

# THE EPIPHANY MESSENGER



A HELPING HAND  
FOR  
BIBLE STUDENTS

# EPIPHANY STUDIES

IN THE

# SCRIPTURES

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

---

SERIES X

---

## THE EPIPHANY MESSENGER

(For His Silver Jubilee As Such, Nov. 1, 1926 Nov. 1, 1941)

---

17,000 EDITION

---

“I Fell at His Feet to Worship Him And He Said unto Me,  
See Thou Do it Not; I am Thy Fellow servant, and {one}  
of Thy Brethren that Have the Testimony of Jesus; Worship  
God.” (Rev. 19: 10).

PAUL S. L. JOHNSON  
PHILADELPHIA, PA., U. S. A.  
1941

# 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: 810.

---

COPYRIGHT 1941

BY PAUL S. L. JOHNSON

## AUTHOR'S FOREWORD

GOD HAS been pleased to reveal every detail in the outworking of His plan beforehand by prophecy and type (Amos 3:7). Evidently, there should be in these two forms more details revealed as to the more than as to the less important seasons of His plan. Judging from the standpoint of this rule, the three most important seasons of His plan's elective periods are the Jewish Harvest, the Parousia and the Epiphany; for decidedly more prophetical and typical Scriptures focus their light on each one of these three periods than upon any other elective periods of God's counsel. When we consider the immense amount of prophecy and type that focused their light upon the person, character and offices of our Lord while He was in the flesh, upon the office and works of the Apostles and upon the condition and doings of God's nominal people of the Jewish Harvest, we will readily recognize it as one of the most important seasons in God's plan. Again, when we consider the immense number of prophetical and typical details relating to our Lord's, Bro. Russell's and certain of his supporters' Parousiac ministries, to their opponents' activities and to Satan's empire in its preparation for overthrow, we must conclude that the Parousia is one of the most important periods of God's plan. And, finally, when we consider the immense number of prophecies and types that relate to the actual overthrow of Satan's empire by the World War, World Revolution, World Anarchy and by the last phase of Jacob's Trouble, all four of these phases being mingled with famine and pestilence, Israel's large scale return to Palestine and conversion to Christ, the development of two new elect classes of God's people as such, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies, as the Court of the Epiphany Tabernacle, and the formation of the Epiphany Camp, consisting of the loyal justified and the converted loyal Jews, we should conclude that it is one of the three main seasons of God's plan. When, in addition to these considerations, we keep in mind that the Gospel Age is repeated in three miniatures during the

Epiphany and hence all types and prophecies that refer to the Jewish and Gospel Harvests and the Interim (the time between them) have three small applications in the Epiphany, and when we further consider that, in addition, several types and prophecies forecast the Epiphany messenger's experiences and acts, and that those that type and prophesy the work and experiences of the 49 star members, their associates and their opponents, have the three miniature applications to him, his associates and opponents, it becomes again manifest that the Epiphany is one of the three most important periods of all elective seasons of the Divine Plan of the Ages.

This book contains an exposition of some of the main prophecies and types that point out the Epiphany messenger in his experiences and works as the Divinely chosen teacher and executive, under the Lord Jesus as Head, as to Epiphany conditions and matters. Having been written by himself, it is autobiographical of him in his office work and experience. But it is autobiographical in a limited sense, *i.e.*, to some of the many types and fewer prophecies that forecast his office work and experiences, but that ignore his personal life apart from his office. This fact makes the book one of the only two of its kind in existence, since it consists largely of expositions of some of the Biblical types and prophecies treating of him as the Epiphany messenger. He is aware of the fact that some will be disposed to accuse him of conceit, pride or arrogance for so writing of himself, as in the past some have sneeringly referred to him as one who "sees himself in the Scriptures." At least these sneerers will admit that certainly our Lord did "see Himself in the Scriptures" without the least conceit, pride or arrogance. Doubtless most of these sneerers will admit that our beloved and saintly Pastor likewise did "see himself in the Scriptures," and that without the least conceit, pride or arrogance. While it is not recorded of him, St. Paul doubtless did also "see himself in the Scriptures," and we may be sure without the least conceit, pride or arrogance. Is it not possible, yea, altogether probable, that the Lord, who appointed the author to be the Epiphany messenger, and who later gave him to see various types and prophecies that relate to his experiences and work as such, gave him previously the development in grace that would enable him without conceit, pride or arrogance to

“see himself in the Scriptures” as the one that Divine grace, finding faithful in the lower service of one of the leading pilgrims, promoted to the office of the Epiphany messenger without detriment to his character through the inevitable accompaniments of that office? If another thinks that he could not “see himself in the Scriptures” without conceit, pride or arrogance, let him consider that some others than he may by Divine grace have been given the Lord’s Spirit in a sufficient measure to “see themselves in the Scriptures” without the weakness that these sneerers acknowledge themselves to have. Let them rather seek grace generously to thank God that some of their brethren have grace which such sneerers seem not to have; and such grace sought and found will cure them of the evil of heart that makes them so sneer, and will fill them with gracious praise of God for the favors that others than themselves have. Let all of us pray for this blessing on their behalf in rich measure.

Why do Epiphany types so markedly point out individuals, e.g., the Epiphany messenger? We reply: (1) The Epiphany as the special time of manifesting pertinent persons and movements demands it; (2) The development of 60 groups of Epiphany Levites and their leaders, because of their great diversity, in the few years of the Epiphany, especially in its first period, that devoted to dealing with Azazel’s Goat, requires it for their identification, especially that the Epiphany messenger might know how variously to deal with these leaders and groups, though in no case did he recognize such as typed until the antitype had for some time been fulfilling; (3) The need of encouraging him to go on in his office work has required it, otherwise through the many long-drawn-out calamities, attacks, misrepresentations, betrayals, desertions, etc., that have fallen to his lot, he would have fainted and (4) the understanding of the pertinent persons and groups as typed necessitates it, since it would in due time help each one to see his place and do his part.

There have arisen in the experiences of God’s people conditions that call for the elucidation of the Scriptures that are expounded in this book. The Lord over 25 years ago appointed the author to the office of teacher and executive as to His Epiphany work toward the Little Flock, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies, without, however, putting as such the first of these three classes into his charge. The Bible teaches

and experience corroborates that the envy, ill-will and unholy ambition of certain misleaders, through worldwide misrepresentations, have deceived the brethren into not accepting and cooperating with the Epiphany messenger in his Divinely appointed office and work. The Lord for many reasons has permitted the misrepresentations of such envy, ill-will and unholy ambition externally to turn the bulk of God's people against the former, in favor of the evildoers. But, "be not deceived! God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Now, after 25 years, what is the result? This, that the misleaders in all cases have become, some gross, and some refined false teachers, and failures unto bankruptcy as to accomplishing the work now due to be done according to God's plan. These two facts—false teachers and unfruitful executives as to God's Epiphany purposes, have they all proved themselves to be—stand out undeniably; and as a result, God's people, divided into 60 groups, are in confusion as to the what's, how's, whys and what-to-do of their present unhappy and seemingly hopelessly disastrous lot.

This book, among other reasons, is sent forth on this, the 25th, anniversary of the author's entering his present office, which he did, unconsciously to himself, Nov. 1, 1916, on his hearing of our beloved Pastor's passing beyond the veil, to point to the Divinely indicated way out of the confusion and disastrous lot prevalent now among God's people. And certainly, these two conditions make it most timely that on this, the silver jubilee anniversary of the author's entering into his office work, this book, that contains the diagnosis and prescribes the cure for the open sore of God's people, should go forth on its mission of blessing to the Israel of God everywhere; and it goes forth with the author's fervent prayer that the Lord bless it in its mission to His own. That grace, mercy, peace and truth may become the portion of all the Israel of God everywhere is the ardent hope and prayer of

Your brother and servant,  
PAUL S. L. JOHNSON.

Philadelphia, Pa.,  
Nov. 1, 1941.

# CONTENTS

## CHAPTER I. EPIPHANY SEASONS.

PARALLEL ANNUAL DAYS. THE MINIATURE GOSPEL AGES— SMALL, MEDIUM AND LARGE. THE SMALL MINIATURE MILLENNIUM. THE SMALL EIGHT WONDERFUL DAYS. THE LARGE EIGHT WONDERFUL DAYS. THE DAYS OF WAITING FOR THE WAVE LOAVES' PRESENTATION. PARALLELS OF THE PAROUSIA AND THE EPIPHANY.....	9
---	---

## CHAPTER II. SHORTER FORECASTS.

THE ONE AND TWO OF DEUT. 32:30. THE ANGEL OF REV. 10:9, 10; OF 22:10, 11. THE EIGHT PRINCIPAL MEN OF MIC. 5:5. MEDAD. JONATHAN, ELEAZAR, JEDAIAH, JACOB, AARON, ITHAMAR, ZECHARIAH.....	109
--	-----

## CHAPTER III. NEHEMIAH—TYPE AND SMALL ANTITYPE.

THE LARGE ANTITYPE. GRIEF OVER JERUSALEM'S DESOLATION. NEHEMIAH'S COMMISSION. INSPECTION. BUILDING THE WALL. OPPOSITION. OPPRESSION. INTRIGUES. GUARDING THE WORK. VARIOUS PREACHINGS. THE TABERNACLE EXPERIENCES AND SERVICES. BETHEL EVENTS AND EXPERIENCES.....	143
--	-----

## CHAPTER IV. ZERUBBABEL AND EZRA—TYPE AND SMALL ANTITYPE.

THE COMMISSION. SIXTY GREAT COMPANY GROUPS. ALTAR AND FOUNDATION. STOPPAGE OF BUILDING, RENEWAL AND COMPLETION OF BUILDING. TEMPLE MINISTRIES. EZRA'S COMMISSION. HIS FELLOW TRAVELERS AND JOURNEY. HIS ATTITUDE AND ACTS TOWARD THE SINNING.....	207
---	-----

## CHAPTER V. MORDECAI AND ESTHER—TYPE AND ANTITYPE.

TWO PUBLIC FEASTS. TWO CALLS. A WICKED PLAN. COUNTERACTIVE EFFORTS. TWO PRIVATE FEASTS. THE CONSPIRACY OVERTHROWN. THE FINAL BATTLE. THE AFTERMATH.....	275
--	-----

CHAPTER VI.  
THE SMALL PARALLELS OF JUDAH'S AND  
ISRAEL'S KINGS.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS. EARLIER KINGS OF ISRAEL. EARLIER KINGS OF JUDAH. THE MIDDLE KINGS OF JUDAH. THE LATER KINGS OF ISRAEL. THE LATER KINGS OF JUDAH. THE LITTLE JEREMIAH.....	333
--	-----

CHAPTER VII.  
THE ANTITYPICAL JUDGES, LARGE AND SMALL

GENERAL REMARKS. OTHNIEL. EHUD. SHAMGAR. DEBORAH AND BARAK. GIDEON. ABIMELECH, JEPHTHAH. SAMSON, MICAH. THE LEVITE AND THE DANITES.....	419
---	-----

CHAPTER VIII.  
JOB—TYPE AND ANTITYPE.

PRELUDE. JOB'S TWELVE SPEECHES. ELIPHAZ'S THREE SPEECHES. BILDAD'S THREE SPEECHES. ZOPHAR'S TWO SPEECHES. FLIHU'S SPEECH. JEHOVAH'S THREE SPEECHES. EPILOGUE .....	531
--	-----

CHAPTER IX.  
JOSEPH—TYPE AND SMALLEST ANTITYPE.

INTRODUCTORY CONSIDERATION. JOSEPH'S HUMILIATIONS. JOSEPH'S PREFAMINE EXALTATION. JOSEPH'S FAMINE DEALINGS WITH HIS BROTHERS AND FATHER. JOSEPH'S FINAL DEALINGS WITH HIS FATHER INCLUDING THE FATHER'S FAREWELL TO HIS SONS. THE FINAL SCENES.....	601
---	-----

CHAPTER X.  
CONCLUDING THOUGHTS.

GENERAL REMARKS ON OTHER PERTINENT TYPES. PROPER VIEW OF PAST EVIL DEEDS. EXHORTATIONS FOR THE FUTURE. GLORIOUS OUTLOOK. ....	667
---	-----

## CHAPTER I.

### EPIPHANY SEASONS.

PARALLEL ANNUAL DAYS. THE MINIATURE GOSPEL AGES—SMALL, MEDIUM AND LARGE. THE SMALL MINIATURE MILLENNIUM. THE SMALL EIGHT WONDERFUL DAYS. THE LARGE EIGHT WONDERFUL DAYS. THE DAYS OF WAITING FOR THE WAVE LOAVES' PRESENTATION. PARALLELS OF THE PAROUSIA AND THE EPIPHANY.

THE Apostle Paul, in 1 Tim. 6: 14, 15, indicates that the Epiphany as a period is divided into various seasons, as can be seen quite clearly in Rotherham's rendering: "Keep the commandment without spot, free from reproach, until the forthshining of our Lord Jesus Christ, which *in its own fit times* the happy and only Potentate will show." The I.V. renders these verses even more clearly, as follows: "Keep the commandment spotless, unrebutable, until our Lord Jesus Christ's Epiphany, which *in its own seasons* He, the blessed and only Potentate, will manifest." That the Epiphany is a period of time is not only evident from the statement of the passage just quoted on its having seasons, but is also manifest from 2 Tim. 4: 1: "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick [fallen angels and New Creatures] and the dead [Adam's fallen race] at His appearing [Epiphany] and kingdom." Accordingly, Adam's fallen race will be judged during the Millennium, during the Kingdom, and the fallen angels and New Creatures during the Epiphany. The other four occurrences of the Greek word *epiphaneia* in the New Testament use it in the sense of an activity, *bright shining*, *i.e.*, manifestation of persons, principles and things by the bright shining of the Truth. Such an activity can take place at any time, *e.g.*, in the Jewish Harvest (2 Tim. 1: 10), during the Epiphany as a period (2 Thes. 2: 8) or during the entire period of our Lord's Second Presence, *i.e.*, during the Parousia, Epiphaneia and Basileia (2 Tim. 4: 8; Tit. 2: 13).

The Scriptures show that so far as the world is concerned, the Epiphany is divided into four distinct periods: *i.e.*, (1) the War and its aftermath, (2) the Revolution, or Armageddon, and its aftermath, (3) Anarchy and its aftermath, and (4) Jacob's Trouble and its aftermath. But so far as God's people are concerned, it is divided into two periods: (1) the time in which the Priesthood deals with Azazel's Goat, and (2) the time in which the Priesthood deals with the cleansed Levites. In this chapter, from the standpoint of their relation to God's people, we will deal with the first of these two periods alone. The Bible and fulfilled facts prove that of this first period there are at least eight seasons, more or less touching on or reaching into one another, as the case may be.

The first of these to be considered may fittingly be called the parallel annual days. This period was recognized by the author as he viewed certain fulfilled facts. In his dealing with various Levite leaders he noted that when a Levite leader in one of the three Levite groups—antitypical Gershonites, Merarites and Kohathites—would do a certain revolutionary thing, a Levite leader of another Levite group would do a parallel revolutionary thing exactly one year to the day later. *E.g.*, exactly a year from the time that H.J. Shearn and Wm. Crawford (Libnite Gershonite Levite leaders) did certain revolutionary things, J.F. Rutherford and J. Hemery (Mahlite Merarite Levite leaders) did respectively similar revolutionary things. Then, exactly a year after the latters' pertinent revolutionisms I.F. Hoskins and I.I. Margeson (Shimite Gershonite Levite leaders) did respectively similar revolutionary things. And still exactly a year later C.E. Heard and W.M. Wisdom (Mushite Merarite Levite leaders) did respectively similar revolutionary things. Please note that the first year (parts of 1915 and 1916) the *Libnite* Gershonite Levite leaders did revolutionary things; and exactly two years later (parts of 1917 and 1918) the *Shimite* Gershonite Levite leaders did similar revolutionary

things. Again, please note that the second year from the start of these cycles (parts of 1916 and 1917) the Mahlite Merarite Levite leaders did certain revolutionary things; and exactly two years later (1918, 1919) the Mushite Merarite Levite leaders did similar revolutionary things. Thus as between the two older subdivisions (Libnites and Mahlites) of the antitypical Gershonites and Merarites respectively, their parallel revolutionisms were exactly a year apart; but as between the older and the younger subdivisions, *viz.*, the Libnite and Shimite Gershonites as one set of these, and the Mahlite and Mushite Merarites as the other set of these, the parallel revolts were two years apart.

