileia* will likely be ended. It will thus be seen that on some phases of this subject we cannot as yet speak with positive assurance. On this subject "now we know in part" only. Later we trust to know perfectly on this line of thought. Therefore in discussing this matter let us be cautious not to be positive in our statements. Until the advancing light will justify a more positive statement, let us confine ourselves to such sobriety of speech as leaves the details of this time feature as they have been set forth in this article, which as above stated are a matter of *inference* and not of *positive proof*. It would be wiser to say nothing at all on the subject to those who do not accept the Parousia Truth, and very little to others not in the Epiphany Truth.

(50) We have been asked the question, Have we any Scriptural authority for holding that the days of the Son of Man as spoken of in Luke 17: 22, 26, etc., are only two periods, and not more than two? To this question we answer, We understand that the Scriptures teach that the days of the Son of Man are two and only two periods. Several considerations prove this. The statements made in vs. 26 and 27 harmonize

with this thought; for the people in the days of Noah are there spoken of from the standpoint of two periods (1) before the flood and (2) during the flood, as being like the people in the days of the Son of Man. The people eating, drinking, etc., during the Parousia before the outbreak of the great tribulation, were in their activities likened to the people in the period before the flood in their activities; and the people during the great tribulation are likened in their overwhelming to the people being destroyed during the flood. For these two sets of two activities the expression "the days" is used in vs. 26 and 27, while in v. 30 the expression "day," and not "days," is used to represent the period of the great tribulation. Since according to vs. 26 and 27 the expression, "the days of the Son of Man," is limited to the two periods—the one just before the trouble and the trouble period itself—we conclude that this expression refers to two and only to two periods. Since v. 30 refers to the second of these as a day, but such a day as the faithful would not especially desire, because of its sufferings; since v. 22 refers to a day of the Son of Man's days especially desirable to the Church; since the Parousia as the day of His coming has always been desired by the Church; and since no other than these two days are mentioned in the connection, we conclude from these facts as a second reason, that the expression "the days of the Son of Man" refers to two and only to two periods. Thus the Scriptures in Luke 17: 22-30 are the authority for believing that the expression, "the days of the Son of Man," in Luke 17: 22, 26, means two and only two periods.

(51) The expression, The Time of Trouble, is used in two senses. In its wide sense it covers the period from 1874 until the end of anarchy and of Jacob's trouble. In its narrow sense it covers the period from the beginning of the World War in 1914 until the end of anarchy and of Jacob's trouble. It is in the narrow

—the second—sense of that term that we use it in our subject. We understand that the special tribulation period and the Epiphany as a period are one and the same thing. We purpose here to prove this thought from the Scriptures and to illustrate it from our Pastor's writings. We will give the Scripture proof first. In Luke 17: 29, 30 we have a passage to the point. We have just pointed out how the Parousia and the Epiphany are each called a day, how, among other passages, in Luke 17: 30 our Lord calls the Epiphany a day, and how, among other passages, in Luke 17: 22, 26 He calls them both days. That in Luke 17: 30, when the Lord Jesus said, "Even thus shall it be in the *day* when the Son of Man is *revealed*," He meant the Epiphany by the expression, "in the day," is evident from the fact that it was to be in the Epiphany when He was *to be revealed*. Comparing the statement of this verse with the preceding verse, we see clearly that the Epiphany and the Time of Trouble are identical; for Jesus said in Luke 17: 29, "But *the same day* that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven and destroyed them all." We know that, among other things, Sodom types Christendom and the Nominal Church (Rev. 11: 8), that its destruction types their destruction; and that "the day" of its destruction types the period of their destruction. We also know that their destruction began through the World War. Therefore the period of the World War was a part of the Day of Christendom's and the Nominal Church's destruction, in which Day Jesus, in v. 30, says that He will be revealed. Hence the World War was in the Epiphany; yea, it was in the beginning of the Epiphany. Thus this expression shows when and with what the Epiphany began. Having by this passage proven when and with what the Epiphany was introduced, the World War, we will next prove through what it will progress.

(52) Matt. 26: 64 proves that the Epiphany will

progress through the Revolution: "Hereafter [during the Epiphany] shall ye [your class—the Christian clergy, just as St. James classes those who killed our Lord with the predatory Jewish and other capitalists in the end of this Age, Jas. 5: 6—see also D 411] see [have epiphanized unto you] the Son of Man, sitting on the right hand of power [exercising Jehovah's power of vengeance] and *coming in the clouds of heaven*." The clouds of heaven represent the troubles of the symbolic heaven—the powers of spiritual control—during the World War and the Revolution of the Time of Trouble. Since the Nominal Church—the powers of spiritual control—will be destroyed in completion during, yea, early, in the Revolution, and hence will be out of existence before the Anarchy; and since all of the clergy will be slain in the Revolution and Anarchy (Is. 65: 11, 12; Jer. 25: 34, 35; 2 Kings 10: 18-28), and hence will be in oblivion before the Anarchy is over, the Lord evidently reveals Himself as present to the clergy as a class in the troubles on their systems ("the clouds of heaven"), during the War partly and during the Revolution completely. Hence this passage proves that the Epiphany began with the World War, which began the destruction of the Nominal Church (the Greek Catholic Church in Russia, Poland and Romania and the Roman Catholic Church in Poland, Servia, Montenegro, Austria, Belgium and France, are striking examples of how the War began the destruction of the Nominal Church—"the clouds of heaven"), and will progress through the Revolution, early in which its destruction will be completed. Hence this passage proves that the Time of Trouble and the Epiphany are identical.

(53) We now will quote and expound passages that prove that the Epiphany will end with the Anarchy and Jacob's trouble, *i.e.*, will end with the end of the trouble. A passage that proves this with reference to Anarchy, though it also refers to the War, Revolution,

Famine and Pestilence, is 2 Thes. 1: 7, 8: "The Lord Jesus *shall be revealed* from heaven with His mighty angels [the agents whereby He will pour out vengeance] in *flaming fire* [destructive troubles—War, Revolution, Famine, Pestilence and Anarchy], taking vengeance on them [the Second Deathers in the Nominal Church] that know not God and [on them, the Second Deathers in the Truth] that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." Accordingly, this passage proves that the Epiphany will be completed by the Anarchy. A passage that proves this with reference to Jacob's trouble, so far as the Lord's revelation of Himself to Israel is concerned, is Zech. 12: 9, 10: "It shall come to pass *in that day* that I will seek to *destroy all the nations* that come against Jerusalem [in the time of Jacob's trouble, Zech. 12: 1-8; Ezek. 38; 39]; and I will pour upon the House of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of grace and of supplication, and they shall *look upon Me* whom they have pierced (Rev. 1: 7); and they shall mourn *for it*" [the piercing, I.V.], etc. All Truth people recognize at once that this passage refers to the end of Jacob's trouble, and that it proves our Lord's revelation of Himself to Israel as their long rejected Messiah. Hence these two verses prove that the Time of Trouble and the Epiphany are identical.

(54) By the above-discussed passages we have proven that the Epiphany began with the War and will progress through the Revolution and will end with the Anarchy and Jacob's trouble. Its beginning, progressing and ending with the Time of Trouble demonstrates its identity with the Time of Trouble. These Scriptures prove that the Lord's epiphanizing Himself to the world and to the Great Company is a gradual, a progressive work, coming to a completion only at the end of the trouble. The passages so far quoted directly prove their identity. We will now quote and discuss some passages that indirectly prove their identity.

Though indirectly, yet powerfully is this proven by 2 Tim. 4: 1: "Who [the Lord Jesus] will judge the living [the fallen angels and new creatures] and the dead [Adam's condemned race] at His appearing [Epiphany] and Kingdom." Adam's race, but not new creatures, will be judged during the Kingdom; hence it is the fallen angels and the new creatures who will be judged—separated (Matt. 25: 31,32)—during the Epiphany. Scripture, Reason and Facts prove that during the War this separation between the new creatures—the Little Flock and the Great Company—began. However, since this is an Epiphany work, according to this passage, the Epiphany was here during the World War; but other Scriptures show that this separation of these two classes will continue during the Revolution. Probably it will continue until the early part of the Anarchy. Mal. 3: 2, 3: "Who may abide the day of His coming [Parousia]? and who shall stand when He appeareth [the Epiphany]; for He is like a refiner's fire and like fuller's soap. [The Parousia time and the Reaping time are identical, as above shown, therefore they ended in 1914. Hence, according to this passage, the time of His appearing—the Epiphany—began with the trouble time.] And He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver [separating the dross of error from the silver of Truth]; and He shall purify the sons of Levi [the Little Flock and the Great Company] and purge them as gold [the Little Flock] and silver [the Great Company]." While, of course, this work had its beginning in the Parousia, most emphatically has it been going on since the Epiphany. This passage proves that the Epiphany was to begin long before Anarchy and Jacob's trouble would end, because the Little Flock, with the exception of a few of its members, will leave the world before Anarchy begins; and these few will leave early in Anarchy. We will, without quotation, simply refer to 1 Cor. 3: 12-15, which in part teaches the same things as Mal. 3: 2, 3, and which in

the light of what we have said on that passage can readily be seen to prove that the Epiphany and the Time of Trouble are identical with one another. Matt. 7: 26, 27 teaches that the Nominal Church of Great and Little Babylon and its teaching and practices—the house built on the sand—was to begin to be destroyed during the War—"the winds blew"—and their destruction would at least in Great Babylon be completed early in the Revolution—"the floods came." Passages previously quoted prove that this is an Epiphany work; hence this passage proves, in connection with the others, that the Epiphany and the Time of Trouble are identical.

(55) All of the foregoing passages prove, even as our Pastor taught, that our Lord's revealing Himself during the Epiphany is a gradual work. It had in the war a small beginning to some of the world and to some—the Lot class—of the Great Company. Repeatedly it was explained to some worldlings and Great Company members that the World War was one of the signs of our Lord's Second Presence; and we all recall how some worldlings accepted this thought; and, of course, the Lot class of the Great Company accepted the thought. In one of the Southern cities the local ministerial conference shortly after the outbreak of the War discussed it, and concluded that it was a sign of the Lord's Second Presence; and knowing that our Pastor had forecast it as coming in 1914, declared that he was right on that feature of his time-setting, and that they had been wrong on the subject. These are some of the factual evidences of the Lord's beginning to reveal Himself to the world and to the Great Company. Thus experience corroborates the Bible teaching that the Epiphany began with the World War, and that thereby the Lord began in a small way to reveal Himself as present to some of the world and to some of the Great Company, as their Deliverer.

(56) In another passage the progressive work of the

Epiphany is clearly implied—1 Tim. 6: 14, 15—which we give in what we consider the best translation: "Keep this commandment. . . unrebukable, until our Lord Jesus Christ's Epiphany, which *in its own seasons* He will manifest." Not only does this passage prove that the Epiphany is a period, but it also shows that it progresses through successive seasons, which will *be manifested as such*. How will these seasons of the Epiphany be manifested as such? By our Lord manifesting himself by degrees as the purposes and needs of each of these seasons require, the complete manifestation coming as a grand climax to all of the Epiphany work, at its end—the end of Anarchy and of Jacob's trouble. Still another passage, compared with the foregoing passages, implies this progressive character of the Epiphany: Col. 3: 4, "When Christ, who is our Life, shall appear [manifest Himself completely to the world], then shall ye also appear [manifest yourselves] with Him in glory." This passage doubtless refers to the grand climax of the Epiphany and its work at the end of the trouble. Thus it implies that all of the true Church will be beyond the veil with the Lord before the Anarchy ends, and thus before the Epiphany ends, so that with Him it may shine forth—be epiphanized. But according to 2 Tim. 4: 1, during the Epiphany the true Church and the Great Company are separated; and we have seen that this began in the War. Hence we see that Col. 3: 4, compared with other Scriptures, teaches that the Epiphany and its work are progressive, having in the War their small beginnings, in the Revolution their growth and development and reaching at the end of the Anarchy and of Jacob's trouble their grand climax, so far as the world is concerned. This climax is so overshadowingly important that our Pastor placed by far the most emphasis upon it when treating of the Epiphany work, though he did not leave unnoticed the earlier features of the Epiphany and its

work toward the world and toward the Great Company, as we will show later on.

(57) We desire to quote some passages from our Pastor, to the effect that the Epiphany and the Time of Trouble are identical. It should be noted, in the following quotation from his writings, that while he shows that the Epiphany and the trouble time are identical, he lays the greatest stress upon the grand climax of the Epiphany, which, of course, occurs after the last member of the true Church has left the world. In construing his thought let us not forget that he uses the word *epiphaneia* in both of its senses, *i.e.*, sometimes as the period called the Epiphany, and sometimes as the work of that period—manifestation—and that most of the quotations are made from the booklet, Our Lord's Return, which was written in 1902, when he thought that the faithful Church would all be beyond the veil before the trouble would begin—a thought that he later saw was incorrect. With this modification kept in mind and allowance made for it, it will be seen how clearly in the following quotations he teaches that the Epiphany and the Time of Trouble are the same period. On this subject, as on all others of a prophetic character, his thought became brighter and brighter as the perfect day approached. Some of these quotations we have already given, but in an abbreviated form. Their unabbreviated forth will serve to impress them the more firmly on our minds.

(58) Our Pastor held the thought of the identity of the Epiphany and the Time of Trouble. Among other publications this can be seen in his booklet, published in 1902, entitled Our Lord's Return. On this point we will first quote some of his remarks found in that booklet (17, pars. 1, 2) in connection with his discussion of gathering the wheat and burning the tares: "The separation of the tares from the wheat, and the gathering of the wheat into the garner of heavenly conditions, precedes the work of cleansing the wheat-field

of its symbolic tares by symbolic 'fire'; and this entire Harvest work [with respect to the wheat] is to take place during the Parousia [presence] of our Lord, before His Epiphaneia [manifestation] . . . The Truth will be the separating medium, and not until the separation is complete and the 'wheat' all garnered into the glory of the Heavenly nature [later he saw that part of the Church would be in the flesh during some of the 'fire' period], will the 'fire,' the great Time of Trouble mentioned by the prophet and by our Lord, burn and consume, symbolically, all the 'tares'." In this section the reaping of the wheat is assigned to the Parousia and the burning of the tares—a work of the Time of Trouble—is assigned to the Epiphany. Again, on the next page of this booklet, he shows the identity of these in connection with the parables of the pounds and talents: "This reckoning with the servants signifies a reckoning with the Church first, after His return, and corresponds to the separating of the wheat and tares, [in the reaping time] in the other parable. It is comparatively easy for any one to realize that this part of the Lord's work at His Second Advent is the work which precedes the Epiphaneia, or manifestation, to the world. It is during this period that the Watchers are to be aware of the presence [parousia] of the Lord, and of His scrutiny, or judgment, of them, which will then be in progress. Only the faithful will know, however—only they will be 'accounted worthy to stand before the Son of Man' in that judgment—all found unworthy shall 'stumble.' 'The wicked [and slothful servants] shall not stand in the assembly of the righteous' (Ps. 1: 5). It is of this period of His presence, and this feature of His work, that the world is to be in total ignorance, and 'not know,' until, having finished reckoning with His servants, and having glorified the faithful [later Brother Russell saw that the Church would not be glorified before the trouble], the judgment of the world shall *begin with 'a time of*

trouble such as was not since there was a nation.' That trouble is symbolically pictured as a fire, and we are told by the Apostle that our Lord shall be revealed [*apokalypto*—uncovered, disclosed, made manifest] in flaming fire [judgments], taking vengeance [hence the trouble time is the Epiphany, according to his views].

(59) Again, their identity is shown p. 20, par. 1 and p. 21, par. 1: "We are not, however, to understand that the Lord will take the Church away to Heaven, and then come back again, *and make His Epiphaneia, or Apokalypsis . . .* Our Lord and His Church *will not be absent from the earth during the period of the world's tribulation*; but on the contrary will continue present, but invisible, bringing upon the world the tribulation foretold in the Scriptures, which will result in the humbling of the hearts of mankind, that they may say eventually, 'Come, let us go up to the mountain [Kingdom] of the House of the Lord, . . . and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths It is manifest, therefore, that the Church, although absent from the world during the period of the tribulation [his later thought was that part of the Church would remain in the flesh during some of the trouble time] in the sense of being 'changed' from human to Divine nature, will be present in it with Christ, as associate executors of Divine Justice, breaking to pieces the present order of affairs, and ready to heal the hearts of the world as soon as they shall be broken in their pride, and prepared for the 'Balm of Gilead.' In the following quotation from this booklet, p. 39, par. 1, he not only shows that the Epiphany is a period, but that that period is the Time of Trouble, and that during that period the Great Company will receive the manifestation. "As therefore we softly whisper, 'Behold the Bridegroom!' it is not with any hope of arousing the world to faith in the Lord's presence, etc. They are not worthy to know and would only misuse the knowledge now. By and by, in the

Lord's due time, they shall *know—in the period* of the Epiphaneia and Apokalypsis of the Son of Man. They will be *awakened* by the *great crash of the Day of Trouble* But the foolish Virgins, overcharged with the cares of this life, or the deceitfulness of riches [wealth, reputation, influence, etc.,] will not have within themselves ['in their vessels'] a sufficiency of the oil [Holy Spirit]; and consequently they will be unable to get the light in time to go in with the wise virgins before the elect number shall be completed, and the door of opportunity to become part of the Bride of Christ shall forever close. True, they will later obtain the oil, as is shown in the parable, but too late to be of the 'Little Flock' who shall be accounted worthy to share the Kingdom and to escape the great Time of Trouble coming upon the world. The foolish virgins will be obliged to pass through the trouble with the world, and will share thus in its distress, represented in the parable by the words, 'wailing and gnashing of teeth.'"

(60) In the following passage (Z '14, 252, col. 2, par. 1), referring in the first part to the climax of the Epiphany at the end of the trouble, and in the second part to the Epiphany as beginning with the Time of Trouble, he shows both the progressiveness of the Epiphany from the start to the end of the trouble, and also their identity. "With the conclusion of this work of separating the wise virgins, and after they shall have entered into the joys of their Lord by the glorious change of the First Resurrection, then will come Immanuel's Epiphaneia, revealing, showing forth. 'When He shall appear, ye also shall appear with Him in glory' [so far he refers to the climax of the Epiphany at the end of the trouble. What follows refers to its progress throughout the Time of Trouble]. 'He shall be revealed in flaming fire, taking vengeance.' In other words, the revelation of Christ to the world will be subsequent to His revealment of Himself to the

'wise virgin' class. The world will know that He has taken His great power and begun His Reign of Righteousness, not by seeing Jesus in the flesh, *but by seeing the great Time of Trouble which then [beginning with the World War] will break upon the world*—a Time of Trouble such as never was since there was a nation.' —Dan. 12: 1; Matt. 24: 21."

(61) The following passage taken from "What Pastor Russell Said" (p. 97, pars. 5-7) gives us the same lines of thought and shows that our Pastor in 1914, before the war broke out, expected the Epiphany to begin in October, 1914. "What do you expect, then, Brother Russell, in October, 1914? I expect October will come and the kings of the earth—the Gentiles—will not know that their lease is expired. What then? A thunder clap out of a clear sky, that will *begin* to show these kings that a new Ruler is taking possession of the world. How will it come? I do not know the particulars. I have merely the outline. The first thing in order will be the manifestation of God's Kingdom. How? The revealment, the making known. What do you mean? The Epiphaneia. He has been here and is to continue a thousand years. His Parousia [in its widest sense] will not end in this forty years. None others are made aware of these things yet. 'Ye, brethren, are not in darkness that that day should overtake you as a thief.' Next in order will be [the Apokalypsis] the revealment. How will that be? 'I have my idea,' some one says. 'I think that He will come and will sit on the circle of the Heaven and every eye will look up and all fall down and weep and howl.' Not a bit of it! I think the Bible way of telling that matter is this way, dear friends: 'He shall be revealed in flaming fire taking vengeance.' What is that? A great system of judgments *will begin* [with the World War] *at that time*. Flaming fire, outward manifestation of judgment. Why did you say, 'fire'? Because the Bible uses that as a symbolical expression, just as He said,

the fiery trials which are to try you,' and the gold is being prepared by fire. It is said of the world, not the Church, 'He shall be revealed in flaming fire, taking vengeance.' That will be after October, 1914? Yes. How long will it take [until its completion]? I do not know. Have you any guess? Guesses are very dangerous things, and if I do any guessing I will give you the reason why I guess. In this case we have seen the parallel in the ending of the Jewish Age. The city was destroyed in A.D. 70. The ending of the Gospel Age and the baptism of trouble will come; the elements will melt with fervent heat; the capitalistic elements and the whole world will become like a furnace—every man's hand against his neighbor. That is the Bible description of it. The fire will come on men in a natural way. It is their own fire that they have built. It is because they are not living up to their grant. The Bible indicates that this condition would have come long ago if God had not held it back. When the right time comes God will no longer hold the four winds back, and the conflagration will be thorough and swift and terrible. Jesus said, speaking of that time, 'Unless those days be shortened no flesh shall be saved; but for the elect's sake those days will be shortened.' "

Accordingly, it will be seen that our understanding of the identity of the Time of Trouble and the Epiphany is in harmony with the Scriptures and with our Pastor's thought on the subject. "We are in the Epiphany." "The Epiphany is in our midst." Blessed is he who understands, and acts according to this thought.

(63) The Epiphany is the last special period of the Gospel Age, and therefore it will continue at least until the last member of the Little Flock leaves this earth, and probably nearly until about the establishment of the earthly phase of God's Kingdom. This probability is due to the fact that the Epiphany implies a revelation (*apokalypsis, uncovering*) of the Lord's

Second Advent to the world as the present King and as the Destroyer of Satan's Empire, as well as to the Great Company and Youthful Worthies as their Cleanser and Deliverer. Since the Epiphany is from one standpoint a part of the Gospel Age, of course, apart from the sowing of the Gospel Age, and the reaping of its Harvest, the Little Flock's mission during the Epiphany must include all aspects of its other Gospel-Age work and of its other Harvest work. Therefore we who have not only lived in the Parousia, but who also are living in the Epiphany, carry over with us all the duties and privileges of the faithful Church of the whole Age and of its Harvest, except their sowing and reaping features, and the exclusive possession of antitypical Elijah's mantle, and its resultant work. Hence we see that we retain as a part of our mission, with three exceptions, all general features of the Church's mission in the flesh; *i.e.*, each is to seek to glorify God and Christ, to make his, and help others to make their, calling and election sure, and in case of special opportunities to witness to the Kingdom, even helping inquirers to justification. Here we will limit our discussion to the Church's work belonging exclusively to the Epiphany, ever keeping in mind, however, that the Parousia Truth given through that Servant is the foundation for our understanding of the Church's Epiphany work, which, therefore, must be performed in harmony with its foundation; *i.e.*, the Parousia Truth. We feel it necessary and appropriate to emphasize repeatedly this thought, that we may maintain a proper balance in the relationship of the Parousia and Epiphany Truth, both of which are in harmony with one another, with the former, of course, as the dominating element. The Epiphany Truth is merely supplemental to the Parousia Truth, added to enable the Church, amid changed conditions, to act properly toward the added duties and privileges of the Epiphany. Therefore let none of the brethren

become weary (we are sure the faithful will not) at our repeated reference to that Servant and his writings. This is done "lest we forget," and fall from what we have already attained. Phil. 3: 15, 16.

(64) It will be found that to be faithful to the advancing Epiphany Truth we will still have to remain dead to self and to the world, as well as alive to the Lord. This will be necessary in order to be favored with its understanding, as well as properly to watch and pray along the lines of its requirements. This will be necessary, if we would spread it among the faithful Church, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies and measurably witness to some of it to the world. Properly to develop a Christlike character in its varied features in Epiphany respects will demand the same deadness to self and the world and aliveness to God, as certainly the endurance of evils heaped upon us will call for these. Let us therefore, as the heart of our consecration, realize its two aspects of deadness to self and the world and aliveness to God. If we do these things, we will do all other things that flow out of them, and thus will never fall, but rather make our calling and election sure. Certainly a part of our Epiphany work is to learn its Truth. But here again let it be said, not to the exclusion or subordination of our study of the Parousia Truth: Let us continue daily to read at least eight pages a day on week days and ten pages on Sundays in the "Studies" and "Tabernacle Shadows," which will enable us to complete them in a year. Let us also study the Berean Comments and our Pastor's Towers. We suggest a careful study of The Present Truth as especially helpful along lines of Epiphany Truth, also a habitual looking up and studying of its Scriptural references; for we desire that the faith of its readers be built, not upon it, but upon the Word which it expounds; hence our copious Scripture references. Some of the classes on their own initiative began

the study of The Present Truth according to the Berean method; and some inquiries have come to hand as to the propriety of such a course. We would answer this with the remark that we can think of nothing against such a course, rather we believe it will result in blessing, provided that such studies are given secondary place to the six Volumes and Tabernacle Berean studies, which should be the main studies of the classes.

(65) Having learned the Epiphany Truth as it becomes due, let us spread it, offering it to all the brethren, especially to those who are dissatisfied with corporational and associational Revolutionism against the Lord's Arrangements, Charter and Will given through that Servant. As in the Parousia its Truth was the means of separating the wheat from the tares and the Wise from the Foolish Virgins, so in the Epiphany its Truth, derived from the Bible and harmonious with Reason and (recent) History is the means of separating the ripe from the unripe wheat, the Elijah class from the Elisha class. Tact, combined with candid exposures of, and opposition to, the course of the Revolutionists is to mark our activity toward them. But we are in all cases to assume that the individuals are of the Little Flock, and to treat them as such, until it is manifest that they are Revolutionists or their partisan and ardent supporters. These are thus evidenced to be of the symbolic man who slays with the sixth slaughter-weapon, Revolutionism, and are thus proven to be no longer of the Little Flock. Let us be tactful, longsuffering, patient, meek and gentle toward all, especially toward those who give evidence of being members of the Little Flock, only then acting with no more than needed severity, when those with whom we deal are undoubtedly proven to be a part of the sixth slaughter-weapon man, whose course forces the faithful to proper, Scriptural severity (Tit. 1: 10-13). We can spread the Epiphany Truth by word of mouth, by

arrangement for meetings where it is expounded, by inviting especially Truth people to attend these, by circulating its literature, by sending to The Present Truth the names and addresses of Truth people in lists; *i.e.*, (1) Society, (2) Standfast, (3) P.B.I., (4) Dawn, (5) Independent Truth people, etc.; by praying for and defending its work and workers, by supporting it in every proper way, and last, but not least, by adorning its doctrines with holy lives.

(66) In dealing with the Youthful Worthies especial care must be exercised to give them a foundation of comfort in the promises that are theirs, lest they become entirely discouraged. It is of course a disappointing thing to learn that, instead of being an antitypical priest, one is an antitypical Levite. While it is proper that those consecrated ones who consecrated since Sept. 16, 1914, be gradually, kindly and sympathetically led into an understanding of their real place in God's Plan, *i.e.*, that they are antitypical Levites, not Priests; yet in giving them this thought let us remember to exemplify the helpful sentiment of the quotation on the title page of the Poems of Dawn:

"A bending staff I would not break,
A feeble faith I would not shake,
Nor even rudely pluck away
The error which some truth may stay,
Whose sudden loss might leave without
A shield against the shafts of doubt."

It is a part of our priestly privilege to seek to win responsive justified ones to consecration by expounding the Lord's plan to them. This exposition should, first of all, clarify the general features of God's plan and then should clarify to them the special call of the Youthful Worthies and their privileges as to that call accompanied by a winsome effort to incite them to a sober consideration of responding favorably to those privileges by a whole-hearted consecration.

(67) Such care should not always be exercised with

the Great Company brethren, whose envious grasping for power and lording it over God's heritage, or ardent and partisan support of those who exercise such qualities require at times very plain and severe treatment. Even with these let us be very lenient, especially at first, only then resorting to proper, Scriptural severity when, as will surely be the case as the separation goes on, we are forced thereto by their conduct, if we would be faithful to the Lord's cause under the circumstances (Lev.16: 20-22). This Scriptural severity toward them is implied in the conduct of the High Priest (whose Body members the faithful are) in leading Azazel's Goat from the Door of the Tabernacle to the Gate of the Court. The goat was tied for several hours, and consequently was restless and anxious for liberty, and, as is the way with goats, doubtless tugged away at its rope in hope of gaining freedom. When untied by the high priest the goat doubtless jerked his arms severely, perhaps alternating with a few butts, as it sought to break away from his hold, no doubt obliging him to give some counterjerks to make the goat go toward the gate of the court. These counterjerks properly correspond with the opposition and the public exposures that our High Priest is making through His members in the flesh, and the leadings apart from jerks doubtless correspond to the effect that Epiphany Truth has in providentially leading Azazel's Goat toward the Gate of the Court, which experiences are necessary to the delivering of it to the fit man, or man of opportunity, for its wilderness experiences.

Azazel means *avertor, perverter*, and is Satan (1 Cor. 5: 5) in his capacity of using the Great Company to avert and pervert the Lord's Truth and arrangements; *i.e.*, to work Revolutionism, which the High Priest (through His members) attacks and resists by Scriptural teachings, Reason, and History; *i.e.*, by an exposure of the acts of the Revolutionists. Of course,

Azazel's Goat does not enjoy the jerks of the High Priest, as the High Priest's members do not particularly enjoy its jerks and the necessity of exerting counterjerks! This severity is also implied by the shaving of all the flesh (Num. 8: 7) of the antitypical Levites connected with their separation for the antitypical Levitical work (Num. 8: 5-22). As facial shaving is at times a painful thing, how much more so is shaving parts of the body that are much more tender! In the type the shaving was a part of the cleansing of the Levites, and represents a cleansing of the antitypical Levites from wrongly claimed powers and privileges by the application to them of the pertinent Old Testament types. The High Priest does not do the shaving. Each Levite does this to himself; but the High Priest hands each Levite the razor—sharp exposures—scriptural, reasonable and factual—for his use. The sprinkling with the water of separation represents their cleansing from more or less Adamic corruption, while the washing of their robes implies their ridding themselves by the Truth of evil qualities which their measurable willfulness developed. They "cause (see the margin) the razor (sharp, exposing truths) to pass over all their flesh," *i.e.*, they themselves apply to their sins the exposures of them that they compel the faithful to make, in order to remove their rebellions against the Lord's Truth and arrangements. Therefore the under-priests are not to be blamed for their course in this respect, much less the High Priest, whom the Great Company really blame, when they fault His members for doing what He directs them to do. The under-priests, faithful to their Head, will continue this course until the Lord's good will is accomplished in the cleansing of the antitypical Levites. Then the latter, understanding what it meant, will likewise appreciate the work of the under-priests in exposing their evils with a view to their correction. The Little Flock's work toward the Great Company has now two

general branches (1) one toward its Truth section; the other (2) toward its nominal-church section. The former is done by distribution of pertinent volunteer Present Truths, discourses and conversations; the latter by lecture, colporteur, sharpshooter, volunteer and conversation work.

(69) "The Church which is His Body" has not lost every privilege implied in the commission to be witnesses for God to the world (Acts 1: 8; John 15: 8-11), even if she has lost the controllership of the public work to Nominal Spiritual Israel. On the contrary, it is her privilege to reprove for sin, righteousness, and judgment to come in the Kingdom, when specially called upon to do it. This we may do as individuals, though not so markedly as we did during the reaping and gleaning time, which the Great Company and Youthful Worthies are especially to do. It is our privilege to witness by word of mouth, by letter and by printed page as formerly. However, our work toward the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies takes much of the time and strength that we formerly gave to the Nominal people of God, and this bids fair to continue for some time. Then, according to the Scriptures, we will be privileged again by public meetings, volunteer and colporteur work to give a widespread public testimony respecting the good news of the Kingdom as a means of comfort to the poor, chastised world. Rev. 19: 5, 6 (Praise our God, all ye His servants, even ye that reverence Him, both small and great. And I heard . . . and as the voice of many waters [peoples], etc.) indicates this.

(70) After the fires of this apocalyptic day have revealed each one of the consecrated class as being in his place, not only will there come more and more peace among the Truth people, but they will do a work of great prosperity. However, until the Great Company recognizes itself as such, it will not prosper in its work, as witnesses the failure of everything to

which it has turned its hand thus far. How glad we will be when conditions again become peaceful among God's people! And they will!

(1) What, first of all, is the design of this chapter? Despite the non-appearance of the word Epiphany in our English Bibles, how does the matter stand as to the corresponding Greek word? How many times does this word appear in the Greek? What will help us in arriving at the meaning of this Greek word? What seven things will help thereto as to the words *epiphaino* and *epiphaneia*?

(2) How is the word *epiphaino* formed? What is the force of each part of this compound word when combined? To what will this help? What is the primary meaning of *epiphaneia*? As a rule, to what does it refer? What will make this plain? With what will we precede the study of *epiphaneia*'s six N.T. appearances? How is the meaning *to shine brightly* given to *epiphaino* in Luke 1: 78? Acts 27: 20? Tit. 2: 11, 12? Tit. 3: 4? What is apparent from the four passages just studied?

(3) In what two senses is the word *epiphaneia* Biblically used? How does 1 Cor. 4: 5 show this without using this word? How will the four passages giving the first sense be presented? How does 2 Tim. 1: 9, 10 prove the first sense? To what period does this passage assign its epiphanizing?

(4) What is the blessed hope of Tit. 2: 13? How do Col. 3: 4 and 1 John 3: 2 teach this? What is not, and what is meant by the glory of God and Christ in Tit. 2: 13? How do the cited passages prove this? What two things does Tit. 2: 13 teach of our Lord's entire second stay on earth, as to an epiphanizing work? What does 2 Thes. 2: 8 mean? What does it teach on our Lord's epiphanizing as to Antichrist? What does 2 Tim. 4: 8 mean? What does it teach on our Lord's epiphanizing? What have we learned by this study of the four passages containing the word *epiphaneia*?

(5) In how many passages is this word used in a slightly different sense? What is this sense? How in 1 Tim. 6: 15 is the word *epiphaneia* translated? Why, in the first place, did not St. Paul in this passage not exhort Timothy alone? What parallel acts illustrate that certain ones beside Timothy are here exhorted? What in this passage

proves that the word *epiphaneia* here means a period? In what capacities will our Lord do this, according to this passage? What do we call this period in English? What is the rendering of this passage in the I.V.? What is the first fact proving that there are periods in the Epiphany? The second? The third? The fourth? The fifth? The sixth? The seventh? What follows from these seven proofs?

(6) What is the general teaching of 2 Tim. 4: 1 as to the Epiphany as a period? How does the I.V. render 2 Tim. 4: 1? What is the preferable pertinent rendering? To what periods of the Second Advent is the reference? What is a less preferable, but possible rendering of 2 Tim. 4: 1? If the second rendering is preferred, what does it do to an opponent of the Epiphany as a period? Why is he not thereby helped? What is the reason for this reason? Why is the I.V.'s preferable rendering the better? Who are the dead of 2 Tim. 4: 1? How is this illustrated by Matt. 8: 22 and 2 Cor. 5: 14? How does each of the cited passages prove that they will have their judgment in the Millennium? Accordingly, who are the quick [living] of 2 Tim. 4: 1? How does the judging process proceed as to the judged? How does Matt. 25: 31-33 show this? What do experience and observation since 1917 show on this point? Who else are being judged in the sense of being separated during the Epiphany, according to 2 Tim. 4: 1? What two results follow their Epiphany judgment? What, accordingly, does 2 Tim. 4: 1 teach as to the word *epiphaneia*?

(7) How are the words *epiphaneia* and *apokalypsis* related in meaning? Why is this evident? What examples prove this? What do they not imply as to Jesus? What do they imply? What other sense has the word *apokalypsis*? How do the cited passages prove this? What is the special time for epiphanizing and apokalypsizing? How do the cited Scriptures prove this thought? To what do the three cited Scriptures respectively refer? How do three other Scriptures show that the Epiphany is the Time of Trouble and a time of trial? In what three ways is it proved that the epiphanizing or apokalypsizing is a gradual work? How do the cited passages prove this? What do we conclude as to the meanings of these words in both of their

senses? What went on from 1874 onward? What has been going on since 1914? When will it reach a climax? Why is the Time of Trouble emphatically the Epiphany, the Apokalypse?

(8) What does the preceding discussion of 1 Tim. 6: 15 and 2 Tim. 4: 1 show? What two conclusions as to the meaning of the word *epiphaneia* are we warranted to draw? What results does the above study yield us? To what will these thoughts be helpful?

(9) What will help to a better understanding of the word *epiphaneia*? On what are dictionaries a unit as to the meaning of the word *parousia*? How can this be seen? How do these versions show this as to the cited passages? What do their margins show? In what only two cases does the A.V. translate the word correctly? What does the word not mean? What does it mean? What does the best Biblical scholarship show on this point? How does 1 Thes. 5: 1-5 prove this? How does Jesus show this in Matt. 24: 37-39? How does He show this in the nearly parallel passage, Luke 17: 26?

(10) What is the first stage of the Second Advent called in the Bible? How do the other cited passages prove this? Why does this word also apply to the Epiphany? How do the cited passages prove this? Why does it also apply to the whole thousand years of Jesus' Second Advent? How do the cited passages prove this? What has been done by citing the three sets of passages in this paragraph? Why is this word applicable to all three stages of our Lord's second stay on earth?

(11) What two activities of our Lord have marked the first stage of His Second Advent? From what passages do we conclude this? Why so? How do the cited passages prove the first of these activities? The second of these activities? What kind of brethren will then be delivered? How do the cited passages prove this? When, according to Luke 17: 26-30, will the Epiphany come as the manifestation time for the Great Company? To what conclusion are the ablest Bible students coming? From what do they reach this conclusion? What does the author do with, and believe as to this conclusion? How do the cited passages prove this? How will God's watching people be favored as to this knowledge?

(12) What is the third stage of Jesus' Second Advent? What is it called in the Greek? How does 2 Tim. 4: 1 prove the answers to the two foregoing questions? Who made the Kingdom their theme? In how many N.T. passages does the word *basileia* occur? In what two senses? By what is it otherwise referred to? How do the cited passages of the first list prove that the militant, preparatory stage of the Kingdom is referred to in them? Of the second list prove that its glorious reigning stage is referred to in them? What conclusions do we draw from a study of these two sets of passages? What are the three stages of our Lord's Second Advent? Why is it important to keep these in mind? What are their mutual relations?

(13) What did the Parousia and Epiphany do to one another? When did this begin and end? Why do we teach that the Parousia ended October 16, 1916? What occurred the next day further corroborating this? What was the difficulty with the Levitical leaders?

(14) What period does the Epiphany cover? What two facts corroborate this? Prove this from the cited Scriptures. What event marked its beginning? Why? What is its exact length?

(15) For whom was the Parousia? Why? For whom is the Epiphany? For whom is it not? What and for whom have the Priests to do now during the Epiphany?

(16) What are our Lord's Epiphany works toward the world and the Church?

(17) When and how did the separation of the world begin and progress? What is its present condition? What does this prove *in re* Jordan's two smitings?

(18) What is the time relation of these smitings to the war? What has not since occurred? What was the purpose of these smitings? This purpose being attained, of what is there no further use? What conclusion should certain brethren draw from this?

(19) What is the Lord's purpose in the division of the peoples? How is this purpose related to His second work for the world? When and how did some of the world learn of His presence? What was not, and what will be sufficient for all to learn this? Why will this be the case?

(20) Explain 2 Thes. 1: 7, 8 as a proof of this. How will the tribulation work the manifestation to the world?

What will be the character of His two Epiphany works toward the world?

(21) What points of similarity is there between the Lord's Epiphany work for the world and Great Company?

(22) What two pictures show the separation of the Lord's people? When did each one begin antitypically? What facts disprove a future first smiting of Jordan?

(23) What three facts prove that the separation of God's people is an Epiphany work? Explain 2 Tim. 4: 1 in detail. How does it prove that this separation is an Epiphany work?

(24) Describe the present progress of this Epiphany work. What will its completion include? What conclusion can we draw from its present state?

(25) What must be finished before the manifestation is made to the Great Company as such? Harmonize the fact that some, now in the Great Company, knew of His presence during the Parousia with the teaching that His manifestation to that class is an Epiphany work.

(26) By what two means will the manifestation be made to the World and Great Company? Of what do the latter's instructions consist? Why will these alone not be sufficient? What will be added to complete the manifestation? Describe the past insufficient operation of both of these means? Why will more come? Explain, type and antitype, Benjamin's experience in Egypt. Describe the works of the Great Company, after their repentance, giving Scripture proof.

(27) What two great events will follow the manifestation to them? Prove the answer. In view of these things what should we say?

(28) What two things as to the meaning of the word *epiphaneia* (and *apokalypsis*) have been shown above? What did the P.B.I. editors endorse in the two first numbers of their two periodicals? What did they repudiate in 1920? What did they claim? What did they one-sidedly quote to prove their changed view? How does the quotation from Our Lord's Return, p. 39, refute their changed view?

(29) Who else misuse our Pastor's writings in the same way? What do they allege of us? How does their guilt therein compare with that of the P.B.I. editors? Why is

this so? What should they (and all others) first do, before attempting to teach others? Else what will result? What should be said, if they were careless as to our printed and oral teachings on the subject? What is the likelier explanation of their course? What has been going on ever since 1874? How does the pertinent citation prove this as our Pastor's thought? What has additionally set in? What two kinds of proof exist thereon? In what order will they be presented?

(30) What identification is made in the quotation above from Our Lord's Return, p. 39? With what does the Great Tribulation begin, proceed and culminate? By what is each of its stages accompanied? How do the cited passages prove this? To whom will our Lord manifest Himself in the Great Tribulation? As what? How do the cited passages prove this? During what period is this manifestation time? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What follows from these two facts and their Biblical proofs? How do the cited passages prove that the Time of Trouble began with the World War? What follows from this? What, accordingly, proves that we are in the Epiphany?

(31) What is the second sign-prophecy proving that we are in the Epiphany? What work does the judging process do on the judged? How does Matt. 25: 31, 32 prove this? When is Adam's dead race to be judged? How do the cited passages prove this? When are the fallen angels, also the new creatures to be separated? How does 2 Tim. 4: 1 prove this? What would follow, if it can be proved that the Church of the Firstborn is being separated into its two classes? From the standpoints of what three figures can this be shown? How does Mal. 3: 2, 3 prove this by what it says on the Lord's Parousia design as to new creatures? On His Epiphany design as to new creatures? Why will such separations follow? What will result as to the two classes among the sons of antitypical Levi? What, accordingly, are we shown in Mal. 3: 2, 3? What follows from this? What do we, accordingly, see on all hands? How do some of the Epiphany saints stand as to the Great Company? How will the rest of them later stand? How do the Levites stand toward these? What illustrates this? What does this fact set forth? Into how many general

groups are the Levites divided? What are these? What kind of experiences marked the pertinent separations? What results therefrom? How do the cited passages prove this? What conclusion is to be drawn from this sign-prophecy?

(32) From what other feature of this sign-prophecy does this conclusion follow? In what does this picture center? What results from this viewpoint? What facts prove the taking of the pertinent power from the one by the other class? Where are these matters detailedly treated? What does the pertinent figure prove? By what third figurative transaction is this separation shown? Where will details thereon be given? Why is this an Epiphany work? How does 1 Cor. 3: 11-15 show this? What conclusion should be drawn from the three figures studied in this and in the preceding paragraph?

(33) What third sign-prophecy proves that we are in the Epiphany? How did this division manifest itself before the World War? What effect in each country did the World War have on this division? What two things reopened this division? What is a present danger? What does this prove as to antitypical Jordan? What kind of a work is that just described? Why so? What conclusion is to be derived therefrom?

(34) What fourth sign-prophecy proves that we are in the Epiphany? What has already been shown as to antitypical Jehu? As to antitypical Hazael? What additionally was there shown of antitypical Jehu as to antitypical Jehoram and Hazael? To what do these three correspond in Rev. 16: 19? What do we find as to world-wide conservative labor in relation to radical labor? Into what will conservative labor be swept? What is proved by the existence of the three above-mentioned parties? How so?

(35) What is the fifth sign-prophecy proving that we are in the Epiphany? Before what could the Youthful Worthies not be manifested as a class? Why not? What does the Gideon type in Judg. 7: 25—8: 1 show on this point? Since when have these complaints been increasingly heard? What follows from the fact that the Youthful Worthies are now manifest as a class?

(36) What is the sixth sign-prophecy proving that we are in the Epiphany? How long was that Servant as such

to function? How do the cited passages show this? Who, according to the Bible, was to function after him? How does Matt. 24: 45-51 show this? What happened according to this prophecy? In what three ways did J.F.R. sin? As what did these three deeds manifest him? What is proven by his coming into his pertinent activity after that Servant's work was finished?

(37) What is the seventh sign-prophecy proving that we are in the Epiphany? How so? What preceding battle proves the same thing? How so? What third fact proves it? How do the cited passages prove it? What conclusion follows? Along what lines is antitypical Gideon's Second Battle fought? Of what is it, accordingly, a proof? What does the fulfillment of the foregoing seven sign-prophecies prove?

(38) What other things prove that we are in the Epiphany? How many of such will be given here? What is the first time-prophecy proving that we are in the Epiphany? When did the scene at Bethel antitype? What Biblical thought opens the length of the day of 2 Kings 2: 3? How does the cited passage prove this? What are we told in 2 Kings 2: 3? At what time does its antitypical day end? What had by then occurred? When did it begin? In fulfillment of what? What kind of a separation was it? When was it complete? What follows from this fact? Why?

(39) What is the second time-prophecy proving that we are in the Epiphany? When and by what did the hour of temptation begin? When did it end? Of what kind of a day was it an hour? What was its design? What would it by its end determine? What decision was not reached during the Parousia? When would it have to be reached?

(40) What measurement of the Great Pyramid corroborates this time prophecy? How does it do so? What date does this measurement point out as that of the Great Company's manifestation separate from the Little Flock? How as to representation was the separation made? What occurred within the following nine months? What conclusion results therefrom? What fact is to be noted in connection with the foregoing ten proofs? With what does this fact well accord? What do the foregoing ten proofs not exhaust? Why will others not be presented here? What will a proper study of these proofs imply? What

will happen to those not having such an appreciation, and those having it? What will they declare?

(41) What will be here examined? Which of The Dawn's two expressions will here receive attention, as more clearly stated? What does this statement insufficiently present as the meaning of the word *epiphaneia*? Whose and what true definition does it attack as erroneous? What sophistry does it set forth as to the alleged self-evident meaning of the word *parousia*? To what does it limit the use of the word *epiphaneia*? What kind of use does it make of a quotation from the booklet, Our Lord's Return?

(42) How should such use be designated? In how many senses did our Pastor, in harmony with the Bible, understand the word *parousia* to be used? What was the first of these? How do the cited passages prove this? What was the second of these? How do the cited passages prove this? What was the third of these? How do the cited passages prove this? What do the above citations include? What do they prove The Dawn to have lost? What, accordingly, does it repudiate? What two things does it imply thereon? How many senses does the Bible teach on the word *epiphaneia*? How is the *period* sense proven by the A.V. rendering of 2 Tim. 4: 1? How does the I.V. show this as to 1 Tim. 6: 15? How is the *bright shining* sense proven by the four cited passages? Why is this period called the Epiphany? How is the period since 1914 marked in this respect? What do the above-cited six passages, as the full number of the occurrences of the word *epiphaneia* in the Bible, prove as to our Pastor? As to The Dawn?

(43) What two misrepresentations are especially implied in The Dawn's thought as to our Pastor's pertinent view? Of what trickeries was it guilty therein? To palm off what errors? What proves that The Dawn misrepresented him thereon? What is the first pertinent quotation from the booklet, Our Lord's Return? The second? The third? The fourth? The fifth? The sixth? The seventh? The eighth? The ninth? The tenth? The eleventh? The twelfth? The thirteenth?

(44) How does the proof thereon read in Z '14, 252, pars. 6, 7?

(45) How does the proof thereon read in The Bible Students' Monthly, 1914, No. 1, p. 1, last two pars. and p. 2, par. 1?

(46) What do these fifteen quotations from our Pastor's writings prove? Of what does this prove The Dawn guilty?

(47) On what have questions come to hand? What do they imply? How do the cited passages prove the Epiphany to be a period? How many of such seasons will it have? How many are already wholly or in part in the past? How many more, not already mentioned, will it have? What must be done with the questions? With what will the next one end? What will follow the period of the good Levites' manifestation?

(48) What is the Epiphany sometimes called? How do the cited passages prove this? What is the Parousia sometimes called? How do the cited passages prove this? Accordingly, what are these two periods separately and together called? How will these facts help us to prove that the Epiphany is a period of forty years? What inference is suggested, as based on the Parousia's lapping for two years and one month into the Epiphany?

(49) What does this not necessarily imply? Why not? Why are we assured that the Little Flock's deliverance tarries for many years yet? What two thoughts kept in mind will help us to see that the Epiphany will end before the deliverance of the Great Company? What do the lapping of the Parousia into the Epiphany and of the latter into the Basileia suggest as to when the Gentiles will recognize the established Kingdom? What does the devotion of nearly 42 years in service for the sealing of the Elect suggest as to the duration of the service of sealing the Great Company? What will probably soon follow? How long after 1956 until the Gentiles will recognize the Kingdom? What will thus be seen? Why? What may we later expect? How, accordingly, should we speak when discussing this subject? In the meantime, how should we express ourselves? What course should we pursue herein toward those not in the Parousia Truth? Those in the latter, but not in the Epiphany Truth?

(50) What Scriptural authority have we for holding that the expression, the days of the Son of Man (Luke 17: 22, 26, etc.),

are two periods only? What bearing have vs. 26, 27 on this question? Why? What are the points of comparison in the two sets of periods? What bearing has the expression "days" in vs. 26, 27 and the expression "day" in v. 30 on this question? What conclusion do we, accordingly, draw? What other considerations, based on v. 30 and v. 22, throw light on the question? What four reasons give this light? What, then, is the Biblical authority for our answer to the question under discussion?

(51) In how many and in what senses is the expression Time of Trouble, used? How are the special trouble period and the Epiphany related? What is here purposed to do as to their identity? What proof will be first offered? What passage proves this? What has just been proven as to the Parousia and the Epiphany as being called days? How does Luke 17: 30 prove that the Epiphany is its day? What does a comparison of vs. 30 and 29 prove? What do Sodom, its destruction and its day type? With what did Christendom's and the Nominal Church's destruction begin? What follows from this? When and with what did the Epiphany begin? What will next be proven?

(52) Through what does Matt. 26: 64 prove that the Epiphany will proceed? How does it prove this? When will the present powers of spiritual control be completely destroyed? When out of existence? In what does our Lord reveal Himself as present to the clergy? What, accordingly, does this passage prove? What of the nominal church's destruction did the World War accomplish? In what will it progress and be completed? What as identical does this passage treat?

(53) What is the teaching of the next passage to be quoted? Of what, in general and in particular, does 2 Thes. 1: 7, 8 treat? How is this proven? How do the quoted passage and cited passages on Jacob's Trouble prove this? What does Zech. 12: 9, 10 prove to be the time of Jesus' revealing Himself to the Jews? What do these two verses prove?

(54) What have we proven by the above-discussed passages? What results from this? What do these Scriptures show as to the character of our Lord's epiphanizing Himself? What other kind of proof passages will now be discussed? How does 2 Tim. 4: 1 prove the Epiphany and

the Time of Trouble to be identical? What do other Scriptures indirectly prove of the Epiphany and post-World-War trouble features? How does Mal. 3: 2, 3 prove this indirectly? How does 1 Cor. 3: 12-15 prove the same thing? How does Matt. 7: 26, 27 prove this?

(55) What as to our Lord's revealing Himself do all the passages discussed foregoing prove? During what did it have its small beginnings? What examples prove this? What has experience to say on this matter?

(56) How does 1 Tim. 6: 14, 15 imply the progressiveness of the Epiphany work? How does our Lord now manifest Himself? In what will it culminate? How does Col. 3: 4 prove this point indirectly? To what part of the Epiphany does this passage especially apply? What does it teach of the entire Church's whereabouts by the end of the Epiphany? How is this thought of Col. 3: 4 on the progressiveness of the Epiphany work reinforced by 2 Tim. 4: 1? How did our Pastor emphasize this climax?

(57) What will be quoted in corroboration of the above teaching? What should be noted as to these quotations? What two things must be kept in mind, if the quotations are to be properly construed? What was the character of our Pastor's Truth thoughts? In what form have some of these quotations been used?

(58) What is the quotation from O.L.R. (Our Lord's Return), p. 17, pars. 1, 2? How does it identify the Epiphany and the Time of Trouble? What is the pertinent quotation on page 18? How does it show the same identity?

(59) What is the quotation on p. 20, par. 1 and p. 21, par. 1? How does it prove the identity of the Epiphany and the Time of Trouble? What is the quotation from p. 39, par. 1? How does it prove the same identity?

(60) What is the quotation from Z'14, 252, col. 2, par. 1? How does it prove the same identity?

(61) What is the quotation from, What Pastor Russell Said, p.97, pars.5-7? How does it show the same identity?

(62) What are we warranted in concluding from our study? From what source? From whose corroboration? In what are we? What is in our midst?

(63) What is the last special period of the Gospel Age? How long, accordingly, will it last? Why is this true? What follows as to the Church's Epiphany work from the

fact that it is a part of the Gospel Age? What, accordingly, will and will not the faithful Church now do in relation to its Parousia work? How would we summarize the Church's pertinent work? To what work will our present study be limited? What is its foundation? What results from this? Why should this be repeatedly emphasized? What is the relation of the Epiphany Truth to that of the Parousia? Accordingly, what should not weary the brethren? Why not?

(64) What will be necessary for faithfulness to the advancing Epiphany Truth? Why so? In what respects will such faithfulness exercise itself? What will result from our doing these things? What study should engage our attention now? How in relation to the Parousia Truth? How can our Parousia studies be continued? What other careful study is suggested? Accompanied with what? Why is this recommended? What pertinent course has been followed in the Epiphany classes? What answers were given to pertinent inquiries?

(65) Having learned the Epiphany Truth what next is our privilege? To whom in general? In particular? Why? What similarity marks the effects of the Parousia Truth and the Epiphany Truth? How should the Epiphany Truth be presented? What are we in all cases to assume? How are we to act accordingly? Until when? What does revolutionism manifest in new creatures? What qualities should mark our course to all? When should we use severity? How much of it? By what methods should we spread the Epiphany Truth?

(66) What should be done in dealing with Youthful Worthies? Why? Why are they liable to discouragement? What is proper to do toward those who consecrated since Sept. 16, 1914? How should this thought be given them? What does the poem on the title page of the Poems of Dawn teach on this subject? What in this connection is a part of the Priests' privileges? With what should we seek to enlighten them? Along what lines should we proceed therein? With what goal in view?

(67) How should our course toward the unclean Great Company differ from this? Why so? How will this course be started and proceed? What will faithfulness to the Lord force upon us as to the unclean Great Company?

Wherein is the Scriptural severity implied? How does the picture of Azazel's goat show this? When tied to the tabernacle's door? While free from it? With what do the high priest's counter-jerks correspond? The leadings, apart from jerks?

(68) What does the word *Azazel* mean? Who is Azazel? For what does he use the Great Company? What does the High Priest do oppositely? With what? How do the participating ones feel toward their mutually antagonistic courses? By what else is the pertinent severity shown? How does this hurt? What is the shaving, type and antitype? What are the relations of the High Priest and the Levites to the shaving? What does the sprinkling with the water of separation type? How is the shaving done? Why? Who should not be blamed therefore? What will the underpriests continue to do in this matter? How long? When will the Levites appreciate this work?

(69) What has the Church not lost as to the witness to the world? Despite what? What privilege may individual members of the Church exercise as to "reproving"? Under what special circumstances? Whose special work is this now? By what methods may the Church do this? What prevents our doing much of such work now? For how long? Then what will the Church do? By what means? What proves this?

(70) What will come after the apocalyptic fires of this day have revealed each one of the consecrated in his class? Until when will the Great Company not prosper in its work? What shows its present lack of prosperity? How will we feel after peace is restored among God's people?

The Lord's Epiphany has come,
His kingdom's at the door;
And though the mountains shake and fall,
And waters rage and roar,
And earth and heaven pass away,
In faith that knows no fear
We lift our heads with joy and sing,
Deliverance is here!

CHAPTER II.

GENERALITIES ON THE GREAT COMPANY.

A SUMMARY ON THE GREAT COMPANY'S GENERALITIES. SOME DETAILS ON THE GREAT COMPANY'S GENERALITIES. PURIFICATION OF THE TRUTH AND ITS SERVANTS (LEV. 12). THE MOTHER OF A SON. THE MOTHER OF A DAUGHTER SOME LESSONS. JULIAN T. GRAY'S VIEW. HUGO KARLEN'S VIEW. SOME QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE GREAT COMPANY. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

HAVING made a fairly detailed study of the Epiphany in its twofold meanings, especially in that of it as a period, we now come to the study of the first of its elect classes, the Great Company, treating first of the Great Company's generalities, then of its details. We will first give a summary, then some details on the generalities of the Great Company. This class is called in Joel 2: 29 "the handmaids," and a Great Multitude in Rev. 7: 9; 19: 6 [the same two Greek words are in the A. V. translated, "much people," but should have been rendered, Great Multitude]. The individuals of this class were originally invited through the High Calling to the Divine nature and joint-heirship with Christ (2 Pet. 1: 4; Rom. 8: 17; Eph. 4: 4); but, alas, they failed to keep faithfully their consecration vows, and have had, therefore, to be remanded to a secondary class. These have in practice rebelled or supported rebels against more or less of the teachings and arrangements of God's Word (Ps. 107: 10, 11). They have by sin marred their characters and spotted their robes (1 Cor. 5: 1-13; Jude 23; Rev. 7: 14). They have failed faithfully to sacrifice their humanity for God (Heb. 2: 15; Jude 22). They have fellowshipped with the world (2 Tim. 4: 10; Jas. 1: 8). They have accepted and spread various false doctrines (1 Cor. 3: 12, 15; Matt. 25: 3, 8). They have developed sectarian systems (1 Cor. 3: 3, 4; Matt. 7: 26; 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20). They have usurped the office and

persecuted the persons of their faithful brethren (Is. 66: 5). They have more or less served Satan (Heb. 2: 14, 15). They will receive from him the destruction of their flesh and works (1 Cor. 5: 5; 1 Tim. 1: 20; Matt. 7: 27; 1 Cor. 3: 15); but they will finally escape with their lives, after losing the prize of the High Calling (1 Cor. 3: 15; Heb. 2: 15; Jude 22, 23; Phil. 3: 14). Accordingly, they will meet a great disappointment, when they learn that they have lost the Divine nature and joint-heirship with Christ (Cant. 5: 6, 7; Matt. 25: 11, 12, 30). This consideration, combined with the thought that they will be lost unless they repent, will lead them to cleanse themselves (Rev. 7: 14). Thereafter they will have a successful ministry (Cant. 5: 9—6: 1; Rev. 19: 6); and will in Heaven attain a subordinate spiritual glory (Ps. 45: 14, 15; 1 Cor. 5: 5; Rev. 19: 9). As parts of the Firstborn they will be Levites in God's Temple and Noblemen in God's Kingdom (Heb. 12: 23; Rev. 7: 15; Ezek. 44: 10-14). Many members of this class are just now, at the end of the Age, coming into special notice, activity and prominence. This class and the Little Flock, it will be noticed, are developed during the Gospel Age ("in those days," Joel 2: 29) in which Jesus and the Apostles labored, in which the great Apostasy developed, and in which—at its end—the Lord restored the primitive teachings and practices of Christianity.

(2) In general God's Plan treats of two classes, a heavenly class and an earthly class; an Elect class and a non-elect class; Jesus and the Church, His Bride, as the Elect class, and the world of mankind as the non-elect class. It is impossible clearly to understand the Scriptures without understanding the distinction between these two classes. We may speak of the distinction between them as a primary lesson in Biblical knowledge (2 Tim. 2: 15); and, of course, this distinction must be kept in mind to help us understand

various details given in the Scriptures. The Bible contrasts these two classes in many ways of which the following are a few: Each class has its respective call, one limited, the other general (1 Cor. 1: 26-29; John 12: 32); there are two ways for them to travel, one the "narrow way," the other the "highway" (Matt. 7: 14; Is. 35: 8); there are two sets of conditions, one difficult, the other easy, amid which they are developed (2 Tim. 3: 12; Is. 25: 8); a different set of promises pertains to each of them—one heavenly, the other earthly (Heb. 10: 32-34; Amos 9: 14, 15). Two different abodes will be their eternal home, one the new heavens, the other the new earth (2 Pet. 3: 13; Rev. 21: 1); each is to share in a different resurrection—one of the just, the other of the unjust (John 5: 28, 29, A.R.V.; Acts 24: 15). And each will receive a different nature as a reward of faithfulness, one Divine, the other human (2 Pet. 1: 4; Is. 65: 16-25).

(3) But, according to God's Word, these are not the only classes for whom there is salvation provided; for the Scriptures speak of other classes than these who will ultimately attain eternal life. Of one of these other classes our text treats under the term, "a Great Multitude," usually called the Great Company. Of this class this and the following two chapters will treat. We are not to understand that during the Gospel Age God has been calling two classes to salvation; for the record is: "Ye are all called in the one hope of your calling" (Eph. 4: 4); that is, we are not to understand that God has been offering two sets of people two different salvations during the Gospel Age, as inducements for them to serve Him; for such a thing is nowhere taught in the Bible. Rather, there has been only one actual salvation offered to those who turn from sin to righteousness, from Satan to God, during the present Age. To these God has offered as the prize (Phil. 3: 14) the Divine nature (2 Pet. 1: 4), and joint-heirship with Christ (Rom. 8: 17),

on condition of faithfulness unto death (Rev. 2: 10). How then, one may ask, does another class obtain salvation during this Age? We answer that the majority of those who hear and accept the Lord's invitation to consecrate their humanity to death in His service, and to develop heavenly hearts and minds (Rom. 12: 1, 2), fail so to run as to obtain the prize of the Divine nature and joint-heirship with Christ; rather as respects the prize they become castaways (1 Cor. 9: 24-27), because they do not prove "more than conquerors" of sin, error, selfishness or worldliness, by which through unfaithfulness they became defiled. Yet they do not wholly give up the Lord and righteousness; rather, for awhile they are double-minded partly for the Lord, and partly for self, the adversary and the world (Jas. 1: 8; 3: 15). Later by a penitent, believing and obedient use of the Lord's grace exercised through His Word and providence they are recovered; and changing their course become zealous for the Lord and His cause, and finally overcome (1 Cor. 5: 5; 3: 15; Jude 22, 23). These, of course, by their double-dealing fail to qualify for the Bride of Christ; and their condition would be pitiable indeed, unless the Lord should arrange some other salvation for them. This in His compassion He has done, without having invited them to such a salvation, when He first called them by the Gospel. He proposes to make them Bridesmaids for the Lamb's Wife, by inviting them *as a class* for the *first* time at the end of the Gospel Age to be present as guests at the Marriage Supper of the Lamb (Rev. 19: 9); and the record is that many will avail themselves of this privilege, and will then have white robes, *i.e.*, pure characters, and be granted palms, *i.e.*, victory (Rev. 7: 9).

(4) The possibility of there being such a class lies in the fact that it is possible to lose the prize of the High Calling. Scriptural teachings are to the effect that one can fall from the High Calling (1 Cor. 9: 24-27; 2 Tim. 2: 5;

Jas. 5: 19, 20; Rev. 3: 11); Scriptural exhortations imply the same thing (Heb. 2: 1-3; 3: 12-14; 4: 1, 11); Scriptural examples prove the same fact (Rev. 2: 5; 2 John 8; 2 Tim. 4: 10); and the sin unto death is in line with the same thought (Heb. 6: 4-6; 10: 26-31; 2 Pet. 2: 20-22; 1 John 5: 16; Jude 4-19). The last line of thought even proves that one can fall so far as to lose eternal life altogether; and, of course, therefore, one could lose the special prize of the High Calling. If all were of the second death class who lose the prize of the High Calling, of course there could be no opportunity for one to be of the Great Company. But some being saved through various punishments (1 Cor. 3: 15) proves another than the High Calling salvation. The fact, then, that there is a Great Company proves that some fall from the Little Flock without sinking into the second death class. The Great Company consists of those who are not sufficiently faithful to be of the Bride of Christ, but faithful enough to keep out of the second death. They are not good enough to be Kings and Priests with Christ (Rev. 20: 4-6); but are good enough to be Nobles and Levites (Rev. 7: 9, 14, 15), and are too good to be destroyed in the second death.

(5) The individuals of this class at their consecration and Spirit-begettal started out as prospective members of Christ (Eph. 4: 4; Heb. 3: 14); for they heard and heeded the invitation to exercise repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus (Acts 20: 21), and accepted the invitation to consecrate themselves as living sacrifices to God (Rom. 12: 1; Prov. 23: 26). Their failing to gain the prize has not been due to the Lord's not loving and helping them sufficiently; for He loves and helps especially all that truly give themselves, and most especially those who continue loyal to Him (John 14: 21-23); but it has been due to the fact that they forgot their "first love" by which they for awhile kept the Lord's Word

(John 14: 15; Rev. 2: 4). They received the Lord's Spirit of sonship when they complied with the conditions of justification and consecration (John 14: 15, 16; Rom. 5: 1, 2; 6: 3; 8: 10; 1 Cor. 12: 12, 13; Gal. 3: 26, 27; 2 Cor. 5: 17). The Lord sent them, as well as the Faithful, abundant instructions, encouragements, exhortations, warnings, rebukes, disciplines and corrections to deter them from a wrong course (Heb. 12: 5-13; Rev. 3: 19); and their taking the wrong course was entirely due to their failing to watch, to pray and to keep themselves in the love of God sufficiently to carry out their consecration, and thus to remain standing in His special favor (Matt. 26: 41; Jude 21), as prospective members of the Bride. There have been such measurably unfaithful brethren throughout the entire Gospel Age (1 Cor. 5: 1-5; Jude 22, 23; Matt. 7: 26, 27; 13: 7, 25, comp. Luke 8: 14; 1 Tim. 1: 19; 3 John 9, 10).

(6) Their course toward the Lord, the Truth and the remainder of the Lord's people has not been a praiseworthy one. But not all of them have been equally guilty of wrongdoing. Some of them have been nearly faithful enough to be of the Bride; and some of them have been nearly unfaithful enough to be of the second death class (Jude 22, 23). Between these two extremes of character in these brethren there have been and are now all sorts of variations of double-mindedness. With some of these bound children of God the trouble has been not so much a turning to sin as a failure to sacrifice unto death, through fear of the sacrificial death (Heb. 2: 15). Unlike the Master (Heb. 12: 2, 3), they do not endure the cross and despise the shame. Others of them, in addition to failing to sacrifice self and the world, give themselves up to various sins, and serve the adversary through spreading errors of doctrine and practice in religious matters, thereby spotting their garments, as the passages quoted at the end of the preceding paragraph prove. Altogether

as a class they are more or less wayward and self-willed, instead of being obedient and surrendered to the Lord's will. Thus they fail both with respect to their justification and consecration privileges and duties.

(7) This condition, of course, unfits them for the position of Kings and Priests, their characters not being of so good a quality as that required for Kings and Priests of God. How could God give the Divine nature to those who rebel and support rebels (Ps. 107: 10, 11) against His ways? How could He make them of the Bride of His Son when they defile the bridal garments of holy characters? (1 Cor. 5: 1-13; Jude 23). How could He proclaim them "more than conquerors" (Rom. 8: 37), when they compromise with the enemy through fear of the sacrificial death? (Heb. 2: 15). How can He give those the best that Heaven affords whose hearts cleave to the world? (2 Pet. 2: 7, 8; 2 Tim. 4: 10; Jas. 1: 8). How can He make them of the Christ-Body, from which the *rivers* of living waters will flow (John 7: 37, 38; Rev. 22: 1, 2), in view of the fact that through false teachings they corrupted the *wells* of Truth? (John 4: 14; 1 Cor. 3: 12-15). How could He make them parts of the Temple of God (Rev. 21: 3; Eph. 2: 20-22; 1 Pet. 2: 5) who have developed the false religious systems during this life? (1 Cor. 3: 3, 4; Matt. 7: 26, 27; 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20). How could He make them His most honored ones, since they dishonored the faithful ones? (Is. 66: 5). Surely it is unreasonable that He should treat the measurably Faithful as He will treat the thoroughly Faithful. Neither Reason nor Scripture warrants such a thought. The Faithful are guided by His eye, *i.e.*, they are directed in their life by His Word of Wisdom, the Truth; while the measurably Faithful must be repeatedly chastised, and finally have their fleshly mind entirely destroyed by punishments received at Satan's hands, who, while using them for his purposes, greatly

mistreats them (1 Cor. 5: 5; 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20). In every case that which they made "the stumbling block of their iniquity" becomes the means of their punishment: The favor of the world that they crave they lose; the pleasure of self-indulgence for which they pine turns into ashes grating on their teeth; the sin that they fondle turns into a poisonous reptile, greatly plaguing them by the venom of its sharp fangs; and the errors that they cherish leave their hearts cold and weak and their heads confused and deceived. In life's experiences they are continually meeting contrarieties that make their efforts fruitless. They lose one cherished thing after another, until there is nothing of self and of the world left for them. Thus their flesh gradually undergoes an enforced destruction at Satan's hands (Matt. 7: 27; 1 Cor. 3: 15; 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20), while the flesh of the Faithful is gradually consumed in loving and fruitful sacrifices for the Lord's cause (Phil. 4: 18; Heb. 13: 12-16; 6: 10; 10: 32-34).

(8) Throughout the Gospel Age there have been consecrated individuals, as evidenced by the Scriptures (1 Cor. 5: 5; 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20) and experience, who have pursued the double-minded course of the Great Company, and as a result have had to undergo the above-described enforced destruction of their flesh, instead of having the privilege of sacrificing it completely in loving, willing service of the Lord, the Truth and the Brethren. But, according to many Scriptures, these are first treated *as a class* at the end of this Age. Among other proofs the Tabernacle has no place for their existence as a class until the Epiphany. For they are not as a class of new creatures in the Holy (priests) nor in the Court (justified) nor in the Camp (unjustified) during the Gospel Age. First during the Epiphany do they take their place in the Court. In our times there are more such people than ever before; and the Lord is now dealing especially with them as a class. Among other passages, this class is described in the

fifth chapter of Canticles—the Song of Solomon. Through the Word of Truth the Bridegroom there calls them away from their ways; but they, the foolish virgin, sleep spiritually, and make excuse for not fully yielding themselves to the Heavenly Bridegroom, as He calls them away from their course. When at long last they do give a tardy response, they will find a disappointment in store for them; for then Brideship will have been lost to them (Matt. 25: 8-12). They will be mistreated by the figurative watchmen, the clergy, when they begin to witness to the Truth, as their opening eyes will reveal it to them. They will become zealous for the Lord according to the Truth as against the creeds, proclaiming Him especially to the Israelites (Cant. 5: 8—6: 3), whom as a nation they will have the privilege of converting to Christ. They must pass through "the great tribulation," amid which they will cleanse their robes and make them white in the blood of the Lamb (Rev. 7: 14). Amid this great tribulation it will be their blessed privilege to proclaim the glorious message, "Hallelujah! for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth!" Despite their sorrows and sufferings incidental to the destruction of their flesh and their cleansing themselves, they will rejoice through their tears that the Bride, the Lamb's Wife, will have been completed in holiness and in number, and will proclaim Her glorification with Her Lord (Rev. 19: 6-8). Their spirits, new creatures, will be saved in the Day of the Lord Jesus (1 Cor. 5: 5; 2 Cor. 5: 17). They with joy will in heaven partake as bridesmaids at the marriage supper of the Lamb (Rev. 19: 9; Ps. 45: 14, 15). And, being then spirit beings like the angels, they will be privileged to serve the Lord in His Temple, *i.e.*, as Levites (Rev. 7: 15); while Jesus and the faithful Church will be the living stones of the Temple, and Priests (Rev. 1: 6; 5: 10; 20: 6). The trials and tribulations of these Levites will be a thing of the past, and God's eternal favor will be theirs, on a plane of

being lower than that of the Bride (Rev. 7: 15-17). Thus through the grace and mercy of God these wayward brethren having been brought to repentance, "shall be saved, yet so as by fire," after suffering the loss of the prize—the Divine nature and joint-heirship with Christ, which the Faithful obtain (1 Cor. 3: 14, 15; Rev. 3: 11).

(9) We herewith present in two groups for the study of our dear readers some of the more important Scriptures that treat of the Great Company. In the light of the foregoing we trust that these Scriptures will be clear, and that their study will prove a blessing to all. The first group contains such passages as treat of the Great Company alone; and the second group contains such passages as treat of the Little Flock and the Great Company together. (1) Ps. 107: 10-16; Cant. 5: 1—6: 3; Jer. 8: 20; 1 Cor. 5: 1-13; 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20; Heb. 2: 15; Jas. 1: 8; 4: 1-10; 5: 19, 20; Jude 22, 23; Rev. 7: 9-17; 19: 1-9; (2) Ps. 45: 14, 15; Is. 66: 5-9; Mal. 3: 2-4; Matt. 7: 24-27; 10: 32-39; 13: 7, 8, 22, 23; 16: 24-27; 25: 1-12; 25: 14-30; 1 Cor. 3: 12-15; 1 Pet. 4: 14-18.

(10) After carefully studying these Scriptures let each one of us examine himself in their light to discern, if possible, whether he is a New Creature; and if so, to which of these two classes of new creatures he belongs. These are questions of utmost importance for every New Creature. Properly to learn their answers requires wisdom from above, which the Giver of every good gift and of every perfect gift will bestow liberally without upbraiding upon all who ask for it aright. If any of our readers desire information on this subject or other Biblical subjects and will ask us for it, we will be glad to give it as best we can.

(11) Frequently from 1918 onward we have been asked to explain the antitypical significance of Lev. 12, and as frequently, until 1928, we had been compelled to tell the questioners that we did not under-

stand its antitype. The time evidently was not due to use the passage in its antitypical significance with sufficient effectiveness against errors on the part of the Levite leaders as to the Truth that develops the Little Flock; and therefore for practical reasons the Lord withheld its understanding until 1928. Doubtless the great increase of error among the Levites against the Little Flock's Truth moved the Lord to give the Truth on Lev. 12 as a means of vindicating that Truth as reliable in the form in which it was left by our dear Pastor; for, rightly understood, the antitype of this chapter proves that when our Pastor left us he left with us the Truth that develops the Little Flock, purified from all error and thus fit to be relied upon as a finished product, as well as a proper foundation for the Epiphany Truth. We therefore ask our readers to peruse Lev. 12 before going further in the study of this chapter.

(12) We got the key to Lev. 12 from the typical significance of Rachel, Jacob's favorite wife. We have shown elsewhere that for our time she types the Parousia and the Epiphany truths and the servants who minister these to the two classes especially developed by these in the end of this Age (P '23, 117, par. 5; 118, par. 1). Or, to put it in other words, Rachel represents the spiritual elective truths and their servants that combinedly develop the Little Flock and the Great Company, especially in the end of the Age. In defining Rachel's Gospel-Age significance in the above citation we said that she typed real Spiritual Israel and their promises. This is true enough for the whole Gospel Age, but is not quite specific enough when viewed in relation to her giving birth to her sons, Joseph and Benjamin. The more specific definition for her in this relation is the Parousia and Epiphany or the spiritual elective Truth and the servants who apply it to the development of the Little Flock and the Great Company. But one may ask, Was not Jacob

the type of the servants who apply such Truth to these two classes? We answer that Jacob types the Truth servants in their capacity of starting the antitypical Joseph and Benjamin movements, but those servants who nourished these after they were thus started are represented in the type by Rachel, even as the mother nourishes and develops her children, after the father begets them and after the mother brings them to birth. Hence the mother in Lev. 12, we understand, types the same thing as Rachel does in the end of the Age. Vs. 6-8 prove that the servants that have applied the Truth for the development of the two spiritual classes in the end of the Age are also involved in the antitype of this woman; because no atonement is made for the Truth; but atonement is made for the shortcomings of its servants, because they need it.

(13) We have previously pointed out that the Little Flock is sometimes typed by a male child, and the Great Company by a female child, when the two classes are contrasted; even as Little Flock members are spoken of as Jehovah's sons (John 1: 12; 1 John 3: 1, 2), while Great Company members are spoken of as Jehovah's daughters and as His maidservants (2 Cor. 6: 18; Joel 2: 29). Aaron and Miriam (Num. 12: 1-16) may be cited as proofs of this fact, as given in the types. Accordingly, we understand the male child of Lev. 12: 2 to represent the Little Flock in the Parousia, and the female child of Lev. 12: 5 to represent the Great Company in the Parousia and in the Epiphany. A comparative type showing the two classes together in these periods is that of Elijah and Elisha coming together to Gilgal (1874), Bethel (1878), Jericho (1881), Jordan (1914) and beyond Jordan (1916-1917) (Z '15, 286, pars. 6-12). It is to be noted that in the case of the birth of a son 40 days were required for the full purifying of the mother (Lev. 12: 2, 4; compare with Luke 2: 21-24), while 80 days were required for the full purification

of the mother in the case of a daughter's birth (Lev. 12: 5). We understand the 40 days' period for the purifying of the mother after the birth of a son to represent the 40 years of the Parousia (1874-1914). The purifying of the mother during those 40 days types two things: (1) the ridding of the Truth (in its application to the Little Flock—the male child) of all error attaching to it; and (2) the purifying of its faithful servants, so that it was proven by October, 1914, that they had retained their crowns and therefore henceforth would retain them. Further, we understand the 80 days' period for the purifying of the mother after the birth of a daughter to represent the 80 years of the Parousia and Epiphany combined (1874-1914 plus 1914-1954). The purifying of the mother during these 80 days types two things: (1) the ridding of the Truth (in its application to the Great Company, etc.) of all error attaching to it; and (2) the purifying of the faithful and measurably faithful servants of the Truth of such defilements as would unfit them for their place in the Millennial Age, as well as for a special attestatorial service from October, 1954, onward.

(14) It will be noted that facts prove that both crown-retaining and crown-losing servants have ministered, are ministering and will yet minister both of these kinds of Truth throughout these periods, and that to both classes. But in the type of the mother's seven days' uncleanness (v. 2) it is to be considered that the participation of the crown-losing servants in the picture as related to the developers of the Little Flock is excluded, though they served in helping the Little Flock's development. Both crown-retaining and crown-losing servants are also to be considered as implied in the type of the mother in the picture as related to the developers of the Great Company, though the former are not included in the picture of the mother's fourteen days' uncleanness (v. 5). The

facts of the two antitypes and the two periods of the typical uncleanness and of the typical purification force us to make this distinction in the viewpoint. In both cases, in the first antitypical meaning of the mother—the Truth—the full purification of the pertinent Truth is to be understood as typed by the full purification of the pertinent mother. And in both cases, in the progressiveness of the cleansing, the gradual ridding of the pertinent Truth from errors attaching to it, is meant. The purifying work in both of its senses, *i.e.*, as respects the Truth and as respects its servants, is expressly shown to be the Parousia and Epiphany work of our Lord in His Second Advent (Mal. 3: 2, 3; 1 Cor. 3: 12-15; Matt. 7: 24-27; 2 Tim. 4:1); and its gradualness, so far as its Truth cleansing feature is concerned, is taught in Prov. 4: 18.

(15) We do not know yet in connection with what particular work the antitypical mother of the antitypical daughter *in the sense of the servants of the Truth* will in 1954 bring the antitypical burnt offering and sin offering in attestation of her purification; but we opine it will take the force of converting Israel. We will doubtless have to wait until about that time for certainty as to this knowledge. But we do know in connection with what work the purification of the mother in the sense of the crown-retaining servants as completed was attested, and, therefore, in connection with what work her antitypical burnt offering and sin offering were brought,—the service that we variously call the smiting of Jordan, antitypical Gideon's First Battle, the confessing of antitypical Israel's sins over Azazel's Goat and the executing of the judgment written, with the binding of the kings and princes. That service attested the purification of the antitypical mother; for faithful participation in it proved the crown-retaining servants to be such. Yet their service therein did not merit for them the high calling. This is proved by the fact that they had to bring the antitype

of the mother's burnt offering and sin offering (Lev. 12: 6-8). God's blessings on the Church as a result of the merit of Christ as the proof that God regards Jesus' sacrifice as acceptable were the antitype of the burnt offering that the mother of a son brought; and the amount of Jesus' merit needed to cover the sins of the Truth servants was the antitype of the sin offering that the mother of a son brought. The mother's bringing the burnt offering and the sin offering to the priest types the faith of the pertinent servants in the antotypical burnt offering and sin offering of Christ and the priest's offering these to Jehovah types our High Priest manifesting Jehovah's acceptance of Jesus' sacrifice for the faithful Truth servants in the above-mentioned services and securing God's forgiveness for their unwilling blemishes through His all-prevailing merit. The pigeon or turtle dove offered as the sin offering, and not a bullock, seems to type the fact that not all of Christ's merit, but only enough of it to cover the sins of the antotypical individuals involved was imputed; while the varying value in the burnt offerings—a lamb on the one hand, or a pigeon or turtle dove on the other—seems to imply the thought that more of God's blessings as His manifestation of His acceptance of Christ's merit is given to some than to others of God's servants. Poverty-afflicted Mary bringing the pigeon or turtle dove as her burnt offering (Luke 2: 24) implies, therefore, that she typed such crown-retaining servants as did not get so much of God's blessings as His manifestation of His acceptance of our Lord's merit as others did. A bringer of a lamb would type those who got more blessings in the antotypical burnt offering, e.g., our Pastor, Bro. Barton, etc., as faithful Truth servants received more of God's blessings as attesting His acceptance of Jesus' sacrifice than some of the other faithful Truth servants received through Jesus' ministry.

(16) It will be noted that in the case of bearing a

son the mother was considered as in the usual uncleanness (v. 2) coming through the menses (Lev. 15: 19-28), for a period of seven days; while in the case of bearing a daughter she was considered as in uncleanness for fourteen days, as though of a double menses. A study of Lev. 15: 19-28. As there will be for the race full seven 1, 000-years days before it is clean from the defilements of Adamic sin, so the Faithful through their faith justification are reckoned as having lived through these antitypical seven days and having gotten the complete cleansing from Adamic uncleanness at their end. And by that one imputation of Christ's merit at Pentecost (Heb. 10: 14) they are forever regarded as freed from the Adamic uncleanness. But not so the crown-losing servants of the Great Company Truth, who in the antitype of the 14 days' uncleanness alone are involved, the faithful crown-retainers being ignored in the type from this part of the antitype; even as reversely the crown-losing servants of the Little Flock Truth are ignored in the antitypical seven days' uncleanness of the faithful servants of the Little Flock Truth, as set forth in the type. These crown-losing servants had a part in the first cleansing (typed by the first seven of the fourteen days of uncleanness) (v. 5), but because of their measurable unfaithfulness they must as a class go through another cleansing, in which the merit of Jesus will be specially used (Num. 8: 12, 21). This second atonement for them is implied in the second set of the seven days in the fourteen, as set forth in v. 5. This second imputation set in some time between October, 1923, and October, 1924, at the presentation of the first part of the Good Levites—the second of the antitypical wave loaves in the finished picture. It is especially the statements of vs. 2 and 5 that made us say above that the crown-retaining servants are excluded from the type of the fourteen days' uncleanness and the

crown-losing servants are excluded from the type of the seven days' uncleanness. Perhaps the 33 days of v. 4 (33 being a combination and multiple of 3, which is symbolic of good) refer to the faithful servants in their goodness; while the 66 days (66 being a combination and multiple of 6, which is symbolic of evil and imperfection) are perhaps introduced to call attention to evils and imperfections in crown-losing servants.