As there are two subdivisions among the Gershonites and also two among the Merarites, thus four subdivisions in all, so are there four subdivisions among the Kohathites. The first leader of a subdivision of these to become active was Menta Sturgeon (parts of 1916 and 1917), whose movement corresponds to the Uzzielites; the next was A.I. Ritchie (parts of 1917 and 1918), whose movement corresponds to the Hebronites. These two movements died, the Scriptural proof of which will be given in Chapter IX. There have, however, been successor movements to these. The leader of the third group—the Izeharites—is Carl Olson, whose first activities were in parts of 1918 and 1919. The leader of the fourth group—the Amramites—is R.H. Hirsh, whose first pertinent activities were during parts of 1919 and 1920. It will be seen that the Uzzielite Kohathites, in Menta Sturgeon, began their activities a year after the Libnite Gershonites began theirs, in H.J. Shearn. This resulted in Menta Sturgeon's doing parallel things at the same time as J.F. Rutherford. Accordingly, also, the first activities of the Amramite Kohathites, in R.H. Hirsh, came exactly a year after the parallel acts of the Mushite Merarites, in C.E. Heard. After in 1918 we recognized these annual parallels, we watched various ones who acted as revolutionary leaders and always

found their similar revolutionisms coming on the anniversaries. We could do this only imperfectly in the cases of C.E. Heard and Carl Olson, being able to secure information on comparatively few of their revolutionisms and the dates of the same. But in the cases of H.J. Shearn, J.F. Rutherford, I.F. Hoskins, Menta Sturgeon, A.I. Ritchie and R.H. Hirsh, with whom we had intimate and personal dealings, we were able to note many of such. We have in Vol. VII, Chap. III, under the twelfth set of evils there exposed, given very many of these, and we refer our readers to them in proof of the statements of this and the preceding paragraph. These facts prove that the annual parallels involving the revolutionisms of the leaders of the subdivisions of the Gershonite, Merarite and Kohathite Levites furnish us with one of the Epiphany seasons.

In Vol. IX, Chap. III, Scriptural proof is given that during the Epiphany we are living over on a small scale the Gospel Age, in that we showed that the 1874-1914 unbelief of nominal Spiritual Israel as to entering and conquering antitypical Canaan, the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit, as the second application of the type of Num. 13 and 14, occasioned a second wilderness wandering—the Epiphany wandering—just as the 29-69 A.D. unbelief of the Jewish Harvest's nominal people of God in the first application of Num. 13 and 14 occasioned the first wilderness wandering—the Gospel-Age wilderness wandering of God's people. Accordingly, we see that in the Epiphany we are living over the Gospel Age on a small scale. In contrast with one another, we may designate the involved periods: the Large Gospel Age and the Miniature Gospel Age. And the facts of the case prove that there are three of such miniature Gospel Ages. This is due to the fact that the real Little Flock of Spiritual Israel deals with the nominal Little Flock of Spiritual Israel, *i.e.*, the Great Company, in three distinct groups: (1) the unclean Truth Levites manifested under bad Levite leadership; (2) the good Truth Levites

manifested under good Levite leadership; and (3) the nominal-church Levites manifested under Foolish Virgin leadership. The largest miniature Gospel Age, which covers the whole Epiphany, 1914-1954, is the period of the manifestation of the third class mentioned above, and may be called the Large Miniature Gospel Age; the next smaller miniature Gospel Age, which covers the period from the Summer of 1918 to late 1937, is the period of the manifestation of the second class mentioned above, and may be called the Medium Miniature Gospel Age; and the smallest miniature Gospel Age, which is the period from the Spring of 1915 into the Summer of 1920, may be called the Small Miniature Gospel Age.

In time the Small Miniature Gospel Age compares with the Large Gospel Age as a day to a year, *i.e.*, the Divinely designated events, acts and persons of one year in the Large Gospel Age appear on the stage of the Small Miniature Gospel Age in a day. In other words, there are as many days in the Small Miniature Gospel Age as there are years in the Large Gospel Age. In time the Medium Miniature Gospel Age compares with the Large Gospel Age as a year to a century, *i.e.*, the Divinely designated events, acts and persons of one century in the Large Gospel Age appear on the stage of the Medium Miniature Gospel Age in a year of the Medium Miniature Gospel Age. In other words, there were as many centuries and a fraction in the Large Gospel Age as there were years and a fraction in the Medium Miniature Gospel Age. In time the Large Miniature Gospel Age compares with the Large Gospel Age as 25 months compare with a century, *i.e.*, the Divinely designated events, acts and persons of a century in the Large Gospel Age appear on the stage of the Large Miniature Gospel Age in 25 months. In other words, there are as many 25-month periods in the Large Miniature Gospel Age, 1914-1954, as there are centuries in the Gospel Age. This does not mean that every event, act or person of

the Gospel Age had parallels in these three miniatures. Rather, it means that only such events, acts and persons as have been connected with the outworking of God's Gospel-Age Plan and the relation of God's people to that Plan, and such as have had an appreciable influence on the outworking of that Plan and God's people as related to it, have parallels in these miniatures. Of these three miniatures the Small one first, then the Large one next, and, finally, the Medium one, came to our attention, and became clear to us.

The evening of Feb. 16, 1918, the anniversary of our Pastor's birthday, we delivered a lecture to the Philadelphia Epiphany Church on That Faithful and Wise Servant; and at the end of the service we offered to lecture on the morrow on That Evil Servant, if the Ecclesia desired it. Thereupon it voted unanimously that we should so do. Just after we left the meeting place, R.G. Jolly remarked to us that A.I. Ritchie had told him that there were as many days from the day of Bro. Russell's death, Oct. 31, 1916, to the day J.F. Rutherford ousted the four directors, July 17, 1917, as there were years from 539 to 799 A.D. Nothing was said as to this suggesting a Gospel Age re-enacted on a small scale. This thought of A.I. Ritchie, as stated, struck us as remarkable. But upon investigation we found that A.I. Ritchie's figures were one day short, hence that from the day of the toga scene, Oct. 30, 1916, when Bro. Russell in reporting his part of the inkhorn man's work as finished thereby resigned his office as that Servant, to the day of the four directors' ousting there were as many days as there were years from 539, when the papacy began its civil rule as distinct from its ecclesiastical rule, until 799, when the papal Millennium began. We had already recognized that the Society was a Little Babylon; and as we studied over this matter and compared it with Church history (Kurtz, Vol. I, 487) we learned that Pope Leo III (795 to 816) in 799 had for his power-grasping a great struggle with an opposition

party at Rome, in which he nearly lost his life, and from which he fled to Charlemagne in France for protection. The result of Charlemagne's intervention was the pope's being made in 799 secure in his position and his beginning the papal Millennial reign. The great similarity of these events to the power-grasping of J.F.R., his severe verbal beating by six brothers in the Bethel dining room, July 17, 1917, in protest at his power-grasping in attempting to oust the four directors, and his fleeing to his new Board for protection, which that day installed him firmly in power, raised the question in our mind, Have we in Little Babylon a little Roman Catholic Church, with a little pope, J.F.R., as its head?

We then instituted a comparison of Church historical persons, events and acts from 539 to 799 with those among the Lord's people from Oct. 30, 1916, to July 17, 1917, and found a remarkable set of correspondencies between the pertinent persons, events and acts of the former set of years and corresponding latter set of days. Next we worked out a table of corresponding years backward from 539 to B.C. 2, the year of our Lord's birth, and days backward from Oct. 30, 1916 to the day corresponding to B.C. 2, making each day correspond to the proper year from the standpoint of a day in the small period standing for a year in the large period, and thus found that from this standpoint May 9, 1915 corresponded to 2 B.C. Then we worked forward these two periods, comparatively a day for a year, and found that the year in which this matter was worked out, 1918, corresponded with Aug. 9, 1920. Then these two comparative sets of chronology were placed in a large loose-leaf book, the Gospel-Age years on the left-hand pages of the book when open and the Small-Miniature-Gospel-Age days on its right-hand pages, the corresponding years and days on the parallel lines of the pages. Then followed a comparison of Church historical events, acts and persons, with their pertinent years,

with the events, acts and persons, with their pertinent days in the Small Miniature, as we had these recorded in our diaries and other sources of pertinent information. We found, as should be expected from God's way of keeping time, that the days of this Miniature began at 6 P.M. It was about 10 P.M., Feb. 16, 1918, when Bro. Jolly told us of A.I. Ritchie's statement, that there were as many days from Oct. 31, 1916 (actually from Oct. 30, 1916) to July 17, 1917, as there were years from 539 to 799. Accordingly, from God's standpoint we heard of this matter first, Feb. 17, 1918, and this date in the Small Miniature corresponds to the year 1014 A.D.

This date made it possible for this matter to be subjected to an acid test: If it were true it would enable us to know beforehand, from early in 1918, what in a general way, but not in detail, would happen among God's people until Aug. 9, 1920, and the dates on which the pertinent things would occur. Many, many times it was subjected to just such a test; and it always stood the test. Thus, e.g., we anticipated events connected with the Fort Pitt Committee and the P.B.I. during the Spring, Summer and Fall of 1918. Among others, the following may be cited: During early May, 1918, we told R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and two other friends of the Philadelphia Ecclesia that these two brothers and ourself would on July 27, 1918, meet a severe defeat at the hands of the other four members of the Fort Pitt Committee, whom in Vol. VII, Chap. III, we called the group, but that on July 29 (which began at 6 P.M., July 28) we would turn upon them and give them a crushing defeat. Of course, we did not know beforehand the details, but we did foreknow the generalities as just given. How did we know these events over two months ahead of time? By certain events of the years 1174 and 1176. The forecast events occurred at the Asbury Park Convention, which was held July 26-29, and that on the dates forecast over two months beforehand. The circumstances were

these: The people of Lombardy, Italy, in their love for freedom were for centuries in conflict with the Holy Roman Empire, which sought their subjugation. At the time in question Frederick Barbarossa was the emperor of that empire. He was determined to crush the liberty-loving Lombards. Hence he invaded Lombardy with a large army, and in 1174 severely defeated the Lombards; after defeating them he went to Rome and other parts of Italy, and did not return to Lombardy for two years. In the meantime the Lombard leader reorganized his forces; and when Frederick Barbarossa returned war broke out again, resulting in the complete crushing of the emperor, in 1176.

The corresponding days in the Small Miniature were July 27 and 29, 1918. On July 27 the group, through H.C. Rockwell, began to attack the other three Fort Pitt Committee members, more particularly ourself. H.C. Rockwell's savage attack of us was recognized as such by the friends in general, and, among others, aroused the sympathy of F.H. McGee, one of the group's members, toward us. Contrary to their promise of July 18 not to bring up the Committee's disagreements in the presence of the convention, I.F. Hoskins and I.I. Margeson the afternoon of July 27 called a meeting of the elders and deacons, to which many others came, and presented a misleading account of the Fort Pitt Committee's doings, accusing the three brothers, especially us, of obstructing the Lord's work. They called for the dissolution of the Fort Pitt Committee and the election of a new committee free of the alleged obstructers. Many indeed were the misrepresentations by which they secured the support of the bulk of the conventioners to favor the dissolution of the Fort Pitt Committee late that afternoon. That night they secured the election of the four members of the group and three other brothers, as a new committee. Sunday A.M., while the new committee was holding a meeting to organize itself, etc., we were the convention speaker. And, true to the notice that we

gave the group, that if it would bring up the trouble in the Fort Pitt Committee before the convention, we would give a full exposure of the group's course throughout the existence of that committee, we laid bare the real situation in that committee. This we did, not only to reply to the misrepresentations of the day before, whereby the group's spokesmen secured the overthrow of the Fort Pitt Committee, but also to give our sympathizers the facts necessary to arm them for the onslaught that we were planning to make on the group at the convention business meeting July 29.

Against the group's plan to organize a corporation to control the general work of the Church, which was the main cause of the dissension in the Fort Pitt Committee, and which led to a deadlock there, we determined to launch our counter attack. Our speaking against the group's purpose of forming a corporation to control the general work of the Church led to many desiring to hear the question debated and consequently to the convention's appointing I.F. Hoskins as the defender of that view and us as the opponent of that view, to debate the question as to whether a corporation should be formed to administer the work of the General Church. We were appointed to speak first and discussed the question along the lines laid down in Vol. VI, Chap. II, on the Church completely organized. Then I.F. Hoskins spoke, but his defense of his position was so weak as to make him appear ridiculous. Asked later why he and his fellow committee members declined to appear and discuss the Fort Pitt Committee's affairs at the Sept. and Dec., 1918, conventions at Philadelphia, he said of the only two set debates ever held by him and us with each other, "Every time I appear on a platform to debate with Bro. Johnson he makes me look like thirty cents." This was due to the fact that his side of the question looked like thirty cents in contrast with our side of it. After that debate (the evening of July 28, July 29 God's time) there was a general repudiation of the

group's viewpoint by the conventioners on the subject and an endorsement of our viewpoint.

The morning of the 29th was by the convention devoted to business. The new committee brought in its recommendations, which were; to publish a regular semi-monthly magazine, for which it had already appointed an editorial committee of five, and to form a corporation. Both of these recommendations we opposed and they were voted down almost unanimously. If our memory serves us right, its editorial committee was by the convention's vote dissolved. The P.B.I. Committee was by the convention permitted to publish a monthly bulletin, which was to be devoted to giving merely news-items of general interest to the Church, and which, contrary to the convention's instruction, they misused for propaganda purposes, *e.g.*, to advocate the formation of a corporation. They also went beyond their instruction, by having F.H. McGee and J.D. Wright publish several attacks on us, to which we replied in the first issue of *The Present Truth*. The group left that convention completely defeated and greatly discredited. Indeed, their leader, I.F. Hoskins, was reduced to great abjectness by F.H. McGee for his Asbury Park Convention course toward us, even as Frederick Barbarossa was greatly humiliated by Pope Alexander III. F.H. McGee was so shocked at the gross breach of faith against us on the part of I.F. Hoskins, I.I. Margeson and H.C. Rockwell and their unfair attacks on us that with great difficulty was he persuaded to withdraw his tendered resignation from the P.B.I. Board. Thus the forecasts that we had made over two months before for July 27 and 29, 1918, were fulfilled, P.B.I. leaders forcing the course of the pertinent events.