(17) The above study suggests several lessons that may well be here emphasized. The first of these is this: The 40 days of the purification for a mother of a son proves that the Parousia—the Reaping time—is a period of 40 years; and the 80 days of the purification for a mother of a daughter proves that the Parousia and the Epiphany total 80 years, and that accordingly the Epiphany is a period of 40 years. These periods are proved to be of equal length and of 40 years each by the following facts: (1) they are in the same connections together called *days* and each in the same connection is called a *day*, combined with the fact that the Parousia is repeatedly spoken of as 40 years; (2) the twofold stay of Moses for 40 days in the mountain; (3) the period of 40 years for each being required in order to have a full symbolic night from October, 1799, to October, 1954, with April, 1877, as its exact midnight, as required by the parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins; (4) 40 years seem to be the Bible period for trial along the line of certain principles, like the 40 years' trial in the wilderness, the 40 years' reigns of Saul, David and Solomon, as trial times, the 40 years of the Jewish Gospel and Millennial Age harvest trials; accordingly we would expect the Great Company and Youthful Worthies, as classes, similarly to have 40 years—the Epiphany—set aside as the special trial period along the lines of the principles applicable to them; (5) the Lord's use of twelve hours to the working

day (John 11: 9) and His providing in the parable of the Penny for an eventide and consequently a night to follow the day of reaping (Matt. 20: 8), show that the symbolic twelve-hour night period that follows the Parousia time of Reaping (the twelve-hour day) must be of equal length, thus proving that the Epiphany is likewise 40 years long, the former being the day and the latter the night, referred to in Ps. 91: 5, 6 and 121: 6; (6) the Eight Large Wonderful Days, being eight decades, likewise show that the Parousia began in 1874 and that the Epiphany will end in 1954; and (7) now the 40 and 80 days of Lev. 12 are an additional proof.

(18) A second lesson that we can learn from our study of Lev. 12 is in connection with a time feature and a future work—a period and a work of about two years and one month following the antitypical 80 days. We have seen from the study above that the time of sacrificing in attestation of the purification set in immediately after the completion of the 40 days, and that the sacrificing occurred in the antitype in connection with the smiting of Jordan, etc., a period of about two years and one month. This period we frequently have called an interlapping of the Parousia and the Epiphany. There being 13 lunar months in the lunar year which ended in the Spring of 1916, the period from September 20, 1914, to November 3, 1916—the period during which smiting lectures began and ended in Jordan's first smiting—was just about two years and one month lunar time. But there will, in antitype of the sacrifice after the 80 days' purification, set in a similar period and similar work, and as the typical sacrifices at the end of the 40 and 80 days are parallel it is quite probable that for about two years and one month there will be an interlapping of the Epiphany and the Basileia [Kingdom], during which there will be a service going on by the Great Company, similar in duration to that which went on for the

Little Flock from September 20, 1914, to November 3, 1916, in Jordan's first smiting. This work will likely be that of the Great Company's converting Israel.

(19) A third lesson is also taught by Lev. 12: The Truth that develops the Little Flock was clean from error by October, 1914. As the mother of a son was completely purified at the end of the 40 days, so the Truth needed for the development of the Little Flock, as distinct from the Truth needed for the development of the Great Company, was free from all error by October, 1914. This fact proves that the Little Flock Truth, *i.e.*, the antitypical Parousia silver, as left by our Pastor with the Church, was refined from all the dross of error (Mal. 3: 3, first clause). And this fact proves that the Levite leaders who have rejected Parousia teachings and have set other teachings in their place have rejected Truth and put in its place error. This shows how utterly false is the claim of that evil servant, that he is giving teachings, contradictory to Parousia teachings, as meat in due season which could not be seen by Bro. Russell, they being not yet due! On the contrary, the full purification of the mother of a son at the end of the 40 days proves that whatever is presented contrary to the teachings that developed the Little Flock as held by our Pastor at October, 1914, must be error, and therefore must be by Satan through his servants put forth as darkness for light. Whenever, therefore, the Levites, particularly the Channelites, tell us that their contradictions of the Parousia teachings as left by our Pastor at October, 1914, are as meat in due season truths that our Pastor could not see, they being not then due, let us tell them that this cannot be so, for the Parousia teachings as the symbolic silver were by October, 1914, purged from all the dross of error, even as the Lord's holy Word teaches (Lev. 12: 3; Mal. 3: 3).

(20) A fourth lesson may well be drawn from our study of Lev. 12 and is implied in Mal 3: 3, the first

clause: the gradual purging of the Truth from error during the Parousia and Epiphany until no error remains therein—the mother gradually undergoing purification as the 40 or 80 days progressed. God did not give all the Truth to that Servant at once; nor did He rid his teachings of all error at once. This was a gradual work from both standpoints, and we see it manifest in his setting aside from time to time some of his former understandings of Scriptural matters and putting correct views in their stead, *e.g.*, the deliverance of the Church, the end of the trouble and the establishment of the Kingdom in Israel by October, 1914, the day of the Penny parable representing the Gospel Age, the pound representing the Holy Spirit, the New Covenant operating during the Gospel Age, etc., etc., etc. We should not by these previously misunderstood teachings be made to lose confidence in him as a Divinely appointed teacher; rather in the light of the teachings of the above-cited passages we should expect that he would make such corrections of former misunderstandings, until all such misunderstandings as to the teachings necessary for the development of the Little Flock were by October, 1914, set aside. Nor are we to expect him to have put aside all misunderstandings as to teachings necessary for the development of the Great Company; for the mother of a daughter was not purified until the end of the 80 days. Hence his uncertainty as to whether the Little Flock would be completely delivered before the dealings with Azazel's Goat would be begun and as to the length and purpose of the Church's stay in the world after 1914, his expecting antitypical Elijah to leave the world before antitypical Elisha would begin his ministry, the meaning of the midnight in the parable of the Ten Virgins, etc., etc.,—matters that are needed for the development of the Great Company in so far as they pertain to the Epiphany.

(21) And the same principles apply to the Parousia-

Epiphany Truth (the Little Flock's part having been duly clarified) needed for the development of the Great Company. It has not all been made clear at once to and by the Epiphany messenger, nor have all his misunderstandings as to its details been removed at once. Both of these features of this work have been progressing and may be expected to progress as the Epiphany advances—as the antitypical mother of the Great Company advances toward 1954. This principle will account for a number of clarifications of immature, and the corrections of wrong understandings of some of its presentations and will doubtless account for future ones. But this should not shake our confidence in the Epiphany messages and its messenger. It should rather, while not making us lose confidence in it and him, move us to recognize the faithfulness of our Lord to Epiphany interests in His ministry of gradually burning the dross of error from the silver ore of Truth (Mal 3: 3). Such a view of the matter will keep us back from either worshiping or depreciating messengers and will enable us, while using them for our help, always to look to and praise the Lord for the Truth; for, after all, He is the real source of the cleansed Truth (Mal. 3: 3), and as such He deigns to use mouthpieces, not as lords over God's heritage, but as helpers of their faith, partners of their hope, inspirers of their love and patterns of their obedience.

(22) In the August, 1932, Berean Bible Student, pp. 6, 7, is a letter from a "Faithful Berean," who signs himself J.T.G. (initials of Julian T. Gray) and who offers an exposition of Lev. 12. His thought is that the mother of the son is "Nominal Fleshly Zion," "the Jewish ecclesiastical system, " the son is Jesus, the son's birth is Jesus' resurrection in 33 A.D., the 40 days of purifying are the 40 years from 33 to 73 A.D., the purifying of the mother of the son is Israel's expiation of her sins from 33 to 73 A.D.! He further claims that the mother of the daughter is the Nominal Church

—"Nominal Spiritual Zion," the daughter is the true Church, Christ's body, its birth was the resurrection in 1878, the 80 days are the 80 years from 1878 to 1958, the purifying of the mother of the daughter is the Nominal Church's expiation of her sins for 80 years. This interpretation is a piece of error, for which the Lord holds the editor of the Berean Bible Student in part responsible, for giving it publicity. If he were a conscientious man, and disbelieved it, he would not have published it, or would have published it with refutative comments, which he did not do. In this his course is in marked contrast with that of our Pastor, who in every issue of the Tower gave the brethren to understand that his stewardship implied his preventing what he considered error from getting a hearing through the Tower. Of course, this article is published (see its third paragraph) as an attempted refutation of our interpretation, which, if correct, overthrows The Berean Bible Student's Harvest errors, allegedly based on our Pastor's article, *The Harvest Is Not Ended*. Let us look at the interpretation that The Berean Bible Student publishes as a letter of J.T.G., without correctional comment.

(23) J.T.G.'s interpretation is all right with but one exception—and that is that in every detail it is wrong! This we will now proceed to show. In the type the mother of a son was gradually purified during 40 days and was entirely clean at the end of the 40 days, and on that 40th day offered through the priest an acceptable burnt-offering and sin-offering. In the antitype the sin-offering would represent Jesus' sacrifice and the burnt-offering God's manifested acceptance of it. The woman's bringing these sacrifices would represent the faith of the bringer in the antitypical burnt offering and sin-offering. Did Nominal Fleshly Zion in 73 A.D. accept Jesus in His sin and burnt offering; and did Jesus, the only Priest who could then make atonement, in 73 A.D. bring Nominal Fleshly Zion—

Israel—into at-one-ment with God? None of these things has even yet happened. This one consideration would be sufficient to manifest the error of J.T.G.'s thought. But we will consider this interpretation further. Did Jesus, the new creature, at and by His resurrection come out of Nominal Fleshly Zion? Certainly not; for by His resurrection He, from one standpoint, came out of hades (Acts 2: 27, 31), and from another came out of antitypical Sarah's womb. It was during His 3½ years' ministry while in the flesh that Jesus came out of Nominal Fleshly Zion, just as the man child by coming out of the Nominal Christian Church was born out of Nominal Spiritual Zion into the Truth as due. Certainly Jesus was no longer a part of Nominal Fleshly Zion when its leaders excommunicated Him as a blasphemer. When He arrived beyond the camp He was out of Nominal Fleshly Israel, as He started on His journey to leave it the moment His ministry began to make Him unpopular with those who sat in Moses' seat (Heb. 13: 12-14). Thus Jesus' resurrection could not be the birth here typed. The mother of Jesus' new creature could not have been Nominal Fleshly Israel, for what is born of flesh is flesh. Again, in no sense was the mother of Jesus' new creature unclean, for it was the pure Truth that as a mother—antitypical Sarah—developed Jesus as a new creature. Hence the mother here typed cannot be Nominal Fleshly Israel. Israel's expiation cannot be the purifying here typed; for expiation is suffering to the limit deserved as punishment for sin, regardless of whether reformation sets in or not; while purifying is a cleansing work; moreover Israel was not purified by A.D. 73; nor was she gradually undergoing purification from 33 to 73 A.D.; rather Nominal Fleshly Zion was becoming more and more unclean ("the overspreading of abomination") each year from 33 to 73 A.D., and has continued unclean ever since, expiation being by it completed in 1878 (Is. 40: 2) for rejecting

Christ; and in 1914 for sins against the Law (Lev. 26: 24). Thus in every detail is the mother and the son in Lev. 12 misinterpreted by J.T.G.

(24) Equally erroneous and foolish is his interpretation of the mother and the daughter with its accompanying details. Nominal Spiritual Zion will not be cleansed at the end of 80 years from 1878, but long before that—in the earthquake—will be annihilated. She will not bring the antitypical burnt-offering and sin-offering to Christ by that time; because she was eternally cast off from God's favor in 1878; and certainly if the voice of the Bridegroom and Bride will never again be heard in her, Jesus will never make an atonement for her. Nay, she remains eternally in the lake of fire from the earthquake onward (Rev. 20: 10). Hence she will not bring the antitypical burnt and sin-offering in 1958, nor at any other time, nor will Jesus offer this on her behalf. Again, the sleeping saints by their resurrection in 1878 did not come out of the Nominal Christian Church, but came out of hades and out of antitypical Sarah's womb. Their spiritual birth, if it were from Nominal Spiritual Zion, would require her to be not nominally spiritual, but actually spiritual. Just as our Lord throughout His ministry in the flesh was coming out of Nominal Fleshly Zion and was completely out of it when utterly rejected by Nominal Fleshly Zion, so all through the Gospel Age since the Nominal Spiritual Zion came into existence, have the faithful while in the flesh come out of her and completed this coming out in every place just before Nominal Spiritual Zion began there to travail (Is. 66: 7), this coming out being completed everywhere by Passover, 1916, which likewise overthrows the thought under review. The Nominal Church's expiation, which will be by eternal annihilation, cannot be the purifying here typed; because it has been becoming viler and viler ever since its rejection in 1878 and will be at its vilest at its annihilation, and thus will never be purified.

(25) Thus in every detail the interpretation of J.T.G. on the mother and daughter and the connected events is proven erroneous (2 Tim.3: 9). And, dear brethren, in his third paragraph he says our interpretation is "mainly nonsense." He does not attempt to show its alleged nonsense. He who writes such folly on types inveighs a number of times against our dealing much in types! In the Foreword of Vol. II, we Scripturally justify our course on types, and that overthrows another Levitical and Jambresian outcry against the Epiphany Truth.

(26) There has come to us for answer the following question: What do you think of Bro. Hugo Karlen's thought on the purification of the mother of a son and of a daughter (Lev. 12) as he gives it in his May, 1935, paper, *The Stone Witness in Egypt*? We answer: Bro. Karlen's view stated in his own words is as follows: "According to the Jewish Law, a woman giving birth to a man child, should go through a period of purification of 40 days. If she gave birth to a maid child, the period of purification should be 80 days. See Lev. 12: 2-5. The woman here represented the whole Church of God on the earth; the Jewish Church during the time of the Old Covenant, which gave birth to the man child, Christ Jesus, and the general Christian Church, which brought forth the maid child, the Little Flock, Christ's coming bride. These 40 and 80 days in the type seem to picture forth the 40-year harvest of the Jewish Age, 29-69, and the Gospel Age 'harvest' of 80 years, 1874-1954."

(27) The first thing that strikes our mind in Bro. H.K.'s view is its ambiguity and incompleteness. In the first place he speaks of the Jewish Church and "*General*" Christian Church as the whole Church of God on earth. While such a view is necessary for his theory, the Bible never by direct terms nor by inference intimates that the Jewish Church and the "*general*" Christian Church (whatever he means by the term

"general" in the last expression) are "the whole Church of God." Though the Bible does call Fleshly Israel (those called out of Egypt, since the word *Church* means those called out) the church in the wilderness (Acts 7: 38), it never expressly nor by inference calls Fleshly Israel the Church of God nor a part of the Church of God. This term belongs exclusively to the true Christian Church, the Body of Christ, either as a whole (1 Cor. 10: 32; 15: 9; Gal. 1: 13) or in ecclesiastas as local parts of it, in which case it uses actually or inferentially a qualifying term like the Church of God at Corinth, etc. (Acts 20: 28; 1 Tim. 3: 5; 1 Cor. 1: 2; 2 Cor. 1: 1). In no sense is the Jewish and "general" Christian Church one church ("whole Church of God"). But what does he mean by the term, Jewish Church as the mother of Jesus? If he thereby means the Nominal Jewish Church, everything said above against J.T.G.'s same view applies against his view. In addition to what was said above against the pertinent part of J.T.G.'s view, the following must be said against this feature of H.K.'s view, if by the expression, the Jewish Church, he means Nominal Fleshly Israel: Since H.K. rightly holds that the 40 years of the Jewish Harvest were from 29 to 69, and since Jesus did not come out of Nominal Fleshly Israel in the sense of being no more a part of it, which was not a birth until April, 33, the 40 days could not type the 40 years from 29-69; hence could not type the 40 years from April, 33, to April, 73, which is J.T.G.'s false view of the time of the Jewish Harvest. Moreover, the term, man child, when referring to God's Anointed never in the Bible means Jesus alone; but means either Jesus and the Church as the Christ, the one new man (Is. 66: 7; Eph. 2: 15), or their counterfeit as the Anointed, Antichrist (Rev.12: 5, 13). Again, if by the term, "the Jewish Church," H.K. means real Fleshly Israel as distinct from real Spiritual Israel, he must thereby mean the faithful of the Old

Testament up to and including John the Baptist, as distinct from those Israelites indeed of the Jewish Harvests who, of course, then became Spiritual Israelites. Jesus in no sense, either as a human being or as a new creature, can be spoken of as being born, *i.e.*, begun or developed by these Israelites indeed, in A.D. 29, because as to their sacrificed humanity and as to their new creatures they came after Him and never mothered Him in the Covenant, but came after Him in the same fellowships as He, in sacrifice of the humanity and in development of the new creature. Nor could He be spoken of as having come out of them in A.D. 29, for they continued with Him in fellowship (Luke 22: 28). Hence He did not undergo even a figurative birth from them. He was not as a new creature begun by these or any other human; for it was God, after begetting Him, who directly applied without any human agent the Covenant promises to Him, *i.e.*, acted in the place of the servants of the Truth as part of the mother in applying the Covenant promises. And for God there could be no atonement made after the 40 years or at any other time. Consequently, the term, "real Fleshly Israel," could in this connection be applied to the Ancient Worthies only. But these neither underwent a purification for 40 years, 29-69, nor at the end of that time did they bring the antitypical sin and burnt offering, since their last member, John the Baptist, had died about 38 years before. Neither did Jesus, the only atoning Priest officiating in the year 69, offer to Divine justice the merit of His sin offering for them, nor did He work on their behalf resuscitation from the dead, justification and restitution in the year 69, typed by offering the burnt offering for the mother of a son, since He as Head and the Church as Body will do these three things for the Ancient Worthies in the Millennium. While it is true that the Oath-bound promises in their highest features as antitypical Sarah did conceive Jesus in A.D. 29, which may be Scripturally regarded

as a reckoned birth, yet that Truth in so far as it conceived Him was then perfect, hence needed no purification for 40 years. Nor was any Ancient Worthy nor any other human the agent that brought Him to this spiritual conceiving; for John the Baptist did not minister the Sarah promises to Jesus. Hence we see that neither nominal nor real Fleshly Israel brought Jesus to a reckoned birth in A.D. 29, as H.K.'s theory requires. Hence, and additionally, since God took the place, in the mother, of the servants applying the Truth to Jesus, there was no one for whom the sin offering and burnt offering were presented for the mother in A.D. 69. These considerations overthrow H.K.'s view on the mother of the son. It will be noted that he did not attempt to explain the purification of the mother during the 40 years, its completion at their end, and how the antitypical sin and burnt offerings were made for her in A.D. 69. As shown above, none of these points can be explained according to his view.

(28) Now as to his view on the mother of the daughter. What does he mean by the term, *general* Christian Church? If by that term he means the *Nominal* Church, the birth of the true Church from her was completed from 1914 to 1916, when the last members came out of her in each country just before it became involved in the World War, *i.e.*, from 1914 to 1916 (*Is. 66: 7, Rev. 7: 1-3*). And such a birth began for the Church in the Time of the End, in 1846, when the cleansed Sanctuary first became separate and distinct from the nominal Church. Thus the true Church's birth from the nominal Church in the Time of the End does not agree with his date 1874. Moreover, before 1846 many companies of God's people left Babylon during the reformation and before, which again does not agree with his thought. Moreover, every argument that we used against J.T.G.'s thought as to the mother of the daughter being the nominal Church applies against H.K.'s thought on the same subject, if by the

term, the general Christian Church, he means the nominal Christian Church. But if by that term he means the real Christian Church, we answer that the real Christian Church is not the mother of the Little Flock; for that would make the Little Flock its own mother; while the Bible teaches that its mother is the Sarah Covenant, which consists of the highest features of the Oath-bound promises and the servants in their capacity of applying those features to the development of the Little Flock (Is. 54: 1-17; Gal. 4: 21-32). 5 Again, since he defines the daughter as the Little Flock, its reckoned birth set in at Pentecost, while his setting makes it 1874, which, as our view shows, was the date of the beginning (a figurative birth) of the Parousia Little Flock—then the Parousia section of the Little Flock was given a figurative birth—its Parousial start typed by Joseph's birth. Thus in either way of understanding the term, the general Christian Church, his understanding of the mother and daughter is proven wrong. Accordingly, his view of both the mother and son and the mother and daughter is thoroughly wrong. Our understanding of it as given above is the proper view of it, as it is in harmony with the seven axioms of Scriptural interpretation.

We will now study some pertinent questions.

Question: Is not the Great Multitude of Rev. 7: 9-17 and 19: 1-9 the Restitution class, and therefore not a Spiritual class?

Answer: We think that they do not represent the Restitution, but a Spiritual class. This is clearly implied in v. 6, where their voice is distinguished from the voice of *many waters*, peoples, *i.e.*, among others, some of those who will be of the Restitution class. More clearly yet is it implied in the family figure in vs. 7-9 by the fact that they are described as those who are invited to the Marriage Supper of the Lamb. In this picture the Bridegroom is Jesus, the Bride is the Little Flock, the Guests at the Marriage Supper are the Great Multitude. The following order of events

connected with the family figure proves that these Guests could not be the Restitution class: First, there is the marriage; second and afterward, the marriage supper; third and still later, the begetting of children; and fourth and finally, their birth. The Great Multitude, the theme of Rev. 19: 1-9, being the Guests at the Marriage Supper, cannot be the Restitution class, which will be the children of this Marriage, begotten and born after the Marriage Supper. The figure of Levites and Noblemen used in Rev. 7: 15 likewise proves them not to be of the Restitution class. The expression, "serve Him day and night in His temple," proves them to be antitypical Levites. Here the figure is that of Priests, Levites and Israelites. The Priests are Jesus and the Church; the Israelites are the Restitution class; part of the Levites are the Great Company (Mal. 3: 2, 3). The fact that the Levites had no inheritance in the land proves that the Millennial Levites will all either be or become spiritual; hence, none of them will ultimately be of the Restitution class. To be before God's *kingly throne* (Rev. 7: 15), but not to stand before His *judicial throne* (Rev. 20: 12), means to be a nobleman and officer of the Kingdom. Here in the Kingdom figure (not in the Court figure where He functions as judge) The Christ in the throne is the King; the Great Company are the officers, nobles, before the throne; and the Restitution class are the subjects of the King and the subordinates of His officers, the nobles; therefore, they are not represented in this scene, which implies a palace scene; for their place is outside of the palace. Ps. 45 introduces the same and additional distinctions. V.1 introduces Jehovah; vs. 2-9 introduce Jesus; vs. 9-13 introduce the Church as Jesus' Bride; vs. 14 and 15 introduce the Great Company as the Bridesmaids; v. 16 introduces the Ancient Worthies as Christ's children and the Restitution class' princes; while v. 17 introduces the Restitution class separate and distinct from all other

classes. Ps. 107 also introduces the same and other distinctions; vs. 2-9 treat of the Little Flock; vs. 10-17 treat of the Great Company; vs. 17-22 treat of Fleshly Israel cast off from and restored to God's favor; vs. 23-32 treat of man kind during and just after the great tribulation; vs. 33-38 treat of the Restitution class during the Millennium; vs. 39 and 40 treat of the wicked, and vs. 41 and 42 of the righteous during the Little Season after the Millennium. What Paul says of the man that committed fornication with his father's wife (1 Cor. 5: 5) proves that the Great Company will be spiritual; and hence will not be the Restitution class: "Deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the *flesh* [for the overcoming of his evil disposition, that he might learn not to fornicate any more, even as Hymenaeus and Alexander were delivered unto Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme any more, 1 Tim. 1: 20] that the *spirit* [the new creature] may be saved [by being awakened from the dead as a spirit] in the day of the Lord Jesus." These considerations, among others, prove that the Great Multitude is not the Restitution, but a Spiritual class.

(1) Question: Does not the fact that one is cut off from the World's High Priest disrobe him of Christ's righteousness, represented by the High Priest's linen robe?

Answer: As we understand the matter it does not. If Aaron's robe alone would represent Christ's righteousness, then the robes of Aaron's sons would not represent that righteousness, which, of course, they do; nor would it be represented by the garments of Nadab and Abihu who, while being carried out in their priestly garments (Lev. 10: 5), represent both of their antitypes as cut off from the Priesthood, however, at a stage in which they were not yet unto a completion in the condition representing the Second Death class, even as every one who is cut off from the antitypical Priesthood falls first into the Great Company, and

only later some of them fall into the Second Death, represented here as in the finished picture. Moreover, the Levites wore white robes, tentatively representing Christ's righteousness, and in this picture, which is one figuring forth the Gospel-Age Levites, type a class that never was in Christ, the World's High Priest (1 Chro. 15: 27). If the questioner's thought were correct, there would be no Great Company at all; for all cut off from The Christ would under these conditions have to go into the Second Death. Accordingly, we answer that the robe of Christ's righteousness, being worn by those in Christ, by the Great Company, and tentatively by the Youthful Worthies and the justified, is not for the World's High Priest alone. Hence one cut off from that class does not necessarily lose it.

(2) Question: Are the errors of doctrine and practice of which the Great Company are guilty an evidence of the Lord's disapproval of them?

Answer: We believe they are, so far as Little Flock membership is concerned. Had they been faithful, the Lord would not have permitted them to become thus deceived (Ps. 91: 3-7). It is because they have been so willful as not to be submissive to His teachings, given by precept, that He has arranged for them to fall into Azazel's hands that they might be punished in the destruction of their flesh, and that by a sad experience, contaminated with Azazelian errors and practices, they might learn that their only safety is in the way of obedience to the Lord's teachings and arrangements. He also permits them to fall into these errors of doctrine and practice that they may learn the lesson that the Lord will not use them, but the Priesthood, as His primary mouthpiece; that it is not for them to approach His altar to offer incense—a privilege reserved for the Priests alone. Thus viewed, their going into errors of doctrine and practice is of a threefold character: (1) it is punitive, *i.e.*, a punishment for sin; (2) it is educational, *i.e.*, for reformation, in that it is

to teach them by sad experiences the unprofitableness of disobedience and the profitableness of obedience; (3) those of them who are rightly exercised by their experiences and learn to suffer joyfully for Truth and Righteousness will have these sufferings counted for the expiation of the world's willful sins.

(3) Question: Should we not in Christian love and longsuffering continue to give priestly fellowship to manifested crown-losers?

Answer: We should not in Christian love and longsuffering continue to give priestly fellowship to manifested crown-losers. To give them priestly fellowship is neither Christian love nor Christian longsuffering. The very God of love forbids it; and therefore to give it must be a violation of Christian love and longsuffering. A little consideration will show that it is neither Christian love nor Christian longsuffering to give them priestly fellowship. In the first place, it is a direct act of disobedience to God, who commands us to withdraw priestly fellowship from such (1 Cor. 5: 5; 1 Tim. 1: 18, 19; Lev. 13: 3, 8, etc., 44-46). Again, God expressly charged the Israelites to be exceedingly careful to do what the manifesting and sentence-announcing priest charges to be done with their types, the spotted lepers, citing the case of Miriam, the classic type of crown-losers, as the typical example therefore (Deut. 24: 8, 9). If it were not important to refuse such priestly fellowship, God would not have commanded such carefulness in doing it. Further, not only obedience to God requires it, but the protection of the other brethren from contamination requires it, as St. Paul suggests in 1 Cor. 5: 5-7, and as the type of driving the contaminating leper outside the camp (Lev. 13: 44-46; Num. 12: 14, 15) suggests. Note how great has become the contamination of the various Truth groups, because they at the start failed to sever themselves from their manifested crown-lost leaders. Surely here a little leaven leavened the whole lump.

Thirdly, the peace and prosperity of the faithful will be retarded by the failure to withdraw priestly fellowship from such. Then, the crown-losers would be hindered from their cleansing, if such fellowship were not withdrawn. Not only so, but it would result in the second death of such if, due to the failure to withdraw priestly fellowship from them, they do not cleanse themselves. Certainly only mischief alone could result to them and others from such failure, while the withdrawal of such fellowship is one of the indispensables for their cleansing. We are satisfied that the failure so to do will result in those failing so to do themselves becoming manifested as crown-losers; for such failure is revolutionism against one of God's arrangements. It is, therefore, not true Christian love and longsuffering which refuses to withdraw priestly fellowship from manifested crown-losers. On the contrary, the above-mentioned considerations prove that true Christian love and longsuffering dictate such withdrawal of fellowship from manifested Levites.

(4) Question: How can we think of Satan as bound now, if he is instrumental in the destruction of the Great Company's flesh?

Answer: To see daylight through this question we must realize that the binding of Satan, the individual, and the Satan system does not mean their inactivity, and that it is not an instantaneous act, but that it is a progressive matter, going through several stages. The binding of the individual Satan respects the fallen angels and means that our Lord gave the fallen angels so much Truth between 1874 and 1878 that Satan from then (1878) onward could no more control them as he had been doing before; yet he has otherwise continued very active among them. Again, the binding of the Satan system as respects the world is a progressive one, going through four stages, amid each one of which he displays great activities, as the following will show: The first stage was from 1874 to 1914 and

thus preceded the World War. It gave the world so much Truth against the foundation errors of Satan's empire, the Divine right of kings, clergy and aristocracy, and against its supporting errors, eternal torment and the consciousness of the dead, as made it impossible for Satan longer to control mankind with those errors; yet he was very active while thus being bound. The second stage is now going on. It began at the end of the War and will be completed by Armageddon. It will give the world so much Truth as against dictatorships as will make it impossible for Satan to rule mankind by dictators, proven by the outbreak of Armageddon; yet during this stage of his binding Satan has been very active. The third stage of his binding will be between Armageddon and Anarchy, beginning at the end of the former and ending at the beginning of the latter. It will give the world so much Truth as will make it impossible for Satan to rule mankind by the Socialistic government that he will establish after Armageddon, which third stage of his binding as complete will be evident by the outbreak of Anarchy; yet Satan will be very active during that period. The fourth stage of Satan's binding will be during the reign of Anarchy, and will be active into its last phase, *i.e.*, during the plundering expedition against the Jews of Palestine, which reign of Anarchy the Lord will destroy by overwhelming the plundering hosts of anarchists in Palestine through a mighty display of retributive justice. This stage of his binding will complete it from every standpoint, but amid each part of it Satan will be very active. When Anarchy will have been overthrown, Satan will not only have been completely bound, but he will then be spirited away from this earth and imprisoned, unable for the rest of the 1,000 years to tempt the people or to learn what is going on among them. The above five features of Satan's binding, one as to the fallen angels, the other four as to mankind, prove that his binding is a progressive

one, stretching through five stages over a period of more than 80 years, and that his binding process does not mean that he is rendered therein inactive, but it does mean that as each stage is completed he will no longer be able to control through the errors whereby he controlled before such stage of his binding set in. Hence during each stage he has activity and power enough to destroy the fleshly minds of Levites.

(5) Question: If God arranged for 60 groups of Epiphany Levites as antitypical posts for the Epiphany Tabernacle's Court, why do you blame the Levite leaders for making these various groups or antitypical posts of the Epiphany? Are they not thereby performing God's good pleasure?

Answer: That the questioner is laboring under a misunderstanding is evident from a number of Scriptural passages and facts. Every one of such groups arises amid a sifting, *as a sifting movement*; and no sifting movement is Divinely approved (2 Thes. 2: 9-11). All new-creaturely sifters defile God's Temple; hence they will end in destruction (1 Cor. 3: 17; please note that this passage occurs amid a discussion, among other things, of new-creaturely leaders who are sifters, one of the things here discussed being the experiences of the saved Great Company members; Ezek. 9:7). Again, the pertinent types prove this of all new-creaturely sifters who defile God's Temple; e.g., Jannes and Jambres (Ex. 7: 11, 12; 2 Tim. 3: 1-9); Nadab and Abihu (Lev. 10: 1-5, 8-11; see footnote in T-119, in editions from 1909 onward); Moses and Aaron smiting the rock (Num. 20: 10-13; compare 1 Cor. 10: 4; Heb. 6: 6; 10: 29) and the firstborn [leaders] of the captive that was in the dungeon [Great Company] (Ex. 12: 29; compare with Heb. 2: 15; Ps. 107: 10, 14, 16; 69: 33). Hence if in any of these sifting movements a new-creaturely leader defiles God's Temple, which occurs by his deceiving new creatures into his

sifting movement by his errors, he is not only not doing a Divinely approved, but is doing a Divinely disapproved work. How, then, are we to harmonize this teaching with the thought that God desires the 60 Epiphany posts about the Epiphany Tabernacle's Court? We answer, by keeping the following things separate and distinct in our minds: God does not have the Great Company groups in their uncleansed condition placed as antitypical posts about the Epiphany Court; because as such they are not doing God, but Azazel service. It is only as these groups are cleansed (for a parallel thought please see Lev. 14: 49-53; and for the synonymous thought please see Num. 8: 1-26) that they will be set up as antitypical posts about the Epiphany Court. Considering the typical posts, we can see that this is true of the direct type. When the trees from which the posts were made were developed as trees they corresponded to the groups formed by new-creaturely sifters. When they were cut down they were not yet posts in the court. At this stage of the type, cutting-down the trees, which are not yet made into posts, corresponds to the sifted groups under new creaturely sifting leaders getting the first impulses toward their being destined for antitypical posts. God's real servants cut down the antitypical trees by applying the first pertinent truths to these siftlings as individuals and groups. Next these cut-down trees were brought (Ex. 31: 1-6) to Bezaleel (our Lord), Aholiab (the star-members) and their companions (especially, but not exclusively, the non-star-membered general elders), who sawed off this part, trimmed off that part, fixed the other parts of these cut-down trees, until they were actually no more trees, but posts fit to be set up in the Court of the Epiphany Tabernacle. The turning of these cut-down trees into posts types the work that our Lord, the Parousia and Epiphany messengers and their helpers have in the end of the Age put on the Great Company as individuals and as groups, fitting them as

groups and individuals of such groups to take their place as cleansed individuals in such cleansed groups about the Epiphany Tabernacle. The erecting of the antitypical posts is a future work. The work that is now going on consists in part of the growing and cutting down of such symbolic trees (gathering the sifflings into their pertinent groups and giving them their first impulses toward their future mission), and in part of the sawing and trimming off of excess parts of the symbolic trees (driving out of the groups unfit leaders and led ones, cutting off their wrong teachings, works, arrangements and organizational features). The work that yet remains to be done on these symbolic trees and posts is the completion of the above mentioned things, the giving of right teachings, works, arrangements and organizations to these groups, as well as to superintend their cleansing, as typed in Num. 8 and Lev. 14. And, finally, these things having been done, the posts will be put around the Epiphany Tabernacle, *i.e.*, put into their right spheres of service. We believe that we will shortly see this work enter its final stages of tree-growing and cutting-down, and, to speak literally of the other features, of ridding the groups of their evils and of giving them the positive equipments and positions for their true Levitical service. This explanation will enable us to see the erroneousness of the implications in the question under consideration. Hence we answer the question: While God has arranged for the 60 Epiphany posts to be placed around the Epiphany Court, He disapproves as evil the work of the Levite leaders in forming the groups of uncleansed Levites, as a forbidden sifting work.

(6) Question: Is it proper to say that the Great Company is doing Azazel's work, or should we say that they are in Azazel's hand for such experiences as are Divinely intended to result in their cleansing, or is their work partly a work for the Lord?

Answer: To us it seems that all three queries in our question require an affirmative answer. Certainly their revolutionizing against the Lord's teachings and arrangements, and introducing false teachings and arrangements, prove them to be doing Azazel's work. The fact that they are called Azazel's Goat proves that they do his work, just as the contrasted name, the Lord's Goat, proves that the Little Flock is doing Jehovah's work. It is also true that they are in Azazel's hand for such experiences as are Divinely intended to result in their cleansing, even as St. Paul says of some of this class, as illustrations of the entire class: "Deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit [new creature] may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. 5: 5). "Of whom are Hymenaeus and Alexander, whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme" (1 Tim. 1: 20). Their work, especially toward the public, is in part a work for the Lord. The good part of their mind enables them to do some things that are a service for the Lord, while the bad part of their mind prompts them to do a service that is for Azazel. Double-minded and double-serving, they are in a pitiable condition. But in due time the reformable among them will gain by the blood and ministry of the Lamb deliverance from their bondage unto the liberty that the single-minded new creature enjoys. We fervently pray for this on their behalf.

(7) Question: What is meant by the expression, "A Good Levite"?

Answer: For the Epiphany a good Levite is a new creature who, as it were, just failed of winning the crown, who disapproves of revolutionisms against the Parousia truths and arrangements, who either has accepted and served the Epiphany Truth, or will shortly accept and serve it, and who before his manifestation as a Levite will revolutionize against the Epiphany arrangements.

(8) Question: What are some of our Pastor's testimonies on the Great Company as Levites, separated from the Little Flock of Priests, and manifested as such in the extreme end of the Gospel Age—during the Epiphany?

Answer: We will give a few from among a number. The first of these is in Z '11, p. 22, pars. 5, 6; par. 5, beginning at the 8th line, as follows: "Similarly, those who have made a full consecration are subjected to severe tests, and, if they prove unfaithful, they will not remain members of the Royal Priesthood. But this does not prove that these will be unworthy of some opportunity for serving the Lord. These *will be* represented in the Levite class. [The antitype of which will be the Great Company.] All the Levites are consecrated to God. But the more than conquerors' are the selected ones, the ones who stand the tests and prove faithful. Such as fail to stand these tests then will be rejected from the condition represented in the Holy, which is the 'gold' condition and represents the Divine nature. Being denied the liberty accorded to the Priests, these will go out from this condition and will have merely the standing of justification, which, if they maintain, will constitute them worthy of eternal life. But that life will not be human, because they gave that up in order to become Priests. *Their failure puts them out of the Holy condition back into the Court condition.* Only the Priests will be in the HOLY. Only the Levites will be in the Court. But even the chosen ones, while separated *in their minds*, will be commingling with the others so far as their persons are concerned. *The Court, therefore, in its last analysis, represents the Spirit—begotten ones* as separated from the world. The Great Company class are, therefore, not represented as in the Camp, but are attached to the Priests."

We will proceed to the next reference, which is in Z '11, p. 234, col. 2, pars. 4, 5, beginning at par. 4, line 4: "The Lord's arrangement is that the Great Company

class shall have a special trial and testing and shall be *forced* forward in *the time of trouble* [italics ours], inasmuch as they did not carry out their covenant of sacrifice willingly. We must remember that the types of the Law-Covenant were arranged to represent matters as they would be seen by us in the *Conclusion* of the antitypical Day of Atonement, and not to represent the things as they would be seen while they were in progress" [*i.e.*, as they progressed at the time he wrote]; "some one might take our Crown; and we might be thus relegated to the 'Great Company.' So these things represent the results as they will be in the end of this Age. There will be a 'Great Company' class which will bear certain iniquities." The next reference is Z '11, p. 349, col. 2, last par.: "While the Court condition seems to represent at the present time all those who are approaching God and loving righteousness and desiring harmony with Him, it appears as though, with the closing of this Age, there will be an adjustment of matters by which all those who have not come to the point of full consecration and to the point of Spirit-begetting, who would not belong to the household of faith and to the 'Church of the Firstborn,' in the absolute sense, will go out and cease to be recognized as in the Court. Meantime, the class who have already made consecration, 'presented their bodies living sacrifices,' received the begetting of the Spirit and enjoyed for a time the privileges of being members of the Body of Christ—these, failing to maintain their standing, are represented as *separated from* the '*Little Flock*' class at the end of this Age [italics ours]. Their condition apparently is represented by the Court Condition thereafter." Our next reference is Z'16, p. 39, par. 1: "They [Elijah and Elisha] simply walked on. Suddenly the chariot of fire appeared and separated them. . . . What does this signify in antitype? We think that it signifies a division between the Little Flock and the Great Company." Z '16, p. 264, par. 1: "It will be after

the smiting of the Jordan—after the division of the people by the message of the Truth and the mantle of Elijah's power—that the separation of the Church into two classes will take place. Thereafter, the Elijah class, the Little Flock class, will be clearly manifested, separate and distinct from the Great Company class. The division, be it remembered, will be caused by the fiery chariot." Next we quote from the Reprints, Vol. 7, 5846, col. 1, par. 2: "Are you expecting the fiery chariot any minute now, or do you think it some little distance off—perhaps some months yet, or perhaps a year, or probably more, is my thought." Finally we quote from the 1916 Convention Report, p.198, col. 2: par. 2, under Q. 10, beginning in the 4th line, "the Great Company class will first be manifested when the Elijah class will be separated by the fiery chariot, that from that time and onward it would be proper to speak of some as being of the Little Flock and others of the Great Company, but that division not having yet been made of the Lord, you and I would not be authorized to recognize any such division which God has not recognized. It will be for Him to determine who are of the Little Flock and who of the Great Company... We do not understand, therefore, that they are to be viewed as being in the Court at the present time, but after the Lord has manifested the distinction between the Elijah class, the Royal Priesthood class, and the Great Company class, the Elisha class, then thereafter those will be represented as being in the Court. But not yet. The division has not yet taken place." (This was said in 1916.)

(9) Question: Since the Great Company Levites no longer have access to the antitypical lampstand and table, on what do they feed to sustain their spiritual lives?

Answer: They would, of course, be able to feed on what they once had while in the Holy; but for the most part they neglect this and see only counterfeit light,

i.e., such as never was on the antitypical lampstand, and thus partake of unclean bread, *i.e.*, such as never was on the antitypical table. So far as the meat in due season—the advancing Truth—is concerned, they do not partake of, but reject it, while in the fit man's and Azazel's hands. And as a result their new creatures are famished, weak, sickly and asleep, out of which sleep some of them will never awaken. After the Levites' cleansing, they will doubtless partake of the Epiphany truths that are for them; for then they will be somewhat like the good Youthful Worthies, who are privileged to see and appreciate every truth except such truths as the Lord may desire to be limited to the priests. Let us remember that in the transitional period everything is to be open to the cleansed Levites except such things reserved to the priests alone; and in the Millennium everything in the Bible will be seen by the Ancient and Youthful Worthies and by the faithful restitutionists. The only thing that the consecrated faithful natural man will then not appreciatively see is the operation of the Spirit of begettal. So is it now with the good Youthful Worthies. So will cleansed Levites appreciate everything in spiritual matters except such as pertain to the operation of the completed anointing. Whatever, however, the Lord may give during the Epiphany for the priests alone will be for them alone, until it has served its secret purpose; then it will be understood by the properly disposed Levites. *E.g.*, now the understanding of the priestly matters pertinent to leading Azazel's Goat to the Gate, delivering him to the fit man and abandoning him to Azazel, is withheld from them. After they are cleansed they will understand these things. So there will doubtless be things connected with the priests' activities toward them after they are cleansed which will be concealed from them until the secrecy has served its purposes, when they will be clarified to them. We are in the transitional period as respects the Gospel and

Millennial Ages. During the Gospel Age very many Biblical things—the things of the Spirit—were concealed from all but new creatures. During the Millennium, when the secret features of God's Plan will have been carried out, they, except the operation of the Spirit of begettal, will be understood by all the faithful consecrated. Now God is treating the faithful non-priests in the same way. Hence this transitional period partakes more of the Millennial than the Gospel-Age privileges in this respect. This change of operation began in 1881 with the ending of the general call; for from that time on the Lord gave all the faithful consecrators for whom no crowns were available an understanding of all deep things, except an appreciative understanding of the operation of the Spirit of begettal in the heart.

(10) Question: Do you expect the cleansing of the Levites to be completed before the revolution?

Answer: So far as the Nominal Church Levites are concerned, we do not expect their cleansing before the revolution; for the great bulk of them will in the revolution be finally put into the fit man's hands. Nor are we to expect that all of the Truth Levites will have their cleansing completed by that time. We believe that the cleansing of the good Levites and the better of the other Levites began in the fall of 1923, and their cleansing is progressing. If the two thieves type the two classes of the last uncleansed Truth Levites, *i.e.*, the worse and the worst of the bad Levites, the cleansing of the less bad of these would begin just before the revolution, while the worst of the bad Levites would apparently not begin to get their cleansing before the revolution, if indeed they are to get it at all. Our present data are rather meager on this subject, and therefore our answer must be more or less incomplete. Doubtless later we will have more light on the subject.

(11) Question: Should one co-operate in the work

toward Azazel's Goat, if not certain that he is in the Body of Christ?

Answer: It is proper to help in the work toward Azazel's Goat, if one is consecrated and knows that such a work is in the Divine order. For such should always resist revolutionism and withdraw fellowship from revolutionists, and brotherly help and favor from willful revolutionists. For this reason we encourage Youthful Worthies to assist the priests against Azazel's Goat. And they do this, *e.g.*, giving us names and addresses of Truth people for volunteer literature, testifying against revolutionism by word of mouth and participating in antitypical Gideon's Second Battle, and in the distribution of Elijah's Letter and John's Rebuke. Of course, even a cleansed Levite should properly resist the revolutionism of Azazel's Goat and they have in not a few cases done so. While God does not count such activity as a part of the activity of the World's High Priest, He nevertheless approves of it as a work of righteousness. If one is a new creature and is not manifested as a Levite, even if he fears that he is not in the Priesthood, he should believe he is of it and cast out his fears, which doubtless come from Satan; for God counts all new creatures as priests who have not been manifested as Levites.

(12) Question: Shall we regard as Levites those brethren who reject the Epiphany Truth?

Answer: If they have not been in the Epiphany Truth, we should not now regard them as Levites for such rejection; for God is keeping the Epiphany Truth hidden from those priests, in the various groups, whom He desires less markedly than the Epiphany saints to resist the revolutionism of the groups where they are. There are two classes among the priests: the more and the less courageous. The former He gives the Epiphany Truth for a more pointed resistance of Azazel's Goat. One could not remain among the Levite groups and offer such marked resistance. Therefore, the Lord

lets the less courageous priests remain among these groups for a milder resistance not incompatible with their remaining among them, but withholds from them the Epiphany Truth, so that they might remain with a good conscience where they are. Those new creatures who have had the Epiphany Truth and then rejected it, are to be regarded as Levites; for they have revolutionized against the Lord in His Epiphany purposes.

(13) Question: How may we be sure whether a person is a priest or a Levite?

Answer: We should accept all brethren as priests who consecrated before Oct., 1914, and came into the Truth by Passover, 1916, if they are not revolutionists or partisan supporters of such. While some who consecrated before Oct., 1914, and came into the Truth before Passover, 1916, are Youthful Worthies, we do not know who these are. Therefore, we are to accept all brethren, having consecrated before Oct., 1914, and having received the Truth before Passover, 1916, as priests, unless they revolutionize or partisanly support revolutionists. It is revolutionism or its partisan support against the Truth and its arrangements, and *only* revolutionism or its partisan support against the Truth and its arrangements, that manifests crown-losers as such. The great touchstone of manifesting Leviteship is revolutionism or its partisan support, and nothing else. The reason that misconduct cannot be the touchstone for us is that we do not know how to decide what varying degrees of misconduct in various brethren forfeit their crowns. Therefore such judging is forbidden. The Lord alone—the heart searcher—is competent to give such a decision. We have no right to judge anyone to Leviteship. But, after God, by the individual's revolutionism or its partisan support, has manifested him to us as a Levite, then, of course, we as parts of the Priesthood are privileged to declare the Lord's manifested judgment as such. We earnestly exhort the brethren to take heed to the thing that manifests

Leviteship, and we earnestly caution them against making character blemishes on the grounds of declaring brethren to be Levites.

(14) Question: If no Levites were in the court on the day of atonement, how could antitypical Levites—the Great Company and Youthful Worthies—assist the World's High Priest in leading out the antitypical Goat of Azazel?

Answer: Not everyone that acts toward Azazel's antitypical Goat is pictured in the type. This is so in this instance, because, had the type recorded such a thing it would have taught an untruth. *E.g.*, if the Levites in the type had assisted Aaron in leading out Azazel's goat, it would mean in the antitype that the new creatures of the Great Company in every case would assist the World's High Priest in leading out his own humanity from the antitypical Court; even as the activity of Aaron's body in the sacrifice of the Lord's goat types each Body member of the World's High Priest co-operating with the Head in sacrificing that Body member's humanity. Of course the antitypical Levites do not assist in leading forth their own humanity. Any assistance that a Great Company new creature or a Youthful Worthy, as a Levite, gives the World's High Priest in leading Azazel's antitypical Goat forth, is rendered in relation to others than himself. This they often do, *e.g.*, many antitypical Kohathite and Gershonite Levites resist the revolutionism of the antitypical Merarites. Among others, the P.B.I. and Hirshite adherents have fought the Society on the 1925 error, even as many of the Society adherents, as antitypical Merarites, have fought the P.B.I. adherents, antitypical Gershonites, on their false chronology, etc. The Youthful Worthies in the Epiphany Truth have also rendered assistance in this work to the World's High Priest. They could not have been represented in this work by typical Levites assisting Aaron with Azazel's goat, because that would mean that their

humanity is represented in Azazel's goat, which represents the humanity of the Great Company alone.

(15) Question: Are there any members of the Azazel Goat class in the Nominal Church who are to be led to the gate and to the fit man?

Answer: The bulk of Azazel's Goat is now in the Nominal Church; and through antitypical Gideon's Second Battle we are leading its Protestant section to the gate and to the fit man; and through Elijah's Letter and John's Rebuke we are leading its Catholic section to the gate and to the fit man. Our Lord indicates that such are now in the Nominal Church when He exhorted that the flight from Babylon be not delayed until the Time of Trouble—the Epiphany: "Pray that your flight be not in the winter." Jeremiah indicates the same thing when he expresses the disappointment of this class in the words: "The summer is past, the *winter* is here, and we are not saved," *i.e.*, from Babylon. The foolish virgins not getting the oil and its consequent light until the wise have all entered the door of the high calling and it is closed, proves the same thing; for we are now over many years beyond the ending of Spirit-begetting. Since Spirit-begetting has long since ceased and those in the Truth are by no means enough to constitute a company much larger than the Little Flock, and since the Great Company is saved during the tribulation, the bulk of its members must be now in Babylon (Rev. 7:14) Some will only then be delivered after Babylon is destroyed (Ps. 107: 14-16). But Babylon is not yet destroyed. It would not at all surprise us, if from 500, 000 to 1,000,000 Great Company members should be now in Babylon.

(16) Question: Are the Great Company brethren branches in the Vine, or are they pruned off?

Answer: The Great Company as such are not particularized in the figure of the Vine and Branches. We know that crown-losers all through the Age have been by God counted as parts of the Embryo Christ, until

in the Fall of 1916 the Lord began to lead them forth out of the Holy into the Court. It is from this same standpoint that they were in the Vine as branches during the Gospel Age. Hence they are not the branches that were cut off from the Vine and burned. Those so treated are the Second Death class, whose second death is symbolized by the fire and the destruction of the cast-off branches.

(17) Question: Is the Great Company being now manifested to us as such—a thing denied by Bro. Oleczynski?

Answer: Bro. Oleczynski's criticism of us (without mentioning our name) is quite sharp, because of our teaching that the Great Company is now being manifested to the Faithful, he claiming that this makes us a judge contrary to the Lord's Word. Here again his error is a revolutionism against our Pastor's teaching, who said that (not before, but) after the separation of Elijah and Elisha it would be proper for us to point out this and that one as being in the Little Flock, or as being of the Great Company, when the Lord shall have revealed them as such to us. We will quote our Pastor's words, in one instance, on this subject. In the 1916 Convention Report, page 198, 2nd col., Question 10, speaking of the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha, our Pastor says, "From that time and onward it would be proper to speak of some as being of the Little Flock and others of the Great Company." But Bro. Oleczynski boldly contradicts our Pastor, saying that it is forbidden judging to do this. There was a time that he believed that the separation in the Church in 1917 was the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha, and that it was right to consider the Society's president, etc., as of the Great Company; for which reason he accepted our article on the subject published in the English Truth No. 60, and in the Polish Truth No. 1, and translated it into Polish for publication. As a P.B.I. sympathizer he very

likely now rejects it. If so, he has probably accepted the P.B.I. position which, unable to answer our interpretation of the events of 1917 as the fulfillment of our Pastor's forecast of the separation between antitypical Elijah and Elisha, denies that the smiting of Jordan and Elijah's and Elisha's separation are typical! Our arguments on this subject have never been met, either by the Society or the P.B.I. in their repeated efforts to do so. The reason is plain: Our view of the matter is the Truth, the great foundation Epiphany Truth, and as such it is unshakable. If that separation has taken place, of course those who understand it Scripturally can see who is of antitypical Elijah and who is of antitypical Elisha; for if they could not see this, they could not see the separation which implies the classes becoming distinct from one another.

There are other considerations that prove this. Our Pastor taught that in the very end of the Age, *i.e.*, during the Epiphany, the crown-losers would be driven out of the Holy into the Court as Levites distinct from the Priests. After such manifestation they were to be cleansed and consecrated to the Levite office (Num. 8: 5-19). It will be noticed (Num. 8: 13) that the typical Levites were set before Aaron and his *sons*, who cleansed and consecrated them to their Levite service. This types that Jesus and the *Church* would cleanse and set them aside for their Divinely pleasing work, not for the Azazelian work that they are now doing. Aaron and his sons had to see them as Levites in order to consecrate them. This types that not only Jesus, but that also the Church on this side the veil would see just who are Levites, otherwise the Church could not co-operate with Jesus in their cleansing and consecration. Had Aaron's sons not seen them, they would have been blind, which would have debarred them from priestly functions, and therefore from the work of cleansing and consecrating the Levites (Lev. 21: 17, 18). Their seeing the Levites types the antitypical Priests

seeing the antitypical Levites as distinct from themselves—the Little Flock now seeing the Great Company as distinct from itself. We would be spiritually blind in this respect, if we did not see them and thus of course could not co-operate in cleansing and consecrating them. This proves that the Little Flock at the pertinent time—now in the Epiphany, the very end of the Age—would know the Great Company, *i.e.*, that the latter would be manifest to the former.

Such recognition of the Great Company as such has been grossly misrepresented as "judging." This we emphatically deny to be the case. God by Jesus had done all of this judging when He, by October, 1914, took away the crown from the last of the crown-losers. It was at least several years later that He began to *manifest* them to the faithful Priests. And how did He manifest them? Certainly not by the latter judging them. They are incapable of judging them; for to judge implies the ability to discern exactly the kind and degree of conduct that forfeits the crown. This requires an ability among other things to read the heart and to know exactly what varying degree of willfulness in each case causes the crown to be forfeited. These things we, of course, cannot do. But God can and did do this. Then later on He manipulated circumstances so that the Great Company's double-mindedness would lead them to revolutionize against God's teachings and arrangements. After they did that, He then revealed to us what we did not know before the Epiphany, *i.e.*, that by their *revolutionism* God manifests the Great Company brethren as such to the Little Flock (Ps. 107: 10, 11). When we found out that their revolutionism was the means that God was using to inform us, *i.e.*, manifest to us, that they were Levites, we of course saw them as such. But our seeing them as such was no more judging them as such than if as spectators at a trial when we see a judge sentence a criminal we recognize the latter as sentenced. What sane person

would say that our recognizing him as sentenced makes us judge him? Thus we can readily see that our recognizing God's manifestations of Levites as such is not our judging them. But we do accept, endorse and act in harmony with God's judgment of them, when we recognize and announce them to be Levites. We cannot do this in any case, however, unless persistent revolutionism, *e.g.*, like Bro. Oleczynski's, is exercised. Then, when it is exercised, we know that the Lord has manipulated circumstances in their lives in such a way as reveals to us their double-mindedness in revolutionism; and thereby He tells us that He has judged them as having forfeited their crowns, *i.e.*, as having been cast out of the Little Flock into the Great Company. Thereupon, knowing that they are no longer in the Holy, we withdraw priestly fellowship from them. Knowing that they, as Levites in the Court, are our brethren, we give them as much brotherly fellowship as their revolutionism permits. If this greatly displeases them, we cannot help it. We must act toward them as the Lord desires us to do, and cannot accept and act out their revolutionistic desires for us to continue to recognize them as Priests, nor can we feel and act toward them exactly as we did before they were manifested as Levites. By and by, however, when they are cleansed, they will recognize that our course toward them was the right one for us to take—typed by Aaron's leading the goat to the Gate, delivering it to the fit man and later abandoning it in the wilderness to Azazel. And until they will so recognize it, we are content to bear their mistreatment of us as incidental to our faithfulness, as parts of the World's High Priest, to our mission toward Azazel's Goat.

(18) Question: In dealing with the Catholic section of Azazel's Goat, why do we not limit our Double Herald work to the Civil rulers and to Catholics, even

as John did not deliver the rebuke to Salome, but rebuked Herod and Herodias?

Answer: In answer to this question a number of things should be said: (1) We do not deliver the rebuke of antitypical Herod and Herodias to antitypical Salome—the Federation of Churches, an organization—though we do deliver it to individual Protestants, but do so regardless of their relation to the Federation of Churches. (2) There is no evidence that John delivered his rebuke to Herod or Herodias *to their face*, though when it was reported to Herod, it appeared and appealed to him as a direct personal rebuke, for which reason it is Scripturally stated in the second person (Matt. 14: 4; Mark 6: 18). John's rebuke of Herod was addressed to the people. Perhaps if the rebuke had been given privately to Herod, he would not have so greatly resented it, since it would not have struck him as injuring his prestige and influence among the people. (3) In leading the Truth section of Azazel's Goat to the Gate, we do not send our rebuking literature to those of them who are of a certainty known to us as such, but to other Truth people. Nor do we give the Truth literature that rebukes the Protestant section of Azazel's Goat to the members of that class known to us as such, for which reason we avoid giving such literature, among others, to the Protestant Clergy among whom are many members of Azazel's Goat. By distributing the pertinent literature to those open to its message, we resist before them the revolutionism of these two sections of Azazel's Goat. (4) To hand the Double Herald to the Catholic Clergy and to their known partisan and bigoted supporters, would mean to lead the Catholic part of Azazel's Goat to the Gate by a totally different method from that employed in connection with the Truth and the Protestant sections of Azazel's Goat, and we see no reason for a departure from the method so far used and blessed. We do, however, see reasons against using the

method of directly giving the rebuking literature to known members of the Catholic section of Azazel's Goat, *e.g.*, the stirring up of unnecessary strife and perhaps riots. (5) It is more effective to resist the Catholic section of Azazel's Goat in its revolutionism by arousing Protestants to oppose its revolutionism than by appealing to its supporters to do this. (6) To give the rebuke directly to the Catholic Church would interfere with our purpose and make our work ineffective, since it would lead to the almost immediate suppression of the work. (7) If the Double Herald work is in part antitypical John's rebuke, the most sober methods of presenting it should be used, and these we believe to be the ones that we are using, and which have been so abundantly blessed of the Lord.

(19) Question: What is priestly as distinct from brotherly fellowship?

Answer: Priestly fellowship consists of new creatures' jointly seeing in the light of the antitypical candlestick the Truth as due for the Priests to enjoy, partaking jointly of the antitypical loaves of presence, the truths that strengthen us in every good thought, quality, word and work for our Heavenward journey, and sacrificing and suffering jointly at the antitypical Altar in priestly work. Priestly fellowship, therefore, is a joint participation in the enlightening and strengthening truths and in sacrificing and suffering in the High Calling. In these respects we do not fellowship with the Great Company, Youthful Worthies and the Tentatively Justified, all of whom are our brethren from various standpoints. There are some truths and some works that they and the Priests have in common, *i.e.*, more or less of the Truths in the Volumes and the work of testifying to the coming Kingdom and against certain errors, etc. In these we have more or less fellowship; but it is not to be so intimate as that which we have with the Priests. Where any of them mix errors and wrongs with any of these things we of

course are not to fellowship therein with them. With Great Company members very little brotherly fellowship can be enjoyed by the Priests until the former are cleansed. Indeed, after they fall into Azazel's hands the Priests must withdraw all brotherly help and favor from them until they are cleansed.

(20) Question: When the former is withheld, is it to be understood that the latter is also?

Answer: No, except as the modifications just given apply.

(21) Question: Have we Scriptural examples of this?

Answer: In Bible times the Great Company as such did not exist. Hence in those times it required a Divine revelation to manifest any individual who had lost his crown. We have mention in the Bible of three individuals of this kind, all of whom had gone so far wrong as to be in Azazel's hand, cut off from all brotherly help and favor (1 Cor. 5: 1-13; 1 Tim. 1: 20). Nothing is said on the subject of fellowship with respect to Hymenaeus and Alexander; but in the case of the Corinthian brother the brethren were told not to fellowship with him (1 Cor. 5: 9-13); nor did they fellowship with him until he was cleansed (2 Cor. 2: 6-10). Perhaps in this case, his sin being reprehensible even to the heathen (1 Cor. 5: 1), the cause of Truth required severer treatment than should be given the average Great Company member.

(22) Question: Are you not arrogating Apostolic powers when you point out individuals as members of the Great Company?

Answer: When our Pastor said that only an Apostle could know who was in the Great Company, he referred to conditions prior to the Epiphany; for at that time there was no Great Company as such. Hence it was wrong for any of us before the Epiphany to say of this or that one that he was of the Great Company, for Divine inspiration was necessary to know it then;

hence it was then a purely Apostolic power. But since the Epiphany began (Mal. 3: 2, 3; 1 Cor. 3: 12-15; 2 Tim 4: 1), the Great Company as such has been coming into existence. Hence now Divine illumination—not Divine inspiration—on Epiphany matters is all that is needed to recognize members of the Great Company as such, even as our Pastor taught would be the case after the Little Flock and Great Company as such were separated. (Z '16, p. 264, col. 1, par. 1; Convention Report 1916, p. 198, col. 2, ques. 10.) As in the type Aaron and his sons would have been physically blind or nearly so, if they could not have seen the Levites *as such*, when they were set before them *as such* at the time of their cleansing and consecration (Num. 8: 13), so would we in the antitype be spiritually blind or nearly so, if we could not now see the Levites *as such* as the Lord is setting them before us *as such* at this the time of their cleansing and consecration.

Question: How can we of a certainty know that a new creature is of the Great Company?

Answer: By his clear, persistent revolutionism against the Lord's teachings and arrangements (Ps. 107: 11).

(23) Question: Will the Great Company realize and acknowledge that they constitute that class, while yet in the flesh? Or will they continue to the end to believe and claim that they are in the High Calling?

Answer: Our understanding is that while yet in the flesh the Great Company class will recognize themselves as such. This is clearly shown by their message given while they will yet be among men: "Let us be glad and rejoice and give honor to Him; for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and His Wife hath made Herself ready" (Rev. 19: 7). The marriage is the First Resurrection. It will not be announced by they Great Company in Heaven; for it will be completed before they reach Heaven, and thus will be known there before their arrival. Hence they make the announcement

of it as a completed thing while here in the flesh, and thus show that they recognize themselves as not of the Bride. This is also implied in the account of the cleansing, consecration and service of the Levites in the Tabernacle as set forth in Num. 8: 5-22; for here the Levites are represented as recognizing themselves as set apart for Levitical service as the servants of Aaron and his son, typing how the Great Company will recognize their setting apart while in the flesh to be the servants of Jesus and the Church. The same thought is typed in Joseph's brethren recognizing him as separate and distinct from themselves, Joseph here typing Jesus and the Church. The cry, "The harvest is passed, the summer is ended, and we are not saved" (Jer. 8: 20), is another proof that the Great Company will, while in the flesh, recognize themselves as such. The following passages imply the same thing: Cant. 5: 6; Ps. 107: 13-15; Matt. 25: 10-12, 30. Therefore we understand that the Great Company while yet in the flesh will recognize themselves as constituting this Company.

(24) Question: Do you understand that the only sins which the sufferings of the Great Company will expiate on behalf of the world will be deliberate sins against the Lord's Law and people?

Answer: Yes.

(25) Question: Do not the bullock, the Lord's goat and Azazel's goat represent three different phases of our Lord Jesus' one sacrifice, alone?

Answer: We do not so understand matters. The 1908 to 1911 sifters, as antitypical Korah (1 Cor. 10: 10, 11; Num. 16: 1-50; P '19, p. 144, col. 2, par. 1), taught that they did; but the fact that antitypical Korah so taught should prompt the Faithful to conclude that such teaching is erroneous. To date they have failed to show any reason why the death of two of the beasts and the sending away alive of the third into the wilderness should type three aspects of Jesus'

one sacrifice. Without any Scriptural warrant they—rather, Satan—invented this theory in order to evade the plain Scriptural teachings that there are two antitypical sin-offerings, or to put it another way, one sin-offering in two parts, and that there is one antitypical expiation for willful sins. As repeatedly shown Hebrews 7: 26, 27 teaches the World's High Priest and two sin-offerings—that of Jesus, offered first, and that for the sins of those who during the Gospel-Age have become members of His body, and then afterwards that of the Church, offered for the people's sins. Heb. 13: 11, 12 identifies Jesus' sacrifice with that of the bullock, which was the first beast burned without the camp, as Jesus' sacrifice preceded that of the Church; and then verses 13 and 14 identify the sacrifice of the Church, which follows that of Jesus, with that of the Lord's goat, which, after the bullock's burning without the camp, was likewise burned there, *i.e.*, it was treated just like the bullock, the type of Jesus. In Heb. 9: 16, 17 (see Diaglott), the Apostle by the doctrinal statement of the fact assures us that the blood-sealed Covenants of God's Plan are sealed by *plurality* of sacrifices. This proposition he then proceeds to prove by a reference to the only two blood-sealed Covenants of God's Plan—the Law Covenant and the New Covenant. The proof that the Law Covenant as a blood-sealed Covenant was sealed by a *plurality* of sacrifices—bulls and goats—St. Paul gives in Heb. 9: 18, 19; and the proof that the New Covenant will be sealed by a *plurality* of sacrifices—"better sacrifices" than those of the Law Covenant—St. Paul gives in Heb. 9: 23 It is because the Lord's antitypical Goat is not yet completely sacrificed unto death that we know that the New Covenant is not yet sealed and in operation (Heb. 9: 16, 17). Thus the Apostle teaches that the bullock and the goat type Jesus and the Church. Furthermore, Azazel's (Satan's) goat is identified by St. Paul with the Great Company (1 Cor. 5: 5; 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20); for just as Azazel's goat was

sent away to him in the wilderness, so the Corinthian brother and Hymenaeus and Alexander, as representative members of the Great Company, were delivered over to Satan—Azazel. Thus we find the Scriptures to teach that the bullock, the Lord's goat and Azazel's goat do not type three aspects of Jesus' one sacrifice, but type respectively Jesus, the Church, and the Great Company, in their consecrated humanity, and that the sacrifice of the bullock and the goat as sin-offerings type the sacrifice of Jesus and the Church, His Body, as sin-offerings. There are many other Scriptures that teach the Church's participation with Jesus in the sin-offering. Those consecrated Spirit-begotten persons who (apart from such as through misrepresentations) were led to believe that the Truth teachings were to the effect that the Ransom and the sin-offering are one and the same thing) deny that the Church is a part of the sin-offering count "the blood of the [sacrificial] Covenant, wherewith they were sanctified [not justified] an unholy thing [not as of the sin-offering, hence a thing not pertaining to the holy things of the Altar and the Mercy Seat]" and fall away into the Second Death (Heb. 10: 29). Such we understand to be the Lord's sentence upon antitypical Korah, from whom we exhort the Lord's people to withdraw both priestly and brotherly fellowship. (2 John 10, 11.) With such we are not to eat—partake of the teachings that they set forth (1 Cor. 5: 11).

(26) Question: When does the cleansing of the crown-losers begin?

Answer: It has been going on in individuals all through the Gospel Age, and that often in the pertinent spots shortly after the spotting of their robes set in its various forms of evil. E.g., the incestuous brother at Corinth (1 Cor. 5) was by his experience at Azazel's hands soon cleansed of that gross sin (2 Cor. 2: 4-11). From this example we conclude that all crown-losers who during the Gospel Age have been accounted worthy to attain life experienced their cleansing from

sin, selfishness and worldliness during this life. So, also, during the Epiphany there has been a cleansing going on in individuals from almost the outstart of their spotting of their garments. But there has been no class cleansing of the Great Company yet. This will set in, we believe, before very long, very shortly after the 60th post has been set up, which seems to be in the not distant future.

(27) Question: Wherein does the cleansing of the crown-losers consist?

Answer: Properly and clearly to answer this question we must distinguish between several things: (1) between the things in them that must be cleansed; and (2) between individual cleansings up to the time of their class cleansings and their class cleansings as such. There are two distinct classes of things from which crown-losers must be cleansed: (1) sin, selfishness and worldliness, and (2) error. Crown-losers as individuals up to the time that crown-losers as a class obtain their cleansing, have had to be purified from the first set of things, *i.e.*, sin, selfishness and worldliness; for if they would not in this life have been cleansed from these in the sense of overcoming them, they would have to die the second death. But this class of crown-losers do not necessarily in this life have to cleanse themselves from the second set of things, *i.e.*, errors; for if this had been the requirement, the vast bulk of the crown-losers would have died the second death, *e.g.*, the various crown-losers who all through the Age died in Babylonian errors, the spy-members of both Harvests, and the bulk of the crown-losers in the Epiphany Levite groups, who have died without getting the Epiphany Truth. Almost all of the just-mentioned kinds of crown-losers died without getting the meat in due season, and would thus have gone into the second death, if as a part of their cleansing God had required them to get rid in this life of their errors and accept the Truth due in their times. Hence for the saving of their lives God has required of them merely

to cleanse themselves in this life from the spots on their garments consisting of sin, selfishness and worldliness. The time of the cleansing of such from error and of their getting the Truth as due will be after their resurrection as spirits (Rev. 7: 17). This view of the twofold cleansing of such crown-losers is necessary, or we would have to conclude that all crown-losers who did not in this life get the cleansing of both sets of evils above-mentioned died the second death, which would put the vast bulk of these into the second death. But the case will be different with the class cleansing of the crown-losers, which is to set in shortly after the 60th Epiphany post is erected. They will have to cleanse themselves from their errors and accept the Parousia and Epiphany Truth, as well as overcome their sins, selfishness and worldliness. That they will have to overcome their errors in this life is evident from the fact that, until their cleansing from both sets of evils shall have made at least a large beginning, they will not be able to minister to the Priests (Num. 8: 7, 21, first and second clauses, 22, 13-19). And as a part of their cleansing, *i.e.*, that which must be made Godward, "*before God*," as distinct from their personally effecting their own part in the cleansing process pointed out in Num. 8: 7, 21 (first and second clauses), they will have to undergo the washing in the blood of the Lamb (Rev. 7: 14), which is typed in Num. 8: 8, 12, 21, last clause. If thus we keep in mind the distinctions between (1) the two sets of evils from which the Levites must be cleansed, and (2) the individual cleansings before the class cleansings begin, and the class cleansings as such, we will as above outlined have proper and clear answers to the several phases in the question just answered.

(1) What is the first elect class of the Epiphany? How will it be discussed? What is it called in Joel 2: 29? In Rev. 7: 9; 19: 6; 19: 1? To what were its individuals originally invited? How do the cited passages prove this? What happened to them because of unfaithfulness? What

does Ps. 107: 10, 11 teach of them? 1 Cor. 5; Jude 23; Rev. 7: 14? Heb. 2: 15; Jude 22? 2 Tim. 4: 10; Jas. 1: 8? 1 Cor. 3: 12, 15; Matt. 25: 3, 8? 1 Cor. 3: 3, 4; Matt. 7: 26; 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20? Is. 66: 5? Heb. 2: 14, 15? 1 Cor. 5: 5; 1 Tim. 1: 20; Matt. 7: 27; 1 Cor. 3: 15? 1 Cor. 3: 15; Heb. 2: 15; Jude 22, 23; Phil. 3: 14? Cant. 5: 6, 7; Matt. 25: 11, 12, 30? Rev. 7: 14? Cant. 5: 9—6: 1; Rev. 19: 6? Ps. 45: 14, 15; 1 Cor. 5: 5; Rev. 19: 9? Heb. 12: 23; Rev. 7: 15; Ezek. 44: 10-14? When in the Gospel Age do they come into special prominence? When is the time of their and the Little Flock's development? During which two of its periods?

(2) In general, of how many classes does God's plan treat? What are some of the contrasting designations of these two classes? To what is an understanding of these necessary? What kind of a lesson may the distinction between them be called? How are they distinguished as to numbers? As to ways of travel? As to conditions? As to promises? As to final homes? As to resurrection? As to final nature?

(3) Why is salvation not limited to these two classes? What is the first of these other classes? In how many of this book's chapters will these be treated? In this matter what are we not to understand? How is this proven and taught in Eph. 4: 4? How many salvations have been offered during this Age to those who turn to God? What has God offered these? On what condition? How does Rev. 2: 10 prove this? What makes some lose the high calling salvation? What is their attitude toward God and righteousness? What do they later do? How do the cited Scriptures prove these three lines of thought? Of what do they fail? In their extremity what does God do for them? What does He propose to make them? By what does He do this? What is the pertinent record?

(4) Wherein lies the possibility of there being a Great Company? What four lines of thought prove the possibility of there being a Great Company? How in each line of thought do the cited passages prove it? What two conclusions flow from the fourth of these lines of thought? What would follow as to the Great Company, if all who have lost their crowns were to become Second Deathers? What proves another than the high calling salvation to be operating? What follows from the fact that there is

a Great Company? Of whom does the Great Company consist? For what are they not good enough? For what are they good enough? For what are they too good?

(5) How did the individuals start out who later became of this class? What two facts prove this? How do the cited passages prove these two facts? What was not the cause of their failing to gain the prize? Why not? Why was it? How do the cited passages prove these two reasons? What did they receive when complying with the terms of justification and consecration? How do the cited passages prove this? What did the Lord send them? How do the cited passages prove this? When have such brethren existed? How do the cited passages prove this?

(6) What has not been the character of their course toward the Lord, the Truth and the brethren? What have been the variations of their unfaithfulness? What have existed between these two extremes? What has been the trouble with some of these bound brethren? Whom did they not imitate? To what have others of them given themselves up? What characterizes all of them as a class? In what respects do they fail?

(7) For what does this condition unfit them? What nine reasons prove this? What different procedures mark God's dealings with the Little Flock and the Great Company? How does the stumbling-block of their iniquity affect them? As to worldliness? Selfishness? Sin? Error? How do life's experiences affect them? What do they lose? What does this mean? How do the cited passages prove this? What is the contrasted experience of the Faithful? How do the cited passages prove this?

(8) What kind of individuals has there been throughout the Gospel Age? What proves this? When are these first treated *as a class*? How does the tabernacle picture show this? At what time are there more individuals of this kind than at other times? Among other passages, where is this class described? What response, according to Cant. 5, do they first make to the Bridegroom's call? At long last on responding what do they meet? Why? How does Matt. 25: 8-12 show this? When enlightened and witnessing, what do they experience? Becoming zealous after enlightenment, to whom especially will they preach? With what result? How does Cant. 5: 8—6: 3 show this? Through what must they pass? What will

they accomplish therein? What message will they then proclaim? Despite their sorrows and sufferings, what will they do? Why? How does Rev. 19: 6-8 show this? What will their spirits experience? How do 1 Cor. 5: 5; 2 Cor. 5: 17 prove this? Of what in heaven will they partake? How do the cited passages prove this? What will they then be privileged to do? As what, from the temple picture? From the kingdom picture? How do the cited passages prove this? What will then be their experiences in contrast with those of the present? How does Rev. 7: 15-17 prove this? What will they have lost in their saved condition?

(9) What will be here presented? In how many groups? Of what does the first group of Scriptures consist? The second? What does each one of the first group of passages mean? The second?

(10) What, in the first place, should be done after a careful study of these passages? If one find himself to be a new creature, what, in the second place, should he seek to learn? What is required properly to answer these questions aright? Who will supply it? What may those desiring information on these and other Biblical subjects do to obtain it?

(11) What have the brethren in past years done as to Lev. 12? What has until lately been the answer received by them? Why was this so? Why has it lately become understood? What does a right understanding of Lev. 12 prove?

(12) What furnished the key to the understanding of Lev. 12? What does Rachel type? How may this be otherwise stated? What should be said of the definition of the Rachel type as given in P '23, 117, par. 5? What is the specific definition as to the antitype of the birth of Joseph and Benjamin? How can this definition be harmonized with the antitype of Jacob in these transactions? What does the mother in Lev. 12 type? How can we prove that the servants of the pertinent truths are a part of the antitypical mother?

(13) How are the Little Flock and the Great Company sometimes, *in contrast*, typed? In harmony with what Biblical usage is this? Cite an example of such a type. What do the male child and the female child of Lev. 12 type? What is a type almost parallel with this one?

What were the periods of purification for the mother of a son and the mother of a daughter? What is typed by these periods? What is typed by the purifying of the mother of a son? By her purification in the birth of a daughter?

(14) In what activities have the faithful and the measurably faithful servants of the Truth shared? How are they to be considered in the type as differentiated in respect to the double cleansing? What necessitates this distinction? What is typed in the first sense of the antitype in both cases by the full purification of the mother? What is typed by the progressiveness of the purification? Whose is the antitypical purifying work? Explain the Scriptures proving this. Explain how Prov. 4: 18 shows the gradualness of the cleansing of the Truth.

(15) What is yet unknown as to the work typed by the mother bringing the sacrifices 80 days after a daughter's birth? What is typed as to work by the sacrifice of the mother 40 days after a son's birth? What did that work attest? How so? What did their service therein not merit? What proves this? What was typed by the mother's burnt offering and sin offering? How is the antitypical mother's faith typed? What is typed by the priest's offering the typical sacrifices? What is typed by the fact that, not a bullock, but a pigeon or turtle dove was offered as the sin offering? What is typed in the varying value of the burnt offering? What set of antitypical sacrificers did Mary's burnt offering prove her to type? Give several examples of the other set.

(16) How long was the mother unclean in her separation after the birth of a son? After the birth of a daughter? What gives us the clue to the antitype? What is the antitype of the seven days' uncleanness? Of the fourteen days' uncleanness? When did these respective imputations take place? Why is the pertinent set of class servants excluded from the picture of the other? What is probably suggested by the numbers 33 and 66 for the days following the end of the uncleanness in the pertinent cases? Why?

(17) What is suggested by the above study? What is the first of these? Please give the first proof for this. The second. The third. The fourth. The fifth. The sixth. The seventh.

(18) What is the second lesson suggested by the chronology shown in Lev. 12 connected with the antitypical sacrifice of the mother after her purification? Describe the period of about two years and one month following October, 1914, as to its Little Flock work. In what kind of time is this period given? How so? What does this period suggest as to an antitype of the mother's sacrifice after the 80 days? What parallel things are thereby suggested? What interlappings are thus indicated?

(19) What is the third lesson suggested by the purification completed in 40 days? What does this imply as to the Little Flock Truth as left by our Pastor? What does this imply as to the Levitical teachers' repudiating his teachings and substituting contradictory ones in their stead? What other Scripture suggests the full purification of the Little Flock by October, 1914? Explain how it does so. What does this prove as to that evil servant's pertinent claims? What is the character of Levitical teachings on Little Flock matters contrary to such teachings as left with the Church by our Pastor? Why so? Who is the author and who are his agents as to such contrary teachings? What should we say to their teachers? Why should we so speak?

(20) What fourth lesson is implied in Lev. 12: 2, 4, 5 and Mal. 3: 3, first clause? In what fact is this lesson implied? What did not happen with the Truth as our Pastor gave it during the 40 years? How was the pertinent work done? Give some examples of his purging the Truth from errors during these years and his setting it forth without errors. What should his mistakes not arouse in us? Why not? What teachings are we not to expect him to have purged from all errors? Why not? What illustrative examples apply in this connection?

(21) How does this apply to the teachings as to the Great Company in so far as they are Epiphaniac? What two features do we see herein operating? How have they been unfolding? How may they be expected to continue to unfold? How long will it last? For what does this principle account? What should it not arouse in us? To what should it arouse us Christward and toward the Parousia and Epiphany messengers? From what should it deter us as to these latter? How should it move us to regard the Lord in His relations to His servants and them in theirs to us?

CHAPTER III.

AZAZEL'S GOAT.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS. THE HIGH PRIEST'S LAST WORK IN THE FLESH TOWARD HUMANS. CONFESSING THE SINS OVER AZAZEL'S GOAT. LOOSING THE GOAT. LEADING THE GOAT TO THE GATE. MEMBERS OF THE HIGH PRIEST UNTIL MANIFESTED AS LEVITES. WITHDRAWING PRIESTLY FELLOWSHIP AND DELIVERING TO THE FIT MAN LEADING THE GOAT TO THE WILDERNESS. ABANDONING IT TO AZAZEL. IN AZAZEL'S HANDS. WITHDRAWAL OF PRIESTLY FELLOWSHIP. JUDGING BEFORE AND AFTER THE TIME. MISREPRESENTATIONS. AZAZEL'S GOAT IN THE NOMINAL CHURCH. JOHN'S REBUKE. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

IT SEEMS to be the Lord's will that the entire subject of Azazel's Goat be presented to the whole Church *D.v.*, we will do this as it is treated in Lev. 16: 20-22, etc.

(2) Ordinarily, but, we believe, not happily, Azazel's Goat is spoken of as the Scapegoat. The word "scape" is an abbreviation of the word "escape"; and the thought of a runaway goat is given by that expression. This evidently is not the thought of the original word. In the Hebrew, the A.R.V., etc., one of the goats of Lev. 16 is called Jehovah's Goat, the other Azazel's Goat. The words Jehovah and Azazel are proper nouns, the one being a name of God, and the other being a name of the Devil. We believe it would be well for us to accustom ourselves to the expression Azazel's Goat rather than scapegoat, as a help for us better to understand what this class has done and is doing. The thought connected with the two antitypical Goats seems to be the following: One of them furthers God's interests, and the other, temporarily, those of the Devil. Throughout the Gospel Age the antitypical Goat of the Lord by reason of its faithfulness has built up the true Church (Matt. 7: 24, 25), and thus has served Jehovah; while the antitypical Goat of Azazel by reason of its measurable unfaithfulness has throughout the Gospel Age built up the Nominal

Church (Matt. 7: 26, 27, see Berean Comments); and therefore has served Satan's interests. Such also are the thoughts of 1 Cor. 3: 11-15 (see vs. 4-10), though this passage like the preceding one has also a personal application. Even in our day the antitypical Goat of Azazel is building up a little Babylon, which claims to be the Little Flock, while like Great Babylon it persecutes the Little Flock.

(3) The name Azazel's Goat is very appropriate to the class that it designates; for the word Azazel means averter, perverter, and designates Satan as a Revolutionist, who, grasping for power, and lording it over others, averts Truth and Righteousness, and perverts them into subtle errors and wrongs. And this is what Azazel's Goat throughout the Gospel Age, including the Epiphany, has been doing. As revolutionists grasping for power and lording it over others, they have averted Truth and Righteousness, and perverted the ways of the Lord into error and wrong, and thus have advanced Satan's interests. However, it has not been to their eventual pleasurement that they have followed such a course. Rather Satan has always given individuals of this class very buffeting experiences, which through the goodness of God have inured to the destruction of their flesh. —1 Cor. 5: 5; 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20.

(4) The Scriptures teach that there is a class of saints who revolutionize and support revolutionists against the Lord's ways (Ps. 107: 10, 11; typed by certain Baal worshipers and kissers); sin more or less grievously, thereby spotting their garments (1 Cor. 5: 1-13; Jude 23; Rev. 7: 14; symbolized by the Levites in Ezekiel 44: 10-13); through fear of the sacrificial death fail to carry out their consecration (Heb. 2: 15; Jude 22; typed by Azazel's Goat); fellowship, but unsatisfactorily to themselves, with the worldly (Gen. 13: 11-13; 2 Pet. 2: 7, 8; 2 Tim. 4: 10; James 1: 8; typed by Lot); accept and introduce various

errors (1 Cor. 3: 12, 15; Matt. 25: 3, 8; typed by Eli); develop sectarian and erroneous systems (1 Cor. 3: 3, 4, Matt. 7: 26, 27; 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20; typed by the builders of the Tower of Babel); gain the Faithful's office by wrong (Is. 66: 5; typed by Elisha's rending his garments, when about to pick up Elijah's mantle); persecute their faithful brethren (Is. 66: 5; typed by Miriam and by Lot's shepherds); serve as slaves by these things Satan's interests (Heb. 2: 14, 15; typed by servants at Pharaoh's court); receive from him the destruction of their flesh and works (1 Cor. 5: 5; 1 Tim. 1: 20; Matt. 7: 27; 1 Cor. 3: 15; typed by Lot's and Rahab's loss of all things); finally escape with their lives only (1 Cor. 3: 15; Heb. 2: 15; Jude 22, 23; typed by the deliverance of Lot and Rahab); will meet a great disappointment (Cant. 5: 6, 7; Matt. 25: 11, 12, 30; typed by the ten spies); will cleanse themselves (Rev. 7: 14; typed by the Levites, Num. 8: 7, 12); thereafter have a successful ministry (Cant. 5: 9—6: 1; Rev. 19: 6; typed by the Levites); will share a subordinate spiritual glory (Ps. 45: 14, 15; 1 Cor. 5: 5; Rev. 19: 9; typed by the Levites); and will be, as parts of the firstborns, Levites and Noblemen. (Rev. 7: 15; Ezek. 44: 10-14; Heb. 12: 23.) These in their humanity are the antitype of Azazel's goat.

(5) Important parts of God's plan are many sided, and are therefore set forth in the Scriptures by a variety of pictures, as well as by copious literal passages. As one of the features of God's plan the manifestation of the sins of God's nominal people is set forth by various Scriptures.

All of the Prophets, particularly Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and John, tell of these, sometimes in symbolic, sometimes in literal passages. Ps. 149: 5-9 gives us, partly in literal, partly in symbolical language, a description of how the Little Flock in the end of the Age would punish the kings and princes, as well as their supporters, by stating the facts, and giving the proofs of their wrong-doings

before the whole world, the proofs being compared to fetters and chains. From a somewhat different angle the same general thought of spiritual punishment being meted out to the Rulers, Aristocrats, Clergy, Labor leaders and their supporters in their organizational capacities through a manifestation of their wrongs is given us in Elijah's smiting Jordan. The incident of the angels declaring to Lot Sodom's wickedness and overthrow tells the same story from a still different viewpoint. Samuel declaring to Eli the wrongs and punishments of his sons, etc., gives us another view of the same general event. So, too, something of this thought is typed in the spies at Jericho telling of Jericho's sins and impending destruction. Perhaps the clearest of all these pictures is that of Aaron's confessing Israel's sins over Azazel's goat; and as such it will be discussed in this article.

(6) Better to understand our subject it is necessary for us to keep in mind whose High Priest it is that confesses the sins over Azazel's Goat. It is not the Church's High Priest, Jesus; but the World's High Priest, Jesus and the Church, that does this, as Aaron, in the atonement day type, represents the World's High Priest. This we recall was thoroughly proven to us in Tabernacle Shadows. Another thing that will also prove helpful to us better to understand our subject, type and antitype, is to remember that the transaction with Azazel's Goat is the last High Priestly act before the change of the Sacrificial Garments; hence His dealing with this Goat before changing His garments proves that it would occur while members of the World's High Priest would yet be in the flesh. While such was not our dear Pastor's thought while writing Tabernacle Shadows, seemingly he later was coming to see it in this way, as the following quotation implies: "In this picture of the robes of the Priest, we understand that the High Priest typified the entire Priesthood, the Under Priests as well as the Head;

that the Head did not need the covering but that the covering of the linen garments represented the merit of Christ imputed to us, the members of His Body, whom the Father accepts and justifies, and whose imperfections are covered through Him. We understand that the white robe represents especially our share in the picture; [and] that the High Priest going forth in [garments of] glory typifies in large measure the glory of the Church in connection with her Head, as we read: 'It doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is.' Another Scripture declares that we shall be His glorious Body, or His Body in glory, and that 'we shall be glorified together with Him' " (Z '10, 136, col. 2). Both the Tabernacle symbolisms and the facts of the case require this change of thought. This is another evidence of our dear Pastor's gradual growth in knowledge. See Vol. III (Elijah and Elisha, Chap. II) for the proof of this thought.

(7) That our Pastor was uncertain on the matter of sprinkling the blood of the Lord's antitypical Goat, *before* the dealing with Azazel's Goat began, and suggested that certainty could be reached only when the fulfilled facts were before the brethren, appears from the following quotations from the book, "What Pastor Russell Said, " under the last questions on pages 289 and 689. The former reference we give first. It begins with the 12th line of page 290: "Then in Leviticus it shows us the place where the Scapegoat is dealt with, after the Lord's goat has been dealt with, but that is not *proof positive* (italics ours) that it will be *entirely after* [italics ours] the Lord's goat has been slain, and after its blood has been offered, because these types could not all take place at the same time, and there would naturally be an order for it, —this first, and that second, and so on; but the fact that the bullock is dealt with first, and that the Lord's goat

is dealt with second, and then the Scapegoat is dealt with third, seems to imply that the tribulation of this class will come more especially at the end of the Gospel Age, after all of the elect shall have gone in [to the Spirit-begotten condition at least]; notwithstanding, we think there is room in the Scriptures to suppose that there have been some of this Great Tribulation class all through the Age, while the great mass of them probably belong in this end, because of the peculiar circumstances now prevailing." So far the first reference. The second begins in the 7th line of the page 690, reading as follows: "It would seem to be after the satisfaction of Justice in respect to all of these [the Church], the full offering of the Lord's merit, and the full acceptance of the whole matter, that then the dealing would take place with the live goat. The teaching of the type would seem to be that the tribulation that will come upon the Great Company will not come upon them in this official manner until after this dealing with [the imputation of the merit for] the Little Flock has been completed. While the Great Company may be sharing in the tribulation of the past, yet this special dealing at the end of this Age would seem to be after the Church had gone beyond the veil. Yet we must say this, dear friends—that every feature of this type and prophecy belong to the future *and is more or less uncertain until it is fulfilled.* In other words, God did not give prophecy and type in advance for us to speculate upon, but so that when due we might know it. Just as our Lord said of Himself at the First Advent, that when they would see certain things fulfilled then they would know they were the fulfillment of the things written. So as we come down to the *beginning of the Time of Trouble* [italics ours], those who would then be living and witness the dealings of the Lord with the Great Company class would see in it something which would be helpful to them—

perhaps more than you and I see now." [Italics ours.] So far the quotation.

(8) What do the fulfilled facts prove? That Azazel's Goat is dealt with before the last member of the Priest's Body leaves the world, and thus before the blood of the Lord's Goat is antitypically sprinkled. We believe that our Pastor's uncertainty on the subject was raised by the fact that the priest was in sacrificial robes while dealing with Azazel's goat. We do not recall a clear expression from him on this point of chronology. But certainly our thought on it is implied in his teachings as to three things: (1) in his thought that the sacrificial robes represent the Church's condition during her sacrificing time (Z '10, 136); (2) in his thought that the blood of the antitypical Bullock is continued on the antitypical Mercy Seat for atonement purposes until the last of the Great Company leave the earth (Z '10, 201, col. 2, pars. 1-3; Z '15, 103, par. 5); and (3) in his reason for proving that the Great Company will precede the Ancient Worthies in the resurrection, because the former are granted the covering of the antitypical Bullock's blood until death, while the latter are later, as the *first* ones so favored, granted the benefit of the antitypical Goat's blood, each use of the merit respectively preceding the resurrection of each class respectively (Z '16, 312, col. 2, pars. 1, 2; "What Pastor Russell Said," p. 15, ques. 3; p. 16, ques. 1). Hence the blood of the Lord's antitypical Goat is not applied until after the Great Company leaves the earth.

(9) Doubtless, as in the case of the time parenthesis as to antitypical Elijah's and Elisha's separation and the former's ascent to heaven, the Lord did not allow our Pastor to see clearly on this matter, because such clearness would have hindered the sore trial that He wished His people to undergo in connection with the separation (Vol. III, Chap. II); so for the same reason the Lord did not allow him to see clearly the time

relation between the sprinkling of the blood of the antitypical Goat and the dealing with Azazel's Goat. Nevertheless the extracts from and references to his writings just given demonstrate that his doctrinal, typical and prophetical views as to this matter logically force us to the conclusion that the Little Flock must be in the flesh during the High Priest's dealing with Azazel's Goat. This is another instance proving that prophecies and types connected with a trial of character cannot clearly be understood until the trial is met by the Faithful.

(10) The fact that the High Priest's dealing with the second goat was his last general ministry as High Priest toward humans before leaving the world convinces us that this transaction began after the last one of His members consecrated himself and was Spirit-begotten, an event that seems to have occurred on Sept. 16, 1914. The forehead sealing of this one and some others, of course, was completed later. That the last one of The Christ was begotten on that date seems to be proven by Elijah's coming to the Mount of God at that time (1 Kings 19: 8; Rev. 14: 1; Z '08, top of p. 223), and by his being thereafter represented in a type picturing events occurring entirely after September 16, 1914—as seated on a hill (2 Kings 1: 9)—and by the fact that the floor line of the Grand Gallery, projected through the step, meets the vertical line of the south wall at the place indicating September 16, 1914. It also is proven by the facts that the reaping ceased on that date; and that the rest of the Harvest work was of a gleaning character. Thus the winning of the last member of The Christ would very properly terminate the general reaping, and give the rest of the work this gleaning character. Furthermore, the High Priest's dealing with Azazel's Goat being His last priestly work in the flesh toward humans, we should expect that every one of His members in the flesh would share in confessing the sins of antitypical Israel

over the antitypical Goat of Azazel, which would imply that the last one of them had had the satisfaction of Justice made for him previously. These considerations, as well as the facts of the case, which will be given later, prompt us to conclude that the confession of these sins in the antitype began the Fall of 1914.

(11) The thought that the begettal of the last member of The Christ was on September 16, 1914, seems to be implied in the type of Lev. 16: 16, 18-20, *i.e.*: immediately after the imputed merit was accepted by Divine Justice for the last member of Christ's Body, the High Priest began to deal with Azazel's Goat. We will quote these verses and give our comments on the *antitype* in brackets as follows: "And He [Jesus, our High Priest] shall make an atonement [satisfy God's Justice] for the Holy [the word *place* is in italics, therefore the Court is not meant. Unlike most other sections of the Scripture this chapter uses the term *Holy* exclusively for what we usually call the *Holy of Holies* (vs. 2, 20, 23, especially 33). Since 1878, beside our Lord, there are many brethren in the Most Holy. For our High Priest to have made atonement for the Most Holy seems to mean that those persons that are *now* in the Most Holy had, *while in the flesh*, Justice satisfied for them by Christ's merit] because of the uncleanness [sins resulting from the Adamic sin] of the children of Israel [common to Adam's children] and because of their transgressions *in all their sins* [additionally much of the depravity that these saints had while in the flesh was inherited from the depravity of their ancestor's *wilful sins*]. And so shall He do for the Tabernacle of the Congregation [the new creatures while in the flesh have had Justice satisfied toward their humanity by the High Priest's merit] that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness" [which they inherited from their ancestors].

(12) "And He shall go out unto the altar [sacrificed humanity of Jesus and the Church] that is before the

Lord [in the justified condition, and used for His special purposes] and make an atonement for it [please God with them by the imputation of His merit to those, His own excepted, whose consecrated humanity is typed by the brazen altar] and [in addition to and after imputing His merit to our humanity] shall take of the blood of the bullock and of the blood of the goat, and put it upon the horns [powers] of the altar round about [after Jesus imputed His Merit to us, the High Priest, Head and Body, 'thus points out that the altar of earthly sacrifices is acceptable to God by reason of the shed blood (the life given), and that all who will realize the power of the altar (horns are symbols of power) must *first* recognize the blood that sanctifies it.' T. 42.] And he shall sprinkle the blood [impute Jesus' life-rights] upon [to] it [the antitypical altar in so far as it includes the humanity of the Church, but not that of Jesus] with his finger seven times [make a complete work of it], and cleanse it [by washing His prospective members in the water of the Word before the merit is imputed] and hallow it [set apart through working in His prospective members repentance and faith before the cleansing takes place, thereby separating them from those who remain servants of sin] from the uncleanness [depravity] of the children of Israel [those under Adamic condemnation]." When was this work of reconciling the altar finished? When on September 16, 1914, His merit covered the humanity of the last one who came into His Body. [In v. 19 the various steps are traced in reverse chronological order from that of their antitypical fulfillment.] "And when [on September 16, 1914] He hath made an end of reconciling the [Most] Holy, and the Tabernacle of the congregation [the Holy], and the altar [those in the Court who consecrate, consequently immediately following September 16, 1914] He shall bring the live goat" [the High Priest at that time began to deal with Azazel's Goat].

From this explanation we readily see that the Atonement day services teach that Azazel's Goat would be dealt with immediately after the last member of the World's High Priest through the imputation of Jesus' merit became pleasing to the Lord. Accordingly, this picture also is in harmony with the thought that the reaping ended September 16, 1914. This picture therefore proves that the entire World's High Priest was in existence at that date.

(13) From the quotation made above from page 690 of "What Pastor Russell Said," we see that he was in doubt as to whether he saw clearly the time relationship of the Body of Christ leaving this earth and of the High Priest's dealing with Azazel's Goat, and suggested that when the type would be fulfilling, it could be more surely known. The fulfillment having been in our midst now for 24 years, we now know from the facts that Azazel's Goat is dealt with before all of the Body members leave this earth. The work with Azazel's Goat and the Levites is the last work of the World's High Priest as such before in His last members He leaves this earth, and was undertaken immediately after September 16, 1914, when Christ's last member was begotten of the Spirit. Thus the entire Priesthood was in existence.

(14) This entire chapter is a splendid illustration of the fact that the time order of the type frequently is different from that of the antitype, not only as is manifest in the sprinkling of the blood of the Lord's Goat before Azazel's Goat was dealt with, as just shown in v.19; but as also can be seen from the following considerations: In v.6 Jesus' consecration is typed; in v.7 the consecration of the Church is typed; and in vs.11-13 and 27, the 3½ years of Jesus' sacrificial dying from the standpoint of the three burnings, *i.e.*, in the Holy, Court and outside the Camp, is set forth, these burnings, typing Jesus' dying

from three viewpoints, in the type *follow* the consecration of the *type* of the Church.

(15) If the entire Priesthood was in existence Sept. 16, 1914, the last one who would become a member of the Great Company had by this date lost his crown; for God would beget no one of the Spirit for Gospel-Age purposes after the last one of the Little Flock was begotten of the Spirit, as none thereafter would lose his crown. Hence all of those over whom the sins were to be confessed were in existence as such, though not yet as a class, by Sept. 16, 1914; and therefore the sins could be confessed over them.

(16) Nor was it a forced or unnatural matter that such confession should have begun at that time. On the contrary, it was then the most appropriate time in human history to have begun this work; for the World War, having but recently begun, the desire of the whole world was aroused for an answer to the questions: What caused the War? And whose fault was it? And taking advantage of such widespread interest, the High Priest began to declare the sins of Christendom that for centuries led step by step to that war—so far, the world's worst calamity. The work began at that time, because it was then due, as the conditions that called for it, and that guaranteed its success were present in the earth. Thus the sins of antitypical Israel and their effect, the class to do the confessing, the persons in whose hearing the confessing was to be done, and the occasion calling for it were all in existence. Hence everything was, on Sept. 16, 1914, in readiness for the confession to begin. How like God to take prompt advantage of circumstances favorable to His plan!

(17) We desire to consider every thought describing this work of the High Priest as it is given in Lev. 16: 20-22. The first of these thoughts is given in the words: "He [Aaron] shall bring [literally bring near]

the live [Azazel's] goat." This expression seems to mean that Aaron took his goat in hand in order to use it in connection with an atonement service before the Lord. It was thus to be given special attention by the High Priest. Henceforth His services were to be directed mainly toward it in the interests of the people before the Lord, until such services were completed. This would also imply that there would be something for it to do in connection with such services. Hence this picture represents a general change in the activity of the World's High Priest. It would imply, antitypically, that at that time the High Priest would begin a line of work, not so much in the interests of the Little Flock, as in those of the Great Company, for the ultimate benefit of the world. Such a work would require that the High Priest give special attention to matters more or less related to the Great Company, its needs and its interests. It would for the good of the world necessitate His bringing this class more and more into prominence, using them in special ways and ministering toward them before the Lord in a particular manner, all of which were to be a benefit to the Great Company, and ultimately to the world.

(18) What were the acts in the antitype whereby the High Priest brought near those who were represented by the live goat? The first was the activity whereby large numbers of the Lot class were drawn out of Babylon. This seems in a fair measure to have been done by the Fall of 1914, resulting from the intensified public work which began in the Fall of 1910, and progressed especially in the Photodrama work, beginning January, 1914. By the Fall of 1914 a great many of the Lot class had come into the Truth, and began to come forward before the Lord. Another thing that served to "bring near" the antitypical live Goat was the Lord's arranging subtle zeal-testing conditions in the Church from the Fall of 1914 to that of 1916, whereby more and more this class showed itself.

not to be possessed by the zeal that enabled the faithful to prove more than conquerors; and thus the live goat class was becoming more and more marked by prominence in lack of all-conquering zeal. If we read the annual reports in The Tower for the years 1914, 1915 and 1916 we will see in the continually decreasing figures a continually increasing evidence of lack of zeal in large numbers of Truth people. This served to "bring near" the less zealous ones, *i.e.*, made them especially noticeable as not sharing markedly in the High Priest's work. A third thing whereby the High Priest brought near the live Goat was in His emphasizing various teachings pertaining to the differences between the Little Flock and the Great Company; especially was this done from the standpoint of the Elijah and Elisha type. The Towers, Convention Reports and Sermons of those years abundantly prove this. A fourth thing whereby the High Priest brought near the antitypical live Goat was His emphasizing a future smiting of Jordan. His repeatedly warning against pointing out those who lacked zeal at that time as members of the Great Company was still another way of bringing near the antitypical live Goat, for it emphasized the presence of such a class of brethren in the Truth. Still further, his emphasizing before the public the signs of the times during those years brought near many who had lost their crowns in Babylon, by arousing them to give more attention to the Truth message. Some of these as the rest of the Lot class then came into the Truth. A seventh way of doing this was by the emphasis given during those years to "the Penny."

(19) "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat." We have read in other connections of Aaron and his sons laying their hands upon the head of the bullock of the sin-offering and upon the head of the ram of the burnt offering and upon the head of the ram of consecration (Ex. 29: 10, 15, 19; Lev. 8: 14, 18, 22). We recall that this means

that these animals represented them, and thus this action types that it would be the humanity of Jesus and of the Church that would be offered (T. 41, par. 3). The High Priest's laying both hands upon the head of Azazel's Goat types that those who were as a finished picture represented in their humanity in that goat were at the time of the confession, as new creatures, members of the High Priest. But we imagine some will say, Does not this goat type the humanity of the Great Company? We answer, Yes, in the finished picture; but no *new creature* is to be regarded as a member of the Great Company, *as such*, until during the Epiphany he is manifested as such. God has counted every new creature as a part of the High Priest until he is manifested as a Levite, a thing that takes place as Azazel's Goat is led from the Door of the Tabernacle to the Gate of the Court; for while the humanity of the Great Company is being thus led forth, their new creatures are being forced out of the Holy into the Court, as antitypical Levites. Since this took place only after the confession of the sins over them was completed, they were, of course, parts of the High Priest before the confession of the sins began, *i.e.*, at the time that the High Priest put both hands on the head of the antitypical Goat of Azazel. Thus this type proves what our dear Pastor repeatedly taught us, *viz.*, that no one would be a member of the Great Company until the separation of the Little Flock and the Great Company would set in, a thing that had its first beginnings from late in November, 1916, to about the middle of January, 1917, in England, *i.e.*, over two years after the confession of the sins began. Hence when the High Priest laid both of His hands on the head of the antitypical Goat of Azazel, there was no Great Company as such, though there were many individuals who had already lost their crowns, and were shortly to become members of the Great Company. And the live goat at this particular juncture

of the service was used to represent the humanity of just such individuals, who as new creatures, however, were members of the High Priest, a fact that is proved by the High Priest's laying both hands upon the live goat's head. This explanation enables us to see the fallacy of those who, leaving the Truth during the sin-offerings' controversy, 1908-1911, claimed that the fact that the High Priest laid his hands on the head of the live goat proves that it represented Jesus' humanity, and not that of the Great Company.

(20) Having seen what is represented by the High Priest's laying both hands on the live goat, we inquire, How did He do it in the antitype? We reply, by the teachings emphasized over and over again during those years, that there was not yet a Great Company; that we were all called in the one hope of our calling; and that we should not before the separation between the Little Flock and the Great Company say of any individual that he was a member of the Great Company. Thus the High Priest antitypically laid His hands upon the live Goat's head declaring that all of those who would later be remanded to the Great Company were then His members.

(21) A consideration of the sins that the High Priest confessed will help to clarify our subject. Not all kinds of sins were confessed over Azazel's Goat. The Adamic sins were not confessed over this Goat; because the Great Company does not atone for the Adamic sins. This is done solely by the blood of the antotypical Bullock and Lord's Goat, without any additions from the sufferings of Azazel's Goat. What other sins then remain for which atonement must be made? We answer, willful sins; not indeed all willful sins, but the willful sins of a certain class. Surely Azazel's Goat does not atone for willful sins of the Second Death class; for that would imply their return from the Second Death—a thing that will not occur. What class is it, then, for whose willful sins Azazel's

Goat atones? We reply Those of the world, especially of the Nominal People of God. This is taught in the following language: "And [Aaron shall] confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel [those in the Camp, typical of Nominal Spiritual Israel] and all their transgressions *in all their sins.*" We notice that the last clause does not read, "all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions," *and* "all their sins"; but it reads "*in* all their sins." This seems to mean that they had more than sins simply; rather that in their sins there was special guilt, which is here spoken of as the iniquities and transgressions in their sins. In Ps. 107: 17, Israel and its wrong-doings are described as follows: "Fools because of their transgression [rejection of Christ] and because of their iniquities [sins against the Law Covenant] are afflicted" [from 607 B. C. and 33 A. D. onward]. This passage gives us the clue to the one that we are explaining. It shows us that willful violations of the moral law and willful wrongs against The Christ are meant by the iniquities and the transgressions of the antitypical Camp (Nominal People of God) *in* all their sins. Accordingly, we understand that the Great Company atones for those sins against God's Law and His saints that are sins against knowledge and ability, the purpose of such atonement sufferings being to enable the whole world to be free from the claims of Justice against willful sins, and thus to have a clean slate with which to begin the Millennial opportunities, since the blood of The Christ atones for all their Adamic sins.

(22) The children of Israel in their Camp were in an organized condition, and therefore type the Nominal People of God in its organized capacities, *i.e.*, in state, church, aristocracy and labor. Accordingly, the rulers, clergy, aristocrats and labor leaders and the supporters of these various great ones are typed by the children of Israel whose sins were confessed over

Azazel's goat. Every one of these leading groups has claimed its power by Divine right. What does this mean? The doctrine of the Divine right of kings, summed up in the proposition, "The king can do no wrong," means the following things: That the rulers are God's direct appointees and vicegerents; that they do exactly what God wants them to do; and that He sanctions all their acts. The doctrine of the Divine right of the clergy, summed up in the proposition, "The cleric is God's mouth and hand," means the following things: In religious matters God speaks and acts through the clergy; therefore the *laity* are obligated to believe and practice with blank and unquestioning minds whatever the clergy bind upon them. The doctrine of the Divine right of the aristocracy, summed up in the proposition, "The aristocrats are the stewards and almoners of the Almighty," means that it is the Divine good pleasure that the aristocrats own and control practically the whole earth, and that all others are to be subject to them as slaves, serfs or employees. The doctrine of the Divine right of labor, summed up in the proposition, "The earth's products belong to their producers," means the following: "God gave the earth to all mankind for development and enjoyment; hence its wealth belongs to its producers—the laborers."

(23) Every one of these four doctrines is erroneous, and the practice of them during the Christian Era has produced the terrible violations of the Golden Rule, and the wrongs against the Lord's saints, with which the history of Christendom is replete. When we view the acts that have flowed as a logical consequence from the doctrines of the Divine right of state, church, aristocracy and labor, we will readily recognize both the erroneousness of these doctrines and the willful sins of those holding and practicing them, *i.e.*, sins against better knowledge and ability, contrary to God's laws and saints. The following is a partial list

of the wrongs resulting from the doctrine of the Divine right of kings: claims of unjust "prerogatives," gross oppression of their subjects, ruthless and cruel suppression of rivals, real and imaginary, the rule of might as against right, unjust and cruel wars, robbery of one another's territory and subjects, national hatred, revenge, envy, suspicion, etc., violation of the rights of other nations, violation and repudiation of solemn and binding treaties, support of false religions, union of governments and special religions, persecution of religious dissenters, debauchery and exploitation of weaker nations, traffic in human slavery, favoritism of the classes as against the masses, gross hypocrisy, dishonest and selfish diplomacy, etc., etc. Every one of these things is a violation of the Golden Rule, professedly accepted by these rulers, rests under God's disapproval, and is a demonstration of the falsity of the Divine right of kings.

(24) The following is a partial list of the wrongs resulting from the doctrine of the Divine right of the aristocracy: Exploitation, slavery, serfdom, legal technicalities, evasions, delays and violations, frauds, dishonesty, special privilege, monopolies, manufacturing financial and military panics and wars, indifference to the masses, gambling, wanton luxury and waste, unfair and destructive competition, corruption of politics, morals and government, support of oppressive and persecuting governments, etc., etc. Every one of these is a violation of the Golden Rule, professedly accepted by these aristocrats, rests under the Divine disapproval, and is a demonstration of the falsity of the doctrine of the Divine right of the aristocracy.

(25) The following is a partial list of the wrongs resulting from the doctrine of the Divine right of the clergy: Priestcraft, pride, intolerance, hypocrisy, superstition, error, persecution of dissenters, blasphemy of the Divine Person, Character, Plan and Works, sanction of the wrongs of rulers and aristocrats, union of

religions and states, secularization of religion, fomenting wars and national hatreds, rivalries, distrust and revenge, destruction of real religion, etc., etc. Every one of these things is a violation of the Golden Rule, professedly accepted by the clergy, rests under the Divine disapproval, and is a demonstration of the error of the Divine right of the clergy.

(26) The following is a partial list of wrongs resulting from the doctrine of the Divine right of labor: Class discontent, envy, hatred and violence, repudiation of contracts, limitation of production, unjust strikes, coercion, riots, revolutionism, incendiarism, etc., etc. Every one of these things is a violation of the Golden Rule, professedly accepted by labor, rests under the Divine disapproval, and is a demonstration of the falsity of the doctrine of the Divine right of labor. Of these four social groups, manifestly the last is the least guilty.

(27) Looking back to the time from the Fall of 1914 into that of 1916, we immediately recall that the World's High Priest did then declare these sins in the hearing of consecrated people, both in the nominal church and in the Truth, and therefore declared them in the hearing of Azazel's Goat. When we consider the subjects treated of before the public at that time this is also manifest. Our Pastor's sermons in the papers repeatedly referred to such sins; so, too, did the lectures for the public declare the same things. The volunteer tracts evidenced the same wrongs; and best of all, Vol. IV, *The Battle of Armageddon*, specialized in by the colporteurs during those years, manifested these gross sins. There can be no doubt of the fact that at that particular time Christendom's sins were held up before the public in the hearing of Azazel's Goat as never before in the Harvest. The reason for this is simple enough. The war aroused interest in just such subjects, and made it timely to declare Christendom's sins as the cause of the

terrible war, the first feature of the Great Tribulation. Thus we see that fulfilled facts proved that the World's High Priest confessed the willful sins of the nominal people of God, *i.e.*, wrongs that they knew to be wrongs, and were able to avoid, in the hearing of those who had lost their crowns, and who as a result were shortly to be put into the Great Company.

(28) The recital of these sins and the teaching of a future smiting of Jordan stirred up powerfully those in the Truth who were about to be placed into the Great Company, to do a work of smiting the peoples. By the Lord's permitting our Pastor during 1916 sometimes to teach that the smiting of Jordan was then going on, and at other and later times to speak of it as future, the prospective Great Company was impressed deeply with the thought that the future would see the first smiting of Jordan, and hence with great *zeal* and *noise* did what they thought was the first, but what proved to be the second smiting of Jordan! But if we keep in mind that the High Priest's confessing antitypical Israel's sins during 1914-1916 over Azazel's Goat was what by another picture is called the first smiting of Jordan, we will have no difficulty in seeing that that was the second smiting of Jordan, which began in the Fall of 1917, starting a year after antitypical Elijah had finished Jordan's first smiting, *i.e.*, a year after the High Priest had finished confessing the above-mentioned sins.

(29) The account of the High Priest's confessing the sins of Israel over Azazel's goat is closed with the statement of His "putting [laying] them [Israel's iniquities, etc.] upon the head of the goat." Thereafter the goat would "bear upon him all their iniquities." In the light of other Scriptures (Is. 53: 4, 5, 6, 11, 12; Ezek. 18: 20; 1 Pet. 2: 24, etc.), to bear iniquity and sin means to suffer punishment for iniquity and sin. Hence we would understand the "putting of them [Israel's iniquities and transgressions in all their

sins] upon the head of the goat" to mean that the High Priest would authoritatively as God's mouthpiece declare that the privilege of suffering for the willful sins of the people was given to Azazel's Goat, and that therefore in the antitype the Lord would privilege the World's High Priest as His Mouthpiece authoritatively to teach in the hearing of these brethren that it is the privilege of the Great Company to suffer the punishment of the world's willful sins. And as we look back to the teachings of those years we find that from 1914 to 1916 it was repeatedly explained to the brethren that the Great Company would be privileged to suffer for mankind's willful sins.

(30) It should not be forgotten that Azazel's Goat consists of the humanity of the *entire* Great Company. The Scriptures show us that a part of this class would during the Parousia be in the Truth, and that the rest would be in the nominal church. Thus Elisha and Miriam type those Great Company members who during the Parousia have been in the Truth. Lot types a part of the Great Company which, toward the end of the Parousia, from 1910 onward until just before the tribulation involved each country separately, left, in each country, the nominal people of God, and came in among the Truth People, the last one of this particular part of the Great Company coming into the Truth shortly before America declared war on Germany, as is suggested by Lot's leaving Sodom before the fire and brimstone fell upon the city. Abihu and Jambres seem to represent Great Company sifting leaders in and out of the Truth during the early stages of the Epiphany. The Virgin of Cant.5 represents those Great Company members who, after the escape of the Lot class, but before its complete destruction (v. 7), leave Babylon. Rahab, Eli and the Foolish Virgins represent those Great Company members who remained in the nominal church until the Parousia ended some of them remaining there until

some considerable part of the Epiphany shall have passed. Some of these seem to be the ones especially referred to as getting their deliverance amid Nominal Zion's travail (Is. 66: 8; Ps. 107: 10-16). Unless we keep in mind these different pictures and note the chronological relations of the different sections of this class to their coming into the Truth, we will fail to see clearly the various views as to certain groups and activities of the Great Company, and will become confused on various Scriptural lines of thought regarding their activities.

(31) In order clearly to understand the High Priest's dealing with Azazel's Goat it is necessary for us to keep in mind that while the confession of the sins was made over the entire class, whether in or out of the Truth during the same period, 1914-1916, the other steps with Azazel's Goat are taken at two different periods, the Lord dealing *first* with that section of it which has hitherto been in the Truth. Then, after He had begun to deal with its last section among the Truth People, the steps following the confession of the sins were taken by Him with the part of Azazel's Goat not yet in the Truth. Up to July 18, 1920, only that portion of Azazel's Goat which is in the Truth had been dealt with in the steps subsequent to that of confessing the sins and loosing Azazel's Goat; for the fulfilled facts of the antitype prove that only Truth People as parts of Azazel's Goat had been led to the Gate and delivered to the fit man, by him taken into the Wilderness, there let go, and there falling into Azazel's hands. After the last Truth section of Azazel's Goat *under bad Levite leaders* had entered into the antitype of all of these steps, the Lord began to lead to the Gate Azazel's Goat in the nominal church. We now see that the public testimony that the Little Flock has been giving against Eternal Torment and the Consciousness of the Dead is connected with the leading of the nominal-church section of Azazel's

Goat from the Door of the Tabernacle to the Gate of the Court. Additionally, John's Rebuke, Elijah's Letter, etc., are leading the Catholic section of the Goat to the Gate. The Great Company section in the Truth doubtless tried to fulfill this type; but we are certain that the faithful will be the only ones to persevere therein (1) unto a completion (2) in the true spirit of the High Priest; and therefore they alone will antitype the High Priest's Body under the Head leading the Goat to the Gate of the Court.

(32) Since that part of Azazel's Goat not yet in the Truth has not [This was written in 1920] been dealt with in the steps beyond its leading to the Gate, we will do well to avoid all speculation as to details as to the subsequent steps, since such details cannot be clearly seen before they set in. Therefore in the subsequent parts of this article we will limit [in 1920] our study to the steps taken with the Truth section of Azazel's Goat following the confession of sins over the entire Goat. These steps are the following: (1) loosing the Goat; (2) leading it to the Gate of the Court; (3) passing it through the Gate; (4) delivering it to the fit man; (5) leading it forth to the wilderness; (6) letting it go into the wilderness, *i.e.*, delivering it to Azazel for his using it and destroying its flesh. These six steps, plus the confession of the sins over it, complete the seven (perfect number) things done to Azazel's Goat.

(33) It will be noted that the Authorized Version does not say that Azazel's goat was *tied* at the door of the Tabernacle, nor does its wording imply it. Yet the Hebrew does imply that this goat, as well as the Lord's goat, was tied at the Tabernacle's door. The word translated "present" (Lev. 16: 7) should be rendered "to place, " "make stand, " "set, " "station, " or "fix." Azazel's goat was brought into the Court with the Lord's goat. Therefore it must have been secured at the door of the Tabernacle during the time the High

Priest dealt with the Lord's goat, which must have lasted at least an hour. No normal *goat* would have remained "stationed" that long unless artificially secured. Hence our Pastor was right in speaking of its being "tied" at the door. Furthermore, the antitype seems to prove this. The figurative rope by which Azazel's Goat has been tied to the antitypical Door is the spirit of consecration knotted by the Word and the Providence of God. Such a condition restrained the natural mind of the Great Company and hindered them from doing as they pleased, typed by the goat's being unable to loose itself. This, of course, applies to the class as such; for such individuals as ceased being of the Great Company by becoming of the Second Death class are not pictured in the goat.

(34) We may be sure that the typical goat, because it was a *goat*, did not relish remaining bound at the door; rather that it longed for freedom, and consequently jerked repeatedly at the rope in its efforts to gain liberty, especially, we fancy, as the Priest passed in and out the door, and as time wore slowly on for the goat, "stationed" in such an unusual place. This illustrates how the Great Company because of its double-mindedness has not been submissive to the terms of consecration; but has repeatedly sought, "through fear of death," to obtain freedom from the painful experiences of consecration, especially when the High Priest would be more or less in evidence to them as working sacrificially with them. However, through the power of the Divine Word, one of the figurative knots, and especially through that feature of His providence which placed controllership in "that Servant's" hands—the second knot—the Lord hindered this class from indulging in its characteristic waywardness, as to the general Truth work. The High Priest, in both the Head and members, especially in "that Servant," continually interfered with the selfish and worldly plans of this class.

(35) Remembering that His dealing with this Goat followed September 16, 1914, we are to look for some events which would begin when the confession of sins was about half completed, and which would end after the High Priest would finish confessing the sins over the Goat. These events we believe to be (1) the truth becoming dim on "that Servant's" powers as to his corporations and the various headquarter churches; (2) the death of our dear Pastor, who as "that Servant," the Lord's special eye, mouth and hand, controlled the general work, and held the Levitical leaders, and through them the other Levites, in subjection to himself (Num. 3:32), as long as he lived, even though for a long time they were very restive under his restraints, as can be seen in America, in the experiences of (1) Bro. Rockwell on the one hand and Bros. Rutherford and MacMillan on the other hand; and (2) Bros. Shearn and Crawford in Britain on the one hand, and Bro. Hemery on the other hand; as well as in the case (3) of Bro. Sturgeon in America on the one hand, and Bro. Holmes on the other hand. Bro. Ritchie also had his little troubles over Bro. Martin's being promoted above him as Manager. However, they were held down until our Pastor's death as a sacrifice was accomplished by the Lord, which completely untied the second knot, when they gained a freedom of action not had before. This lingering death is typed by the High Priest's untying the second knot of Azazel's goat. The steps taken in Britain to take control (1) of the I.B.S.A., and (2) of the Tabernacle away from our dear Pastor and lodge it in British hands, antitype some of the goat's jerkings, as it was being untied, as false views as to our Pastor's powers respecting his three corporations and respecting the ecclesiastas at the Society's various headquarters gradually grew; and as he was for quite a long time a dying man (for months he was actually dying, but would not give up), under the sacrificial

work of the High Priest. Similarly the quarrels of Bros. Rockwell, MacMillan and Rutherford for pre-eminence in the general work of the Society, those of Bros. Sturgeon and Holmes for pre-eminence at Bethel; and Bro. Ritchie's personal feelings and Bro. Martin's air of triumph over him as to the Tabernacle Management before our Pastor's death antitype the goat's jerkings while it was being untied. The scramblings for power that set in immediately after the death of "that Servant" correspond to the first jerkings of the goat before the High Priest began to lead it to the gate of the Court.

(36) Above we said that (1) the Word of God and (2) the Providence of God, centering in the powers of "that Servant," were two symbolic knots firmly holding by the spirit of consecration (rope) the Great Company to the door of the antitypical Tabernacle. The antitype moves us to assume that, as is usual with firm knots, the goat was secured by two knots. Above we pointed out that these two symbolic knots were untied gradually: (1) by the Lord's permitting the spread of errors on our Pastor's powers, *e.g.*, as to his three corporations and the Brooklyn and London Tabernacles; and (2) by the latter's gradual death. We will offer a few facts to prove that the Lord allowed the Truth as to our Pastor's powers toward his three corporations and the headquarters' churches to be dimmed by the gradual spread of errors on the subject: After (1) Bros. Shearn and Crawford with confederates and (2) Bro. Hemery with confederates had for some time discussed the matters pro and con, at a meeting of the Tabernacle elders the evening of October 22, 1915, the subject was brought up as to whether efforts should not be put forth to secure for the elders "the control of all its [the London Tabernacle's] services and activities." On October 29, 1915, a joint meeting of the elders and deacons discussed the same subject. It was agreed that, if

the congregation should hear of the matter, they should be told that the elders had the subject under advisement, and were going to refer it to our Pastor. This agitation increased among the elders until the evening of October 13, 1916, when 11 of them signed a report, a petition, and a resolution that were calculated to intimidate Bro. Russell (1) into giving up his controllership of the Tabernacle by the implied threat, that things would go to pieces, unless the desired changes were made; and (2) into letting the elders have such controllership (clericalism). The letter of the 11 elders written October 14 (Saturday) as a last attempt to procure the signature of the other 7 elders, reached them October 16 (Monday), and made a deadlock between the two sets of elders, as on the same day Bros. Rockwell, MacMillan and Rutherford came to a deadlock on the occasion of our Pastor's last day at Bethel during his effort to reconcile them. These 11 British elders had the secretary write a letter to our Pastor on the evening of October 21, to accompany their communication. The date, October 21, was the very day that our Pastor during the evening told us that responsible brethren in Britain were disregarding his arrangements! What a significant coincidence! Thus, when the confession of the sins was about half over, the High Priest began untying the first knot and completed it in a year, their communication reaching Brooklyn just after our Pastor's funeral, and *before our going to Britain*.

(37) The second knot, our Pastor's control of the work, was by his gradual dying untied, until its untying was completed by his death. It was in the Spring of 1916 that he remarked that the British managers, supported by other influential British brethren, were so grossly disregarding his directions that he, as a protest, felt like severing himself entirely from responsibility for the British Branch; *for they wanted the I.B.S.A. to be British controlled, as a British corporation.*

Perhaps it was at that time that the Lord began to untie the second knot; and we know that He completed its untying on October 30, 1916, in the toga scene on the Pullman car, after which our Pastor lay down to die. Details on these matters we have treated elsewhere. Simultaneously agitations were going on in the Brooklyn Tabernacle to reduce our Pastor's influence there; and false claims were being set forth as to the powers of the I.B.S.A. and the P.P.A. relatively to the W.T.B.&T.S. (our *Pastor* in *reality*, while he was alive), in America, especially by J.F.R.; and after our Pastor's death his course as to the P.P.A. and the I.B.S.A. proves that he felt that they were more or less independent of the W.T.B.&T.S., *i.e.*, of our Pastor, who voiced his objections to these perversions in Z '15, 359, par. 7. We here remark that on that page, and wherever else he refers to the Society as controlling the work, he meant himself by the term Society, and did not mean the Directors, nor the Shareholders, nor both of them.

(38) Because of the uses that the Lord has been pleased to make of us, from the time the High Priest had untied the Goat, until the present, in connection with its various sections, we will have to write of ourself, which we assure our readers we do not do to boast nor to set ourself forth "as some great one." God forbid! Our so doing is necessary to clarify our subject. We trust that all will understand our motive. As far as we are personally concerned we were not only free from quarreling for power or pre-eminence with any other leader among Truth people (though we have since learned that our continually increasing advancement by our dear Pastor in the service, particularly from 1912 onward, more particularly from 1914 onward, and most particularly from early 1916 onward, made us an object of envy to certain leaders); but we were also not even aware that any of the Bethel brethren were quarreling for power and pre-eminence,

until A.H. MacMillan, at the Milwaukee Convention (Sept. 16-24, 1916), told us of Bro. Rockwell's envying, etc., his promotion by our Pastor to be the latter's representative at the Tabernacle and Bethel. We knew nothing of Bros. Sturgeon's and Holmes' quarrels, or of Bro. Ritchie's hurt, and Bro. Martin's elated feelings, until after our return from Britain. Then, too, it was only from Oct. 21, 1916, onward that we learned (and that first from our Pastor at Dallas, 10 days before his death) that the English Managers and other prominent British brethren were not submissive to "that Servant."

(39) Thus when through God's Grace it fell to our lot to be selected by Him to take a prominent place among the Body members in the work of co-operating under our Head in leading Azazel's Goat from the Door of the Tabernacle to the Gate of the Court, we, unconscious of the use the Lord was making of us, were put into a most unusual position, in some respects somewhat like that of a sheep among wolves. In our guilelessness we never suspected that *brethren* could be guilty of duplicity, trickery, fraud, treachery to "that Servant" and to fellow servants, envious grasping for power, lording it over God's heritage, and dividing the Flock in their own interests, unless like former sifters they ceased to be brethren, and were put into the Second Death class. Hence the gross wrongs of the Levitical leaders, brought by the Lord to our attention, filled us with deepest grief at their sad condition, horror at the deep guilt of their sins, righteous indignation at their wrongs against the Lord, the Church and "that Servant," pitying love for their dangerous condition, combined with loving efforts to rescue them, and energetic measures to shield the Flock from their injurious ways. These things have characterized our dealings and attitude toward (1) Bros. Shearn and Crawford, (2) Bros. Hemery and Thackway, (3) Bros. Rutherford and MacMillan, (4) Bro. Sturgeon

and Sr. Henderson, (5) Bro. and Sr. Ritchie, (6) Bros. Hoskins and Margeson and (7) Bros. Hirsh and Kittinger; and will, please God, we hope, characterize us in our future dealing with other Levitical leaders. While we by no means desire to imply that we did not make mistakes in this work, we did the best we knew how to do under most stressful conditions; but we do know that we accomplished the Lord's will in the work He gave us to do, and trust His grace to cover our weaknesses, and to overrule wherein we failed of perfection.

(40) May we again be permitted to say a word as to our writing of our work. Modestly to speak of the use that the Lord makes of one, when it is necessary in the interests of the Lord, the Truth and the Brethren, is not only not forbidden, but is approved by the Lord, as can be seen from the course of Jesus (John 8: 12-59, etc.), St. Paul (2 Cor. 11: 1-12-18) and "that Servant." (Z'16, 170-175; Z '06, 211-239; Z '96, 47; D 613, 614.) We make this explanation because the Levites are likely, as they have in the past, to accuse us of pride in our writing of our activities as to Azazel's Goat. Some Levites claim that we are nursing a grudge, and that this explains our activities toward them, even as Catholic theologians have said the same things of antitypical Elijah. We pity these poor brethren who so surmise evil. They object to our referring to events of the past twenty-two years, claiming that we should forget the past, while they forget that the Catholic Church objects to her past history of nearly 1700 years being urged against her. For the same reason as our Pastor wrote against the Papacy for ancient wrongs do we write against similar past wrongs.

(41) When in August, 1917, we wrote Harvest Siftings Reviewed, we still hoped that a healing of the breach in the Church could be accomplished; therefore we held back some facts that would have been greatly to our advantage to have been told, but that, if told,

would have hindered, we thought, a healing of the breach. Therefore in the hope of benefiting the entire Church we suffered the disadvantage of withholding certain facts that, if told, would have advantaged us by proving unanswerably our claim that our authorization papers on November 10, 1916, the day the credentials were dictated, were by the Executive Committee declared to be bona fide. To hold back these facts now will injure the Church, and benefit proven wrongdoers; and as nothing now obligates us to withhold them, and believing that it is the Lord's will, we will, for the good of the Church, and eventually of all concerned, tell certain facts that the Executive Committee, Nov. 10, 1916, asked us to conceal from the British brethren, because they thought it better for and during the work of adjusting the Tabernacle trouble, if the British Managers and the London Tabernacle Congregation did not learn that we knew these facts, before we left for Europe. We give it in a nutshell: Before leaving for Britain we had read, Nov. 8, 9 and 10, 1916, the full correspondence from both sides of the controversy among the Managers and the elders of the London Tabernacle, telling (1) of Bro. Shearn, supported by ten other elders, seeking to secure the annulment of our Pastor's controllership and arrangements in Tabernacle matters; and (2) of Bro. Hemery, supported by six other elders, seeking to prevent it. Bro. Hemery, we are convinced by his course in other matters, opposed Bro. Shearn's plan because it involved his dismissal from the assistant Pastorship. His course in other matters suggests that he would have favored the plan, if it had been in his interests so to do. However, we did not suspect such a thing, until his evil acts became proven to us after our recall, *e.g.*, his suggestion that we favor his becoming the Pastor of the London Tabernacle, and his course as to the scheme of shearing the Society of controllership over the I.B.S.A., a British corporation.

(42) We will here set forth a few facts to clarify the situation. The letter of appointment, given us Nov. 3, 1916, to secure passports, was sent to Washington Nov. 3, 1916. Nov. 4 the passports were granted, according to the government stamp on the application, which we have in our possession, a fact which unanswerably proves that the credentials dictated Nov. 10 were not given us to obtain passports, as J.F.R. falsely asserted in Harvest Siftings. Nov. 6, on the way to our Pastor's funeral at Pittsburgh, Bro. Pierson suggested to us that we visit Finland, for entrance into which our passport application did not ask. Hence, Nov. 8, Bro. Thomson of Washington, D.C., accompanying us to the passport department, we made request that the passports be made out for entrance into Finland. The clerk informed us the passports had been granted and sent to New York, where they awaited us. To grant our request he had them returned to Washington for correction, and we did not get them until Nov. 11, just before our departure, as Bro. Stephenson knows. We arrived in New York Nov. 8, from Washington. Between 5 and 6 P.M. Bro. Ritchie handed us the full correspondence as to the Tabernacle trouble for our study. We studied it carefully, and recognizing the course of Bro. Shearn and his 10 confederate elders as treachery to our Pastor, reported it as such Nov. 9 to the Executive Committee. Justice and charity, however, prompt us to say that 9 of them were by a base trick deceived by Bros. Shearn and Crawford to support his plan. A certain sister Nov. 10 showed us a long letter from Bro. Hemery, in which he pled with her to present his view of the matters to our Pastor. *It was this correspondence that moved the Executive Committee, Bros. Ritchie, Van Amburgh and Rutherford, to make, Nov. 10, 1916, our authorization papers bonafide!*

(43) Some may claim that our authorization papers not having been given us by an express order of the

Board were not binding as between the Board and ourself. This claim we deny; because what one does through authorized agents he does himself. The Board, Nov. 2, 1916, in harmony with our Pastor's decision, voted to send us to Europe, charging Bros. Ritchie, Rutherford and MacMillan to make the necessary arrangements with us, *not restricting them as to what these arrangements should be*, *i.e.*, it gave them discretionary powers. A majority of these brothers, Bros. Ritchie and Rutherford, with Bro. Van Amburgh, the Society's Secretary and Treasurer, in carrying out this charge of the Board, declared, Nov. 10, 1916, that our authorization papers were bonafide. Bro. MacMillan, who was not present at the time, offered no objections, so far as we know, and if he did, he would nevertheless have been bound by the action of the majority of the three brothers appointed Nov. 2 by the Board to make arrangements with us. Hence our authorization papers were binding as between the Board and ourself. And since we were sent by the Board, and it did not authorize these or anybody else to make arrangements for our *return*, we could not be recalled except by direct action of the Board, whose special representative exclusively we were. If anyone objects that it was the Executive Committee that gave us our authorization papers, and not the Committee of Nov. 2, we reply: (1) There was no Executive Committee as such for the Society until Nov. 7; (2) the work given the Committee of Nov. 2, in so far as our going to Europe is concerned, was executive in character; hence (3) when the Board gave the Executive Committee executive charge of all the work, the latter inherited from the Nov. 2 Committee, whose majority, however, made the authorization papers valid, its one and only executive work. Because of the fact that the latter committee had not finished its work as to ourself, it had to surrender to the Executive Committee, for its disposal, its unfinished work, *i.e.*, necessary

arrangements for our going to Europe. Thus from every standpoint the validity of our authorization papers is vindicated. It was a mere *fabrication*, contradicted by all the evidence, that we left for Europe with non-bonafide authorization papers. See Vol. VI, Chapter I.

(44) The following fact ought to convince Bro. Hemery that before our departure we read his correspondence as to the matter: After the Executive Committee had bona fide our authorization papers, and had asked us to handle the Tabernacle matter, we remarked to them that Bro. Hemery among other things had sent two 1916 Tabernacle schedules, one being without, and one with, various signs before the names of the 18 elders, indicating their varying stands on the issue. We told the Committee that we wanted the one with the signs on it, so as to have a record of the stand of each elder. J.F.R. then spoke for, and in the presence of the Committee to this effect: We, too, will want one; please copy on the clean one Brother Hemery's signs and the key to them, and thus both we and you will have a line-up on the elders, and will know best how to deal with each one. (We still have this schedule, Bro. Hemery overlooking it, when he rifled our portfolio!) They charged us not to let any one in Britain know that we had seen the Tabernacle correspondence; and of course we kept the charge. When Bro. Crawford the evening of Nov. 22 asked us whether the correspondence on the Tabernacle had reached Brooklyn before we left, well knowing what he meant, we asked, "What correspondence?" We used the same method that our Lord did with the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, when He, well knowing what they meant, answered their query with the question, "What things?" And as the two proceeded to tell Jesus what He knew, so Bro. Crawford told us what we knew; and the next day Bro. Shearn, after conferring with Bro. Crawford, handed us the

full correspondence of his side *for our decision on the case*. Bro. Hemery also gave us the correspondence of his side. Thus without any breach of confidence toward the Executive Committee, or duplicity towards the Managers, on our part, we left the latter under the impression which they, after the manner of the two disciples, inferred, but which we did not give them, that they were the first to inform us of the Tabernacle situation. The Lord undoubtedly overruled to effect this result.

(45) Above all things else it was the *knowledge of this correspondence*, coupled with the sense of grave responsibility imposed upon us by our authorization papers, that weighed so heavily upon us as to disable us from making a comforting speech to the Bethel family, when called upon to do so at our last meal before sailing to Britain. On the way to Britain we gave the most prayerful and careful thought to the British situation. By Nov. 17, two days before we landed, our plan of procedure was in general outline made up, and our usual cheerfulness returned, for we fully believed that we could shortly convince Bros. Shearn and Crawford of their mistake, and thus looked forward with pleasure to being a peacemaker. We deeply loved them, the latter for his defense of the Covenants very early in 1909 against the sifters, when the light on the subject was dim; the former because of his helping the conscripted brethren legally and otherwise. Remembering Bro. Hemery's wrong course on the Vow and the New Covenant in 1908 and 1909, we balanced the latter's wrongs of those years with the former's wrongs as to the Tabernacle; and the latter's right stand on the Tabernacle with the former's good deeds just mentioned; and thus on our arrival in England we were thoroughly impartial in our love to all three Managers, and faithfully sought the good of all; and were most deeply disappointed, as we later told the Tabernacle congregation, that our hopes that

our visit would be one of glad service in helping and comforting the brethren, one and all, had not been fully realized in every case, on account of the incorrigible course of Bros. Shearn and Crawford, which we did not at all expect. Details on the trouble with these two brothers we did not give in *Harvest Siftings Reviewed*. This we did later, on becoming convinced it was the Lord's will that these be given. [See Vol. VII, Chapter I.] Here we desire to give only such general statements as are necessary to show how our conduct toward them was a part of the work of the World's High Priest in leading a part of Azazel's Goat to the Gate.

(46) In every one of the experiences connected with leading various sections of the Goat to the Gate, as the Lord has been pleased to use us, the following things, we are fully persuaded, we did under His manipulation without in the first cases realizing that we were dealing with Azazel's Goat: (1) We had a clear insight into the *revolutionism* of all the persons involved; (2) we lovingly and plainly showed them the wrongs that they were committing; (3) we made most loving, gentle efforts privately to win them from their wrong course; (4) in the discussion of the principles and facts involved, in every case we refuted the reasons that they advanced in their own justification; (5) we found every one of them guilty of revolutionism, some guilty of error, and all of falsehoods, told to hide the character of their acts; (6) we only then took the aggressive after their unrepentant wrongs resulted, or were resulting, in injury to the Lord's cause; and (7) we with increasing strictness, first privately and then publicly, after they spoke of it publicly, resisted their increasing revolutionism, until we became uncompromisingly opposed to them because of their violations of Truth and Righteousness. We are fully convinced that in these seven activities our Lord used us to accomplish His good pleasure in leading the Goat to the

Gate of the Court, and in putting it into the fit man's hands, in the first definition of that term—"unfavorable circumstances." These seven acts constituted our part under Jesus in leading the Goat out.

(47) It goes, of course, without saying that in the work of leading the Goat to the Gate and the fit man, we did not among the priesthood in the flesh act alone toward the various sections of Azazel's Goat. Under our Head we always have had as colaborers a majority of those who by right had power over the involved section of the Goat, until each section arrived at the Gate, and was put into the hands of the fit man, understood as unfavorable circumstances; and then we were in every case forsaken by the majority, and were left with a small minority, which, however, would increase, until there were gathered to us many brethren, the majority of whom in the next shaking would be manifested as another section of Azazel's Goat, and would be led to the Gate and the fit man. The following facts will illustrate these remarks: As against Bros. Shearn and Crawford we had the support of the Board in our authorization papers, Bro. Hemery and the majority of the Tabernacle Congregation, until they were not only by us, Jan. 14, 1917, but by them, Jan. 22, put into the fit man's hand. The majority of the Board in our authorization papers and the majority of the Bethel family stood with us as against Bros. Hemery and Thackway, until not only we, but also they, had led them to the Gate and placed them in the fit man's hands. The majority of the Board, despite the compromise resolution on the British affair, supported us as against J.F.R. and A.H. MacMillan, until not only we, but they, led them to the Gate, and put them into the fit man's hands. The majority of the Fort Pitt Committee and the New York Ecclesia stood with us as against Bro. Sturgeon and Sister Henderson, until they were in the fit man's hands. Until Bro. and Sr. Ritchie were put into the fit man's hands the majority

of the Mizpah Convention stood with us. The majority of the Fort Pitt Committee as respects carrying out the charge that it received from the Fort Pitt Convention stood with us, until Bros. Hoskins and Margeson fell into the fit man's hands. This is true of the majority of the Philadelphia Church in our dealing with Bros. Hirsh and Kittinger. We opine this will continue to be the case, until all Truth sections of Azazel's Goat will be in the fit man's hands. Thus others of the Body members co-operated with us under our Head in leading Azazel's Goat to the Gate of the Court, in each case the Lord using us first, and then afterward our supporters, to deliver the Goat to the fit man.

(48) The set of facts just referred to also proves that those New Creatures who have lost their crowns are in the High Priest's Body and share in His work until they are manifested as Levites, when they cease acting as a part of the High Priest, and are represented in their humanity as a part of Azazel's Goat, e.g., Jesse Hemery while co-operating with us as against the revolutionism of Bros. Shearn and Crawford was yet in the High Priest's body; but as soon as he became manifest as a revolutionist, which was March 1, 1917, he ceased co-operating with us, and we began with the co-operation of others under our Head to lead him to the Gate. This will account for the fact that has so often been exemplified since the Fall of 1916, that brethren who stood right for a while fell later into revolutionism. We are surely living in a solemn time! It is, among other reasons, because parts of Azazel's Goat in the Truth have not yet been led to the Gate that no one can yet be sure that he will prove to be a "more than overcomer" in the finished work.

(49) Some have asked how we know that the World's High Priest led the Goat to the Gate, since the type does not expressly state it? We answer, We know it for three reasons: (1) 1 Tim. 1: 20; 1 Cor. 5: 3-5 indirectly prove this by showing that the High

Priest in His members indirectly delivers the Goat to Azazel, by cutting it off from their protecting care, which indirectly results in its falling into Azazel's hands; (2) as there was no one but Aaron in the Court during the entire Atonement Day service; and (3) as the fit man belonged to the camp (Lev. 16: 26), evidently Aaron led the goat to the gate of the Tabernacle; and there, as we have pictured it on The Present Truth's cover, delivered the goat to the fit man.

(50) Again, looking at the character of a goat under the circumstances of the Atonement Day, we can readily see that it must have tugged away at the rope, unwilling to be led to the gate; that it jerked repeatedly at the rope in hope of deliverance from the high priest; and that it would not be surprising, if it butted the high priest; for such acts comport well with a goat's disposition! Even if the type does not expressly tell of such acts of the goat, it is a reasonable inference that such acts were committed by it. Certain it is that in the antitype things illustrated by tuggings, jerkings and buttings have set in. The tuggings suggest the steady efforts of the antitypical Goat in revolutionism to go in another direction than toward the Gate and the fit man, as they are led on by their ambitions to work out schemes of their own; the jerkings fittingly picture the repeated efforts of this class to get away from being led and delivered to the fit man, by defending itself against its steady leading by the High Priest toward the Gate; while the buttings correspond to the attacks that the revolutionists make upon the High Priest in His members, *e.g.*, J.F.R.'s pettifogging tactics against us during the first so-called "two hours' hearing before the Board," April 11, 1917, after our return from Britain.

(51) Briefly would we mention the dates and the acts whereby the leaders of the Azazel's Goat class were started toward the Gate, and were put into the fit man's hands. In all these dates and acts our High

Priest was pleased to use us to initiate the work of fulfilling His good pleasure as to the Goat, as well as to arouse the other Under-priests to co-operate therein. Our first opposition, *expressed* Nov. 25, 1916, at a Managers' meeting, to Bro. Shearn and his Tabernacle plans, which would have made a premature division in the Society and Tabernacle, started him toward the Gate; and our mailing (in an answer to his Jan. 11 letter) on Jan. 14, 1917, a letter that we signed that day, but dictated the day before, and that gave him up to his plan to resign, landed him on our part in the fit man's hand; while Bro. Thackway, supported by certain of the other seven elders who opposed Bro. Shearn, preparing against his plan certain resolutions which he presented to the Tabernacle Congregation Jan. 8, 1917, started him, on the part of the Church in its faithful elders, toward the Gate; while the Ecclesia landed him in the fit man's hands, when, against his opposition, it passed these resolutions Jan. 22. Our remonstrating March 1, 1917, with Jesse Hemery for his rebuking us for our course, by his adding an unfriendly postscript, Feb. 26, 1917, to his friendly letter of Feb. 25 (*Harvest Siftings Reviewed*, see Vol. VI., Chap. I.), *after the "absolutely without authority" cable reached him*, A.M. of Feb. 26, started him toward the Gate, and our suspending him as Manager the evening of March 11 landed him on our part in the fit man's hand; while Bro. Housden and the majority of other Bethelites resenting his repeated snubbing of us started him, on their part, March 3, to the gate, and landed him in the fit man's hands the evening of March 13, when they sided with us, against him, on the Board's authority as above J.F.R.'s; and they showed it by absence from his new dining-room, where his supporters, at first only 3 in number, would eat, while all the other Bethelites ate with us, until March 18. Our declining, Feb. 19, 1917, in a cable to J.F. Rutherford, to reinstate at his *command* the dismissed Managers,

started *him* toward the Gate; and our conversations with, and actions toward him, June 23 (see Vol. III, Chapter VII), landed him on our part, in the fit man's hands. What became the Board's majority, beginning April 13, 1917, by disapproving his course of ignoring the Board in our appeal from him to it on the British matter, at our so-called second "Two hours' hearing (?) before the Board," started him, on their part, toward the Gate; and their giving him up in their speeches, July 17, 1917, at the ousting, was a withdrawal of priestly fellowship from him, putting him on their part into the hands of the fit man, even though they did not know they did it.

(52) Our disapproving Nov. 25, 1918, of Bro. Sturgeon's plan, advocated by him and Sister Henderson, to force a premature division in the Brooklyn Tabernacle Congregation, started him toward the Gate; and our publicly charging him as seeking through Sr. Henderson to divide the New York Ecclesia, now partly with the P.B.I., as well as charging him with other things, giving cogent proofs, and that before that Ecclesia, the evening of March 11, 1918, put him into the fit man's hands; while the New York Ecclesia, March 3, resenting his mouthpiece, Sr. Henderson, circulating her printed attack on us in his defense, as the first public evidence of his divisional and other works, started him, on their part, toward the Gate, and their voted disapproval of his mouthpiece the evening of March 13 for his divisional and other wrong activities put him on their part into the fit man's hand. Our resenting, July 27, 1918, Bro. Ritchie's favoring, contrary to his principles, the power-grasping group of the Fort Pitt Committee, as against us, at the Asbury Park Convention, started him in a *public* way on our part toward the Gate, and August 27 our giving him up as a hopeless case in our answer to his typewritten attack on Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed, on our part put him into the hands of the fit

man; while the Philadelphia Ecclesia, September 1, calling upon him to justify his insinuations of its unfairness as to the P.B.I. leaders, on its part started him to the Gate, and it and the Mizpah Convention, September 10, accepting our refutation of his attacks and our exposures of his course (in co-operating with J.F.R. and W.E. Van Amburgh in some of their usurpations, while on the Executive Committee of the Society), and of his weakness, especially in the Board meeting of June 20, 1917, landed him in the fit man's hands. Thus was it done by our supporters.

(53) We mention the above dealing with Bro. Ritchie as one that is publicly known, and as an example of what was done with him as to his general act of supporting against his principles the P.B.I. revolutionists, and that against us, who opposed them from the standpoint of the principles that he endorsed. We might mention another general act of his wherein on the dates immediately to be given in connection with Isaac Hoskins, and for revolutionistic acts of busy-bodying in the Fort Pitt Committee's policies through Bro. Margeson, against the instructions of the Fort Pitt Convention, he was by us, and then by the majority of the Committee, started toward the Gate, and given to the fit man by the very acts that were done toward Isaac Hoskins in starting him toward the Gate and delivering him to the fit man; for these acts opposed Bro. Ritchie's intrigues. We call the dear ones' attention to the many anniversaries indicated in these dates, remarking that with 6 P.M. God begins the new calendar day.

(54) Our slight disapproval (February 19, 1918) of certain acts of Isaac Hoskins connected with his course toward Bro. Margeson, as to substituting another letter for that which the Fort Pitt Committee was considering, started Isaac Hoskins toward the Gate; and through our offering a series of motions which were all presented and passed a little after 6 P.M.,

June 22, 1918, as to headquarters, the managing editor, the salaries for the secretary and managing editor, and publishing The Bible Standard before the Asbury Park Convention, Isaac Hoskins was on our part put into the fit man's hands; while the majority of the Committee sympathizing, April 13, 1918, with our protest against the "doctrinal-clearing-house" resolution of February 23, started him toward the Gate, and their insisting on carrying out their program of June 22 despite his opposition gave him, July 17, to the fit man for suitable experiences, which he got.

(55) The act of conducting the leaders to the fit man involves leading their partisan supporters to him. The fulfilled facts seem to imply that conducting individual leaders with their supporters to the fit man is not done merely once in each case. Apparently in every general act of revolutionism the leader and his supporters therein, which supporters are not always the same individuals in the different general acts, are led to the Gate and to the fit man, as often as they engage in general acts of revolutionism. By a general act we mean a course on one point of policy consisting of many single deeds. Their sum total constitute the general act, *e.g.*, J.F.R.'s many deeds of busybodying in our British work, and his many deeds of usurping power over the Board constitute what we mean by general acts. He began his busybodying first by a letter dated February 2, 1917, and second by the following cable which was received by us February 6, 1917, *i.e.*, before his letter of February 2 came to hand (*Harvest Siftings*, p.3, par.1): "Have contending sides sign agreed statement of facts [Bros. Shearn and Crawford refused to do this] and send for *my decision.*" *This he presumed to do in the case of the Board's Special Representative clothed with full powers.* Our being the Board's, not the Executive's, Special Representative made J.F.R.'s course, unknown to the Board, and increasingly protested against by us, one

of busybodying in the Board's and our business. A certain Scripture, which, *D. v.*, we will in due time expound to the Church, sets forth his course in this matter as gross busybodying, *reaping fearful consequences*.

(56) In our earlier writings we used the term, "dragging Azazel's Goat from the Door of the Tabernacle to the Gate of the Court." We believe it preferable to use our later term, "leading," etc., though we have to do some hard pulling at the wayward Goat!

(57) Above we referred several times to the World's High Priest putting certain leaders into the hands of the fit man. We now desire to give explanations and proofs. Our dear Pastor has given us two definitions for the fit man, both of which the antitype so far fulfilled proves to be correct: (1) Unfavorable circumstances (T 70, par. 3) and (2) persecuting persons (T 68, par. 1; 75, par. 5). Certainly the Scriptures teach these definitions, and the fulfilled facts corroborate them. In I Cor. 5: 3-5 a charge is given whose execution put the evil-doer into a position like that in which Azazel's Goat now is. In this passage it will be noted that there are three actors: (1) our Lord, in whose name the action is done; (2) a special representative of the Lord, the Apostle Paul, and (3) a part of the under-priesthood, the Ecclesia at Corinth, which was fully authorized to act in the matter at hand. Then there was a brother whose great sin required the special activity of a part of the World's High Priest against him. That activity was a withdrawal of fellowship, which put the person concerned into the unfavorable circumstances involved in being out of harmony with the Lord, with His special representative, and with the Ecclesia, to which the brother was subject in the Lord. As a result of falling into these unfavorable circumstances that brother suffered doubtless from persecuting persons; and the passage clearly implies that through his unfavorable circumstances he fell into the

clutches of Satan, Azazel, for the destruction of the flesh, the purpose being to deliver his new creature, which purpose seems to have been effected (2 Cor.2: 5-11). While the passage does not expressly mention the fit man, it implies his activity in the sense of unfavorable circumstances. Similar cases without the details of 1 Cor. 5: 3-5 are given of certain ones who did not keep a good conscience, and who made shipwreck of faith—faithfulness (1 Tim.1: 19, 20). Then the type of Lev. 16: 8, 10, 26, particularly the last verse, shows that persecuting persons also are meant by the fit man; for unfavorable circumstances could not wash their garments, conduct, and flesh, their weaknesses, not having any, because of not being persons. Humans, therefore, also must be meant by the fit man. Below we will give facts that will prove this. Azazel is not the fit man because he neither belongs to the camp, nor will he wash his garments, nor will he ever be forgiven.

(59) It should be emphasized that the High Priest who delivers the Goat to the fit man is the World's High Priest, and not simply the Church's High Priest. Above we gave the Scriptural proof as to whose High Priest it is who acts as to Azazel's Goat. As in the Corinthian case, the Lord Jesus functioned chiefly, using a special representative, St. Paul, and then other Under-priests, the ecclesia, who had the authority to act, so the antitype indicates this has been done thus far in dealing with the class typed by Azazel's goat in its various parts.

(60) As was manifest in the Corinthian case the delivery to the fit man occurred as a result of the withdrawal of priestly fellowship from the impenitent wrong-doer, so in dealing with the Great Company as a class in its various sections Jesus, the brother whom He has been pleased to use as a representative member of the Under-priesthood toward this class, and the other involved Priests, have given up the impenitent

wrong-doers; have ceased to labor with them longer as with Priests; have dealt with them correctively; and have withdrawn priestly, but not brotherly fellowship, which should to the extent that it is helpful be given, while they are in the fit man's hands, though not with the former cordiality, for the rescue of the wrong-doer (2 Cor.2: 5-11); for we should seek to save the lives of these brethren; but must take heed that we do not violate Truth and Righteousness while so doing (Lev. 10: 6, 7). As we look over the events wherein we, co-operating with and under our Head, and with our fellow Under-priests, delivered Bros. Shearn, Hemery, Rutherford, Sturgeon, Ritchie, Hoskins, etc., to the fit man, it was in every case done by a withdrawal of priestly fellowship. Hence the withdrawal of priestly fellowship (1 Cor. 5: 2-5) is the process immediately preceding the delivery of Azazel's Goat to the fit man. The difference between the two in the type is this: Aaron made the goat pass through the gate, typing withdrawal of priestly fellowship, and then put the rope into the fit man's hand, and then let go his hold thereon immediately, these two acts typing, putting the Goat into unfavorable circumstances and into the hands of persecuting persons, which two things are the antitypical fit man.

(61) But there is in one respect a difference in the delivery of Azazel's Goat as done by our High Priest, and as done by the Under-priests. Both our High Priest and ourselves as Under-priests withdraw priestly fellowship and deliver this class to the fit man, in so far as the fit man is *unfavorable circumstances*; but only our High Priest delivers this class to the fit man *in so far as the fit man consists of persecuting persons*. There is good reason for this distinction in the actions of the Head and Body of the World's High Priest. The Head knows just what persons and afflicting experiences will destroy the flesh and save the spirit, while we do not. Therefore He is, but we are

not capable of fruitfully delivering them to persecuting persons. Moreover, if we should do this, we would destroy our ability to help them to repentance; for they would unchangeably resent our help under such circumstances. It is therefore to the glory of God and the good of all concerned that the Under-priests do not give these over to persecuting persons. Hence let none of the Under-priests betray these brethren to affliction. And we are sure that they have not done, nor will do this, despite false accusations hurled at some of them on this score. "Sufficient to such a man is this punishment which was inflicted of many" (2 Cor. 2: 6), and which brought him under the disapproval of God's very Elect. Yea, this is a most unfavorable circumstance. But we have no right to go beyond making such resistances to, and exposures of their revolutionism, and such efforts to rescue them, as will bring upon them (1) the disapproval of the Under-priesthood; (2) undo their activities among the Priests; and (3) encourage them to reformation, locally, if their wrong is limited to a local ecclesia, generally, if their wrong affects the General Church. To go beyond such a course would cause us to disobey the injunction of Lev. 10: 6, 7. We are to leave it to the Levites to drag them away from the Priests, their beliefs, their services and their fellowships, into beliefs, activities and fellowships that are unpriestly (Lev. 10: 4, 5). Of course the Priesthood is not to deal with them as Priests, nor in any sense co-operate with them as Priests. All priestly fellowship should be withdrawn from them upon convincing proof of their Leviteship. The brethren should be cautioned both against a precipitate judgment, and a too lenient treatment of such persons. Scriptures, Reason and Facts should control our course in so responsible an act. We stand ready to help the brethren in handling difficult cases, if our help is desired by the brethren.

(62) We will henceforth in this article use J.F.R.

and his partisan adherents as examples to illustrate the varied experiences of Azazel's Goat from its delivery to the fit man, until considerable of their experiences at Azazel's hands are set forth. This is done, because they, so far [June, 1920], afford the clearest illustrations of these various steps; but doubtless many more of such experiences are yet future. So far as we are concerned we delivered J.F.R. to unfavorable circumstances June 23, 1917. From that time things went from bad to worse with him so far as concerns his relations with the Priests. The caption (*Harvest Siftings*, 10): "Would force his return to Great Britain" is certainly an example of a *lawyer's* method of inoculating a jury with a thought without giving any proof of it; for not one word explanatory of the heading is given in that section. This method was frequently used in his *Harvest Siftings*, the instrument of a real harvest sifter, and the most deceitful piece of literature ever published by a sifter. We refer to the section so subheaded because some correspondence between the Board's majority and J.F.R. is given thereunder pertaining to our line of thought. Any experienced person will at once see the *Lawyer's* evasions in the way he treated the communications of the four brothers. This correspondence shows how these four brothers who were then Under-priests, with full authority as Directors to act, were forced to come to the conclusion that he was incorrigible, and with that conclusion to put him into unfavorable circumstances, into the fit man's hands. This occurred July 17, the date of the four brothers' public protest. That his circumstances were then most unfavorable as respects his relation to the priests is evident from what he did from June 23, onward. As he said, shortly after answering their letter he left for a two weeks' trip. During that trip, forced thereto by his unfavorable circumstances, through his unholy ambition and at Satan's suggestions, he began a campaign of misrepresentations

against the Directors and ourself, until he succeeded in persuading prominent brethren to sanction his taking drastic steps, in which they promised and gave him help. Additionally, during that time and during the next week, the following things, the majority of them, at his instance, were done by him and his partisan followers in his support: circulation of petitions in Bethel and the Tabernacle in his support as against those who opposed his usurpations; his personal representative, A.H. MacMillan, through R.J. Martin, calling a policeman to eject from the Tabernacle the majority of the Society's directors, *its legal controllers*, J.F.R.'s. *perjuring* himself by declaring under oath that there were four vacancies on the Board, when there were none; appointing four pseudo-directors on whose support he could depend, a support gained by colossal misrepresentations; ousting four legal directors; forced before the Bethel family, July 17, 1917, to listen for about four hours to protests by six priests, supported by others in the Bethel family, all of whom unanswerably proved him to be a sinner and a usurper against human and Divine laws; unauthorizedly, publishing Vol. 7; procuring from his Board (thereby deceiving Bro. Pierson, the vice-president, as the latter declared) its sanction of thrusting, without inquiry from the churches, the Board situation upon the Church, which was begun July 19 by his sending broadcast to the churches as a letter what he afterward used as the inset on the first page of his Harvest Siftings; being forced to face Bro. Magee (Asst. Attorney General for N.J.), who utterly defeated him on the legal points at issue before the Philadelphia Church, July 19; and worst, because most wicked of all, writing Harvest Siftings. A person forced to such acts as these to justify his usurpations certainly had been put into most unfavorable circumstances—the fit man.

(63) We cite as illustrative of the second stage in the journey to the wilderness the experiences of the

Society adherents connected with the restrictions put upon them by the Government on account of the espionage act, as examples of experiences as the fit man's hands, in so far as the fit man types *persecuting persons*. We have already (P '19, 95, par. 4, etc.) given our thought on this subject, and answered their false charges against us as betraying them to the officials. (P '19, 161, 162.) On this point we might remark that the fit man as persecutor need not be officials; any persecutor, public or private, fits the picture.

(64) We noted above in connection with leading the Goat to the Gate that every new general act of revolutionism is resisted by the World's High Priest, and by such resistance the revolutionists are led anew to the Gate and fit man. Hence as often as they are led to the Gate and fit man are the leaders, and the groups whose leaders they are, given suffering experiences at the fit man's hands. The facts of the antitype seem to suggest that while the type is but a single act in each step, each antitypical step, e.g., loosing the Goat, leading it to the Gate, passing it through the Gate, delivering it to the fit man, etc., consists of a number of general acts. The parts of each step will apparently be as many as are the general acts connected with each step.

(65) Letting the Truth section of Azazel's Goat go in the wilderness seems to mean the part of the fit man's course whereby he puts Azazel's Goat into a condition of isolation from the Faithful, whose measurable favor and help they enjoyed previously to this step—a condition in which they are not even given brotherly fellowship (1 Cor. 5: 11, 13). To Azazel's Goat in the nominal church the thought will be similar, except they will also lose the favor and help of the nominal people of God (T, 70-72). In describing in Tabernacle Shadows the wilderness experiences of this class, our dear Pastor explained them from the

standpoint of that part of Azazel's Goat that is yet in Great Babylon; but as we said in the first part of this article, we will leave details as to that part of Azazel's Goat for treatment until after their fulfillment's have set in. There is a difference between the World's High Priest's withdrawing priestly fellowship just before delivering Azazel's antitypical Goat to the fit man, and the fit man's letting this class go into the wilderness, *i.e.*, putting them into a condition wherein they experience the full loss of the Priesthood's favor and personal help, by their withdrawal of *brotherly* fellowship. The former act naturally occurs before the latter. Again we will refer to J.F.R.'s. case to illustrate this point. As shown above, from June 21 to June 23, 1917, we were withdrawing priestly fellowship from him, completing it by the conversation referred to in Vol. I, Chapter VIII and in Vol. VI, Chapter III. But this did not end our loving efforts to help him. It will be recalled (Vol. VI, Chapter I) that we mediated, July 18-25, 1917, between the Board's majority and J.F.R. Before, during and after this mediation he was in very unfavorable circumstances. The night of July 17, Bro. Pierson, in a meeting of *J.F.R.'s.* Board, insisted on his restoring the ousted Directors; and his threat of resignation, if it was not done, somewhat halted J.F.R. in his course. The next morning the latter made a very humble prayer, confessing some of his weaknesses before the Bethel family. This prompted us to express appreciation and to offer him help. Just before, Bro. Hoskins asked us for our advice on the situation, and we offered a proposition, which he accepted, and which we then offered to J.F.R. This led to a meeting of most of his Board and ourself, and later to certain conversations. The outcome was our becoming a mediator. Throughout the mediation, with loving practical proposals for a cure of the situation, we kept steadily to our purpose that Truth and Righteousness

must prevail. When from July 19 to July 24 he broke a number of his agreements as to a settlement; when July 24 he went back on his final agreement to submit the case to a Board of Arbitration of three lawyers; when July 25 we gave him our kind, but firm and unchangeable offer that he must surrender, both by accepting the ousted Directors as proper Board members, and by accepting two other brothers elected by the Board as forming with him an executive committee; when he refused to accept this proposition, and countered it with a demand that the four harmoniously submit to his Board, coupled with the threat that, if they would not, he would publish the British and Board matters; and when at our expostulation—that this would be to the great injury of the Church—he would not relent; we therefore and thereupon withdrew all favor and help, and all brotherly fellowship, from him as to the British and Board matters. Thus his giving such a refusal, ultimatum and threat, which his hard circumstances forced one of his character to give, became the occasion of his losing the favor and help of our brotherly fellowship; and thus he was proven to be in the wilderness, *i.e.*, without the favor and help of the first priest whose favor and help he lost as far as the British and Board matters were concerned. The fit man—his unfavorable circumstances—began thus to let him wander in the condition of isolation from our brotherly favor and help. When, July 27, the four Directors refused to submit to his new Board or to discuss matters further without advice from their legal counsel, he was in the condition of isolation, as far as their brotherly favor and help were concerned as to their ousting. In due time we will give the Scripture that indicates July 25 as the date of his first being let go in the wilderness. Similar experiences we could trace in connection with Bros. Shearn, Hemery, Sturgeon, Ritchie, Hoskins, etc., but the above case is sufficient to illustrate how the fit man, unfavorable

circumstances, brought them to a condition where (without the brotherly favor and help of the priests that delivered them to unfavorable circumstances, and that sought for a time in brotherly fellowship to help them while they were therein) they are isolated from all favor and help of those priests who led them to the fit man.

(66) Our course of loving brotherly favor and help toward J.F.R. and his seven accused companions before their trial (see pars. 80-83) illustrates how as a brother we sought to help them, while they were in the fit man's hands in the second sense of that term—persecuting persons; but when J.F.R.'s. letter was published accusing us of betraying the eight convicted brothers to the authorities, we did nothing further for him; for we withdrew from him even brotherly fellowship, which we will gladly give him, should he ever be cleansed; but we did not in any way seek to prevent his release, as we have been falsely accused of doing. Thus in this respect persecuting persons led him into a condition in which his actions, conformable to his perverted character, put him into utter isolation from the favor and help of ourselves as a brother. Every new general act would repeat for the leaders and their followers experiences like the above.

(67) To deliver this class to Satan is done in two ways: (1) indirectly, by the Priest putting them into the hands of the fit man, and (2) directly, by the fit man letting them go into the condition of isolation from the brotherly fellowship of the Priests, when Satan lays hold on them to use them for his unholy purposes (Lev. 16: 10, "to send him away for Azazel, " A.R.V.; 1 Cor. 5: 3-5; 1 Tim.1: 19, 20). The Lord's design in this is a twofold one: (1) He permits them to be used by Satan in carrying out the latter's plans, *i.e.*, to build up Little Babylon, as their kindred spirited brethren built up Great Babylon during the Gospel Age, that it may be unanswerably

demonstrated, by the wrongs of teaching and practice into which Satan leads them, that they are not Little Flock members; and (2) He permits them to have such buffeting experiences at Satan's hands as are designed to break their willfulness, and bring them to repentance, when their new creatures can be saved through the destruction of their fleshly minds (1 Cor. 5: 5; 1 Tim. 1: 20; Ps. 107: 10-16). So far none of the Great Company groups have finished their experiences at Azazel's hands; therefore only a part of such experiences can be given. Again we will refer to J.F.R.'s experiences in Azazel's hands to illustrate a part of what is typed here. We stated above that on July 25, 1917, when he refused a just peace, and insisted on an unjust one, and threatened unless his ultimatum were accepted he would publish the British and Board matter, we stopped in a brotherly way favoring and helping him amid the unfavorable circumstances that his unrepented usurpations as to the British and Board matters brought upon him from June 23 onward. Satan immediately seized him July 25, as we left him, according to a Scripture that in due time, *D. v.*, we will expound to the Church, and on July 27 caused him, according to the same Scripture, to do certain things by the influence of four sets of persons: (1) fallen angels, (2) his submissive P.P.A. members, (3) his executive committee—Bros. Van Amburgh, MacMillan and Hudgings—appointed that day, (4) his partisans in the Bethel, all of whom influenced or supported him in taking (1) the steps that marked his conduct in the Bethel dining room culminating in his committing physical violence against our person in plain sight of the Bethel family, and (2) the steps that culminated in our eviction from Bethel that day, July 27. See Vol. VI, Chapter I.