Some general remarks on the Small Miniature Gospel Age should be made here, in order better to clarify it. As shown above, it began on May 9, 1915, as the day corresponding to the year 2 B.C., our Lord's birth year. The way the events developed, it appears that, after our Pastor's

death, corresponding to 540, we were privileged to play a twofold role in it (in fact, we have been privileged to play the same two roles in the other two miniatures). On the days following Oct. 31, 1916 and corresponding to the Large-Gospel-Age years, we were privileged: (1) in matters of teaching to set forth teachings that correspond with the doctrines that the Lord's special mouthpieces, star-members, were privileged to set forth in the corresponding years; and (2) in matters of arrangement for the Lord's work (executive matters) to stand for the things corresponding to the thing for which civil rulers stood in opposition to the wrong policies of Greek Catholicism, the papacy and Protestant sectarianism, and for the things for which Bro. Russell stood against the policies of the sifters of the Harvest. On the other hand, the Libnite Gershonites (those following H.J. Shearn and Wm. Crawford) corresponded to the Greek Catholics, especially from the second to the ninth centuries, they in their executive deputyships corresponding to the Roman emperor. The Societyites nearly up to the Society election, Jan., 1918, corresponded to the Roman Catholics, *i.e.*, nearly up to the end of the tenth century, with J.F. Rutherford corresponding to the pope and the Board corresponding to the changing rulers of the West. Then, beginning before the functioning of the Fort Pitt Committee, the Shimite Gershonites correspond *chiefly* to the Roman Catholics from near the end of the tenth century until about the Reformation time, F.H. McGee corresponding to the pope, and the P.B.I. Committee to the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. But during this time, as a *subordinate* feature, the Societyites, etc., continued their previous role as little papists, etc. Sometime before the time of the Society's convention, May 29–June 1, 1919, at Brooklyn, the Societyites again assumed the *chief* role of the little Roman Catholic Church, with J.F.R. as the little pope and the Board as rulers, corresponding to the Roman

Catholic Church, with its pope and Romanist rulers, especially the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, until he was made powerless, as controller. This in general continued to the end of the Small Miniature.

Thus we see that the larger roles of the Small Miniature correspond to the larger roles played during the Gospel Age proper. The parts that H.J. Shearn and his followers played up to the time of the Summer of 1917 corresponded to the part that the Greek Church and its leaders, who were always more or less opposed by the papal party, played. The part that J.F.R. and his followers played from early in 1916 to late in 1917, corresponded to the chief part that the pope and his supporters played from about 250 A.D. to the end of the tenth century. The part that F.H. McGee and his supporters played from about Dec. 1, 1917, to about May 1, 1919, corresponded to the chief part that the papal party played from near the end of the tenth century until well into the fifteenth century, the Societyites during this period playing a subordinate part as the little papal parties of these times; and then from that time onward to about Aug., 1920, the part that J.F.R. and his supporters played corresponded to the chief part that the papal party played from about the middle of the fifteenth century until the end of the Small Miniature. During all these times, beginning with Constantine the Great, the rulers favoring the apostasy corresponded to executive officials as deputies of the above-mentioned groups.

During all these movements among Truth people minor movements were led by various Kohathite leaders who, while more or less opposing the Merarite and Gershonite chief leaders, were more or less affiliated with them. Thus Menta Sturgeon was more or less opposed to the little papal parties and was more or less in spirit related to the form of opposition that the Libnite movement represented. Hence he corresponds more or less to certain deputized executives and leaders among the Greeks. And A.I. Ritchie was more

or less opposed to the papal parties, yet was more or less affiliated with the Mahlite Merarite and the Shimite Gershonite movements. Hence we find him corresponding, as a deputized executive, to certain rulers of the Ostrogoths and Franks. Also, Carl Olson, as a teacher, seems to correspond to certain protesting Romanist theologians in England; R.H. Hirsh, as a teacher, corresponds to crown-lost leaders in the Protestant sects, while C.E. Heard, as a teacher, corresponds to Romanist theologians not quite loyal to the papacy, but nearer so than those protesting Romanist theologians who correspond to Carl Olson. These general outlines will help us to have a better view of the details to be given later. These details we will give in parallel columns, with the correspondencies set over against one another. We cannot give many of these details, for that would make this chapter almost the size of a book. But we will trace the main ones connected with the more important epochs of the two respective periods. We will date each set of events, beginning with the events of the Smyrna period toward the end of John's life. In a few cases we construe sometimes the date in the Gospel Age from the corresponding date of the Small Miniature and sometimes *vice versa*, and that because of some uncertainty as to the exact date in one or the other of the cases. We will give the Gospel-Age events in the first column and those of the Small Miniature in the second column. We repeat the fact that the days in the Small Miniature begin at 6 P.M., not at midnight, which must be kept in mind in the following.

A.D.	1915
90 John's first Epistle influences certain brethren to give him some relief in his burdensome service.	8/8 Bro. Russell's pertinent letter induces the London Tabernacle to relieve him of some of his financial burdens in the Lord's work, by assuming its current mortgage-interest and other current expenses.

- 95 John's third Epistle and Revelation, written in an anti-clerical sense, curtails clericalism somewhat.
- 103 The attitude of clericalists begins to convey the thought that they were developed enough to be able to sustain the Church without the supervision of the Apostles and star-members.
- 165 The king of the Longobards, allied with the Marcomani (both Germanic nations), is defeated by the Romans on the Danube.
- 166 First Asiatic synod is held which presumes to legislate for the Asiatic churches.
- 173 A very large Asiatic Synod is held; it seeks to get control of the Asiatic Church; but interested leaders effect a restraint on its plans.
- 202 Pantaenus' (leader in the Alexandrian Church) and Irenaeus' deaths become the occasion for clericalism's advancement.
- 8/13 Bro. Russell's letter to the London Branch managers curbs J. Hemery's clericalism, by appointing the other two managers each to preach once a month, and other elders occasionally, in the London Tabernacle.
- 8/21 The London managers' informing Bro. Russell that the Tabernacle had assumed all current expenses was their first intimation that it could get along without Bro. Russell's supervision.
- 10/22 Bro. Johnson and his host and hostess at New Berlin, Ohio, receive a setback from the usurping majority in their efforts to reunite the divided Church there.
- 10/23 The London Tabernacle elders discuss their taking control of all Tabernacle affairs.
- 10/30 Joint meeting of the London Tabernacle elders and deacons discusses ways and means of getting control of the Tabernacle's affairs. J. Hemery and sympathizers put restraint on this effort.
- 11/28 Clericalism in the London Tabernacle advances through H.J. Shearn's and W. Crawford's efforts to have its pulpit open to all elders of that church.

205 Tertullian sets forth the thought of the Father's supremacy, the Son's creation by, and subordination to the Father and the Spirit as the channel for God's work.

208 Epigonus, a Noëtian, identifies the Father and the Son, manifested, however, in two different modes.

208-243 The controversy on Modalism (the identity of the Father, Son and Spirit, manifested under three different forms) results in the defeat of Modalism.

238 Beryllus of Bostra, Arabia, teaches a sort of Modalism and is fought by the first outcropping of trinitarianism in the theologians [extremes of error fighting one another].

12/1 Bro. Russell in Z '15, 359, pars. 7-17, sets forth the thought of the W.T.B. & T.S. being the absolute controller of the I.B.S.A. and the P.P.A., through which two latter corporations the former one does its work.

12/4 H.J. Sheam's resolution, unanimously passed by the Tabernacle elders, to form separate Sunday night classes in N.E. London, is based on the thought of the identity of the W.T.B. & T.S. and the I.B.S.A., working in different modes.

12/4-1/8, 1916 The controversy on the N.E. London evening meetings, based on the thought of the identity of the W.T.B. & T.S., P.P.A. and the I.B.S.A., results in the defeat of that idea, by a majority of the Tabernacle elders' claiming that the manner of holding those meetings disagrees with the identity of the three corporations.

1/3, 1916 First separate meeting of the N.E. London friends, its dependency on the London Tabernacle being opposed by the Crouch End elders, supported by H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford, which was the first step taken toward separating the identity of the three corporations while stressing their unity.

243 Anti-Beryllian views, are widely circulated among the clergy, resulting in their rejecting the views of Beryllus.

244 Under Origen's teachings an Arabian synod rejects the views of Beryllus, who recants; and it accepts Origen's view of the separate personalities of the Father and the Son and the Son's being without a beginning.

251 Cyprian of Carthage and Cornelius of Rome strongly advocate the doctrine of the apostolic succession of bishops and the subordination of the elders and laity to them.

254 Origen's death.

258 Cyprian's death.

262 Dionysius of Rome teaches the separate, eternal and consubstantial [pertaining to oneness of being] existence of the Logos as to the Father, whose view is endorsed by Dionysius of Alexandria.

1/8 The corporational implications of the N.E. London first meeting are discussed by the Tabernacle elders, resulting in further appointments made there.

1/9 Under W. Crawford's influence some of the Tabernacle elders, by implications as to the N.E. London meetings, take the view that the two corporations are separate and distinct, with the I.B.S.A. being always implied in the existence of the W.T.B. & T.S.

1/16 H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford strongly advocate that all Tabernacle elders have the right of regular access to its pulpit as our Pastor's representatives and that the deacons and ecclesia should be subject to this course.

1/19 W. Crawford changes his view into more independence of the I.B.S.A. from the W.T.B. & T.S.

1/23 H.J. Shearn increases his convictions on the right of the London elders to access to the Tabernacle pulpit.

1/27 J.F. Rutherford sets forth the substantial identity of the W.T.B. & T.S. and the I.B.S.A., and H.J. Shearn sets forth the corporational implications of the separate and unauthorized existence of the Crouch End meetings as involving

262-325 The controversy over the Son's consubstantiality with the Father, quiescent for awhile, breaks out afresh in 262 and continues increasingly until settled officially at the Nicene Council in 325

264 A synod at Antioch debates, in a trinitarianistic-developing sense, the unitarianistic non-preexistence of our Lord held by Paul of Samosata, who by keenness and equivocal terms nonplussed his adversaries for several years.

269 Paul of Samosata, an ancient unitarian, is condemned by a synod of trinitarianistic-developing members.

271 The holders of trinitarianistic-developing views condemn the view that separates the Father and the Son as persons without holding to the unity of their being.

the separate and equal existence of the I.B.S.A. as always involved in the existence of the W.T.B. & T.S.

1/27-3/30 The controversy on the corporational implications of the meetings of N.E. London and Crouch End friends, quiescent for awhile, breaks out 1/27 with more vigor, increasingly carries on and ends officially 3/30 in favor of the substantial unity of the W.T.B. & T.S. and the I.B.S.A., by the decision of a smaller committee of the Tabernacle elders on the relation of the Tabernacle and the Crouch End meetings, qualifiedly accepted by the elders.

1/29 Some Tabernacle elders, led by H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford, debate with others, led by J. Hemery, the formers' corporational implicationary views on the Crouch End meetings and were by J. Hemery nonplussed for awhile.

2/3 The Shearno-Crawfordistic Tabernacle elders condemn the Hemeryistic elders' view as extreme.

2/5 In an elders' meeting the holders of the corporational implications of the separate N.E. London meetings condemn the view of those who hold that the W.T.B. & T.S. and the I.B.S.A.

272 Paul of Samosata, as an ancient unitarian, is expelled from his office by the trinitarianistic-developing groups.

are separate corporations, and are not in actuality one and the same thing.

2/6 J. Hemery and his supporting elders are temporarily displaced in their stand by the Shearno-Crawfordistic elders' securing the authorizing of the corporational implications in the Crouch End meetings, by the said meetings' being held under a temporary authorization from the elders.

275 Porphyry, the ablest infidel of ancient times, begins his work of 15 books against Christianity.

2/9 Bro. Eddington, a Tabernacle elder, begins a letter to the Tabernacle elders in favor of textbookism.

276 Porphyry completes the above-mentioned work against Christianity.

2/10 Bro. Eddington completes his letter to the Tabernacle elders in favor of textbookism.

278 Indecisive discussions on the relations of the Father and the Son, as to the Latter's alleged coeternity, consubstantiality and coequality with the Father, assume a more questioning aspect.

2/12 After lengthy discussion, in which half of the Tabernacle elders favor scheduling all Crouch End meetings, it is agreed to appoint a committee to investigate this subject and report at least a week before the elders should vote on it, this entire course showing the elders' uncertainty as to the implications of the Crouch End meetings on the question of relations of the W.T.B. & T.S. and the I.B.S.A. as to the latter's existence, essential unity and equality as always implied in that of the former.

299 Christian bishops discuss Porphyry's books against

3/4 Bro. Eddington's letter, objecting to Dawn studies,

against Christianity; and various of them decide to reply, e.g., Methodius of Tyre, Eusebius of Caesarea, Apollinarius of Laodicea.

318 The Arian controversy begins on the Father and the Son, as one being in two persons, the majority taking sides against Arius.

325 The Council of Nice sanctions the view of the Father's and the Son's coeternity, consubstantiality [oneness of being] and coequality.

334 Ulfilas, an Arian, prepares himself to be a missionary to the Visigoths.

339 Julian the Apostate, through the murder of his relatives by Constantine's three sons, begins his hatred of Christianity.

etc., is read to the Tabernacle elders, who as a body decline to discuss it, and send him word that individual elders will reply to his extreme textbookism.

3/23 Controversy in the Tabernacle elders' committee on essential unity and on the separateness of the Tabernacle and the Crouch End ecclesiæ is reported to the elders, with the majority favoring this view —a thing implying the essential unity, separateness, coexistence and equality of the W.T.B. & T.S. and the I.B. S.A.

3/30 The Tabernacle elders' committee qualifiedly approve of the relation of the Tabernacle and Crouch End ecclesiæ as being essentially one yet separate and equal—a thing that implies the essential unity, and actual separateness, coexistence and equality of the I.B.S.A. with the W.T.B. & T.S.

4/8 J., as a supporter of Bro. Russell's methods, arranges for his follow-up work to be done at Louisville, Ky., by a Sr. Wilson.

4/13 Bro. Eddington, through his supporters' being set aside by J. Hemery's main supporters, begins to write a paper renouncing the I.B.S.A. under Bro. Russell.

- 340 Ulfilas continues to prepare himself for converting the Visigoths to Arianism.
- 341 Ulfilas is consecrated missionary bishop to the Visigoths to convert them to Arianism.
- 348 Ulfilas begins his work among the Visigoths.
- 355 Pagan Visigoths violently persecute Ulfilas and his converts.
- 359 Ulfilas begins translating the Bible into Gothic, inventing the Gothic alphabet therefore.
- 362 Christian theologians debate the views of Julian the Apostate, the former barely defeating the latter in public.
- 378 Emperor Valens is defeated by the Goths after their conversion to Arianism.
- 379 Theodosius becomes emperor, adopting other tactics with the Goths, who seek to increase their conversionist work, and that against the emperor's wishes.
- 4/14 J. seeks to enlist Sr. Wilson to do his follow-up work regularly.
- 4/15 J. receives the privilege of conforming follow-up colporteurs to Bro. Russell's methods. Sr. Wilson accepts J.'s pertinent offer.
- 4/22 J. assures Sr. Wilson that Bro. Russell approved her doing J.'s follow-up work.
- 4/29 In certain quarters violent objection is raised against J.'s being "followed up" by colporteurs.
- 5/3 J. gives Sr. Wilson certain pertinent instruction as he for the first time uses her in his follow-up work under Bro. Russell's appointment.
- 5/6 The Tabernacle elders discuss Bro. Eddington's views on textbookism and Berean studies, and barely defeat them in argument and vote.
- 5/22 Menta Sturgeon, in charge of the pilgrim department at Brooklyn, receives a defeat on public meetings by J.'s colporteur claims.
- 5/23 Menta Sturgeon changes tactics with colporteurs, whose conversionist activities are sought to be increased by J.'s seeking to secure Sr. C. White as a companion for Sr. Wilson,

381 Council of Constantinople decrees the deity of the Holy Spirit, thus completing the doctrine of the trinity.

against Menta Sturgeon's wishes 5/25 J.F.R., the three British managers and others assert the implied coexistence, consubstantiality and coequality of the W.T.B. & T.S., the I.B.S.A. and the P.P.A.