(68) When the ousted Directors that morning in the P.P.A. meeting, after he refused to permit us to speak in their defense, refused to submit to his proposals

as above given, or to discuss matters further with him without legal advice, he was left by unfavorable circumstances, the fit man, in a condition isolated from their brotherly favor and help. So far as they were concerned he immediately fell into Satan's clutches. Their answer greatly angered him. Jumping from his chair and jumping backward with a dramatic gesture he shouted in great wrath, "Then it will be war!" After the noon meal, July 27, he began war, on us, then on them, for after first ordering us to leave Bethel immediately, he ordered them to leave by July 30. July 29 he sent out for the first time his Harvest Siftings, which Bro. Pierson characterized as a production of Satan, and which is a Satanic misrepresentation of the British and the Board affair; for on that date, a date which the Scriptures also mark as the one on which Satan appointed J.F.R. to that work, he sent W.F. Hudgings with a number of copies of Harvest Siftings to Boston, where that evening it was read to the Boston elders and deacons. In that paper, first us, and afterward the four ousted Directors, he most flagrantly misrepresented in a way that only a new creature who was under Satanic control could do. August 8, a date Scripturally marked for this deed, he completed his series of wrongs against the ousted Directors by forcing them out of Bethel, another act that could not under the circumstances have been done by a new creature, unless he was under Satanic control. And what has been his history ever since? It has been largely one of iniquity, false teachings, blunders and troubles, wrecking one thing after another, until it is only his blind partisans that do not recognize his woeful, Satan-directed condition. Will he continue going from bad to worse, or submit to the three things of Num.8: 7? If not the latter, he will reap the full penalty of sin (Rom. 6: 23; Gal. 6: 7, 18; Heb. 6: 4-8; 10: 26-31; 2 Pet. 2: 1-22; John 5: 16; Jude 4-19). O what a fearful thing is revolutionism

in the forms of Clericalism, Sectarianism and Abihuism as exemplified in him!

(69) Experiences similar to his, though on a less marked scale, characterize the lives of Bros. Shearn, Hemery, Sturgeon, Ritchie, Hoskins, Heard, Olson, Hirsch, etc., while in Azazel's hands. As we previously saw that each new general act of revolutionism brought anew to these brothers experiences in being (1) led to the Gate; (2) passed through it; (3) delivered to the fit man; (4) led to the wilderness; and (5) let go in the wilderness; so at the end of these five stages in each general act of revolutionism Azazel's Goat falls anew into Azazel's hands for experiences suitable to the new sins of revolutionism. In other words, the experiences of the antitypical Goat in these stages or steps are repeated as often as there is a general act of revolutionism committed by this class. Hence as often as we see revolutionism in any leader among the Truth People, we begin to lead him and his supporters to the Gate of the Court, and exhort our fellow-priests to co-operate with us therein. This explains our Divinely commanded activity toward the Levites. Those who think that in doing so we are nursing a grudge totally misunderstand our work and motives. We cannot hope for the present to make them understand; but we comfort ourself with the reflection that the Lord and our enlightened fellow Priests understand, and that by and by our dear Levitical brethren will understand. Then all will be peaceful and lovely again among God's people, separated into their respective places. God speed that glad day! O let us pray and work for it in harmony with the Lord's Word, beloved! And the Lord will answer our prayers and prosper our work in this respect; for "the zeal of the Lord of hosts shall accomplish it" "in due time"! Amen.

(70) We will summarize our foregoing discussion by defining the seven stages or steps in the experiences

of Azazel's Goat, in order that the dear brethren may have them together for comparison and contrast.

(1) Confessing the sins: a declaration of the willful sins of organized Christendom by the World's High Priest.

(2) Loosing the Goat: The World's High Priest giving the Great Company a measure of liberty: (1) by taking away certain truths through permitting errors to blind their former understandings of those truths, and (2) by removing Providential hindrances to their measurable freedom of action.

(3) Leading to the Gate: The World's High Priest their resisting revolutionism.

(4) Passing it through the Gate: The High Priest withdrawing priestly fellowship.

(5) Delivering to the fit man: The High Priest delivering them up to unfavorable circumstances and persecuting persons.

(6) Leading to the wilderness: Unfavorable circum-stances and persecuting persons giving them distress.

(7) Letting go in the wilderness: Unfavorable circumstances and persecuting people putting them, through occasioning them to commit willful sins, into a condition of utter loss of the favor and help of God's Real or Nominal people, *i.e.*, the loss of their brotherly fellowship, because of their coming in matters of faith and practice into the control of Azazel, who uses them to further his purposes.

(71) Those Levites who submit to the three things of Num. 8: 7 and to the one thing of Num. 8: 12 (see also Rev. 7: 14), are rightly exercised by these experiences, and will gain life as well as atone for the world's willful sins, a blessed privilege; and those Levites who do not submit to these things lose life and all else. O Lord! save thy endangered Levites for Jesus' sake; for they are Thy children, bought by Jesus' precious blood! Amen.

(72) Years before the fulfillment of this type occurred, our beloved Pastor, in Tabernacle Shadows, etc., gave us the general outlines of the antitype which we have just studied, though, of course, he could not give the details of the fulfillment. And now we find them to have been remarkably fulfilled according to his outline given about sixty years ago. The details of the antitype belong to the Epiphany; and, as a part of its light, are now due to be understood, and as such we present them to the Church. Let us all praise our Father and our God for, and properly use this glorious light!

(73) Inasmuch as the Great Company as a class did not exist before their separation from the Little Flock, it was impossible before their separation to distinguish the Little Flock members from the prospective members of the Great Company; and for this reason the Lord strictly forbade our judging that this or that individual was a member of the latter class. All the consecrated were to be received and treated as members of the former class until the separation. Before the separation, therefore, all were regarded as Priests, and no distinction could be made between priestly and brotherly fellowship among New Creatures. However, by the separation a change was made; for those who were remanded to the Great Company, by becoming Levites, ceased to be Priests; nevertheless they remained brethren because of participation in the Holy Spirit. When one is manifested to the Priests as a Levite he no longer is to be treated by them as a Priest. During 1917 certain ones, together with those who heartily supported them by *revolutionism* against the Divine arrangements given by "that Servant," and against his Will and Charter, became manifest as members of the Great Company; for such revolutionism is, in part, the murmuring of Matthew 20: 11-15, and is, in part, the swaying of the sixth slaughter weapon of Ezekiel 9: 2, 5-10. And whether all of us have been

conscious of the meaning of our acts or not, as a matter of fact we who stood out against, and withdrew from these revolutionists have withdrawn priestly fellowship from them. What are the forms of such fellowship wherein no one else shares? Do they not consist of the exclusive use of the privileges of the antitypical Lampstand, Table of Shewbread and Incense Altar, while the Church is in the flesh? This being true, have we not refused to see as light coming from the true Lampstand the delusions that the Society leaders have taught? Assuredly! Therefore we have withdrawn priestly fellowship from them as respects the privileges associated with the antitypical Lampstand. Further, have we not refused to accept for ourselves and to give to our fellow Priests for strength for our journey Heavenward what these offer as Shewbread, which as additions to, and misrepresentations of the real "loaves of presence" their leaders have prepared for spiritual food? Certainly! Therefore we have withdrawn priestly fellowship from them as respects the privileges connected with the antitypical Table of Shewbread. And have we not refused to share with them in the sore afflictions brought upon them, in part, by their errors of interpretation and wrongs of conduct, as being the fiery trials of the Priest offering incense at the antitypical Golden Altar? Positively! Therefore we have withdrawn priestly fellowship from them as respects the privileges belonging to the Golden Altar. Manifestly, therefore, we have withdrawn priestly fellowship from them. But have we withdrawn brotherly fellowship from them? Assuredly not until they fell into Azazel's hands! Do we not, as new creatures, in common with them use, in as many particulars as their repudiations do not prevent, the same truths that they and we had together before they were cast out of the Holy? Do we not have access with them to the antitypical laver to wash away with them the filthiness of the flesh? And

do we not with them share in the merit of the antitypical Bullock's blood shed on the antitypical Brazen Altar? Most assuredly! Therefore, while withdrawing priestly fellowship from them, we have retained brotherly fellowship with them under the above mentioned limitation, and thereby not only did no forbidden judging, but did a Divinely ordained and pleasing act; for God does not desire the Priests to fellowship the Levites as Priests, but simply *as Levites*.

(74) In the increasing light of the Epiphany period, we have been privileged to see that, since the Levites represent for the Epiphany the Great Company, their three division—the Gershonites, the Merarites and the Kohathites (Num.3: 17, etc.)—represent the three divisions of the Great Company. We understand that those new creatures who ardently support "Rutherfordism" and Standfastism are antitypical Merarite Levites. Since the P.B.I. and its ardent supporters in many particulars acted like J.F.R. and his ardent supporters, even to doing many similar things exactly a year to the day afterward; and since it and its ardent supporters advocate for the Charter of their Society certain changes from the W.T.B.&T. Society's Charter (in spite of the writer's warnings, oral and in print, to the contrary, they still *persist* in supporting changes from that Charter which they once considered a part of the Divine arrangements for the Lord's work), it and its partisan supporters are antitypical Gershonite Levites.

(75) All must admit that some day, by Divine direction, the Priests will withdraw priestly, not brotherly, fellowship from those who, ceasing to remain Priests in the Holy, become, as the Great Company, Levites in the Court. The only question now remaining to be answered is: *Has the time come for such a withdrawal of priestly fellowship?* All of us have by our conduct answered this question affirmatively, so far as the upholders of "Rutherfordism in the Society"

and Standfastism are concerned; and all of us have been forced to do this with the P.B.I. revolutionists who have mistaught doctrinally and have revolutionized against the Lord's arrangements. Accordingly, the time for such a course on our part has come—now in the Epiphany, when their manifestation as Levites has come (2 Tim. 4: 1; Rev. 7: 9).

(76) Levites strenuously condemn an activity of the Epiphany priesthood as a forbidden judging when we announce God's judgment as to new creatures that repudiate various features of the Truth and its arrangements, and teach errors and set up wrong arrangements in their stead that they are of the Great Company. They dogmatically announce that no one has authorized any such judging. God in Lev. 13 and 14 about 20 times commanded the typical priest to pronounce the spotted leper unclean; and the spotted leper types the unclean Great Company, while Aaron and his sons, so announcing, represent Jesus and His body members announcing Great Company errorists as such. They misapply the forbidden judging of Matt. 7: 1, 2 to such announcing, whereas it is a sanctioned judging of John 7: 24 and the commanded judging of 1 Cor. 4: 5. In 1 Cor. 5: 5; 1 Tim. 1: 18, 19 God authorized certain of His priests to make such announcements. Especially in 1 Cor. 4: 5 the Word, among other things, commands such judging. Frequently opponents of such announcements quote 1 Cor. 4: 5 as though it taught that we are not to judge *until we are on the throne*. This passage does not forbid judging before we are on the Throne, *but before our Lord's Second Advent*. In misusing this passage to teach that it forbids our judging until we are on the Throne Levites charge that we are usurping God's exclusive function of judging and that we are judging before the time. We never have, in our pertinent work, attempted to exercise God's exclusive prerogative. It is His prerogative to retain one in, or dismiss one

from, the high calling; we have never attempted the latter. We have always waited until He had by the revolutionism of crown-losers (Ps. 107: 10, 11) manifested His judgment of them to Leviteship; then, as His providences indicated it to be necessary, we have simply announced His manifested judgment, and never have made nor could make such a sentence. No one can point out a single case in which we attempted to *sentence* an individual to the Great Company, though after God manifested them as such, we have so announced them. With reference to such we have always waited until God manifested His sentence through the revolutionism of the pertinent individual before we announced his Leviteship.

(77) Neither have we announced the Lord's judgment of them before the time. 1 Cor. 4: 5 as fully commands such announcement after the time, as it forbids its announcement before the time. The following will, we trust, clarify the subject: There are three periods in our Lord's Second Advent, in each of which He brings to light the hidden things of darkness and makes manifest the counsels of hearts; but in each He does so with regard to different classes: (1) In the Parousia He did such a work with respect to the tares and the Second-Deathers. Before He manifested such it was wrong to announce this one as a tare, or that one as a Second-Deather; but after He had manifested them as such, it was no longer a prohibited activity to announce the pertinent ones as such, as need called for it, even as our Pastor spoke of Messrs. Barbour, Paton, Williamson, McPhail and Henninges, as Second-Deathers, and often mentioned by name prominent worldly nominal-church members as tares, as his article in Z '11, 120-122, quoted in P. '34, 27, entitled, Judging Nothing Before the Time, shows. During the Parousia it was wrong to announce anyone as of the Great Company, because the Lord at that stage of His Second Advent had not yet proceeded to manifest

the Great Company as such. All of the passages from our Pastor that Levites cite in disapproval of such an announcement properly apply to the Parousia and previously. For use of them at that time we say to them a hearty, Amen! But to apply them to the Epiphany is a violation of the right division of the Word of Truth (2 Tim.2: 15). While quoting from our Pastor so many passages that forbid in the Parousia the announcing of anyone as being of the Great Company, why do not Levites quote Z '16, 264, par. 1 and Convention Report 1916, 198, col. 2, par. 2, Question 10, in which passages our Pastor said that after the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha and before the former would leave the world these classes would be separate and distinct; and that after their separation it would be in order to point out manifested members of antitypical Elisha as such? Many of them know of these quotations. Why do they not refer to them instead of applying Parousia things to the Epiphany?

(78) The separation of the Great Company and the Little Flock occurs in the second stage of our Lord's Second Advent—the Epiphany (2 Tim. 4: 1), which is the same as the Time of Trouble, when the Great Company is developed (Rev. 7: 14). Accordingly, our Lord Jesus has since 1914 begun to deal with the Great Company and is (2 Tim. 4: 1) now judging them, bringing to light their hidden things of darkness and manifesting their hearts' counsels. These, by their revolutionism (Ps. 107: 10, 11), He is now manifesting to us as crown-losers. Hence, when to protect the Flock it becomes necessary to announce them as Levites, it is no more a forbidden work to make such announcement. Why not? Because it is after the time; for we have waited until the Lord manifested their hidden things of darkness and their hearts' counsels. Not only are we not now forbidden, but are commanded by 1 Cor. 4: 5 to announce them as such when need so requires. Thus it is proper now, in the Epiphany

to announce the Lord's manifested judgment (2 Tim. 4: 1) as to Great Company members. And this is our Pastor's thought too; for he taught that the Epiphany began in 1914. He further taught that the Great Company would be developed in the Time of Trouble, *i.e.*, the Epiphany. Moreover, in the Epiphany, in 1916, as the two above references prove, he taught, that it would after the separation be proper to point out Great Company brethren as such, this to be done by the Little Flock before its leaving the world, which (on the basis of Col. 3: 4) he taught would be during the Epiphany. Hence he did not condemn, but approved Epiphany announcements of Great Company members. But in the Epiphany it would be wrong, as being before the time, to announce some as sheep and others as goats, which judging is Millennial.

(79) In the Millennium, Basileia, the third stage of our Lord's Second Advent, the Lord will bring to light individually the world's hidden things of darkness and manifest their hearts' counsels, and thereby will manifest the sheep and the goats as separate and distinct (Matt. 25: 31-33). Before He does this it will be wrong to point out any as goats; but after He does it, it will no longer be wrong so to do. To sum up: Before the Parousia it was wrong to point out any as tares or as Second-Deathers; but after the Lord's Parousia manifestations of them as such it was no longer wrong so to do; before the Epiphany it was wrong to point out any as Great Company members; but after their Epiphany manifestations by the Lord it is no longer wrong so to do; before the Basileia it is wrong to point out any as of the goat class; but after the Basileia manifestations by the Lord it will be no longer wrong. Hence 1 Cor. 4: 5 no longer forbids, but commands, as necessity demands, pointing out Great Company brethren as such. This, then, overthrows the pertinent Levite contention on "judging."

(80) Our readers will recall that in the letter that

he wrote the night before he was taken to Atlanta, and that has been published in "The Tower," "St. Paul Enterprise" and the "Labor Tribune," the latter being distributed widely as volunteer matter, J.F.R. intimates that the seven leaders of those who disapproved of his efforts to control the Society as "that Servant" did, were present at the trial, and aided the prosecution against the eight accused brothers. This letter, backed by corresponding teaching, makes many of the supporters of the Society believe these seven brothers to be of the antitypical Judas. Recently we received a letter in which the following occurs: "Sunday evening Brother G.H. Fisher addressed our class, and among other things openly accused the [seven] brethren who had been active in the Society of betraying the eight convicted brethren . . . and of scheming later to keep them in prison."

(81) These charges move us to make the following statement: The news of their arrest greatly *grieved* us. Before the arrest we had never spoken or written to any one directly or indirectly connected with the prosecution of the accused brothers. Afterward in and out of meetings we counseled the brethren to take the side of, and pray for the accused; because the issue was a battle between Israelites and Egyptians; and in such an event all of us should take the side of the former, however much evil they may have done us. All agreed with this view. Before the trial the prosecutor subpoenaed us, among others, to gain information from ourself against the brothers. In every way we could we defended them, giving no information that could be used against them, telling everything that we reasonably could in their favor, and refuting everything *that he brought up against them*, except four irrefutable lines of acts to which we will refer later, but for which we made excuse pleading their inexperience. So strongly did we defend them that the prosecutor, knowing that we would be a witness unfavorable

to him, did not subpoena us to be present at the trial; while he did subpoena the ousted Directors, several of the Society supporters and others. Through Pilgrim Brother Herr we sent J.F.R. word revealing to him the prosecution's lines of attack, and did this expressly to help him forearm himself. Despite his knowing of our efforts to help him, he accused us of betraying him to the prosecution. We designedly remained away from the trial, so as to secure ourself from being placed on the stand. Our stand, so favorable to them, was reported by Brother Herr and others to many of the Society brethren, some of whom then wrote to us expressing their appreciation. Between the arrest and trial, and before we were subpoenaed to appear before the prosecutor, we met Brothers Cole and Van Amburgh on a Brooklyn street, and extended our hand to, and were about to express our sympathy with the latter, but he disdainfully refused our hand, and turned his face away. However, we did not allow such and worse treatment to interfere with our love and well doing toward the accused brothers.

(82) It was not, *humanly speaking*, in any sense the disagreement in the Society that brought these brothers into trouble, as some mistakenly believe. We are reliably informed that, among others, the following acts, proven against them, effected their conviction, the judge doubtless arousing additional feeling against them: (1) Their denunciation of patriotism in Vol. VII [had C.J. Woodworth followed "that Servant's" known interpretation of the frog coming out of the mouth of the dragon, given, e.g., in the Armageddon Tract, as the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings, and then properly applied it against the Kaiser, and omitted his denunciation of patriotism, which, though often abused, is a good quality, instead of Vol. VII bringing them into, it would have helped them out of their trouble. It would not surprise us, if the Lord, in disapproval, allowed this trouble to come upon them as

a direct consequence of their deviating from "that Servant's" known interpretation of the frog coming out of the dragon's mouth, etc.]; (2) their writing letters into the camps, which letters fell into the censor's hands, advising the drafted brothers not to put on the uniform, nor to drill, nor to wash dishes, pare potatoes, clean the barracks, etc.; (3) their furnishing affidavits and other instruction to Truth people and *others* whereby to claim exemption on the ground of conscientious objection; (4) writing the brethren unpatriotic letters, which were intercepted by the censors, and delivering unpatriotic speeches. These were the main things that effected their sentences, we are reliably informed. We surely rejoice in their release; but their unbrotherly course in accusing us so falsely is regrettable. Of course, these accusations fit into their scheme that they are of the Little Flock, and that the seven brothers are of the antitypical Judas; but they do not fit into the facts of the case, nor into the Bible teaching with reference to the convicted brothers as undergoing Great Company experiences. To ourself it seems that their imprisonment was due to two things, one commendable, the other not: (1) the second smiting of Jordan and (2) wrong-doing against the Lord's Saints and arrangements. In other words, as the Great Company *suffers in part for righteousness and in part for unrighteousness*, so these, as of such, do.

(83) So far we have answered for ourself. As for the other six brothers we can say this much: We do not believe that they aided the prosecution, though one of them (Brother Ritchie) under subpoena was forced to go on the witness stand; but while there, we are reliably informed, did nothing else than identify A.H. MacMillan's handwriting, which the latter himself also recognized and acknowledged. We do know of all of them that they endorsed our view as expressed above—*i.e.*, standing by Israelites as against Egyptians; and we are reliably informed that Brother Hirsh not only

told Pilgrim Brother Cole, who was present at the trial, that he both deeply sympathized with the accused brothers, and had taken advantage of the opportunity that his own arrest had afforded to defend the accused brothers, but also expressed himself similarly to Brother DeCecca, one of the accused brothers, the day the trial began, the unapproachableness of the other accused brothers preventing a similar course on his part toward them. Furthermore, we did nothing by motive, word or act that in any way was calculated to hinder their release, nor do we know or believe it of the others. How inconsistent such charges coming from the Society leaders are appears from the following: At the trial they sought through their counsel, after failing to get their own indictment quashed, to prevent the indictment against Brother Hirsh from being quashed, who (charged as a co-defendant, because his name appeared in "The Tower" as an Editor, contemporaneously with some of their alleged offenses against the espionage act) was recognized by the prosecution as not guilty, because it was found that he ceased to act as an Editor before the alleged offending "Tower" article appeared. The prosecution therefore moved that the indictment against him be set aside, a thing which was stoutly resisted by the counsel of the convicted brothers. By seeking to prevent the quashing of his indictment the accused brothers sought through their counsel to have Brother Hirsh tried with them, and, if convicted, sent to prison with them, while he did everything he could to shield them and to discourage the prosecution in the things with which they charged the brothers. This shows who really have the spirit of delivering up their brethren, as they have also shown in many other ways. [The foregoing four paragraphs were written in May, 1920.]

(84) Satan is the most cunning being in the Universe. Hence, among others, he seeks to enlist on his side those who like him are more or less cunning. In

working against the Truth servants he always studies how best to overthrow their influence. He therefore uses against them their religious, moral, mental, or social weaknesses, if he can find any of these; or failing to find them, he invents fictitious weaknesses along these lines. If, therefore, he can represent a servant of the Truth as an errorist or a madman, or a sinner, or an offender against society, he will do so, whether the charges are true or false. This accounts for his charging through his dupes our Lord as being illegitimately born, as a madman, as a demoniac, as a blasphemer and as a rebel. It is for this reason that he caused St. Paul to be accused of sedition, insanity and heresy. In the same way he caused "that Servant" to be falsely slandered as a heretic, as an immoral man, as a swindler, and as an unkind and unfaithful husband. Whenever religious errorists and frauds cannot meet the exposures of their false doctrines or evil practices by argument, Satan fills their mouths with false and malicious slanders against their exposers. For this reason Satan, knowing that both in Britain and in America we were exposing and thwarting the evils that he desired to introduce among the Lord's people, misrepresented our British and American work through those who have since been manifested as bad Levite leaders. Then to destroy our influence he caused his main mouthpiece among Truth people to publish abroad these misrepresentations, with the false addition that we were insane. When our reply proved the falsity of both sets of charges, the same chief mouthpiece of Satan among Truth people, and others of his kind, began to misrepresent us as having devoured our companion's patrimony, as having deserted her, and as not having provided for our own. When these false charges no longer deceived others, and we began to show Scripturally the evil character, teachings and practices of "that evil servant," and "foolish, unprofitable shepherd," Satan gave his partisans another list

of falsehoods to spread—falsehoods which are calculated to give the impression that we are a blasphemer, a demoniac and a madman, this propaganda being united with oral warnings not to read our writings. Among other things that such scandal-mongers, whose literary mouthpiece Clayton Woodworth became in a communication to the New Era Enterprise of St. Paul, Minn., are peddling about are the stories that we permit no one to testify in prayer meetings whom we do not desire to have testify, and therefore, when leading a prayer meeting, call by name on those only whom we desire to testify, and thus suppress others; that in a prayer meeting we made the claim that we had power to call down fire from heaven and destroy our enemies, as Elijah did with the two companies of fifty; that we stated in a meeting that we were the "World's Great High Priest"; and that we commanded a rebellious brother to drop dead, which to our confusion the brother failed to do! Those who know us and our writings know, of course, that these stories are *falsehoods*. But Satan's and his agents' purpose in circulating them is apparent; for such claims as these misrepresentations put into our mouth could emanate from an insane person only, and Satan and they doubtless seek to give the impression that we are insane, in order to hinder the spread of the Epiphany message. Of course, he finds the bad Levite leaders just the persons to be his ready mouthpieces in this work. So far as we are concerned we rejoice in these experiences. They are so much like those which the Lord, the Apostles, "that Servant" and all other faithful servants of the Lord have undergone because of their faithfulness (Matt.5: 10-12), that we feel ourself to be very highly favored indeed to have fellowship with them in such misrepresentations. Let us, dear brethren, rejoice that thus we may together drink this cup with the Lord and with others of His Priesthood. It is necessary that such experiences come, that

the approved may be manifested, that the partially approved may be manifested, and that the totally disapproved may be manifested. And such will indeed be the result of such experiences; for we are living in the Epiphany! "And who shall stand when He maketh manifest?"

(85) In the foregoing we have discussed Azazel's Goat, in so far as the subject concerns its Truth people members. But there are members of it—by far the larger section of it—in the nominal church. Some of these are in the Protestant denominations; and some of them are in the Catholic denominations. The one and same confession of antitypical Israel's sins and loosing of the Goat served for the Truth and nominal church sections of Azazel's Goat. But after those parts of the work were completed, shortly after our Pastor's death, the next step, leading to the Gate, was taken with its Truth section for two years and eight months before it was taken with its Protestant and Catholic sections. On Nov. 8, 9, 1916, in the reading of the correspondence on the London Tabernacle trouble sent to the Brooklyn office by the two opposing groups of its elders, we took an inner stand against the Libni Gershonite (British) section of that Goat, and on Nov. 25, 1916, at the London Bethel, we took an external stand against it, while at the public meeting in Philadelphia, Pa., held July 18, 1920, the first open resistance was made to the Protestant and Catholic sections of that Goat, and in the Double Herald of September 15, 1922, which, among other articles, contained one that is antitypical John's Rebuke, it, for the first time, worked on the Catholic section alone. The two king errors of the entire nominal church, the consciousness of the dead and eternal torment, were the main subjects on which especially the common revolutionisms of the Protestant and Catholic sections of Azazel's Goat were resisted—leading them to the Gate. This activity, as the antitype of Gideon's second

battle with the Midianites, the Amalekites and the Children of the East, we call, antitypical Gideon's Second Battle. This battle was waged by public lectures on the part of pilgrims, auxiliary pilgrims, evangelists, extension lecturers and local elders, by colporteur and sharpshooter work, by volunteer work and, of course, by conversations.

(86) The literature used by the colporteurs and sharpshooters consisted of a book called, *Life-Death-Hereafter*, and of its various chapters published separately as five Herald Extras (tracts), Herald No. 19 and the Hell and Spiritism booklets, sold as a combination or separately from house to house. The volunteers used the five Extras, distributing them Sundays to the worshipers at Protestant churches, as these left after the morning service. In some cases they were distributed from house to house, sent through the mails to the bereaved, given out in trains, buses, trolleys, etc., and handed to interestable persons as these were met. In the chapter on Gideon, Type and Antitype, in Vol. V, this matter is explained. True to the type, almost no effort was made to defend the two involved errors by the nominal-church exponents under the attacks of antitypical Gideon's Second Battle; for these fled from the attacks in mortal fear. However, in not a few cases they saw to it that volunteers were jailed and fined; and they succeeded in securing the taking away of second-class P. O. rates from our Extras. In this work tens of thousands of the above-mentioned book and booklets and millions of the above-mentioned Extras were distributed. There is scarcely a town in America, Canada, Jamaica, Canal Zone, Trinidad, British Guiana, certain countries of Europe, India and Burma, where we have ecclesiasties, where pertinent lectures were not delivered; in all of them (and in many others) the Extras were circulated; and in those where English, Polish and French are the languages used the colporteurs and sharpshooters distributed our

pertinent book and booklets. However, as shown by the fear of Gideon's firstborn to kill Zeba and Zalmunna, the Epiphany-enlightened brethren failed to wage this warfare sufficiently zealously and courageously to destroy faith entirely in the doctrines of the consciousness of the dead and eternal torment, which will be accomplished later by our Lord, perhaps with the co-operation of all Truth people.

(87) While toward the Protestant section of Azazel's Goat there has been no exclusive work done without involving its Catholic section, *i.e.*, nothing has been done in resisting its revolutionism, which is the antitype of leading the Goat to the Gate, without involving its Catholic section, there has been exclusive work done toward the Catholic section of Azazel's Goat. This is due to the latter's greater and more embracing revolutionism. Both sections of Azazel's Goat in the nominal church have been guilty of the revolutionism of teaching the consciousness of the dead and eternal torment; at least in America the Protestant denominations have not been guilty of a practical union of state and church, though the Lutheran Church in Germany, Scandinavia and the Baltic provinces, the Episcopal Church in England and the Presbyterian, or Reformed, Church in Scotland, Germany, Holland and Switzerland, have been guilty thereof, while the Romanist Church has been guilty of an actual union of church and state in many European and Latin American states and of a practical union with the state in America. Hence an exclusive attack has been made on her in America for her pertinent almost worldwide wrongs, especially in America. This attack has been by lectures, booklets, Herald Extras and the regular editions of the Herald since September 15, 1922, and that by the same kind of agents as were used in antitypical Gideon's Second Battle.

(88) The literature used by colporteurs and sharpshooters has been the Double Herald—Herald No.

14—which, if published in the same form as the Hell and Spiritism booklets, and in the same sized type as that of this book, would make a booklet of about 140 pages. Drawn up in the form of questions beginning with the words, "Do you know," in three articles it gives a general view of the papal Antichrist, and in another it gives a general view, under 14 heads, of the American hierarchy's political working understanding with the state. There have been 100,000 of these circulated. The pertinent literature used by the volunteers has been Elijah's Letter, which we reproduced in Vol. III, Chapter IV, and John's Rebuke, which we reproduced in its Chapter VII. Just short of 2,000,000 of each of these have been circulated, and that mainly from house to house in the form of Herald Extras. Some of these have been distributed at Protestant church doors and, of course, many from hand to hand and by "*wholesale*" use of Rural Route delivery. Then, ever since Nov. 15, 1922, The Herald of The Epiphany has been published, each issue of which has carried under the caption, Signs Of The Times, drawn up as "Do you know" questions, an article exposing the worldwide political meddling of, and its consequences to, the papacy, particularly in America. Thus there has been a years-long and widespread protest against Rome's symbolic harlotry. And Rome's reaction to this protest has been characteristically Romanist: among others, denunciations, arrests, jailings, magisterial and juridical trials, finings, mob violence, threats even of death to the author and the bombing of the Bible House, police intimidation, vile, threatening and anonymous letters and telephone calls, spyings, securing the removal of second-class privileges from Elijah's Letter and John's Rebuke and threats of the same against the regular issues of The Herald Of The Epiphany, etc. Despite these the protests go right on. The civil power's part in the above forms of restraints we recognize as the antitype of John's imprisonment.

(89) Immediately after starting the above-described resistance to the nominal-church section of Azazel's Goat, priestly fellowship was withdrawn from it—putting it through the Gate, since we then knew that all new creatures who remained in Babylon after Passover, 1916, were crown-losers; and thereupon it was delivered to the fit man in the sense of unfavorable circumstances. We can see that the Romanist Church is in the hands of the fit man in both senses of the term: in the worldwide criticism and disadvantageous position that she must endure, in making her desolate, naked and eating of her flesh, in Mexico, Italy, Germany, Spain, Russia, Jugo-Slavia, etc., and shortly in the rest of the European ten-languaged nations' forecast doing of these things (Rev. 17: 16). We can see this in the Protestant section of Azazel's Goat undergoing similar treatment in Germany, in the movement to disestablish the Episcopal Church in England, in the drying up of the support of antitypical Euphrates (Rev. 16: 12), etc. That both sections are in Azazel's hands we can recognize in the overspreading of abominations in doctrine and practice everywhere in Babylon, in the losing fight of the Fundamentalists with the Modernists, in their continued efforts to gain influence, support, etc., from the world, particularly from the state, which in due course brings them into increased trouble. These are only primary ills that the Protestant and Catholic sections of Azazel's Goat are receiving from the fit man and Azazel. The climax of their trouble at the hands of both will come in Armageddon, when their denominations, together with the beast and its image, will be destroyed (Rev. 18: 19), combined with much mental and physical sufferings for them (Rev. 14: 9-11). The shock and other ills that these experiences will bring to them will finally destroy their fleshly minds, primarily paving the way to their rescue from Babylonian doctrines and arrangements, and preparing them to receive the Truth, which,

secondarily, will thereafter cleanse them (Num. 8: 7, 21), and furnish them opportunities to serve God in spirit and Truth, and finally fit them to stand before the Throne and serve God in His Temple (Rev. 7: 9, 15).

(1) What is purposed in this article?

(2) What wrong view, derived from the expression, Scapegoat, is associated with this Goat? What Hebrew names are given the two Atonement Day goats? What do these names imply as to the uses of these goats? Cite and explain some Scriptures proving these uses.

(3) Explain the meaning and appropriateness of the name Azazel as associated with the antitypical second Goat. How has its course resulted for it?

(4) Explain the following Great Company acts and attainments with their pertinent Scriptures: (1) revolutionizing and supporting revolutionists, (2) spotting their garments, (3) failing to sacrifice thoroughly, (4) fellowshipping with the worldly, (5) accepting and teaching errors, (6) developing Babylonish systems, (7) usurping the Faithful's office, (8) persecuting the Faithful, (9) serving Satan, (10) having their flesh and works destroyed, (11) delivering their lives only, (12) meeting great disappointments, (13) cleansing themselves, (14) succeeding in their work, (15) gaining a subordinate spiritual nature and (16) becoming Levites and Noblemen.

(5) In what five books and five acts is the manifestation of the sins of God's nominal people especially described and typed?

(6) Whose High Priest confesses the sins over Azazel's Goat? What two facts prove this? Read corroborations of this from T. 49, par. 2; 51, par. 1; Z '10, 136, col. 2, par. 2; P '19, 89, col. 2, par. 4.

(7) What was "that Servant's" mental attitude on the time relation between the sprinkling of the blood of the antitypical Lord's Goat and the dealing with Azazel's Goat? Read two quotations in proof of this.

(8) What do the fulfilled facts on the subject prove? Why was "that Servant" uncertain on this subject? What three lines of his thought prove the truth on the subject? Read his expressions on these lines of thought.

(9) Why was he not permitted to see clearly on this point? What two parallel cases were veiled to conceal the chronology of the antitype? Why were they veiled? How do they prove the rule that types and prophecies connected with a trial cannot be clearly understood until the trial is met?

(10) What event occurred before the World's High Priest began to confess the sins over Azazel's Goat? Why should we expect this event to occur first? What six facts in this paragraph corroborate this thought?

(11) Additionally, what other fact corroborates this thought? What is typed in Lev. 16: 16, 18, 19 by making atonement for the Holy, the Tabernacle and the Altar?

(12) Explain the antitype of the three things done to the altar? How does this passage prove that the confession of the sins over Azazel's Goat began in the Fall of 1914?

(13) When did our Pastor say certainty would be had on this question of related chronology? How may we now answer the question? What is the last work of the World's High Priest while yet in the flesh? And what does this imply as to His last member?

(14) What three types in Lev. 16 show a different time order from that of their antitypes?

(15) What conclusion respecting all Great Company members may we draw from the fact that by the Fall of 1914 all the members of Christ were in existence? Why is this conclusion valid? What work could then be undertaken?

(16) What conditions existed making the Fall of 1914 the appropriate time to begin to confess the sins over Azazel's Goat?

(17) What is meant typically and antitypically by the expression, Aaron "shall bring the live goat"?

(18) In what seven ways did the World's High Priest bring Azazel's Goat near before the Lord?

(19) What was typed by Aaron's laying his hands on the head of the live goat? What parallel acts prove this? How may we answer the objection that the goat typed the Great Company's humanity? What teaching is corroborated by this type? What class did not exist as such when the World's High Priest laid His hands on the head of

Azazel's Goat? What had they lost by that time? How do these considerations refute the claims that Azazel's goat represents our Lord's humanity?

(20) How did the World's High Priest antitypically lay His hands upon the head of the live Goat?

(21) What kinds of sins were not, and what kind of sins were confessed over Azazel's Goat? How is this proven in Lev. 16: 21? How does Ps. 107: 17 corroborate this? What is the purpose of the atoning work of Azazel's Goat?

(22) In what condition was Israel in the Camp? and what does this type? What peculiar doctrines have the four organized groups of Christendom claimed? Define and explain the right claimed by each of these four groups.

(23) What are the inherent character and practical results of these four doctrines? What are the leading wrongs flowing from the doctrine of the Divine right of kings? What must we conclude with reference to each of these wrongs?

(24) What are the leading wrongs flowing from the doctrine of the Divine right of the aristocracy? What must we conclude with reference to each of these wrongs?

(25) What are the leading wrongs flowing from the doctrine of the Divine right of the clergy? What must we conclude as to each of these wrongs?

(26) What are the leading wrongs flowing from the doctrine of the Divine right of labor? What must we conclude with reference to each of them? Which of these four classes is the least guilty?

(27) What did the World's High Priest from 1914 to 1916 do with these wrongs? By what means was this done? How did His work of that time on this line compare with it at other times? Why was this so? What do the fulfilled facts of that time prove?

(28) What effect did this confession have on the prospective Great Company? What re-enforced this effect? What was the final impression made upon the prospective Great Company by our Pastor's later teaching on the smiting of Jordan? As a result, how did they act? How can we prove that theirs was the second smiting of Jordan?

(29) What is meant, type and antitype, by putting the

sins upon the head of Azazel's Goat? Cite and explain corroborative passages. How was this done in the antitype?

(30) How many of the Great Company are represented by Azazel's Goat? In what two religious spheres do we find these? Point out from the standpoint of the time of their coming into the Truth the antitypes of Elisha, Miriam, Lot, Abihu, Jambres, the Virgin of Cant. 5, Rahab, Eli and the Foolish Virgins. Why is it necessary to understand these time distinctions?

(31) What is the time difference in dealing with these two sections of Azazel's Goat: (1) from the standpoint of confessing over it the sins of the people and (2) from the standpoint of all the subsequent steps? With what section only until July 18, 1920, have these subsequent steps been taken? When and with what did the work toward the other section begin? Who would seek to fulfill the type? Who only would fulfill it?

(32) Why should we avoid speculating on these subsequent steps in the case of Azazel's Goat in the nominal church? To which section of Azazel's Goat will we in the rest of this article limit our study? Why? From what six standpoints will we view it?

(33) What thought is neither stated nor implied in the A. V. respecting the live goat? In what is that thought implied? Give some definitions of the word translated "present," "presented." (Lev. 16:7, 10.) What typical and antitypical facts prove these definitions? To whom does and to whom does not the antitype apply? Why?

(34) How did the typical and antitypical Goat act while tied at the door of the Tabernacle? How and by whom was this Goat class hindered from obtaining its liberty?

(35) When was the loosening of the Goat class due to begin and end? By what acts was it loosed? What prevented its loosing previously? What groups showed restiveness before being loosed, in America and in Britain? What antitypical jerkings in Britain and America accompanied the loosing of the Goat? What antityped the first jerkings of the Goat just before the High Priest began to lead it to the Gate?

(36) Why do we assume that the live goat was tied by two knots? What were the antitypical rope and knots?

How were the two antitypical knots untied? What are the main historical facts connected with the loosing of the first knot holding the antitypical Goat, in Britain? What two coincidences occurred on the same dates as two of those historical facts? When during the confessing of the sins did the first part of the antitypical loosing begin and when did it end?

(37) By what was the second antitypical knot untied? Under what circumstances and when did it begin and end? How did the untying of the first knot proceed in America? What warning was raised against the error accompanying the loosing of the first knot, and how was the warning stated?

(38) What did clarifying the subject from this loosing of Azazel's Goat onward require of its expounder? What was his relation to the leaders' contentions for power? When and how did he first learn of American and British brethren contending for power?

(39) Into what kind of a position was he put when first set to work in co-operating under the Lord with others in leading the Goat to the Gate? Of what did he not surmise brethren to be capable? How did their wrongs affect him? Toward what sets of leaders was he so affected? How does he not and how does he think of his work?

(40) Under what circumstances may one with the Lord's approval modestly speak of his work? What facts prove this? What reasons required the writer of "Azazel's Goat" to write of his work?

(41) How could the writer of Harvest Siftings Reviewed have unanswerably proven his credentials bonafide? Why did he then withhold, and why did he three years later give this proof? What were the facts then withheld and since given? What seems to have put Bro. Hemery against Bro. Shearn's plan as to control of Tabernacle arrangements? What seems to prove this?

(42) Give the occurrences from November 3 to November 11, 1917, which prove that the credentials were not given to obtain passports, but were bonafide.

(43) What principle and facts prove the credentials to have been binding as between the Society's Board and their recipient? How do this principle and these facts hold as to the act of the Executive Committee? What

judgment should be passed on the claim that his credentials were neither valid nor bonafide?

(44) What facts as to the Tabernacle schedules prove that he saw the Tabernacle correspondence before leaving for Europe? How did he refrain from violating the Executive Committee's charge to keep secret the matter of his having seen and read the Tabernacle correspondence before leaving for Europe?

(45) How did the knowledge of the Tabernacle correspondence affect him? How did he overcome this? How did he balance his attitude toward the three managers? How were his hopes as to making peace disappointed? How only had the conduct of Bros. Shearn and Crawford been set forth up to and including the article on Azazel's Goat?

(46) What seven things were done with respect to the revolutionism of Azazel's Goat? Who directed in these seven things? What did they accomplish?

(47) By what proportionate number of the pertinent Under-priests in the flesh and in the Epiphany work were the various sections of Azazel's Goat led to the Gate and fit man? Show how with six groups of leaders this was done.

(48) How are unmanifested crown-losers related to the World's High Priest? Give an example in proof. How does this consideration explain the contradictory conduct of certain brethren? When only will it be certain whether one will remain in the World's High Priest?

(49) By what three ways can we prove that the World's High Priest leads Azazel's Goat to the Gate?

(50) What three things may we reasonably infer the live goat did as it was led to the Gate? For what two reasons may we draw this inference? What things have occurred in the antitype suggestive of tuggings, jerkings and buttings?

(51) What have been the two stages in the beginning and in the ending of leading Azazel's Goat members to the Gate and delivering them to the fit man? What have been the acts and dates of these two startings and deliverings in the cases of (1) Bro. Shearn, (2) Bro. Hemery, (3) J.F. Rutherford, (52) (4) Bro. Sturgeon, (53) (5) Bro. Ritchie, (54) and (6) Bro. Hoskins?

(55) What is involved in conducting leaders to the fit man? What do the fulfilled acts imply as to frequency of conducting individuals of Azazel's Goat to the fit man? What is meant by a general act? What does each general act require to be done to its doer? Give an illustration.

(56) What two terms have been used with reference to conducting Azazel's Goat to the Gate? Which is the preferable one?

(57) What are the two definitions of the fit man? In what two ways are these definitions proven correct? Explain 1 Cor. 5:3-5 as showing the activity of three groups of the World's High Priest delivering a Great Company member to the fit man as unfavorable circumstances and to Azazel. Show how 1 Tim.1: 19, 20 gives the same line of thought. Show how Lev. 16: 8, 10, 26 shows the fit man to represent persecuting persons. Why is Satan not the fit man?

(59) Whose High Priest delivers Azazel's Goat to the fit man? How can this be proved by Scriptures and facts?

(60) By what act is Azazel's Goat passed through the antitypical Gate? By what acts is it delivered to the fit man? What does and what does this not imply? What Scriptures and facts prove these things?

(61) Wherein do and wherein do not the Head and Body cooperate in delivering Azazel's Goat to the fit man? Why should our Lord alone deliver them to the fit man as persecuting persons? Of what have some of the Underpriests been falsely accused in this respect? How far may these go in delivering the Goat to the fit man? After doing these things, to whom should they leave them? What should they not give them? How should they act in so responsible a matter?

(62) What is meant by leading the Goat to the wilderness? Who serve as marked examples of being led to the wilderness? When did J.F. Rutherford's fit-man experience begin? How did this manifest itself from the Board's correspondence with him and the circumstances of his trip? What additional things did he and his supporters do showing them to be in unfavorable circumstances?

(63) What in their careers shows fit-man experiences from the standpoint of the fit man as persecuting persons? How did they seek to represent these experiences? And

what false charge did they bring against others on this point? What need the fit man as persecutors not be?

(64) In what respect are all of the stages of the antitypical Goat's experiences similar?

(65) What is typed by letting Azazel's goat go in the wilderness? How does 1 Cor. 5: 11, 13 prove this? What will this experience mean to the nominal-church section of Azazel's Goat? What is the difference between the Priesthood's part in delivering Azazel's Goat to the fit man and its being let go in the wilderness? How does the history of the effort to mediate between the Board's majority and J.F. Rutherford illustrate this difference so far as the dealings with the latter are concerned? How was this illustrated in the dealings of the Board's majority with him from July 27 onward? How has he been ever since from the standpoint of the British and Board matter? In what other brothers' experiences were the same lines of thought in evidence?

(66) How was this principle exemplified in the experience of the Society leaders in bonds? How often and in what connection are we to expect to see this same principle exemplified?

(67) In what two ways does Azazel's Goat fall into Azazel's hand? Prove this. What are the Lord's two purposes in this? Why can this stage of the experiences of Azazel's Goat not be given in detail? How does J.F. Rutherford's course on July 25, 1917, illustrate this?

(68) On July 27 and 29 and August 8? How has his course since that time illustrated this? What alternative is before him and all others like him?

(69) Who else have undergone similar experiences? How often will the individuals of the Great Company fall into Azazel's hands? What should the Priests do at each general act of revolutionism on the part of members of Azazel's Goat? What effect should the Levites' misunderstandings and imputations of evil motives have on the Priests? What is to be the outcome, and what should we do with respect to it?

(70) What are the seven typical stages in the experiences of Azazel's Goat? Briefly define the antitype of each of these stages.

(71) What must the antitypical Levites do to share in

suffering for the willful sins of the world, and to gain life? What will result from a failure to do this? What should the sense of their danger prompt us to do for them?

(72) When and by whom was an outline of our study given? How do the outline and the detailed fulfillment agree? Who is privileged to see these things now? How should this knowledge affect us?

(73) Before what did the Great Company not exist as a class? What followed from this fact? What, accordingly, did God forbid? How were all the consecrated, accordingly, to be regarded and received? What distinction was then not made? What occurred through the separation? What did the Great Company yet remain? How should they no longer be treated? What occurred in this respect in 1917? Why? How do the cited passages show this? Whether consciously or unconsciously, what did those do who withdrew from the revolutionistic brethren? Of what forms does priestly fellowship consist? How have we, accordingly, refused to regard the Society's new light? What does this imply? How have we refused to regard their alleged strengthening food? What does this imply? How have we refused to regard and co-operate in their sufferings connected with their works? What does this imply? What is implied from the three standpoints just presented? What have we not withdrawn from them? How is this shown as to some teachings? As to the antitypical laver? As to the antitypical Bullock's blood? What follows as to both kinds of fellowship? What results therefrom? Why is God pleased with our pertinent course?

(74) What has the increasing Epiphany Truth enabled us to see as to the Great Company? Who are the antitypical Merarites? Who are the antitypical Gershonites?

(75) What must all admit? What question remains? How is it to be answered as to the Societyites and Standfasts? The P.B.I.?

(76) What priestly activity do the Levites condemn? What do they dogmatically announce? What refutes their claim? How so? What forbidden judging do they misapply? What passages sanction Epiphany judging? How in each case? Which of these passages does so especially? How is this passage frequently misapplied? To what kind

of judging does this passage not apply? What kind of judging does it forbid? While misapplying this judgment to be delayed until we are on the Throne, what do Levites charge that we usurp by our present judging? As to time what do they claim of it? With what kind of judgment is the priesthood not charged? Why not? For what has the priesthood always waited? Then what did it do? When? What cannot be pointed out? Why not? For what has the priesthood always waited? After that what has it done?

(77) What else has the priesthood not done, though accused thereof? What kind of judging does 1 Cor. 4: 5 command? What will clarify this subject? What kind of manifestation did the Lord make during the Parousia? Before such Parousia manifestation what would have been pertinently wrong? What not so afterward? What was our Pastor's pertinent Parousia course? How does the pertinent article read, as abridged in *The Present Truth*, No. 180? What announcement would have been wrong, if made during the Parousia? Why? When do the passages quoted by Levites from our Pastor's writings against such judging apply? What is violated by applying them to the Epiphany? What passages from that Servant's writings on judging as proper apply to the Epiphany? What does he say therein? What is wrong in the pertinent Levites' course as to these passages and those applying to the Parousia?

(78) When does the separation between the Little Flock and the Great Company occur? How do the cited passages show this? What has our Lord Jesus been doing with the Great Company since 1914? By and for what is He manifesting them as crown-losers? Why and under what circumstances is it no longer forbidden, but commanded to announce them as such? What is proper to do now? What were our Pastor's pertinent thoughts? Hence what did he not condemn, on the contrary approve? What judging would be wrong in the Epiphany?

(79) What will our Lord bring to light in the Basileia? What stage of His Second Advent is it? What will He thereby manifest? What would be wrong before He does this? When will it be no longer wrong? How should this discussion on judging be summed up for the Parousia?

For the Epiphany? For the Basileia? What conclusion do we draw as to the application of 1 Cor. 4: 5 as to judging? What does this do with the Levites' pertinent contention?

(80) By what was J.F.R.'s letter, written just before he was sent to Atlanta, circulated? Against whom was it written? Of what did it accuse them? What was the natural effect of such charges on his adherents? Who repeated them before a class?

(81) What statement was first made in answer to these charges? What was the author's course before the pertinent arrest? Afterwards among the brethren? Before the prosecutor? What was the effect on the prosecutor? What message was by the author sent to J.F.R. through Bro. Herr? Despite this, what did J.F.R. do? What was the author's course as to attendance at the trial? What effect did Bro. Herr's reporting his pertinent activities have on many Societyites? What is the story of a pertinent meeting on a street? With what was this courtesy not allowed to interfere?

(82) *Humanly* speaking, what did not bring the Society leaders into trouble with the government? What four acts precipitated them into this trouble? How could the first and main one of these causes have been avoided? Despite their false accusations, what made the author rejoice? Into what did their accusations fit? Into what do they not fit? What, seemingly, were the causes of their imprisonment? What, in other words?

(83) What was the pertinent course of the other six accused brothers? What view of the author's did they endorse? To whom did R. H. Hirsh express sympathy during the trial? What pertinent thing did he do for the accused? What prevented his expressing sympathy with all of them during the trial? What did the author not do as to their release? What inconsistent course did the indicted leaders pursue as to R. H. Hirsh during the trial? What does this prove that they sought to do with him? What does this show of them?

(84) What is characteristic of Satan and of many of his servants? What does he do to overthrow the influence of Truth servants? What does he, accordingly, do? For what does this account as to his course against our

Lord, Paul and that Servant? How does Satan use those false teachers and frauds who cannot meet the exposures of them? For what will this account? What did he add thereto? On these falsehoods being proven to be such, what did Satan's mouthpieces falsely charge? On the refutation of these falsehoods and the author's proof that J.F.R. was that evil servant and the foolish, unprofitable shepherd, what did Satan give them to spread? What falsehoods, under the lead of Clayton Woodworth, did Satan then give them to spread? What was Satan's purpose therein? Whom does he find as ready mouthpieces for such falsehoods? What should be the effect on God's people who for righteousness' sake suffer such evils? Why are such Epiphany experiences allowed as to the three involved classes?

(85) What have we discussed foregoing? Where is the larger section of Azazel's Goat? How are they distributed? What confession of antitypical Israel's sins and loosing of the Goat applied to the whole of Azazel's Goat? When was that work completed? What then set in? How long did this work continue before it began to turn to the Protestant and Catholic sections of Azazel's Goat? With what and when did resisting the revolutionisms of its Truth section begin internally? Externally? When and with what did it begin toward its Protestant and Catholic sections? Its Catholic section alone? What are the two king errors of the nominal church? How and against whom were these errors pertinently used? Of what is this activity an antitype? What three special forms of work characterize it? Who engaged in the lecture work?

(86) What literature has been used by the colporteurs and sharpshooters? What was used by the volunteers? What methods of distribution did they use? Where will details on this work be found? True to the type, what did the exponents of the two king errors fail to do? How did they act in the battle? What did they do in lieu of answering? How much literature has been distributed in this battle? How widespread has the lecture work been? The volunteer work? The colporteur and sharpshooter work? What, as typed by the course of Gideon's firstborn, have the Epiphany brethren failed to do? When

will the work be completed against the two king errors? Through whose co-operation perhaps?

(87) What kind of work has not been done toward the Protestant section of Azazel's Goat that has been done toward its Romanist section? Why so? Of what have both of them been guilty? Of what has its Protestant section not been guilty in America? Where has it been guilty thereof? Of what has Rome been guilty? Where in general? In particular? What has resulted therefrom? Especially where? What forms have these attacks assumed? By what means?

(88) What literature has been used by colporteurs and sharpshooters therein? How large a booklet would it make? Of what does it consist? How many have been circulated? What pertinent literature has been used by the volunteers? Where are these reproduced? How many of each of these have been circulated? In what three ways mainly? What has The Herald Of The Epiphany done in this matter in each issue since Nov. 15, 1922? What, accordingly, has been done in this respect? What has Rome's reaction been to this activity? Despite this, what has continued? What is to be recognized in the civil authority's part in some of these reactions?

(89) What set in immediately after starting the above described resistance to Azazel's Goat in the nominal church? Why immediately thereafter? What occurred thereupon? Wherein do we see that the Romanist part of Azazel's Goat is in the fit man's hands in both senses of the fit man? The Protestant part? What indicates that both sections of Azazel's Goat in the nominal church is in Azazel's hands? What kind of ills are these to them? Wherein will the climax of their sufferings come? Of what will they consist? What primary effects will these have upon them? Secondary effects? Final effects?

DAVID'S LAMENTATION OVER SAUL AND JONATHAN.

Thy beauty, Israel, is gone
Slain in the places high is he:
The mighty now are overthrown;
O thus how cometh it to be!
Let not this news their streets throughout,
In Gath or Askalon, be told;

For fear Philistia's daughters flout,
Lest vaunt the uncircumcised should.

On you, hereafter, let no dew,
 You mountains of Gilboa, fall:
Let there be neither showers on you,
 Nor fields that breed an offering shall,
For there with shame away was thrown,
 The target of the strong (alas),
The shield of Saul, e'en as of one
 That ne'er with oil anointed was.

Nor from their blood that slaughter'd lay,
 Nor from the fat of strong men slain,
Came Jonathan his bow away,
 Nor drew forth Saul his sword in vain.
In lifetime they were lovely fair,
 In death they undivided are.
More swift than eagles of the air,
 And stronger they than lions were.

Weep, Israel's daughters, weep for Saul,
 Who you with scarlet hath array'd;
Who clothed you with pleasures all,
 And on your garments gold hath laid.
How comes it he, that mighty was,
 The foil in battle doth sustain!
Thou, Jonathan, oh thou (alas)
 Upon thy places high wert slain!

And much distressed is my heart,
 My brother Jonathan, for thee;
My very dear delight thou wert,
 And wondrous was thy love to me;
So wondrous, it surpassed far
 The love of women (every way).
Oh, how the mighty fallen are!
 How warlike instruments decay!

CHAPTER IV. LEPROSY—TYPE AND ANTITYPE.

LEPROSY'S TWO TYPICAL SIGNIFICANCES. BRINGING THE LEPER TO THE PRIEST. SYMPTOMS OF LEPROSY. JUDGING. SIX FORMS OF LEPROSY. FIRST FORM, TYPICAL OF SIN. SECOND FORM, TYPICAL OF SELFISHNESS. THIRD FORM, TYPICAL OF WORLDLINESS. FOURTH FORM, TYPICAL OF ERROR GENERAL PRINCIPLES APPLICABLE TO ALL FOUR FORMS. FIFTH FORM, TYPICAL OF POWER-GRASPING AND LORDING. SIXTH FORM, TYPICAL OF SECTARIANISM. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

IN THIS chapter it is purposed to study the details on leprosy as these are given in Lev. 13 and 14. Leprosy is one of the most dreaded of diseases, not the least dreadful feature of which is its almost incurability. It is largely an Asiatic disease, though it is sometimes found outside of Asia. When it covered the entire person it typed the Adamic depravity (Lev. 13: 12, 13), but when it covered but part of the body it typed Great Company uncleanness. Apart from vs. 12, 13, Lev. 13 and 14 treat of leprosy as being only in parts of the body, or of a garment, or of a house. We could not understand why one entirely covered by leprosy should be counted clean from the standpoint of Lev. 13 and 14 and one be counted unclean, if he had leprosy only in a part of his person, unless the Lord intended to bring out two kinds of leprosy in the antitype, one in the type having it universally being considered as typing a person or class having a different kind of antitypical leprosy from that typed by one who had it only in parts of his body. As we look at the specific kinds of leprosy mentioned in Lev. 13 and 14, apart from the case mentioned in Lev. 13: 12, 13, we find that they always refer to specifically located forms of it: the swelling (Lev. 13: 9-11, 14-17), the boil (vs. 18-23), the fevered spot (vs. 24-28), leprosy in the head (vs. 29-44), leprosy in a garment (vs. 47-59) and leprosy

in a house (Lev. 14: 33-53). While leprosy covering the whole body fittingly types the Adamic corruption, which depraves all men in every one of their faculties and qualities, a localized form of leprosy would not represent such a condition as is common to all men. It must type the uncleanness that is localized in one class. This class, for various reasons that will come out as we proceed with our study, is the Great Company. Hence, localized leprosy types Great Company uncleanness.

(2) Leprous Miriam (Num. 12) is the classic type of the Great Company in their uncleanness. As unleprous Aaron in Num. 12 types faultfinding, busybodying Little Flock members feebly interfering with and contradicting Jesus as He speaks through His special mouthpieces, so leprous Miriam represents faultfinding and busybodying Great Company members grossly interfering with and contradicting Jesus as He speaks through His special mouthpieces. Her becoming leprous represents how such Great Company members become unclean in doctrine (1 Tim. 1: 19, 20) and life (1 Cor. 5: 1-4), as her being driven without the camp represents the disfellowship that falls to the lot of the unclean Great Company (1 Tim. 1: 20; 1Cor. 5: 5, 9-13). Naaman, the Syrian (2 Kings 5), is a type of radical Society leaders in 1919, 1920. Gehazi and his house made leprous (2 Kings 5: 27) type J.F.R. and his special supporters as having Great Company uncleanness put upon them perpetually. Uzziah (2 Chro. 26: 19-23) types J.F.R. becoming manifest as in Great Company uncleanness in 1917 in connection with his busybodying as the executive of a corporation in a certain priestly work in England. Please see Vol. III, Chapter VI, for details of the antitypes of Naaman's and Gehazi's leprosy. Uzziah's we will discuss sometime later. We merely cite them here as types of Great Company uncleanness. While these cases will help us to see that localized

leprosy types Great Company uncleanness, the specific proofs will appear as we give the details of Lev. 13 and 14. With these generalities given we are ready to take up the details of these chapters.

(3) Jehovah speaking to Moses and Aaron (v. 1), types God in the Gospel Age, especially in the Jewish and Gospel Harvests, and more particularly in the Epiphany, speaking to Jesus, as His Executive, Mouthpiece and Leader for Spiritual Israel (Moses) and as the Church's High Priest (Aaron). V. 2 gives some symptoms that may indicate leprosy, though they do not necessarily do so, as the sequel shows. However, they were sufficient to arouse the fear that their possessors might have leprosy. Hence the charge that the person with these symptoms be brought to Aaron or to one of his sons. As only generalities are given on these symptoms in vs. 2-8 and the details are given from v. 9 onward, we will not here explain the antitypes of the rising (swelling), scab or bright spot, but will leave them for discussion when we come to the details; for as we proceed we will see that vs. 2-8 give a general, not specific discussion of leprosy. Aaron here types our Lord as our High Priest. Bringing the leprosy-suspect to Aaron represents bringing to our Lord as High Priest as He acts through His special eye, mouth and hand, one suspected of Great Company uncleanness for investigation of the case. That the leprosy here typed cannot mean the Adamic depravity is evident from the fact that there is no need of an investigation as to whether one has it or not, since all men have it by heredity, and all priests are fully aware of this fact. Hence the suspected leprosy here types suspected Great Company uncleanness, which must be investigated in order to determine whether Great Company uncleanness is present or not. Here, then, is our first specific reason for claiming that, apart from that of vs. 12, 13, the leprosy of Lev. 13 and 14 types Great Company uncleanness. A

second reason is this: We do not bring to the Priesthood Adamic depravity for an investigation of its presence or absence, since the Priesthood's work is now, in the Gospel Age, not specifically with the Adamic sin, but with God's people and only exceptionally with the sins of God's people, in so far as they deal with sin as priests. How is the antitypical bringing done? By the Lord's people opposing the uncleanness of the Great Company, *i.e.*, opposing their revolutionistic teachings and practices. So do we bring such to the antitypical Aaron or to one of the antitypical priests.

(4) Some details on the antitype are necessary to be given here, if it is to be properly understood. How are such antitypical lepers brought by us now to our High Priest's notice for investigation? Certainly not to Him as such to investigate; for He knows the case before any of us suspect it; for He knew when each crown-loser lost his crown, which in all cases happened before October, 1914. How, then, are they brought to Him for investigation? We answer: They are brought to Him for investigation *as He acts through His special eye, mouth and hand*. That this is true we can see from the case presented in 1 Cor. 5—the Corinthian brother who, marrying his stepmother, became guilty of incest. The Lord Jesus knew of this incest as it was committed, and knew of the involved willfulness as it was being exercised. But His *special* eye, mouth and hand on that occasion, Paul, did not know the details; and as he therein acted as Jesus' eye, mouth and hand (in the name of our Lord Jesus, with the power of our Lord Jesus—v. 4), he had to investigate the case in order to pronounce a proper decision on it. Hence we understand that Aaron here types our Lord as He acts in His special eye, mouth and hand. Since inspiration ceased, Jesus did not act through an eye, mouth and hand for such purposes until the Epiphany, for it required Inspiration

to know who belonged to the Great Company, before God began to deal with it as with a class during the Epiphany. Hence to bring a Great Company suspect to the antitypical Aaron now means for such a one to be brought to the investigating and judgment-pronouncing activity of our Lord as He acts through the Epiphany messenger. No other individual as such is used by our Lord for such activity.

(5) But one may object, Does not v. 2 say that the suspect may be brought to an under-priest? We answer, Yes. But that under-priest does not type an individual priest, which would have been the case had his name been given as typing an individual in the end of the Age. But as no name is given he does not type an individual in the end of the Age or any other time, though if for another time, such a named priest, if Eleazar, would have typed the Twelve, not an individual, if Ithamar, the 35 star members (not an individual) between the two Harvests. What, then, is typed by the leprosy-investigating and decision-pronouncing underpriest? Fortunately, as in the case of the eye, mouth and hand of antitypical Aaron, we have a New Testament Scripture (1 Cor. 5: 4) to give us the answer to our pertinent inquiry, so have we a New Testament Scripture to give us the answer to our present inquiry. It is also 1 Cor. 5: 4, 5. Here we are told that in addition to our Lord acting through Paul as His eye, mouth and hand, the Corinthian ecclesia acted, and in v. 13 is commanded so to act. Accordingly, we understand that an under-priest investigating and deciding on a leper suspect types an ecclesia investigating and deciding on a Great Company suspect. Accordingly, we conclude that no ecclesia member as an individual has the right to investigate and pass on a Great Company suspect. This, apart from the High Priest acting through His special eye, mouth and hand, can be done only by an ecclesia, and that alone in the case of members of that ecclesia. No ecclesia can do

this as to members of another ecclesia, because an ecclesia does not have its sphere of activity in other ecclesiasties. The General Church is cared for in this matter by our Lord alone, acting through His eye, mouth and hand toward the General Church.

(6) The first clause of v. 3 tells of the examination of the leper-suspect. This types that the antitypical priest will examine the Great Company suspect, which proves that the Lord does not desire the priest to shut his eyes to the facts of the case, as certain ones have decried the antitypical examination as uncovering one of the robe, but desires a careful inspection of the actual condition of the Great Company suspect to be made. The middle clauses of v. 3 give the two unfailing symptoms of real leprosy; the sore must (1) make the hair within it turn white, and (2) must be deeper than the surface of the skin, deeper than skin deep. What is wrong with the hair turned white in such a case? It has deteriorated, has become depraved. What does this type? Hair in Bible symbols types the powers of God's people, real or nominal, as can be seen from the hair of Samson (Judges 16: 17, 19, 22, 30) and of those who had hair like women (nominal churches, Rev. 9: 8). The primary power of the real people of God is the Truth (Dan. 8: 12; 12: 7); and their secondary power is the Divine arrangements for doing the Lord's work. With these two things on their side they are invincible. For their symbolic hair to turn white means a corruption of the Truth and its arrangements setting in. Hence one of the symptoms of Great Company uncleanness is their corrupting the Truth and its arrangements—revolutionism against the Truth and the Truth arrangements, or to put it another way, to set aside the Truth and to put error in its place and to set aside the Lord's arrangements and to put others in their place. In other words, the hair turning white in the sore represents what is told us in literal language in Ps. 107: 10, 11,

which for years we have recognized to give the mark or indication of Great Company uncleanness.

(7) But v. 3 gives a second symptom that must be present before one could with certainty be declared to be a leper. The sore must not be merely a superficial one, only skin deep. It must be deeper than the skin, "in sight be deeper than the skin of his flesh." In other words, it had to be a deep-seated evil. This represents the fact that the revolutionism must be persistently willful. Hence, as we have repeatedly pointed out, the revolutionism must be persistent, refusing to yield to loving dissuasion, exhortation and expostulation, before one is to be considered in the Great Company, one of the symbolic lepers. Why must such willfulness be added to the revolutionism? Because all priests, except Jesus, have made mistakes on matters of teaching and arrangement, which would mean, if only the symbolic hair turning white would be a sure proof of Great Company uncleanness, that all priests, except Jesus, would drop into the Great Company; hence there would be no Little Flock; for in many things we all err. *E.g.*, how often in our Berean studies we give mistaken answers! In our services we often use wrong methods for doing the Lord's work. But these of themselves alone would not cause us to have Great Company uncleanness. It is only when persistency therein against loving dissuasion, exhortation and expostulation sets in that the case is one of Great Company uncleanness; for the faithful under such dissuasion, exhortation and expostulation give up their errors and wrong arrangements. This shows that their aberrations were of weakness and not of willfulness. Hence only then can we be sure that we are dealing with Great Company uncleanness, when in a new creature we see a corruption of the Truth and its arrangements (the hair turned white) and a steadfast persistence therein (deeper than the skin). Thus,

in the type and antitype infallible symptoms of typical and antitypical leprosy prevail.

(8) In the type when a priest would see the two typical symptoms—the hair turned white and the plague deeper than the skin—he was to declare the patient leprous—unclean (v. 3). In the antitype, when the investigating priest sees in a new creature persistent revolutionism against the Truth and its arrangements, he is to declare the guilty one to be antitypically leprous, to have Great Company uncleanness. This has been going on ever since 1917, and that despite the protests of the antitypical lepers and sometimes of uninformed priests, who cry out against this Divinely commanded work as "judging." It is true that after the Apostles fell asleep until the Epiphany, it was a forbidden thing to pronounce one guilty of Great Company uncleanness, because until the Epiphany set in, it required inspiration to diagnose a case of Great Company uncleanness, and such inspiration ceased with the death of the last Apostle. It is only since the Epiphany set in that the Lord has revealed to us the token of Great Companyship. Hence, apart from inspiration, none could, before learning this token, know who was in the Great Company. For this reason, that token not being known before the Epiphany, our Pastor repeatedly warned the brethren not to judge as to who are in the Great Company, a proper warning for the time before the Epiphany; though he clearly taught that this judgment would come in "the end of the Age"—the Epiphany (See Z '10, 243-245; Z '11, 120-122, 349; Z '14, 38, 79; Z '16, 264; 1916 Convention Report, 191, Question 10; etc.). The Epiphany (2 Tim. 4: 1) being the time for the separation of the Little Flock and the Great Company, who are included in the expression "quick," of course those who would cooperate with the Lord intelligently in that separating work would have to know the token of Great Companyship—persistent revolutionism

against the Truth and its arrangements. Hence our Pastor taught (Convention Report 1916, page 191, Question 10) that when the separation between the Little Flock and the Great Company would set in, it would be proper to point out who is in the Great Company. This judging *after* the time is commanded in 1 Cor. 4: 5 and in Lev. 13: 3, 8, 15, 20, 22, 25, 27, 30, 36, 44; and those who denounce it are denouncing what God commands, and of course they will have to make amends for such a course, which in some is a matter of ignorance, in many is more or less of arrogance, and in some is more or less willful. Just as the chief objection in the great nominal church to the Parousia Truth expressed itself in the words, "A second chance"! so the chief objection in the little nominal church to the Epiphany Truth and work expresses itself in the word, "Judging"!

(9) Vs. 4-6 treat of cases that are not advanced sufficiently to receive a final judgment, but are still of the leprosy-suspect kind and therefore should be held under scrutiny, under surveillance. The bright spot turning white, *i.e.*, becoming like the well skin, types the revolutionism being displaced by the Truth and Truth arrangement in the suspect, under pertinent teachings. Its not being deeper than the skin types the lack of persistency in the revolutionism. Its not turning the hair white types the revolutionism being but very slight or on an unweighty matter. Still the one who was thus conditioned became a leprosy-suspect in the type and had to be treated accordingly—shut up seven days, put under sufficient observation. This types the fact that if one hovers dangerously near Great Company uncleanness, he is to be put under surveillance, under observation, the *seven* days typing that it is to be done *fully* and *sufficiently*, *i.e.*, the investigating priest, the Lord's special eye, mouth and hand, or an ecclesia, is not to be hasty in arriving at a decision in the case; he or it is not to take snap judgment

in the case. He or it is to take plenty of time and make very careful observations before coming to a decision; for a wrong decision means much of evil to all concerned. Hence the Lord arranged the type to show that He would give the antitypical instruction on the mode and spirit of procedure as just outlined. The shutting up implied more or less of restraint in the type, and typifies that the suspect is to endure more or less restraint from the investigating priest, whose investigating activities of themselves put him under more or less of restraint.

(10) As v. 4 shows that the priest is not to be too quick to pronounce a person leprous, so v. 5 shows that he is not to be too quick to pronounce him clean. This is indicated by the statement that even if the plague has not in the first seven days increased, the suspect is not to be pronounced clean, but to be shut up seven days more; because a sufficiency of time may not have been allowed for the disease to manifest its real nature yet. So in the antitype the investigating priest is not to be in a hurry. If the second investigation does not suffice, a third should be undertaken and the case be treated as under observation, until a full, proper decision can be reached, when, if no persistent revolutionism appears, the brother should be declared as not guilty of Great Company uncleanness (v. 6). In the type if the plague was but a scab, which of course would not be leprosy, the suspect should be declared clean. In the antitype the fault would be one of weakness or ignorance, a thing which of course all under-priests have; hence the suspect should be declared free of Great Company uncleanness. The suspect washing his clothes types the brother ridding himself by the Word of the weakness or ignorance, which leaves him antitypically clean (v. 6). But if after the first seven days when the suspect was seen by the priest for his cleansing, the scab spread, the priest should see him again. Antitypically

this would mean that if after the first period of observation the antitypical priest should find the suspect developing unfavorable symptoms, he should still wait a while longer in hopes that the brother might yet recover himself, in the meantime exhorting the suspect to reformation (v. 7). But if after these three attempts to bring such an one to repentance the revolutionism spreads, then the investigating priest is to pronounce him guilty of Great Company uncleanness, which implies that he will withdraw priestly fellowship from him. Our study of vs. 1-8 results in our recognizing that they give us only generalities, not particularities, on leprosy—type and antitype. The details will come out in the rest of the chapter. The whole procedure given in vs. 1-8 proves that no reference here is made to leprosy as typing the Adamic depravity, which without any investigation we all know exists in all, while the kind here referred to antitypically is limited only to certain ones and needs investigation to discover; hence these verses deal typically with Great Company uncleanness.

(11) Five details on leprosy are brought out in the rest of Lev. 13, which treats of five kinds of leprosy: vs. 9-17, of a rising or swelling; vs. 18-23, of a boil; vs. 24-28, of a burning; vs. 29-44, of the head; vs. 45, 46, of their patient's treatment and vs. 47-59, of a garment. Four of these forms of leprosy attached themselves to persons, and one to things—garments; and in Lev. 14: 33-53 a sixth form of leprosy is brought to our attention—leprosy in a house. The four kinds of leprosy that afflict humans will first receive our attention. These four forms of literal leprosy correspond to the four forms of Great Company uncleanness. The swelling or rising kind of leprosy represents Great Company *sin* as a kind of its uncleanness. The boil kind of leprosy types Great Company *selfishness* as a kind of its uncleanness. The burning kind of leprosy types Great Company *worldliness*.

as a kind of its uncleanness. The head kind of leprosy symbolizes Great Company *error* as a kind of its uncleanness. The Bible teaches that Great Companyship shows itself in any one of these four forms of evil, even as leprosy showed itself in the four above-mentioned forms. We are often accused of using types to teach doctrines. This is a misrepresentation. Like our Pastor we use them to illustrate doctrines taught in clear Scripture. Let us first, therefore, note how the Bible in literal passages teaches that sin has caused the loss of one's crown and has caused his manifestation as such. It was the sin of the worst form of unchastity, incest, that caused the Corinthian brother to forfeit his crown and be manifested as a Great Company brother (1 Cor. 5: 1-13). It is sin that spots one's robe and Jude shows that the robes of some of the Great Company brethren are spotted (Jude 23). Accordingly, we see that literal Scriptures prove that sin has caused the loss of crowns and has manifested that loss. We will now take up the study of vs. 9-17, which type sin as a phase of Great Company uncleanness.

(12) Swelling leprosy (v. 10) certainly fittingly represents Great Company sin as a form of its uncleanness; for what is sin in ultimate analysis but a swelling of self against God and His will? Certainly sin is an arrogant swelling of self-will as against God's order and authority. From this standpoint, if Great Company sin is at all represented by a form of leprosy it is most fittingly represented by its swelling form. Hence we conclude that the swelling form of leprosy types Great Company sin as a form of its uncleanness. The swelling's color, white, suggests the disease of sin. Its turning the hair white types that it is accompanied with error in teaching and arrangement. Indeed, if it were a case of sin only, apart from inspiration we could not know whether the sin had caused the forfeiture of the crown, since we are incapable of judging

the degree of allowance that God makes in sin apart from weakness and ignorance. But if one is guilty of some gross sin and we find him going blind on the Truth and drunk with error in teaching and arrangement ("if it have turned the hair white"—v. 10), we have a partial, though not full proof of his having forfeited his crown. We say partial, not full proof, because another thing must be present to make the proof full; the error must be persisted in (quick [living, red] raw flesh in the rising, which proves the disease deeper than the skin—not simply a superficial matter). When these two things follow a more or less gross sin, we know that the sin caused the brother or sister to forfeit his crown and is manifesting him as a crown-loser. The force of the adjective in the expression, "an *old* leprosy" (v. 11), seems to be that of the word *former* in the expression, '*former* lusts,' in 1 Pet. 1: 14, even as in 2 Pet. 2: 20 we read of *pollutions formerly* overcome and later yielded to. When the investigating priest finds these conditions present, he is to do what Paul and the Corinthian ecclesia did in a like case—pronounce the evil-doer guilty of Great Company uncleanness in the form of sin (v. 11). The summary dealing with such an one is proven to be the right course, as indicated not only at the end of v. 11, "shall not shut him up," but also by Paul's and the Corinthian ecclesia's summary dealing with the incestuous brother.

(13) At first sight the thought expressed in vs. 12, 13, that if one is covered over entirely with leprosy, he is to be called clean, strikes one as most unusual and unnatural. The question naturally arises, Why should he not be considered the most unclean of the unclean? This natural thought can be reasonably answered only as follows: Leprosy, if covering the whole body, is by God used to type the Adamic depravity, because it defiles all our sentiments and qualities, and because all humans have it—the Little Flock, the Great Company,

the Second Death class, the Youthful Worthies, the justified and the unjustified—while partial leprosy is by God used to type the superadded Great Company uncleanness, because it occurs on the body in spots only. And since in this and the next chapter the Lord is furnishing types of Great Company uncleanness alone, one whose body is entirely covered with leprosy could not be used to type Great Company uncleanness; hence he would type one clean of the particular antitypical uncleanness described in these two chapters. Hence vs. 12, 13 describe a form of leprosy of which these two chapters, as a whole, do not treat typically or antitypically; and, therefore, it is ruled out of consideration, when the forms of leprosy treated in these chapters, typically or antitypically, are kept in mind. We can see at once that if God uses the form of leprosy that covers the whole body to type the Adamic depravity, which depraves all the faculties and qualities of all classes, that form of leprosy could not be used to type Great Company uncleanness; for all other classes, including, *e.g.*, the Little Flock, which does not have Great Company uncleanness, have that kind of antitypical leprosy. The fact, therefore, that vs. 12, 13 bring to our attention is a conclusive proof that Great Company uncleanness, and not the Adamic depravity, is typed by the forms of leprosy detailed in Lev. 13 and 14. The statements of vs. 12, 13 apply to one whose leprosy is white over all his flesh; but if (v. 14) raw flesh should appear on such an one, this being localized in a spot or spots, he was to be declared unclean from the standpoint of Lev. 13 and 14, and thus would be a type of an unclean Great Company member, not because his whole body is white with leprosy, but because in spots the raw flesh was visible. In such a case two things would be purposed: (1) it was desired by God to type the pertinent person's Adamic depravity; and (2) it was desired by God to type his Great Company uncleanness. Accordingly,

in type and antitype the priest was to pronounce the suspect unclean as viewed in these two chapters (v. 15).

(14) Vs. 16, 17 treat of the cases of healed lepers; for at times in Israel lepers became clean, not only by a miracle, as in the cases of Naaman and the many lepers that Christ healed, but also by natural causes. In all cases, the healed leper (v. 16) was to show himself to the priest, who was to attest his cleansing and admit him again into the fellowship of Israel as a cleansed leper, as Lev. 14: 1-32 shows in detail. The healing of the leper who had a swelling leprosy is described in v. 16, in the words, "If the raw flesh turn again and be changed unto white." This types the fact that in some cases Great Company uncleanness due to gross sin can be and does become cleansed; the evil action can be and does become repented of; and the evil characteristics can be and do become purged out of the character. This is illustrated in the case of the incestuous Corinthian brother (1 Cor. 5: 1-13) who, according to 2 Cor. 2: 5-10, repented and amended his character ("raw flesh turn again and be changed unto white"). The charge that he come to the priest (v. 16) types the fact that a cleansed Great Company brother should come to the antitypical priest—to our Lord, if He by His special eye, mouth and hand pronounced the brother to be in Great Company uncleanness, as He acts through that eye, mouth and hand, or to the ecclesia, if the ecclesia pronounced him to be in Great Company uncleanness—and make matters good with him or it. As in the type the priest examined ("shall see"—v. 17) the one who claimed to be healed, in order to determine if he be actually clean (for some lepers may have misrepresented the condition in order to get back into the fellowship of Israel), so in the antitype the investigating priest must examine the professedly repentant Great Company brother to determine whether he is actually repentant

and has made amends. Some might profess repentance—some have actually done so—who are not repentant; hence care should be exercised in this matter; for a premature pronouncing of such an one as clean is sure to work mischief—has already worked mischief. But if the repentance is sincere, the penitent one should be received into brotherly, not priestly, fellowship, as Paul charged in 2 Cor. 2: 5-10. This will be shown in detail in Lev. 14: 1-32.

(15) The second form of leprosy, that of a boil, is treated in vs. 18-23. It will be noted that the boil was healed (v. 18), and that in it appeared a rising, *i.e.*, another boil (v. 19). We understand that in vs. 18-23 the form of leprosy manifesting itself in a renewed boil represents selfishness as a form of Great Company uncleanness. That selfishness is a form of Great Company uncleanness is evident from a number of literal Scriptures. That their humanity does not remain dead to the selfish sentiments, Heb. 2: 15 shows us, for it speaks of them as those "who through *fear* of [the sacrificial] death are all their lifetime subject to bondage." Thus they dread the weariness, the painfulness, the unpopularity, etc., of the sacrificial death to such a degree as to avoid it in a slavish fear that puts them into the spirit of bondage all their life. Matt. 10: 39 tells us that he that findeth his life [after consecrating it to death seeks to recover it] shall lose it. Matt. 16: 25 tells us that whoever *wills* to save his [consecrated] life shall lose it. Luke 14: 26 assures us that whoever does not hate [deny himself of] his [consecrated] life cannot be Christ's disciple. V. 33 tells us that the consecrated one who does not forsake his human all cannot remain in the Little Flock. John 12: 25 assures us that he who loves [indulges selfishly] his life shall lose it. Selfish lusts so war against the soul as to cause one to lose his crown, if he gives himself over to them (1 Pet. 2: 11). And 1 Pet. 1: 14. exhorts us to avoid the former lusts—selfishness—as

opposed to holiness. Also 1 Cor. 9: 27 shows that selfishness causes the loss of the crown. These and many other Scriptures show us that selfishness is a form of Great Company uncleanness. What is typed by the boil's healing and then later breaking out again? When we consecrated we put natural, proper, human selfishness to death; for one of the features of consecration is deadness to self. Such becoming dead to self healed the antitypical boil; but if one turns again to a life of selfishness the antitypical boil breaks out again as symbolic leprosy.