A few remarks additional to those made before, when introducing the parallel Gospel Ages, will help us better to understand their foregoing features. The parallels so far compared with one another have as the key that unlocks them the thought of the falling away (1) in the form of church organization: bishops as distinct from the presbyters, and the clergy as distinct from the laity, (2) in the form of doctrine, especially as this concerns the trinity, and (3) in the form of practice, especially in executiveness. The chief of these three is the apostacy on trinitarianism. In the Small Miniature the W.T.B.&T.S. corresponds to the Father, the I.B.S.A. to the Son and the P.P.A. to the Holy Spirit. With several exceptions, wherein J.F.R.'s acts parallel those of the Bishop of Rome, the acts that parallel the apostatizing acts involved in the development of trinitarianism were wrought by what we may term the Hemery-Shearno-Crawfordistic movement that increasingly developed the theory of the always implied existence of the I.B.S.A. in the W.T.B.&T.S. (the Son's coeternity with the Father), its essential being (the Father's and the Son's consubstantiality) and its equality (the Father's and the Son's equality) with the W.T.B.&T.S. The Hemery-Shearno-Crawfordistic movement's policies of dealing with the dividing up of the London Tabernacle and the relations of the three churches to the two involved corporations, took such turns as increasingly implied that the I.B.S.A.'s existence was always implied in the existence of the W.T.B.&T.S., the older of the two corporations, that it was substantially

the same corporation as the W.T.B.&T.S. and that it was its equal in position, power and honor. With this view J. Hemery agreed. This view was the basis of their revolutionisms in the London Bethel and Tabernacle matters. Later they accepted the same views as to the relation of the P.P.A. to these two corporations, a view that J.F.R. first developed.

When the source of their revolutionary acts is recognized to be their false theories as to the relations of these three corporations, the development of these false theories will readily be seen to parallel exactly in act and time the development of trinitarianism; for the varied development of these false theories on the relation of these corporations proved to be the bases of the varied steps taken in breaking up the London Tabernacle members into three actual ecclesiastas. Had J. Hemery, H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford remained loyal to the priority, essential separateness and superiority of the W.T.B.&T.S. to the I.B.S.A., they would have accepted the former's policy (Bro. Russell's policy) to keep the London Tabernacle intact as the one Truth Church in London as dominating the situation, and would not have acted out theories that contradicted the former's priority, essential separateness and superiority over the latter, just as trinitarianism would not have been developed had the Father's sole eternity, sole substantial deity and sole supremacy been maintained. Their false theories on the relations of these two (and the later three) corporations are the point of contact that shows the parallels as to trinitarianism in the Gospel Age and in its Small Miniature, from 205 to 381 A.D. in the former, and from Dec. 1, 1915, to May 25, 1916, in the latter, clericalism marking the time from 95 to 202 A.D. in the former, and from Aug. 13 to Nov. 28, 1915 in the latter. The unfaithfulness of the involved managers, etc., made them amenable to uses parallel to those that Satan made of the apostates of the first four centuries of the Gospel Age. My soul, walk carefully!

- 381 Ulfilas, Arian missionary and converter of the Visigoths, sickens and dies at Constantinople.
- 382 Theodosius conciliates the Goths, enrolls many of them in his army and advances their leaders.
- 385 Visigoths exercise more or less wavering in their loyalty to Theodosius.
- 386 The Ostrogoths attempt to invade Theodosius' territory and meet a repulse.
- 388 The Vandals, certain Visigoths and Alani begin their relations, which in time grew into a plan to invade Gaul. Jovinian preaches and writes against the Church's rising formalism, asceticism and reliance on external good works.
- 395 Arcadius, Eastern Emperor, lowers the wages of the Goths; the Visigoths rebel thereat.
- 400 Visigoths under Aleric invade Italy.
- 5/25 J.'s relation to the colporteurs changes, in his being appointed to the general introduction of the Pastoral work.
- 5/26 Menta Sturgeon slackens the zeal of the follow-up colporteurs, directing them to ends that he desired.
- 5/29 Srs. Wilson and White, more or less wavering in loyalty to Menta Sturgeon, join J. for the Baltimore follow-up work.
- 5/30 J.'s first Pastoral work lecture (at Baltimore) is unsuccessful in results.
- 6/1 With his sending word to Philadelphia of its follow-up workers' and Sr. Sanford's coming, the last for the Pastoral work, J. henceforth devotes his extra time to the Pastoral work. Bro. Russell speaks and writes against formalism, self-torture and external good works as meritorious.
- 6/8 Menta Sturgeon makes conditions harder for J.'s follow-up colporteurs, after their ill success at Philadelphia, which dissatisfies them.
- 6/13 Follow-up colporteurs write to headquarters on unsatisfactoriness of their work, in view of the harder conditions imposed upon them.

- 400-415 Tichonius in the controversy between the Catholics (led by Augustine) and the Donatists (led by Petilian) on the nature of the true Church, sets forth the truth that lies in the middle of these two extremes, i.e., the distinction between the Real and the Nominal Church.
- 402 Visigoths defeated in Italy by Stilicho.
- 406 Vandals (this word means travelers, pilgrims) invade Gaul with allies from three Germanic tribes, the Alani, Suevi and Burgundians.
- 6/13-6/28 Bro. Russell writes much on the distinction between the Little Flock and Great Company, as can be seen in the July and August Towers, and in sermons indicated the same as against those who took opposite extremes on the nature of the true Church.
- 6/15 Headquarters turn down the suggestions of the follow-up colporteurs.
- 6/19 From Brooklyn J. starts a New England pilgrim trip, with regular and special Pastoral workers and prospective Pastoral workers.

A few remarks on the relations of the Germanic nations and the Roman world will clarify some of the above, as well as some of the following points. The Germanic nations before invading the Roman Empire were in almost all cases Arian Christians, the heathen Franks at the time of their invading Gaul being the most notable exception to this rule. These Arian nations parallel various harvest branch workers loyal to the Lord's arrangements, while the various Roman nations represent various harvest branch workers more or less disloyal to the harvest arrangements. The conversion of such Arian Christian nations to Catholicism parallels the transition of those who stood for the Lord's arrangements to espousing or submitting to revolutionistic arrangements. E.g., the Visigoths parallel the colporteurs, especially the follow-up colporteurs; the Ostrogoths those in executive ways loyal to the Lord's arrangements; the Franks the Society Board; the emperors at Constantinople and their special representatives in state or army those in an executive deputyship who were more or less disloyal to the

Lord's arrangements; the Vandals the faithful pilgrims; and the Longobards the supporters of Bro. Russell's arrangements, the real opponents of J.F.R.'s usurpations in Society matters. The kings of these Arian nations, except those of the Visigoths, parallel Bro. Russell, until his death. Accordingly, the territories of these Arian nations parallel the sphere of the pertinent branch workers; and their invasions of the Roman Empire parallel the various branch workers' opposing the movements away from the Lord's arrangements. Greece parallels the sphere of more or less deputy executive unfaithfulness; Italy the sphere of executiveness proper; France the sphere of the Board; Spain, after its invasion by the Visigoths, the sphere of the colporteurs; and North Africa the sphere of conventions; Britain later became the sphere of the pilgrims' activities. These and other features will come out as we go on. If the friends had a good Church History, e.g., Kurtz' three-volume Church History, which can frequently be bought in second-hand book stores for \$1.50, they will be able better to profit from these parallels. With these few clarifying remarks we proceed with the parallels:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 408 The second Visigothic invasion of Italy.  | 6/21 Follow-up colporteurs report unfavorably to headquarters on the work while at Cromwell, Conn.   |
| 409 The Vandals invade Spain.   | 6/22 Bro. Russell at St. Louis criticizes colporteur zeallessness, which arouses them to greater zeal.   |
| 410 Alaric, Visigothic king, dies; Atawolf becomes his successor.                                       | 6/23 Sr. White becomes discouraged at small success from cards left at J.'s meetings, and at Brockton takes up Photo-Drama inquiry cards also. |
| 411-421 In the controversy on sin and grace between Augustine and Pelagius, in which the former defends | 6/24-7/4 Bro. Russell condemns total depravity in all except Second Deathers, and sets forth the Truth on                                      |

total depravity and the latter man's present natural sinlessness, Tichonius sets forth the Truth that none are totally depraved and that the race naturally consists of two depraved classes (none totally depraved), the faith and unbelief classes, the former class coming into relation with the Lord by a cooperation of their wills and Divine grace.

415 Atawolf, king of the Visigoths, is murdered; Wallia succeeds him; and the Visigoths become dissatisfied in Spain.

418 The Vandals in Spain and Gaul become subordinate to Wallia, king of the Visigoths, who accepts subjection to the Western Empire.

426 The Nestorian controversy begins. Arians support Nestorius against the trinitarians.

427 The Nestorian controversy continues and increases.

428 Boniface, Roman Governor of Africa, calls on the Vandals to help him.

the two naturally depraved classes, the faith and unbelief classes, as against the two extremes' views that J.F.R. and H.C. Rockwell held.

6/28 Sr. Wilson gets word not to go to Portland, Me., for follow-up work; she and Sr. White become dissatisfied with follow-up work.

7/1 Sr. White falls in with a plan to do J.F.R.'s follow-up work in the West, J. acquiescing therein.

7/9 J. gives the first talk at the Newport Convention, defending the unity of God and attacking the Godmanists.

7/10 H.C. Rockwell, C.J. Woodworth and R.H. Barber speak severally on Christ's three natures, and F.C. Detweiler on the relation of the human and Divine natures in Christ, the latter darkening the subject.

7/11 F.C. Detweiler, convention chairman, asks J. to preach in the absence of

- 429 Genseric, king of the Vandals, goes to Africa with his army.
- 431 At the Council of Ephesus some of the leading Arians consult on the busybodying of the monks in general Church works
- 432 Patrick begins the conversion of Ireland and works with great success there until his death, about 465.
- 451 The antipapal party at the Chalcedon Council decrees the pope and the patriarch of Constantinople chief and equal patriarchs. The Council declares the human and the Divine natures in Christ unmixed and inseparable.
- 455 Genseric, king of the Vandals, captures Rome and, despite the objections of Pope Leo I, plunders it.
- 462 The Ostrogoths resume friendly relations with
- R. J. Martin, on the Spirit of a Sound Mind.
- 7/12 Bro. Russell comes to the Newport Convention and in his address refutes God-manism.
- 7/14 While at the Newport Convention R. E. Streeter and H.C. Rockwell speak on the Call and R.G. Jolly and C.J. Woodworth on Justification, Bro. Russell and J. discuss the busybodying of the St Paul Enterprise in the general work.
- 7/15 J. preaches the Baptismal sermon at Newport Convention, thereby beginning a fruitful season in his pilgrim work until about 8/17.
- 8/3 Bro. Russell's offer to make A.H. MacMillan his special representative, puts him on an equality with J.F.R. and with the latter chief above all other deputies of Bro. Russell at the Bible House. The I.B.S.A. as a corporation and as a religious body in England is declared to be unmixed and inseparable.
- 8/7 Bro. Russell, as leader of the pilgrims, lays hold on J.F.R.'s pilgrim powers and privileges and, despite the latter's objections, curtails them.
- 8/14 Bro. Russell, as executive, and his lieutenants

the emperor.

become more friendly with A.H. MacMillan, after a slight strain on their relations.

465 The Suevi become Arians. St. Patrick's death.

8/17 J. at Mattoon, Ill., decides to introduce the Pastoral work along more conservative and helpful lines at conventions and thus ends a phase of his pilgrim work.

474 Theodoric becomes the king of the Ostrogoths. Zeno becomes Eastern Emperor.

8/26 Bro. Russell enters into the final stages of his work as executive. H.J. Shearn comes forward as advocate of changes in the London Tabernacle arrangements.

475 The Visigoths conquer the most of Spain. Longobards seek new territories for their activities.

8/27 Sr. White completes her Western follow-up work. Bro. J. at Nashville Convention applies for the British trip.

476 Odoacer overthrows the Western Empire and subjects the pope to himself.

8/28 Bro. Russell as finance planner causes Menta Sturgeon to suffer eclipse on policies affecting the Soda mine venture, and J.F.R. becomes subject to Bro. Russell in his returning to the East.

477 Genseric, king of the Vandals, dies.

8/29 Bro. Russell returns to Bethel from his pilgrim trip at Nashville.

481 Clericalism and the two natures in Christ are widely discussed.

9/2 At H.J. Shearn's suggestion Bro. Thackaway introduces a resolution to discuss the London Tabernacle arrangements and its relation to the I.B.S.A.

482 Emperor Zeno compromises on the matter of

9/3 H. J Shearn compromises on the positions of

- the two natures as these were in controversy by the sees of Constantinople and Alexandria.
- 484 The pope sets forth principles opposed to those of Zeno and of the patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria on the relation of the two natures.
- 487 The Rugians, Germanic Arians, are defeated and denationalized by the Herulian Odoacer.
- 487-493 The Longobards settle in the Rugians' territory.
- 491 Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, defeats Odoacer, king of the Heruli.
- 493 Theodoric completely defeats the Heruli, kills Odoacer and measurably frees the pope
- 493-508 The Longobards in Germany war on the Heruli and in the end completely defeat them.
- 496 The heathen Clovis, king of the Franks, on the verge of defeat, prays to the Christians' God for
- J. Hemery and W. Crawford as to the Tabernacle's relations to the I.B.S.A.
- 9/5 J.F.R. sets forth principles in opposition to those of the three British managers on the relation of the Tabernacle and the I.B.S.A.
- 9/8 The Kuehn supporters, as opponents of finances as to the Soda mine, are set aside by Bro. Russell.
- 9/8-9/14 Real supporters of Bro. Russell's ways take the position held by the Kuehn supporters as against the Soda mine venture.
- 9/12 During his trip with Menta Sturgeon and J.F.R. to the Soda mine, Bro. Russell begins to doubt his recently accepted view of the anti-Kuehnite theory as to the Soda mine.
- 9/14 Bro. Russell sets aside the view of the anti-Kuehn group, reverses himself on his rejecting that of the Kuehn group and thereby frees J.F.R. measurably from the influence of the anti-Kuehn group.
- 9/14-9/29 The real supporters of Bro. Russell's ways oppose and defeat the Soda-financiers group.
- 9/17 A.H. MacMillan, on the verge of defeat, asks the Lord for help, which He uses J. to give him at

- victory, and defeats and completely overthrows the Alemanni, a Germanic tribe. the Milwaukee Convention, and wins out in his debate with Bros. Bradford and Abbott on the St. Paul Enterprise publishing Truth matters.
- 505 Theodoric, Ostrogothic king, defeats Emperor Anastasius; Belisarius, famous general of Justinian, is born. 9/26 Bro. Russell gives H.J. Shearn a rebuff in his managerial ambitions; Menta Sturgeon comes to the fore as a warrior against some of Bro. Russell's executive arrangements.
- 507 Visigoths are defeated by Clovis, who in turn is checked by Theodoric. 9/28 Sr. White is set aside as follow-up colporteur by A.H. MacMillan, who is checked by Bro. Russell.
- 512 Waccho becomes king of the Longobards 10/3 Bro. Russell takes steps toward sending J. to Europe.
- 525 Efforts are made to reconcile the pope with the emperor and the patriarch of Constantinople. 10/11 Efforts are made to reconcile J.F.R. with A.H. MacMillan and H.C. Rockwell.
- 526 Theodoric dies and Athalaric becomes king of the Ostrogoths. 10/17 Bro. Russell's leaving Bethel for the last time (night of Oct. 16) occasions his entering a diminished executive functioning of his office.
- 527 Justinian becomes emperor. 10/18 A.H. MacMillan comes more prominently to the fore in deputyship for Bro. Russell at Bethel.
- 533 Belisarius begins war on the African Vandals, defeating them in two battles. 10/24 Menta Sturgeon triumphs over Bro. Russell in taking two pilgrim services from him before the San Antonio Church.
- 534 Belisarius completes the 10/25 Menta Sturgeon

conquest of the Vandals by taking Sardinia, Corsica and the Balearic Islands, and receives a triumph at Constantinople. Burgundian empire ceases.