(16) The development of leprosy in the renewed breaking out of the boil is described in the language of v. 19, which tells of a white rising, or a bright white spot somewhat reddish. This represents the selfish sentiments exalting themselves and grasping for the powers of selfish indulgence, to which the consecrated are to remain dead. It must in type and antitype be shown to the investigating priest (v. 19). In both type and antitype the priest must examine the disease (v. 20). Particularly in the antitype must the priest give it diligent attention. But he must look further than the exercised selfishness; for the one through whom the antitypical Aaron examines the case or the under-priest, ecclesia, not being able to tell the degree of selfishness involved, must seek corroborative evidences of the selfish life, typed by the priest looking at certain attendants of the renewed boil—the depth below the skin and the hair turned white. These two particulars in the type have the same antitypical significance as we saw them to have in vs. 3 and 10—the latter referring to corruption of the Lord's Truth or arrangements—revolutionism—and the former to persistency therein. Whenever one lives a selfish life, avoiding sacrifice for the Lord, the Truth and the brethren, and it is coupled with his perseveringly revolutionizing against the Lord's Truth and arrangements, the examining priest may be sure that he is dealing

with an antitypical leper. Therefore he is to pronounce him unclean with Great Company uncleanness, even as in the type (v. 20) the typical priest pronounced the leper unclean; for in the former case it is antitypical leprosy broken out of the healed antitypical boil and in the latter case it is the typical leprosy broken out of the healed typical boil.

(17) The conditions (v. 21) that did not in the type warrant a sentence of uncleanness are: the absence of white hair in the boil and the sore not being lower than the skin. Antitypically, this would mean that even if there is some selfishness present (the renewed boil), if there is no accompanying persistent revolutionism present, the sentence of Great Company uncleanness is not to be passed. The reason for this is very evident; for we cannot of the selfishness alone determine whether it is a matter wholly belonging to Great Companyship or not; for all Little Flock members, except our Lord, have been guilty of more or less selfishness, and that without losing their crowns; since it requires a considerable exercise and development in selfishness to require the forfeiture of one's crown. Hence, first, without the two above-mentioned accompaniments of selfishness we cannot tell when it is that of Great Company uncleanness and, accordingly, are incapable of pronouncing finally on the case. Hence we see that, secondly, in all cases of the suspicion of the loss of a crown there must always be persistent revolutionism against the teachings and arrangements of the Lord. It is for this reason, thirdly, that we have not stressed sin, selfishness and worldliness unaccompanied by persistent revolutionism as manifesting Great Companyship. We have, fourthly, stressed them only when there has been persistent revolutionism present with them; and this is the case because, unknown to us, at the time the Lord was using us to give the teachings antitypical of the typical ones in the chapters that we are studying.

(18) When the spot on the boil was somewhat dark (v. 21) the person under examination was as a suspect to be shut up seven days. This dark color of the boil types that there is such a condition in the selfishness under observation as to warrant the fear that the pertinent person is perhaps an antitypical leper, hence must be kept under such restraint as the surveillance at hand warrants. The seven days represent a full time for the matter at hand to develop. The investigating priest, therefore, is to continue holding the person under observation and put on him the pertinent restraints, until a full time for his case to develop has been given to him. If, after the typical seven days, the bright spot in the boil had spread much in the skin (v. 22), the priest was to pronounce the person a leper, because such spreading abroad implied that the leprosy was more than skin deep and that it turned the hair white. So in the antitype, if under the further observation of the examining priest persistent revolution against the Lord's teachings and arrangements manifests itself, the antitypical priest is to declare the one examined to have Great Company uncleanness (v. 22). But, if during the period of observation, the bright spot did not spread and thus did not go deeper than the skin nor turn the hair white (v. 23), the examining priest was to pronounce the person clean. In the antitype, if the selfishness under seasonable observation shows no increase of a kind that produces persistent revolutionism against the Truth and its arrangements, the brother or sister under observation should be regarded free from Great Company uncleanness. In the type the boil was to be considered a burning, but not a leprous one. In the antitype the case should be considered as a form of selfishness that does not bring with it the loss of the crown.

(19) The third form of leprosy is brought to our attention in vs. 24-28—a hot burning. We understand that in these verses worldliness as a form of Great

Company uncleanness is typed. That worldliness is also a form of Great Company uncleanness literal passages of the Scriptures teach. We will refer to some of these in proof of this fact, which will also corroborate our thought that the four forms of Great Company uncleanness are set forth in Lev. 13 and 14, so far as the antitypes of leprosy in persons are concerned. This is proved in Matt. 13: 22. The four kinds of soil (Matt. 13: 3-8, 18-23) represent the heart condition of the four classes who hear the Word: the hypocrites (vs. 4, 19), the tentatively justified (vs. 5, 20, 21), the Great Company (vs. 7, 22) and the Little Flock (vs. 8, 23). Please note how worldliness is said in v. 22 to be characteristic of the Great Company—the care of this world and the deceitfulness of riches. Mark 4: 19 adds, lusts of other things, and Luke 8: 14 adds, pleasures of this life. All four of these particulars are worldliness as a characteristic of Great Company uncleanness. Luke 21: 34 enumerates the following forms of worldliness: surfeiting, drunkenness and cares of this life, as characteristics of crown-losers, especially of those of them who are foolish virgins. Jas. 4: 4 points out that worldliness makes symbolic virgins, symbolic adulteresses—Great Company members. These Scriptures are sufficient to prove that worldliness is a form of Great Company uncleanness. We, therefore, understand that it as such is typed in vs. 24-28. Certainly, worldliness in a new creature is a burning fire, the literal rendering of the expression rendered *hot burning* (v. 24). It often manifests willfulness (*quick flesh that burneth*). It certainly often has the antitypical white bright spot, somewhat reddish, or white, which colors prove it to be properly leprosy-suspect—the appearance of Great Company uncleanness. In the type such a case had to be brought to the priest for examination (v. 25). So such a degree of worldliness in a new creature as properly arouses in a true priest the fear that its possessor

may be in the Great Company must be brought to the attention of an antitypical priest, who must give it a thorough inspection. If he find in it the antitypical hair turneth white (v. 25), revolutionism against the Lord's Truth and arrangements, and if he find it is to be persistent—deeper than the skin (v. 25), he is to pronounce its possessor (v. 25) guilty of Great Company uncleanness; for he has the unmistakable marks of Great Companyship, antitypical leprosy (v. 25). He thus decided the case.

(20) V. 26 suggests carefulness in the typical and antitypical examination. Such carefulness in this and the other forms, typically and antitypically, is needed both in justice and charity. For in the type to have decided wrongly of one unclean would have endangered others, which both justice and charity forbade, or wrongly of one clean would have subjected an innocent one to great hardships and sufferings—cutting him off from fellowship and association with fellow non-leprous Israelites, and condemning him to association with leprous ones only. In the antitype to palm off a Great Company brother as a Little Flock brother would endanger Little Flock brethren to the unholy contagion of sin, selfishness, worldliness and error, or to treat a Little Flock brother as a Great Company member would cut him off from fellowship with his class and condemn him to the contamination of uncleansed Great Company members. Of course, both justice and charity forbid this. Hence, in all the cases brought to our attention in these two chapters, we note the great carefulness inculcated to make a correct diagnosis of the cases presented for examination. As in the other cases so far studied, where the certainty-giving characteristics were absent (hair turned white and the sore deeper than the skin) judgment was to be suspended (v. 26). So in the antitype, where there is no persistent revolutionism, judgment must be suspended. If in the type the place was somewhat dark

(v. 26), as a leprosy suspect the person had to be shut up seven days. So in the antitype, if there is good reason to fear that the pertinent worldliness may have led to the loss of the crown, the brother concerned is to be restrained by obstacles being placed in the way of his worldliness, by his receiving less cordiality, etc., from those who have good reason to fear that something is wrong with the brother. If, as in the type, it should later appear, after these restraints are put on him, that he is a persistent revolutionist against the Lord's Word and arrangements (if it be spread much abroad in the skin—v. 27), the antitypical priest should declare him to have Great Company uncleanness. But, if such revolutionism does not appear (if the bright spot stay in his place, hence no hair turning white and the evil not going deeper than the skin—v. 28), despite the manifest worldliness (somewhat dark—v. 28), the antitypical priest shall pronounce him free of Great Company uncleanness, since priests also give more or less manifestations of worldliness (it is an inflammation of the burning—v. 28).

(21) So far we have studied three of the four forms of personal leprosy—type and antitype. We come in vs. 29-44 to the study of its fourth form—leprosy in the head, typing error in teaching and arrangement. As in the case of the other three forms of Great Company uncleanness, we will again quote literal passages, this time to prove that such error is a mark of Great Company uncleanness. Perhaps the classic passage on this subject is 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20, in which certain ones are spoken of as having made shipwreck of the high calling on matters of faith, especially on the resurrection (2 Tim. 2: 17, 18), for which, among others, Hymenaeus and Alexander were delivered to Azazel, as contaminated with Great Company uncleanness. Ps. 107: 10, 11 shows that some have become imprisoned (shut up) in a symbolic dungeon for revolutionizing against the Lord's Truth

and arrangements. Jas. 5: 19, 20 shows that crown-losers *err* from the Truth. Accordingly, we see that error is one of the forms of Great Company uncleanness. The symbolism of leprosy in the head (the hairy part) or the beard (v. 29) is very instructive, since hair especially represents the Truth, as well as its arrangements. Throughout this section the infection is almost always shown to be in the hair, or where the hair normally is. This form of leprosy is called a scall (vs. 30, 31). One having a scall must, in type and antitype, be examined by the priest. If deeper than the skin and having *yellow* hair (yellow, not white, because age usually makes the hair white), it was a case of leprosy in the type, picturing persistently held error in the antitype, and is, accordingly, to be dealt with, in type and antitype, as the similar symptoms in the other three forms of leprosy, typical and antotypical, as shown above.

(22) V. 31 shows that if the suspect had not developed in the type or antitype, in the two condemning symptoms, he is not to be pronounced unclean, but is to be shut up, restrained, while undergoing a sufficient scrutiny. If black hair had been in the scall, it would have proved the person to be free of leprosy. But if none were in it, and it was not deeper than the skin, he was to be a leprosy-suspect. The absence of black hair would type that the view held by the antotypical suspect was not a part of the Truth so far developed or due. The skin depth of the scall has the same antotypical meaning as we have already seen in the other forms of leprosy, as also the seven days' shutting up has the same antotypical meaning as has already been pointed out. The examination on the seventh day (v. 32) had the same antotypical significance as was before pointed out. So do the other items of v. 32. The shaving of all but the scall (v. 33) seems to type the thought that the antotypical priest should sever from the "new view" every feature of the known

Truth so that the new view may be closely examined in itself, so that it may, of its own implications, unfold its exact character and be carefully studied from this standpoint during the second set of antitypical seven days. If, under sufficient study (the seventh day—v. 34), the view is found to have no erroneous implications (not spread) and is not stubbornly held (not deeper than the skin), the priest is to pronounce the suspect free of Great Company uncleanness. This shows that unimportant mistakes made are not to be held as proving one to have Great Company uncleanness, *e.g.*, often a brother or sister makes a mistake in a study, but gives an answer that is against no known Truth; he is not therefore to be considered unclean. If the mistake is a very minor, negligible one, after being analyzed sufficiently, it should not be held against the brother. Again, a matter presented as a probability should be considered from the same standpoint. Many a priest makes mistakes on arrangement and teaching matters—yea, all of them except those who spoke under inspiration. The mistake, however, betrays an imperfection against which the suspect must guard himself and of which he should rid himself, typed by the suspect washing his garments (v. 34).

(23) In v. 35 the case is presented from the standpoint of one actually later becoming leprous, typing a case proven under examination to contain Great Company uncleanness after a cleansing had set in; for as in the type, so in the antitype, a mistake that had no erroneous implications is later developed into lines that do have such implications, and not only so, but also becomes persistent revolutionism (spread much). In such a case the suspect is to be re-examined (v. 36). Willfulness is present, as typed by the scall spreading abroad in the skin, and without looking for other forms of error (not seek for yellow hair), the priest is to declare the suspect to be contaminated with Great Company uncleanness. V. 37 types the fact that when

the mistake or the new view on its repetition has no erroneous implications and is held with no contradiction of, but in harmony with the Truth (black hair grown up therein), and is held without stubbornness and aggressiveness, the suspect is to be considered as healed, and is to be pronounced clean by the priest. Vs. 38 and 39 caution against declaring a freckled person, as such, a leper; for certainly freckles are not leprosy, even though they be as numerous as the over 7,000 counted on the face of a boy a few years ago in the U. S. It has been learned that freckles are due to the skin absorbing more light than it can take care of. This suggests an antitype that all of us will agree is not a sign of Great Company uncleanness. As we know, light is used to represent the Truth (Prov. 4: 18). Some of our brethren, yea, all of us, doubtless, at some time or other, have been offered more Truth than we could absorb. It was too strong meat for us at the time; *e.g.*, the chronology has been too hard for some of the brethren; so have other things. But who having a sober mind would think of consigning such to the Great Company? Such a rule would have consigned every Little Flock member to the Great Company. Vs. 40 and 41 contain another caution against diagnosing as leprosy a case of baldness, which, of course, one could have without having leprosy. Baldness would represent absence of much of the Truth. A baldness on the head toward the forehead ("forehead bald"), which symbolizes the intellect or its contents, would represent a lack of some one element or more elements of the Truth. But in neither case is one to be consigned to the Great Company; for it is not the amount of the Truth that one has that determines his place, but his heart's attitude toward the Truth that he has. If the largeness of the amount of the Truth that one has would determine his place in the Little Flock, there would have been no Little Flock members during most of the interim between the Harvests.

The fact that most of the Little Flock does not have the Epiphany Truth, which is very great in bulk, does not at all prove them to be of the Great Company.

(24) Vs. 42-44 indicate under what circumstances baldness would show leprosy: if a leprous sore (a white reddish sore—v. 42) would be in his baldhead or bald forehead. Such a sore would type the fact that in the lack of Truth that one would have, error would arise. The fact that it was such a sore in the bald spot implies that it was deeper than the skin. Hence, thereby persistent adherence to error is symbolized. But every sore on the baldhead or bald forehead would not be leprosy. To determine the actual condition the typical priest had to be called to look into the case (v. 43). He had to determine it in the same way that other cases of leprosy were determined (as the leprosy appeareth in the skin of the flesh), *i.e.*, deeper than the skin, with the added feature of the sore being white reddish, which color betrayed the disease as perhaps leprosy. The fact of baldness precluded the presence of yellow hair, which did not need to be present, since the malady's being in the baldhead (leprosy is in his head—v. 42) suggests the erroneousness implied in the antitype. If it were genuine leprosy it always would make the hair, if present, yellow. Hence if it were a genuine case of leprosy (v. 44), the priest had to pronounce him a leper, typing the fact that the antitypical priest would have to declare a persistent errorist in teaching and arrangement, contaminated with Great Company uncleanness. If it were an ordinary sore of non-leprous character, the priest would pronounce the suspect clean, typing the fact that if the antitypical priest on examining the suspect find that he is not persistent in error, he is to declare him free of Great Company uncleanness.

(25) In vs. 45 and 46 some general instructions that apply to all kinds of leprosy are set forth. The first thing that a typical leper, convicted as such by the

examining priest, had to do was to rend his clothes (v. 45). We have already seen that one's clothes symbolize one's graces or official powers, or both. To rend one's garments does gross violence to them. Therefore, to rend one's garments types to do gross violence to one's graces or to his official powers, or to both of them, *i.e.*, he will greatly mar his faith, hope, self-control, patience, piety, brotherly love, charity, etc., by wrong thoughts, motives, words and acts; and he will greatly mar his official knowledge and the official duties and privileges that he has had in the Lord's service. It is usually done in increased power-grasping and lording it over brethren, working against fellow servants and increasingly polluting the Truth and misleading others. We recall that at the separation of Elijah and Elisha, the latter rent his garments from top to bottom, and that this found its antitype in the gross wrongs committed by the Society leaders and their partisan supporters and in their violating their official powers as crown-losers and in their grasping for priestly powers, all of which were very grossly misused. The similarity of this action in the leper and in Elisha is another proof that the leper afflicted as in Lev. 13 and 14 represents those afflicted with Great Company uncleanness, even as we saw to be the case with Elisha (Vol. III, Chapter II). The second item connected with a priest-convicted leper is that he had to bare his head and keep it bare. We recall that while the high priest could go bare headed, to represent that as a priest he was not subject to another priest, the underpriests had to have their heads covered by wearing bonnets to indicate their subjection to the high priest. In antitype of this our High Priest, Jesus, serves with a symbolically uncovered head, *i.e.*, He functions as a Priest without any subordination to any other priest; for He is the Head over all things to the Church, which is His body (Eph. 1: 22). His under-priests, however, do not function with a symbolically uncovered head,

unsubordinated to another priest; for as under-priests they are subordinate to the High Priest as their Head. For a typical under-priest to uncover his head implied his casting off subordination to the typical high priest. Hence the lepers in uncovering their heads type the manifested crown-losers repudiating Jesus' headship and taking back their own heads—they cease to be beheaded for the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus. Jesus is no more their Head; for He is the Head of His body members only, which Great Company members no more are, and which Youthful Worthies never were.

(26) What is typed by covering the upper lip (v. 45)? In Bible symbols the mouth represents mouthpieceship, *e.g.*, God's mouth is the Bible (Is. 1: 20; 40: 5; 45: 23). Lips in Bible symbols represent Truth (Ps. 63: 5; Zeph. 3: 9—the word translated *language* is the Hebrew word for lip; see margin). There are especially two great symbolic lips: the Song of Moses, the burden of the Old Testament, and the Song of the Lamb, the burden of the New Testament. Hence these two parts of the Bible are God's lips, the upper of which is the New Testament and the lower of which is the Old Testament. Thus, the lips of God's people as His mouth are the New Testament and the Old Testament. To cover one's upper lip would make one speak very unclearly, as one can see if he covers it and then speaks. Hence, for God's people symbolically to cover their upper lip would make them speak forth the things of the New Testament—the Truth especially of and related to the high calling—unclearly, erroneously. And as to cover the upper lip makes the lower one function unclearly, so the symbolically covered upper lip will make the lower one—the Old Testament teaching, related to the fall, permission of evil and restitution—speak unclearly. What is represented by the cry, Unclean, unclean? Usually speech in the type is antityped in pantomime, not in speech. Accordingly, we are

to look for the cry, Unclean, unclean, to be fulfilled in acts. It occurs as follows: While the Great Company is in an unclean condition it not only defiles its acts and character, but also more or less of its teachings—it teaches errors. Its living wrong and teaching error are its cry, Unclean, *i.e.*, in God's and the Church's sight its acts and teachings by their nature cry out, "I am unclean; I am unclean." Of course the unclean Great Company does not in so many words say that they are unclean. But acts speak louder than words and their teachings and acts declare them to be unclean.

(27) The first thing that v. 46 says of the leper is that as long as the plague is in him he shall be defiled—unclean. Remembering that the plague was a swelling, a boil, a hot burning, or a scall, we know how long the typical leprosy would be in a leper. Antitypically as long as there is persistent sin accompanied by persistent error, as long as there is persistent selfishness accompanied by persistent error, as long as there is persistent worldliness accompanied by persistent error, and as long as there is persistent error, even if one does not seem to betray persistent sin, selfishness or worldliness, the Great Company is defiled, and they will as long as they are in that condition continue to defile themselves, the Truth and all who will expose themselves to their influence. There is no cleansing for them as long as they so continue. Hence, until they repent and make amends they are to be held unclean (he is unclean—v. 46). The second item mentioned in v. 46 is that he, the leper, shall dwell alone. What does this mean in the antitype? Priestly fellowship should be withdrawn from him! The priests should not study with such, *i.e.*, attempt to exercise the sight of the Lampstand with them; for they are cut off therefrom. The priests should not seek to cultivate the graces of the spirit in fellowship with them, in which graces (feeding at the antitypical Table of Shewbread) they are strengthened for their journey to the Divine

nature; for these Great Company brethren have been by the Lord cut off from that Table. The priests are not to sacrifice with them at the antitypical Golden Altar, serve the Lord's cause sacrificially with them; for they have been cut off from the sacrifices offered at that Altar. Priestly fellowship consists in their privileges at the antitypical Golden Candlestick, Table and Altar. Here is their fellowship (Ps. 133: 1, 2); here is their dwelling (Ps. 91: 1). They are to put the Great Company "alone," by themselves, so far as concerns these priestly privileges. This is for the good of all.

(28) The final item that v. 46 states of the leper is that his habitation is to be without the camp. Hence, at the time Israel was in the wilderness the leper could not live in the camp with other Israelites. After Israel in Canaan dwelt in cities the lepers were kept outside the cities, in the country, in uninhabited places, in the wilderness—here, again, the allusion to Azazel's Goat shows that the leper represents the Great Company. Thus they were cut off from the fellowship and the habitation of God's people as long as they remained lepers. They could, of course, associate with fellow lepers, but not with the clean Israelites, who were warned of their presence by the muffled cry, Unclean. Antitypically are the symbolic lepers to be cast out from association with the Little Flock and good Youthful Worthies, who are to take warning of their presence by their muffled teachings—errors. They are to go out into the antitypical wilderness, there to suffer buffeting experiences at Azazel's hands until they have suffered the destruction of their fleshly minds. They should not be encouraged to come in among the Little Flock and good Youthful Worthies, rather they are to be discouraged therefrom until they have cleansed themselves from their defilements of teaching and practice. They may, of course, associate with those of their own kind, dwelling together and defiling one another

more and more; but they are not to dwell (be made to feel at home) among the priests and good Youthful Worthies until they repent and amend their ways—until they wash their robes in the blood of the Lamb and their garments in the water of the Word. We thank God that they will sometime do this. For this let us also hope and pray; and when it comes, we will welcome them to our bosoms, comfort them with God's Word and instruct them how to serve the Lord in spirit and Truth, which they will also learn to do. Thanks be to God for this prospect which in due time will be realized.

(29) Our foregoing study of Lev. 13 covers the four forms of typical and antitypical leprosy as related to persons; but there are two forms of it related to things, as distinct from persons—leprosy in a garment (Lev. 13: 47-59) and leprosy in a house (Lev. 14: 33-53). We desire, additionally, to study these impersonal forms of leprosy; for without an understanding of them we will fail to obtain a well-rounded view of Great Company uncleanness. We will take them up in the order of their appearance in Lev. 13 and 14. For the present we will pass by the study of Lev. 14: 1-32, 49-53, reserving its study for a later time. We do this so as to get a full view of antitypical leprosy, before we consider its cleansing. Doubtless the cleansing of the leper is presented between the last two forms of it, because the first five forms of it are in the antitype connected with individuals who as such must undergo cleansing, while its sixth form is antitypically connected with groups, whose cleansing is described after their uncleanness is described. We will therefore begin our study in this connection with leprosy in a garment, as this is set forth in Lev. 13: 47-59.

(30) In Bible symbols, as often indicated in these columns, garments symbolize: (1) the graces of the Holy Spirit (Col. 3: 10-14; Is. 61: 3; 1 Pet. 3: 4; 5: 5; Jude 23; Rev. 3: 4; 16: 15); (2) their opposites, the

disgraces (Ps. 69: 11; 73: 6; 132: 18; Col. 3: 8, 9); and (3) official powers (Ex. 28: 2-39; 2 Kings 2: 8, 14; Is. 22: 21; Rev. 12: 1). In Lev. 13: 47-59 they evidently do not have the first and second meanings; for in both of these forms—graces and *disgraces*—they are implied in Lev. 13: 1-44. Accordingly, we understand the garments of Lev. 13: 47-59 to represent official powers, and a leprous garment would represent official powers defiled with Great Company uncleanness. This particular form of Great Company uncleanness exists as power-grasping and lording it over God's heritage on the part of leaders. That such a form of Great Company uncleanness exists we can see from a number of literal Scriptures. Perhaps the classic example of this form of Great Company uncleanness is Diotrephes (3 John. 9, 10). His unholy power-grasping and lording appear in his loving the preeminence and in his rejecting John and others as the Lord's messengers, forbidding the others to receive them and casting out of the church those who would receive them. These acts also show lording it over God's heritage. John's saying that on his coming he would remember his deeds and prating words implies his dealing with him as with a crown-loser. 1 Pet. 5: 3, 4 cautions against lording it over God's heritage, as a quality that debars from receiving the crown of glory that fadeth not away, *i.e.*, as a crown-losing quality. Our Lord's warnings against the Nicolaitanes (Rev. 2: 6, 15) as the overcomers, lords over, God's people, implies that such are not saintly overcomers, but are Satanic overcomers of saints and others. What Paul says (1 Cor. 9: 27) of teachers who fail to keep under the body and bring it into subjection, which would include failing to overcome power-grasping and lording it over God's heritage—that they would be castaways from the high calling, implies that these evils are Great Company uncleanness (see Berean Comments). Thus we see that these have symbolic leprosy in their symbolic

garments, official powers. Accordingly, literal passages teach the thought that we have suggested to be typed by leprosy in a garment. Our view is, therefore, not a human fancy.

(31) It will be noted that in vs. 47 and 48 three kinds of garments are brought to our attention: garments of linen, wool and skin. It will also be noted that these correspond with three of the four kinds of curtains in the tabernacle. At first sight one might object to the garments of wool as corresponding to one of the materials in one of the tabernacle's curtains, since one of these was made of goats' hair, which curtain represents us as justified and its section doubled in the front of the tabernacle, our justification; but on closer thought this objection will fall to the ground, for wool is also used to picture our justification (Is. 1: 18). Moreover God expressly says in the Hebrew that the pascal *lamb* could be taken from the sheep or the goats (Ex. 12: 3-5). In English we restrict the use of the word *lamb* to the young of sheep; but in Hebrew the word *seh*, here translated *lamb*, as v. 5 shows, may be used of the young of the sheep or the goats, though in English we call the latter animal a *kid*. Hence the curtain that was between the tabernacle's linen curtain and the one of rams' skin dyed red could have been woven from wool. Hence we think that the correspondence in our text as against the tabernacles curtains covers the three items mentioned above. Apparently the curtain of rams' skin dyed red is not here referred to, because it represents, not our justification, but Christ's ransom, which remains forever undefiled, and hence is not used in the symbols of Lev. 13: 47, 48. Accordingly, we understand the linen garment to be related to leaders as to new creatures in certain respects, the woolen garment to be related to leaders as to the justified in certain respects, and the garments of skin to be related to leaders as to the world in certain respects. These respects are connected with

their official powers. The linen garments type their official powers as exercised toward new creatures; the woolen garments type their official powers as these are exercised toward the justified; and the garments of skin type their official powers as these are exercised toward the world. The warp (v. 48) seems to refer to official powers as to teaching and the woof to official powers as to arrangement.

(32) The plague of leprosy in a garment types Great Company uncleanness in the exercise of official powers. These official powers refer to those of local elders and deacons and general elders. Leprosy in a garment represents the Great Company uncleanness in these two classes of elders and in deacons, and therefore refers to these as leaders grasping for power and lording it over others. If the leprous garment is linen it represents their grasping for power and lording it over new creatures in new-creaturely respects, either in using their office as teachers of error (leprosy in the warp), or as corrupters of the arrangements (leprosy in the woof) for serving the new creatures. If the leprous garment is woolen it represents their grasping for power and lording it over the justified in justified respects, either in using their office as teachers of error (leprosy in the warp), or as corrupters of the arrangements (leprosy in the woof) for serving the justified. If the leprous garment is skin or made of skin it represents their grasping for power and lording it over the world in matters pertaining to the world, either in using their office powers as teachers of error (leprosy of the skin, v. 48), or as corrupters of the arrangements (leprosy in the thing made of skin, v. 48) for serving the world. Thus we see that every kind of persons toward whom they can serve—new creatures, the justified and the world—and every kind of service that they can perform—in teaching and arrangement are set forth in the types of vs. 47, 48. Every kind of usurpation that they can commit—power—grasping and

lording as manifest Satanic twins—is set forth in v. 49.

(33) In v. 49 the symptoms of leprosy in a garment are described. If the plague be greenish or reddish in the garment it is a case of leprosy in a garment. These two colors, green and red, represent the two forms of usurpation that constitute Great Company uncleanness in leaders. The green color, as mentioned first here and in Lev. 14: 37, stands for the first form of usurpation, its power-grasping form, in leaders as a form of their Great Company uncleanness, while the color red, as mentioned second, stands for lording, the second form of usurpation in leaders as a form of Great Company uncleanness. Leaders have certain office powers. Thus local elders have those office powers for those services that in harmony with the Lord's Word the ecclesia votes them, as to doctrine, refutation, correction, instruction in righteousness (2 Tim. 3: 16, 17) and comfort (Rom. 15: 4) in and out of the ecclesia's meetings. They may also on invitation serve other ecclesiases. General elders have those office powers for those services that the Lord in harmony with His Word gives them in and out of any ecclesia where they are by these ecclesiases invited to serve in the same five respects. To perform these services in harmony with the Lord's Spirit, Word and providences is their privilege. But Satan constantly seeks to stir them up to become some great ones, with more powers than the Lord has appointed as their official powers. And, unfortunately, he has succeeded in causing many of them to *arise* (Acts 20: 30), to grasp for and exercise more powers than the Lord has given them. The leaders are the special targets of Satan, who seeks to stir them up to pride. Our Pastor once remarked that according to his observation 95% of the leaders who have fallen fell through pride. In every case of Great Company leaders they have been guilty of power-grasping and lording. When we pass them one after the other in review

we will see this to be the case. From first to last they want more than the Lord gives them; hence under Satanic temptation they grasp for power and lord it over God's heritage, which makes them fall under God's disfavor.

(34) It will be noted that the words, garment, skin, anything of skin, warp and woof, in v. 49 type the same things as we suggested in par. 32. Hence we need not repeat these details. But it would be well for us to note how greatly the Levite leaders have contaminated their official powers. J.F.R. has corrupted almost every feature of the high-calling truths; and before he has run his full course he will have done this with every feature of them, his right eye utterly darkened. There is, so far as we know, not one arrangement for doing the Lord's work as He gave them to us through that Servant used any more by him. His was a garment leprous through and through. The same is more or less true of other Great Company leaders, e.g., H.J. Shearn, Wm. Crawford, Jesse Hemery, Carl Olson, Menta Sturgeon, F.H. Robison, I.F. Hoskins, W.F. Hudgings, W. E. Van Amburgh, A.H. MacMillan, E.G. Bolger, etc., etc. Pitifully unprofitable has their course proven. For a little prominence, for a little honor of men, for a little glitter of preeminence, they have forfeited the privileges of service in the high calling! How poor is the judgment, how unsound is the mind, and how dangerous is the course of such! "The Lord gave them the desire of their heart, but sent leanness into their soul." All over their garments, whether of linen, or wool, or skin or any thing of skin, whether in the warp or the woof, the greenness of power-grasping and the redness of lording it over God's heritage are visible. Plague-stricken, leprosy-stricken, is written all over them. Not only such as for the most part were general elders in the Church, but very many of the local elders, though on a smaller scale, have been colored with the same symbolic green

and red in their garments—power-grasping and lording.

(35) And surely the Lord's Word has been antitypically fulfilled—"and shall be showed unto the priest" (v. 49). Those whose power-grasping and lording involved the general Church were brought to Jesus as He worked through His special eye, mouth and hand. Alexander, Hymenaeus and Philetus (1 Tim. 1: 20; 2 Tim. 2: 17) were brought to Him as He acted through Paul, and Diotrephes (3 John 9, 10) as He acted through John. It is most emphatically so now, in the Epiphany, when it is due to deal with the Great Company as such as a whole and in its 60 divisions, that the leprous garments of these Great Company leaders, both general and local, are brought to the Lord Jesus as He acts with the former through the Epiphany messenger supported by fellow priests, and with the latter through local ecclesiastas. A very large part of our time since our Pastor's death has been devoted to the examination of such power-grasping and lording general elders. Many of these, yea, most of these examinations have been made in The Present Truth. Some of them were made before it was published, but their processes and results have in large part been presented in Epiphany publications. It was not only necessary that the examinations be made in public, because the power-grasping and lording has been public, but also to enable the priesthood to co-operate with the Lord acting through the Epiphany messenger in dealing with such. Many blame us as a slanderer for publishing such examinations, but such we are not; for the offenses, being public, must be publicly rebuked, not only to equip the priesthood in the flesh to co-operate in the matter, but also to shield brethren endangered by the leprous garment. The Lord's course in this matter is best, and in the end will be recognized by all worthy of life as being such. The expression, "shall be showed unto the priest," also implies

that any priest or Youthful Worthy seeing cases of real power-grasping, especially in a general elder, should bring it to Jesus' attention as He acts in these matters through His eye, mouth and hand in such cases. Nor should they count such as tale-bearing.

(36) V. 50 treats of the typical examination and of the shutting up of the garment seven days. It will be noted that in the examination of the typical garment in no case was judgment pronounced at the first examination, as was in extreme cases done with leprosy in a person. This was designedly done, because in the type no symptoms were given that would at the first examination warrant a complete decision. In the respects mentioned in this paragraph the antitype is interesting and meaningful. In cases of power-grasping and lording there must be an examination made either by the High Priest acting through His eye, mouth and hand, when the power-grasping and lording are done by a general elder, or by an ecclesia, when the power-grasping and lording are done by a local elder or deacon. This is a duty that must not be shirked, because wherever there is power-grasping and lording Satan has special designs: on the general Church, when a general elder is the offender, or on a local Church, if the offender be a local elder or deacon. Courageously must the case be grappled with, as our Pastor advised in the Nov. 1, 1916, Tower, in the article on, The Hour Of Temptation. But for obvious reasons snap judgment must be avoided ("shut up seven days"). In the nature of the case the offender must be dealt with in examination and restraint (shut up) so that the case may be rightly decided. If a premature decision were made, the examining priest would not have data of a convincing kind to present to the Church, general or local, as the case may be. Hence enough time must be allowed to elapse so that the case may show itself, in its real character. But if there are grounds for fear that there is power-grasping and lording present, the examining

priest, general or local, should subject the suspect to restraints of resistance, expostulation, warning, limiting of service, etc., which the guilty will resist.

(37) As in the type the priest re-examined the garment on the seventh day (v. 51), so after giving what ordinarily would be a sufficient time to elapse for the antitypical leprosy to show itself, the examining priest should again investigate the case, to see if there has been a further development of the power-grasping and lording in the use of the official powers under suspicion. If in the type the plague spread in the garment, either in the warp or the woof, or in a skin, or in any work of skin, the plague was to be diagnosed as a fretting leprosy and the garment was to be pronounced unclean (v. 51). In the antitype the following is suggested by the type: The plague spreading represents that the power-grasping and lording would during the time of symbolic restraint be increasing, which could be in several respects, *i.e.*, more of power-grasping and lording acts of the same kind as first made the symbolic garment a leprosy-suspect, or an extension of such acts into a different direction, or a combination of both. *E.g.*, J.F.R.'s course in 1917 consisted of these two things and a combination of both, and that in many directions. Among such cases we might cite his conspiring to get executive and managerial powers in the Society, and after getting them trying to get controllership power over the Board in various ways, even to the degree of ousting its majority contrary to human and Divine law. The spreading could also take the form of usurping teaching powers (in the warp) or arrangement powers (in the woof) toward new creatures (linen garment) or toward the justified (woolen garment) or toward the world in teaching powers (in a skin) or in arrangement powers (in any work that is made of skin). Thus it can manifest itself variously.

(38) In the type (v. 51) such a plague in a garment is called a *fretting* leprosy. This peculiar name was given to it, because it brings out the character of the antitypical leprosy. Fretting is just the word to designate the unrest that unholy ambition, grasping for power and lording it over God's heritage, gives its victims. Their scheming disposition gives them no peace, but urges them on to all sorts of further arousing fretfulness. Again will we illustrate this by the case of J.F.R. He fretted to make by-laws. These made, he fretted to arrange the details of the voting shareholders' meeting to pass them, fretted when the resolutions committee delayed reporting them to the degree that he intruded into that committee's deliberation room, fretted into threatening them, influencing them, to report the by-laws unamended, fretted to have them voted on by the shareholders' meeting, fretted to have the Board pass them, rushing a special meeting of the Board to spread them on the Board's minutes, fretted then to get controllership of the Board, fretted into busybodying in the English situation, fretted into many sorts of mistakes on that matter and the Board matters, fretted into besmirching our British work, fretted into obtaining an illegal opinion on alleged vacancies in the Board, fretted into ousting the Board's majority, fretted into plunging the controversy on the Church, fretted into publishing Vol. VII without the Board's knowledge and consent, fretted into writing Harvest Siftings while we were acting as mediator between him and the Board's majority, fretted into waging the political campaign to blacken the Board's majority and us and secure his re-election. What shall we say more of his fretting course in the big drive, the military question, the bonds' buying matter, arranging to publish 2, 000, 000 copies of Vol. VII while he was imprisoned, thereby going over the heads of the acting executive committee, which foiled that power-grasping act just in time to prevent the government from

pouncing upon the Society again, causing the by-laws to be passed contrary to law on electing officers and directors, first for 3 years and 10 months, thereafter for 3 years, etc., etc.? Certainly fretting is a finely-fitting descriptive word for the unclean use of official powers in power-grasping and lording in his case. And the same thing in principle holds in the cases of others, like H. J. Shearn, Wm. Crawford, Jesse Hemery, Isaac Hoskins, etc., etc. Of course, in such cases a declaration of uncleanness by the examining priest had to be made (it is unclean, v. 51) and must be made in similar cases whenever proven to have the same qualities in principle.

(39) V. 52 tells what the examining priest should in the type do with such a garment—it had to be burnt. Regardless of whether the garment was linen, woolen, or of skin, or whether the plague was in the warp or woof of the linen or woolen garment, or in the skin or thing made of skin—it had to be burnt. What does this type? The abused office powers must be taken away from the offender—they must be made non-existent so far as he is concerned. Let us see how this occurs, first in the case of usurping general elders, then of local elders. In the case of general elders Jesus does this and announces the fact through His mouthpiece, as we can see in the case of Diotrephes (3 John 9, 10). In the Epiphany Jesus has been doing this and has been announcing it through the Epiphany messenger. How are the office powers vacated? By dismissing the offender from membership in the Little Flock, whereby one loses his office of general elder in the Little Flock; for certainly a general elder who loses membership in the Little Flock loses the office of general eldership in the Little Flock, since, to hold such an office, one must be a member in that company, just as anyone losing citizenship in a country thereby loses any office he may have had in that country. Such a dismissal does not imply losing an office in a business

corporation, *e.g.*, J.F.R.'s dismissal from the Little Flock did not imply his loss of the presidency of the Society. He committed usurpations against the Church as general elder and in his office as president of the Society, but the loss of official powers that his power-grasping and lording brought upon him were those that he had as general elder in the Little Flock; for the initial uncleanness that characterizes the Great Company is the uncleanness that deprives one of membership in the Little Flock. The same principles apply to other power-grasping and lording usurpers among general elders in the Little Flock. In an ecclesia, its validly pronouncing a local elder a usurper in power-grasping and lording likewise manifests him as having been cut off from the Little Flock by our Lord previously, which cutting off deprives him of his right to his office as a local elder in the Little Flock. If the entire ecclesia sanctions his usurping power-grasping and lording, it is cut off from being a Little Flock ecclesia, just as a group whose members were in the Little Flock movement, partisan supporting a power-grasping and lording general elder, becomes a Great Company group or movement. "It shall be burnt with fire." This types the complete annihilation of such persons' official powers (v. 52).

(40) Vs. 47-52 describe an undoubted case of a leprous garment. Vs. 53-58 describe cases in which for awhile there is a measure of doubt, and how certainty in one way or the other is reached. If at the end of the seven days' shutting up the priest's examination manifests that the plague has not spread in the garment in warp or woof or in anything of skin (v. 53), the priest shall command it to be washed and then shut up seven days more (v. 54). Antitypically if the examining priest finds that the power-grasping has not continued in its former unfolding, nor in new directions, nor in a combination of them, neither toward the Church (linen), nor toward the justified

(wool), along the lines of teaching usurpations (warp), nor of arrangement usurpations (woof), nor toward the world (skin), along the two just mentioned lines (v. 53), the antitypical examining priest shall exhort the priests and others to apply to the offender the water of the Word (Eph. 5: 26) to cleanse him from the uncleanness of his former usurpations (v. 54). Such usurpations were not in themselves extreme enough to manifest the offender as a persistent usurper in power-grasping and lording. But after this antitypical washing the offender must be antitypically shut up (v. 54) for the antitypical seven days, *i.e.*, he must be put under restraint, circumscribed in his official activity, not shown so much respect, esteem and cordiality, etc., as formerly. This must be done by our High Priest through His special eye, mouth and hand, when the offender is a general elder, and by the local ecclesia, if the offender is a local elder. Sometimes the restraint consists of debarring the offender for awhile from all official activity. This should be done, if the offence is more or less public, and if it is more or less exaggerated, as a safeguard to all concerned. With a local elder this may be done by letting him remain unelected at the next election, or giving him less important services as his duties.

(41) V. 55 shows the case of the suspected garment after being washed not showing any improvement (not changed its color, even if the plague did not spread). In such a case the garment should be destroyed (burnt in the fire), because it is unclean. It is an inward fit regardless of whether the leprosy shows itself on the interior or exterior of the garment. After a sufficient time has elapsed in the antitype, following the priest's exhorting the offender to amend, his case should be re-examined. The typical garment not changing its color from green and red types impenitence, refusal to confess the wrong and to promise amendment, on the part

of the offender. His office powers should be taken from him, even if he has not continued to exercise his former usurpations, nor usurped in other directions, nor combined the two forms of usurpation (be not spread). By his impenitence, etc., he proves that his office powers are defiled with Great Company uncleanness—power-grasping and lording—hence he must be dismissed from his office: his office powers must cease to exist. If he be a general elder, Jesus will do the dismissing, both from the Little Flock and from his office, and manifest it through His special mouth making the pertinent announcement. If the offender be a local elder, the Lord Jesus will dismiss him from his place in the Little Flock and by the ecclesia from his office as local elder in that ecclesia ("Thou shalt burn it in the fire") (v. 55). In the garment it was a fi et inward, *i.e.*, in the interior of the garment, regardless of whether it showed itself externally (without); *i.e.*, on the outside surface of the garment, or internally (within), *i.e.*, on the inner surface of the garment. Antitypically there is unholy ambition in the heart of such an one (fi et internally), which expressed itself in former power-grasping and lording. That it still exists in his heart is evident from his impenitence, regardless of whether he let it appear externally, *i.e.*, publicly to many (bare without), or internally, *i.e.*, privately to a few (bare within). The impenitence is the thing that manifests the real trouble. Bro. Shearn is an example of this form of power-grasping and lording. After our washing him with the water of the Word he promised amendment, but thereafter when Wm. Crawford learned of this he persuaded him to withdraw his repentance, which he did. Hence the old colors of antitypical green and red appeared. Hence his office powers were severed from him (burnt).

(42) V. 56 discusses the case of the washed leprous garment that loses its green and red colors, but is somewhat dark after the washing and shutting up seven

days. The discolored part was to be torn out of the garment. This represents the case of official powers that were used usurpatorially, but that under the washing through the Word and sufficient restraint were cleansed partly from power-grasping (green) and lording (red). Accordingly, the offender partly repented and partly gave up his usurpations. What is typed by the rending of the dark spot out of the garment? It seems to type the removal of those features of service wherein the power-grasping and lording partly persist. *E.g.*, if a pilgrim would usurp powers connected with public meetings, he should, even if he repent partly, be retired awhile from giving public meetings, though continuing to give parlor meetings, or be removed from pilgrim work, but allowed to do evangelistic work or colporteur work. If a local elder be given the opportunity of giving discourses to the Church (linen), to the justified (wool) and to the world (skin), and use these to grasp for powers not implied in giving such discourses, whether in teaching (warp) or arrangement (woof), even if he partially repent, he should be refused the privilege of giving discourses and be limited to leading Berean studies or testimony meetings.

(43) V. 57 treats of a garment wherefrom the dark part was rent and wherein afterward the plague appeared again. This case types official powers once misused, in the unholy ambition of power-grasping and lording, and under some repentance partially withdrawn from such misuse, and later on being again fully misused, toward the Church (linen), the justified (wool) or the world (skin), in teaching (warp) or in arrangement (woof). There have been such cases; and doubtless there will still be such cases. The type indicates what is to be done with such. It calls such a case a spreading plague. This types the fact that one who once was partially healed of power-grasping and lording and then falls again into them has an unholy ambition.

spreading from one act of power-grasping and lording into another, that his cleansing was not fully undergone, and that not watching and praying against it, he fell again into this evil. It shows that the matter of power-grasping and lording is not simply a weakness, but is a matter of a large degree of willfulness against which he has not properly set himself. Moreover, it indicates that the evil is deep-seated, yea, so deep-seated as to require his official powers to be taken entirely away from him (thou shalt burn that wherein the plague is with fire). How is this done? In the case of a general elder Jesus cuts him off from the high calling which, of course, deprives him of his office as a general elder, and then causes his Great Companyship to be announced through His special mouth. Thus his manifestation as a Great Company member demonstrates his loss of his official powers as a general elder. In the case of a local elder Jesus cuts him out of the Little Flock and causes this to be announced through the vote of the ecclesia which declares him guilty of power-grasping and lording, and thereby deprives him of his office as elder.

(44) V. 58 gives us the case of a garment that becomes free of the plague by the washing in the water—free from it in linen, in wool, either in warp or woof, in skin or in work of skin. This would indicate that the leprosy was not deep-seated in the garment and that after obtaining its cleansing it could readily be used as before it became leprosy-stricken, the only condition being that it must again be washed in water. This represents a case, either in a general or local elder, who grasped for power and lorded it over others, either the Little Flock (linen), the justified (woolen) or the world (skin), either in teaching (warp) or arrangement (woof) respects. But as the water of the Word was applied to him he recognized his wrong, bewailed it, acknowledged it and put it effectually aside, regardless of whether it was against the Church (linen), the

justified (wool) or the world (skin), or whether it was done in teaching (warp) or arrangement (woof) respects. His was a genuine repentance which worked a reformation that need not be repented of. The case, therefore, was one largely of ignorance, or of weakness, or of both. Hence it did not lead to his loss of his official powers in the general Church, if he were a general elder, or in a local church, if he were a local elder. In the type a second washing in water was necessary. This represents the fact that such a misuse of one's official powers, though properly amended, implies natural weakness toward unholy ambition, and this must be cleansed away by a second washing of the water, *i.e.*, through the Word an energetic and successful effort was made to purge out of the character the weakness toward unholy ambition. V. 59 sums up the subject as given in vs. 47-58.

(45) We now come to the study of Lev. 14, but will deviate from the order there given, because we think we can better present our subject, if we study the sixth form of Great Company uncleanness as presented in vs. 33-48—leprosy in a house—before studying the cleansing of leprous persons and houses. Doubtless the Lord presented the cleansing of individual Great Company persons in vs. 1-32 first because in vs. 33-48 the Lord treats of the leprosy in a house. We hesitated for some time before deciding to change the order of this chapter's discussion, but finally made it, because the brethren will likely understand it better after our previous studies, if the sixth form of Great Company uncleanness is presented before the cleansing of the individuals and sects is studied. The antitype of the persons and the act of v. 33 are the same as we found in Lev. 13: 1, even as the language of the two verses is the same. Hence our former explanation will suffice. Vs. 34-53 give instructions that apply not to the wilderness sojourn of Israel, but to their living in Canaan (v. 34). The reason is apparent; for Israel did not

build houses during their wilderness sojourn, but then dwelt in tents; and because of the antitype the Lord arranged the type to suit the conditions of Israel dwelling in Canaan, where they ordinarily lived in *houses*. These houses wherein leprosy was God designed to represent Great Company groups, subdivisions, *i.e.*, their sectarian bodies. Hence the leprous houses of Canaan are used to represent the Great Company sects; and these suggest to us the sixth form of Great Company uncleanness—their sectarianism, their partisan support of power-grasping and lording leaders. We have frequently in these columns called attention to the fact that partisan support of power-grasping leaders is one of the marks of Great Companyship, since both the usurpations of such leaders and their partisan support are revolutionism against the Lord's arrangements.

(46) As we proved from literal Scriptures of each of the other five forms of antitypical leprosy that they are forms of Great Company uncleanness, so we desire to prove this of this sixth form of antitypical leprosy by literal Scriptures. Ps. 107: 11 in its last clause is such a proof: "And contemned the *counsel* of the Most High." We have already shown that God's "*counsel*" or plan consists of the various series of arrangements whereby He brings various classes to eternal life. He who revolutionizes against these arrangements, *i.e.*, sets them aside and puts others in their place, condemns, considers negligible, of no importance, the counsel of the Most High. One of God's arrangements for His Church is its unity under Christ alone (Ps. 133: 1-3; Eph. 4: 3-7). Partisan support of power-grasping leaders is sectarianism in opposition to this unity (1 Cor. 1: 11-13; 3: 1-23). Hence, according to Ps. 107: 10, 11, it is an evidence of Great Company uncleanness. St. Paul by his application of 1 Kings 19: 18 in Rom. 11: 4, 5, to the Gospel-Age Elect, has given us a clue to understand 1 Kings 19: 18 from its connection as applicable during the Epiphany, when

we have the 7, 000 of the very Elect who overcame Baal worshiping and kissing, all others then living being more or less guilty of one or the other of these. *Baal* means *lord* and refers to Satan as the usurper, the power-grasper and lord over others. To worship Baal means to serve him in his power-grasping, which is done by imitating his power-grasping to bring people under control, and thus ultimately under Satan's control. Hence all power-graspers are Baal-worshipers. Accordingly, the power-grasping leaders among God's people are afflicted with the Great Company uncleanness of Baal worship. In ancient times loyalty was pledged by a kiss, as now it is pledged by a handshake. Hence for any of God's people to kiss Baal means to give partisan support to power-grasping leaders in their devotion to what is actually Satan's power-grasping course.

(47) Hence the Baal-kissers among God's real people are the partisan, sectarian, supporters of power-grasping leaders. These are, therefore, afflicted with Great Company uncleanness, since none of the 7, 000 bow the knee to Baal nor kiss him. Acts 20: 30 is another passage that is in line with the thought we are expounding—"to draw *disciples after them*." These Scriptures are sufficient to prove that partisan supporters of power-grasping leaders—sectarians—are crown-losers. Hence we understand the house of v. 34 to represent the Great Company as a sect or a combination of sects. And the leprosy in such a house we understand to be partisan support by the sect of its leaders—sectarianism. Sectarianism is a great sin; for it does not act from devotion to the Truth, the Truth arrangements and the Spirit of the Truth, but from devotion to partisanship. The Truth, its arrangements and its Spirit are by it neglected or antagonized whenever this is in the interests of the sect. Their actual, though not verbal motto is: "My party—I stand for it, right or wrong." Therefore they support

their sect and leaders regardless of how wrong they are. Among Truth people the partisan support that the Societyites have given "the channel" and "the present management" in their gross wrongs and errors ever since 1917 is a classic example of the partisanship, sectarianism, that is a part of Great Company uncleanness. This partisanship is at least as extreme as that which the most bigoted of Romanists give the papacy and their church. In what sense can God be spoken of as putting the plague of antitypical leprosy into such a sect? Somewhat after the manner of His sending strong delusions upon reprobates (2 Thes. 2: 9-11). He withdraws hindrance from Satan's efforts to make them partisans, sectarians.

(48) In the type (v. 35) the owner of the house was to tell the priest of his fears that the house was plague-stricken. We understand the owner of the house to represent the leaders of the Great Company sects; for the sectarian support that they are given comes from those symbolically owned by them, since these in a sense give themselves to the leaders. Hence these Baal-kissers surely belong to the Baal-worshippers. But how do these owners come to the priest, the Lord Jesus in this case, as acting through His special eye, mouth and hand, since the matter is not one of a local, but of the general Church? Or to put it concretely, How did J.F.R. and his subordinate leaders tell our Lord as He acted through His eye, mouth and hand, that symbolic leprosy, Great Company uncleanness, afflicted the Societyites as a sect? Certainly they did not do it by word, for they do not believe they are leaders of a sect, nor that their following is a Great Company group, nor that it is afflicted with Great Company uncleanness. As often stated in these columns, typical speeches are usually antityped by acts. And surely by their acts they have told the Lord that the Society is a sect, that their following is a Great Company group, and that it is afflicted with Great

Company uncleanness. Their revolutionary acts in teaching, arrangement, power-grasping, lording and sectarianism, as very multitudinous as they are, are crying out in deafening loudness that the Society is a sect, that their following is a Great Company group, and that it is afflicted with Great Company uncleanness. And their followers by yielding them partisan support are giving a loud amen to the loudly sounding acts of their leaders. ("It seemeth to me there is, as it were, a plague in the house. ") Similar acts on the part of the P.B.I., the Dawn, the Bolgerite, the B. S. C., etc., leaders cry out loudly with reference to their respective houses, "It seemeth to me, there is, as it were, a plague in the house." This is clear and factual.

(49) Since the leprous house types a Great Company sect, the priest to whom its examination in the type was referred must represent our Lord as High Priest, hence must have been the typical high priest, which is also implied in the word *the* before the word *priest* in v. 35. That Jesus is typed by the examining priest is evident from the fact that a Great Company sect is formed of crown-losers, not from one, but from many ecclesiasties, and of some belonging to no ecclesia. Hence it grew out of a movement affecting the general Church, which implies that its examination is a thing that our High Priest handles, since a local ecclesia has no jurisdiction outside of its own sphere. Accordingly, both the language, *the* priest, and the nature of the case imply that Jesus is the antitypical examining priest, which implies, as already shown, that He does it through His special eye, mouth and hand for the time. Since there were no Great Company sects until the Epiphany, it follows that He does the pertinent examination through the Epiphany messenger. With this the facts of the Epiphany happenings are in harmony. The charge to empty the house of things not yet contaminated by the leprosy (v. 36), types the

fact that our Lord requires all things of teachings and arrangements in a Great Company sect not yet contaminated with Great Company uncleanness to be separated in mind from that sect, so that these might be preserved from corruption and so that the things distinctive of that sect (house) may be examined in themselves. After making this mental separation then the priest is to examine the pertinent sect. This implies that the antitypical priest must limit himself to fault-seeking in his examination when faults factually exist. This is one of the objections that Levites make to the pertinent course of The Present Truth. They charge that it is devoted to criticism and knocking only. While asserting that the bulk of the matter appearing in The Present Truth is in exposition of the Word free from criticism of Great Company uncleanness, as our readers know, we admit the charge in so far as our examinations of Great Company sects are concerned, declaring that this is the Divine will in respect to this matter, even as v. 36 teaches. Under the circumstances it would be only unnecessary work to mention their agreements with Truth teachings and arrangements, since according to the charge of v. 36 these are to be passed by. Hence the omission of the mention of these implies that they are present in the pertinent Great Company sect. In other words, God wants the antitypical priest to attend strictly to the matter at hand—see whether there is any Great Company uncleanness in the sect or not. Perhaps one reason why the average Levite thinks that The Present Truth contains nothing but criticisms and "knockings" is that, apart from subscribers, we send to the members of each group those issues only that examine the uncleanness of that group. The priest going in to see the house (v. 36) types our Lord directing His attention, in His eye, to the pertinent Great Company sect. It is a mental going.

(50) V. 37 shows the typical examination and its

finding of the typical leprosy. This types how the Lord Jesus through His eye makes the antitypical examination of a Great Company sect and finds signs, symptoms, of antitypical leprosy. The walls of a house, like the walls of a city, Biblically symbolize powers. Hence the walls of the leprous house symbolize the powers of a Great Company sect. The word *strakes* is the old English word for streaks. These hollow streaks are somewhat like the streaks of mold that one sees in a damp, musty house. They represent the Great Company uncleanness found in their sects. The colors *green* and *red*, as we saw in our study of Lev. 13: 49, type power-grasping and lording respectively—evils that are always present in uncleansed Great Company sects; for their leaders in their unholy ambition (Acts 20: 30) are always guilty of these and their followers support them therein. And it is particularly, though not exclusively, their followers' support of their power-grasping and lording that is typed by the green and red color of the hollow streaks. These latter being deeper than the surface of the walls, like the leprosy of the person being deeper than the skin, types the willfulness of the partisan support of power-grasping and lording. The priest leaving the house (v. 38) types the Lord in His eye directing for the time His attention away from the examination, after He has sufficiently done it for the purpose at hand and preparatory to His putting the pertinent sect under restraint. His so doing is typed by the priest shutting up the house. It consists in His curbing its activities and privileges, usually by untoward experiences, *e.g.*, the Society in our exposures of its leaders in 1917, the P.B.I. by our 1918 and 1919 exposures of their evil doings of the immediate past, etc. The seven days have the same antitypical meaning as we have shown in this article before—a sufficient time to elapse to allow for further development of the pertinent uncleanness, which is a reasonable thing.

(51) The priest returning and examining the house (v. 39) after the seven days types our Lord through His eye redirecting His attention to the Great Company sect in question and re-examining its sectarian powers (walls). In the type, if the plague had during the seven days spread in the walls (v. 39), the priest was required to command that they take away the stones which the plague was and throw them into an unclean place outside the city. The spreading of the plague types the increase of the power-grasping and lording in teaching and arrangement respects. If this takes place, the antitypical High Priest through His eye, mouth and hand commands that the symbolic stones-power-grasping and lording leaders (1 Pet. 2: 5)—be disowned and cast out from among the Lord's people (city) as evil (unclean place). Several examples will clarify this. When the Society's uncleanness through its supporting J.F.R. 's revolutionism in teaching and arrangements became strongly manifest, after previous examinations, the Lord through The Present Truth sent word to its board of judgment to deprive him of all his office powers. At other times He sent them word to disown and cast off his illegal directors from among God's people, as being evil. Similar things were done with the P.B.I., Olsonites, Adam-Rutherfordites, etc., etc., etc. The dust on the walls within the house throughout it (v. 41) symbolizes the false teachings and arrangements of the Great Company sects. The scraping of the dust down from off the walls and gathering it represents The Present Truth refutatively gathering together the erroneous teachings and arrangements of the Levite sects. This was done in the articles reviewing and examining them, e.g., Olsonism Examined; P.B.I. Chronology Examined; Views and Reviews; Behold the Bridegroom, Examined; the Right-Eye Darkening articles; Riemerism on the New Creature Examined; Bolgerism examined; Brickerism Examined, etc., etc.,

etc. Certainly there was a thorough scraping down of the pertinent symbolic dust! This was poured outside of the symbolic city into an unclean place—cast out from among God's people as evil.

(52) Putting other stones (v. 42) in the place of the removed ones types supplanting the unclean teachers by clean ones, and putting other mortar in the place of that scraped off means to put true teachings and arrangements in the place of the wrong teachings and arrangements. In time this will be done in every case in which the group remains a Great Company group. Vs. 43-45 show what was to be done in case a house was cleansed from leprosy and the leprosy returned and spread abroad in the house. This would type what was to be done with a Great Company group that became unreformably defiled after a measurable cleansing. The return of the plague and the spreading of the plague abroad in the house types the re-defilement of the group, that the group as such, but not necessarily all the individuals, has become uncleansible. Such a thing could be the case only if it turns out to be an antitypical fretting leprosy, *i.e.*, Great Company defilement in incurable partisan support of power grasping and lording leaders. V. 45 shows how the destruction of the house takes place. The breaking down of the house types the group as such being made to cease being a Great Company group. This occurs through our Lord casting entirely off such a body organized as it is from being a Great Company movement. This has occurred in the case of the original antitypical Uzzielites, Sturgeonites, as a group, the original antitypical Hebronites, the Ritchieites, as a group, and the original antitypical Izeharites, Olsonites, as a group. It has also in a certain sense occurred with the Society as a corporational group. This happened in 1920 when antitypical Boaz (Ruth 4: 9-11) "bought" from the Society editors, directors and management all the rights that they had in antitypical

Elimelech (Great Company leaders), Mahlon (the leaders of the more faithful justified). Chilion (the leaders of the less faithful justified) and antitypical Ruth (the Youthful Worthies).

(53) What does this mean? Not that God has cast off antitypical Elisha, the good Societyites, from being a Great Company movement. Rather that He no longer from 1920 onward recognizes the Society, as a corporation working through its board, editorial and managerial officials, as managing the work of antitypical Elisha, the good Societyites. The work, therefore, that that corporation as such has been doing since 1920 God no longer recognizes as a Great Company and Youthful Worthy work; but He does recognize the proper work that individual members of antitypical Elisha as such do as a Great Company (and Youthful Worthy) work. The work that that corporation as such has been doing since 1920 as organized in its directors, editors and management is unqualifiedly Azazelian, *i.e.*, Satanic, hence in no sense God's work. Stones (leaders), like Menta Sturgeon (now dead), and A.I. Ritchie, have been utterly removed from the group movement that they formerly controlled. There were two things that led to the casting off of the Society as a corporation in its officers—their denial of the existence of, and service to the Youthful Worthies (as set forth in the Ruth type) and their acting the hypocrite in getting from antitypical Naaman a prolongation of powers for the directors and officers of the Society (Gehazi hypocritically asking for and getting money and two changes of garments from Naaman). The breaking down of the timber of the typical house (v. 45) represents the disassociating of the members of such a Great Company group from membership in it and from their support, as a group, of its leaders, teaching and arrangements. The breaking down of the mortar represents the overthrow of the evil teachings and arrangements of such

a group as such. As illustrations of such we may refer to our final refutations of Olsonism, whereby the former Olsonites gave up their faith therein. The refutation of Society errors of teaching and arrangement after 1920 are further examples to the same effect. The Bible types the destruction of the P.B.I. as organized in their charter (Judg. 8: 17), which is to take place after antitypical Gideon's Second Battle. It will be noted that the priest does this breaking-down work (vs. 44-45), typing that it will be our Lord who will do the destructive work in the antitype (through His eye, mouth and hand). The carrying of all the house's materials outside the city types the casting out from among God's people the three above-mentioned items of the antitypical house. Casting them into an unclean place types that these antitypical things will be repudiated as unclean by God's people.

(54) V. 46 brings to our attention the contaminating effects of partisan support of a Great Company sect on those associated with it. To enter a leprous house during the time it was shut up was a forbidden thing in Israel and could only then be done, if revolutionism against God's typical arrangements was committed. A partisan attitude toward that house was shown to exist in the one who entered it while it was shut up. Such an intruder was to be unclean until evening. His entering such an house types association with that sect and implies a revolutionistic attitude on the part of the antitype; and that revolutionism consists in a partisan support of that sect. Such a support is bound to make one unclean; for the works of sectarianism are wrath, strife, envy, prejudice, partiality, enmity, persecution and misrepresentation of the faithful, approval of certain evils and disapproval of certain good things of the Truth and its arrangements. Sometime these friends will recognize these evils as committed by them, but the priesthood recognizes them already. And this uncleanness will more or less remain

in them until the end of the Epiphany (until the even). We are not to think that the cleansing of these will be instantaneous. So far as the cleansing that comes to them by the blood of the Lamb (Rev. 7: 14) is concerned, it will be instantaneous, but so far as the cleansing that comes to them by the water of the Word (Num. 8: 7) is concerned, it is a gradual matter, completed by the end of the Epiphany (even).

(55) V. 47 tells us of the defiling effects of sleeping and eating in a leprous house. In Bible symbols a bed represents one's faith, creed (Ps. 4: 4; 36: 4; 41: 3; 63: 6; Is. 28: 20). To sleep in a symbolic bed would signify to find rest in one's faith or creed. To sleep in a leprous house would, therefore, signify to feel at ease, rest in the beliefs of a Great Company sect while it is unclean. This would imply that such an one is content with the false teachings and wrong practices of that unclean Great Company sect. Of course, such a course would make his qualities (garments) unclean, defiling them with the *disgraces* and errors of that sect. This would require for their cleansing a washing in the water of the Word, as well as in the blood of the Lamb. To eat in Bible symbols means to appropriate to one's self the things symbolically eaten (Ps. 22: 26, 29; 78: 24, 25; Cant. 4: 16; 5: 1; Is. 3: 10; 4: 1; 7: 15; 30: 24; 55: 1, 2; 61: 6; 65: 4, 13). To eat in a leprous house, therefore, types to accept the false teachings and the wrong arrangements of an unclean Great Company sect as one's own. Such believing and practicing are bound to defile the symbolic eater. His qualities of heart and mind become defiled, his doctrines become defiled and his services become defiled. He becomes quite unclean, and this will manifest itself by his seeking to curb the progress of the Truth and to advance the interests of error. Hence his garments in all three senses of the word become defiled, and for him to become clean he must thoroughly

wash out the spots and filth from his garments, until they are clean.

(56) From vs. 39 to 47 the things connected with a fretting leprosy in a house are set forth. V. 48 shows what is to be done with a house not stricken with a fretting leprosy. The priest's coming to the house (in v. 48) was after the removal of the infected stones, the scraping of the walls, the substituting of new stones in the walls for the removed ones and the plastering with other mortar. This represents that after a Great Company sect has been freed from power-grasping and lording leaders and partisan support of these and gotten better leaders and proper teaching and arrangements, the examining priest is to direct to it his attention for examining purposes. If the typical priest found that the leprosy had not spread in the house, he was to declare it to be clean, which types that if the examination, after replacing the infected symbolic stones and mortar by clean symbolic stones and mortar, discloses that there has been not only no increase of partisan support of power-grasping and lording, but also a setting aside of this evil, a real reformation, He, Jesus, is to declare the Great Company sect clean; for it has been healed of its stroke of antitypical leprosy along the lines of power-grasping and lording in false teaching and wrong arrangement. The bulk of the rest of the chapter (vs. 49-53) treats of the cleansing ceremony in the case of a cleansed leprous house. As this ceremony is somewhat akin to the first part of the cleansing of a leprous person (vs. 1-7), we will examine these verses later. Thus we have brought to a close our study of the six forms of leprosy as typical of the six forms of Great Company uncleanness; and in this study we have found a very fine description of typical and antitypical leprosy, and a marvelous and Divinely inspired description and vindication of the priesthood's Epiphany

work. "How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord, is laid for your faith in His excellent Word!"

(1) What will we study before studying Num. 12? Why? What is the character of leprosy? In what continent does it mainly exist? What did it, according to Lev. 13: 12, 13, type when covering the entire body? When affecting only parts of the body? Apart from vs. 12, 13, of what do Lev. 13 and 14 treat? Only how could we understand the facts brought out by these two verses and these two chapters aside from these two verses? What are the two kinds of antitypical leprosy thus brought to light? As distinct from the kind of leprosy of vs. 12, 13, what kinds of leprosy are referred to in the rest of Lev. 13 and 14? What are their six typical forms? Why does leprosy covering the whole person fittingly type the Adamic depravity? Why do the kinds of leprosy localized in parts of the person fittingly type Great Company uncleanness?

(2) Who is the classic type of the Great Company from the standpoint of leprosy? How is this proved by her pertinent contrast with Aaron? What, in the first place, in Miriam's experience shows that she types Great Company members? How is this proved by the cited passages? What, secondly, in her experience proves that she types Great Company members? How is this proved by the cited passages? How is Naaman such a type? Whom, therefore, does he type? How are Gehazi and his house such a type? Uzziah? When will details on him be brought out? Why are they here cited? For what will these cases here serve? How will the pertinent detailed proofs be given? For what do the generalities so far given prepare us?

(3) Whom does Jehovah speaking to Moses and Aaron in v. 1 type? What does v. 2 give as to leprosy? What do these symptoms not necessarily prove? What are they sufficient to arouse? What did such a fear require? What only are given in vs. 2-8? Where are the details given? Where will these be studied? What will the study of vs. 2-8 show? Whom does Aaron here type? What is typed by bringing a leprosy-suspect to Aaron? What proves that the antitypical leprosy here typed cannot be the Adamic depravity? What kind of antitypical leprosy is, accordingly, here typed? What does this fact constitute? What

second fact proves the same thing? How is the antitypical bringing done?

(4) What details are needed here to make the antitype intelligible? How are antitypical lepers not, and how are they now by us brought to the High Priest for investigation? What case proves this? Give the proof negatively and positively. What do these facts prove? Since inspiration ceased and until the Epiphany, what did Jesus not use as to Great Company matters? Why not? What results therefrom in the Epiphany as to bringing a leper-suspect to Jesus?

(5) What objection may be used to this thought? How is this objection to be answered? What would the naming of Eleazar or Ithamar for other than the end of this Age have indicated, so far as the antitypes are concerned? What is typed by the investigating and decision-pronouncing under-priest? How does 1 Cor. 5: 4, 5 prove this answer? How does v. 13 also prove it? What, accordingly, is typed by the pertinent under-priest? What conclusion is to be drawn from this fact? Apart from cases brought to antitypical Aaron, who only can properly do this work? To what brethren must such activities of an ecclesia be limited? What results from this? Why? How is the General Church taken care of on this point?

(6) What does the first clause of v. 3 tell? What does this type? What does the antitype prove? What do the middle clauses of v. 3 give? What is wrong with hair thus turned white? What does this type? How do we Biblically arrive at this thought? What are the two things that constitute the power of God's people? What do these make them? What is typed by the leper's hair turned white in the sore? What is one of the symptoms of Great Company uncleanness? How may the matter be otherwise expressed? How is this thought literally expressed in Ps. 107: 10, 11? What do these verses give?

(7) What second symptom of leprosy does v. 3 give? What does it type? What kind of revolutionism manifests Great Company uncleanness? Why must persistency be added to revolutionism to make the latter Great Company uncleanness? What would result from such a condition? What illustrations are to the point? What must be present to manifest Great Company uncleanness? In whom is it not present? Why not? When only can we be sure that

We are dealing with Great Company uncleanness? What kind of symptoms prevail in typical and antitypical leprosy?

(8) What, in the type, was the priest to do, if he saw the two pertinent symptoms prevail? In the antitype? Since when has this been going on? Despite what? Between what times was it wrong to declare one to be in the Great Company? Why? Since when has the token of Great Companyship become due to be understood? What results from these facts? Why did our Pastor for the Parousia and before speak against judging as to who are in the Great Company? When, according to him, would such judging be in order? What separation takes place during the Epiphany? What would those have to know who would co-operate with Jesus in that separation work? What did our Pastor say as to judging when the separation would come? Where? How does 1 Cor. 4: 5 prove this? How do Lev. 13: 3, 8, 15, 20, 22, 25, 27, 30, 36 and 44 prove this? What will those have to do who denounce this work? What characteristics does such denouncing have? What parallel actions show themselves in this connection?

(9) Of what do vs. 4-6 treat? How must such cases be treated? What is typed by the bright spot being turned white? By its not being deeper than the skin? By its not turning the hair white? Despite these conditions, how must the pertinent person be regarded and treated? What does this type? What is typed by the seven days? What does this mean for the investigating priest or ecclesia? What must he do before coming to a decision? Why? What did these principles move the Lord to do with the type? What is implied by the shutting up in the type? In the antitype?

(10) What does v. 4 show—type and antitype? How is this indicated? Why is the decision, type and antitype, to be delayed? What was done, type and antitype, if the second investigation justified no decision? How long was the investigation to go on in each case? What should be done in each case when a decision was reached? If in the type the evil was only a scab, what was the decision? What does this mean in the antitype? What is typed by the suspect's washing his clothes? What was to be done if, after the first seven days, the plague spread? What does

this type? If no repentance sets in after the third investigation, what is the antitypical priest to do? What is therein implied? What does our study of vs. 1-8 do with our understanding of their contents? Where will the details come out? What does our study of vs. 1-8 prove of it negatively? Why?

(11) How many details on leprosy are brought out in the rest of Lev. 13? What is each of these and where is it described? How many of these attach to the person? How many to garments? What form of leprosy is set forth in Lev. 14: 33-53? To which of these will we give our attention first? To what do these four forms of leprosy correspond? What are these four forms? What does each type? What does the Bible teach of these four forms, type and antitype? What false charge is made against Epiphany friends? What is the truth on the subject? What should we first note? How is this shown in 1 Cor. 5? In Jude 23? What conclusions should be drawn from these two facts and two sets of passages? What will we now study?

(12) How does the swelling form of leprosy type Great Company sin? What do we conclude from these facts? What does the whiteness of the swelling suggest? The hair turning white? If only gross sin were involved, what could we not do? Why? What is furnished, if error is added to the gross sin? Why is this proof only partial? What is the condition if persistency in error follows on gross sin? What is the force of the adjective *old* in the expression, "an *old* leprosy"? To what does it correspond? What is the investigating priest to do when he finds these conditions present? By what three Scriptures is the summary course proved to be the right one to follow?

(13) What is the first impression made on one by the teachings of vs. 12, 13? Why? How only can this natural thought be reasonably answered? Why from the standpoint of Lev. 13 and 14 could the Lord not use the leprosy that covers the entire body to type Great Company uncleanness? What would such an one type in contrast with the uncleanness typed in these two chapters? By contrast with the forms of antitypical leprosy treated of in these chapters as a whole, what must be done with the kind of antitypical leprosy treated of in vs. 12, 13? What, therefore, can we at once see? Why? What follows from the fact that vs. 12, 13 type the Adamic depravity, as to Great

Company uncleanness? To whom do the statements of vs. 12, 13 apply? What is the case, type and antitype, if raw flesh appears in such an one? Why? As what is he to be declared, in type and antitype? Why is he not, and why is he to be so declared? In such a case what two things would be typed? What, accordingly, was the priest to do from the standpoint of these two chapters?

(14) Of what do vs. 16, 17 treat? What occurred at times in Israel with lepers? In what two ways did this occur? What was the healed leper to do? Why? Where is this shown in detail? What words describe the healing? What does this type? What case illustrates this? How do the cited passages show these points? What is typed by the charge that the cleansed leper show himself to the priest? To which antotypical priest should the cleansed one come? Why? Why was an accurate examination needed, in type and antitype? What, in type and antitype, would a premature pronouncing of one as clean effect? If the repentance is sincere what should not, and what should be done? Where in type is this whole transaction shown?

(15) What is the second form of leprosy? Where is this treated? What two things are stated of the boil in v. 18? What is typed by the renewed boil, as described in vs. 18-23? How does Heb. 2: 15 show selfishness to be a kind of Great Company uncleanness? Matt. 10: 39? Matt. 16: 25? Luke 14: 26, 33? John 12: 25? 1 Pet. 2: 11? 1 Pet. 1: 14? What do these and many other Scriptures show? What is typed by the boil's healing and breaking out again?

(16) In what language of v. 19 is the development of leprosy in the boil described? What does this type? What must be done in type and antitype with such a case? What must the priest do with the disease? In what particularly? For what else must he look? Why? What are these, in type and antitype? What will make the priest's diagnosis certain? After reaching such certainty what should he do, in both type and antitype? Why?

(17) What are the conditions that do not warrant a sentence of Great Company uncleanness, in type and antitype? Why in the antitype? What first results therefrom? Secondly? Thirdly? Fourthly? Why was stress laid on persistent revolutionism?

(18) What determines the shutting up of the suspect, in

type and antitype? What do the seven days of the restraint type? What, therefore, is the investigating priest to do? What was the priest to do after the seven days, if the bright spot had spread? What would such spreading imply? Under the antitypical conditions, what is the examining priest to do? If there is no typical or antitypical spreading, what is the examining priest to do? In such circumstances, how is the typical and antitypical boil to be considered?

(19) Where is the third form of leprosy brought to our attention? What does it type? What other kind of Scriptures proves that worldliness is a form of Great Company uncleanness? To what do they lend corroboration? How is this proved by Matt. 13: 22, combined with its context? How do Mark 4: 19 and Luke 8: 14 add to this proof? How is this proved by Luke 21: 34? Jas. 4: 4? For what are these Scriptures sufficient? What is worldliness in a new creature? What two things does it often manifest? What should be done to such a suspect, in type and antitype? What should the antitypical priest do about it? If he finds persistent revolutionism what is he to do? Why?

(20) What does v. 26 suggest? Why should carefulness be exercised by the examining priest, in the type and antitype? What do we, accordingly, note in all the cases mentioned in Lev. 13 and 14? Under what circumstances is judgment to be suspended, in type and antitype? One to be shut up? What should be done, if it should later appear that the suspect is a leper, type and antitype? If he is not one, type and antitype? What corroborates such a decision?

(21) What have we so far studied? What is presented in vs. 29-44? What will first be done as to the thought of vs. 29-44? How does 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20 prove that error is a part of Great Company uncleanness? How does 2 Tim. 2: 17, 18 corroborate the thought of 1 Tim. 1: 19, 20? How does Ps. 107: 10, 11 prove this thought? Jas. 5: 19, 20? What do we conclude from these passages? How does the symbolism of leprosy in the head and beard apply here? What is the fourth form of leprosy called? What must the priest do with one having a scall, type and antitype? What two things would prove the uncleanness, type and antitype? What should be the resultant course?

(22) What does v. 31 show should be done with the

suspect? What should be done, if black hair were in the scall? What if not, and the scall was not deeper than the skin? What is typed by the absence of black hair? Skin depth of the scall? The seven days' restraint? The examination on the seventh day? The shaving of all but the scall? What should the priest do, if no unfavorable symptoms appear in the antitype? What does this show as to unimportant mistakes? What are some examples? What have all uninspired priests made? What should be done with the mistake?

(23) From what standpoint is the matter stated in v. 35? What does it type? What is to be done, type and antitype, in such a case? What is present, typed by the spreading of the scall? What should then be done? Without what? What does v. 37 teach, type and antitype? Against what do vs. 38, 39 caution, type and antitype? What causes freckles? What is typed by them? Why? What has the experience of all of us been on this point? What should not be done therefore? What do vs. 40 and 41 contain? What does baldness represent? Baldness toward the forehead? What is not to be done to such, type and antitype? What three reasons prove this?

(24) What do vs. 42-44 indicate? What would such a sore type? What would it imply? What would this implication type? What would every sore not necessarily imply? How was the case determined? What was precluded by the baldness? Apart from yellow hair, what was alone sufficient to establish leprosy? What in the antitype? If hair were present, what would establish the fact of leprosy being present? What would the priest have to do, if leprosy were present? What did this type? If no leprosy were present, what would the priest have to do? What does this type?

(25) What is given in vs. 45, 46? What was the first thing for the convicted leper to do? On what symbolism is the antitype based? What is it? How are the two forms of the antitype performed? How does Elisha's rending his garments apply here? What does the similarity prove as to the leper's antitype? What is the second thing that the convicted leper had to do? On what symbolisms is the antitype based? What is the antitype?

(26) On what symbols is the antitype of the covered lip based? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What

does the covered lip type? What does a covered upper lip do with the lower lip? What is the antitype? How is typical speech usually antityped? And how not? Accordingly, in what are we to expect the cry, Unclean, to be antityped? How does it occur? What in this connection does the Great Company not say in words? How does it speak?

(27) What is the first thing that v. 46 says of the leper? How long would the typical leprosy be in a leper? The antitypical leper in sin? Selfishness? Worldliness? Error? What will the Great Company continue to do in their defilement? What must be done in order to their cleansing? What is the second item mentioned in v. 46? What does it type? In what three activities will the priests refuse to fellowship with the Great Company? Why?

(28) What is the final item that v. 46 gives on the convicted leper? What does this prove of lepers while Israel was in the wilderness? While in Canaan? To what is the allusion here? From what were they cut off? How long? With whom could they associate? By what were clean Israelites warned against them? What are the antitypes of these things? Where were the lepers to go? What is the antitype? Why are they to go there? What encouragement should not be given the Great Company? With whom may they associate? Among whom are they not to dwell? Until what happens? For what should we thank God, hope and pray? What will the priests do when it comes? In view of this prospect, what do the priests now do?

(29) What did our former study of Lev. 13; 14 cover? What other kinds of leprosy are referred to in these chapters? To what is the present study devoted? Why? In what order will they be studied? What will we pass by in this study? Why? Why is the cleansing of the lepers presented between the presentation of its fifth and sixth forms? With what will we begin this study?

(30) What three things are Biblically symbolized by garments? How do the cited Scriptures prove this of each sense? Why does Lev. 13: 47-58 not use the word garment in the first two senses? In what sense do we understand it to use this word? A leprous garment? How does this form of Great Company uncleanness exist? What other kind of Scriptures also proves it? What is the classic example in proof of this? In what four things did

his power-grasping manifest itself? What do these acts show? What is implied in John's words on dealing with him? How does 1 Pet. 5: 3, 4 prove the same thing? Our Lord's warnings in Rev. 2: 6, 15? Paul's statement in 1 Cor. 9: 27? What may we conclude from our study of these passages?

(31) How many and what kinds of garments are brought to our attention in vs. 47, 48? To what do these correspond? What objection may at first thought be offered to this claim? What overcomes this objection? From what might the pascal lamb be taken? How does this answer strike one accustomed to English only? What overcomes the objection, despite our pertinent English idiom? Of what might the curtain between the linen and rams' skin curtains have been woven? What conclusion may, accordingly, be drawn in harmony with Biblical symbols? Why is no correspondence to the curtain of rams' skin dyed red given in Lev. 13? What do we understand as to the relation of the linen garment? The woolen garment? The skin garment? With what are these respects related? What do the linen garments type? The woolen garments? The skin garments? The warp? The woof?

(32) What does leprosy in a garment type? What two classes have these powers? To whom and what does leprosy in a garment refer? If in linen, what does it type? In what two respects? If in wool, what does it type? In what two respects? If in skin or in things of skin, what does it type? In what two respects? What is, accordingly, typed in vs. 47, 48? What else in v. 48?

(33) What is described in v. 49? What would prove leprosy to be in a garment? How many forms of antitypical leprosy do green and red type? What does each of them type? What do leaders have? Local elders? General elders? What is the privilege of these? What does Satan seek to do to them? What has he succeeded in doing to many? Who are Satan's special targets? Why? What did our Pastor say of fallen leaders' fall? What is true in every case of Great Company leaders? What will prove this remark? What do all of them want? What does Satan do with them accordingly?

(34) What should be noted of the words, garment, etc., in v. 49? What should we here note? Of J.F.R. ? Of whom may the same things in principle be said? What

has their course proven to be? For what have they forfeited the privileges of service in the high calling? What is a proper judgment thereon? What did God do as a recompense? What permeates their symbolic garments? What is written over them? Whose else symbolic garments are symbolically green and red?

(35) What has been fulfilled as to these? How is this done with power-grasping and lording general elders? Give some illustrations of such in the Apostolic times? When is this work especially in order? With whom? Through whom in the general Church? In local churches? Since when have large amounts of time been devoted to this work? In what mainly? What has been done with examinations conducted before that magazine was published? Why did this have to be done publicly? Why and as what is the Editor therefore blamed? What other reason requires this publicity? What must be the best course? How will it eventually be recognized? What is also implied in the expression, "It shall be showed to the priest"?

(36) Of what does v. 50 treat? What did not occur at the first examination of a plague-stricken garment? Why was this done? By whom must the examining be done? What makes the difference? Why must this duty not be shirked? How must it be done? What is our Pastor's advice in dealing with power-grasping local and general elders? What should be avoided? What does the case require? Why? Why should a premature decision be avoided? What results from this? What should be done, if grounds exist for suspecting the presence of power-grasping and lording?

(37) What is typed by the priest's waiting until the seventh day and then examining the garment? Why should the second examination be made? What was to be done, if the plague was found to spread in the garment? What is the antitype? In what three ways may this usurping manifest itself? How does J.F.R.'s course in 1917 illustrate this? In what particulars? What forms could this symbolic spreading take?

(38) What is such a plague typically called? Why this name? How does it define the mental state involved? How do the details of J.F.R.'s "fretting" illustrate this up to the time of his re-election in 1918? Thereafter until the election of the Society's officers and board for 3 years and

10 months, etc. ? How does the word *fretting* describe his pertinent actions? Whose cases betray the same spirit of fretting? What must be done in all such cases by the examining priest?

(39) What does v. 52 charge as to such a garment? Regardless of what? What does this type? Through whom does it occur with usurping general elders? What case shows this? How does Jesus do this during the Epiphany? How are such office powers vacated? What act illustrates this fact? What does such dismissal not imply? What example shows this? How did he usurp? Why should it have cost him membership in the Church? To whom else does this principle apply? How does this principle apply to a usurping local elder or deacon? What happens to an ecclesia that partisanly supports a usurping elder or deacon? What comparison shows this? What type does such cutting off fulfill?

(40) What is the difference between the case presented in vs. 47-52 and those in vs. 53-58? What was to be done, if after the second examination no certainty was reached as to the typical garment? What does this type? What is the character of the pertinent usurpations? What was to be done after the washing? What does this imply? How must it be done as to a general elder? As to a local elder? How is the restraint sometimes to be effected? Under what circumstances? Why? How may it be done as to a local elder?

(41) What phase of a leprous garment does v. 55 discuss? What should be done with such a garment? Why? What is such a leprosy called? Regardless of what? After what should the offender be re-examined? What is typed by the colors not changing? What should result on such becoming manifest? Even under what circumstances? What does his impenitence, etc., prove? What must result after these are manifested? If the offender be a general elder, who will do the twofold dismissing? Through whom will He manifest it? Who will do it, if the offender be a local elder? Through whom will He manifest it? Describe a garment with a fret inward. Regardless of what? What do these terms "without" and "within" mean? What is typed by the fret inward? What proves its continued existence in the heart? Regardless of what? How did Bro. Shearn manifest this principle? With what result?

(42) What phase of a leprous garment does v. 56 discuss? What was to be done with the dark part of the garment? What does this case represent? What did the offender do in part? What is typed by rending the dark part out of the garment? What illustrates the operation of this principle in a pilgrim? In a local elder?

(43) Of what phase of a leprous garment does v. 57 treat? What does it type? Why is this arrangement necessary? What does the type call such a plague? What does it type? What does this disprove as to the fault? And prove? What else does it prove? What is required in this case? How is it done in the case of a general elder? What does the manifestation of his Great Companyship demonstrate? How is this done in the case of a local elder?

(44) Of what phase of a leprous garment does v. 58 treat? What would this indicate of the leprosy? On what condition could it be used again? What cases would this phase of a leprous garment type? What did they at first do? What effect did the washing of the Word have on them? Of what did their offenses mainly consist? What did not have to be lost in such a case? What is typed by the second washing? What does v. 59 do?

(45) With what will our study proceed? What will be done as to the order of our study of Lev. 14? Why? Why did the Lord first present the cleansing process in vs. 1-32? Why, again, was it decided to change the order of studying the two sections of Lev. 14? Where have we in reality studied v. 33, type and antitype? What does this make unnecessary? To what do not, and to what do the instructions of vs. 33-53 apply? Why was this done? What did God design as to leprous houses? What, accordingly, do leprous houses type? What do they type of these sects? To what in this respect has attention been repeatedly called? Why?

(46) What parallel course as to literal Scriptures will be used here? How does the last clause of Ps. 107: 11 prove this? What is God's arrangement for the unity of the Church? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What is in opposition to this unity? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What conclusion do we, accordingly, draw? How does Paul in Rom. 11: 4, 5 apply 1 Kings 19: 18? What clue does this give us as to the antitypical 7, 000 in the Epiphany? What is typed by Baal

worship? How is this made clear? What does this prove as to power-graspers among God's people? What is typed by Baal kissing? What facts clarify this?

(47) Who are the Baal-kissers among God's real people? With what are they afflicted? What implies this? How does Acts 20: 30 accord with the thought of partisan support of power-grasping leaders? For what are the Scriptures cited in this connection sufficient? What, accordingly, do we understand such a house to type? It's being leprous? Why is sectarianism a great sin? How does it treat the Truth, its arrangements and spirit? What actually, though not verbally, is the sectarian's motto? What results from the practice of such a motto? What is the classic example of such sectarianism among Truth people? How does it compare with that of the most bigoted Romanists? In what sense can God be spoken of as putting antitypical leprosy into such a sect?

(48) In the type what was the owner of the plague-stricken house to do? Whom does he type? Why? Who is the antitypical priest in such a case? Why? How do the partisan leaders come to Him complaining of the plague-stricken condition of their houses? How did J.F.R. and his subordinate leaders not do so? Why not? How did they do so? What proves this to be true? What are some details thereon? How do their followers give the amen to their act speeches? By whom are similar things said by acts?

(49) Who is the examining priest for a Great Company sect? Why? Who, therefore, was the examining typical priest? What proves this? What fact proves Jesus to be the examining priest? Why can a local ecclesia not be such an examining priest? What two arguments prove that Jesus is the examining priest? How does He do it? Before what period were there no Great Company sects? What follows from this as to the subject under study? What are in harmony with this? What is typed by the charge to empty the house? Why was it given in type and antitype? What is typed by the priest then examining the house distinct from what was emptied out of it? What is implied thereby in the antitype? How do the Levites act toward this feature of The Present Truth? On the contrary, of what does the bulk of the matter appearing in The Present Truth consist? To what extent do we admit

the charge? Why is the charge without merit? What proves that the Lord wants such criticism made? With what unnecessary work do the criticizing articles dispense? What is implied in omitting mention of good points in the Great Company sects? What does God want done in the examination? What conduces to the Levites' thinking that The Present Truth is devoted to criticism alone? What is typed by the priest going into the house?

(50) What does v. 37 show? What does this type? What do walls represent? What do the walls of a leprous house represent? For what word does the word *streaks* stand? Like what did they look? What do they represent? What do the green and red colors here represent? Why are these antitypical evils present in uncleansed Great Company sects? What is more particularly typed by the green and red streaks? What is typed by their being deeper than the wall's surface? By the priest leaving the house? By his shutting up the house? Of what does this restraint consist? What does the shutting up for seven days type?

(51) What is typed by the priest returning after seven days and re-examining the house's walls? If the plague was found to have spread during the seven days, what was the priest to do? What does the spreading of the plague type? What do the stones, city and unclean place type? How is this harmonious with Bible usage? What in such an antitype does the High Priest do? What facts in Society matters prove this? Among what other Great Company sects was this in principle done? What is typed by the dust of the house? By scraping it down and together? In what kind of articles was this done? What are the titles of some of these? What did these reviews and examinations do? What is typed by the dust's being carried out of the city and cast into an unclean place?

(52) What is typed by putting other stones in the place of the removed ones? Other mortar in the place of that scraped off? In time how extensively will this be done? What do vs. 43-45 show? What does this type? What does the return of the plague type? It's spreading abroad? When only could such an antitype set in? What does v. 45 show? What is typed by the breaking down of the house? How does it occur? In what three cases has this occurred?

In what sense has it also occurred to the Society? How and when?

(53) What does this mean, negatively and positively? What results from this as to antitypical Elisha? The Society as a corporation in its officials? What has occurred with the antitypical stones of the Sturgeonites, Ritchieites and Olsonites? What two things led to the casting off of the Society as a corporation in its officers? What, is represented by the breaking down of the timber? Of the mortar? What are some illustrations of these things? What does the Bible type as to the P.B.I. in its charter? When is it to take place? Who does this breaking-down work? What does it type? What is typed by the priest's carrying the debris outside the city and casting it into an unclean place?

(54) What does v. 46 tell us? What things did entering a shut-up leprous house betray? How long was such an intruder to remain unclean? What does entering such a house type? What would be the antitypical effects? Why? What is the time-contrasted recognition of these evils? How long will this uncleanness in part remain? How long will their cleansing by the Lamb's blood take? By the washing of the Word?

(55) Of what does v. 47 treat? What does a bed symbolically represent? How do the cited passages prove this? What is represented by sleeping in such a bed? In a leprous bed? What does this imply? What effect would such contentment have? What would cleansing therefrom require? What is the symbolic meaning of eating, in, the Bible? How do the cited passages prove this? What is typed by eating in a leprous house? What effects will this have? In what respects? How will this uncleanness manifest itself? What happens to his garments? What must he do with them?

(56) What is the contrast between the thoughts of vs. 39-47 and v. 48? After what was the priest to come to the house? What does this represent? What was the typical priest to do, if he found that the leprosy had not spread? What does this type, negatively and positively? Why? What is treated of in vs. 49-53? What relation is there between the cleansing of these verses and that of vs. 1-7? What will, accordingly, be done with the study of vs. 49-53? With this what do we bring to a close? What two things have we found in this study? What may we say?

CHAPTER V.

THE YOUTHFUL WORTHIES.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS. SEVEN LINES OF BIBLICAL PROOF OF THE EXISTENCE OF YOUTHFUL WORTHIES. THEIR PRESENT WORK. THEIR REWARDS, MILLENNIAL AND POST-MILLENNIAL. THE ARTICLE, 'WORTHIES—ANCIENT AND MODERN;' REVIEWED. AN ANALYSIS OF THE ARTICLE. POINTS OF AGREEMENT. BASIC ERROR OF THE ARTICLE UNDER REVIEW. HALF-TRUTHS EXPOSED. TENTATIVE JUSTIFICATION SCRIPTURAL. MISLEADING OMISSIONS. SOPHISTRY ON THE TIME AFTER CHRIST'S RESURRECTION REFUTED. A SUMMARY. OTHER HALF-TRUTHS EXPOSED. FOG ON THE COVENANTS DISSIPATED. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

IN DESIGNATING Biblical ideas it is well, as far as possible to call them by Scriptural terms. This we usually do, *e.g.*, Instruction, Justification, Sanctification, Redemption, etc. Sometimes we are compelled to designate a Biblical idea by a term not found in the Bible; *e.g.*, *Tentative* Justification, *Vitalized* Justification, etc. That these are Scriptural thoughts is apparent (Rom. 4: 1-25; John 3: 36; Rom. 4: 11; 1 Cor. 6: 11; Heb. 9: 24; 10: 14; James 2: 14-26; 1 John 2: 2). So, too, we do not find the expression "Ancient Worthies" in the Bible, though the faithful of the Old Testament are called ancients (*zekenim*, Is. 24: 23), elders and old men (*zekenim*, Ps. 107: 32; Joel 2: 28; *presbyteroi*, Heb. 11: 2), and are referred to as persons "of whom the world was not *worthy*" (Heb. 11: 38). So also the term "Youthful Worthies" is not found in Scripture; though, as will be shown in this chapter, the idea that is intended to be conveyed by these words is Biblical. The nearest approach to this language that we find in Scripture is the term "young men," literally "youthfuls" (Joel 2: 28), in harmony with the use of the word "ancients" (Is. 24: 23); and in distinction from the class so designated. It does not seem to us to be the best use of language for Biblical students to distinguish these two classes by the contrasting

terms, Ancient and Modern Worthies; because the term, *Modern* Worthies, is not so nearly a Scriptural expression as is the term, *Youthful* Worthies. Moreover the Biblical thought (Joel 2: 28) is better brought out by the contrasting names, Ancient and Youthful Worthies. Therefore this book calls them Youthful Worthies.

(2) Before the General Call to the Divine nature and joint-heirship with Christ ceased in 1881, the persons that we call "Youthful Worthies" did not exist as individuals of a class; but since that time they have been, and now are coming as such into existence, and are showing evidence of existence as such. Yea, we would not be surprised, if they become shortly very marked as a class, separate and distinct from the Little Flock and the Great Company. The reason for their coming into existence as a class, though undiscerned hitherto as such, is that, since the General Call ceased in 1881, more people consecrated to the Lord than could be provided with crowns that awaited aspirants; and therefore the surplus consecrators were not begotten of the Spirit. The Lord seemingly held them in reserve; and as from time to time crowns were lost by the measurably unfaithful, He selected the most faithful and eligible of these by Spirit-begetting to have the lapsed crowns. As time went on, the number of these in reserve seems to have continued increasing more rapidly than the number of those who lost their crowns; consequently a large number of them was in reserve, when all the Elect were finally won. Since that time many more are consecrating, and doubtless still greater numbers will consecrate, for none of whom crowns will be available. "That Servant," among other places, treats of this class in F. 156, 157; Z '11, 181, pars. 5-10; Z '15, 269, pars. 11, 12; Question Book, 151, 152.

(3) The Epiphany seems to be shedding considerable light on this class, light that was not due during

"that Servant's" life. Doubtless more will become due on this class as the "bright shining" increases. It therefore is appropriate that we present some of the Epiphany Truth pertaining to the Youthful Worthies. The Lord bless it to all of us, especially to the class immediately concerned—the Youthful Worthies!

(4) To us as Bible Students the source and rule of faith and practice is the Bible alone; hence our faith and practice on all religious subjects should come to us from the Scriptures. We must require, therefore, that light on this, as well as on all other subjects of faith and practice, be shown to flow from that Book of whose teachings it says, "The entrance of Thy Words giveth light" (Ps. 119: 130; Is. 8: 20). Do the Scriptures teach that there will be such a class as we call "Youthful Worthies"? Our answer is: They do. We will quote and discuss some of the main passages on this topic.

(5) We begin with our text, the clearest of all on this subject: "And it shall come to pass afterward [after the Gospel Age, during which the Lord pours out His Spirit for His servants, the Little Flock, and handmaidens, the Great Company, compare Joel 2: 29 with 2 Cor. 6: 17, 18] that I will pour out My Spirit for all flesh; and your [The Christ's] sons [converted fleshly Israel and the persevering, but unconsecrated believers of the Gospel Age] and your daughters [converted Gentiles of the Millennial Age, Is. 60:4] shall prophecy [teach the Truth to those of mankind who then will not know it, Matt. 25: 35, 37, 40]; your old men [Ancient Worthies] *shall* dream dreams [will be given new and inspired deeper revelations as a part of 'another book of life,' Rev. 20: 12] and your young men [Youthful Worthies] shall see visions" [will be given inspired less deep representations, clarifying and elaborating for themselves and the people the teachings of the Old and New Testaments, as well as of "another book of life"]. All classes from among mankind

savingly associated with the Plan of God are thus treated of in Joel 2: 28, 29. These and the repentant fallen angels will constitute the seven [perfect number] classes of those whom Christ delivers from sin and condemnation unto perfection and everlasting life in His work as Savior.

(6) 2 Tim. 2: 20: "In a great House [the great House of the typical Aaron, Lev.16: 6; Num.17: 2,3; 3: 6-9,17-20, consisted of his sons and the three typical classes of Levites—the Kohathites, Merarites and the Gershonites; accordingly, in the great House of our Great High Priest, there are four classes antitypical of these] there are not only vessels of gold [the Little Flock, Mal. 3: 3], and of silver [the Great Company, Mal. 3: 3, see Berean comments on Mal. 3: 3 and 2 Tim. 2: 20], but also of wood [the Ancient Worthies] and earth [the Youthful Worthies, who with the Ancient Worthies will be, during the Millennium, the human members of the antitypical Aaron's House, as they were or are also human before the Millennium], and [additionally] vessels of honor [the faithful Restitutionists] and dishonor [the Goats of the next age]."

(7) Ps. 72: 3: "The mountains shall bring peace to the people; and the little hills by righteousness." This entire Psalm describes the Millennial reign of Christ, implying that symbolic Jerusalem will be the seat of Government (v. 16). Literal Jerusalem was built upon two mountains, Zion and Moriah, and upon two hills, Akra and Bezetha. Zion and Moriah represent the heavenly and the earthly phases of the Kingdom respectively—*i.e.*, The Christ and the Ancient Worthies as the two higher powers of the Kingdom. (See v. 16, "top of the mountains," etc.) Akra and Bezetha represent the tributary (subordinate) powers of the Kingdom, *i.e.*, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies. (See Berean comments on the "hills.") As Moriah was the first height of literal Jerusalem to be

built by the Israelites, so the Ancient Worthies were the first part of the Kingdom to be developed. And as Zion was the second height of this city to be built by the Israelites, so the Little Flock was the second part of the Kingdom to be developed. As the hill Akra, one of "the little hills," was the third height of Jerusalem to be built by the Israelites, so the Great Company is the third class among the powers (a subordinate power) of the Kingdom to be developed. And as the hill Bezetha was the fourth and last height of Jerusalem to be built by the Israelites, so the Youthful Worthies are the last one of the powers (the other subordinate power) of the Kingdom to be developed. The world of mankind are symbolized by the valley sections of literal Jerusalem. The thought of this passage seems to be that the two phases of the Kingdom, co-operated with by the subordinate powers of the Kingdom (the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies), will be used by Jehovah to bless the world of mankind with peace and prosperity through righteousness during the Millennium.

(8) Before presenting the Scriptures on our next point, we desire to make some preliminary explanations. Bible Students will recall that in Tabernacle Shadows the Levites are set forth as typing the Faith Justified; that in F. they are set forth as typing the Ancient Worthies, the Great Company, etc., and that in The Towers from 1907 onward they are set forth as typing the Great Company. These various antitypes seem to give some of the friends difficulty, as if they were not in harmony with one another. The harmony between these different statements will become manifest, if we rightly divide the Word of Truth, as did our Pastor, from the standpoints of the Gospel Age, the Millennial Age and the Transitional Period between them. We understand that all three sets of thoughts given by our Pastor are correct. The Gospel Age has its peculiar set of antitypical Levites, the Faith

Justified, including the Youthful Worthies who become and remain such during the Transitional Period; the Millennial Age has its peculiar set of Levites, the Ancient Worthies, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies; and the period that forms the transition between these two Ages, *i.e.*, the Harvest, particularly its Epiphany period, has its peculiar set of Levites, *i.e.*, the Great Company. Hence we are to understand that these three sets of antitypical Levites are not contradictory of one another. We must not, however, confuse them with one another. If we limit each set to its particular period of time as above, and remember of the Gospel-Age Levites that they lap over the Harvest Period, because of the lapping of the two Ages, they will be found to harmonize with one another. The fact that the typical Levites represent different sets of antitypes is not to be considered exceptional. Such things are frequent in the Scriptures, *i.e.*, Samson, Joshua, David, etc., are types of various sets of antitypes. By using one type to represent various antitypes Jehovah shows His manifold Wisdom.

(9) In each of these three periods we are to understand that the antitypical Levites consist of three groups, Kohathites, Merarites and Gershonites. During the Transitional Period those Levites, the tentatively justified, who will not consecrate lose their tentative justification, *i.e.*, cease to be tentative Levites and are put out of the Court; while those who do consecrate, the Youthful Worthies, retain their tentative justification and remain in the Court as Gospel-Age Levites of three groups, Kohathites, Merarites and Gershonites, *throughout the Transitional Period*. Additionally, the Great Company becomes during this Transitional Period Levites of three groups, Kohathites, Merarites and Gershonites. But it must be kept in mind that the Great Company Transitional Levites are different from the Youthful Worthies as persisting Gospel-Age Levites in the transition time. Excepting

the Good Youthful Worthies, the three groups of each class are associated severally with one another; and thus are of the corresponding groups of each of these two classes, *i.e.*, those Youthful Worthies who are associated with the Transitional (Great Company) Kohathite Levites, *i.e.*, the partisan Olsonites, Sturgeonites, etc., are the Kohathites of the Youthful Worthy (Gospel-Age) Levites; those Youthful Worthies who are associated with the Transitional (Great Company) Merarite Levites, *i.e.*, the partisan Society adherents, etc., are the Merarites of the Youthful Worthy (Gospel-Age) Levites; and those Youthful Worthies who are associated with the Transitional (Great Company) Gershonite Levites, *i.e.*, the partisan Pastoral Bible Institute (P. B. I.) adherents, etc., are the Gershonites of the Youthful Worthy (Gospel-Age) Levites.

(10) Num. 3: 6-8; 1:49-54; 3: 23, 29, 35, 40-51; Heb. 12: 23 prove that the three groups of Levites, *as types of the Millennial Levites, together* with Aaron's family, type the Church of the Millennial, not Gospel, Age, firstborns, as Jehovah's servants in a particular sense. The priests represent the Little Flock; and *from the standpoint of the Millennial Levites* the Kohathites, the Ancient Worthies; the Merarites, the Great Company; and the Gershonites, the Youthful Worthies. (See F 128, 129.) It will be noticed that the statement on page 129, with respect to the Gershon family, is that it represents the "saved world of mankind." This was doubtless the best that could then be given. The clear Truth on the "Youthful Worthies" not being due before the Epiphany, we see that the Millennial Gershonites as a class could not then be understood as a type. But when we consider the fact that the typical Gershonites were (1) counted in as a part of the firstborns (Num. 3: 12-17, 45), and (2) furthermore were separated (Num. 1: 49-53) from the "Israelites" for the service of the Tabernacle, to which

the "Israelites" were not to come nigh for service (v. 51), we can readily see that they type for the Millennium a part of the Church of the Millennial, not Gospel, Age firstborns, and not "the saved world." The fact that this could not be seen by "that Servant" is not to his disparagement in any sense, any more than was it to the disparagement of Jesus that He could not, while in the flesh, know the time of the judgment Day. Nobody can see Truths before due; and explanations of Scriptures before they are due, unavoidably need, and, when due, receive some adjustment. As all three classes of Levites were given to Aaron and his sons for the service (1) of the Tabernacle and (2) of the people (Num. 3: 6-8); so the Ancient Worthies, Great Company and Youthful Worthies will be given to the antitypical Aaron and his sons to serve (1) them and (2) the people, the world of mankind; and as all three classes of the Levites were given (Num. 3: 23, 29, 35) special locations about the Tabernacle, separate and distinct from the "Israelites" of the other tribes, these three classes type three classes separate and distinct from the World of Mankind, who are typed by the "Israelites."

(11) Is. 60: 13: "The Glory of Lebanon [Lebanon means *white*, and its evergreen trees, the glory of Lebanon, represent the righteous as *antitypical Levites*, Ps. 92: 12, 13] shall come unto Thee [the antitypical Levites will be brought to Christ and the Church, Num. 3: 6-9], the fir tree [Ancient Worthies], the pine [the Great Company] and the box [Youthful Worthies] together [rendering a co-operative service], to beautify the place of My sanctuary"—a Levitical work (Num. 3: 6-9) it was to beautify the sanctuary of the Lord.

(12) Dan. 4: In this chapter an account is given of the experience of the three Hebrew Youths—Shadrach, *royal*; Meshach, *guest*; and Abed-nego, *servant of the prophet*. Z '15, 260, pars. 9, 10, explains that the image types militarism, to which God's people in the end of

the Age will not bow down; and Z 1899, 170, pars. 3, 7, explains that the image types Churchianity—the Beast and his Image—to which God's people in the end of the Age will not bow down. Both applications are reasonable, and we believe are correct. It is not accidental that God's people who refuse to bow down to Militarism and Churchianity in the end of the Age, should be represented by *three* Hebrew youths refusing to worship the Golden Image. Evidently these three youths represent three classes—the Little Flock, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies—those who have to cope with the spirit of Militarism, Papalism, and Federationism, and who refuse to bow down to them, though led by this course to great sufferings. Not only does the number of the Hebrew youths suggest these three classes as living side by side at the extreme end of the Age, but their names are significant of the same thought: Shadrach, *royal*, reminds us of the royal priesthood (1 Pet. 2: 9); Meshach, *guest*, reminds us of those who are invited to be guests at the Marriage Supper of the Lamb, an Epiphany work (Rev. 19: 9); Abed-nego, *servant of the prophet*, would seem to suggest another class, separate from the others, and specially devoted to the mouthpiece of God.

(13) 2 Kings 2: 9, 10: "And Elisha said, I pray thee, let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me. And he [Elijah] said, . . . It shall be so unto thee." That there is something wrong with the translation, "double portion of thy spirit," is manifest from the fact that the Lord will not give twice as much of His Spirit to others as to His faithful Little Flock, to whom of all His creatures He gives the largest measure of His Spirit. The expression *pe shenayim* translated here "double portion," occurs in but two other passages of the Old Testament—Zech. 13: 8; Deut. 21: 17. In the former passage it is translated "two parts,"; *i.e.*, two classes, the Little Flock and the Great Company

(see Berean comments); in the latter passage, as in 2 Kings 2: 9, it is translated "double portion." This translation is manifestly incorrect; for if, *e. g.*, a father in Israel had five sons, he did not divide the inheritance into six equal parts, and give two parts to the firstborn, and one part to each of the other four sons; for the firstborn usually received the bulk of the inheritance, and that legally, as now, *e.g.*, among the nobility of Britain, etc. The following is what took place in Israel in the case of Israel's firstborns: They formed two classes; they became at their father's death the heads of their families, *i.e.*, they became the fathers of the families; and they remained sons also. These two relations, constituting the firstborns as two classes, seem to be meant by the expression *pe shenayim* in Deut. 21: 17. Thus we see in these two passages, the only ones in Scripture, apart from 2 Kings 2: 9, where the expression *pe shenayim* occurs, it means two classes. And this seems to be its meanings in 2 Kings 2: 9: "Let there be of me two classes [acting] in thy spirit" [power, *i.e.*, office as God's mouthpiece to Israel].

(14) We are familiar with the fact that "that Servant" taught that Elisha typed the Great Company and the Ancient Worthies, *i.e.*, two classes. Accordingly 2 Kings 2: 9 properly rendered teaches the thought that Elisha types two classes. We are also aware of the fact that "that Servant" taught that the Unbegotten Consecrated who will be faithful will be associated in reward and office with the Ancient Worthies in the next Age (F. 156, pars. 1, 2; Z '11, 181, pars. 5-10; Z'15, 269, pars. 11,12; Question Book, 151, 152). This thought of his gives us the connecting link to interpret this message fully. Certainly in the antitype of 2 Kings 2: 9, 10 the Ancient Worthies personally took no, part; for these verses were antitypically fulfilled after September 16, 1914, and before June 27, 1917, while the Ancient Worthies are not yet recovered

from the tomb. How then could we construe the facts harmoniously with this Scripture? We answer: They were present and spoke *representatively* in their associates, the "Youthful Worthies"; as they will also *representatively* in these partake of the rest of the antitypes of Elisha's acts, all of which type things that will occur before the Ancient Worthies shall have returned from the dead, though we may look for a second fulfillment, after the Ancient Worthies return. So viewed we recognize that 2 Kings 2: 9, 10 teaches us that the Youthful Worthies share with the Great Company in being God's mouthpiece to Nominal Spiritual Israel—share in the powers symbolized by Elijah's mantle. The above seven lines of Scriptural thought prove that in the end of the Gospel Age and in the Millennial Age there is a class that is separate and distinct from the Little Flock, the Great Company, the Ancient Worthies and the Restitution class; a class faithful to God while Satan, Sin and Death hold dominion over the earth; and afterward associated with the Little Flock, the Ancient Worthies and the Great Company in blessing the World of Mankind, the Restitution class. Therefore we conclude that the Youthful Worthies are those faithful brethren who, consecrating since 1881, are not Spirit-begotten.

(15) What is the present work of the Youthful Worthies? Above we saw that the Youthful Worthies as Gospel-Age Levites consist of Kohathites, Merarites and Gershonites in the Transitional Period, even as the Great Company as Transitional Levites consists of Transitional Kohathites, Merarites and Gershonites; it was also above suggested (in view of Elisha typing both of these classes, at least as respects the partisan Society adherents, 2 Kings 2: 9) that the Kohathites of each of these two classes, the Merarites of each of these two classes, and the Gershonites of each of these two classes severally work together. Unless the Lord should separate the Gospel-Age Youthful Worthy Levites

in their three groups from the corresponding groups of the Transitional (Great Company) Levites, the work of the former in their three groups seemingly would be to co-operate severally with the corresponding three groups of the latter, *in so far as the latter work along the lines of the Teachings, Arrangements, Charter and Will* (the Kohathites being exempt from the corporational obligations of the Charter and Will, not having symbolic chariots, Lev. 7: 9), *which the Lord gave through "that Servant."* The good Levites of both classes during the Transitional Period will mingle more or less among the Priests, *and will do a work that will be of special helpfulness to the Priests.* In view of these conditions the questions will arise in the mind of every faithful Youthful Worthy, "What should I do in the Lord's service? and with which group of the Lord's People should I associate myself? ' We know of no better answer to give to this question than that each one seek faithfully to do that which he thinks is the Lord's will for him to do; and associate with that group of the Lord's people of whose principles and course he can approve. This will lead each one to his proper group and work at this time.

(16) From the fact that the Gershonites had charge of all the curtains and coverings of the Tabernacle, except the second veil, and the curtains of the Court, including the gate of the Court, with their cords (Num. 3: 25-27; 4: 21-28), it would seem that the Millennial ministry of the Youthful Worthies will be especially to teach and apply to the people the doctrines of Justification and Consecration, with certain limited features of the truths implied in these two lines of thought, *i.e.*, certain features of the truths respecting Sin, Righteousness, Repentance, Faith, Consecration, Obedience, the Sin-offerings, the High Priest, the Under-priests, the Graces, etc., with the explanation of suitable Scriptures, as proof texts of these truths, and as refutation texts against errors on these subjects. As the antitype

of the hill Bezetha in Jerusalem, it would seem that the Youthful Worthies will teach things respecting, and exercise some subordinate powers for the Kingdom. Details on their present and future mission must be left for later consideration.

(17) Something as to the rewards of the Youthful Worthies: We understand that they will be rewarded in association with the Ancient Worthies. The Divine Attributes in relation to the earthly parts of the Oathbound Covenant, as well as specific passages seem to prove this to be true of them.

(18) First we will reason from the Divine Attributes in their relation to the earthly parts of the Oathbound Covenant in apportioning rewards *to those who faithfully serve God, while sin is in the ascendancy*, i.e., some "which be of the faith of Abraham." In the Lord's Plan His Wisdom arranged, and His Power, Justice and Love will co-operate to give Princethip as a reward (Ps. 45: 16; Is. 32: 1; Gal. 3: 6-9) in the Millennium to the Ancient Worthies, who (before, Matt. 11: 11-13; Heb. 2: 3, the Ransom merit was available for imputation, and the general call to the Divine nature and joint-heirship with Christ began) were faithful to God amid conditions made very difficult by reason of the ascendancy and the domination of Satan, sin, error and death among men. Accordingly, we reason that the Divine attributes would arrange for a similar reward for the Youthful Worthies in the Millennium for similar faithfulness to God (after the imputation of the Ransom merit was no longer available for certain consecrators, and the general call to the Divine nature and Joint-heirship with Christ ceased, but before the application of the Ransom merit is made and the Kingdom of God is established among men) amid conditions made very difficult by reason of the ascendancy and domination of Satan, sin, error and death among men. The reason is very apparent; both classes show the same spirit of faithfulness

amid the same hard conditions under the handicap of there being no Ransom merit available for their use. The unchangeableness of God's holy character in view of His oath to the *entire* faith class guarantees a similar reward to those who were similarly faithful under similar difficult conditions and who were subject to a similar handicap in a similar inavailability of the Ransom merit for their benefit (Gen. 22: 16-18; Gal. 3: 6-9; Rom. 4: 16).

(19) Joel 2: 28 shows that their measure of the Spirit would enable them to have special revelations in the form of visions.

(20) 2 Tim. 2: 20 proves that as a part of the household of the faithful they will be honorably used, and will be next to the Ancient Worthies on earth in Christ's family.

(21) Ps. 72: 3 shows that with the Great Company they will be Nobles in the Kingdom of God, wherein The Christ will be the Kings, and the Ancient Worthies will be the Princes.

(22) Is. 60: 13 proves that they will receive as a reward the perfection of human nature, thus partaking in the "resurrection of the just" with the Little Flock, Great Company and Ancient Worthies (Luke 14: 14), and in the "better resurrection" with the Ancient Worthies (Heb. 11: 35).

(23) Num. 3: 40-51, compared with Heb. 12: 23 (The Judge [Rewarder] of all [Spirit-begotten ones], *also of just men perfected in their dispositions,*" I. V.), proves that they will be a part of the Church of the Millennial, but not of the Gospel-Age, firstborns, and as such will be honored with the privilege of serving Christ and the Church in the interests of the world of mankind as teachers of the people, from whom, however, they will be separate and distinct.

(24) 2 Kings 2: 9, 10: As a part of the antitypical Elisha they will be privileged to share in many restitution works, as many things that they will do before

entering into their reward will be repeated after the "better resurrection," *e.g.*, the awakening of the Shunammite's son, the healing of Naaman's leprosy, etc. Thus theirs will be a glorious reward during the Millennium.

(25) But the fulness of their reward comes after the Millennium, when they will, with the Ancient Worthies, be changed from human to spirit beings. Z '13, 52, 53 proves, *e.g.*, by their being antitypical Firstborns and Levites without inheritance in the land, that the Ancient Worthies will be made spirit beings after their Millennial work. Some of these arguments prove this of the Youthful, as much as of the Ancient Worthies. It pleased the Lord to privilege us in 1905 to be at the Bible House in Allegheny, when for the first time "that Servant" announced that seemingly the Ancient Worthies would be made spirit beings after the Times of Restitution. He said that the location of the Kohathites' tents, as in the case of those of certain Amramites (Moses, Aaron and his family, but not Moses' family, 1 Chro. 23: 13-15) and of those of the Merarites, next to the Tabernacle, separate and distinct from the tents of the "Israelites," seemed to prove that the Ancient Worthies would become spiritual after the Millennium. With the thought of F. 129 regarding the Gershonites in mind as representing "the saved world of mankind," we asked him whether that reason would not prove that the entire saved world would become spiritual, and that this earth would not be man's eternal home? After some discussion "that Servant" dropped the matter, and did not for several years bring it up again, when he again taught that the Ancient Worthies would become spiritual. For the first time, in 1909, something appeared in "The Tower" intimating that the Ancient Worthies would become spiritual; and in Z '13, 52, 53, beginning with col. 1, par. 2, fulfilling a promise that he had several years before made to the Church, *i.e.*, that he would some

time give the Scriptural proof for the Ancient Worthies' change of nature, he gave a number of proofs on that subject. We refer our readers to that Tower, requesting them, if they have it, to read in it the article to which we allude, before proceeding further with this article.

(26) It is reasonable and Scriptural to expect for the Youthful Worthies, as well as for the Ancient Worthies, that they will receive ultimately a higher reward than they could have on this earth. As the Ancient, so the Youthful Worthies would be everlastingly degraded instead of being everlastingly rewarded for their Millennial service and suffering for the world, and their post-Millennial service for the faithful of the world, and for their post-Millennial suffering for righteousness at the hands of the Second Death class, if they would remain on the earth forever; for since all human beings found worthy of everlasting life will henceforth be equal (Matt. 25: 34; Rev. 21: 24), it would follow that the Youthful, as well as the Ancient Worthies, from being the Millennial superiors, would be *degraded* to being the eternal equals of the world of mankind, if as human beings they remained eternally on this earth. Thus God would not only not give them any reward for their Millennial and post-Millennial service and suffering, but would post-Millennially give them no more than He will give to those who would not serve Him, but did serve Satan, sin, error and death, during the period that these were in the ascendancy and domination among men. The Divine Attributes do not reward such faithfulness by eternal degradation. Therefore we should not expect that the Youthful and the Ancient Worthies will remain on the earth amid human conditions and associations, *i.e.*, remain human.

(27) It would seem that the Divine Attributes would reward them far above the world of mankind for their Millennial and post-Millennial service and

sufferings, which will be far above those of the saved world. This, combined with the preceding point, proves that they will be made higher than human beings.

(28) Heb. 12: 23 (compare with Ex. 12: 11-13, 21-23, 27; 13: 1, 2, 11-15; Num. 3: 40-51) proves that the names (disposition and nature) of all the firstborns are written in heaven, *i.e.*, that all of them will finally develop spiritual dispositions, gain spiritual bodies, and thus have a spiritual inheritance as theirs. Numbers 3: 40-51 proves that the Gershonites, together with the Kohathites and Merarites, were taken for the firstborns of Israel; consequently the former, typing the Youthful Worthies, are included among the number of the Church of the Millennial, but not Gospel-Age, firstborns whose names are written in heaven, *i.e.*, the Youthful Worthies will develop spiritual dispositions, gain spiritual bodies and inheritances.

(29) Num. 18: 20, 23, 24 proves that neither the priests nor the Levites had any inheritance in the land. This, of course, included the Gershonites as well as the priests, Kohathites and the Merarites. As "that Servant" implies in the article referred to above, not to have any inheritance in the land types that the antitypes of these four classes of Levi's descendants would not have an earthly but a heavenly inheritance, *i.e.*, heavenly dispositions, bodies, homes, etc. Therefore the Youthful Worthies, as the antitypes of the Gershonites, will become spirit beings.

(30) Num. 3: 23: The location of the Gershonites, being separate and distinct from the locations of the twelve tribes of the "Israelites," would type for the Youthful Worthies a spiritual inheritance; as the locations of the Kohathites (Num. 3: 29), and the Merarites (Num. 3: 35), and the priests (Num. 3: 38), all separate and distinct from the locations of the twelve tribes of the "Israelites," the world, would

type spiritual inheritances for the Ancient Worthies, Great Company, and Little Flock.

(31) Heb. 7: 1-10: To give tithes according to this passage symbolizes to acknowledge one's inferiority and subjection to the one to whom one gives tithes. And since "the four distinct families of Levites may properly represent four distinct classes of justified humanity, when the reconciliation is completed—the saints," etc. (F 128), the type (Num. 18: 21, 24) seems to prove that the world of mankind will be inferior and subject to the Ancient Worthies, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies; and the type (Num. 18: 25-32) seems to prove that these three classes in turn will be inferior and subject to the Little Flock. Inasmuch as the Youthful Worthies, as well as the others, will be receiving tithes forever from the saved world of mankind, and inasmuch as all on earth as kings (Matt. 25: 34; Rev. 21: 24) will be equals of one another, it follows that the Youthful Worthies will have a higher than a human inheritance on this earth, *i.e.*, a heavenly disposition, nature, abode.

(32) Rev. 20: 9: Before suggesting this verse as a probable proof that the Youthful Worthies will be made spiritual, we quote from Z '13, 53, col. 1, pars. 1-4, for the purpose of proving that the words printed in italics contain a principle that demonstrates that the Youthful Worthies are meant by the term, "Camp of the Saints," and that the term, "Beloved City," here applies to the Ancient Worthies *as the representatives of the Beloved City, the Glorified Church.* The Tower quotation to which we refer reads, as follows:

(33) "This same thought [that the Ancient Worthies will become spiritual] seems to be pictured in the Revelation. At the end of the thousand years Satan will be loosed that he may go forward to test the people that are on the earth, to manifest to what extent their hearts are loyal to God and to the principles

of righteousness. The result of this test will be that some will fall away (Rev. 20: 7-10). We read, 'And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and fire came down from God out of Heaven, and devoured them' (Rev. 20: 9). The 'beloved city' is the New Jerusalem; the Church in glory, not the Church in the flesh. The rebellion incited by Satan will be not only against the earthly Princes, but also against The Christ.

(34) "By that time, having reached perfection of organism and powers, the people will assert themselves *in thus going up to encompass the camp of the saints* ['and the beloved city,' which in the text is also referred to as encompassed]. *That the Church cannot be meant is evident from the fact that human beings could not attack an unseen force of spirit beings, as the Church until then be.* Just as in Great Britain, the people have gone to Parliament to protest, so the rebellious faction of mankind will protest against their faithful Princes. We fancy that we hear them say, 'It is time that this government be turned over to us. We protest against your remaining in power any longer.' In rebelling against the earthly phase of Messiah's Kingdom, however, they are rebelling against the Lord. Consequently Divine judgment will overtake them—'fire from Heaven.'

(35) "Since this rebellion is to occur at the close of the Millennial Age, and since mankind will at that time have reached perfection; therefore this separation of the Ancient Worthies from the rest of the world seems to imply that God has some special purpose in respect to them. *The term camp itself implies that theirs is only a temporary condition or arrangement, and that God has some better thing in store for them.*"

(36) Let us notice carefully the first set of words that are printed in italics above, and the words that

are in their midst in brackets. If the expression, "*compassed* the Camp of the Saints," proves that the glorified Church cannot be meant by the "Camp of the Saints," for the reason "that human beings could not attack an unseen force of spirit beings, as the Church will then be," it would follow for the same reason that by the expression, "*compassed . . . the Beloved City*," the glorified Church cannot be meant, though that expression would ordinarily suggest the glorified Church. Rather, it would seem that the Ancient Worthies, *as the visible representatives of the invisible Beloved City, as such*, are here meant by the expression the "Beloved City." If this is true, then "the Camp of the Saints" would be another class, *i.e.*, the Youthful Worthies, against whose subordinate power the goat class will rebel after Satan is loosed; and therefore the language in italics at the end of the quotation would prove that the Youthful Worthies will become spiritual. It not being due to be understood at the time "that Servant" wrote the article, no one could see it then, though his statement gives us the clue to the proper understanding of the passage.

(37) The foregoing, we trust, will be sufficient to enable us to recognize and stand properly related to the Youthful Worthies. The Heavenly Father and the Heavenly Lord richly bless them in their place and service!

(38) A number of our correspondents have called our attention to an article entitled, "Worthies—Ancient and Modern," in Z '20, 21-28, and have asked us to express our opinion of it. This request has prompted us to review here the teachings of Z '20, 21-28. We feel all the freer so to do, because the Tower calls the subject an "open question." It begins the article as follows: "Question: Do the Scriptures teach that at this time the Lord is developing a class which can be properly designated a 'modern [Youthful] worthy class?' There has been much discussion of the above question,

and we deem it necessary and proper that the Watch Tower *now* [italics are ours] consider it." The obvious impression given by this quotation is that the Tower has not previously considered this subject. This impression is an untrue one, as the subject was set forth quite correctly in Z '18, 355-357 with quotations from "that Servant's" pen. But the two articles flatly contradict one another, that of Z '18, 355-357 plainly affirming, and that of Z '20, 21-28 flatly denying our dear Pastor's thought that those who consecrating and proving faithful in the interval between the close of the General Call in 1881 and the inauguration of the earthly phase of the Kingdom, and finding no crowns available for themselves, will become associated in reward and service with the Ancient Worthies in the Kingdom. (F 156, pars. 1, 2; Z '11, 181, pars. 5-10; Z '15, 269, pars. 6, 7, 11, 12; Question Book, pp. 151, 152.) Those who believe that the Society is "the channel" for giving the seasonal meat to the priests, it would seem to us, must be perplexed by this as well as by other pointed contradictions appearing in the Tower during the last twenty-one years.

(39) The question before us for discussion is not a subject of comparatively minor importance, such as varying interpretations of isolated verses, all such interpretations being in harmony with the general Plan; but it is a *doctrinal* question, and one of no small importance, affecting as it does the standing of thousands of people now consecrated, and that of hundreds of thousands that will yet consecrate. For the benefit of those who may not have read the article under review we give the following brief analysis of it. First, it lays down three requirements that the Lord makes as precedents of obtaining His approval: (1) Faith leading to justification, (2) consecration, (3) faithfulness amid the Divinely applied tests. Second, it refutes the claim that unconsecrated people interested in, and measureably serving the Truth are to be associated in reward

and service with the Ancient Worthies. Third, it refutes the thought that the following passages teach that there will be a Modern (Youthful) Worthy class: (1) Zeph. 2: 3; (2) Ps. 41: 1, 2; (3) Zech. 13: 8, 9; (4) Amos 9:13; (5) Matt. 8: 11; (6) John 8: 51. Fourth, it quotes and explains partially, and then repudiates totally our Pastor's view of the subject as stated in F 156, pars. 1, 2 and Z '15, 269, col. 2, pars. 6, 7, etc. Fifth, it sets forth the claim that the doctrine of the Modern (Youthful) Worthies as taught in the foregoing references of "that Servant's" writings contradicts the doctrines of the Ransom, the Advocate and Mediator, the Covenants and the Church's Commission. We are glad to express our hearty agreement with some of these positions; but the Scriptures and "that Servant's" "well reasoned" expositions compel us to dissent from others. We of course are not positive of the authorship of the article; but its style, manner of reasoning and underlying error, the denial of Tentative Justification as now operating, are those of J.F.R. At any rate as one of the Editors of the Tower at headquarters, he has doubtless given the article his endorsement.

(40) We begin first with the pleasurable task of expressing our agreement with the claim of the article that those friends who assent to the Truth, and who render it some service, but who do not consecrate, are not to be the associates of the Ancient Worthies in reward and service in the Millennium. And the reason why they will not be such is, because they are not in character like the Ancient Worthies. To be the latter's Millennial Associates certain people will have to exercise the same kind of justifying faith, the same kind of consecration to the Lord, and the same kind of faithfulness amid similar trials as were theirs. Hence no matter what relation some may hold to the Truth and the Truth people, if they do not do the three things that the Ancient Worthies did, they will not be

their Millennial Associates in reward and service. Nor did our Pastor ever intimate that they would so be. In the places where he treats of the Millennial Associates of the Ancient Worthies, e.g., F, 156, pars. 1, 2; Z '11, 187, pars. 5-10; Z '15, 269, pars. 11, 12, etc—he (expressly in F 156, pars. 1, 2) shows that he is discussing the Millennial reward and service of those unbegotten consecrators who from 1881 onward act in the above three mentioned particulars, just as did the Ancient Worthies. Nor have we nor anybody else in harmony with that Servant's thought on the subject ever taught such a reward and service for such unconsecrated Truth friends. Hence though the article under review, in denying such honors for such unconsecrated Truth friends, sets forth the Truth with reference to them; yet it sets forth such Truth as does not answer the question with which the article begins, and to which it proposes to give an answer: "Do the Scriptures teach that at this time the Lord is developing a class which can be properly designated as a 'modern [Youthful] worthy class?'" If such error on the subject is taught, it is of course in the province of the Tower, while treating on the subject of the Youthful Worthies to correct it; but it should, it seems to us, do so in a way as not naturally to leave some people under the impression that such persons are meant by the term Modern (Youthful) Worthies; for they are not meant by that term by those who are in harmony with our Pastor's thought.

(41) But perhaps it was the purpose of The Tower editors in part to correct the erroneous thought that the children of the consecrated would become Ancient Worthies, which some got from Clayton Woodworth's letter entitled, "A Father's Letter to his Son," in Z '08, 263, 264. If such was their purpose, it is worthy of all praise. It may prove further helpful to the friends to learn that that letter was through a mistake inserted in The Tower to fill up space by another

than our Pastor, during the latter's absence from the Bible House on a prolonged Pilgrim trip, and that "that Servant" on being questioned on the subject denied the general teaching of the letter, and the mistaken conclusion that some drew from it as to the Truth people's children as *such* becoming Ancient Worthies, as well as deplored its appearance in the Tower.

(42) Again we are pleased to agree with the article under review in its denial that the following Scriptures apply to the Youthful Worthies: Zeph. 2: 3; Ps. 41: 1, 2; Zech. 13: 8, 9; Amos 9: 13; Matt. 8: 11; John 8: 51. It quotes them as being applied by some to prove that there will be a Youthful Worthy class to be the Millennial Associates of the Ancient Worthies in reward and service. None of these passages has any specific reference to such a class; our dear Pastor never so applied them; neither have we ever so applied them; nor have we ever heard of their being so applied, before we read the article under review. These passages being, therefore, inapplicable to the subject, it is not necessary for us to discuss them on this point, remarking however in passing that we do not understand Zeph. 2: 3 and Zech. 13: 9 to apply to the Israelites alone, and that during Jacob's trouble, as The Tower now claims. Rather, we understand them as "that Servant" has expounded them. So, too, we think our Pastor's later thought on Matt. 8: 11; Luke 13: 29, that those coming from the East, West, North and South are the Little Flock (Ps. 107: 3; Acts 15: 14; Z '14, 59, col. 2, pars. 1, 2), is better on account of its closer agreement with the connection than that which the article under review quotes from Z '04, 335. However, as these points are not relevant to our subject, we pass them by without further comment.

(43) In discussing another's teaching it is always well to find out what the real basis of his position is; for this enables one the more readily to test its truth

or error. Some writers for varying reasons keep their basic principle more or less out of sight; and this has been done in the article under review. Usually such a course is pursued because, if the basic principle, of the argument were clearly recognized, the reader would the more likely be turned against it. The following considerations on this point are here worthy of note: (1) From December, 1909, until his death, as can be seen from many Towers published from December 15, 1909, until that of September 15, 1916 (Z '09, 360; Z '10, 12, 13; 93, col. 2, pars. 3-6; 246, col. 2, pars. 1-4; Z '11, 394; Z '12, 152, col. 2, par. 4; Z '13, 92-94; Z '14, 67; Z '15, 103, 104; 292, 293; Z '16, 281), and from the Foreword of F. written Oct. 1, and finally approved for the press Oct. 16, 1916 (P '22, 192, 6), our Pastor taught Tentative and Vitalized Justification, separate and distinct, as operative during the Gospel Age; (2) The Truth people believe in Tentative Justification as operating during the Gospel Age, in harmony with the Scriptures, *e.g.*, Rom. 4: 1-25 and our Pastor's teachings. (3) J.F.R., the leading spirit among The Tower editors, and at least one of his editorial associates, W.E. Van Amburgh, deny the doctrine of Tentative Justification as operative during the Gospel Age. (4) They do not deny it in The Tower expressly in so many words; but they repeatedly, as in the article under review, deny the thought contained in the expression, Tentative Justification. (5) When writing of Gospel-Age Justification, they not only *uniformly* ignore both (a) mentioning the term, Tentative Justification, and (b) explaining the idea involved in that term; but also *uniformly* use language that is true of Vitalized Justification only, and that is untrue of Tentative Justification. (6) This same method of making people forget certain phases of a doctrine by ignoring them, and by talking as the purpose in view required on others of its phases exclusively, whenever discussion of that doctrine occurred,

was characteristic of, and conducive to the great falling away in the beginning of the Age. (7) If Truth People generally knew that this method was being used by at least two of the Tower editors, they would be more on their guard against various errors that J.F.R. and some of his associates have been holding, and are "privily" bringing in among the unsuspecting' sheep. If our dear readers will keep in mind that The Tower's denial of Tentative Justification during this Age is the foundation of its rejecting the Scriptural doctrine that those faithful consecrators from 1881 until Restitution sets in, for whom there are no crowns available, and hence no Spirit-begetting for Gospel-Age purposes possible, will be the Millennial Associates of the Ancient Worthies in reward and service, they will be able by Scriptural, reasonable and factual thinking completely to overthrow every argument that the article under review presents to defend its thesis; for through Tentative Justification alone can God now deal with this class in preparing them for association with the Ancient Worthies.

(44) The main difference between Tentative and Vitalized Justification is the following: In the former God reckons the merit of Christ as imputed to and for a believer, whereas it is not actually so imputed; in the latter God actually had Christ's merit imputed for and to a believer whose consecration God was about to accept by the begetting of the Spirit. Now to the Scriptural proof of the former: Very briefly would we note some of the thoughts that St. Paul in Rom.4: 1-12 gives us on Tentative Justification. Having in the preceding section demonstrated Justification by faith alone, he in Rom. 4: 1-12 proceeds to prove that the same kind of a faith Justification as operated in the Patriarchal and Jewish Ages also operates during the Gospel Age. This he proves by citing (1) the experience of Abraham, and a Scripture (Gen. 15: 6) with reference to him (vs. 1-3), as an

example and proof for a Gospel-Age Justification (vs. 4, 5); and (2) the experience and statement of David (vs. 6-8, compare with Ps. 32: 1-5) as an example and proof for a Gospel-Age Justification. This must, therefore, refer to Tentative Justification; for that was the only kind experienced by Abraham and David. Then he proceeds to prove that such a Tentative Justification is during the Gospel Age applicable to ALL believers. We call particular attention to verses 11, 12, which we quote from the Diaglott: "And he [Abraham] received the symbol of circumcision as a seal of the righteousness [Tentative Justification is here meant, because the merit that by imputation vitalizes Justification was not yet in existence] of that faith which he had while in uncircumcision; in order that he might be [1] the FATHER OF ALL [whether they are consecrated or not] uncircumcised [Gentile] BELIEVERS [hence not only consecrated, but also unconsecrated believers], that righteousness [Tentative or Vitalized Justification, dependent on the non-imputation or the imputation of merit for them] may be accounted unto *them* ["ALL uncircumcised BELIEVERS"]; and (2) a father of Circumcision [Jews] not only to those who are of Circumcision [those Jews who do not accept Christ] but to those also who tread in the footsteps [those Jews who accepting Christ left all to journey to Heavenly Canaan, as Abraham left all to journey to earthly Canaan] of the faith of our father Abraham which he had in uncircumcision." Undoubtedly these twelve verses, as well as the rest of the chapter, especially verses 21-24, prove Tentative Justification as operative during the Gospel Age. The distinction between the faith of a tentatively justified believer and that of a consecrated believer is among other ways brought out in the Greek through the prepositions *epi*, on, for the faith of a tentatively justified believer, and *eis*, into, for the faith of a consecrated believer, as can

be seen in the use of the former in Rom. 4: 5, 24; Acts 16: 31 and of the latter in John 3: 36; Acts 10: 43. The latter kind of a faith is a consecrating faith which puts one into Christ; for a faithful justified believer continues to believe until he believes into (comes into) Christ. Among others, the following Scriptures prove Tentative Justification: 1 Cor. 7: 14; Rom. 12: 1; 8: 29, 30; 1 Cor. 1: 30; Lev. 9: 9, 12, 18. The following, among others, treat of Vitalized Justification: Heb. 9: 24; 10: 14; Jas. 2: 14-26; 1 John 2: 2; 1 Cor. 6: 11. If the writer of the article under review believed in Tentative Justification as now operating, and thought logically on it, he never would have written that article; *for it is based on the denial of Tentative Justification as now operating*, whereas Tentative Justification furnished a basis for the Old Testament Faithful to have such relations with God as resulted in their qualifying for their Millennial reward and service; *and whereas similar results for the Youthful Worthies are now possible from the same kind of a Justification.*

(45) As we are aware, every important feature of God's plan, illustrative from the standpoint of the At-one-ment, is symbolized in connection with the Tabernacle; hence the Lord has taken care to symbolize Tentative and Vitalized Justification by that curtain of the goats' hair (Ex. 26: 7-9) which was doubled "in the forefront of the Tabernacle," the part visible to those in the Court typifying Tentative Justification, and the part visible to those in the Holy typifying Vitalized Justification. The following considerations will make this clear. The covering of badger (seal) skins, clearly visible to those in the camp, types The Christ class as they appear to the world, *i.e.*, as unattractive and repulsive. The rams' skins dyed red, hidden under the first covering, represent the merit of Jesus' humanity. The ten curtains of goats' hair *covered by the rams' skins dyed red* represent the justified humanity

of the Church as covered by Christ's merit. The eleventh, the *uncovered* curtain, *i.e.*, that which was doubled "in the forefront of the Tabernacle," represents not the Church's justified humanity, but Justification by faith, the part (as stated above) visible to those in the court typing Tentative Justification, and the part visible to those in the Holy typing Vitalized Justification. The linen curtains type The Christ as new creatures, in whom *as such* there is no sin (1 Pet. 2: 22; Rom. 8: 1-4; 1 John 3: 6, 9). This curtain *as doubled* was first antitypically brought to our attention in The Tower of December 15, 1909, in the article on the Wedding Garment, and was repeatedly so brought to our attention since that time, by the true channel for the seasonal meat, our dear Pastor, in the distinction between Tentative and Vitalized Justification; but the part visible in the antitypical court is now denied by the counterfeit channel for giving seasonal meat to the priests, which, as a corporation, was the true channel for the work of the antitypical Mahlite Merarites.

(46) The main differences between Tentative and Vitalized Justification are: (1) As concerns God's Justice, the former operates without, the latter with its being satisfied by Christ's merit; (2) as concerns Christ's merit, the former acts without, the latter with the imputation of His righteousness in the interests of the person concerned; (3) as concerns the recipient's activity, the former operates by the sole instrumentality of faith in the teachings of the Word on pertinent subjects without consecration, the latter by the instrumentality of such a faith with consecration; (4) as concerns the things imputed, the former has its faith actually, and Jesus' merit reckonedly (Rom. 3: 21-28; 4:3-8, 21-25; 10: 4), the latter its faith and Jesus' merit actually, imputed as righteousness (1 Cor. 1: 30; Gal. 2: 16-20; 3 : 22; Phil. 3: 9) [the term, "the faith of Jesus" means the faithfulness,

righteousness, of Jesus]; (5) as concerns the Adamic sentence, the former is without, the latter with its cancellation; (6) as concerns fellowship with God, the former is partial, the latter is full; (7) as concerns opportunities for entering covenant relations with God, while the former always gives opportunity of entering a grace-covenant relation with God, it does not always open an opportunity of entering into the Sarah-Covenant relation with God, as can be seen in the case of the Ancient and Youthful Worthies; the latter always gives access to the Sarah-Covenant relation with God.

(47) The doctrine of Tentative Justification as operating from the time of Abel, Enoch and Noah (Heb. 11: 4-7), until restitution begins, is a Scriptural one, and will remain so despite the denials of the counterfeit channel for seasonal meat for priests, which was the true channel for the work of the antitypical Mahlite Merarites, developed since the death of the true channel for giving seasonal meat to the household, "the Steward," "that Servant," our beloved Pastor. As long as Rom. 4: 1-25, etc., remain parts of the Bible, that doctrine will stand despite the attacks that the counterfeit channel for giving seasonal meat to the priests makes upon it.

(48) But some may ask, How does the article under review deny Tentative Justification as now operating? We answer, not only by its entire basis and its main general lines of argument by which it seeks to set aside the doctrine of the Youthful Worthies; but by specific statements which imply such a denial. Additionally many brethren know that J.F.R. and W.E. Van Amburgh deny Tentative Justification, e. g.; the former often doing it before the Bethel Family in the Spring and Summer of 1917, the latter doing this not only then and there, but also before the Class at New Britain, Conn., December, 1919, in answering a question as to whether "that Servant" taught it. We

will quote only one statement among many that prove that they deny, not the express term, *which would result in their arousing opposition to their efforts*, but the *idea* implied in the doctrine of Tentative Justification as now operating. Z '20, 26, col. 2, par. 2, opens as follows: "Stated in other phrase, justification *since the resurrection of Jesus* results *only* (italics in both cases are ours. St. Paul thought differently, Rom. 4: 1-25; so did "that Servant") to those who have imputed to them the merit of Jesus' sacrifice." This statement is true of Vitalized, but untrue of Tentative Justification. And because of the exclusive emphasis on the idea of Vitalized Justification, and the absence of the idea of Tentative Justification (perhaps the omission of both of these terms is not unintentional as conducive to making their readers forget the distinction!) the article, like other recent Tower articles on Justification is grossly misleading. Half-truths are more misleading than whole errors, as the course of every erroneous system proves. And the half-truth that the article under examination sets forth as the whole truth on Gospel-Age Justification will prove to be so on the subject of the Youthful Worthies, if the brethren do not keep in mind the other half-truth on Gospel-Age Justification. The antitypical curtain as doubled is necessary for us to keep in view to see daylight on Gospel-Age Justification; as the fog in the article under examination exists largely, because The Tower editors teach only one-half of such truth.

(49) There is another point in the article under review in connection with which only half of the Truth is told, and that in such connections as results in the accumulation of more fog on the subject that it professes to elucidate. We refer to the treatment of the justification of the Ancient Worthies and of that of the Gospel Church. As far as it speaks of the justification of the former its language is correct enough; but it befogs the subject by what it leaves unsaid as

to the nature and privileges of their justification, which need consideration in order to estimate properly the relation of their justification to the Divine Justice and the Ransom merit, and the similar relation of the justification of the Youthful Worthies to the Divine Justice and the Ransom merit. The article under examination, to prevent its readers from concluding (as the article certainly gives that impression) that the justification of the Ancient Worthies was complete, vitalized, should have mentioned the following facts: (1) Their justification was of a kind in which the satisfaction of Justice did not take place; (2) that they lived and died under the Adamic sentence; (3) that they were justified to fellowship only; (4) that their trial was of faith and obedience only, proved by Samson's case especially, and not of love, without a trial and possession of which no one will ever gain everlasting life; and (5) that their trial for life, unlike that of the Vitalizedly Justified, who are tried for life now, was not in this life; but is to be in the Millennium (Heb. 11: 40). None of these five thoughts is true of the Vitalizedly Justified. Hence the article, by the way it links all justification previous to the Millennium, leaves the reader under the impression that the Ancient Worthies' being pleasing to God in their justification was in the same sense as is the privilege of the Gospel Church in its justification to be pleasing to God. These important omissions put such great blemishes into the article as becloud the points which should be emphasized, and which, when clearly set forth, prove for the Youthful Worthies the same relation to the Divine Justice and the Ransom merit as that of the Ancient Worthies. Surely all of us recall how "that Servant" stressed the differences between the nature and privileges of the justification of the Ancient Worthies, which was tentative, because not made through the actual imputation of Jesus' merit, and that of the Gospel Church, which is vitalized,

because made through the actual imputation of Jesus' merit to the consecrated. (50) We see, then, that the justification of the Ancient Worthies was *not to life*, which requires the satisfaction of Justice by the actual imputation of Christ's merit (Rom. 3: 21-26; 5: 18, 19); for they remain until the present under the Adamic sentence. Whatever Covenant favors God gave them, instead of setting this sentence aside, *were given them conformably with Justice exacting from them the Adamic death*. Hence they were not *as Ancient Worthies* put on trial for life. Their trial was of faith and obedience, and that from Abraham onward in connection with Grace Covenant (Rom. 4: 13-16; Gal. 3: 18). This Grace Covenant neither ignored, nor set their Adamic sentence aside; but recognized its justice; and did not interfere with its execution; but meantime operated toward them as an unconditional promise, *made possible through their Tentative Justification (Rom. 4:13-16), in view of the fact that a Ransom would some day, satisfy Justice and cancel the Adamic sentence for them*. Hence God dealt with them as a kind prison warden would with a worthy convict in view of his future lawful freedom. He could do this in harmony with Justice and the Ransom, by leaving them suffer the former's sentence, and in the meantime give them opportunities of demonstrating their faith in, and loyalty to Him, as a preparation for their future lawful freedom. Thus He arranged in their interests as Millennial works: (1) the application of the Ransom as a seal of the New Covenant for the cancellation of their Adamic sentence, (2) their awakening from the dead, and (3) their reward, not everlasting life, for which they must first stand trial, and that under the New Covenant (Heb. 11: 40), but human perfection and princedom (Heb. 11: 39, 35; Ps. 45: 16). Their Tentative Justification, *i.e.*, justification to fellowship (Jas. 2: 23) by their faith, which faith in

due time was proven to be genuine by their consecration faithfully maintained under sore trial (Jas. 2: 21, 22), made it possible for God to give them such promises as gave them the hope of a reward in the future (Heb. 11:10, 13-16), and as left them under the curse, while they exercised hope in the promises. Without such a Tentative Justification God's Covenant dealings with them could not have taken place; with it they could; for thus in harmony with the curse and His Justice God has always drawn near to those who have drawn near to Him. Praised be His Holy Name for such wondrous grace!

(51) These are the second set of things that the article under review omits mentioning, and thereby befogs the question that it professes to clarify. The two sets of things, (1) Tentative Justification with what it implies as the basic one, and (2) the exact position of the Ancient Worthies as to Justice, the sentence, their covenant standing, their trial and future relations to the Ransom and the New Covenant, clarify the situation as to the Youthful Worthies; for the latter's relation to God is now precisely the same as was that of the Ancient Worthies in all essential respects, *i.e.*, as to (1) repentance, (2) faith, (3) justification, (4) consecration, (5) faithfulness in hard tests of faith and obedience apart from a trial for life, (6) environment inconducive to righteousness and conducive to sin, (7) satisfaction of Justice, (8) the Adamic sentence, (9) the earthly features of the Oath-bound Covenant, (10) God's gracious Love, (11) the merit of Christ, (12) the New Covenant, (13) a trial for life, (14) the impossibility of entering the High Calling because of its unopened door, which is no fault of theirs. The fact that one class lived, when it was *too soon* for Divine Justice to be satisfied for it on the basis of the *imputed* merit, and the fact that the other lives, when it is *too late* for the Divine Justice to be satisfied for it on the basis of the *imputed merit*, by

which alone access to the High Calling is possible, are facts that are equalized before the bar of Justice and the Ransom by the consideration that both lived, when it was *too soon* for Divine Justice to be satisfied for them by the *applied* merit. Hence giving the Youthful Worthies under the same conditions the opportunity of becoming the Millennial Associates of the Ancient Worthies in reward and service is no more contrary to the Divine Justice and the Ransom than was giving the Ancient Worthies the opportunity of qualifying for their Millennial reward and service. St. Paul and "that Servant" were among the deepest and sharpest reasoners on the Ransom that ever lived, by far more able as such than the Tower editors; and they neither saw nor made a denial of the Ransom in their teaching Tentative Justification (Rom. 4: 3-12) as giving Youthful Worthies (Gal. 3: 6-9; Rom. 4: 11-16; 2 Tim. 2: 20; Joel 2: 28) a standing of fellowship with God and a trial of faith and obedience, but not a standing in a trial for life, even as was the case of their teaching of the Ancient Worthies.

(52) The mere fact that the Youthful Worthies are living since the resurrection of Jesus is not determinative as to the principles of exact Justice and the Ransom. Divine Justice can never, either before, or after the Resurrection of Jesus, consent to its violation, which dealing with the Youthful Worthies exactly as with the Ancient Worthies no more does than did Dealing with the Ancient Worthies; and since it is the merit of Jesus alone that propitiates Justice, and not *the time in which once lives*, any time argument truly based on Justice and the Ransom that would disprove the harmony between Divine Justice and the Ransom on the one hand, and the opportunity of qualifying for Youthful Worthiship on the other (since it is given them, while under the sentence, *in view of the future application of the Ransom, as was the case with the Ancient Worthies*), would equally disprove the harmony between

Divine Justice and the Ransom on the one hand, and the opportunity of qualifying for Ancient Worthiship on the other; for it is not the difference of time, as the article under review claims; but the *essential nature of Divine Justice and of the Ransom* in their relation to the Tentatively Justified and unbegotten consecrated, *in view of a future application of the Ransom merit, that determines the question*. Hence the argument of the article under review that such an opportunity operating *now* is contrary to Justice and the Ransom is unscriptural, unreasonable and unfactual—fog!

(53) To sum up in the form of a question and answer: What made the Old Testament Faithful available for Ancient Worthiship? Answer: Tentative Justification, consecration and faithfulness in their trial of faith and obedience, *in view of a future application of the Ransom for them*. What now makes the Unbegotten Consecrated available for Youthful Worthiship? Answer: *In view of a future application of the Ransom for them*, the same three things. In other words through Tentative Justification God has given both of these classes, in view of the future application of the Ransom for them, an opportunity to gain a reward that will glorify His name, and hence their trial is, in each case alike, in harmony with the Ransom.

(54) The article under review claims that, when our dear Pastor taught for the Youthful Worthies Millennial association with the Ancient Worthies in reward and service, he meant those unbegotten consecrators only who would live in the interval between the begettal of the last member of the Little Flock and Restitution times; and then the article proceeds to deny this half-truth. The article to prove that such was his thought quotes only a part of what he said; and lets the part unquoted that shows that he included all such as could not be provided with crowns, and

be begotten of the Spirit, from the time of the close of the General Call in 1881 until Restitution sets in. Both of these lines of thought, among other places, he expounds in the two paragraphs of F 156. The opening sentence of the first of the two paragraphs proves that he refers to both "Another point arises here: In view of the fact that the High Calling [the General Call] is closed [in 1881 it ended; he does not say, "In view of the fact that the High Calling *will be closed*"], etc. Here is another case of the editors telling half of the truth only; and then unwilling to let us enjoy this half, they even proceed to deny IT!"

(55) The claim of the article that the Harvest began 1878 and ended 1918 will be found refuted in Volumes V and VI of this work, to which we refer our readers for details. The Pyramid's corroboration of this refutation as pertaining to 1918 is found in Vol. III, Chapter VII. The last member of the Little Flock having been begotten by the Fall of 1914, and the last member of the Little Flock having been sealed in the forehead Passover, 1916, shown as above indicated, all persons consecrating since the first of these two dates cannot Scripturally hope for Little Flockship, and should not be encouraged so to hope. Their hope is in Youthful Worthiship. To arouse them to false hopes now will only give them greater disappointment by and by.

(56) Further, the article under examination claims that: "No one of the human race can stand before God without a Mediator or an Advocate," and hence reasons that there can be no opportunity of qualifying for Youthful Worthiship before the New Covenant is in operation; because they are under neither an Advocate nor a Mediator. We quote the above sentence as an example of sweeping statements and half truths that abound in the article. The following corrections must be made to make the sentence tell

the truth: (1) In order that Adam and Eve before their fall and Jesus be not ruled out from having had a standing before God, the word "fallen," or its equivalent, must be inserted between the words "the" and "human." The editors would grant this, as a later statement of theirs proves. (2) In order that the standing of the Ancient Worthies *in covenant relation with God as justified to fellowship, while on trial of faith and obedience*, but not on trial *for life*, be not ruled out, the sentence must be corrected somewhat as follows: "No one of the fallen race can stand *in covenant relation* before God's *Justice in a trial for life* without a Mediator or an Advocate." So corrected the sentence tells the truth; but so corrected the sentence destroys The Tower editors' argument based on its half-true sentence, as the following considerations prove: God did without a Mediator or Advocate enter into covenant relation with the Ancient Worthies *as such*, not indeed as freed by His Justice from the sentence in a trial for life (for they had no such standing and trial before Him); but without being on trial for life, and while suffering the Adamic sentence under the demands of Justice, they stood without an Advocate or Mediator before God's Love in covenant relation, a relation made possible in virtue of their Tentative Justification, which God's Wisdom planned for, and which His Love gave to them (*in view of the fact that the Ransom would in the Millennium be applied for them and thus satisfy Justice for, and release them from the Adamic sentence*) before they would or could obtain the blessings that Divine Justice stopped them from receiving until the Ransom would be applied for them (Heb. 11: 39, 40). Hence under the same conditions God could without an Advocate or a Mediator have the same covenant dealings with the Youthful Worthies. Hence the editors' argument against there now being Youthful Worthies from the standpoint of their not having an Advocate or Mediator falls to the

ground. This argument is not, as they claim, "another point that is controlling in this question, and *settles it beyond peradventure of a doubt.*" Rather, it is only some more fog! Moreover, the Youthful Worthies are tentatively under an Advocate through their Tentative Justification.

(57) The same remark that it is only fog applies to the editors' argument that the doctrine of the three Covenants, typed by Abraham's three wives, estops there being a Youthful Worthy class before the inauguration of the New Covenant; because they are not children of antitypical Sarah or Hagar. It is true that the Youthful Worthies are not children of the Sarah, or of the Hagar Covenant; neither are the Great Company; nor were Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, etc., nor any of the preceding and subsequent Ancient Worthies, *as such*, as is manifest from the fact that some of them died, before either of these Covenants produced seed. For their argument to be binding, it must be proven that no other Covenant than these two has either operated hitherto or is now operating. But such an alleged proof is false; for the Covenant, certain earthly features of the Oath-bound Covenant (Gen. 22: 16-18), that operated between God and Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the subsequent Ancient Worthies, and that anticipatorily operated between God and Abel, Enoch, Noah, etc. (Heb. 11: 3-7, 39, 40), is the Covenant that operates now between God and the Youthful Worthies; for if it could operate anticipatorily in the case of Abel, Enoch, Noah, etc., it could now operate in the case of the Youthful Worthies, as the whole trend of Scriptures, Reason and Facts implies that it does. If any doubt still lingers on this subject, Gal. 3: 6-9 and Rom. 4: 16 same kind of Faith that Abraham had will, *each in his own class*, with Abraham be blessed with the privilege of blessing all the families of the earth! . This promise is the

Covenant! It now operates toward the Youthful Worthies; for they "are of the faith of Abraham," *i.e.*, "they trust where they cannot trace" (2 Cor. 4: 13; 5: 7)—and "are therefore blessed with faithful Abraham." It is true that the earthly features of the Oathbound Covenant do not now give life; for life will be given both of these classes by the Keturah Covenant; but it does give them a certain kind of a standing before God, *even as previously defined*. The Covenant that during this life operated toward Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the other Ancient Worthies was *not* typed by any of Abraham's three wives. Nor are those of its features that cover the Great Company and fleshly Israel (Rom. 11: 28, 29). But as the very identical condition does not unmake the Great Company's and fleshly Israel's Oath-bound Covenants, this Covenant's not being typed by any of Abraham's wives does not make it non-existent; for many passages testify of its existence; and this is the Covenant that is similar to the one that covers the Youthful Worthies.

(58) Hence The Tower editors' reasoning that, since the Youthful Worthies are not developed by Sarah or Hagar, and that, since Keturah is not yet operating, there is no such a class now, presupposes the proposition that there is no other Covenant than these three, which presupposition is untrue. Therefore their argument on this point is built upon quicksand; and if we keep in mind that the Covenants which operate between God and the Ancient and Youthful Worthies do not now give them life, but leave them under the Adamic sentence, from which they will be delivered by the Ransom, the Godward seal of the New Covenant, the future mother of their humanity, all of the figurative fog raised by their argument about the *three* Covenants disproving the existence of Youthful Worthies vanishes before the sunrays of Truth!

(59) Finally, the commission of the Church is appealed to by the article under review as a proof that

there is no authority for the Church to preach the doctrine of the Youthful Worthies. And to prove this claim Is. 60: 1-3 is quoted. Some bracketed comments that the article makes on these verses contradict our Lord's use of them, *e.g.*, the expression, "to proclaim liberty to the captives and the opening of the prison to them that are bound," is explained to mean to preach deliverance to the Great Company now captive and bound in Babylon! This *gloss* is given to prove that the Church is commissioned to preach to the Great Company! Our dear Pastor explained the captives to mean the slaves of sin, and the prisoners to mean those in the cells of the tomb. This we believe to be correct. But higher Authority than our dear Pastor, even our beloved Lord, has clarified this passage (Luke 4: 16-21) up to and including the first clause of the second verse, *i.e.*, "to preach the acceptable year of the Lord," where he stopped, because the rest of the message was not "fulfilled," *i.e.*, was not then due, and would not be due to be preached until the end of the Gospel Age. He tells us that the day He was speaking all that He quoted was due to be preached as seasonal meat; and since the Great Company class comes into existence at the end of the Age, that part of the quotation that the Tower applies to them evidently does not so apply. It was then due to preach deliverance from sin and death; but not deliverance of a non-existent class from a non-existent Babylon! On the contrary, the expression, "to preach good tidings [the gospel, Gal. 3: 6-9] to the *meek*," is applicable from Jesus' time until Restitution, as in Jesus' day it was due to be preached to the then living Ancient Worthies; therefore it includes, among others, the persons who will become Youthful Worthies. The expression, "to comfort all that mourn," we believe will include, among others, the individuals who are of the Great Company, *when they come to mourn*. And the other expression, "to preach good tidings to the meek,"

will apply to them individually *when they become meek*. So this passage is broad enough in its terms to warrant preaching to the individuals of both classes. But there is no specific reference to either class *as such* in these verses. Hence they do not prove the contention of the editors. So, too, the Great Commission, Matt. 28: 18-20, to which however they do not refer, is stated in such broad language—"makes disciples," a thing that can be done with unbegotten consecrators, as is evident from what was done for 3½ years before Pentecost—that it includes Youthful Worthies and Great Company members, as individuals, but not as classes; for the primary application of the passage is to making disciples among Gentiles for the Little Flock. Since the Oath-bound Covenant (Rom. 4: 16; Gal. 3: 6-9) is the heart of the gospel, we are commissioned to preach it to *all "that be of the faith of Abraham"*; (those who walk "by faith, not by sight"); therefore to the Youthful Worthies. Hence the Tower's argument on the Church's commission is only some more fog that vanishes before the sunrays of Truth.

(60) Our conclusion, therefore, is that there is no argument in Scripture, Reason or Fact contradictory of the doctrine of there being a class of Youthful Worthies now being qualified for Millennial association with the Ancient Worthies in reward and service; rather that there is in Scripture, Reason and Facts much that teaches it. Hence since no more consecrators can enter the High Calling, let us preach the opportunity of Youthful Worthiship to the *meek*, assuring them that "they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham" with the privilege of blessing all nations, even as the Bible teaches (Rom. 4: 16; Gal. 3: 6-9).

(1) What kind of terms should we use to designate Scriptural ideas? What are some examples and exceptions to this rule? What is the Scriptural usage with respect to the terms, Ancient and Youthful Worthies?

(2) Since what date have the Youthful Worthies been

developing? Why? Since what event have all consecrators become of the Youthful Worthies? Why? Where does "that Servant" treat of them? Read the reference that he makes to them.

(3) When is special light on them due to shine? Why?

(4) Whence does this light shine for and upon us?

(5) Show how Joel 2: 28 treats of all classes of the saved from among mankind, including the Youthful Worthies. How many classes of beings will be saved from sin? What are these?

(6) Explain 2 Tim. 2: 20, and show how it treats of four classes, including the Youthful Worthies.

(7) Explain Ps. 72: 3, and show how it treats of four classes, including the Youthful Worthies. How does the chronology of the building of Jerusalem on its four heights type the chronology of the building of antitypical Jerusalem in its four classes? Summarize the thought of this passage.

(8) What are the three sets of antitypical Levites? Where does our Pastor severally set them forth? How are they to be harmonized? How are they separated from one another in time? What should we avoid as to these? What corresponding facts will help in understanding that the Levitical type has three sets of antitypes?

(9) How many and what groups does each set of Levites have? Who are and who are not the tentative Epiphany Levites? What happens with the latter? Who are the other Epiphany Levites? In what groups? How are these two sets of Levites associated?

(10) Read and expound the cited Scriptures as proving that these four classes constitute the Church of the firstborns. Explain these classes as typed in the Tabernacle service. Why could not the antitypical Gershonites be clearly seen before the Epiphany? What facts prove that the Gershonites represent not the saved world, but the Youthful Worthies?

(11) Explain Is. 60: 13, and show how it refers to the Ancient Worthies, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies as antitypical Millennial Levites. What fact proves this thought?

(12) Briefly expound Dan. 4, type and antitype. What is there in the number of the Hebrew youths typing the

three classes of the consecrated now? What is there in their names typing these classes?

(13) What does the expression "double portion" not mean? Why not? What are the Hebrew words from which it is translated? Explain the meaning of these words in Zech. 13: 8; also in Deut. 21: 17; also in 2 Kings 2: 9.

(14) According to "that Servant" how many and what classes does Elisha type? Harmonize his thought with the fulfilled facts that prove that Elisha types the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies. In what power do the Youthful Worthies share?

(15) What conclusion is to be drawn from the foregoing Scriptures on the Youthful Worthies' associations and work?

(16) From the standpoint of the Tabernacle picture what is the present and future ministry of the Youthful Worthies? From the standpoint of the Kingdom picture what is it?

(17) By what two methods of proof do we demonstrate the Millennial rewards of the Youthful Worthies? Whose associates will they be in their Millennial rewards?

(18) How by reasoning on the Divine attributes do we arrive at the conclusion that the Millennial reward of the Youthful, will be similar to that of the Ancient Worthies?

(19) What does Joel 2: 28 teach on their Millennial reward?

(20) What does 2 Tim. 2: 20 teach on their Millennial reward?

(21) What does Ps. 72: 3 teach on their Millennial reward?

(22) What does Is. 60: 13 teach on their Millennial reward?

(23) What do Num. 3 and 4; Heb. 12: 23 teach on their Millennial reward?

(24) What do 2 Kings 2: 9, 10 and later acts of Elisha imply on their Millennial reward?

(25) What will be their post-Millennial reward? Where did "that Servant" give proofs that the Ancient Worthies would become spiritual? To whom are some of these proofs also applicable? What is a brief history of the development of the light on the Ancient Worthies' becoming spiritual?

(26) Reasoning from certain Scriptural data and the Divine attributes, how do we arrive at the conclusion that the Youthful Worthies will not remain on the earth after the Millennium?

(27) How should we expect that the Divine attributes will reward them post-Millennially?

(28) From Heb. 12: 23; Ex. 12: 11-13, 21-23, 27; 13: 1, 2, 11-15; Num. 2: 40-51, show that the Youthful Worthies will have a heavenly disposition and nature.

(29) How does Num. 18: 20, 23, 24 prove that they will attain unto a heavenly inheritance?

(30) How does Num. 3: 23, 29, 35, 38 prove that they will attain unto a heavenly inheritance?

(31) How do Heb. 7: 1-10; Num. 18: 21, 24, 25-32, compared with Matt. 25: 34; Rev. 21: 24, prove that they will attain unto a heavenly inheritance?

(32) Who seem to be meant by the expressions, "Camp of the Saints" and "Beloved City"? What principle of Z 1913, 53, seems to prove this?

(33) Give a brief summary of Rev. 20: 7-10.

(34) What cannot by human beings be done to an unseen force of spirit beings? What does this prove with respect to both the "Camp of the Saints" and "The Beloved City"?

(35) What does the term "camp" imply as to a condition?

(36) What does the expression, "*encompassed* the Camp of the Saints and the Beloved City," imply with respect to the camp and city? Why? Why could not the fullness of the passage be seen in our dear Pastor's day?

(37) What may we expect further on the Youthful Worthies? What is sufficient for present needs? How should we use it?

(38) On what article has the author been asked his opinion? To what did this request move him? With what question does the article begin? What statement follows the question immediately? What impression does this statement make? How had the subject been previously treated in the Tower? How do these two articles stand toward one another as to their answers to the question at

issue? How do the citations from our Pastor's writings prove the Truth on the subject? What is the effect of the pertinent contradictions on Tower readers?

(39) What is not, and what is the character of the question before us? Why is this so? Analyzed, what is the first main thought of the article under review? Its second? Its third? Its fourth? Its fifth? What can be done with some of the positions of this article? What with others? Why? What may be said as to the authorship of the article? Why was J.F.R. very likely its writer? Of what is there certainty?

(40) With what task is the review begun? Why so? Why is this reason true? Regardless of their relation to the Truth people, what three things will be required of the Millennial associates of the Ancient Worthies? Who was in harmony with this thought? What do his pertinent expressions show? Who else never taught the error here examined? What must, therefore, be our judgment on the use of this point by the article under review? Under what circumstance may this erroneous point be refuted? How should it be done? Why?

(41) What might have been The Tower's purpose in refuting this error? If so, how should we estimate it? How did the pertinent letter come to be inserted into The Tower? How did our Pastor view the thought of that letter and its appearance in The Tower?

(42) With what other teaching of the pertinent article may we well agree? How does The Tower quote the cited passages? What should be said of such an application of them? Who have not so applied them? Why is it unnecessary here to discuss the cited passages? What remark is pertinent as to Zeph. 2: 3 and Zech. 13: 9? How are they to be understood? Which is preferable, the 1904 or the 1914 application of Matt. 8: 11 and Luke 13: 29? Why so? What light thereon is shed by Ps. 107: 3; Acts 15: 14? Why do we pass these points by?

(43) What is helpful in discussing another's teaching? Why? What do some writers often do with their basic principle or principles? Why? What is the pertinent course of the article under review? What is the first consideration worthy of noting here? How do the pertinent Tower citations prove our Pastor's thought on Tentative

Justification? What was his last written expression on the subject? When was it finally approved by him? What is the second consideration worthy of noting here? In harmony with what is this teaching? What is the third consideration worthy of noting here? The fourth? The fifth? The sixth? The seventh? If such denial is kept in mind, what will the reader be able to do? Through what kind of thinking? Why so?