535 Belisarius returns to Italy to conquer the Ostrogoths and takes the Island of Sicily.

536 Belisarius conquers lower Italy. Vitiges becomes the king of the Ostrogoths.

537 Belisarius is besieged in Rome for a year by the Ostrogoths.

538 The Ostrogoths raise the siege of Rome against Belisarius.

539 Belisarius captures Vitiges and overthrows the Ostrogoths. This allows the pope a free hand at Rome.

540 Vitiges is taken to Constantinople as the captive of Belisarius and given to Justinian.

542 The pope seeks the power from the Ostrogoths; and the boy Walthari becomes

triumphs over Bro. Russell in taking his place three times during the San Antonio public lecture (night of 24th) and receives quite an ovation at the end of the lecture. Bro. J. ceases introducing the Pastoral work.

10/26 Menta Sturgeon starts his ascendancy over dying Bro. Russell as executive, and increases it as to his pilgrim office.

10/27 Menta Sturgeon increases his ascendancy over Bro. Russell as executive, who prepares himself for the conference on the Soda mine affairs.

10/28 Bro. Russell thwarts M. Sturgeon's ascendancy over him in executive matters.

10/29 Bro. Russell's weakness occasions his giving way to M. Sturgeon's executive acts.

10/30 M. Sturgeon gets complete control executively by Bro. Russell's resigning his office in the toga scene, which also gives J.F.R. a free hand.

10/31 Bro. Russell's death makes his power go over to a deputy, M. Sturgeon, who delivers it to A.H. MacMillan.

11/2 J.F.R. asks J. whether Bro. Russell was to have a successor. The Society

Longobardic king.

Board appoints a committee to arrange with J. matters affecting his European trip. J.'s letter of appointment is dictated.

543 The pope increases his aspirations to become a civil ruler.

11/3 J.'s telling J.F.R. that Bro. Russell was to have a successor moves J.F.R. to seek his executive powers.

544 The Ostrogoths under Totila reconquer parts of Italy from the Romans. Belisarius is sent by the emperor against them.

11/4 A.I. Ritchie opposes J.F.R.'s efforts at taking over executive power; and A.H. MacMillan uses M. Sturgeon to oppose him.

545 Totila is only partially successful because of differences among the Ostrogoths, some wanting others as king instead of Totila, which plan is rejected

11/5 A.I. Ritchie is only partially successful for lack of support. H.C. Rockwell approaches J. with a proposition to become the Society's President; he refuses to enter into the plan.

548 Belisarius returns to Constantinople from Italy, only partially successful against Totila.

11/8 M. Sturgeon gives up trying to set A.I. Ritchie aside in A.H. MacMillan's favor.

549 Audoin becomes king of the Longobards; and Totila besieges Rome.

11/9 J. on studying the correspondence of the two sides on the London Tabernacle controversy takes a stand against the Shearno-Crawford side. A.I. Ritchie's course on this correspondence circumscribes J.F.R.

550 Efforts are made to overthrow Totila. Audoin supports the Romans against Totila. Both sides seek Audoin's support by favoring him.

11/10 J.F.R. and W.E. VanAmpburgh seek to nullify A.I. Ritchie in the executive committee. J. favors the former ones. All three committee members validate J.'s letter of

551 Narses becomes Belisarius' successor in Italy against Totila. Audoin with sanction of the Empire leaves his country to assume rule and home in Noricum and Panonia.

552 Narses badly defeats Totila in Italy.

553 Narses, assisted by Audoin, again badly defeats Totila.

554 Narses completely defeats Totila and the Ostrogoths leave Italy and become extinct as a nation.

561 Audoin and his son Alboin war on the Gepidae.

562 Audoin and his son Alboin continue to war on the Gepidae.

appointment; and credentials are dictated as genuine.

11/11 J.F.R. displaces M. Sturgeon as A.I. Ritchie's opponent. J.'s credentials are signed by A.I. Ritchie and W.E. VanAmburgh as genuine; and he sails for Britain with powers of attorney.

11/12 J.F.R. cripples A.I. Ritchie in executive respects and as to candidacy for Society's President. 11/13 J.F.R., by assistance of J.'s influence as represented in his voting shares proxied for J.F.R., again badly cripples A.I. Ritchie as executive and as candidate for the Society's President.

11/14 J.F.R. relegates A.I. Ritchie to impotency in executive matters; and the latter ceases to act effectively as executive in Society matters.

11/21 J., following the reading of his authorization papers to the three British managers, takes a course on the pilgrim work resented by H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford.

11/22 J. hears from W. Crawford of the Tabernacle's correspondence and tactfully draws him out thereon, a thing antagonistic to the latter.

563 Alboin defeats the Gepidae. Columba comes to Britain (Scotland) from Ireland and begins the conversion of the land and dies in 597.

565 Justinian dies; Alboin succeeds Audoin as king of the Longobards.

567 Remembering Narses' former invitation, the Longobards invade the Alpine regions to the northeast of Italy, planning to invade Italy proper shortly.

568 Longobards, Arians, invade Italy and in 21 years conquer almost all of it, Rome always, and Ravenna almost to the end, holding out against them.

11/23 J. is given the managers' copies of the Tabernacle's correspondence, a defeat of H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford. J. prepares his first sermon for the comfort of the British brethren, the lecture at Liverpool (11/19) and the morning one at London (11/26) being a report on Bro. Russell's last days, death and burial.

11/25 A.H. MacMillan ceases further opposition to J.F.R.'s claims to deputyship for the Board. J. questions the three managers on the Tabernacle situation and sympathizes with J. Hemery, as the other two managers disparage him.

11/27 On the basis of his authorization papers, particularly J.F.R.'s telling him to act executively in Britain, J. plans executive acts in British matters.

11/28 J. exercises executive acts in British affairs, e.g., puts J. Hemery in charge of the Pastoral work, makes all three managers the V.D.M. committee, continues Bro. Russell's sermons in the newspapers, revises the Manchester Convention program and begins to warn against the eleven elders' stand on the Tabernacle arrangements—

570 Alboin defeats disastrously the opposing Romans.

573 Alboin is killed.

574 Authari (long-haired), Alboin's minor grandson, succeeds Clepho, Alboin's successor, under a regent.

584 Authari attains his majority and becomes full king of the Longobards.

589 Arianism of the Visigoths is overthrown in Spain through the pope's manipulations. The Longobards under Authari decide to increase their Italian dominion.

590 Authari continues to increase his Italian dominion.

all executive acts, the Brooklyn office, now under J.F.R.'s influence, never coming under J.'s executive powers, and the London office by the managers for a long time resisting it, but finally submitting thereto.

11/30 J. defeats the eleven elders' position on the Tabernacle arrangements.

12/3 H.J. Shearn, W. Crawford and F. G. Guard take sides against J., slightly showing it at his Forest Gate visit.

12/4 A letter arrives from Brooklyn corroborating J.'s stand that the Tabernacle arrangements be congregational in kind.

12/14 J. begins to resent H.J. Shearn's and W. Crawford's opposition, expressed in the former's letter mailed 12/12 and received 12/13 or 14, declining to change the convention program as he had suggested.

12/19 Colporteurs are induced to give up Bro. Russell's methods, and to accept those of J.F.R. J. decides to enforce his control in executive matters in Britain, particularly as to the Manchester Convention program, on which the managers sought to override him.

12/20 J. rebukes the managers for declining to accept

Gregory the Great becomes pope.

591 Authari, still opposing the Catholics, seeks to take Ravenna. He dies.

592 Agilulf succeeds Authari and, while maintaining his Arianism, seeks to conciliate the Catholics.

593 Gregory the Great seeks through the Longobards' queen to Romanize them.

597 Gregory I sends Augustine to England to convert the Anglo-Saxons; and as a result of the work begun that year increasingly large numbers of Anglo-Saxons were won to Romanism. Columba dies after fruitful missionary work in Britain.

his convention program revisions, and insists on their printing the program as he revised it, appointing J. Hemery in charge of the program. J.F.R. more and more takes over the work of the executive committee.

12/21 J. seeks to draw J. Hemery to his support.

12/22 J., declining the Shearno-Crawford-inspired F. G. Guard, Jr.'s advice to keep his hand off British executive matters, and to restrict his activities to pilgrim work in Britain, continues to insist on observance of Bro. Russell's arrangements, but adopts a more conciliatory course toward H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford.

12/23 J.F.R. sends a letter to the managers approving of J.'s British office, and appointing J. Hemery as J.F.R.'s special representative in Britain and Ireland, both things calculated to Rutherfordize J.'s work and supporters.

12/26 J.F.R. arouses A.H. MacMillan to the public work and as a result of steps taken that day many new ones from the public were increasingly won for Rutherfordism. J. ends first phase of his pilgrim work toward the British brethren, and begins its second phase.

601 Augustine unsuccessfully attempts to subject the Welsh bishops to Romanism.	12/31 A.H. MacMillan unsuccessfully seeks to subject the pilgrims to Rutherfordism. 1917
606 Emperor Phocas and his supporters acknowledge the pope's primacy.	1/5 H.J.S. and W.C. write a submissive letter to J.F.R. A.H.M. and W.E.V. arrive at the Pittsburgh voting shareholders' meeting, determined, at J.F.R.'s suggestion, to have him voted sole executive and managerial powers.
615 Agilulf dies and is succeeded by Adalwaldus as Longobard king.	1/14 J., ceasing conciliatory tactics, takes a decidedly oppositional stand toward H.J. S. and W. C. as Tabernacle elders, actually, though not consciously, withdrawing priestly fellowship from them.
625 Adalwaldus dies; Ariowaldus becomes the Longobard king.	1/24 E. Housden at J.'s invitation joins the latter at Leeds, where J. decides to give him W.C.'s place as assistant manager.

This is a place to make a few remarks on the Gospel-Age Moslems' and Christians' (?) conflicts, as related to our subject. In the parallels the Moslems correspond to the civil powers in the Small Miniature; the Christians (?) correspond to Truth people in the Small Miniature. Their conflicts correspond to the controversies between the civil powers and Truth people on militarism and conscientious objection. The earlier conflicts between them correspond to the phases of these controversies between the British civil powers and the British brethren. With the Moslem invasion of France the pertinent conflicts begin to parallel those between the American civil powers and the American brethren. Their subsequent conflicts in France parallel

those that involved the Society Board; in Spain those that involved the colporteurs; in Italy those that involved the executive departments of the Society; in Palestine (the crusades) those that involved the brethren in court controversies; the phases of the conflict involving the Turks and Christians (?), those that accompanied the gradual victory, with incidental repulses, of the Societyites against the American civil powers in their court battles. The parallel events are so very numerous that our space will allow us to give only a few, *i.e.*, the most important parallels.

630 First battle between Moslems and Christians (?), at Muta, Syria, ends indecisively with victory inclining more to the Moslems than to the Christians (?).

633 The monothelite controversy begins, with Pope Honorius and the patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria endorsing monothelitism and the monk Sophronius, later the patriarch of Jerusalem, rejecting it.

635 Oswald, a non-Romanist, becomes the Christian king of Northumbria and chief king of the Anglo-Saxons.

636 Rothari, an Arian, becomes the Longobards' king, reigning until 652.

637 Saracens capture Jerusalem and frustrate the opposition

1/29 First argument is held between the British Government and Society barristers in the High Court on elders' exemption from the draft, the Government barristers gaining a slight advantage in the debate.

2/1 The controversy over the oneness of the I.B.S.A., as a corporation, and of the Tabernacle in their purposes begins. J.F.R., J. Hemery and E. Housden agree to this oneness, but H.J.S. and W.C. oppose it.

2/3 J. dismisses H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford as Bethel managers after they attempted to use Matt. 18: 15-18 on him for official acts, they arranging for the second before taking the first step.

2/4 J. first sees himself typed as the little Nehemiah, John Hus having been the large Nehemiah.

2/5 The British High Court rules that elders are

of Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem, and of his clergy to monothelitism.

subject to conscription in Britain, which temporarily shuts off H.J.S.'s and his supporters' objection to the oneness of the I.B.S.A. and Tabernacle in their purposes.

638 Emperor Heraclius issues the Ecthesis, sanctioning monothelitism.

2/6 J. Hemery, as the representative of the Society's President, stands for the oneness of purpose of the Tabernacle and the I.B.S.A. as the Society's British representative.

642 Oswald dies. Oswy succeeds him.

2/10 J. meditates drawing up charges against H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford.

643 Rothari, Longobard king, begins to codify the Longobards' laws in Latin.

2/11 J. begins to draw up charges against H.J.S. and W.C. at Edinburgh, on the basis of Truth principles.

648 Emperor Constans II publishes the Typus, whereby he calls upon all to come back to the status before the monothelite controversy started, i.e., that neither two nor one will in Christ be taught, thus seeking to have the question ignored altogether.

652 Rothari dies and is succeeded by Rodoaldus.

2/16 J. Hemery counsels the dropping of the controversy of the oneness or separateness of the I.B.S.A. and the Tabernacle, seeking to have the question ignored altogether.

653 Rodoaldus dies and his successors until Liutprand (712-744) seek to act peaceably with the pope, with occasional fallings out between them.

2/20 J. sees himself pictured by Mordecai; he starts from London on what proves to be his last pilgrim trip in England in 1917.

655 Pope Martin dies in exile.

2/21 J. begins to preach against textbookism and clericalism and until April 21 seeks to act peaceably with J.F.R., with occasional fallings out between them.

2/23 Bro. McCloy receives word of appointment of investigation

660 Aribertus, Longobard king, dies and is succeeded by Gundibertus.

662 The monk Maximus, the leader of those espousing the doctrine of two wills in Christ (dyothelitism) is by various punishments made incapable of public service. Gundibertus dies; Grimwaldus reigns.

664 Oswy sets aside the Old British Church's ways and accepts those of Rome.

667 Grimwaldus secures himself against repudiators of his power by appointing trustworthy lieutenants.

671 Grimwaldus, Longobard king, dies; Perctarit succeeds, during whose reign the Longobards give up Arianism and become Catholic.

680 The First Trullan Council is held to overthrow monothelitism.

commission, which began a defeat of J.F.R. in Britain.

2/28 J. receives his recall as the Society's special representative, unauthorizedly sent by J.F.R., and temporarily he accepts it as valid.

3/2 W. Crawford is refused reinstatement into the office of Treasurer of the London Bethel, is excluded from election as elder and is refused the treasurer's keys by Bro. Housden. J., believing his recall to be valid, declines J. Hemery's invitation to take the head of the dining room table and accepts the place of a subordinate.

3/4 J. gives up entirely his office work to J.F.R.'s usurpations as to his British work.

3/7 J. reasserts his Board-given powers against J. Hemery's protests and secures them by obtaining the support of the chief ones at the London Bethel.

3/11 J. comes to see that J.F.R. and J. Hemery by overthrowing Bro. Russell's arrangements were perverting J.'s supporters in Brooklyn and London.

3/20 J. Hemery, H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford confer to overthrow the policy of J., that the purposes

686 Perctarit, Longobard king, dies and is succeeded by Cuninbert.

692 The second Trullan Council is held; and first steps are taken, resulting in a schism between the Eastern and Western Churches.

700 Cuninbert dies.

701 Aribertus becomes Longobard king, whose eleven years' upright reign were marked by differences with the dukes of the Longobards, who mutinied against him.

711 The Saracens invade Spain, foreshadowing much trouble for the Spanish and other Christians (?).

of the I.B.S.A. as a corporation and the London Tabernacle are one.

3/26 J., on the advice of his solicitor, decides to give up further attempts as to seeking control at the London Bethel and decides to return to America.

4/1 J. Hemery confers with the Tabernacle elders and then denounces J. before the London Tabernacle elders, which starts a rupture between two groups of British Great Company members. J. sails from Liverpool for America.

4/9 J. arrives in New York and is met by W.E. Van Amburgh, who promises him that there will be no rifling of his effects at Bethel, as was done at the London Bethel, when J. refused to go to Bethel, unless he obtained such assurance.

4/10 J. first meets J.F.R. the evening of April 9 and asserts his office as Epiphany messenger, under the mistaken impression that his office was that of the steward of the penny parable, and for eleven days holds to this; the Bethel anti-Rutherford leaders disapprove.

4/20 Vol. VII's diatribe against patriotism is approved, foreshadowing much trouble for the colporteurs and other Societyites.

712 Aribertus drowns in the Tiber under the weight of gold that he was carrying. Liutprand, greatest of Longobard kings, ascends the throne, and, though unsuccessful, seeks until 744 to extend his authority over entire Italy.

721 The Saracens first invade France.

732 Charles Martel, Commander of the Franks, with the help of Liutprand and others, decisively defeats the Saracens between Tours and Poitiers, which stayed their further advance in France.

737 Charles Martel with the help of Liutprand completes the defeat of the Saracens in France, driving them back into Spain.

738 Gregory III appeals, in vain, to Charles Martel for aid against Liutprand, who nearly took Rome, almost the only non-Longobard part of Italy.

741 Charles Martel dies and is succeeded by his two sons:

4/21 J. loses ground with J.F.R. for his views, but holds to his Epiphany office, of which, until May 23, he fruitlessly seeks to obtain recognition.

4/30 First discussion of Board over draft-talk in Congress.

5/11 J.F.R. as the Board's mouthpiece reads a statement on conscientious objection to the Bethel family and receives additional suggestions from other Bethelites, J. suggesting the thought that all priestly support be withheld from the fighting forces, all of which refuted the militarists' arguments.

5/16 J.F.R. as the Board's mouthpiece publishes in the Tower the above-mentioned statement, with the suggested additional arguments of J. and others, finally refuting the militarists' arguments against the Board's position on conscientious objection.

5/17 J.F.R. seeks, in vain, aid from his Board sympathizers against J.'s efforts at reestablishing Bro. Russell's arrangements and his recognition as the Lord's choice as executive in the work.

5/20 The Board ceases to be a unit, dividing into two parts:

(1) Carloman and (2) Pepin the Short, who divide the kingdom of the Franks between them. During the period 741-752 Adalbert, a Frank, Clement, a Scot, and Virgilius, an Icelander, oppose papal corruptions.

744 Liutprand, Longobard king, dies and is succeeded, first by Hildebrandus, then later in the year by Rachisius.

747 Carloman gives up his kingdom and leaves it in the hands of Pepin the Short.

749 Rachisius dies. Astolphus succeeds as king of the Longobards.

751 Astolphus captures Ravenna.

753 Astolphus asks the pope to submit to him in their

(1) A.I. Ritchie, I.F. Hoskins, J.D. Wright and R.H. Hirsh; and (2) J.F.R., W.E. Van Amburgh and A.N. Pierson (the last taking the other side from July 15 to Nov. 6, 1917). During the period 5/20-6/1 J., R.H. Hirsh and I.F. Hoskins oppose Rutherfordism usurpations.

5/23 J. ends a series of failures to arouse the Board's majority to press the questions of enforcing Bro. Russell's policies and his being recognized as the leader in the work, and works to have the Board put into control.

5/26 A.I. Ritchie, I.F. Hoskins and R.H. Hirsh, deserted by J.D. Wright, give up activities to enforce Bro. Russell's policies, which gives the other Board party its will. Thereupon J. seeks to arouse J.D. Wright to proper action in this matter.

5/28 J. sets forth to J.D. Wright that his credentials were genuine and his English work good, and appeals to him to help secure the operation of Bro. Russell's policies.

5/30 J. wins over J.D. Wright to his view of the situation.

6/1 J. asks J.F.R. for his return to Britain, to finish

- controversy. The pope refuses. his work there. J.F.R. refuses.
- 754 The pope asks the Frank king, Pepin, for help against Astolphus 6/2 J.F.R. seeks to get help from the Board members against J.'s return to Britain.
- 755 Pepin, at the pope's instigation, against Carloman's request, wars on and defeats Astolphus. He refuses to give up the exarchate of Ravenna to the Eastern Emperor, who had lost it to Astolphus. 6/3 Some of the Board, against the stand of others, frustrate J.'s efforts to have it return him to Britain, and refuse to yield their power to a deputy
- 756 Pepin gives the pope the exarchate of Ravenna, which thus becomes the Papal States; Desiderius becomes the Longobard king, and reigns until 774. 6/4 The Board's foregoing course gives J.F.R. control as against J.'s deputyship for British matters. Henceforth J. seeks to get his British activities investigated by the Board.
- 766 Desiderius, Longobard king, presses the pope, and Pepin acts conciliatorily between them, by advising a compromise. 6/14 J. hands J.F.R. the petition that he had persuaded the four friendly Board members to sign and that asked for an investigation of his British work by the Board, which compromises by ordering the investigation by the four signers.
- 768 Pepin dies; his sons Charlemagne and Carloman succeed him. 6/16 The cleavage of the Board sets in again, four as against three.
- 770 Charlemagne marries Desiderius' daughter. 6/18 The Board's four investigators, on reading the report of the British investigation commission, accept the thought of the genuineness and fruitfulness of J.'s authority in British matters.
- 771 Charlemagne divorces Desiderius' daughter and becomes sole king of the Franks. 6/19 After hearing J., the Board's committee decides to give up espousing his full at the death of Carloman.

Franks at the death of Carloman.

772 Charlemagne debates unfavorably the course of Desiderius in siding with his daughter and Carloman's two sons, whom Charlemagne would not allow to reign in their father's stead. Charlemagne debates the question of making the pope subject to him.

773 Charlemagne begins his war on Desiderius and his supporters.

774 Charlemagne conquers the Longobards, takes Desiderius as prisoner to France, confirms the pope as his vassal over the exarchate of Ravenna. Desiderius' son Adelgis spends the rest of his life seeking to gain the kingdom of the Longobards, but is driven out of Italy permanently.

British authority and adopts a compromising report for the purpose of securing unanimity in the Board thereon.

6/20 The full Board discusses its four members' compromising report on J.'s British activity, and accepts a less favorable resolution presented by J.F.R., alleging as his reason J.'s claims as to his British authority and his wanting to promote a Board division. The four introduce a resolution to abrogate J.F.R.'s powers as executive and manager.

6/21 On the basis of the Board's compromise resolution efforts are made to send J. and I.F. Hoskins away from Bethel on pilgrim trips, as a means of overcoming him and the Board's majority's favoring him.

6/22 The Board's compromise prevails against J., who, ordered by J.F.R. to leave Bethel, appeals against it to the Board. J.F.R., fearing to bring the matter to the Board, leaves it in abeyance. J. seeks, without success, until July 15, to regain his executive position, in interviews with J.F.R., the four Board members and, finally, A.N. Pierson, whom he wins over to view matters favorably as to J.'s British activities.

799 Claudio of Turin comes to Charlemagne's court. Some Roman nobles nearly kill Pope Leo III because of his usurpations, in a riot at Rome, but he escapes to the court of Charlemagne, who takes his side. The Papal Millennium begins.

7/17 J., after returning to Bethel from his visits in New England with I.I. Margeson and A.N. Pierson, meets the four Board members. J.F.R. raises a great disturbance by his reading the four opposing Board members out and four subservient pseudo-Board members into the Board, for which he is severely denounced by the four ousted ones, F.H. McGee and J. J.F.R. takes refuge with his new Board; and the Little Papal Millennium begins.

800 Pope Leo II submits as a vassal to Charlemagne, crowning him emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, and thus retains rulership of the Papal States under Charlemagne.

7/18 J.F.R. submits to the Board's controllership and acknowledges it as supreme in Society matters, and thereby gains its recognition as the Society's executive and manager.

It should be here remarked that sometimes the old Board and sometimes the new Board acts as the controller in the Small Miniature from July 17, 1917 to about Dec. 1, 1917, corresponding to the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire.

802 The decretals of Pope Hadrian I (previously sent to and sanctioned by Charlemagne) receive public sanction at the diet of Aix-la-Chapelle for the whole empire.

7/19 J.F.R.'s circular letter (the insert of his Harvest Siftings), after having been sanctioned by his bogus Board, is sent to all the classes.

809 The Council of Aix-la-Chapelle inserts into the creed the filioque clause ("and from the Son"), teaching that the Holy

7/27 The course of J.F.R., acting as President of the P.P.A., to control the W.T.B. & T.S. and I.B.S.A. in the P.P.A. meeting, by requiring

Spirit proceeds from the Son equally as from the Father, as the equal of Them. Claudius, afterwards of Turin, receives his first persecutions for zeal against image worship.

811 The so-called Isidorian decretals (not the pseudo Isidorian decretals) are first circulated.

813 Claudius, principal man of the Sardis Church, who the next year was sent to Turin by Emperor Louis, begins his fight on image worship and works of merit as taught by the pope. Claudius continues this work in his expositions of numerous Scriptural books and in his controversies until 839, when he dies.

814 Claudius fights image worship at Turin, when he arrives there.

816 Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, France, begins his work against image worship as Claudius' assistant

821 Bernard, nephew of Emperor Louis, is blinded by the latter.

the four directors to accept his Board or face war, is pivoted upon the P.P.A. as implied in the existence of the other two and acting as their plenipotentiary. J.F.R. attacks J. physically and ousts him from Bethel for the latter's attacks on the former's pseudo-saintliness.

7/29 Harvest Siftings is first circulated, by being taken to Boston by W.F. Hudgings, at J.F.R.'s beck.

7/31 At the meeting of the P.P.A., wherein I.F. Hoskins and R.H. Hirsh were ousted as directors and members of it, J. soundly upbraids J.F.R. for the numerous falsehoods and other evils of his Harvest Siftings, all of which were a service of alleged images of saints and meritorious works. J. continues this work until Aug. 26, when he finishes writing Harvest Siftings Reviewed.

8/1 J. attacks J.F.R.'s Harvest Siftings, in defense of his supporters and himself.

8/3 R.H. Hirsh writes for the five anti-Rutherford directors, The Open Letter to The Boston Convention, which was distributed to the conventioners, Aug. 5.

8/8 A.N. Pierson, at the Board's instigation, is deceived and taken advantage of by J.F.R. and other Board members.

- 823 Claudius of Turin begins his commentary on Leviticus.
- 825 Claudius defends himself against the charges of false teaching and of forming an anti-Catholic sect.
- 829 The controversies that the sons of Emperor Louis started in 829 increased over a long period and resulted in the division of the empire into three parts: France, Germany and Italy.
- 831 Claudius attacks the pope, denying that he is Peter's successor, and declaring that if he does not act apostolically, but as an evil-doer, Matt. 23 applies to him. Paschasius Radbertus invents and begins to spread the doctrine of transubstantiation, which teaches a counterfeit body of Christ.
- 839 Claudius of Turin dies.
- 842 Image worship is completely victorious in Great Babylon.
- 8/10 J. begins to write that part of *Harvest Siftings Reviewed* that treats of his British pilgrim work.
- 8/12 J. writes that part of *Harvest Siftings Reviewed* that refutes Clayton Woodworth's false view of the Steward and vindicates his own, which was endorsed by that Servant
- 8/16 The controversy in the Society's Board begins, which increased over a long period and resulted in the formation of three groups in the Board: (1) A.N. Pierson; (2) W.E. Spill, J. A. Bohnet and Geo. H. Fisher; (3) J.F.R., W.E. VanAmpburgh and A.H. MacMillan.
- 8/18 J. begins to write the part of *Harvest Siftings Reviewed* that exposes J.F.R.'s many acts of power-grasping, denying that he is that Servant's successor. Society supporters first claim that they are antitypical Elijah, i.e., that the Great Company is the Little Flock, the counterpart in Little Babylon of transubstantiation in Great Babylon, a counterfeit body of Christ
- 8/26 J. finishes writing *Harvest Siftings Reviewed* in its first draft, up to his answer to the second part.
- 8/29 Throughout Little Babylon the fictitious representations [their alleged good

characters] of Little Babylon's saints are worshipped by their partisans.

843 The Longobard kingdom is revived with an independent line of kings, though divided into various duchies, and it remains such until dissolved in 961.

844 Paschiasius Radbertus, after considerable polishing of his views on transubstantiation, publishes them in a book, presenting it to Charles the Bald, who asks Ratramnus (the star-member succeeding Claudio of Turin) his opinion thereon. Ratramnus writes a powerful refutation of transubstantiation.

850 Ratramnus writes on a double predestination.

857 Bardus, regent at Constantinople, is refused communion by the patriarch Ignatius, for which the former displaces the latter with Photius.

858 Nicholas I, most powerful pope between Gregory I (pope, 590-604) and Gregory VII (pope, 1073-1085), is proclaimed another Elijah. He uses the pseudo

8/30 Light After Darkness sidestepping the British situation, J. enters into an independent course with his sympathizers against J.F.R. and his Board; and in this

they hold quite well together until Dec. 26, when J. and Menta Sturgeon enter on divergent courses, tending toward divisions.

8/31 J.F.R., after considerable polishing, sets forth the view that his supporters are antitypical Elijah and presents it to R.H. Hirsh, who asks J. for his opinion. The latter refutes the view. J.F.R. begins to use his thought to arouse his followers to the alleged first smiting of Jordan.

9/6 J. first sees the division in the Church as the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha.

9/13 A.H. MacMillan is held at arm's length by W.E. VanAmpburgh, who is by the former displaced with M. Sturgeon in privileged service.

9/14 J.F.R. makes strenuous efforts to prove himself right in the Board controversy, and is proclaimed by Clayton Woodworth as another Bro. Russell, whose

- Isidorian Decretals in proof of the supremacy of the pope.
- 867 Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, accuses the pope of heresy at a Constantinopolitan council.
- 869 Ignatius, deposed patriarch, is restored and Photius is excommunicated.
- 871 Alfred the Great from 871 to 901 fosters a true religious spirit in Britain.
- 872 John VIII becomes pope and reigns until 882 and enters into a course of greatest hypocrisy and unconscionableness.
- 877 The emperor restores Photius to the patriarchate of Constantinople.
- 878 Photius confutes and subsequently defies the pope, who orders him to vacate the patriarchate of Constantinople.
- 879 Pope John VIII excommunicates Photius.
- 885 Hadrian III is made pope through a subterfuge election by lawless Romans, in disregard of the law on papal elections.
- penny parable view he uses to prove J.F.R.'s supremacy.
- 9/23 M. Sturgeon accuses J.F.R. of introducing arrangements contrary to those of Bro. Russell.
- 9/25 A.H. MacMillan restores W.E. VanAmburgh to his favor and abandons M. Sturgeon.
- 9/27 J. from 9/27 to 10/27 fosters a holy spirit among the opposition pilgrims.
- 9/28 J.F.R. begins a course of hypocrisy and unconscionableness, culminating in his writing *Harvest Siftings*, Part II, and circulating it Oct 7, at the Brooklyn Tabernacle, and worldwide, Oct. 8.
- 10/3 A.H. MacMillan forgives and restores M. Sturgeon as his chief helper.
- 10/4 M. Sturgeon at the Brooklyn Ecclesia's business meeting exposes J.F.R.'s hypocritical trick to control its election and after the meeting defies J.F.R., when the latter reproves him for his involved course.
- 10/5 J.F.R. withdraws confidence and fellowship from M. Sturgeon.
- 10/11 J.F.R., seeing that he could not secure his election as Tabernacle elder by the required 75% of the votes, retains his eldership by a tricky resolution, which

886 Emperor Leo, the Philosopher, deposes Photius.  
890 Photius dies.

904 Pope Sergius III, 904-911, first of the infamous pornocratic popes, misbehaves with Theodora, the mother, and Marozia and Theodora, the daughters, the three who made and unmade popes of their illegitimate children, grandchildren and paramours. From 904 to 1003 there are almost incessant conflicts between the popes, on the one hand, and the Italian nobles and German emperors, on the other. The tenth century is rightly called the dark century, because evil was then preponderantly triumphant; and, in the large application of the antitype of the tenth plague, in it came the midnight of antotypical Nisan 14, the midnight of the Gospel Age, when the slaying of the antotypical firstborn began.