(44) What is the main difference between Tentative and Vitalized Justification? To what proof thereon should we resort? In what Scripture is this especially taught? What had St. Paul previously to Rom. 4 demonstrated? What does he proceed to prove by Rom. 4: 1-12? How does he first prove it? Secondly? Why must Rom. 4: 1-8 refer to Tentative Justification? After such proofs to what does St. Paul proceed to prove? How do vs. 11, 12 particularly prove it? In what two ways? What undoubtedly do vs. 112 prove? Vs. 21-24? How, among other ways, is the distinction between the faith of a tentatively and of a vitalizedly justified believer brought out in the Greek? How do these two kinds of faith act? How do the cited passages prove Tentative Justification? How do the cited passages prove Vitalized Justification? Had the writer of the article under review believed in Tentative Justification as operating during the Gospel Age and reasoned logically, what would he not have done? Why not? What two reasons prove this reason?

(45) Wherein is every important feature of God's plan symbolized? Illustrative from what standpoint? Accordingly, what in this connection has God symbolized? Whereby? How does this curtain symbolize Tentative Justification? Vitalized Justification? What four considerations will help clarify this? When was the antitypical curtain as doubled (apart from reference to the involved typical double curtain) first brought to our attention? In what? By whom? What did he do with reference to it repeatedly later? As what? What about that antitypical curtain was denied by the counterfeit channel? What kind of a channel was the Society as a corporation up to 1920?

(46) What are the main differences between Tentative and Vitalized Justification: As to God's Justice? As to Christ's merit? As to the recipient's activities? As to the

things imputed? How do the cited passages prove this? As to the Adamic sentence? As to fellowship with God? As to opportunities of entering into covenant relations with God? What kind of a doctrine is Tentative Justification as operative from Abel's, Enoch's and Noah's times to the times of Restitution?

(47) How does Heb. 11: 4-7 prove this of the first mentioned times? Despite what denials will it remain so? Who was the true channel for the meat in due season during the Parousia? How long will this doctrine stand? Despite what?

(48) In what three ways does the article under review deny Tentative Justification? What corroborative facts prove it? How did The Tower editors, and how did they not deny Tentative Justification? What quotation from Z '20, 26 proves it? Of what justification is, and of what justification is not this quotation true? Why is the article grossly misleading on Justification? What character does the omission of both terms likely have? Than what are half-truths more deceitful? What will the half-truth of this article on its subject prove? Under what condition? What is necessary to keep in view to see the full truth on justification? Why does fog exist in the article?

(49) On what other subjects is the article foggy? Why? In so far as it treats of the justification of the Ancient Worthies, how is its language? How does it befog that subject? Why do the pertinent thoughts need consideration? In what similar relation? What five facts should it have brought out on the Ancient Worthies' justification? Why should it have mentioned these? Of what are these five points not true? As a result of these omissions identifying both justifications before the Millennium, under what impression does the article leave one? What do these omissions effect? If stated clearly, how does it put the Youthful Worthies before God's Justice and the Ransom merit? What do many of us recall of that Servant's procedure on this subject? What distinction did he make between the two kinds of justification? Why do they differ?

(50) To what were the Ancient Worthies not justified? Why not? In conformity with what did God grant them covenant favors? What results from this as to a trial for

life for them? For what was their trial? In connection with what from Abraham onward? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What did this Covenant not ignore nor set aside? How did it treat it? How did it operate toward them? How was this possible? How does Rom. 4: 13-16 show this? What will illustrate God's pertinent dealings with them? How could He do this in harmony with Justice and the Ransom? What three Millennial things did He, accordingly, arrange for them? How do the cited passages prove this? What made it possible for God to give them such promises? How do the cited passages prove this? Without such a Tentative Justification what could not have taken place? What glorious favor has God thus been ready to exercise always?

(51) What in order in this set of things does the article fail to mention? What results from this omission? What are these two sets of things? What do they do with the situation as to the Youthful Worthies? Why so? In what fourteen respects are the relations of the Youthful Worthies to God precisely the same as were those of the Ancient Worthies? When did the Ancient Worthies live as to the time of the use of the imputed merit? The Youthful Worthies? Wherein do these differences equalize themselves? What has been indispensable for fallen humans for an entrance into the high calling? What conclusion from these facts should be drawn as to the Youthful Worthies, Divine Justice and the Ransom? What kind of reasoners on the Ransom were St. Paul and that Servant? How so in comparison with The Tower editors? What in this respect did they neither see nor make? How do the cited passages show this? In what two teachings?

(52) What does not determine the principles of exact Divine Justice and the Ransom in relation to the Youthful Worthies? Why not? What does dealing with the Youthful Worthies no more violate than dealing with the Ancient Worthies did? What alone propitiates Divine Justice? What does not do it? What would any time argument against the Youthful Worthies' having a trial for Millennial perfection and princedom truly based on Divine Justice and the Ransom equally do with the Ancient Worthies' trial for the same? Why? What does not, and

what does determine this matter? What follows as to the argument under review?

(53) As summaries: What made the Ancient Worthies available as such? What makes the Youthful Worthies available as such? How may these summaries be otherwise worded?

(54) What misrepresentation of our Pastor's pertinent view does the article under review teach? What does it then proceed to do with this half-truth? How does the article deal with his writing on this head? Where, among other places, does he expound both of these thoughts? What in this citation proves this? Of what is The Tower editors' course on this point another example? Then what do they begrudge us?

(55) Where will their claim that the Harvest began in 1878 and ended in 1918 be refuted? Where with Pyramid corroborations? When was the last member of the Little Flock begotten? Sealed in the forehead? What results as to all consecrating since the Fall of 1914? What is their hope? What will arousing them to false hope occasion?

(56) What further claim does the article make? What conclusion do they therefrom draw? On what alleged reason? Why is the pertinent quotation made? What correction in the statement must be made to fit it truthfully to the case of sinless Adam, Eve and Jesus? Who would grant this? How must the sentence be corrected to fit it truthfully to the case of the Ancient Worthies? So corrected, what does the sentence tell? So corrected, what does it do with The Tower editors' pertinent argument? What considerations prove this, as to the Ancient Worthies? How does Heb. 11:39, 40 prove this? What follows from this as to the Youthful Worthies? What follows as to The Tower editors' argument? What is a proper judgment on their pertinent dogmatic assertion quoted in the text?

(57) What remark is applicable to their claim that there are no Youthful Worthies, allegedly based on the three great Covenants? By whose three wives are these covenants typed? How do these editors, in the first place, reason on the matters? What is conceded on their first point? In objection to their view, what should be said as to the Great Company and the pre-Mosaic Ancient Worthies?

Why so of the latter? For their argument to be binding what must be proven? What would be the character of such an alleged proof? Why? How did earthly features of the Oath-bound Covenant operate toward the pre-Abrahamic Ancient Worthies? How do the cited passages prove this? What does this prove as to the possibility of its operating toward the Youthful Worthies? What three lines of evidence favor this? How do Gal. 3: 6-9 and Rom. 4: 16 demonstrate this? What is the promise of these passages? Why does it operate toward the Youthful Worthies? While the earthly features of the Oath-bound Covenant do not give life, what do they give? By what is the Covenant operative toward the Ancient Worthies not typed? Also those of its features operative toward the Great Company and fleshly Israel? What does this fact not unmake? What does parity of reasoning therefrom prove? Why so? What similar Covenant covers the Youthful Worthies?

(58) What do the pertinent reasonings of The Tower editors on the covenants typed by Sarah, Hagar and Keturah presuppose? What is the character of this presupposition? What follows as to their argument? What, kept in mind, will dissipate the figurative fog raised by The Tower editors' pertinent argument based on the three covenants typed by Sarah, Hagar and Keturah?

(59) What is the final pertinent argument of The Tower editors? How is Is. 61: 1-3, as giving the Church's commission, used by them as an alleged proof thereon? What do some of their bracketed comments thereon do with our Lord's interpretation of Is. 61: 1, 2? Which is the first of these examined here? Why is it given? How did our Pastor explain the pertinent statement? What is the character of his interpretation? What even higher Authority has clarified this passage? How is this shown in Luke 4: 16-21? Up to and including what? What did our Lord stop quoting after the first clause of v. 2? What did He tell us as to all that He quoted? What fact proves, therefore, that the Great Company is not referred to in the clauses applied to them by The Tower editors? What was then due to be preached by our Lord? What was not then due to be preached? On the contrary, how long and to whom is the statement, "to preach good tidings to the

meek," due to be preached? Among others, whom did they include in Jesus' day? Hence, among others, whom do the meek include? Among others, who are those who will mourn, as implied in the expression, "to comfort all that mourn"? When will the word "meek" in the expression, "preach good tidings to the meek," apply to them? What conclusion flows from these considerations as to both classes? What is there lacking to either class in these expressions? What results from this discussion as to The Tower editors' contention? What may be said of the Great Commission of Matt. 28: 18-20, not referred to by the editors? What proves that the Youthful Worthies can be made disciples? How may, and how may not the passage be applied to the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies? To whom does it primarily apply? What follows from the fact that the Oath-bound Covenant is the heart of the Gospel? How do the cited passages prove this? To whom may it, therefore, be preached as such? What does this do with The Tower editors' argument as to the Great Commission and the Youthful Worthies?

(60) What is the negative conclusion from the whole argument? The positive conclusion therefrom? What should, accordingly, the fact that no more consecrators can enter the high calling move us to do? What assurance should we give them?

ABRAHAM

HE lived true, long years a witness
 To the pure high-thoughted Oath,
 That in the ripeness of the Ages
 Will bless Jew and non-Jew both.
 Not a priest, and not a churchman,
 From all proud presumption free,
 Shepherd-chief and shepherd-warrior,
 Human-faced like you and me;
 Human-faced and human-hearted,
 To the pure religion true;
 Purer than the gay and sensuous
 Grecian, wider than the Jew.
 Common sire, whom Jew and Christian,
 Turk and Arab, name with praise;
 Common as the sun that shines
 On East and West with brothered rays.

CHAPTER VI.

RUTH—TYPE AND ANTITYPE.

LEAVING THE TRUTH PEOPLE FOR THE NOMINAL CHURCH AND THE RETURN WITH A NEW CLASS IN GOD'S PLAN. GLEANING FROM 1881 TO 1916. YOUTHFUL WORTHIES' ACTIVITIES AND JESUS' FAVORS TO THEM FROM DECEMBER, 1918 TO JULY, 1919. JESUS SUCCESSFULLY UNDER TAKES FOR THE YOUTHFUL WORTHIES FROM JULY, 1919, TO 1921. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

IN AN ARTICLE that runs through six Towers (Sept. 15-Dec. 1, 1932) J.F.R. attempts to make the story of the book of Ruth type the movement that he has been (mis) leading ever since late in 1916. His effort is another example of his thinking, as the little pope of Little Babylon, to change times and laws. We have several times promised to give the brethren an exposition of the book of Ruth, type and antitype, and will here briefly so do. It will also serve as a positive refutation of the folly that J.F.R. offers on the book. We feel that the error appearing on the subject the Truth thereon is likely now due. To save space we will by the verse number, rather than by quotation, indicate on which verse we are commenting. Please, therefore, for clearness' sake refer to the pertinent parts of Ruth as you read the explanation. We understand that the time of the antitype of the events of this book is from 1844 to 1921. The famine (v. 1) types the scarcity of new Truth among God's people after the disappointment of 1844, until 1874. Bethlehem (*house of bread*) types the sphere of Bible Truth *as due*—very little of it was due in the 30 years mentioned, typed by there being little bread at Bethlehem during the famine. Elimelech (vs. 1, 2; *powerful king*, preferably to *my God is king*) types the crown-lost leaders who partook in the Miller movement, and who after 1844 went back to the Nominal Church (Moab, *from a father*, the Nominal Church, developed

by crown-lost leaders, antitypical Lot). Naomi (*pleasantness*) types crown-lost ledlings. Mahlon (sickly) and Chilion (*pining, destruction*) type respectively the more faithful and the less faithful of the tentatively justified leaders. While in the Miller movement they were more or less in their places *fruitful* (Ephrathites). Judah means *praised*, typing here the sphere of God's people praiseworthy for them to be in. Their going to Moab was unfaithfulness, typing the unfaithfulness of the involved antitypes in going back to the nominal church. The death of Elimelech (v. 3) represents the crown-lost leaders' being swallowed up as to spirituality by the worldly conditions in the nominal church—their new creatures went to sleep. Naomi's and her sons' being thus left types their antitypes' bereavement of the help and fellowship of such worldlified crown-lost leaders. Mahlon's and Chilion's (v. 4) taking Moabitish wives types the two kinds of tentatively justified leaders associating with themselves leadable tentatively justified ones, in character corresponding respectively to the two kinds of above-mentioned justified leaders: Orpah (*stiff-necked, stubborn*) typing those associated with the less faithful justified leaders and Ruth (*friendship*) typing those associated with the more faithful of the justified leaders. Their abiding in Moab ten years types the fullness of time for crown-losers and their justified associates to remain in the Nominal Church.

(2) The death (v. 5) of Mahlon and Chilion in Moab types the swallowing up of the proper spirit of the justified leaders by the conditions in the Nominal Church—their justification lapsed. Naomi's being left by her husband and sons types how the led ones of the crown-losers are forsaken by the unfaithful ones to whom their hearts cleave. It types spiritual bereavement, even as her lamentation thereover (vs. 20, 21) shows that the antitypes recognize that spiritual bereavement has been their experience in the Nominal

Church for having left the association of the saints. God's giving Israel bread again (v. 6) types His giving the Parousia Truth (Elijah's eating the second cake and drinking the second vessel of water), whose beginnings date with our Lord's return, in 1874, the invisibility of the Lord's return, made clear that year, being the first of that "bread." Naomi's hearing of this types these crown-lost led ones, who went back to the Nominal Church between 1844 and 1874, learning through the message that went forth from 1874 to 1878 that the Truth was again advancing and becoming clear and abundant. Her arising that she might return, and her daughters-in-law with her, types their antitypes becoming interested in the Truth then due, this being from God's standpoint to the intent of the crown-lost ones coming into the Truth movement again ("to return"). Their going forth (v. 7) from their dwelling place toward the land of Israel represents their beginning to advance toward the Parousia Truth, away from Nominal Church errors and practices that they had hitherto held, this advance being made by all three classes. Naomi's first appeal to her daughters-in-law to return to their own, types, not words, but acts on the part of the crown-lost new creatures advancing toward the sphere of Truth and its Spirit, which is antitypical Canaan, having somewhere of a stumbling effect on the more or less faithful of the tentatively justified ones, just as Elijah's telling Elisha to turn back does not represent words, but acts of the faithful Little Flock that were repelling to the crown-losers, and that were with difficulty overcome by antitypical Elisha. Doubtless the difficulties in the way of advancing in the Truth against Nominal Church ways, faithfully met by antitypical Naomi, but harder for the others to meet, were among the things that in her had the effect of making her seem as forbidding them to follow her; while the easier way of settling down to a comfortable

life in the nominal church, contrasted with antitypical Naomi's forbidding attitude, made her conduct tell them that they would find ease and agreeable associates in antitypical Moab (vs. 8, 9). Naomi's kissing of Orpah and Ruth types the crown-lost ones' love for the justified at the prospective parting. Orpah's and Ruth's weeping types the grief of the two involved antitypical classes at the thought of parting.

(3) The particular form that Naomi's faithfulness in opposition to the nominal church ways, teachings and practices assumed was her presentation of the Truth on the death state, eternal torment, the high calling, future probation and restitution in opposition to the views of "the shepherds and the principals of the flock." This aroused their outspoken opposition. Antitypical Ruth and Orpah, bereaved of antitypical Mahlon and Chilion, as their symbolic husbands, desired each one of them a group of other leaders (husband, v. 9), which they were looking desirously to "the shepherds and principals of the flock" to become; but antitypical Naomi's course of alienating these made them wonder awhile as to whether to follow her further, since it would deprive them of these as antitypical husbands. Thus it was antitypical Naomi's course and its results on the shepherds and principals of the flock that told them temporarily in the mental attitude in which they were toward such shepherds and principals of the flock to leave her in order to get them as their symbolic husbands. Thus these conditions were obstructive to them. These obstacles they overcame by putting their love for the Lord, the Truth and the antitypical Naomi above their desire to gain the shepherds and principals of the flock as symbolic husbands, leaders. So far both classes did well. Naomi's second effort (v. 11-13) to send away her daughters-in-law was grounded upon the thoughts of her being too old to have children, of her not having a husband and its being too long to wait on prospective children of hers

for them as husbands, if she had a husband and could have children. The following were antitypical Naomi's acts and their results that told to antitypical Ruth and Orpah, who were desirous of winning antitypical husbands, leaders, the antitypes of those things which Naomi told Ruth and Orpah. Antitypical Naomi's witnessing the Truth in the nominal church won nobody who gave promise of becoming leaders, though she doubtless won additions to the Ruth and Orpah classes (no sons in my womb, v. 11). Nor did the antitypical Naomi class have any associates who could act as its leaders (husband, v. 12). Even if these two obstacles could be overcome, the very slow rate of progress in winning others on antitypical Naomi's part would delay matters too long for antitypical Ruth and Orpah to wait for leaders who could otherwise be won by their accepting nominal church leaders as theirs (husbands, v. 13).

(4) Ruth was the only object of Naomi's third attempt (v. 15). Antitypical Orpah's people were the Nominal people of God and their gods were the creeds. This furnishes us the clue as to what the third attempt of antitypical Naomi was. Their full repudiation of the creeds (gods, v. 15) and their determination to leave the Nominal Church had a temporary repelling effect on antitypical Ruth, because these believed the nominal church creeds were to be solemnly adhered to as divine oracles, and that the nominal church as God's mouthpiece, channel, should not be left by God's people. Hence antitypical Naomi's pertinent course at first struck them as impious and naturally suggested to them that they had better leave such impious teachings and its fellowships and return to the teachings and fellowships of the nominal church; but as Ruth overcame the third obstacle to her following Naomi, so the Ruth class overcame the obstacles to consecration. Her telling Naomi to cease from dissuading her types the pertinent class bidding true defiance to the involved

obstacles. Her most touching language in vs. 16, 17, wherein is expressed her determination at all costs to cleave to Naomi, her land, her people and her God, until death, types the act of consecration of the Ruth class, which act is a determination to cleave to the Lord, the Truth, its Spirit and the brethren of both consecrated classes unto death. Ruth's decision made her a *stranger* member of Israel, and thus she types from that decision onward those faithful tentatively justified who consecrate but are not Spirit-begotten, the Youthful Worthies; even as Canaan types the domain of the Truth and its Spirit, and as those born in the land type those begotten in the Truth and its Spirit, so those who dwelt in the land, but were not born in it, type those who dwell in Truth and its Spirit, but are not begotten of the Spirit—Youthful Worthies. As Naomi ceased (v. 18) to dissuade Ruth from following her, so the new creatures' course ceases to become forbidding to those who make a full consecration and faithfully maintain its spirit. Their going on until they came to Bethlehem (v. 19) types how such loyal crown-losers and faithful Youthful Worthies persevered in advancing in the Truth and its Spirit until they came fully into the Bible Truth as due and among those who were in it as such. The coming back again among the Babylon-separated sanctuary class, once left by these very brethren, was bound to excite much interest among those who remained in the Babylon-separated sanctuary class, and who remembered those who left before and were now come back during the Harvest time. This is what is typed by all the city being moved about Naomi, asking, "Is this Naomi?" We may be sure they were heartily received in the antitype, as was also Ruth in type and antitype, as her coming to Bethlehem, type and antitype, conspired to stir up the Truth people.

(5) Naomi's language (v. 20) shows that she was convinced that the Lord had striped her for going

away from the fellowship of God's people, Israel, typing how antitypical Naomi's words and condition told of the disappointments and losses undergone in the years of error, apparent to the Spiritual Israelites, who, despite the famine years from 1844 to 1874, remained in the Truth and its Spirit, as scant as the advancing Truth was during those years. The agreeableness of this Naomi class, indicated in the meaning of *Naomi* (*pleasantness*), which made them comply too readily with the wrong directions of their leaders, had made her amenable to bitter (*Mara*) experiences of disappointment and loss. Beloved brethren, it is always thus when people leave the Truth and its Spirit for error and the world. This should put us on our guard against an easy-going compliance with the directions of leaders, especially at this time when almost all leaders among the Lord's people have become misleaders. Naomi's bewailing her impoverished condition as stripes from the Lord (v. 21) types the words and acts of the Naomi class when they came back among the sanctuary class into the Parousia Truth and its Spirit. V. 22 is a summary repetition of the statements of vs. 19-21, in the way of emphasizing them, typical of how the Lord has emphasized the fact that some of the brethren who fell away from the Babylon-separated sanctuary class from 1844 to 1874 came back to their first love and brought back with them a faithful class of unbegotten consecrated ones from 1878 on.

(6) Noteworthy for the antitype in a chronological way is the statement that Naomi and Ruth returned early in the barley harvest. The barley harvest in Palestine preceded the wheat harvest. Wheat, we all know, is a more valuable grain than barley. The wheat harvest types that part of the Harvest that wins especially persevering Little Flock members, while the barley harvest types that part of the Harvest that wins especially those who become crown-losers. It will be recalled that the penny parable shows that the bulk of

those who were called from the first to the eleventh hour became crown-losers, while the bulk of those won from the eleventh hour onward to the close of the day maintained their crowns. These two times in the Harvest and their gatherings are respectively typed by the barley and wheat harvest times and their gatherings. Accordingly, Naomi's and Ruth's coming to Bethlehem in the beginning, though not in the very beginning, of the barley harvest types certain crown-losers once in the Miller movement Truth, and then forsaking it by a return to the Nominal Church, coming back into present Truth, and bringing unbegotten consecrated ones with them from 1878 to 1881. Thus they came into the Truth in the period of the first call—1874 to 1881, which was in the beginning of the antitypical barley harvest. For, as our Pastor shows, the fullness of the Gentiles came in, in 1878 (B 213; compared with 218, 1; 223, 3). Henceforth these were tested until 1881, when some crowns were forfeited, making special calls necessary from 1881 onward, which proves that in 1881 the general call had fully ceased. Hence no crowns were available for the Ruth class consecrating and coming into the Truth between 1878 and 1881. Thereafter she continues to type those assigned no crowns; for she continued antitypically as the type implies, to be an antitypical stranger in the antitypical land. Accordingly, the facts of the antitype prove that Ruth 1 types events from 1844 to 1881.

(7) We now proceed to a short exposition of the second chapter of Ruth and will find that its time in the antitype is from 1881, when the gleaning began, to 1916, when the gleaning ceased. The crown-losers (v.1) have our Lord as an antitypical kinsman, as an anti typical Boaz, who as such was a kinsman to antitypical Elimelech. Boaz' power and wealth type those of the Lamb found worthy to inherit, among other things, power and wealth (Rev. 5: 12). Zealous Ruth (v. 2), as one of the strangers in the land, recognizing that

she could have opportunities to glean, types the Youthful Worthies, zealous in the Truth, but not Spirit-begotten, from 1881 onward recognizing that they were given opportunities to serve in the Harvest. Ruth's pleading with Naomi to be encouraged to glean types the Youthful Worthies' seeking from their crown-lost associates encouragement to glean in the Harvest of new creatures. The field in which Ruth would be favored by its owner (vs. 2, 3) to glean, of course, types the sphere of service in which our Lord is Chief Reaper, He being the near kinsman to the Youthful Worthies' "father-in-law" — antitypical Elimelech. Her gleaning after the reapers among the sheaves (vs. 3, 7) types the subordinate part after the Little Flock reapers among the ecclesiastas that the Youthful Worthies had. Boaz (v. 4) coming from Bethlehem and blessing his reapers types our Lord's coming forth out of the storehouse of the advancing Truth to bless His own reapers and really blessing them. Their fervently wishing Boaz God's blessing types the Little Flock reapers' praying blessing on our Lord in His Harvest work. Boaz' (v. 5) asking his superintending reaper as to Ruth's identity types our Lord's raising in that Servant's mind the question as to the identity of the antitypical stranger—the Youthful Worthies. This occurred from 1881 onward, as various Tower articles suggest. The superintending reaper's answer (v. 6) types that Servant's explanation, given from 1881 onward in Towers, etc., that more were consecrating than could have crowns, because there were less crowns available, and that such surplus consecrators therefore constituted a class by themselves—the unbegotten consecrated, whom, basing the thought on the Youthfuls of Joel 2: 28, we now call Youthful Worthies, in contrast with and in partial allusion to the Ancient Worthies. Likewise he also pointed out their fellowship with the crown-lost brethren, typed by the superintendent's allusion to Ruth's

fellowship with the crown-lost ones returned from the Nominal Church. The superintendent's praise (v. 7) of Ruth's desire to glean and her industry (the word *not* is in the best MSS. of v. 7's last clause; hence it should be translated, "she tarried not in the [resting] house [even] a little") types the gracious acknowledgment which that Servant made of the Youthful Worthies' zeal to serve and his praise of their industry.

(8) Boaz' addressing Ruth (v. 8) types our Lord's sending the Youthful Worthies seasonable messages adapted to their condition. The question, "Hearest thou not, my daughter?", types both our Lord's tender regard ("daughter") and His encouraging them to listen to that Servant's message with reference to them. Boaz' directing her (v. 8) to abide in his field by his maidens to glean, and not to go to others, types our Lord's encouraging the Youthful Worthies to labor on in the Lord's Harvest field with His faithful consecrated ones, and not to abandon that gleaning work for some other work. Boaz' (v. 9) encouraging her to fix her eyes on the field where his maidens worked types our Lord's encouraging the Youthful Worthies to note carefully by study the true Harvest work, and to serve with the faithful consecrated ones (maidens). Boaz' assuring Ruth that he had cautioned the young men against injuring her, types our Lord's assuring the Youthful Worthies that He had exhorted the abler Truth servants not to stumble the Youthful Worthies in word, manner or deed. Boaz' (v. 9) giving her the privilege of quenching her thirst by the water drawn by the young men types our Lord assuring this class that they were privileged to receive the waters of life drawn from the well of Truth—the Bible—by the pilgrims and elders. The antitypes of Boaz' speech to Ruth were by our Lord given through pertinent Tower articles from 1881 onward. Ruth's humble and reverent acknowledgment of Boaz' graciousness and her wonder as to why she, a stranger, should be thus favored

(v. 10) types the Youthful Worthies' humble and reverent acknowledgment of our Lord's graciousness to them and their wonder as to why, as unbegotten ones in the Truth (a stranger), they have been favored with the privileges of growth in the knowledge, spread and practice of the Truth.

(9) Boaz' answer (v. 11) that her choosing the God of Israel, the land of Israel and the people of Israel, as her God, land and people, and that her having given up the gods, the land and the people of Moab, were the reason for his course toward her, types our Lord's assuring the Youthful Worthies (through pertinent Tower articles, later through Vols. 3 and 6 and later through other Tower articles and questions) that their having by consecration chosen Jehovah, His Truth, its Spirit and His people as their portion, and that their having given up sin, error, selfishness and worldliness and the practicers and abode of these, were the reason for His course toward them. His wishing her (v. 12) the Divine rewards for her works types our Lord's causing by His Word, Spirit and Providence, desiringly ministered to this class, the blessing that God ordains for the Youthful Worthies, who take refuge in the God of Spiritual Israel. This answer was also given in the above-mentioned literature. Ruth's answer (v. 13) types the prayer of the Youthful Worthies for Jesus' continued favor. Her telling the reason (v. 13) for her being emboldened to express such a wish types the Youthful Worthies' declaring that the Lord's past graciousness in pouring out words and acts of friendliness and comfort toward them encouraged them to ask for continued favor upon them who are the unbegotten consecrated ones. Boaz' inviting her (v. 14) to partake of the repast that he had provided for his workers, both of the milder and sharper (vinegar was then a condiment) forms of food, types our Lord's assuring this class of His desire for their feeding on the Truth in its milder and sharper forms, which also appears

from various Tower articles inviting them thereto. Ruth's accepting the invitation types the Youthful Worthies' accepting the antitypical invitation. Ruth's sitting (v. 14) beside the reapers types the Youthful Worthies' partaking of the Truth with the servants of the Truth as reapers. Boaz' passing her parched corn types our Lord's giving this class appetizingly-prepared food through the Tower, etc. (Luke 12: 37). Her eating unto satiety types their satisfying their hunger for truth by the Truth. Her leaving (v. 14) the meal place for her work types that this class, instead of wasting time in idle speculations, use for service the strength derived from their necessary food for their consecrated hearts and minds.

(10) Boaz' charging the young men to let her glean among the sheaves, not to shame (misrendered reproach) her, designedly to put in her way rich gleanings and not to rebuke her (vs. 15, 16), types our Lord's charges to the servants of the Truth, especially through Tower articles, to encourage the Youthful Worthies to seek to win others for the Truth, to refrain from such words or acts as would entice them to spiritual unchastity, designedly to put opportunities of service in their way and not to berate, belittle or scold them. Ruth's gleaning all day and beating out her gleanings (v. 17) types the Youthful Worthies' industry and efficiency in winning and developing new creatures. An ephah was about a bushel and to have gleaned an ephah full in one day was an unusually large amount to glean, which types the large success the Lord granted to the gleaning Youthful Worthies. Ruth's taking (v. 18) her gleanings to the city types the Youthful Worthies' bringing their gleanings into the Truth as due. Her bringing her gleanings to Naomi types the Youthful Worthies' introducing their gleanings to their crown-lost associates. Naomi's seeing (v. 18) the gleanings types the crown-losers' taking note of the ones won for the Truth by the Youthful Worthies.

Naomi's bringing forth food that she had reserved for Ruth types the crown-losers' giving the Ruth class the kind of spiritual food that they thought best for them, after they had themselves partaken thereof. Naomi's questions (v. 19), indicating her wonder at Ruth's success, types the crown-losers' wonder at where so many could be won for the Truth. Naomi's recognizing that Ruth must have been especially favored to be so successful and her wishing it to be well with her favorer ("blessed is he that did take knowledge of thee") types that the crown-losers recognize that in success in service the Youthful Worthies have been highly favored and that they wish well to the Favorer. Ruth's declaring (v. 19) that the person in question was Boaz types the Youthful Worthies' ascribing their success to the Lord, in whose Harvest they had been working.

(11) Naomi's bespeaking (v. 20) blessings upon Boaz for his kindness to the living and the dead types the crown-losers' wishing success to our Lord in His work for His favors to the crown-loser and tentatively justified leaders swallowed up in the Nominal Church and to the crown-losers and Youthful Worthies in the Truth. Her declaring that Boaz was one who had the right to redeem (see the margin) types the crown-losers' teaching the Youthful Worthies that our Lord was one who had the right to acknowledge the Youthful Worthies as a class by themselves, take them to Himself acceptably as such and use them as such. Ruth the Moabitess (v. 21) telling Naomi that Boaz had told her to glean in close association with his reapers to the end of the Harvest types the Youthful Worthies by word and act telling the crown-losers that Jesus invited them to glean until the end of the Harvest, which means to 1916, in its gleaning aspect. Naomi's (v. 22) telling Ruth that it would be good for her to continue with Boaz' maidens, and evil for her, if she would be found gleaning with others in another field types the crown-losers' by word and act encouraging

the Youthful Worthies to continue as for their good in the Lord's Harvest field with His faithful consecrated ones, and by no means to allow themselves to be deceived into other works than gleaning in the Lord's Harvest; for if found so doing it would mean loss of the Lord's favor. Ruth's following Naomi's suggestion (v. 23) types the Youthful Worthies' following the crown-losers' pertinent suggestion. Ruth's doing this until the end of the barley harvest types the Youthful Worthies' gleaning in the Lord's Harvest field from 1881 to Feb., 1908, when the antitypical Barley Harvest was over, that date marking the start of the eleventh hour, when the antitypical Wheat Harvest began. Her continuing to do so until the end of the wheat harvest types the Youthful Worthies' gleaning Little Flock members from Feb., 1908, until Passover, 1916, when the last Little Flock member was gleaned. Thus our study shows that the antitype of Ruth 2 was enacted during the gleaning period—1881 to 1916. Ruth's remaining with Naomi throughout the Harvest types the Youthful Worthies' remaining with the crown-losers to the Harvest's end.

(12) Ruth 3 antitypically covers the period from Dec., 1918, to July, 1919. The facts of the antitype that we will now present will prove this. It will be recalled that Vol. VII and the Societyites claimed that the door to the high calling would be closed at Passover, 1918 (actually it closed Sept. 16, 1914, so far as new begettals are concerned, though the gleaning of the faithful begotten ones continued until Passover, 1916). This view of the Society friends made them properly conclude that, so far as new consecrators were concerned, these would form the class of "Modern" (the literal Biblical term is *Youthful*) Worthies. And to win such was one of the privileges of service before the Societyites. These thoughts were expressed in Z '18, 355-357. The expression of these thoughts was made by the good crown-losers in the Tower, in studies and in conversations (their bad leaders were then in

prison). All of us know that this was done, at that time very generally among the crown-losers. And it meant that the Youthful Worthies as a class were to be brought to the fore in blessing and service henceforth, as the pertinent discussions of those times brought them to the fore in the studies of that time. These are the antitypes of Naomi's (good crown-losers) telling Ruth (v. 1) of her ambitions for her prosperity. Her reminding Ruth (v. 2) of Boaz' being a near relative, one who might redeem, types the good crown-losers', who were now in control of the Society's work and also were in other groups, *e.g.*, Standfasts, Olsonites, etc., telling the Youthful Worthies that our Lord Jesus could now acknowledge them as a separate class, take them to Himself and use them fruitfully as a class by themselves. Her telling Ruth (v. 2) that Boaz was that night winnowing barley types the crown-losers' publishing the statements of the above-mentioned Tower article and the oral teachings of the crown-lost Societyites, Standfasts, Olsonites, etc., that our Lord was at that time engaged in dealing with the Great Company amid trialsome experiences (winnowing the barley in the threshing floor). The persecutions of that time were among these winnowing experiences. Naomi's telling Ruth (v. 3) to wash, anoint and adorn herself so that she might attractively present herself to Boaz at the threshing floor types the crown-losers' exhorting the Youthful Worthies attractively (in cleansing from filthiness of the flesh and spirit and in holiness of mind and heart) to present themselves to the Lord as a special class during the testful conditions of Great Company winnowings (separations from worldliness). The truths that were at that time gladdening the Church (the completion of the Church; The Last Related Acts of Elijah and Elisha, etc.) at this time were also gladdening our Lord (Boaz, eating and drinking and being merry). These are patent facts.

(13) Naomi's telling Ruth not to manifest herself for her purpose until after Boaz had finished eating

and drinking types the crown-losers' counseling the Youthful Worthies to wait until the Lord had indicated by His teachings and providences that He had appropriated the pertinent teachings joyfully and that the time had come to make special effort to present themselves as Youthful Worthies for His separate acknowledgment, union and use of them in service. As in the type the time for Ruth to approach Boaz (v. 4) was after he had ceased for the night from winnowing the barley, so in the antitype after Jesus was about to make a transition from Great Company work toward Youthful Worthy work was the time for antitypical Ruth to go to antitypical Boaz for the purpose intended. The instruction to uncover his feet and lie down (v. 4) types the exhortations that the crown-losers gave to the Youthful Worthies to be humble and quiescent in waiting upon the Lord, until the Lord would take up their case. Naomi's telling Ruth that Boaz would then tell her what to do types the crown-losers' assurance to the Youthful Worthies that the Lord would make known to them what to do. Ruth's promise to do all she was told by Naomi types the Youthful Worthies' factual and verbal assurances to do all that their crown-lost associates told them. All of the above thoughts are contained in the above-cited Tower article and in the incidental studies, conversations and pertinent acts late in 1918. Not only the known facts of that time were such, but in the nature of the case that article among Truth people would produce such discussions and acts. Ruth's doing the things charged her (v. 6) types the Youthful Worthies' fulfilling the antitypes above mentioned. Thus our application is decidedly factual, for most of us are witnesses that these events occurred in 1918 among Truth people.

(14) On Dec. 9, 1918 and Dec. 24, 1918, the first and second issues of *The Present Truth* appeared. These treated the Epiphany, The Last Related Acts of Elijah and Elisha, The Withdrawal of Priestly Fellowship From Levites, Prophets And Prophets, Types

and Antitypes, Conventions of Priests and Levites, The Church Completely Organized (as a proof that while Merarite and Gershonite Levites have corporations controlling their work, Priests must not), judging (as to manifested Levites) and Defense of Peace Among God's People (as related to the separation between the Priests and Levites). All these teachings applied to the relation between the Little Flock and the Great Company in connection with the division between them then in full operation. These teachings gave the Little Flock a great feast with corresponding joy, and in these our Lord shared (Rev. 3:20), whose participation therein is typed by Boaz' feast and joy (v. 7). His lying down for the night at the end of the heap of corn (barley) types our Lord's ceasing for awhile with giving *additional* feasting with reference to the Great Company and temporarily easing the separating trials; for nothing further was given out until the third number of The Present Truth, which appeared Feb. 17, 1919, for the reprint of The Last Related Acts of Elijah and Elisha which went through the press early in February was withheld from circulation among the Societyites until July. Ruth's coming softly, uncovering Boaz' feet and lying down (v. 7), types that the Youthful Worthies, in harmony with the teachings that they had received, as above set forth, quietly, without agitation or ostentation, in the secrecy of their hearts, humbly brought themselves and their cause to the Lord and in silence waited on His decision. Boaz' trembling (v. 8—not fearing), as a half-awakened sleeper always does, types our Lord's earliest movements toward the Ruth class after they had laid themselves at His disposal for the thing at hand. Boaz' turning and seeing Ruth types our Lord's first fixing His ministering attention on the Youthful Worthies as a separate class. This occurred through His arousing the writer to prepare the article on the Youthful Worthies which appeared in the third issue of The Present Truth, that of Feb. 17, 1919. Boaz'

asking Ruth (v. 9), "Who art thou?" types our Lord's raising before the Youthful Worthies the question on the identity and reality of the Youthful Worthies in the pertinent article. (P. '19, 34-36; '20, 51-53; '24, 34-37; '30, 131-133. In these and subsequent Truth references we make them to the reprinted articles for the convenience of those who may not have the earlier ones.) Ruth's answer (v. 9) types the response of the Youthful Worthies as they read the pertinent parts of that article, acknowledging that they were the pertinent class of the Lord's servants. Ruth's request that Boaz spread his skirts over her in acknowledgment of his being one who could redeem her as a near relative types the Youthful Worthies', under influence of that article, requesting the Lord Jesus to acknowledge them as that class of servants and to take them into such a union with Him as would make them fruitful in work for the Lord.

(15) Boaz' answer (v. 10), commanding her for her persevering and adhering to, and seeking him rather than seeking younger men, types our Lord's telling, through the pertinent parts of that article, of His appreciation of the spirit of the persevering Youthful Worthies, who, while sin and selfishness is in the ascendancy in the world, would not follow their practicers, whether great or small, but faithfully served and cleaved to the Lord instead (P. '19, 36, 6; '20, 53, 7; '24, 37, 2; '30, 133, 7). Boaz' (v. 11) encouraging Ruth ("Fear not my daughter") types our Lord's encouraging throughout that whole article the Youthful Worthies. Boaz' promising Ruth to fulfill her requests, because of her publicly known virtue, types our Lord's describing through that article the present rewards and privileges of the Youthful Worthies, because of their publicly known loyalty in consecration. (P. '19, 36, 1, 2; '20, 53, 1, 2; '24, 36, 3, 4; '30, 133, 1, 2.) Boaz' acknowledging his being one who could redeem her, but mentioning that there was yet a nearer redeemer (v. 12) types our Lord's assuring the Youthful Worthies

that He was a close relative to them to acknowledge them, but that there was yet a closer relative—certain Great Company leaders, the directors and editors as representatives of the Society, who by virtue of their being Levites and the Youthful Worthies being Levites, were a class nearer to the Youthful Worthies than the Head of the World's High Priest. (P. '19, 35, 8 [last sentence]; '20, 52, 5; '24, 36, 2; '30, 132, 7; and the preceding set of references.) Boaz' charging Ruth (v. 13) to wait until it would be determined whether the nearer kinsman would acknowledge her and enter into union with her to make her fruitful, types our Lord, by His providential delays in circulating the May, 1919, Truth, which, printed in February and first circulated in July, contained the articles giving the pertinent notice to the nearer kinsman (which delay was due to the leading Society directors' and editors' imprisonment and J.F. Rutherford's illness after their release), bidding this class to wait until the due time for the Society directors and editors to be given a chance to do the antitypical nearest kinsman's part. Boaz' pledging that in case the nearer kinsman failed Ruth, he would take his place toward her (v. 13) types our Lord's assuring the Youthful Worthies that He would stand by them, if the others failed. This pledge is implied in the fact that Jesus recognized the Youthful Worthies as a subordinate part of antitypical Elisha as the last two sets of citations prove by His providential pertinent act. Boaz' telling Ruth (v. 13) to lie down until morning types the Lord's requiring the Youthful Worthies to wait until the time for Him to act for them.

(16) The compliance with this request in the type and antitype is shown in the first clause of v. 15. Ruth's acting in secrecy and Boaz' counseling secrecy (v. 15) types the secrecy of the pertinent acts of Jesus and the Youthful Worthies, as the same thing is implied in Ruth's leaving while the darkness prevented recognition (v. 14). Boaz' charging Ruth to put her apron

(see margin) into a position to receive the barley that he would give her types the Lord's charging the Youthful Worthies to prepare to be fruitful in gaining crown-losers as the fruits of their devotion. This is also implied in the last two references as well as in P. '19, 36, 4; '20, 53, 5; '24, 36, 7; '30, 133, 5. Her complying shows the compliance of this class. Boaz' measuring for her six measures of barley (v. 15) types our Lord's giving this class an incomplete number of crown-losers as a result of her service. Her bringing them into the city types the Youthful Worthies' bringing such crown-losers among the Truth people. This work was done from March to July, 1919. Ruth's coming (v. 16) to Naomi types this class presenting themselves to their crown-lost associates during the time just mentioned. Naomi's question, "Who art thou?", types the Youthful Worthies crown-lost associates' question as to whether they had found out that they were Youthful Worthies or not. Ruth's telling what Boaz had told her types the Youthful Worthies' declaring to their crown-lost associates what the Lord had told them through the truths on the Youthful Worthies, set forth in the Feb. 17, 1919 TRUTH. Ruth's showing the six measures of barley (v. 17) types the Youthful Worthies' introducing to the crown-losers long in the Truth those crown-losers that the Lord had given them as fruits of their work, as the antitype of Boaz' telling Ruth not to go empty handed to her mother-in-law. Naomi's (v. 18) advising Ruth quietly to wait on Boaz, whose character guaranteed that he would persevere in the matter in hand to a successful conclusion, types the crown-losers' advising the Youthful Worthies quietly and trustfully to wait on the Lord, whose character was a guarantee of His persevering in the matter to a successful conclusion.

(17) Ruth 4 covers in antitype the period from July, 1919, to about July, 1921. In Ruth 4: 1, Boaz' going to the gate and sitting down there represents our Lord's preparing to circulate widespread among Truth people

the May (printed in February and circulated in July) and August, 1919 TRUTHS, which contained the pertinent articles, through which Jesus gave the messages antitypical of what Boaz said in Ruth 4: 1, 2. The nearer kinsman's coming to the gate (v. 1) types the Society leaders, its directors and editors, whose chiefs had but recently been delivered from prison, coming by their activities again into prominence among the Truth people. Boaz' asking him to turn aside and sit down at the gate types our Lord's, through the pertinent articles in the May (printed in February and circulated in July) and August, 1919 TRUTHS, attracting their attention and asking them to step before the whole Church in attention to the subject matter of those articles. The nearer relative's complying types the Society directors' and editors' complying with the antitypical requests. The wide circulation of these articles (over 30,000 of the first set and over 20,000 of the second set among Society adherents) could not but have these two effects. The ten men of the city's elders (v. 2) type responsive leaders of the eight Levite groups, which were all formed before the antitype of the gate scene was finished, Little Flock leaders among these Levite groups and Little Flock leaders in the Epiphany movement—ten sets of leaders in all. Boaz' taking (v. 2) the ten elders and asking them to judge as witnesses in the matter of Naomi's parcel of ground left by Elimelech types our Lord's attracting, by the above-mentioned articles, the attention of the ten sympathetic leader classes in the ten groups just mentioned and enlisting them as judges—witnesses—of the matter of bringing the pertinent Great Company's affairs forward for proper adjustment. The elders' seating themselves (v. 2) represents their antitypes' setting themselves to act as requested. Boaz' telling the kinsman of Naomi's selling a parcel of ground belonging to Elimelech (v. 3) types our Lord's declaring through the article in the Sept. 1919 TRUTH ON, The Society As Channel, that the privilege of acknowledging the Great

Company as brethren, then to be gained, but formerly not discernible, and the privilege of managing their work, were obtainable (redeemable) by pertinent sacrificial work (P. '19, 161, 1; '25, 97, 1; '31, 30, 5).

(18) Boaz' declaring to the next kinsman (v. 4) that he had decided to offer to him the chance of acquiring the land publicly types our Lord's similar declaration through the part of the above-mentioned article just cited that urged the Society directors and editors to make acknowledgment of the Great Company as now available for God's dealings, since the Little Flock was complete, and to make faithful use of the privilege of managing the Society's affairs in the interest of the Great Company, and diligently to do it publicly before all the Lord's people, particularly before the ten groups of leaders. Boaz' telling (v. 4) the nearer kinsman, who had the first right thereto, to decide whether he would exercise this right or not, represents our Lord's, through the same citations of that article, calling upon the Society directors and editors (who had the first right to obtain the above-mentioned privileges, since theirs was rightly the controlling position in the Society as to policy and teaching, though they were not controlling, such function having been usurped by one of its members), to decide whether or not they would by faithful performance of their duties control the Society's affairs for the benefit of the Great Company (same citation as above). Boaz' assuring (v. 4) the nearer kinsman that if the latter would not use his prior rights, he would assume them, types our Lord's through those two articles showing the Society directors and editors that if they would not use their position to function properly toward the Great Company as a class and toward their work, he would see to its being done by Himself. The nearer kinsman's telling Boaz that he would perform his part in this matter types the directors' and editors' assertion that they would do the antitypical part as shown above; they accepted it as their task to win little Benjamins

as Clayton Woodworth then put it. Boaz' telling (v. 5) the nearer relative that with Naomi's right he would have to redeem Ruth's right in that field types what our Lord declared in the above citations and in P. '19, 175, 1-4; '24, 82, 4-83, 1; '30, 74, 3-6 on Elisha's request for the firstborn's portion, as showing that Elisha typed the two classes (the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies as mouthpiece to the public) who had the right to the Society's field of service toward the public, including, of course, services to their own classes. Boaz' saying that the nearer relative must thus marry Ruth (there was no question here of marrying Naomi, whose husband had had children by her, and therefore levirate marriage did not apply to Naomi, as J.F.R. claimed) to raise up the name of the dead Mahlon, types that in case of Youthful Worthies the Society directors and editors would have to acknowledge such a class and to unite with it to produce faithful tentatively justified ones of the only kind then producible, the Youthful Worthies, to take the place of dead antitypical Mahlon—dead because his tentative justification had lapsed. The above citations prove it.

(19) The kinsman's knowing well (v. 6) that the field would revert not as his, but to Ruth's offspring, as Mahlon's descendant, and that he would thus only be out of pocket for another's benefit, and his refusing to enter into such a transaction, types the Society directors' and editors' through their president and chief editor giving a refusal to the antitypical proposal of antitypical Boaz, through the article on the Worthies in the Jan. 15, 1920, Tower, wherein he denied the existence of Youthful Worthies, and any other kind of tentatively justified persons, and thus the Society, of course, would not sacrifice, for such a class and for the production of the only kind of faithful tentatively justified ones then winnable (Youthful Worthies), their not wanting to divide their powers with such a class being the selfish reason back of it—marring their

inheritance. The pertinent article, whose contents were previously discussed for several months at Bethel, was written prior to the shareholders' meeting at Pittsburgh, Jan. 3, 1920. The nearer relative's offering and letting Boaz have the opportunity to redeem it types the Society directors' and editors' giving up, through that article and connected acts, their pertinent privilege, which made it revert to the Lord. It was always an evil in Israel not to redeem a redeemable property, or let part of the fatherly patrimony (v. 7) fall to another. This was shown by the resultant limping when such an one had to give his shoe in token of this evil, typing the wrong conduct in an antitypical Israelite who refused to perform the antitype; and it was also an evil in Israel for the fit brother not to enter a levirate marriage with his childless brother's widow (Deut. 25: 7-10), typing any proper candidate who would refuse to raise up antitypical seed to the fallen leaders of any class in Spiritual Israel, capable ones in line for it refusing to take the vacated place of leadership in the Great Company to win and develop the rest of that class, capable ones in line for it refusing to take the vacated place of leadership in the Youthful Worthies to win and develop the rest of that class, capable ones in line for it refusing to take such place among the justified to win and develop the rest of them, or capable ones in any higher class refusing to do this as to the vacated place in a lower class, like the tentatively justified. To enter an antitypical levirate marriage is impossible for the Little Flock, since her Leader, Jesus, never dies, hence the Little Flock never loses her Leader. Not only did they do wrong thereby, but for that act they were surrendered by the Lord to other wrongs, manifesting their spiritual limping. Hence the nearer kindred's taking off his shoe, giving it to Boaz and limping as a result (v. 8) types not only the pertinent wrong of the Society directors and editors in the above-mentioned article, but also the evils that they committed at the voting shareholders' meeting

at Pittsburgh, Jan. 3, in setting aside the annual election of the Society officers, making it triennial, and in setting aside the election for life of the Society directors, making it triennial, which was a gross act of hypocrisy in view of the claims that these made in 1917 and 1918 on an annual election of directors, as well as officers, as being absolutely required by law. This was not only hypocrisy but power-grasping and covetousness. The antitypical limping was also manifested in later wrong of practice and teaching. Thereby the matter of exercising the proper pertinent conduct was left to antitypical Boaz (leaving the shoe with Boaz).

(20) In the case of Ruth there is no record of her loosing the shoe and spitting in the face of the kinsman who refused to marry her to raise up seed to Mahlon, as the type shows (Deut. 25: 9) such should be done. And this was because the circumstances were quite different, the entire transaction being conducted by Boaz instead of Ruth, and that in her absence, whereas in the type the widow was to act with the elders in the transaction. But in the case of Ruth's nearest kinsman, type and antitype, the shoe was taken off, and the antitypical spitting did set in. The secretions of the mouth of God's people are a good thing, and are used to represent the Truth, since their mouth represents mouthpieceship for God (Rev. 3: 16; John 9: 6, see comment). To spit in, one's face represents to use language to the disparagement and disgrace of him into whose face one spits. If it is God's people who do the symbolic spitting, it represents to use the Truth to the disparagement and disgrace of the pertinent person. And not only antitypical Boaz has, as the facts prove, done this, but as the Youthful Worthies have come to see the Truth on the subject they have done it to the Society directors and editors, especially to their chief, as others of God's people, as not expressly required by this particular type, but as implied by the elders', etc., part, have done and will continue to do—using

the Truth on the pertinent subject to the disparagement and disgrace of the antitypical nearest kinsman. Boaz' calling (v. 9) upon the elders and people to bear witness to his becoming the purchaser of the involved property types that through the entire articles of the March, 1920, TRUTH on, "Worthies, Ancient and Modern," Reviewed; The Youthful Worthies (which are republished as Chapter V of this volume) and, Some Hindrances to Fruitful Service, our Lord called the ten group leader classes and all the brethren to witness that He had taken over all the involved rights of the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies away from the directors and editors and exposed their iniquity, their subsequent errors as successively coming out in the Tower evidencing their reprobate state, as well as their subsequent wrong practices; and Boaz' calling (v. 10) upon the ten to witness that he had redeemed Ruth to raise up seed to Mahlon, and thus to preserve his family inheritance in Israel types how our Lord in the whole of the first, second and third of the last-mentioned articles, especially the first, acknowledged His relationship to the Youthful Worthies and that He had acquired this class as His Own, to raise up faithful tentatively justified ones of the only kind then possible—Youthful Worthies, all others of that class forfeiting their tentative justification. The elders and all the others present in the gate saying (v. 11), "We are witnesses," types their antitypes—the Lord's people in general and the good leaders—acknowledging the truths that our Lord set forth in those three articles and His consequent acknowledgment of the Youthful Worthies and accepting of them into union with Him for developing more Youthful Worthies. The good wishes of the elders and people (v. 11) for Ruth and Boaz type the good wishes of the Lord's people in general and the good leaders of the ten groups, that the Youthful Worthies might be fruitful in winning many of their own kind and that our Lord acquire riches and glory thereby in His fruitful sphere of Divine

Truth as due. The wish (v. 12) that Boaz' house developed by Ruth be as the house of Pharez types the antitypes' wish that the Youthful Worthies be a princely class, as the typical one was.

(21) Boaz' taking Ruth (v. 13) to wife and by her becoming the father of Obed (*servile*) types our Lord's uniting the Youthful Worthies to Himself and by them developing a great multitude of new Youthful Worthies. We are not to conclude that our Lord's uniting Himself with antitypical Ruth proves her to be the Church, because, as the Solomon of Canticles which covers Gospel-Age times, He had 60 queens and 80 concubines, as symbolic wives (Cant. 6: 8, 9), yet His only real wife is the true Church (v. 9). The women congratulating Naomi and praising the Lord for the child's birth and for providing a worthy kinsman, type all the worthy groups of the Lord's people wishing the involved crown-losers good and praising God for His involved benefits, and our Lord as being a worthy antitypical kinsman who would therefore receive honor in spiritual Israel for His part in the transaction Their proclaiming the child (v. 15) to become Naomi's help and stay, even to old age, for Ruth's relation to her, as better for her than any children that Naomi could have developed, types the Lord's people proclaiming the later found Youthful Worthies as the helper and stay of the good crown-losers, even unto the end, because of the Youthful Worthies' relation to these crown-losers—the Ruth class being better to these crown-losers than all the classes that they could develop. Naomi's laying the child in her bosom and nursing it (v. 16) types the love and ministry of these crown-losers to these new Youthful Worthies. The women announcing the child as a descendant of the good crown-losers and calling it Obed (*servile*) type all the groups of the Lord's people setting forth the thought that the new Youthful Worthies are descendants of the good crown-losers and that that class would be a servant one—antitypical Levites, not priests. The

facts of this paragraph were all fulfilled in 1920 and 1921. The genealogy following (vs. 17-22) is no part of this history, though related to it, hence we pass it by without further comment. Our very brief exposition above is a truthful, harmonious and reasonable and natural application of the history in the book of Ruth to undoubted pertinent facts, and thus, as the Truth on the subject, is in marked contrast with the unfactual, inharmonious, unreasonable, and forced application of this history to his movement made by J.F.R. in 1932. We might here remark that the exposition given above was not understood by us until years after the antitype was entirely fulfilled; and at that time of our writing the articles through which antitypical Boaz spoke the antitypes of Boaz' speeches in Chapters 3 and 4 we did not realize the uses the Lord was making of us and of The Present Truth, even as our Pastor was unconscious of the antitypical acts he was used to perform.

(22) We have been in receipt of several letters asking us to harmonize our understanding of Ruth as a type of the Youthful Worthies with the comment in the Berean Manual on Ruth 4: 1. In answer we would say that said comment is one of C. J. Woodworth's own additions, against which we have cautioned the brethren in The Present Truth. Turning to E 153 we find no reference there to our Lord as "the Son-in-law of Naomi, type (?) of Eve, that He might redeem Ruth, type of the Church, and her field, type of the world," as the comment puts it. We have been unable to find anywhere in our Pastor's writings that thought expressed, which strikes the thoughtful mind as very unlike one of our Pastor's sober views. Our Lord could not have been a symbolic son-in-law to Naomi suggested by the comment, even if Ruth had represented the Church, for the reason that Ruth was not the daughter but the daughter-in-law of Naomi; nor was Naomi a type of Eve as Christ's alleged typical

mother-in-law; because Eve was not a typical mother-in-law of Jesus; she was actually Jesus' mother, in the sense corresponding to Adam's being His father, indicated in the expression, *The Son of the Man*, whence as respects Eve Jesus might have called Himself the Son of the Woman (Gen. 3: 15). Accordingly, Naomi was not a type of Eve. The comment in question, a product of C. J. W. and not of our Pastor, in so far as we have criticized it, is a fair example of the vagariousness of C. J. W. unguided by our Pastor's thought. Ruth 4: 1-10 in E 153 is used to prove Jesus' Millennial restitution work, which use is not contradictory of our understanding that Ruth types the Youthful Worthies, since they will be a part of the purchased possession delivered in the Millennium, though we doubt that our Pastor had the Youthful Worthies in mind when he cited the passage; for he seems here to cite the passage to prove Jesus' deliverance of the world by a symbolic marriage to the Restitution class, *i.e.*, making Himself one with the faithful Restitutionists (Is. 62: 4, 5). Is. 62: 4, 5 proves that the Church also is part of the husband of this symbolic marriage.

(23) There is very good reason for denying that Ruth types the Church. Ruth does not fit as a type of the Church for the following seven cogent reasons: In the first place, the Church is not a stranger in symbolic Canaan. The Church is typed by one born in the land—begotten of the Spirit. Moreover, the Church did not glean, which is exclusively a Great Company (the poor) and a Youthful Worthy (the stranger) work. The Church was purchased in completion before the last (1914-1916) stage of the gleaning commenced. The Church was a virgin never before married. The Church cannot be married to Jesus levirately, for her Espoused, Jesus, cannot die. No one ever had a right to marry the Church prior to that of Jesus.

(1) What appears in The Towers of Sept. 15-Dec. 1, 1932? Of what are its thoughts an example? What has

the editor of The Present Truth promised? How will it be performed here? As what will it serve? What is the time setting of the antitype of the events given in the book of Ruth? What is typed by the famine of Ruth 1: 1, 2? What does *Bethlehem* mean and type? What does *Elimelech* mean and type? What does *Moab* mean and type here? *Naomi*? *Mahlon*? *Chilion*? What is typed by their being in Ephratah? Judah? Why, in each case? What is involved in their leaving Canaan and going to Moab, type and antitype? What is typed by Elimelech's death? By Naomi's and her sons' being left? By Mahlon's and Chilion's taking Moabitish wives? What does *Orpah* mean and type? Ruth? Their abiding in Moab ten years?

(2) What is typed by Mahlon's and Chilion's death? By Naomi's being left by her husband and sons? By God's again giving Israel bread? What was its first part? What is typed by Naomi's hearing of this? By her, Orpah's and Ruth's rising to return? What is typed by their going forth to return to Canaan? What is typed by Naomi's first appeal to her daughters to return to their homes? What other antitype illustrates this? What were the things in antitypical Naomi that acted repellingly on antitypical Orpah and Ruth? What contrast strengthened this repellent effect? What is typed by Orpah's and Ruth's weeping? By Naomi's kissing them?

(3) What is typed by their insistence to follow Naomi? By Naomi's second attempt to send them away? Why did the antitypes have such an effect? What is typed by Naomi's stating that she was beyond motherhood? And by her saying that if she could become a mother for husbands of them, the time of waiting would be too long for them? What is typed by Naomi's grief for them? What added to it in type and antitype? What is typed by Orpah's and Ruth's second outburst of grief? By Orpah's succumbing and kissing Naomi? By Ruth's surmounting these difficulties?

(4) What is typed by Naomi's third appeal to Ruth to return? By Ruth's overcoming it? By her telling Naomi to cease dissuading her from following? What does the language of vs. 16, 17, type in its various details? What did Ruth's decision make her? What does this type? What does Canaan type? Being born in it? Dwelling as a stranger in it? What is typed by Naomi's ceasing from

dissuading Ruth to follow her? By their going on unto Bethlehem? What was the effect, type and antitype, on the Bethlehemites? Why? How were Naomi and Ruth, type and antitype, received at Bethlehem?

(5) What does Naomi's plaint show, type and antitype? What are the contrasted thoughts, type and antitype, implied in the names, *Naomi* and *Mara*? What lesson should we learn from this? What is typed by Naomi's bewailing her impoverished condition? What is typed by the repetition of the thought of vs. 19-21?

(6) What is noteworthy in the time of Naomi's and Ruth's coming to Bethlehem? How are the barley and wheat harvests and products related, type and antitype? What parable makes this antitypical distinction? How? What is typed by Naomi's and Ruth's coming to Bethlehem at the start of the barley harvest? At the time of what call did their antitypes come into the Truth? What teaching corroborates this thought? Why? How did this effect antitypical Ruth? Before and after which date? What does the antitype prove as to the chronology of the antitypes of the first chapter of Ruth?

(7) What period is covered by the antitype of Ruth 2? What is typed by Boaz' relation through Elimelech to Naomi and Ruth? By Boaz' power and wealth? What is typed by Ruth's seeking opportunities to glean? Her pleading with Naomi to let her glean? What is typed by the field in which Ruth gleaned? Her gleaning after the reapers among the sheaves? By Boaz' coming to Bethlehem to bless, and by his blessing the reapers? By their fervent wishes? By Boaz' question put to the superintendent of the reapers? What shows this? By the superintendent's answer? Wherein given? By his allusion to Ruth's relation to Naomi? By his praise of Ruth's zeal and industry?

(8) What is typed by Boaz' addressing Ruth? By the expression, "Hearest thou not, my daughter?" By his suggesting that she work in his fields? Beside his maidens? By her not going to other fields? By Boaz' encouraging her to fix her eyes on the field where his maidens worked? By his assurances of his measures for her safety against injury? By his inviting her to quench her thirst with the waters drawn by the young men? Wherein were these thoughts of Boaz antityped? By Ruth's acknowledgements and wonder at Boaz' course toward her, a stranger?

(9) What is antitypically implied in Boaz' multiformed answer, type and antitype? Wherein were these antitypes expressed? By his wishing her Divine rewards for her good works? Wherein were these antitypes expressed? By Ruth's answer? By her telling the reasons that emboldened her to request his favor? By Boaz' inviting her to partake of the repast? By its two kinds of food? By Ruth's accepting the invitation? By her sitting at the meal beside the reapers? By Boaz' handing her parched corn? By her eating to satiety? By her leaving for the work?

(10) What is typed by Boaz' fourfold charge to the young men? By Ruth's gleaning all day? Beating out the barley? Gleaning an ephah full? Taking the gleanings to the city? Bringing them to Naomi? Naomi's seeing the gleanings? Naomi's bringing forth food from her surplus? Naomi's questions, indicating wonder over Ruth's success? Naomi's conclusions, based on Ruth's large success? Ruth's revealing Boaz as the one giving success?

(11) What is typed by Naomi's wishing Boaz well for his kindness to the living and the dead? Her declaring Boaz to have the right to redeem? Ruth the Moabitess telling Naomi that Boaz invited her to glean in close association with his maidens until the harvest's end? Naomi's telling Ruth that it would be well to do this and not to be found gleaning elsewhere? Ruth's following this suggestion? Throughout the barley harvest? Wheat harvest? What does our study show of the antitypical chronology of Ruth 2? What is typed by Ruth's remaining with Naomi?

(12) What is the antitypical chronological setting of Ruth 3? What will prove this? What was the view of Vol. VII and the Societyites in 1917 and 1918 on the close of the door? When did it and the gleaning actually close? What did their view make them conclude? Where were these thoughts expressed? What is the antitype of Naomi's telling her ambitions for Ruth? Of her reminding Ruth that Boaz was a near kinsman (redeemer)? What is typed by her telling Ruth that Boaz was winnowing barley on the threshing floor? What were some of the winnowing experiences of that time? What is typed by her telling Ruth to wash, anoint and adorn herself? What truths were at that time gladdening the Church? Our Lord? How was this latter thought typed?

(13) What is typed by Naomi's telling Ruth not to present herself to Boaz for the pertinent purpose until after he had dined? What is typed by the time after Boaz had retired being the proper time for Ruth to present herself? By the instruction to uncover Boaz' feet and lie down there? By Naomi's telling Ruth that then Boaz would tell her what to do? Ruth's promise to do as Naomi had directed? How were the antitypes of Naomi's wishes and instructions for Ruth enacted? How do we know this to be a fact? What is typed by Ruth's doing as Naomi instructed? What is the character of the above applications?

(14) When did the first and second issues of this magazine appear? What are the subjects of their articles? What did these articles give the Little Flock? Who shared in this? By what is this typed? What is typed by Boaz' lying down at the end of the heap of barley? By Ruth's coming softly to Boaz, uncovering his feet and lying down? By Boaz' trembling? His turning and seeing Ruth? Through what was this antitypically done? What is typed by Boaz' question? By Ruth's answer? Her request that Boaz spread his skirt over her? By her statement of his being a near relative?

(15) What is typed by Boaz' commendatory answer? By his encouraging Ruth? His promising Ruth's requests? His acknowledging his near kinship? His mentioning of another, yet nearer? His counseling Ruth to await the outcome of the affair? His pledge to Ruth? Where is it found? What is typed by his telling Ruth to lie down until morning?

(16) How is Ruth's compliance shown in the type and antitype? What is typed by the secrecy and the counseling of secrecy in the involved acts and in Ruth's leaving while the darkness prevented recognition? By Boaz' telling Ruth to put her apron into a position to receive barley? Wherein was this counsel antitypically given? What is typed by her compliance? His giving her six measures of barley? Ruth's coming to Naomi? Naomi's question? Ruth's telling of Boaz' instructions? Whereby was this antitype performed? What is typed by Ruth's showing Naomi the six measures of barley? By Naomi's advice?

(17) How long was the period of antotyping the events of Ruth 4? What is typed by Boaz' going to the gate and sitting down there? What is typed by the nearer relative's

coming to the gate? By Boaz' calling and having him sit down at the gate? By his complying? By the ten elders? By Boaz' asking them to judge as witnesses? The elders' complying? Boaz' telling the nearer relative of Naomi's selling a parcel of Elimelech's land?

(18) What is typed by Boaz' telling him that he had decided to give him the first chance to redeem it publicly? By Boaz' telling him to decide whether or not he would buy it? By Boaz' assurance that he would acquire it, if the other would not? Wherein were the pertinent offers made? What is typed by the nearer kinsman's promising to redeem it? By Boaz' telling him he must with the field redeem Ruth, to raise up seed for the dead? Whose marriage was not herein involved? Why not?

(19) Why did the kinsman balk at this? What is the antitype? Why this in the antitype? Wherein, through whom and how did the directors and editors decline the antotypical offer? Before what date was that article prepared? What was done for several months with its contents at Bethel? What is typed by the nearer relative's offering and letting Boaz have the opportunity? Explain what is typed by the custom of taking off and giving the shoe in redeeming and changing property, and in refusing to marry a childless brother's widow. Why were such transactions evil? What do they type for the three classes in Spiritual Israel? Why does an antotypical levirate marriage not apply to the Little Flock? To what other evils were they given over? What is typed by the nearer kinsman's taking off his shoe and giving it to Boaz? What antotypical wrong acts followed?

(20) What did not Ruth do as required by Deut. 25: 9? Why not? What in this case was done with the antotypical kinsman? What is typed by spittal? What is implied in real and symbolic spitting in the face? How was this done in this antitype? What is typed by Boaz' calling upon the elders and people to be witnesses of the transaction? Through what was this done in the antitype? What is typed by Boaz' calling upon all to witness that he had taken the other's shoe and that he had redeemed Ruth because of the other's failing to do so? To raise up seed to Mahlon? Whereby did our Lord do this? What is typed by the elders' and others' agreeing so to witness? By their three good wishes?

(21) What is typed by Boaz' taking Ruth to wife and producing Obed by her? What are we not to conclude in the antitype from Boaz' and Ruth's marriage? Why not? What is typed by the women congratulating Naomi, praising Jehovah for the birth of Obed and lauding such a worthy one as Boaz? By their statement on Obed's being a help and stay for Naomi, even to old age? On Ruth, who loved her as being to her better than seven sons? By Naomi's putting Obed on her bosom and nursing him? By the women announcing the child a descendant of Naomi? Calling him Obed? Why is the genealogy not further discussed here? What may properly be said of the foregoing exposition of the book of Ruth in antitype? How does it stand in contrast with J.F. Rutherford's application of it? Until when was the foregoing understanding of the book of Ruth not made clear? Of what was the writer of the articles containing our Lord's statements antitypical of those of Boaz in chapters 3 and 4 unaware at the time of their writing?

(22) What might cause some to wonder? Who is the originator of that thought expressed in the Berean Manual on Ruth 4: 1? What does E 153 not give as to the comment? Where else has such a thought not been found? What typical relation did Naomi not have to our Lord, suggested in the comment? What typical relation did she not have to Eve as suggested in the comment? Why did Eve's real relation to Jesus forbid such a thought? Of what is the comment a fair example? How is Ruth 4: 1-10 used in E 153? As such what does it not contradict? Why not? Who did not likely think of the Youthful Worthies while citing Ruth 4: 1-10 in E 153? Why not? What thought thereby did he seem to have in mind? What does Is. 62: 4, 5 also prove?

(23) How many cogent reasons can be given for denying that Ruth is a type of the Church? How is this shown by the fact of Ruth's being a stranger in the land? By the Church as born in antitypical Canaan? By the gleanings of Ruth? By the Church's being completely purchased before the last stage of the gleaning commenced? By her being an unmarried virgin before marrying Jesus? By her not being capable of a levirate marriage with Jesus? By none having a right to her prior to Jesus'?

RUTH'S CHOICE.

"Entreat me not. Let Orpah go,
 If Moab still has charms for her:
 No more my native land I know,
 Nor love the paths which cause to err.
 A hand she does not—cannot see,
 Still waves me on to follow thee.

"Entreat me not. Whate'er the road
 Thou choosest, there I too shall tread;
 And wheresoe'er thou mak'st abode,
 There also shall I rest my head.
 For thee I henceforth all resign—
 Thy people and thy God are mine.

"Entreat me not. When life shall fail,
 And thou, my mother, com'st to die,
 With thee I'll face the shadow'd vale,
 And, where thou'rt buried, I shall lie.
 My leading stars—thy God and thou—
 Not even death shall part us now !"

Daughter of Moab, nobly done !
 On, onward to the promis'd land !
 There shines on righteousness the sun;
 There dwells for God the chosen band;
 On milk and honey shalt thou fare
 And Israel's God accept thee there.

No more the widow's moan shall rend
 Thy bosom, wailing for the dead ;
 New joys shall on thy steps attend,
 New virgins deck thy bridal—bed;
 A num'rous offspring round thee bloom,
 And monarchs issue from thy womb.

More favour'd still, the promis'd seed
 Thy life—blood in His veins shall feel;
 He, who for sinful man shall bleed,
 And Satan crush beneath His heel.
 Such honour on thy name shall rest,
 And unborn millions call thee blest!

CHAPTER VII.

QUESTIONS ON THE YOUTHFUL WORTHIES.

PERTINENT QUESTIONS TAKEN FROM THE PRESENT TRUTH, NO. 26. PERTINENT QUESTIONS TAKEN FROM THE PRESENT TRUTH, NO. 105. PERTINENT QUESTIONS TAKEN FROM MISCELLANEOUS NOS. OF THE PRESENT TRUTH.

FROM various brethren we have received many questions on the Youthful Worthies. We are glad to note the interest of the Lord's people in this as well as in other Biblical subjects. Such an interest is timely, since at this time the Lord has been pleased to arrange for the development of the Youthful Worthies as a class as well as of the Great Company as a class. The Epiphany is certainly an important epoch in the Lord's Plan, among other reasons, because during this time He delivers the Church from the earth, and develops two classes of the Millennial Levites, the Great Company—the Millennial Merarites—and the Youthful Worthies—the Millennial Gershonites. It is because the Epiphany is so important a feature of God's Plan that He so frequently refers to it in the Scriptures. Many of the histories of the Bible are now becoming clear as types of Epiphany antitypes. Some of these have already been presented to the Church, others doubtless will also in due time be made clear to the Lord's people. We have concluded to answer in print the more important questions on the Youthful Worthies which have from time to time come to hand, and take pleasure in doing so in this chapter.

(1) Question: Are the Youthful Worthies of the Household of Faith?

Answer: We use the expression, the Household of Faith, from a variety of standpoints: [1] In the Old Testament times all believers in the promises were of

the Household of Faith (Heb. 11: 1-39). [2] All Gospel-Age believers in Jesus are of the Household of Faith, when we have the Gospel-Age Household of Faith in mind (Rom. 4:11, 12; Z '13, 358, par. 4). This was typed by all children—the afterborn as well as the firstborn—in each family in Israel partaking of the Paschal Lamb in Egypt (Ex. 12: 3-17, 21-28). [3] All new creatures, *as a finished work*, in the end of the Gospel Age, especially during the Epiphany, are the Household of Faith (Heb. 9: 24; 10: 14; 1 John 2: 2; Mal. 3: 2, 3; 1 Cor. 3: 11-15; Z'13, 358, par. 5). Aaron and his house on the Atonement day typed this Household of Faith (Lev. 16: 6, 11). [4] The Little Flock, the Ancient Worthies, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies will be the Millennial Household of Faith (2 Tim. 2: 20). The Priests and Levites dwelling about the Tabernacle type this Household of Faith (Num. 1; 3: 4). The Youthful Worthies, of course, are not of the New Creature Household of Faith, because they are not new creatures. But from the standpoint of having "the faith of Abraham" (Gal. 3: 7, 9) they are, of course, like him, of the Household of Faith. They are among the believers referred to under [2]. They are, however, somewhat different from the tentatively justified who do not now consecrate. The latter during the Epiphany cease altogether to be of the Household of Faith, having used the grace of God in vain; while the former, consecrating and proving faithful, retain their Tentative Justification, and are thus of the Gospel-Age Household of Faith who persist into and during the Epiphany. The reason why they are of the Household of Faith is that they are a faith class; for all that are of the faith of Abraham are of the Household of Faith.

(2) Question: If they are of the Household of Faith, what is their position with regard to the blood of the antitypical Bullock?

Answer: We understand that the blood of the

antitypical Bullock is actually imputed on behalf of that Household of Faith only which consists of new creatures, those referred to under No. [3] of the preceding question. "He hath now appeared in the presence of God [in the antitypical Most Holy, with the antitypical Bullock's blood] for *us*" (Heb. 9: 24); hence for the firstborn only. "By one offering [imputation of His merit] He hath perfected [justified reckonedly] forever them that are sanctified" [the consecrated who become new creatures] (Heb. 10: 14). These are the antitypes of those for whom Aaron made atonement with the bullock's blood. The Youthful Worthies are not among these; for their justification is not vitalized. While because of their faith God tentatively treats them as though the merit of the antitypical Bullock had been imputed on their behalf, actually there has been no such imputation made for them; actually they are not yet released from the Adamic sentence; and actually, with the Ancient Worthies and the Restitution class in general, they must wait for the application of the Lord's merit on their behalf in connection with the blood of the Lord's antitypical Goat; for they are counted in among the Ancient Worthies, of whom it is written, "That they without us [apart from the application of the Lord's merit in the blood of the Lord's antitypical Goat, and The Christ bringing them back from the tomb] should not be made perfect" (Heb. 11: 39).

(3) Question: Do the Youthful Worthies need and actually have an Advocate?

Answer: We believe not. The Advocate's office is to square His clients with Divine Justice. This Jesus does now only for the "us" class, the Church of the Firstborn (1 John 2: 1); for He is the Righteous One who is actually the Propitiation now for the sins of the "us" class only (1 John 2: 2). The Youthful Worthies, not being of the Gospel-Age firstborn, though they will be of the Millennial-Age firstborn, do

not actually have an Advocate; nor is their standing before God of such a kind as needs the Advocate to keep them square with Divine Justice. In fact, their standing is not at all before the bar of Divine Justice, which holds them under the Adamic sentence, and which will not release them from it until God's Justice is satisfied at such a release on their behalf through the Millennial application of the Lord's merit for them. On account of the similarity of their faith to that of the Ancient Worthies they have the same kind of a justification as the former (Rom. 4: 1-10), a justification in which not Christ's merit and their faith, but their faith alone is reckoned for righteousness. This gives them a standing, not before the bar of justice, but before the gate of mercy and grace, which assist them while they are being tried in faith and obedience, not for everlasting life, but for principeship and human perfection, as was the case with the Ancient Worthies. The fact that the Ancient Worthies actually had and needed no Advocate, while on trial of faith and obedience for Millennial principeship and human perfection, proves that the Youthful Worthies do not actually have and need an Advocate while on trial of faith and obedience for Millennial principeship and human perfection. But from the above we are not to infer that they do not have and need the mercy and love of God. These are exercised toward them by Him through Christ, who in their Tentative Justification tentatively imputes His merit for and to them and thus acts as their tentative Advocate; for as the Angel of the Lord encamped about the Ancient Worthies, who reverenced God, to deliver them, so He encamps about the Youthful Worthies, who reverence God, to deliver them. They are privileged to trust God with implicit faith in respect to the three oath-bound promises (Gen. 22: 17, 18), as these apply to them in their earthly respects.

(4) Question: May members of this class participate

in the Memorial Supper, as was their custom before realizing that they belonged to this class?

Answer: The primary participants in the Lord's Supper are the Little Flock. By their participation therein they are privileged to symbolize three things: (1) the death of our Lord Jesus (1 Cor. 11: 26); (2) their faith, appropriating justification through His death (Matt. 26: 28); and (3) their sharing with Him in the privilege of the sacrificial death for the world (1 Cor. 10: 16, 17). The Little Flock will be privileged to do these three things as long as it is in the flesh. The Great Company, as such, will cease in the Memorial Supper to symbolize death with Christ, when they recognize that they are no longer dying with Him; but they will not for that reason cease partaking of the Memorial Supper for the other two purposes above mentioned. So it seems to us the case stands with the Youthful Worthies. They are not privileged in the Lord's Supper to symbolize death with Christ; for they are not dying as a part of The Christ. But they may partake of the Lord's Supper to symbolize His death as the Lamb of God, and to symbolize their faith, tentatively appropriating justification through His death. We have two reasons for believing that it is appropriate for the Youthful Worthies to partake of the Lord's Supper for the first two purposes above set forth. (1) Not only the firstborns, but all Israelites by Divine command and approval (Ex. 12: 25-27; Josh. 5: 10; 2 Chro. 35: 1-19) partook of the annual Passover, the type of the Lord's Supper. This types that all ultimate believers—the Youthful Worthies, as well as all new creatures—may celebrate the Lord's Supper. (2) The Apostles partook of the first Lord's Supper while consecrated but in a tentatively justified condition. At that time their condition was very much the same as that of the Youthful Worthies, though they had a prospect of

membership in the Body of Christ denied the Youthful Worthies.

(5) Question: Are the Youthful Worthies consecrated unto death?

Answer: We understand that their consecration is unto death; for there can be no consecration unto life until the Highway of Holiness is opened. This we can see from the facts and the necessities of the case. The Ancient Worthies consecrated unto death (Heb. 11: 2-39). The Little Flock consecrated unto death (Rom. 6: 1-11). Those who are now of the Great Company also consecrated unto death as candidates for the Little Flock. The Youthful Worthies, so far as their consecration and their covenant promises are concerned, are like the Ancient Worthies. Hence their consecration is unto death. And this has also been their understanding of the transaction at the time they made their consecration. Not only the facts of the case prove that all who consecrated before the Highway of Holiness is opened consecrate unto death, but also the necessities of the case require it; for as long as Satan is in control, so long it will be impossible to carry out one's consecration fully without dying daily, for the conditions of the present evil world are conducive to sin and inconducive to righteousness; and whoever would amid these conditions be faithful to the Lord must be so at the expense of his human rights, *i.e.*, he must consecrate unto death.

(6) Question: Should those who now consecrate be invited to symbolize their consecration by water baptism?

Answer: We believe that they should be invited to symbolize their consecration by water immersion; but they are not thereby to symbolize death with Christ, as the Church has done; for they do not die with Christ. For a long while we could not confidently answer this question either affirmatively or negatively; but later we came to see our way clear to answer it affirmatively.

Our reasoning is somewhat like that which favors Youthful Worthies' partaking of the Lord's Supper. We repeat the thought above given, that they are not by water baptism to symbolize death with Christ, even as in the Memorial Supper they are not to symbolize death with Christ. One may therefore ask, On what, ground do we vindicate their water immersion? We answer: On the ground that their types practiced its type—circumcision (Gen. 17: 12, 13, 23, 27). Circumcision was before the Law the sign, symbol, of the Abrahamic covenant relationship (Gen. 17: 10, 11, 13, 14). Not only were Isaac and Ishmael circumcised, but also Abraham's entire male household, whether born in his service or bought as strangers. Isaac types Spiritual Israel, and Ishmael Fleshly Israel (Gal. 4: 22-31). That part of Abraham's household which was born in his house seems to type others who are benefited with antitypical Abraham through the Abrahamic Covenant, *i.e.*, the Ancient Worthies, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies; while those of his household who were bought with money as strangers seem to type the Restitution class. Thus the types of the Youthful Worthies underwent physical circumcision, the type of water baptism. Hence the antitypes of these in the Gospel Age should undergo the antitype of circumcision—water baptism. The circumcision of heart that Abraham, Isaac, Ishmael and Abraham's household underwent types the circumcision of heart that their antitypes undergo; while the circumcision of the flesh that certain of these underwent symbolizes for the Gospel Age the water baptism that their antitypes undergo. Therefore we accept our Pastor's thought when he said that after Spirit-begetting would cease consecrators should still symbolize their consecration by water immersion.

(7) Question: The Ancient Worthies had their faith imputed to them for righteousness, and were regarded by God as friends, and as such had access to

Him. Is this the standing of the Youthful Worthies, or do they come through the Way—Jesus?

Answer: All of the tentatively justified have their faith imputed to them for righteousness. This would, therefore, include the Youthful Worthies as well as the Ancient Worthies. Just like the Ancient Worthies, the Youthful Worthies are not sons of God; for neither Christ's merit has actually been imputed, nor has the Spirit-begettal been given to either class. Just like the Ancient Worthies they are friends of Jehovah God, and have access to God; but not to Him as *their Father*, even as was the case with the Ancient Worthies. They are not to pray to Him as actually their Father, but as Jehovah, their God. They are not introduced to the Father by the Advocate, though Jesus as God's Vicegerent acts providentially toward them, as He did in His pre-human condition toward the Ancient Worthies. Therefore they do not by Him have access through the one Spirit to the *Father* as the Church does (Eph. 2: 18).

(8) Question: Do the Youthful Worthies have the Holy Spirit?

Answer: In the sense of a new will, a holy disposition, the Youthful Worthies have the Holy Spirit; but they do not have the Holy Spirit of begettal. The Scriptures speak of the two general outpourings of the Holy Spirit (Joel 2: 28, 29). In both cases the Holy Spirit is given; but it is not given as a begettal in both cases. The spirit of begettal to sonship (John 1: 12, 13; Rom. 8: 14-16) is now given to the Gospel Church alone, and will not be given to the world. The world will receive the Holy Spirit in its second outpouring, as Adam and Eve had it before their fall, and as Jesus had it as a human being before Jordan. It is in the latter sense that the Youthful Worthies are now receiving the Holy Spirit. In due time, during the Little Season at the end of the Millennium, we opine, they

will receive the Spirit-begettal as the beginning of their change of, nature.