911 The Carolingian family (descendent from Charlemagne) becomes extinct in Germany.

required only a majority vote, postponing the election of elders of the Brooklyn ecclesia until after the election of the Society's officers in Jan., 1918.

10/12 A.H. MacMillan turns against M. Sturgeon.

10/17 M. Sturgeon gives up all sympathetic cooperation with the Society.

10/30 J.F.R. begins a course of symbolic pornocracy with false principles which influenced J.F.R. into many wrong changes of policy. From this date onward until Feb. 6, 1918, many conflicts occur between J.F.R. and Board members and other Society leaders.

11/6 A.N. Pierson, last Board member who sympathized with the old Board, gives it up.

936 Otto I becomes the emperor of the Holy German Roman Empire; and as a result of the opposition of the German Church the pornocratic popes receive a blow from which they are gradually undermined and by 963 they are made subject to the emperor, their own theologians at their charge presenting the teaching that the pope is subject to the emperor, and rightly so.

946-972 Dunstan's reformatory work proceeds during this period with great blessing, not only to the Church but also to the state and civil society in England.

961 The Longobard kingdom ends.

962 Otto I is crowned emperor by the pope in St Peters, by which is founded the new phase of the empire—the Holy Roman German Empire.

12/1 Here sets in the beginning of the transition from J.F.R.'s primary little papacy to that of F.H. McGee under the control of "the Opposition" leaders, who later develop into the Fort Pitt Committee; both features of this gradual transition, which becomes complete Dec. 28, are effected by the letter to the Bible Students worldwide and the petition to J.F.R. and the Board emanating from 156 signatories, namely members of the Brooklyn Tabernacle.

12/14-1/6, 1918 J. by his lectures on Elijah and Elisha, Calls-Siftings-Slaughter Weapons, etc., works reformatively and successfully for "the Opposition" against J.F.R.'s influence as executive and teacher.

12/26 By J.'s continued advocacy of the separation of Elijah and Elisha as antityped by the separation in the Society and by M. Sturgeon's advocating that J.F.R. and his leading supporters were Second Deathers, "the Opposition" as a unit breaks up.

12/27 "The Opposition" leaders are advanced by F.H. McGee as the executive leaders of the Lord's work, and from here on the Small Miniature Gospel Age

enlarges its viewpoint into a double papacy and empire, F.H. McGee taking the place of the pope and the Fort Pitt Committee the place of the empire, the older picture of the Board as emperor, and J.F.R. as pope taking a secondary place as antipope.

963 The papal pornocracy is by the German Church and Empire completely overthrown and the pope's theologians invent a teaching that the pope of right is subject to the emperor.

12/28 The letter to the Bible Students and the petition of 156 brethren, mainly members of the Brooklyn ecclesia, offering a fair way of solving the trouble in the Board and Society finally effects the overthrow of J.F.R.'s absolutism, A.H. MacMillan at J.F.R.'s charge teaching J.F.R. to be subject to the Board.

973 Otto II becomes emperor of the Holy Roman German Empire, Hugh Capet supporting him.

1/7, 1918 At the first meeting of the Fort Pitt Committee its officers are elected, J. nominating all of them.

974 Rotherius of Verona dies, after a life of many vicissitudes.

1/8 Hearing J. at Avalon, Pa. on Calls-Sifting-Slaughter Weapons, M. Sturgeon becomes his opponent.

986 Efforts are made by the regents of the child emperor, Otto III, to strengthen the empire.

1/20 First Fort Pitt Committee meeting in Brooklyn, after its organization. J. is commissioned to prepare a draft of a letter to rally the Committee supporters to a concerted and strong movement in the Lord's work.

987 Louis V, last king of the Carolingian line in France, dies and Hugh Capet

1/21 M. Sturgeon's attack on J. in a sermon at Brooklyn, in the latter's presence,

becomes king of France, whose rule as Duke of France from 956 onward and as king of France is one of great blessing in reforms for church, state and empire until his death.

989 The influence of the French king, Hugh Capet, prevails above that of Arnulf, archbishop of Rheims, in the Church.

991 A council at Rheims deposes Arnulf.

999 Pope Sylvester II adopts high church (ascetic) views and trickily starts the exclusive papal appointment of bishops and archbishops by sending the ring and staff to his former opponent Arnulf, a step against the French king's and the emperor's powers in this matter in their respective domains.

1000 Emperor Otto III decides to release from vassalage Duke Bolislaw Chrobry, a treacherous and powerful enemy of the empire, and seeks to win him as a friend.

1001 Otto III dies and is succeeded by Henry II.

the afternoon of 1/20 and the latter's exposition of Zech. 11 that night break the former's influence in that Church and increases that of J. there and results in various blessings.

1/23 J.'s draft of a circular letter to the churches is preferred to that of A.I. Ritchie, which results in giving the former more influence in the Church than the latter.

1/25 The Fort Pitt Committee accepts A.I. Ritchie's resignation from membership therein.

2/2 F.H. McGee subtly favors A.I. Ritchie's restrictive views, as against those of J. and the Fort Pitt Committee on general elders.

2/3 Committee members by now decide to favor accepting M. Sturgeon's resignation, but to seek to gain his friendly cooperation with the Committee.

2/4 The Fort Pitt Committee, accepting M. Sturgeon's resignation, undergoes a change by inviting

1003-1046 The emperors, generally with papal cooperation, according to their perverted notions, seek to reform the Church after their ideals of reformation, which, of course, is along lines of Romanist religiosity.

1009 After three campaigns Henry II obtains the subjection of Lombardy and the rest of Italy.

1014 The anti-Pope Gregory is severely denounced and disgraced in favor of Henry II and Pope Benedict VIII. Canute becomes England's king and opposes clericalism.

1017 The Moslem invasions of Italy from Sicily begin to be repelled by the Romanists, led by Benedict VIII.

1018 Benedict VIII and Henry II decree at the Pavian Synod the excommunication of married priests and the enslavement of their children.

R.G. Jolly and I.I. Margeson to fill its two vacancies.

2/6-3/21 The Fort Pitt Committee, generally with F.H. McGee's support, according to its perverted notions, seeks to reform matters among its supporters along the lines of Society ideals as laid down in the Society's charter and Bro. Russell's will.

2/12 The Fort Pitt Committee elects R.G. Jolly and I.I. Margeson to its membership; the latter before being willing to accept expressed his doubts as to J.'s usefulness on the Committee, and thrice exacted from him the statement that he did not believe that he controlled the Committee.

2/17 J.'s Evil Servant discourse at Philadelphia denounces J.F.R. and puts him to disgrace in favor of the Fort Pitt Committee and F.H. McGee. J. opposes clericalism.

2/20 Governmental attacks on the Truth people executively begin to be repelled on patriotic grounds by the adherents of the Fort Pitt Committee, led by F.H. McGee legally, etc.

2/21 F.H. McGee, through the letter of I.F. Hoskins, the Committee's secretary, to Sr. Jordan of Philadelphia on J.'s Evil Servant lecture, in effect disfellowships

pilgrims who hold preaching relations with ecclesiastical bodies without Committee appointment and in effect enslaves such ecclesia members to the Committee.

2/23 J., for his Evil Servant lecture at Philadelphia, is severely criticized at a special Committee meeting, as infringing upon the rights and views of the "conservative party," consisting of a number of the Committee members and of their supporters, while his theory and practice were denounced as radical.

2/24 (night of 2/23) F.H. McGee presents to the Committee a resolution against its liberal party, declaring that those who offer interpretations of new Biblical types, symbols and prophecies not unanimously approved by the Committee shall be considered out of harmony with the Committee. The New York elders endorse this view in reference to M. Sturgeon's Revelation study at Hattie O. Henderson's home.

2/27 The Fort Pitt Committee's open letter to Bible Students is ready for distribution, which makes the Committee ready to appear in another aspect.

3/1 The Fort Pitt Committee's open letter first appears, warring on those

1020 Robert, king of France, is denounced by Benedict VIII and Henry II for not siding with the high-church (very ascetic) monks of Cluny, France, whose alleged rights were claimed to be infringed upon by the more liberal party.

1021 Benedict VIII writes a letter to the archbishops and bishops of France, ordering them, on pain of excommunication, to disfellowship those of the liberal party who hold views and engage in practices contrary to the high-church monks of Cluny.

1024 Henry II, the Bavarian, dies and Conrad II of France, the first of the Salic Emperors, becomes king of Germany.

1026 Conrad II invades Italy, warring on, and conquering several cities there.

1027 Conrad II is received joyfully at Rome by pope and people and is by the former crowned emperor.

1028 The Slavs rebel against the empire.

1037 Conrad II wars against the rebellious archbishop of Milan, against whom he prevails on the pope to issue an excommunication.

1039 The Italian Church disapproves of the attitude of Milan's archbishop, who though excommunicated, continues in his office.

1039 The Moslem world unites, forbidding Christian propaganda in its territories. The Italian churches censure the Milan archbishop, who, though excommunicated, still officiates. Henry III becomes emperor.

opposed to its senders' executive authority.

3/2 The open letter effects a joyful reception of the Fort Pitt Committee by F.H. McGee and its supporters, who hail it as the rightful executive.

3/3 Hattie O. Henderson circulates in the Brooklyn Fort Pitt Committee Ecclesia an open letter, which she called a love letter, against J. as a Committee member, and thus against the Committee.

3/12 Various members of the Committee resist M. Sturgeon's (Hattie O. Henderson being his mouthpiece therein) rebellion and attack on J., at a business meeting of the Brooklyn Church. F.H. McGee disapproves of his attack through her on J.

3/14 The Brooklyn Church censures M. Sturgeon speaking through Hattie O. Henderson for his attacks on J. and incidentally on the Committee.

3/14 The U.S. Department of Justice forbids further distribution of Vol. VII in America. The Brooklyn Church censures M. Sturgeon speaking through Hattie O. Henderson for his attack through her on J. and the Committee.

1042 Edward the Confessor becomes king of England, and stands for freedom of preaching.

1046 Henry III through the Synod of Sutri deposes three popes (Benedict IX, Sylvester III and Gregory VI) for wrong-doing. The Christians encourage the Christian leaders of Spain to attack the Moors of Spain. From this time onward the popes wage an ever increasingly successful fight against the emperors.

1048 Bishop Wazo of Liege, Belgium, the sole protester against torture conversion, dies.

1049 Berengar of Tours, France, a star-member of the Thyatira Church, first attacks transubstantiation. Leo IV confirms the psuedo-Isidorian decretals.

1050 Berengar of Tours is condemned by Lanfranc, etc., for preaching and

Thereby the Committee solidifies. 3/17 J. declines the request of the Philadelphia Church to preach to it until it repudiates the criticisms against the Evil Servant sermons made by some of its members. This repudiation the Church then made by resolution.

3/21 The Committee repudiates J.F.R. in his three presidencies, i.e., of the W.T.B.&T.S., the I.B.S.A. and the P.P.A. The Society issues orders that the colporteurs work with the Six Volumes. From this time onward F.H. McGee increases his influence in and over the Committee.

3/23 No longer are protests made against winning opposition converts by J.F.R.'s denouncing J. (at the Society's Convention, 3/23-3/26, at Brooklyn).

3/24 J. in his lecture on Elijah and Elisha at Jersey City attacks the Societyites' claim to be antitypical Elijah. J.F.R. at the Brooklyn Convention, as the alleged steward, sanctions by inference Clayton Woodworth's interpretation of the Penny Parable.

3/25 Various Committee members, learning that J. against the Committee's

writing against transubstantiation.

1053 Final controversy between the Roman and Greek Churches breaks out.

1054 Final separation of the Roman and Greek Churches takes place. Berengar of Tours is tried by Hildebrand at the Synod of Tours; and a compromise decision results.

1060 Normans under Roger I begin to conquer Sicily from the Saracens.

1063 Berengar renews the controversy against transubstantiation in France.

1066 William the Conqueror invades and conquers England.

1070 Berengar protests against muzzling him on transubstantiation.

1072 Palermo, Sicily, falls from the Moslems to the Normans.

resolution of Feb. 24 (night of Feb. 23) had preached on Elijah and Elisha at Jersey City, criticize, but R H. Hirsh defends him.

3/28 Final controversy between the Committee adherents and M. Sturgeon's adherents breaks out

3/29 Final rupture between the Committee's and M. Sturgeon's adherents sets in. A compromise on J.'s preaching on Elijah and Elisha becomes understood, in view of the effects of J.'s preaching with good results at Jersey City and in view of his refusal to be bound by the resolution, as unscriptural.

4/4 J.F.R. begins on legal lines to flay government officials in *The Kingdom News*, No. 2.

4/7 J. renews the attack on the Societyites as antitypical Elijah in a discourse on Elijah and Elisha at Newark, N.J.

4/10 Arbitrary methods are applied in pilgrim work in the Committee.

4/15 At a Committee meeting J. protests against the resolution forbidding teaching new types, symbols, etc.

4/16 The third number of *The Kingdom News* further flays the government officials on conscription.

1073 Gregory VII becomes pope and reigns until 1085, greatly advancing papal absolutism against the civil powers and high-churchism against the hierarchy and clergy. He starts a new papal policy of rulership.

1079 The controversy with Berengar ends, with the orthodox tolerating him in his retirement and silence. Peter Abelard, who became a star-member skeptical toward Romanism, is born.

1085 Syracuse, Sicily, falls from the Saracens to the Normans; the Spaniards defeat the Moors at Toledo. Gregory VII, one of the three greatest popes, dies in exile, after setting into operation a new papal theory of autocracy. Victor III, elected pope, begins to reign next year.

1090 The Normans complete the conquest of Sicily from the Moslems. Moslem leaders in North Africa stir up their followers to

4/17 F.H. McGee takes another advance step in dominating the Committee and its leading adherents, with marked success until 4/29. He starts during this time the idea of making the Committee a corporation.

4/23 With J.'s preaching, at Providence, R. I., fruitfully on types, symbols, etc., the controversy on such preaching subsides and peace soon results. From here on J. enters a skeptical opposition to F.H. McGee's evils.

4/29 J.F.R. at Louisville attacks the government position on legal lines; he also vindicates the rights of colporteurs against the government's pertinent position. As he is overcome in argument, F.H. McGee presents a resolution at the Committee's meeting to rescind the muzzling resolution, which is passed by a vote of 5 to 2, I.F. Hoskins and J.D. Wright voting negatively. He moved that R.G. Jolly prepare a set of articles, which he, against R.G. Jolly's pertinent convictions, designed should introduce his corporation idea.