(9) On what should Youthful Worthies set their affections?

Answer: On the same things as the Ancient Worthies set their affections. They are to exercise faith, hope, love and obedience toward God and our Lord Jesus in harmony with certain earthly features of the Oath-bound Covenant (Gen. 22: 17, 18). They are to love and serve the Church, even as Abed-nego, one of the types of the Youthful Worthies, signifies servant of the messenger. They are also to love, subordinately to their love for the Church, the Great Company, and the Ancient Worthies, and in a lesser degree, the world of mankind. They should love, trust and study the Word, especially those of its promises which pertain to them. They are not to love this world nor the things of this world; nor should they love sin, error and self. They are zealously to love and pray for the coming Kingdom, earnestly to seek princedom in that symbolic City (Heb. 11: 13-16), ardently to desire perfect humanity for themselves, and warmly to long to co-operate in the Millennial work of destroying all evil and introducing all good. They may also hope to have a change of nature, and to see and be with God, Christ, the Little Flock, the Great Company and the Angels after the Millennium. They have indeed glorious things on which they may set their affections. The Youthful Worthies are not to set their affections on the promises that pertain to the Church and the Great Company.

(10) Question: To what extent should we expect a class not begotten of the Spirit to understand the Plan of God, the Sin-offerings, the Mystery, the Covenants, etc., also the Epiphany message? Is not a clear insight into these things an evidence of Spirit-begettal?

Answer: We are to expect the Youthful Worthies now appreciatively to understand everything in the

Bible *as due*, except those of its features that pertain to the development and operation of the *Spirit which is begotten in the Church*, and the things that pertain to spirit beings. Accordingly, they may and in many cases do understand the Plan of God, the Sin-offerings, certain features of the Mystery and the Covenants and practically everything in the Epiphany message. The general features of God's Plan even honest worldlings who are not consecrated can understand, as all of us have witnessed; and all of these will understand them when the books of the Bible are opened, made plain, before the great White Throne (Rev. 20: 12; Is. 29: 18, 24). The reason why the Youthful Worthies may understand everything in the Bible as due, except the development and operation of the Spirit which is begotten in the Church, and spirit beings, is that "the secret of, the Lord is with them that reverence Him." Their honesty, humility, meekness, hunger and holiness of heart are such as please the Lord; and He is therefore pleased to tell them His secrets as due, in so far as they can grasp them, which, of course, excludes things purely spiritual. If they could appreciatively understand the development and operation of the Spirit which is begotten in the Church, and spirit beings, this would be a proof of their Spirit-begettal. Their not appreciatively understanding these is a proof that they are not Spirit-begotten.

(11) Question: What part should Youthful Worthies take in the meetings?

Answer: If there is a class consisting entirely of Youthful Worthies, according to talent, spirit of consecration and providential situation they may take part in every form of meeting and service therein, such as leading study and other meetings, answering and asking questions, offering prayer, giving testimony, offering motions, voting in business meetings, holding office, etc. In other words, with a proper understanding of their place in the Lord's Plan they can do similar

things in meetings held exclusively for themselves, as the Little Flock members do in their meetings. In their prayers, however, they are to remember to address God as Jehovah their God, not as Father, except in a reckoned sense. In the meetings of the Little Flock (and we are to recognize all as of the Little Flock who consecrated before Oct., 1914, and who came into the Truth by Passover, 1916, unless they are manifested revolutionists or their partisan supporters, Baal worshipers and kissers) the situation of the Youthful Worthies is somewhat different. Not being Spirit-begotten they should neither vote nor hold office in such an ecclesia, nor should they lead meetings, nor should they offer prayer, because the Little Flock's prayers should be offered to God as Father without limitations. In the study meetings they may be asked questions by the leader and give their answers, as well as ask questions for their information, just like the others. The New Creatures should encourage them to take such parts in their study meetings. If the leaders ask for a hymn, the Youthful Worthies also may suggest one, just like the others. In testimony meetings they may also take part in testimony and in praise, but we think it would not be well for them to lead in prayer in such meetings of Christ's Body, for the reason that the prayers of such meetings are to be addressed to God as Father without qualifications, as addressed to the Throne of Grace, to which the Youthful Worthies do not have access. While they may not make motions, vote, or hold office in such an ecclesia, it would be proper for them to be present at business meetings and to offer good suggestions along the line of secular business matters coming before the Church. They should be encouraged to attend all meetings of the Church, and should be made to feel at home among the Priests. Not being members of the ecclesia they can neither be brought to trial before the ecclesia nor bring charges against anybody before the ecclesia.

Hence the advice of Matt. 18: 15-18 in its third step cannot be used as between them and Priests, though between one another that advice should be followed in the first and second steps; and if they have a class of their own, the third step can be taken by them. Of course a Priest would be privileged to advise them in cases of discipline, as well as in other matters.

(12) Question: Should Youthful Worthies meet with the Priests, or should they separate from the Priests, and hold meetings of their own?

Answer: We believe that it will be greatly to the advantage of the Youthful Worthies both in the present and in the future Age to meet now with the Priests. Thereby they will be kept from many an error of doctrine and wrong of practice, from which they will probably not be kept, if they meet with the Levites or by themselves alone. Moreover, they will thereby be kept from many a useless and harmful service. If they meet with the Epiphany-enlightened Priests, they will learn many a truth of doctrine and practice that they would hardly learn otherwise. So, too, they will get many an opportunity of service that otherwise would not fall to their lot. The example of the Priests will also prove more helpful to them in Christian living than that of the Levites or of one another; and that example, of course, can best be observed by contact with the Priests, such as attendance at the same meetings will give them. The greater maturity of the Priests in grace and knowledge will be made more useful to the Youthful Worthies by their fellowshipping with the Priests as younger brethren of these Priests. So, too, they will have a better chance of being in truth "Abed-nego," servant of the messenger, by meeting with the Priests. These are some present advantages for the Youthful Worthies to be gained from meeting with the Priests. Then, we opine that those Youthful Worthies who in this life will have had close contact with the Priests will have memories of

the Priests that will in the next Age prove very helpful to them in the way of encouraging, uplifting and developing them for their everlasting portion. Again, this will make the overcomers among them the higher class of Millennial Gershonites, Shimites.

(13) Question: May the Youthful Worthies assist in Gideon's Second Battle?

Answer: We believe that as antitypical Abed-nego, servant of the messenger, they may have this privilege. From the account of the men of Ephraim, who type the Youthful Worthies, coming to Gideon *beyond* Jordan, (Judges 7: 25—8:3) and especially from his answer to them, we infer that he had not yet engaged in battle with Zebah and Zalmunna; nor does the account anywhere tell us that only the three hundred engaged in the Second Battle; and from the fact that Gideon sought assistance from the Men of Succoth and Penuel, we are warranted in inferring that he would have welcomed assistance from the men of Ephraim. Hence there is nothing in the account to forbid the Youthful Worthies' participation in antitypical Gideon's Second Battle; and as they have in some cases assisted the Priests in their dealing with the Truth Levites, we think that they may also help them in dealing with the Nominal Church Levites, and thus show themselves indeed to be the antitypical Abed-nego.

(14) Question: Will the Youthful Worthies be used to make known to the resurrected Ancient Worthies the development of the Plan of God since they fell asleep, and the nature of the New Era into which they will have entered?

Answer: We think it reasonable to *suppose* that they might in their contact with the Ancient Worthies give them some information on the subjects suggested in the question. However, it should not be supposed that they will be the special teachers of the Ancient Worthies in these respects; for the Ancient Worthies

are, by direct revelations from The Christ ("Your old men shall dream dreams," Joel 2: 28), to get their main information on subjects on which they will need instruction. Details on such questions belong to the next Age, when doubtless we will be able to answer them more in detail than now.

(15) Question: What should the Youthful Worthies do to obtain "a good report"?

Answer: Practically the same things that the Ancient Worthies did and that the Little Flock now does: continue to be dead to sin, error, self and the world, and to be alive to God. The latter they may do by meditating on God's Word, by watchfulness, by prayer, by spreading God's Word, by developing a character in harmony with God's Word and by enduring evil in harmony therewith. In a word, by being faithful to their consecration vows they will obtain a good report through faith and obedience.

(16) Question: Will the Youthful Worthies continue in the flesh from this Dispensation into the next, without necessarily passing into the grave?

Answer: We know of no direct Scripture bearing on this point; therefore can reason on it from analogy only. Like the Ancient Worthies they consecrate to be faithful unto death; as also like the former's consecration theirs has not been accepted as a part of the Sin-offering. It would be reasonable to suppose that like the Ancient Worthies they would have to prove their consecration vows to be genuine unto the limit, which would mean death, or what to them would be its equivalent. However, in view of their living very near the time of the Kingdom, it is possible that some of them will not die. If some of them do not die, but live on, we believe they will have had to demonstrate a faithfulness that will have been tested up to what to them would seem certain death, even if the Lord by an unusual providence should stay the hand of death before its full work would have been wrought.

on them, as persons who would be willing to let it finish its work on them rather than prove untrue to their consecration vows. In other words, they must have the spirit that would be faithful unto death, even if they should not in every individual case enter death, otherwise they would not pass their trial successfully. Perhaps in the future we may be able to be more positive than now on this subject; for as the light advances we may obtain more light on this matter.

(17) Question: Is it correct to say that since Spirit begetting for the High Calling has ceased, the Youthful Worthies can obtain Tentative Justification by consecration only?

Answer: Since Tentative Justification throughout the Gospel Age has been obtained at the time one has exercised faith in Jesus after exercising repentance toward God; and since we know of no Scripture that teaches a departure from this procedure in the case of any one, we would be safe in holding to the Scripturally expressed thought relative to the process by which all, including the Youthful Worthies, receive Tentative Justification, *i.e.*, the acceptance of Jesus as their Savior after exercising repentance toward God. However, the fact that they consecrate puts a seal on their Tentative Justification and as they prove faithful prevents their losing it as do those who fail to consecrate (Rom. 4: 11).

(18) Question: Is it correct to say that some who consecrated after 1881 and before 1914 were put into the Youthful Worthies class, because there were no vacancies at the time in the Little Flock, and that subsequently some of them were received by Spirit-begettal into the High Calling to fill vacancies there, while others remained among and are now of the Youthful Worthies class?

Answer: Yes; this is our understanding of the subject, even as our dear Pastor elaborated it in B 235, in C 205-225, and in F 156, 157. The Parallel

Dispensations and the Parable of the Penny (Vol. V, Chapter I) require this thought. Apparently the Lord made between 1881 and 1914 a reserved list of those consecrators for whom there were no crowns available at the time of their consecration; and when a vacancy occurred, He selected the most available one on the reserved list for that vacancy. Doubtless the Lord considered at least three things in deciding the availability of the candidates: (1) their spirit of faithfulness, (2) their talents for that particular place in the Body for which there was a crown vacant, and (3) their providential situation. We may safely assume that the consecrator who was best qualified in these three respects was chosen by the Lord for the vacancy. Of course, after the last crown was assigned there could be no more vacancies; and hence all on the reserved list as well as all future consecrators had no other Kingdom class position open for their entry than that reserved for the Youthful Worthies.

(19) Question: Should we now encourage believers to consecrate, with Youthful Worthies' prospects as their hope?

Answer: We should now encourage believers to consecrate, because consecration is always in order. We should, however, not now encourage any one to consecrate in hope of the High Calling. Nor should we now encourage people to consecrate offering them as the incentive a reward for so doing, because consecration never should be made in order to get a reward. It should be made out of faith in the Lord's Word, out of grateful love for past mercies and out of appreciative love for God's good Character. When St. Paul (Rom. 12: 1) exhorted the justified believers to consecrate, he did not tell them to do it in view of a future reward, but out of gratitude and appreciation for the past mercies of God. So should we now encourage believers to consecrate. A consecration that is made for a reward is not a Divinely pleasing consecration; but one that is

made out of faith and love is a Divinely pleasing one. Let us therefore emphasize the goodness of God to believers, and not a reward as the incentive for them to consecrate. Of course, we may tell them that the Lord has princedom and human perfection in store for the faithful consecrators; but we are not to encourage them to enter into *business* dealings with God. We are to encourage them to enter into *consecration* dealings with God. Yes, we should zealously encourage believers now to consecrate to God in this true spirit.

(20) Question: In a Tower it was stated that the Jews will be the Millennial Gershonites; while in The Present Truth it has been repeatedly stated that the Youthful Worthies would be the Millennial Gershonites. Which view is Scriptural?

Answer: We believe for many reasons that The Present Truth gives the Biblical view on this subject: (1) As antitypical Levites the Millennial Gershonites will not have an everlasting inheritance *in the earth*, but will be made spiritual with the antitypical Kohathites, the Ancient Worthies, at the end of the Millennium; while God says that after Abraham will have had the land for the Millennium, His seed after him, the Jews, will get it forever (Gen. 17: 7; Acts 7: 5). Hence the Jews cannot be the Millennial Gershonites, since the latter will not have their eternal inheritance in the earth. (2) In Joel 2: 28 the Jews, the "sons," are represented as prophesying, which also the Gentiles, the "daughters," do—a work, therefore, that is not a peculiarly Levitical work; while the Youthful Worthies, the "young men," we are told, will "see visions," *i.e.*, will be given a Kingdom privilege similar to that of the Ancient Worthies, the "old men" who will "dream dreams." These are Levitical honors for the Kingdom time. Hence the Jews, the "sons," will not be Millennial Gershonites. (3) The unbelieving Jews have not obtained a good report through faith (Rom. 11: 30-32), and of course could not be entrusted

with the responsibilities of principeship in the Kingdom, for which characters fixed in faith and righteousness are necessary. Other proofs for the correctness of the view of The Present Truth and the incorrectness of the present Tower view on this subject could be given; but we believe that the three just given are sufficient.

(21) Question: Do Youthful Worthies consecrate to life or to death?

Answer: Youthful Worthies consecrate to death, not to life. The consecration to life is appropriate to the Millennial conditions, not to the Gospel Age conditions; for it is the consecration that leads one into the highway of holiness. This highway of holiness awaits the Kingdom's establishment in its earthly phase for its operation. It cannot operate before the Christ appears with the second sin-offering in God's presence for atonement purposes. The Gospel-Age conditions require a faith that trusts where it cannot trace, that walks apart from sight and that trusts the Lord, though He slays the believer. As long as sin is on the ascendancy, and Satan is operating as the god of this world, so long will it be necessary, if one is loyal to the Lord, to sacrifice one's rights unto death in his opposition to sin and in his service of righteousness. The evil conditions that must be opposed in such a course wear out and take away life. Hence to be faithful in consecration now requires the presentation of one's all to God in service amid conditions that lead to the death of him who thus presents his all. Not only do the conditions of the present deal out death to the faithful, but each of them is invited to make a covenant of service—deadness to self and the world and aliveness to God. There is not the slightest intimation in the Scriptures that those who consecrate too late to have a crown assigned them; but before the highway of holiness is opened, make a different kind of a consecration from those whose consecration was accepted by the begettal of the Spirit.

Their becoming, like the Ancient Worthies, a part of the seed developed by the Oath-bound Covenant in one of its earthly features, proves that they previously entered into a covenant to give up their present blessings and privileges out of devotion to God. It is one thing for one to consecrate unto death. It is another thing for that consecration to be accepted by Jehovah through the begetting of the Spirit—a thing which the Youthful Worthies do not now experience, though at the end of the Millennium this privilege will be theirs. We therefore conclude from the nature of the act of their consecration, the nature of the conditions amid which they must carry out their consecration, the absence of the highway of holiness, their relation to the Oath-bound Covenant, the present dispensation in which we live and the Millennial privileges of the Youthful Worthies, that they now consecrate unto death. It seems reasonable from the above considerations to conclude that all of them will die. While we concede the *possibility* of some of them not dying, it seems much more reasonable to conclude that all of them will die before they experience with the Ancient Worthies the better resurrection; for it seems reasonable that they by death itself deliver the proof of their complete fulfillment of their consecration. If any of them should not die, we would have to assume that at their perfecting there will set in a sudden change in their physical, mental, moral and religious faculties that, apart from an anesthetic or its equivalent, would be most painful to undergo. We never heard our Pastor express an opinion on this phase of our subject, though we were once told by a brother that he understood our Pastor to say that they would not all have to die. Our Pastor has never, to our knowledge, expressed this thought in writing. We know of no express Scripture that directly states that some of them will not die; and in view of the above lines of Scriptural principles, which our Pastor applied

to the Youthful Worthies, we rather think that the above indicated brother, who is the only one we have ever heard so speak of our Pastor, misunderstood him on the subject. It is undoubtedly Scripturally taught that they consecrate unto death, and the burden of proof that they would not carry out to completion such a consecration must rest upon those who say that all of them will not die; and this proof is wholly wanting, since not a scintilla of such proof has, to our knowledge, ever been offered from Scripture, reason or facts; and the fact that many Youthful Worthies have already died is good presumptive evidence of it, in addition to the above-mentioned Scriptural principles that seem to imply that the Youthful Worthies will all die before they experience the better resurrection with the Ancient Worthies.

(22) Question: What will become of a Youthful Worthy who proves unfaithful?

Answer: He will lose his Youthful Worthiship and fall back into the world for restitution purposes. That such unfaithful ones do not go into the second death is evident from the fact that they are not now on trial for life, though they, like the Ancient Worthies in this life, are now on trial for faith and righteousness in order to their qualification for princedom during the Millennium (Heb. 11: 1-40). The time of trial for life on the human plane for all the Worthies is the Millennium (Heb. 11: 39, 40), when the New Covenant, which is the only covenant offering human life everlasting to the obedient, will give such life to the obedient. Consequently, as a tentative Ancient Worthy who proved untrue when on trial of faith and righteousness fell back among the ordinary Israelites, who are to be Millennially tried for life; so will it also be with an unfaithful Youthful Worthy.

(23) Question: Is there any Scripture to prove that the Worthies will be resurrected sexless, like the angels?

Answer: Luke 20: 35—37 is a passage to the point; for it proves that all who experience resurrection—restanding, perfection-will, like the angels, be sinless and sexless: "They that shall be accounted worthy [the overcomers] to obtain that Age [inherit the life and rulership that that Age gives to the overcomers. Some—those faithful in this life—obtain that Age in its beginning: the Little Flock and Great Company on spiritual planes and the Ancient and Youthful Worthies on the human plane, they later getting these on a spiritual plane or on spiritual planes; others will obtain that Age—the blessings it offers—at its end: the restitution class] and the resurrection of the dead [worthiness thus is also required to obtain the resurrection, which consequently is more than the mere awakening from the dead; it is a restanding, a perfecting], neither marry nor are given in marriage; for they are like the angels [who, as sexless beings, neither marry nor are given in marriage. Hence resurrection makes all its participants sexless]. And they are sons of God [sinless in their ultimate development], *being children of the resurrection* [Resurrection, accordingly, is a perfecting process which, completed, leaves its subjects sinless and sexless]." Therefore, in the beginning of the Millennium the Worthies will be sexless according to this passage.

(24) Question: Is it right to say that the Youthful Worthies have the wedding garment tentatively, seeing that they are not of the Bride?

Answer: In the parable of the wedding supper, the wedding garment was not given to the bride, but to the guests invited to the marriage supper. Jesus' relation to the Church as His Bride is not the thing pictured forth in this parable. And we must not confuse that picture with the one in this parable; for part of the guests in this parable are the prospective bride in the other picture. The same kind of confusion is frequently made with the parable of the ten virgins,

the wise of whom are not the bride of that parable, though they are the same persons as in another picture are set forth as the Bride of Christ. In these two parables the Lord is not giving us parables on the Bride of Christ, but is illustrating certain other features of the prospective Kingdom class by wedding guests, and by virgins, who are not the pertinent parabolic brides. Keeping these thoughts in mind, we will be delivered from the confusion in which the one who asks this question seems to be involved. In this parable the wedding garment represents Christ's righteousness—justification (1 Cor. 1: 30). From this standpoint we can answer the above question as follows: The Youthful Worthies, being tentatively justified, have Christ's righteousness tentatively, but not vitalizedly, imputed to them. Hence they may be spoken of Scripturally as having the wedding garment tentatively. But we are not to think of them as being referred to in this parable; for this parable refers to those called before the general call ceased. The inspection of the guests began in 1874, when the King came in, and in 1878, in the no-ransom sifting, the King found the guest—the no-ransomers, led by Mr. Barbour, who, after coming into the outer chamber and waiting to go in to the feasting room, insulted their Host by casting off the wedding garment that He had provided for their proper appearance at the feast. Historically this parable was fulfilled before there were any Youthful Worthies. Hence they are not included in the picture. However, by accommodation, we may speak of them as having the wedding garment on tentatively, without bringing them into the parable, since that garment signifies what they tentatively have—Christ's righteousness. This wedding garment, so tentatively held, the Youthful Worthies are to embroider, *i.e.*, they are to develop in Christ's tentatively held righteousness a concordant

character, good disposition, thoughts, motives, words and acts and thus become overcomers.

(25) Question: Can we apply to Youthful Worthies the spirit of certain New Testament exhortations like, "be ye transformed," "set your affections on the things above, and not on the earth," "let us go forth therefore unto Him without the camp," etc., etc.?

Answer: Such passages, of course, do not apply to the Youthful Worthies, who are Levites; for they apply to the priests: some of them to their new creatures and some of them to their humanity. But, while these passages do not apply to the Youthful Worthies, they indirectly may be used in their spirit to their profit. Thus, while they cannot as new creatures be transformed, they as human beings may be changed from more or less corrupt human characters to beautiful and holy human characters—which is a character transformation, but not a nature transformation. Again, while they cannot unconditionally be exhorted to set their affections upon the things above, they can and should be exhorted to set their affections on the truths and character of those features of the Oath-bound Covenant that are theirs—upon the hope of obtaining a perfect human character and body, on the hope of overcoming now their personal enemies—sin, error, present selfishness and worldliness, on the hope of later on helping mankind to overcome sin, error and the effects of the curse, and on the hope of obtaining princedom, whereby they, as a part of the subordinate seed, may bless the nations, kindreds and families of the earth (Gen. 22: 16-18). While they cannot properly be exhorted to go forth unto Christ, bearing His reproach, which is a privilege of the priesthood exclusively, still, since they as Levites are privileged to suffer for righteousness like the Ancient Worthies, it is very proper that they be exhorted to undergo such sufferings. Thus they are privileged to do certain things that are akin to certain

things that the priests do; and therefore they may appropriately be encouraged to do such things. The spirit, therefore, though not the letter, of many exhortations for the priesthood, apply to them.

(26) Question: Should Youthful Worthies join in singing hymns and saying "Amen" to prayers addressed to God as Father?

Answer: With certain mental reservations made by them, we believe that they may do these things. If they, in connection with such hymns and prayers, remember that they are not yet actually, though tentatively or reckonedly, sons of God, but some day will be such actually, and if the things prayed for, in spirit, though not in letter, are for them, they may do so with propriety. Jesus spoke of God as the Father of His disciples before they actually became God's children. This was in view of what they would become. He even, in the Lord's prayer, taught them to address God as Father long before He actually became their Father, though all along He was tentatively reckoned so, and was prospectively so in view of what they were to be (Rom. 4:17). Let us remember that some day the Youthful Worthies will actually be God's sons, as they are tentatively now reckoned as being such. While this does not give them the privilege of access to the Throne of Grace, yet in a manner similar to the Ancient Worthies, and the as yet not Spirit begotten disciples they may, with the above-mentioned mental reservations, join in such hymns and prayers.

(27) Question: Should Youthful Worthies join in singing hymns expressive of the unique experiences and relations of the Church?

Answer: Assuredly they should not join in the singing of such hymns as expressive of their own experiences and relations, yet if the spirit of such hymns is similar to that which underlies their own experiences and relations, though the letter is not, they may sing them, keeping their own experiences and relations

in mind. From another standpoint they may also do this—as a memento and as a celebration of the Church's unique experiences and relations. This is frequently done in other quarters with perfect propriety, *e.g.*, the patriotic song, The Star Spangled Banner, gives some experiences connected with a bombardment of an American fort during America's second war with Britain. Patriotic Americans now sing that stirring song as a memento and celebration of the experiences there described, as well as an expression of patriotism. These two standpoints would abundantly warrant the Youthful Worthies in participation in such hymns as above mentioned.

(28) Question: Would it be in order to ask Youthful Worthies to offer a thanksgiving prayer to Jehovah at the close of a service held under priestly auspices?

Answer: In a service under the auspices of the Great Company, or of the Youthful Worthies, or of both, it would be in order for a Youthful Worthy to lead in prayer, especially if the service were entirely under Youthful Worthy auspices; but this is not appropriate, if it is a priestly service. In fact we believe it inappropriate for a Youthful Worthy to lead any prayer in which priests participate, be that prayer in church or in private; for Youthful Worthies do not have access to the Throne of Grace and should humbly defer to a priest who has such access. A priest's prayers prevail more than those of a Youthful Worthy, hence, also, the priest should, for the good of all concerned, be the one chosen to approach the Lord for all concerned.

(29) Question: Will any of the Youthful Worthies be carried over into the Kingdom without seeing death?

Answer: For the reasons given under a former question, we incline to the thought that all Youthful Worthies must die before they become princes in the earth—must carry out their consecration to the full limit as originally made.

(30) Question: Can a Youthful Worthy be overtaken with the fear of the second death?

Answer: While during the present dispensation the Youthful Worthies are not on trial for life, and therefore cannot now go into the second death, yet they can under the influence of ignorance or doubt be by Satan manipulated into believing that they are going into the second death; and thus they can fear that they are in danger of it. Such a fear is exercised at a fictitious danger, yet have known cases where it was a most distressing fear, despite its groundlessness. In the next Age while on trial for life, both during the development part as well as the final testing part (the Little Season) of that Age, it would be quite, possible for a Youthful Worthy to fear that he might go into the second death. Certainly if our Lord had such a fear in Gethsemane (Heb. 5: 7), the Youthful Worthies could have it as a real danger in the next Age, particularly during its Little Season. Whether any of them will actually so fear we cannot positively say, not knowing any Scripture that bears on this point.

(31) Question: Should a priest ask a Youthful Worthy to pray for him?

Answer: A priest should normally ask priests to pray for him; for their prayers are the only ones that come to the Throne of Grace. But we see nothing wrong in a priest, especially under unique circumstances, like the isolation from other priests, or when in great trial or trouble, asking in a general way for the prayers of Youthful Worthies. Especially if a priest's ministry had special reference to the Youthful Worthies would it be appropriate for him to ask their prayers for that service.

(32) Question: How can Youthful Worthies strengthen their hope and courage and appreciation of the Lord's Truth?

Answer: There are many ways whereby these qualities

can be strengthened in them. The main ways for them to strengthen their hope is to keep the earthly features of the Oath-bound Covenant applicable to them on their hearts and minds and to subject themselves to the influence of these. These, so kept on the heart and mind and yielded to, will strengthen more and more their hope of attaining characters fit for perfect human bodies and of attaining such bodies; so, too, will this strengthen their hope to overcome their enemies—sin, errors, selfishness and worldliness, as well as to strengthen their hope of helping the world in the next Age to overcome their enemies—sin, error and the curse. Finally, these earthly features of the Oath-bound Covenant will strengthen their hope of blessing the human family in the next Age. Keeping in mind and heart the example of Jesus, the Ancient Worthies, the Church and the Great Company, in strengthening their hope and submitting themselves to the influence of their example, will likewise strengthen their hope. Exercise of the hope that they have hitherto developed will likewise strengthen it. Similar principles applied to their courage will strengthen their courage. Especially will the increase of faith, hope, love and obedience tend to strengthen their courage. Of course, the exercise of courage will do this, as also the consideration that the interests of Jehovah, their King, the reputation of their Captain, the Lord Jesus, the great issues at stake in their warfare, the desirability of conquering their enemies and the certainty of victory to the faithful will help their courage to become strong. Their appreciation of the Lord's Truth will become enhanced by a consideration of its loveableness, perfection, beauty, harmony, effectiveness, practicability and durability.

(33) Question: Must the Youthful Worthies be developed as such for fitness for Millennial princedom before the Millennium, or will they get some of their

pertinent development after the earthly phase of the Kingdom is established?

Answer: They will get part of their development for princedom before and part of their development after installation into their office as princes. The following will clarify this: As the Millennial operations progress, they will require higher developed characters in the Ancient and Youthful Worthies, to administer them; for these operations will become ever more intricate in their developing the restitution class; hence ever increasingly higher developed characters will be required successfully and helpfully to apply these operations to the uplift of the restitution class. In both the Ancient and Youthful Worthies characters crystallized in faith and righteousness will be required for fitness to enter into Millennial princedom. Without such a degree of character development one cannot be an Ancient or a Youthful Worthy. But such a stage of character development will not be sufficient to stand final trial for life. An all round character development will be required for such a trial; and this will be the Millennial character development of the Ancient and Youthful Worthies, who will be made thus perfect during the Millennium (Heb. 11: 39, 40). It will be in connection with their service as Princes and Levites that they will be thus perfected. Such services will, therefore, require the development of such characters. Hence, while their loyalty to faith and righteousness, developed this side of the Millennium, will fit them in character for entrance into, and the exercise of their initial princedom duties and privileges, in the very same proportion as the duties and privileges of their princedom increase in their exacting demands on character, they will require increased development of character to meet these demands, until these demands will require perfection of character to fulfill them. Thus we see that increasingly developed characters will be required in the

Ancient and Youthful Worthies to fit them for their increasingly responsible duties and privileges, as the Millennium advances the race toward perfection under the care of the Worthies. In other words, neither class of the Worthies develops perfect characters in this life. This in their human characters is reserved for the Millennium.

(34) Question: What will be wrought in the Ancient and Youthful Worthies to prepare them for spirit nature?

Answer: Some things in this life, some things in the Millennium and some things in the Little Season at the Millennium's end, are wrought in them to fit them for spirit nature. In this life it is necessary in the Oath-bound Covenant for them to prove faithful, as the earthly seed of Abraham, in their trial of faith and righteousness in order to princedom; for only the Millennial princes will be eligible to Spirit-begettal and birth in the next Age. In the Millennium it will be necessary for them to develop in human character so that they may stand the Millennial tests, and perfect human characters as perfect human beings so as to stand as such the human tests in the Little Season and to qualify for the Spirit-begettal at the beginning of the Little Season and thus to stand trial for life as New Creatures during the Little Season. During this period, as our Lord did from Jordan to Calvary, they will have to stand a double trial for life, one as human beings under the New Covenant tests, and the other as New Creatures under certain ministerial Covenant tests. The reason for the former test is that there will be no mediatorial merit any longer available for their humanity during the Little Season; hence, like the restitution class, they will as human beings have to stand a perfect trial before the bar of absolute justice, without mercy. The reason for the second trial is that they will have first to develop and then become crystallized in spiritual characters to fit them

for Spirit-birth at the end of the Little Season. Thus we see that onward from the time in this life when they consecrated to the Lord to the end of the Little Season their experiences will inure to their preparation for spirit existence.

(35) Question: Is it possible for the Youthful Worthies to become overcomers?

Answer: Yes, by Divine grace and faithfulness to their covenant of consecration. That the faithful of them will overcome makes it evident that they can overcome. If they could not overcome, God never would have invited them to attempt it; for He is too practical to attempt impossibilities. His oath to the faithful among them, that they will overcome, proves that they can overcome. The fact that already some of them have overcome proves its possibility for them. If the Ancient Worthies could and did overcome under the power of similar promises, we may safely conclude that they also may and can overcome. If the Little Flock and the Great Company can overcome under harder conditions, the Youthful Worthies can now overcome under easier conditions. They have the faith and loyalty necessary to overcome; hence they can do so. Everything, therefore, connected with their trial necessary for overcoming—God's Word, Spirit and providences—is given them by the Lord to the end that they may overcome, and a faithful use of these will make it possible for them to overcome. Everything, therefore, connected with their trial proves that they may and can overcome. Hence we are safe in concluding that they can overcome. This ought to encourage every one of them faithfully to fulfill his consecration vows in the full assurance that he can overcome by Divine grace, if he will only faithfully keep his consecration covenant.

(36) Question: How far do the promises that apply to the Church apply to the Youthful Worthies in their journey to antitypical Canaan?

Answer: The promises that apply to the Church do not apply to the Youthful Worthies at all. The summary of the promises applicable to the Church are found in Gen. 22: 17, 18 and are spiritual; while those of that passage now applicable to the Youthful Worthies are human. She is promised a Divine disposition and body—"thy seed shall be as the stars of heaven." The Youthful Worthies are promised human dispositions and bodies—"thy seed shall be as the sands by the sea." The second set of promises to these two classes likewise differ. The pledge to the seed on overcoming enemies means for the Church that she will overcome sin, error, selfishness and worldliness; while this promise means for the Youthful Worthies that they will overcome sin, error and such a measure of selfishness and worldliness as is implied in standing trial of faith, but not of perfect love. The promise, "in thy seed shall all nations be blessed," means for the Church that, as the Body of the World's High Priest, she would bless the world with opportunities of atonement; while for the Youthful Worthies the promise means that, as subordinate Levites, they would help the race by teaching how to gain blessings in the atonement opportunities. For the Church, as the Body of the World's Mediator, this promise means that she will give the world the opportunity of covenant relations with God; while the Youthful Worthies will, as assistants, do subordinate teaching work to help the world to and in such covenant relations. For the Church, as Kings, this passage means that she will rule for the suppression of evil and the introduction of good conditions; while it means for the Youthful Worthies the privilege, as noblemen, subordinately to help carry out various applications of this suppressive and constructive work. For the Church, as Mother, this passage means that she will co-operate in the work of giving the restitution class, including the Ancient and Youthful Worthies

human bodies and dispositions, which she will develop unto perfection; while for the Youthful Worthies, as the second-born son, it means that they will be given the privilege to help develop the restitution class toward perfect bodies and dispositions. For the Church, as the Body of the World's judge, it means that they will teach, test, stripe and sentence the world; while to the Youthful Worthies, as assistants, it means that they can go no further than subordinately to teach the world while the latter is on trial for life. For the Church, as the Body of the World's Physician, this passage proves that the Church will cure the physical, mental, moral and religious ills of mankind; while to the Youthful Worthies it means that, as subordinate nurses, they may assist in this healing process. And, for the Church as the Body of the Prophet, this passage means that she will supervisingly teach all things to the world of mankind; while to the Youthful Worthies it means that, as subordinate teachers, they will teach the lower branches of the Truth to the world. These particulars prove that none of the promises applicable to the Church, as summarized in the Oath-bound Covenant, apply to the Youthful Worthies.

(37) Question: How may we best serve the Youthful Worthies associated with the Great Company groups?

Answer: The Youthful Worthies associated with the Epiphany movement are the most fortunate of the Youthful Worthies; for they assist in a marked manner the priests, and hence their work will not need to be burned up, as must be the case with most of the work that the Youthful Worthies do in subordination to the various Great Company leaders. Some of these we can best help by tactful exposures of the revolutionisms of such leaders. Others, more partisan to such leaders, will have to be opposed in a manner similar to that in which we oppose the revolutionism

of the Great Company, that as a result they may suffer experiences somewhat similar to those that the Great Company suffers at the fit man's and Azazel's hands; for any consecrated person who is willful must receive stripes for correction, though these stripes will not in the case of the Youthful Worthies be actually fit man and Azazel experiences. Some—the most stubborn—of them we can best serve by letting them alone, without brotherly help and favor, until they give up their stubbornness, when by tactful instruction we will be privileged to lead them into the right way. Our example of avoiding all forms of revolutionism and of faithfully conforming to the Lord's words and arrangements, will also prove, in the long run at least, a helpful method on our part for them.

(38) Question: Will those of the Youthful Worthies who consecrated between Oct., 1881, and Oct., 1914, in this life learn of a certainty that they were not Spirit-begotten and thus recognize themselves as Youthful Worthies?

Answer: We incline to the opinion that those of them who will live after the cleansing of the Great Company will learn this before leaving the World. Perhaps this will be revealed to them through the difference between their experiences and those of the Great Company. Perhaps it may be through their trials and character attainments, the Great Company attaining perfect love in this life and the Youthful Worthies not. Perhaps it will be through the difference between their knowledge, privileges in service and sufferings, and those of the Great Company. Or perhaps there will yet be given the priesthood an understanding of the different courses through which both of these classes passed between 1881 and 1914. As yet our knowledge on this point is too meager to give a definite and clear-cut answer to this question as to the way the difference will be made known, though we are satisfied that the manifestation will be

brought out in each case. In due time the light will doubtless shine more brightly on this subject than now, and when this occurs, we will have this light, if we continue walking in the light. Nor do we think it wise for us to speculate on this subject. On the contrary, we believe all will do well, to accept every one who consecrated before Sept. 16, 1914, as a priest, until such a time as the Lord will give us an unmistakable indication as to which of these failed to receive the Spirit-begettal and who must accordingly be among the Youthful Worthies. Faith can firmly trust Him, come what may, in this as well as in all other matters of our faith, hope, love and obedience; and therein will it be blessed and honored by the Lord with fuller information when it is due.

(39) Question: May the Youthful Worthies address God as Father in their prayers?

Answer: God is not actually the Father of the Youthful Worthies, who, not being begotten of the Spirit, are really not His children. They are actually now servants and friends of God. Their tentative justification, however, makes them tentatively reckoned as sons of God, just as the disciples before Pentecost were tentatively reckoned as sons of God. Just as the disciples were prospectively sons of God by virtue of their coming Spirit-begettal; so are the Youthful Worthies also prospectively sons of God in view of their coming Spirit-begettal. It will be recalled that in view of their tentatively reckoned standing as sons of God and of their prospective begettal of the Spirit, the disciples were frequently spoken of as having God as their Father (Matt. 5: 17, 45, 48; 6: 1, 4, 8, 9, 15, 18; 7:11; John 16: 27, 28; etc). Since the Youthful Worthies have a similar standing of tentatively reckoned and prospective sonship with God, they may similarly think of themselves as sons of God, even as the disciples did before Pentecost,

but not as actual sons of God. For actual sonship they must wait until after the Millennium in the Little Season, when they will be begotten of the Spirit. It would therefore not be amiss for the Youthful Worthies to pray to God as Father from the reckoned standpoint and also from the prospective standpoint; but it would be amiss for them so to pray without keeping these two standpoints in mind. What we formerly said on the Youthful Worthies not addressing God as Father in prayer must be understood as applying to the actual standpoint only; but it must not be understood as applying to all standpoints; for from the two standpoints above indicated—the tentatively reckoned and the prospective standpoints—they may pray to God as Father and thus, among other things, may use the Lord's Prayer. They are, however, from the fact that they qualifiedly address God, not to lead the priesthood in prayer; because they do not have access to the Throne of Grace; while the priests do have such access. It is for this reason that we suggest that Youthful Worthies do not be asked to lead in prayer in a meeting of priests.

(40) Question: If one came into the Truth before April 18, 1916 (before the sealing of the Elect in the forehead was complete), but is not absolutely certain whether he consecrated before Sept. 16, 1914 (when the last begetting of the Spirit occurred), should he regard himself as a priest and thus take priestly part in the meetings, etc., or should he refrain from cherishing the priestly hope, but hope rather along the line of Youthful Worthiship?

Answer: We are not altogether certain that we can give this question a positive answer. While we know that the majority of those who consecrated between 1881 and 1914 were not begotten of the Spirit, yet our advice has been that others should consider and treat all such consecrators as New Creatures in our ecclesias, for the reasons that we so treated all such

in this way between 1881 and 1914, and cannot prove them unbegotten of the Spirit. This principle is the one that by others should, it seems to us, be applied to such brethren as are included in our question. But how such brethren should regard themselves is a different and difficult question. And this difficulty is not easily solved by the seven things that to the New Creatures constitute the witness of the Spirit—knowledge of the deep things, heavenly desires, opportunities of service, growth in Christlikeness, chastisement for faults, persecution for righteousness and tests of character; for the Youthful Worthies have all of these. Ever since 1881 the deep things, which before that time could be seen by New Creatures only, have been seen by the Youthful Worthies, even as in the Millennium the Ancient Worthies and the Restitution class will see the deep things—in fact everything in the Bible. We can think of but one feature of the witness of the Spirit that the Youthful Worthies do not have—a sympathetic appreciation of the operation of the *Spirit of begettal* in the heart, though they have a sympathetic appreciation of the operation of the Holy Spirit in the sanctified natural human heart, even as Adam and Eve had it before sinning, as Jesus had it before His begettal of the Spirit, and as the Ancient Worthies and the Restitution class will have it in the next Age. The Youthful Worthies, in view of their prospective begettal, desire heavenly things. The great similarity, therefore, between the witness of the Spirit to the New Creatures and to the Youthful Worthies makes brethren other than the ones concerned unable to decide in such a case as the one presented in our question. Such other brethren must leave the pertinent individuals to decide for themselves as to their standing. It would be a handicap for such individuals not to hope for the high calling, if they are begotten; but if they are not begotten it would be unsafe for them to act as priests. It is,

therefore, not an easy matter for such brethren to decide this question. We counsel such earnestly to pray to the Lord for enlightenment as to whether they have a sympathetic appreciation of the operation of the Spirit of begettal in their hearts. They should also request the prayers of undoubted priests. This enlightenment will, we believe, be given in due time to such individuals, and will enable them to see aright in this matter; but in the meantime let the others treat them as New Creatures. Later the Lord will doubtless give all of us certainty as to just who the individual Youthful Worthies are; but we opine that this is a matter that we will not understand before several years have passed. Truly all the light does not come at one time.

(41) Question: In case there is but one priest, and especially if that priest is a sister, in a class, all the rest—say a half-dozen or more—being Youthful Worthies, how should the class be organized?

Answer: If the one priest is a brother and is apt to teach, we would suggest that he be elected an elder. If the sister is apt to preside, we suggest that she be elected as a chairwoman. In either case we suggest that the class be considered a Youthful Worthy class. But if in such a class there be Youthful Worthies who have the eldership qualifications, we suggest that they be elected elders to serve at other meetings than the ones at which the priestly elder leads, or the priestly chairwoman presides; and that at all these meetings the priestly elder or chairwoman be considered not a member of the class, but as a guest whose priestly office is recognized by the class as above indicated. But when the Youthful Worthy elders lead, the priest should consider himself or herself as a visitor and let the Youthful Worthies have full charge of the meetings. This seems to be the spirit of a sound mind on the subject; for it gives the Youthful Worthies a proper scope for developing their qualities.

of heart and mind, and yet puts them into a proper attitude toward the priest in their midst. If there be two priests in a place, and more than two Youthful Worthies, we advise that if one or both priests have elderly qualities the class be considered a priestly class with one or both priests elected as elders (by one another) and that the Youthful Worthies be regarded as associates of the class but not as voters or office holders.

(42) Question: If no priest is available for the office of pianist or organist, should a capable Youthful Worthy be elected to such an office in the Church?

Answer: We believe he or she should not be *elected* to such an office, for that would make him a deacon, or her a deaconess in the Church. We believe it would be in order in such a case for the Church by vote to ask such a Youthful Worthy to play for the Church for an indefinite period without electing him or her to an office in the Church. As typed by Abed-nego [servant of the messenger, *i.e.*, servant of the Church as God's messenger] it would be proper for the Youthful Worthies to give the Church any service which it needs and asks, and of which they are capable, compatibly with the Divine order in Church government.

(43) Question: Does not the reward of being of the Youthful Worthies class require the character and heart attitude found only in those who come over on the side of the Priests in the present sifting? Does not association with the Levitical divisions indicate such a measure of bondage and mis-directed faith as makes them unsuitable associates of the Ancient Worthies?

Answer: Before the Youthful Worthies will be worthy of association with the Ancient Worthies they will have to obtain a good report for faith and obedience, and to the extent that their cleaving to the Levitical divisions implies sympathy with Levitical ways, to that extent they will have to cleanse themselves

if they would be the Millennial associates of the Ancient Worthies. And this the ultimately faithful among them will do. However, it seems to us that their temporarily being entrapped with the Great Company would no more ultimately make them unworthy of being Millennial Levites than the same temporary entrapment of the Great Company would make them ultimately unworthy of being Millennial Levites. In both cases we expect to see a cleansing setting in to make them worthy. But, as we have previously pointed out, those of the Youthful Worthies who associate with the Priests have a chance for a better victory now, and for a better reward hereafter than do those who now associate with the Levites.

(44) Question: How can we know who is a Youthful Worthy?

Answer: First we will answer with reference to those brethren who have consecrated since the Fall of 1914. Knowing from many reasons that Spirit begetting ceased by the Fall of 1914, we readily can know of all who have consecrated since that time that they could not be Spirit-begotten; and that, therefore, their hopes lie in the direction of Youthful Worthiship. With respect to those of them who consecrated since the general Call ceased in 1881 (F 156, 157), we cannot now be sure, though each individual by the various witnesses of the Spirit may be able to learn his position. It would not, however, at all surprise us, if there should arise a Youthful Worthies' movement, separating them from others. If this should prove true, it would doubtless then become clear as to the Youthful Worthiship of all of the unbegotten consecrated.

(45) Question: What is typed by "the poor" and "the stranger" doing the gleaning? How was the field left for them to glean by the reapers?

Answer: In the type (Lev. 19: 9, 10) the owners of the field were told to leave the gleaning for the poor

and the stranger. We understand the owners of the field to represent our Lord (Matt. 20: 1-8). The command not to glean would seem to represent Jehovah's charge to our Lord ["Thou"], to leave something of the Harvest ungathered by the faithful—the reapers ["ye"]—for others to glean. We understand "the poor" to represent the Great Company, who have become poor in the sense of their having lost the riches implied in the possession of the High Calling. "The stranger" seems to represent the Youthful Worthies, who are strangers to the High Calling. The command to leave the gleanings for the poor and the stranger types Jehovah's charge to the Lord Jesus, as we see, *e.g.*, in the Gideon Type, to prepare the faithful Little Flock members for the first battle of antitypical Gideon, for the first smiting of Jordan, for the executing of the judgment written, and for the confessing of the sins over Azazel's Goat, and to set them to work in these activities, thus leaving the balance of the Little Flock as gleanings for others, *i.e.*, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies, to win from 1914 to 1916. During that period the Little Flock did not occupy itself in its work with ministering the truths that brought people into the Truth. The declaration of such truths as led people into the Truth was then left for the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies, to make which was the gleaning work. The faithful occupied themselves with the presentation of such stern truths as exposed and rebuked the sins of Christendom, as announced the destruction of Satan's Empire, and as pronounced judgment on the kings, princes, nations and peoples. Thus while the Little Flock was so engaged the other two classes completed the gleaning—won for the Truth those of the Little Flock that had not been gathered into the Truth before the last one was Spirit-begotten in Sept. 1914. This will account for the fact that antitypical Elisha—

the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies—did not smite Jordan the first time, though sympathetic with antitypical Elijah's doing it. They were busy with other features of the work, the non-smiting features of the work—they were gleaning, and finished it during 1916. There was also gleaning done from 1881 onward to 1914.

(46) Question: Will the Ancient and Youthful Worthies die at the end of the Millennial Age as a step necessary for their change of nature?

Answer: We believe they will, because so far as we know no person can change from a lower to a higher nature without death. In our Lord's becoming a human being he did not die. And from this fact we see that it is possible to change from a higher to a lower nature without death. But there is no record of a change described in the Scriptures from a lower to a higher nature apart from the death of the lower. This seems necessary from the nature of the case; for to appreciate the things of a lower nature one need not become a partaker of that lower nature, *e.g.*, the angels can appreciate human things without becoming human beings; but a lower nature cannot appreciate the things of a higher nature. Hence there is the necessity of a change of affections from human to spiritual things (Col. 3: 1-3), before a change to a higher nature can take place. This implies deadness to self and the world and a Spirit-begetting. Certainly his natural body must be set aside, if a human being is to receive a spirit body. These things involve death. Hence we see that both the Little Flock and the Great Company die, not only because they agreed so to do, but because it is the thing that must be done to gain the higher nature (John 3: 3-8; 1 Cor. 15: 50, 52-54). In a Tower article our Pastor made the statement that we can see how the Ancient Worthies can be changed without death. The reverse was his

thought. In some unaccountable way the word "not" fell out of the sentence. The fact of the matter is this, that he held that they would die; and it is also a fact that we cannot see how they can be changed without death. And this latter thought he intended to express. Why the correction was never made we do not know. The matter was evidently overlooked. At the time we thought of writing to him on the omission, but did not.

(47) Question: Would it be proper for the Youthful Worthies to offer the Lord's prayer just as it is given, *i.e.*, to address Jehovah as "Our Father"?

Answer: We believe that it would be proper for the Youthful Worthies to offer all seven petitions of the Lord's prayer just as they stand; and think it would not be proper for them to alter the introduction, because God is now reckonedly their Father. Their relation to Jehovah is that of reckoned sons, and that of actual friends like the Ancient Worthies (Jas. 2: 23). Hence they may address Jehovah as Father, and as God.

(48) Question: Are the Youthful Worthies to point out the errors and wrongs of Azazel's antitypical Goat?

Answer: Certainly they are not to resist the revolutionism of the Great Company—leading the Goat to the Gate of the Court—in the same sense in which the Priesthood do this, for such is exclusively antitypical Aaron's work. Therefore they are not to be pronounced opposers of Azazel's antitypical Goat, as are the Priests. However, as friends of God and of His Truth and Righteousness, they are to disapprove of all violations of Truth and Righteousness; but in the exercise of this disapproval they are to remember that the Great Company, in God's esteem, is a higher class than they. This thought should greatly moderate their expression of disapproval of the errors and wrongs of the Great Company. Hence whatever disapproval of the Great Company's acts they manifest

is to be rather unobtrusively done. Their words and manner should be very mild. With the Priests the matter is quite different. They are a class superior to the Great Company, who continually seek to revolutionize against what God has given the Priesthood to do. Hence the Priests very properly may be very severe with the Levites—as severe as the latter's acts and the circumstances of the case demand. We believe that it would be very wise for the Youthful Worthies to take particular note of the answer given to this question.

(49) Question: What form of words might the baptizer use in performing the symbol for Youthful Worthies?

Answer: The form of words to be used, it seems to us, should express exactly the nature of the act that is to be symbolized. Since the Youthful Worthies are not baptized into Christ's death, the words which express symbolization into His death should not, in our judgment, be used for them. Hence we advise that the italicized words of the sentence: "I baptize thee *into Christ*," should not be used in symbolizing a Youthful Worthy's consecration. We further think that, so far as the difference in the thing symbolized permits, the same form of words as were used for symbolizing baptism into Christ be used. Accordingly we believe that the following would be a good form of words for the baptizer to utter as he immerses a Youthful Worthy: "Brother (or, Sister) A., in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, I baptize thee." We believe that some such form of words will commend itself to the Holy Spirit in the Church everywhere.

(50) Question: As the Adamic death is cancelled from the Youthful Worthies at consecration, and as they cannot die with Christ, why do they die?

Answer: This question is based on a misunderstanding

of the kind of justification the Youthful Worthies enjoy. Whoever now heartily exercises "repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus" attains tentative justification, and that before he consecrates himself to the Lord, and when he becomes a Gospel-Age Levite by entering the Gate of the Court. This would, therefore, be the experience of one who later by consecration becomes a Youthful Worthy, as it was formerly the experience of those who later consecrated and became Priests. Hence one who will become of the Youthful Worthies class is tentatively justified before he consecrates. His tentative justification, however, does not imply an actual cancellation of the Adamic sentence; for Christ's merit is not actually imputed on his behalf in tentative justification. It only implies that the Lord while not actually canceling his Adamic sentence, treats him for the time being as though it were cancelled, and as though Christ's merit had been imputed on his behalf. Hence he is only reckonedly and temporarily, not actually and eternally, freed from the Adamic sentence. Nor is his consecration followed by an actual cancellation of that sentence, which occurred on behalf of those only who were about to receive the begettal of the Spirit; rather after his consecration his tentative justification persists, and is sealed or confirmed to him, as was the case with Abraham (Rom. 4: 11). Hence like the Ancient Worthies, the Youthful Worthies are actually under the Adamic sentence; but like them they are also treated by God as though they were not under that sentence; and if faithful unto death, they die in God's favor despite the Adamic sentence resting upon them (Heb. 11: 39). The fact then that the Adamic sentence rests upon them necessitates their death; but their death is as pleasing to God as was that of the Ancient Worthies (Heb. 11: 4-6, 13, 16). And this is because their tentative justification by faith persists, as did that of the Ancient Worthies. While their

death is not a sacrificial death in the sense of the death of the Christ class, they actually are faithful unto death like their worthy predecessors, the Ancient Worthies; and for this, like the Ancient Worthies, they will receive with the actual cancellation of their sins under the New Covenant, immediate possession of perfect humanity on awakening from the dead, and also the glorious honor and service of Millennial princedom and Leviteship. Let them rejoice and praise God for such a blessed hope! And we rejoice with them at such a glorious prospect.

(51) Question: How may the Youthful Worthies assist in the work of rebuking antitypical Herod and Herodias?

Answer: We believe that it is pleasing to the Lord for the Youthful Worthies to assist the Priests who lead the Catholic section of Azazel's Goat to the Gate, as they assisted them while they led the Truth and Protestant sections of that Goat to the Gate. The best way that they can do this, in addition to taking part in antitypical Gideon's Second Battle, is, through volunteering John's Rebuke and Elijah's Letter and canvassing for the Double Herald in harmony with the suggestions for that work as given through our former statements on the subject. We desire to say for the encouragement of the dear Youthful Worthies that some of their number have been among the most successful sharpshooters with the Double Heralds. In fact the two who have circulated the largest number of Double Heralds in Philadelphia are Youthful Worthies. One of the Chicago Youthful Worthies is among the most successful canvassers for that paper. We trust that this consideration will encourage all of the Youthful Worthies to go on with this work, and that it will stir up the Priests to greater zeal therein. May the Lord bless all the dear participants in this work!

(52) Question: Is the Youthful Worthies' justification a matter that occurs once for all, or is it a thing that is repeated?

Answer: Their justification consists of the forgiveness of their sins and of the imputation of their faith to them as righteousness. It is an act of God, not of theirs; for "it is God who justifieth." While there was a time in which they were not in a justified condition, before their faith was ever counted to them as righteousness; yet after they enter that state they continue to remain therein. This however does not mean that they no more need to have forgiveness of sins and the imputation of their faith as righteousness; for doubtless they sin daily, and therefore they daily need the forgiveness of sins; and daily need their faith to be reckoned to them as righteousness, and it is God's daily forgiving them, as they in faith ask it, and God's daily imputing their faith to them for righteousness that keep them in the tentatively justified condition. We would therefore answer the question that it is given to them once—we would not say necessarily once for all; for they could lose it and later regain it—and is continually with them by God's daily continuing it to them.

(53) Question: What is typed by the two and one-half tribes being given their inheritance East of the Jordan (Num. 32: 1-42; Josh. 1: 12-15)?

Answer: It seems to us to represent two complete classes and half of another class. The two complete classes we think are the Little Flock and the Great Company, and the third class we believe consists of the Ancient and Youthful Worthies, the half tribe representing the Youthful Worthies, the Ancient Worthies being left out of the picture entirely for the following reason: The setting of the type of necessity excludes the Ancient Worthies from the picture; for Israel approaching the land of Canaan types the Church, Real and Nominal, approaching the Millennial

Kingdom, which fact shows that the Ancient Worthies are excluded from the picture. But since they and the Youthful Worthies are the two halves of the class that will obtain the better resurrection and princedom throughout the earth, and since the Youthful Worthies are a part of the Church in the wide sense of that term, they very fittingly would be typed by the half tribe of Manasseh whose inheritance was East of the Jordan; but for the reason given above, we are not to conclude that the other half of Manasseh typed the Ancient Worthies. The other half tribe of Manasseh and the other nine tribes of Israel, standing for ten tribes, type the entire restitution class, ten being the number of perfection or completion for natures lower than the Divine. That the two and one-half tribes had great numbers of cattle as they approached Jordan (Num. 32: 1), types the fact that the Little Flock, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies would be feeders of many with the Truth as they have been approaching the peoples at the end of the Age, preparatory to entering the new Age. The inheritance of the two and one-half tribes East of the Jordan seems to type the Millennial and post-Millennial inheritance of the Little Flock, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies—another proof that the Youthful and with them the Ancient Worthies will ultimately attain spirit existence.

(54) Question: How do the Youthful Worthies stand in respect to the merit of Christ?

Answer: The justification of the Youthful Worthies is tentative. In tentative justification there has been no actual imputation of the merit of Christ, because it was the imputation of the merit of Christ that vitalized justification, but in tentative justification God for the time being, in order to enable a justified one to proceed to consecration, looks upon him as though the merit of Jesus had been imputed on his behalf, in order to make him acceptable to God for dealing with

him for the purpose of bringing him to consecration. It is for this reason that we call this justification tentative justification. It has been given not as a complete work, but simply in order to give the pertinent person the opportunity of obtaining from the Lord such experiences in His providences and helps from His Word as might lead him on toward consecration. If he yields to the helps of the Lord's providences and to the teachings of the Lord's Word, He will consecrate himself, and thus his justification, while the Little Flock was not yet complete, would have been vitalized through Christ's imputing His merit on his behalf and through God's actually forgiving his sins and imputing to him the righteousness of Christ, if God were about to beget him of the Spirit. No longer is anyone's justification being vitalized, because, the full number of Elect having been obtained, no more begettals of the Spirit set in, and thus there is no more need of vitalizing justification. Accordingly, the Youthful Worthies before their consecration are treated from the standpoint of tentative justification alone; and when they consecrate, they realize the purpose of their tentative justification without the actual imputation of the merit of Christ and consequently without the begetting of the Spirit. Thus we would say that their justification is not a vitalized one, but is a tentative one merely, the merit of Christ not being actually imputed on their behalf.

(55) Question: Must the prayers of Youthful Worthies be brought through Jesus, or do they have the same relation in fellowship with God as the Ancient Worthies had?

Answer: In spirit both classes have prayed in the same way, as far as Jesus is concerned, with the following difference: The Ancient Worthies prayed to God in anticipation of the Messiah's intercession. They believed that God heard them in view of His promises connected with the Seed; and this faith implied that

they looked upon themselves as acceptable through the work that the Messiah would accomplish, though they did not understand the details and philosophy of that work, as we do. In other words, they approached God by faith in the Messiah who would come as the Savior, and through such a faith, had fellowship with God. The Youthful Worthies approach God in the same manner as far as the time difference will permit. The time difference however makes Jesus' coming one that has already occurred; and consequently their faith in the promises implies, through the added knowledge that the Ancient Worthies could not have, that they believe in God's accepting them in virtue of the death of the Messiah who did come as their Savior. Thus in principle their stand before the Lord is exactly the same as that of the Ancient Worthies, though on account of the difference in the time relationship of the two classes to Christ's sacrifice, the faith of the one looked forward to, and that of the other looks backward at Christ as Savior. On this account, the added knowledge that the Youthful Worthies have makes them pray definitely to God to forgive their sins for the merit of Jesus and to give them other needed blessings through His merit, while the Ancient Worthies could not offer their petitions with such definiteness, not having, as said above, the necessary knowledge thereto. The spirit of their petitions is exactly the same. As the Ancient Worthies came to Jehovah as their Covenant God, so do the Youthful Worthies. The Ancient Worthies did not approach God as Father; nor do actually the Youthful Worthies. The Ancient Worthies did not have their justification vitalized; neither do the Youthful Worthies. The Ancient Worthies were fiends of God's; so are the Youthful Worthies. The Ancient Worthies were consecrated to death; so are the Youthful Worthies. The Ancient Worthies had to be faithful unto death to become princes throughout the earth; so far as we at present can see,

so must the Youthful Worthies be faithful unto death to become princes throughout the earth. Both are pleasing to God through faith in the promise associated with Jesus, the Savior. The advantages that the Youthful Worthies have over the Ancient Worthies are those of increased knowledge and increased privileges of service. These bring it about that their faith is not so severely tested as was that of the Ancient Worthies; and this is probably the reason why the Ancient Worthies will occupy a superior place in the Kingdom to that of the Youthful Worthies. These similar relations to the Lord result in the Youthful Worthies presenting their petitions to God in a way very similar to that in which the Ancient Worthies presented theirs—through the merit of the Savior, obscurely seen by the latter, clearly seen by the former.

(56) Question: Will the Ancient Worthies have a more honorable place after the Millennial Age than the Youthful Worthies, and will they both be higher in rank than the Great Company?

Answer: It is our outstanding that the Ancient Worthies will have a higher position forever than the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies. This we prove from the Levitical and Tabernacle pictures. The priests in front of the Tabernacle represent Christ and the Church as the chief class of God's plan during and after the Millennium. The Kohathites to the south of the Tabernacle represent the Ancient Worthies Millennially and post-Millennially, as the chief class of the antitypical Levites. The Merarites to the north of the Tabernacle represent The Great Company as the second highest class of the antitypical Levites, Millennially, and post-Millennially; while the Gershonites to the west of the Tabernacle represent the Youthful Worthies, Millennially and post-Millennially, as the lowest order of the antitypical Levites. Accordingly, we would answer the question that both the Ancient Worthies and the Great Company will forever

occupy a more honorable position, and perhaps a higher nature than the Youthful Worthies. The description of the two classes—the Ancient and Youthful Worthies—in Rev. 20: 9 corroborates this thought, because here at the end of the Millennium, the Ancient Worthies are spoken of as "The Beloved City" in their capacity of being the special representative of Christ and the Church, while the Youthful Worthies are called the "Camp of the Saints" in their capacity of warring on behalf of Truth and righteousness, as the representative of Christ and the Church. A city is superior to a camp, because it represents a higher form of living, and thus seems to indicate likewise the superiority of the Ancient Worthies to the Youthful Worthies—a superiority which according to the Levitical picture will last forever. In general, the fact of their Millennial superiority to the Youthful Worthies would imply their post-Millennial superiority to these, because being faithful in the higher position, they will get a still higher reward than the Youthful Worthies faithful in the lower position, on the principle that "To him that hath shall be given that he may have more" illustrated by our Lord in the servants who had the five and the two talents.

(57) Question: Should the Youthful Worthies form separate classes?

Answer: While there would be no injustice in their forming separate classes, we believe that it would be unwise so to do. We recall that in the Elisha picture, Elisha is used to represent both the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies as Society adherents, and no separation is indicated in this picture. When we look at the Gospel Church throughout the entire Age, we see that no separate congregations were formed for the priests, the Levites and the antitypical camp people respectively. This makes us believe that it would be decidedly wiser for the Youthful Worthies not to form separate classes as such. On the contrary,

those of them that can be associated with priests as a class are thereby greatly advantaged, in that they are kept from many errors and wrong practices, and in that they are given the Truth and correct practices. The work that they therefore will do in connection with the priests will not need to be burned up, as much of the work that the Youthful Worthies do with the Levites will be burned up. Those of them outside of the Epiphany Truth, not recognizing that the division of the Great Company as such is taking place, would of course feel obligated to remain with that Great Company group with which they are associated; and we would therefore think it unwise for them to form separate classes for themselves. Thus we see from a variety of standpoints it would be better for them not to form separate classes.

(58) Question: Do the Youthful Worthies have the wedding garment?

Answer: We understand that they do not have the wedding garment; for the wedding garment consists of the actually imputed merit of our Lord. This merit was imputed on behalf of those who after consecration were about to become New Creatures, and since the Youthful Worthies will not become New Creatures until the end of the Millennial Age, they cannot have the wedding garment. The wedding garment is necessary for one to participate in the special blessings connected with the marriage and the marriage supper of the Lamb. Youthful Worthies will not participate in either of these two things. We can therefore see that they do not have the wedding garment. If they were to have the wedding garment now, they would be on trial for life now, and consequently, could not have the Millennial opportunity. We therefore see that the wedding garment is not for the Youthful Worthies.

(59) Question: If, at the Millennium's end, the Ancient and Youthful Worthies will die, will theirs not be the second death?

Answer: It is true that at the end of the Little Season the Ancient and Youthful Worthies will die. It is also true that it will be a second time for them to have died, but their death will not be the second death, because the second death is used in the Bible in a technical sense, as in striking contrast with the first, or Adamic, death. The first, or Adamic death, will be terminated when the Messiah awakens the sleepers from the tomb and lifts them up by restitution processes unto perfection. The first, or the Adamic death condition, will end, therefore, at a certain time, but what the Scriptures speak of as the second death never will end. No one who has entered into what the Scriptures speak of as the second death will ever return to life. They will be dead—extinct—forever. We think the questioner's difficulty will be overcome, if he remembers that the expression, "the second death," is used in a technical sense with respect to the condition into which the incorrigibly wicked, after final trial and opportunity, are cast. It does not necessarily mean to die a second time—for example, Judas as of the Gospel-Age second death class, has not died a second time; the same remark applies to all of the Gospel-Age second death class, and doubtless some of those who will live through the Time of Trouble and through the Millennium, will, at its end—in the Little Season—be found unworthy of everlasting life and though dying the first time, they will go into the second death. So, too, is this true of the impenitent fallen angels. Therefore, we cannot speak of one's necessarily dying the second death who dies a second time, and this exception holds in the case of the Ancient and Youthful Worthies when they die at the end of the Millennium.

(60) Question: Will the Youthful Worthies, at the end of the Millennium, be fitted by the Spirit-begettal for the spirit condition?

Answer: Our Lord in John 3: 3-8 assures us that

to enter the heavenly condition one must be begotten of the Spirit. It is true that He makes this remark with respect to the Gospel-Age Church, but the same principle must apply to every nature-changed spirit being. If the Ancient and Youthful Worthies are to become spirit beings, they must first be begotten to the spirit nature, and thereafter be developed in character for fitness to live as spirit beings. Accordingly, the principle of what Jesus states in John 3:3-8 is applicable to every being that is transferred from the human to a spiritual plane. This we note to be the case with respect to the Great Company, though, of course, as individuals they were never begotten to that class, but to the Bride class. We therefore look for both the Ancient and Youthful Worthies to be begotten of the Spirit; and this, in all likelihood, will occur during the Little Season, and most probably very early in its beginning.

(61) Question: It is required of Youthful Worthies that they sacrifice all worldly pleasures?

Answer: Those who consecrate while sin is in the ascendancy in the world cannot carry out their consecration apart from renouncing selfishness and worldliness, because Satan sets against a consecrated course the allurements of sin, selfishness, worldliness and error; and one cannot proceed faithfully in consecration without denying himself of these, therefore of selfishness and worldliness. Whenever the satisfaction of a selfish or worldly propensity is not opposed to faithful sacrifice, it is proper to satisfy such a propensity. For example, we properly satisfy our desire for food, drink, rest, etc., every day and these are human, selfish and worldly propensities. We may make use of any of these propensities, if we employ them to help us serve Truth and righteousness. Thus we may eat appetizing foods, that thereby we may gain strength to use in the Lord's service. We may rest when we are weary, in order thereby to recuperate.

our strength the better to serve the Lord; and we may take legitimate forms of recreation and diversion when such are helpful to fit us better for the Lord's service. This use of our selfish and worldly propensities we call their servant use in the interests of righteousness and holiness; but if the indulgence of any of our human propensities implies abstinence from sacrifice in the Lord's service, when the opportunity of service is present, that indulgence may not be permitted without one's being unfaithful. These principles will help us to answer the question in the spirit of wisdom. We would therefore thus sum up: we may use any legitimate, worldly pleasure, if it will help us better to serve the Lord. We may not use any of these, if they hinder our service of the Lord. In solving the question in each individual case, the purpose of the heart in connection with the indulgence must be kept in mind. If it is merely a selfish and worldly purpose, apart from better qualifying us for the Lord's service, the indulgence is to be abstained from. Let us remember the Apostle Paul tells us to use the world, but not to abuse it; and let us not take the monastic view of sacrifice. Jesus is our example in sacrifice; and he participated in the festivities of the Jewish wedding at Cana, where worldly pleasure ran to the very climax; and we are sure that Jesus' course there was not one that chilled and squelched the pleasure of the participants. We should also remember that sometimes our duties toward our earthly relatives require us to give them some of our companionship while they are indulging in worldly pleasures. While they may demand more along this line than our consecration may permit us to give, yet they have certain rights to our companionship in their worldly pleasures which we should cheerfully concede, using in such concessions the spirit of a sound mind that will harmonize the calls of justice and sacrifice. The principle contained in this answer

applies to all the consecrated alike—the Little Flock, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies.

(62) Question: Is it right for a Youthful Worthy to distribute Truth Literature against her husband's wishes?

Answer: Under some circumstances the unconsecrated husband's desires in this matter are to be acceded to. Under other circumstances they are not to be acceded to. If, for example, it would lead to the unconsecrated husband's loss of his position, the consecrated wife, whether of the Little Flock, Great Company or Youthful Worthies; should abstain from the distribution, because of interfering with the husband's rights and duties. So in all cases where such a course would lead to an injustice to the unconsecrated partner or to the consecrated partner, the consecrated should abstain from distribution of the Truth Literature; but where it is a matter of mere prejudice and opposition to the Truth on the part of the unconsecrated husband, and results in no injustice to him, any member of the consecrated class is privileged to distribute such literature; for be it noted that when we consecrated, we consecrated our rights, and not others' rights; hence we may not sacrifice in a way that would do an injustice to others. While we may sacrifice when no injustice is done to others, we cannot allow their enmity to the Truth to be the deciding factor as to whether we should serve the Truth. Let the consecrated, whether wives or husbands, see to it that they do their full duty by their spouses faithfully and generously before they sacrifice; and after having done this, they may conscientiously sacrifice, despite the opposition of the spouse. A wife has certain rights which she may sacrifice, and over which the husband has no control; and if she has done her part toward him and then has extra time, strength, means, influence, etc., for the Lord's service, she should faithfully use these, despite the opposition of a Truth inimical

husband; but tact and discretion should characterize her sacrificing so as not to stir up needless opposition. For the sake of peace it would be frequently wise to perform the sacrifice entirely unknown to the opposing partner. There would be no wrong in such a course, because his rights are not being taken away in the premises. We believe this question can be solved on the principle enunciated by our Lord, "Render unto Caesar, the things that are Caesar's, and unto God, the things that are God's." Caesar cannot force us to abstain from rendering unto God the things that belong to God, and God will not ask us to take away from Caesar the things that belong to Caesar. Briefly, then, we would say, after having fulfilled our duties toward our earthly spouses, we are privileged by the Lord to sacrifice things to Him that duty does not require us to use for our spouses, etc. If such a course on the part of a consecrated one will lead to trouble, let the consecrated one bear this as a part of her suffering with, or for Christ; with Christ, if the consecrated one is a member of the Little Flock; for Christ, if she is of the Great Company or the Youthful Worthies.

(63) Question: Do the Youthful Worthies in this Age have to develop perfect love?

Answer: If the question were put as follows, Are the Youthful Worthies now on trial for life, *i.e.*, are they being tried along the lines of perfect love, on which trial for life must be, we would have to answer, No; for their trial is like that of the Ancient Worthies, who evidently were not on such a trial, as is proven; *e.g.*, by the cases of Samson and David who were among the approved Ancient Worthies (Heb. 11: 32, 39), but who died wishing evil on enemies of theirs. But the Youthful Worthies must now develop disinterested love in some measure, though not necessarily unto perfection; for to carry out a consecration unto death, which is not a demand of justice, duty love, but

is a matter of privilege, disinterested love, it is inevitable, if one is faithful, that he develop a measure of disinterested love, though not necessarily unto perfection, *i.e.*, crystallization. In the case of the Little Flock and the Great Company, their trial being for life, they must develop disinterested love unto crystallization, otherwise they could not get life. The Youthful Worthies, not now being on trial for life, are not required to develop disinterested love unto crystallization. We would not even say that they *must* develop perfect untested love, *i.e.*, gain the mark, though some of them do it, which will bring them a higher reward in the Millennium than those of them who do not develop it. Apparently God does not now permit to come upon them such trials as would be necessary to develop disinterested love unto perfection, crystallization. But He does have come upon them such trials as will test their faith and devotion to righteousness sufficiently to qualify them for Millennial princedom, as well as such as will measurably test their disinterested love.

(64) Question: Does the fact that some since 1914 have seen the hidden mystery prove that there have since 1914 been Spirit-begettings?

Answer: No; for the fact that ever since 1881 the Youthful Worthies have seen the hidden mystery, though not Spirit-begetted, proves that since 1914 the Spirit-begettal is not indispensable to seeing the hidden mystery nor other spiritual things. St. Paul's statement (1 Cor. 2: 14) that only the Spirit-begetted can see spiritual things is not a statement that applies to all times, but only until the general call would cease, *i.e.*, until 1881; for not only do Youthful Worthies since 1881 see spiritual things, and not only some justified ones since 1881 see spiritual things, but in the Millennium not only the Ancient Worthies without Spirit-begettal but also the restitution class will see them, since they will understand everything in the

Bible. Hence St. Paul's statement in 1 Cor. 2: 14 does not apply to all times, but is limited in time; and that time limit is 1881; for since that time both Youthful Worthies and some faith-justified ones have seen spiritual things. This answers an objection that Brother Karlen makes to our understanding of the door of entrance into the high calling closing in 1914. His claim that the date 1943 is the date for the close of the high calling is fallacious, because it makes the floor length of the Grand Gallery 29 inches longer than it is, through making it not a straight line, but a line with a step in it at the south end. If his reasoning were right, we would have to lengthen the Grand Gallery still more by adding to it that much of the height of the small step somewhat over 200 inches south of the north wall of the Grand Gallery as is the difference in the distance between its bottom and top from the break-off about 25 inches south of the Grand Gallery's north wall. This fact proves the fallaciousness of his using the front and top of the step in the south end of the Grand Gallery in measuring the length of the floor line. Furthermore, the length of the Grand Gallery floor line, real and projected, not its floor, is not only by these two facts proven to be the thing that gives the length of the Grand Gallery; but by the nature of the case this is proven; for in measuring the exact length of a room or building we must measure in a straight line and not along irregular surfaces. So good a mathematician as Brother Karlen should have known better than to offer such a measure as the length of the Grand Gallery, for, representing the high calling, its length in Pyramid inches should give us the high calling's duration and the years in which it began and ended. Moreover, Brother Karlen knows that in later years Brother Russell gave up the method of measuring along the front and top of the south step of the Grand Gallery as the way of finding out the length of the high calling, as he also knows

that the Edgar Brothers before 1914 gave the Grand Gallery's straight floor line actual and projected as giving the length of the high calling, and as indicating about October, 1914, as its end. He himself projects that floor line from the break-off to the top of the lower step in the Grand Gallery and not along the line therefrom to the bottom of the small step and along its front. Why then does he not in consistency do the same at the south end of the Grand Gallery? His inconsistency here is a disproof of his method of measuring the face and the top of that step in arriving at the date of the high calling's end. Moreover, his date is wrong because the Pyramid can be properly used only in indicating Biblically given dates, whereas there is no Bible indication for the date 1943 for the closing of the door to entrance into the high calling or for any other special event, so far as our present knowledge goes. While on the subject of the lower step referred to above, we might suggest the symbolism of the line from the break-off to the bottom of that step. It will be remembered that we pointed out in Vol. III, Chapter VII, on The Pyramid's Witness On Elijah And Elisha and on Antitypical Elijah's Reappearance, that the floor line of the Grand Gallery projected to the latter's projected south wall brings us to September 16, 1914, as the date of the last begettal, *i.e.*, the date of the close of the door to the high calling, and that the deviating line from the bottom of the step to where its top meets the Grand Gallery's south wall represents the wrong course of antitypical Elisha from September 24, 1846, to June 27, 1917, when he first came into the open separate and distinct from antitypical Elijah. Something similar is the case in the symbolism from the break-off to the top and bottom of the lower step. The proper floor line projected without a floor from the break-off to the top of that lower step, just like the true floor line actual or projected elsewhere between the Grand Gallery

north and south walls, represents the Little Flock's course in Truth and righteousness, here in opposition to power-grasping crown-lost leaders, while the deviating line from the break-off to the bottom of the step represents the course of the crown-lost leaders in error and unrighteousness culminating in Cyprian's teaching and practicing the error of apostolic succession of the bishops. The Pyramid inches involved in both lines give us the exact dates of the three involved events. We hope some day to give details thereon, giving here only enough to show the erroneousness of Brother Karlen's course of leaving the real floor line actual or projected and of measuring the uneven lines—the face and top of the involved step—when seeking to, fix the end of entering into the high calling.

(65) Question: Is there any evil result arising from teaching that the high calling is still open for new aspirants?

Answer: Error always brings bad results; and in this case it brings especially bad ones. It results in symbolic incest and in the birth of symbolic bastards, who as such will suffer great loss and disappointments. They are guilty of great arrogance, the consecrated (formerly Youthful Worthies) among them, in insisting on foisting themselves upon the Lord as members of His espoused without the Lord inviting them thereto (Heb. 5: 4; John 6: 44), and the unconsecrated (former tentatively justified ones) among them, in insisting that they are invited thereto without the Lord inviting them. The former lose their Youthful Worthiship and become antitypical Moabites, and the latter lose their tentative justification and become antitypical Ammonites in their capacity of claiming those privileges for themselves; and in their capacity of uniting with drunken Great Company members (antitypical Lot) in producing others by such errors, they become, the former, antitypical

Lot's elder daughter, the latter, antitypical Lot's younger daughter. As our Pastor taught, Lot represents that section of the Great Company who left the nominal church just before its destruction set in, *i.e.*, just before the World War, involving their separate countries, began to destroy the nominal-church. His wife turned into a pillar of salt represents crown-losers who before making a full escape turn back in affection to the things left behind, and who as a result go into the second death. His elder daughter and younger daughter represent the Youthful Worthies and the faith-justified ones respectively who made their escape at that time. In the scene in the mountain Lot represents those of the Great Company in the Truth who allow themselves to be deceived (drunken) by the false doctrines (wine) given them by certain Youthful Worthies (their false doctrine [wine] being that they are in the high calling) and certain justified ones (their false doctrine [wine] being that the high calling is still open for them after it in fact is closed). Hence his two daughters represent certain ones of the two classes just mentioned. Lot's being unaware of the incest types the ignorance of the involved Great Company members of the nature of their act. The antitypical incest consists in antitypical Lot and his two class daughters defiling one another by a wrong connection into bringing forth symbolic bastards, the former allegedly in the Little Flock and the latter allegedly invited to Little Flockship. Actually the offspring of such symbolic incest are symbolic bastards—antitypical Moabites and Ammonites. See the entire story as it is recorded in Gen. 19. Symbolic bastards, among whom antitypical Moabites and Ammonites are counted, will not come into the Lord's congregation until after the tenth generation—until after the Millennium, *i.e.*, during the Little Season. In other words they will be restitutionists (Deut. 23: 2, 3; D 575, 576). This means that

antitypical Lot loads great guilt upon himself by his part in symbolic incest, for which he will suffer stripes; and his symbolic daughters lose their standing as Youthful Worthies and faith-justified ones, falling back into the world, while the antitypical Moabites and Ammonites are and remain of the world. Thus we see that the results of teaching that the high calling is yet open to new aspirants are serious indeed. We warn especially Youthful Worthies against the disastrous results of their accepting and practicing this error. It will cause them to lose their standing as Youthful Worthies and put them back again into the world.

(66) Question: If the Youthful Worthies do not eat of the shewbread, how do they understand the deep things?

Answer: The fact that is stated in this question, that the Youthful Worthies understand the deep things, has led C. Kasprzykowski, who has become a sifter of our brethren in Poland, to teach that the Youthful Worthies, while standing in the antitypical Court, put an antitypical arm and hand into the antitypical Holy and take from its table the shewbread thereon and bring it into the Court and there eat it! For such a thought to be true it would mean that their symbolic arm and hand, *i.e.*, their intellects and that part of their affections through which faith works, are Spirit-begotten; for the Holy represents the Spirit-begotten condition. This would make the Youthful Worthies partly New Creatures, which, of course, is an absurdity, and which, of course, involves other absurdities needless to point out. The propounder of such a thought is, of course, on his way into outer darkness, where his character and acts prove he belongs. Apart from his heart condition, which makes him amenable to such folly, his head is shown to be confused; for he seems not to understand what the antitypical shewbread is, nor what eating it means.

Not all Bible Truth, nor even all spiritual Truth is meant by the shewbread. The shewbread, which could be eaten only by the priests (David's eating it was an exception to the rule, partly because of his semi-priestly character as the Lord's anointed, and partly because as such he typed our Pastor, who though therein typed as the Lord's anointed executive, was from another standpoint a priest), typifies something that only the antitypical priests could appropriate to themselves, and this is everything involved in the Sarah Covenant promises. Hence the Sarah Covenant promises—those that God gives to the Christ class alone—are the antitypical shewbread. Again, not only does the propounder of the question not understand what is typed by the shewbread, but he also does not understand what is typed by eating it. Eating the antitypical shewbread does not mean to understand the deep things; it means to appropriate to oneself, to make one's own, the promises of the Sarah Covenant. And since these are made alone to the antitypical priests, the Christ class, none but the Christ class can really claim them, really take them to himself as God's promises to him. Hence neither the Youthful Worthies, nor any others of the non-priestly classes, can eat the antitypical shewbread. The Sarah Covenant, which in its narrow sense consists of the promises to the Divine class, is not the part of the Oath-bound Covenant belonging to the Youthful Worthies. It is the earthly features of the Oath-bound Covenant—such as belonged to the Ancient Worthies—that are given to the Youthful Worthies; and these parts of the Oath-bound Covenant are not represented by the shewbread; nor does the acceptance of these for themselves by the Youthful Worthies antitype the eating of the shewbread; for none but priests were allowed to eat of it. That the Youthful Worthies understand the deep things, is, as we have already indicated, due to the fact that they are consecrated; and

the consecrated have always been privileged to understand, and always will be privileged to understand the Truth as due. Thus the Ancient Worthies were privileged to understand all the Truth due in their days; so, too, will the restitution class understand all of the Bible as it becomes due for them. What St. Paul says in 1 Cor. 2: 14 does not contradict this; for between Pentecost and 1881, to which time alone his words are limited, all the consecrated were New Creatures; hence during that time the term *New Creature* and the term *consecrated* applied to the same persons and were interchangeable. That St. Paul did not mean 1 Cor. 2: 14 to apply to all times is evident from the fact that the Bible teaches (Rev. 20: 12; Is. 29: 18, 24) that everything in the Bible will sometime be understood by the restitution class, who, of course, will not be New Creatures.

(67) Question: Under which covenant are the Youthful Worthies being developed?

Answer: Under certain earthly features of the Oath-bound Covenant, just as the Ancient Worthies were. These features are the following three promises in their earthly aspects (Gen. 22: 16-18): (1) Thy seed shall be as the sand of the seashore [which in contrast with the stars of heaven suggests perfect earthly human beings]; (2) thy seed shall possess the gates of his enemies [overcome Satan, sin, error and death]; and (3) in thy seed shall all the nations be blessed [as princes throughout the earth in association with the Ancient Worthies as the earthly phase of God's Kingdom they will bless the world with Millennial opportunities of restitution]. We rejoice with them that they are so highly favored.

Faith makes the darkest cloud withdraw;
Faith climbs the ladder Jacob saw,
Gives exercise to hope and love,
Brings ev'ry blessing from above.