5/4 J.F.R. completes the refutation of government charges along legal lines. A U.S. Senate committee receives and files a report

further attacks on Christians.

1094 Reports of contemporaneous persecution of pilgrims in the Holy Land stir up Western Christendom.

1095 Pope Urban II at the Council of Clermont, France, enthuses Western Christendom to recover the Holy Land from the Moslems.

1096 Godfrey of Bouillon and other princes start the first crusade, bent on delivering the Holy Land and the holy sepulchre from the Moslems.

1097 Two views arise on papal and imperial theories and practices, resulting in the rise of the two medieval political parties, Guelphs and Ghibelines.

1099 The First Crusaders capture Jerusalem and set

that at Society headquarters German spies are harbored, and thereby stirs up more opposition to Truth people.

5/8 Eight members of Bethel are arrested by the U.S. The report of this and of other persecutions greatly stirs up the Truth people everywhere.

5/9 F.H. McGee arouses the Committee adherents to the first miniature crusade to recover the right of propaganda from persecuting civil powers.

5/10 J. and other Committee members, especially R.H. Hirsh and F.H. McGee, begin to study arguments to vindicate the right of the Lord's people on propaganda and their right to be unmolested while using that right. R.H. Hirsh, after consulting F.H. McGee and J. for pertinent arguments, seeks at Washington the quashing of his indictment.

5/11 R.G. Jolly reports a deed of trusteeship for the Committee; but F.H. McGee wants it changed into incorporation articles, against which R.G. Jolly, R.H. Hirsh and J. register Biblical arguments. Thereupon and henceforth the Committee divides into two groups on incorporation.

5/13 Wm. Hollister, I.F. Hoskins, R.H. Hirsh and

up a Christian kingdom there.

1101 Peter Abelard founds two schools where he teaches, one at Melun, the other at Corbeil.

1106 Peter of Bruys begins to preach against the hierarchical organization of the Romanist Church, as a corruption of the organization of the Church.

1107 The Moors annihilate the flower of the Castilian nobility in the bloody battle of Ucles.

1113 Abelard begins as lecturer on theology at the Cathedral School at Paris a course of teaching that tends to undermine subserviency to Romanist principles and practices.

1118 Alfonzo I takes Sargossa from the Moors.

1120-1138 The Saracens agitate throughout the Moslem world to attack and overthrow the Christian kingdom of Jerusalem and its subordinate kingdoms in the East, and declare them guilty of aggression on Islam.

1121 Abelard is forced by the Council of Soissons to burn his book on the trinity.

J. see the U.S. attorney on the conscription case. J. refutes the U.S. attorney and defends the 8 arrested ones.

5/15 J. more pointedly founds his opposition to the plan to incorporate the P.B.I., on the Levitical wagon type and on the organization of the Church.

5/20 J. begins a more active opposition to organizing a P.B.I. corporation, as a corruption of the Church's organization.

5/21 Government opposition gives the colporteurs a severe setback.

5/27 (evening of 26) J. at Wilmington, Del., preaching on Elijah and Elisha, sets forth certain principles that undermine certain theories and practices of the Committee group.

6/1 J.F.R.'s compromises on conscientious objection, published in the Tower of June 1, 1918, give advantages to the colporteurs.

6/3-6/21 The U.S. Court tries the eight Societyites at Brooklyn on four charges and at 10: 30 P.M. of June 20 all eight of them are declared guilty.

6/4 J. is forced to give ground in a debate on the relations of the Societyites' three corporations.

1125 Lothair II becomes emperor of the Holy Roman German Empire; and Germany is divided by the wars between the dukes Frederick of Swabia and Conrad of Franconia.

1126 Peter of Bruys is burned; Henry of Lausanne becomes his successor. Much discussion prevails on account of the disturbances in the empire, resulting in the pope siding with the emperor, threatening his opponents with defamation and excommunication.

1139 Innocent II holds the second (general) Lateran Council to heal the wounds of the Church. He submits to the terms of Roger, king of Sicily, and grants him the desired lands in Italy.

1141 The Synod of Lens, France, prejudiced in a secret meeting beforehand by Bernhard of Clairvaux, condemns Abelard unheard as a heretic, sending its condemnation to the pope, who approves it.

1142 Abelard dies. Arnold of Brescia as the newly-appointed star-member takes the lead in opposing hierarchical and clerical abuses.

6/8 The Committee's corporation group and its non-organization group clash on the corporation question; and F.H. McGee and R.G. Jolly are appointed a committee to draw up articles for a corporation, which the latter disapproves.

6/9 I.F. Hoskins and I.I. Margeson denounce J., because he warned the first against his course. After the decision to call a convention F.H. McGee and his supporters say they will bring up there the Committee's differences.

6/22 The Committee meets, and on J.'s motion decides to publish The Bible Standard before the Convention, elects R.H. Hirsh managing editor, fixes his and I.F. Hoskins' salary, and sanctions hiring an office. In all this F.H. McGee submits to J.'s proposals.

6/24 I.F. Hoskins and I.I. Margeson resent J.'s course of 6/22, and write to F.H. McGee, who endorses their general attitude toward J.

6/25 J. ceases from his former course doctrinally to fight certain Committee views, and adopts a firmer course of opposition to abuses among P.B.I. leaders and supporters.

- 1146 Arnold of Brescia seeks the reformation of church and state along democratic lines.
- 1147 The second crusade is preached and begun.
- 1148 The crusading armies are defeated and 1149 return home.
- 1149 Henry of Lausanne dies, imprisoned in a monastery.
- 1152 Frederick Barbarossa becomes the emperor. The beginning of the fall of the Christian kingdom of Jerusalem sets in.
- 1153 Jerusalem falls to the Moslems.
- 1154 Frederick Barbarossa humbles the Longobards.
- 1155 Arnold of Brescia is burned.
- 1158 The Longobards are defeated by Frederick Barbarossa, who gives them magistrates.
- 1160 The siege of Milan is begun by Barbarossa.
- 1162 The Longobards lose Milan, Barbarossa razing it to the ground; his
- 6/29 J. begins an agitation for the ecclesiastis' control of the Committee's work.
- 6/30 The convicted Society leaders appeal for bail.
- 7/1 The appeal is studied and 7/2 is denied.
- 7/2 New York elders boycott J. from preaching to the New York Ecclesia.
- 7/5 The old Board group gets control of the Committee. The convicted Society leaders reach the Atlanta penitentiary.
- 7/6 The Society leaders are given prison jobs.
- 7/7 R.H. Hirsch, R.G. Jolly and J. are given no more pilgrim appointments by the P.B.I. Committee, because of the contents of their preaching.
- 7/8 J.'s view of the control of the P.B.I. by the ecclesiastis is by various Committee members rejected.
- 7/11 The old Board group, by the editorial committee's withholding articles, frustrates the decision of the Committee to send The Bible Standard to the printer.
- 7/13 The old Board group plans to oust R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and J. from the Committee.
- 7/15 The old Board group is fixed in its purpose to oust the three. It meets a

magistrates lose power in Lombardy.

setback in I.F. Hoskins' agreeing to send The Bible Standard's MS. to the printer, if I.I. Margeson does not return certain articles within 24 hours.

1165 Great confusion exists among the papal party, the imperial party, the Italian party and the Longobards, each aiming at conflicting purposes.

7/18 At the last Fort Pitt Committee meeting utmost confusion prevails, as the old Board party, F.H. McGee, some of the editors and the three non-corporation brothers disagree.

1170 Peter Waldo begins to study the Scriptures.

7/23 At R.H. Hirsh's suggestion J. seeks certain Scriptures for the first page of The Bible Standard.

1173 Waldo distributes his possessions to the poor.

7/26 J. suggests the free distribution of The Bible Standard at the Asbury Park Convention.

1174 The Longobards, supported by the pope, are warred upon by Barbarossa, who severely defeats them.

7/27 The evening of 7/26 the three non-corporation brothers, assisted by F.H. McGee, pass out The Bible Standard, against which I.F. Hoskins and I.I. Margeson vehemently protest. The old Board group arrays the pilgrims, elders and deacons against the three and forces the dissolution of the Committee.

1175 The Longobard cities renew their league and assemble a large army against Barbarossa.

7/28 J., supported by R.H. Hirsh and R.G. Jolly, rallies the opponents of corporationism by his Sunday A.M. discourse, exposing Committee conditions.

1176 The league of Longobard cities attacks the forces of Barbarossa, utterly defeating them

7/29 J. debates (evening of 7/28) the corporation question with I.F. Hoskins, so completely worsting him

and making him sue for peace with the pope.

that almost the whole convention was turned against the new Committee. In the morning business session their program was defeated almost unanimously and they had to sue for peace with F.H. McGee.

1177 Waldo and others form a company to teach Bible Truth.

7/30 The three non-corporationists agree to a publication of the Committee troubles.

1179 The third Lateran Council refuses the Waldensians the privilege of preaching.

8/1 The editorial committee through I.F. Hoskins refuses R.H. Hirsh the plates of The Bible Standard, which prevents the three from using it to publish the conditions in the Committee in the proposed publication.

1183 Barbarossa is compelled to accede to the independence of Lombardy from the empire.

8/5 (evening of 8/4) The P.B.I. Committee's resolution condemning the activities of the three non-corporationist brothers in effect severs relations with them, making them independent of it.

1184 The pope puts the Waldensians under the ban for their non-papally-authorized preaching.

8/6 The Committee's letter to the Philadelphia Ecclesia in effect bans the three brothers.

1187 Saladin, Moslem ruler, captures Jerusalem.

8/9 Imprisoned Society leaders suffer restrictions, through their adherents' meddling with the prison authorities.

1189 The third crusade sets in. Barbarossa defeats Saladin.

8-11 The P.B.I. Committee frustrates the Government's effort to involve it with W.F. Hudgings.

- 1190 The Order of the Teutonic Knights is founded.
- 1191 Acre in Palestine is taken from the Saracens under Saladin by the Crusaders, especially under Richard the Lion-heart.
- 1192 Saladin under stress makes a truce with Richard the Lion-heart, advantageous to the latter.
- 1198 Innocent III, the most powerful of all popes, becomes pope and immediately sends missionaries to convert the Albigensians, Waldensians and other antipapists.
- 1203 Innocent III starts Peter of Castlenau out to exterminate the Albigensians. He is checked.
- 1204 Peter of Castlenau and his main supporters receive another check from the Albigensians. The Inquisition is started by Innocent III.
- 1209-1229 Innocent III
- 8/12 Bros. Hirsh, Jolly and J. agree to work together against the P.B.I.'s efforts to corrupt the organization of the Church.
- 8/13 W.F. Hudgings overmatches the Government in his trial.
- 8/14 The Government under stress gains a postponement of W.F. Hudgings' trial, advantageous to him.
- 8/20 F.H. McGee sets out on a course to win back those who had withdrawn from the P.B.I. and arouses his party in the Philadelphia Church to seek to win them back to the P.B.I.
- 8/25 At F.H. McGee's instigation I.F. Hoskins appears before the Philadelphia Ecclesia to prove Bros. Hirsh, Jolly and J. to be misrepresenters of P.B.I. conditions, and makes a complete failure of his attempt, in his debate with J.
- 8/26 (evening of 25) I.F. Hoskins and five other P.B.I. leaders receive another disastrous defeat before the Philadelphia Church, in debate with R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and J.F.H. McGee leaves, determined on a fixed repression of the Epiphany movement.
- 8/31-9/20 F.H. McGee

starts a 20 years' long crusade against the Albigensians, in which great battles are fought, with heavy losses on both sides, the Albigensians being ultimately overthrown.

incites a 20 days' conflict between P.B.I. and J.'s supporters, at Philadelphia and elsewhere. In parts of this conflict he writes his Brief Review, inserted into the Committee's August, A Letter of Importance, inserted into its September Bulletin, and many controversial letters are written. J.'s Another Harvest Sifting Reviewed is increasingly circulated, the Philadelphia Convention is held, the Investigative and Remedial Committee is appointed and begins its work. The Philadelphia Ecclesia withdraws its support from the P.B.I., asking for a refund of a part of its contribution, and discontinues to receive its pilgrims. No new methods of conflict are started after 9/20, when the Brief Review was written.

1212 Christians decisively defeat the Moors at Tolosa, Spain. The Crusade of Children sets in.

9/3 The Society's five conventions, ending the evening of the 2nd, arouse the colporteurs to sell the Six Volumes as against the militarists. Sharpshooters join in this crusade.

1215 At the Fourth Lateran Council Innocent III renews the excommunication of the Waldensians.

9/6 F.H. McGee restirs the P.B.I.'s boycotting of J.'s supporters and the Philadelphia Convention.

1217 The Fourth Crusade begins and lasts until the year 1221; Peter Waldo dies.

9/8 Under stimulation of F.H. McGee the so-called "Opposition" opposes registration under the draft until the enrolment of Sept. 12.

1221 The Fourth Crusade ends.

1228 The Fifth Crusade sets in, under Emperor Frederick II, lasting until 1240. It is successful in 1228 and 1229, but in 1239 Theobald of Navarre and in 1240 Richard, Earl of Cornwall, fail in their parts of this crusade.

1231 The Waldensians examine and criticize the empire and the papacy and seek a cure for these. Robert Grossetete, of Lincoln, England, rids himself of pluralities.

1232 The Inquisition, which Innocent III started in 1204, is given a more developed form by Gregory IX.

1235 Grossetete becomes Bishop of Lincoln, England, and reforms the clergy.

1245 The General Council at Lyons rejects the excommunicated Frederick II.

1248 St. Louis IX of France starts the Sixth Crusade.

1249 St. Louis IX after some successes meets

The P.B.I.'s boycotting of the Philadelphia Convention changes J. from a milder to a severer course toward them.

9/12 J. is included in the draft ordered for this date.

9/19, 9/20 The P.B.I. succeeds in overcoming govern-mental suspicions against it as to its Society relations, but J. as director of the Epiphany Movement, 9/30, and as pilgrim, 10/1 makes no headway against such suspicions.

9/22 The Investigative and Remedial Committee begins its work with the Philadelphia Class partisans of the P.B.I. J. gives up advantages as a pilgrim in the interests of his work.

9/23 F.H. McGee develops the spy and intimidation system of the P.B.I., especially in its adherents in the Philadelphia Church.

9/26 J. enters into a course of reformation of pilgrims, dealing especially with Dr. S. N. Wiley.

10/6 F.H. McGee and supporters oppose the efforts of a faction in the committee to control him, and hold it at arm's length.

10/9 J. decides to fight his drafting into the army.

10/10 After some success J. meets rebuffs and defeat

- reverses, is, captured and made to pay a heavy ransom for release.
- 1250 St. Louis sails to Acre, Palestine. Grossetete angers Innocent IV by demands of clerical reform in discussion with the draft officers.
- 1252 Grossetete protests against papal encroachments in England. 10/11 J. gives attention to Society matters as to W.F. Hudgings, and angers F.H. McGee by demands of reform in pilgrims and elders.
- 1253 Grossetete makes his final, most stringent and successful protest against Innocent IV's foisting his absentee grandson upon a canonry in Grossetete's own cathedral. 10/13 At Alliance, O., J. protests against F.H. McGee's and the P.B.I.'s encroaching on pilgrim work.
- 1254 St. Louis returns to France. 10/14 (evening of 13) At Alliance, O., J. makes a final protest and denunciation against F.H. McGee's and the P.B.I.'s favoritism in support of their pilgrims' encroaching on the Epiphany Bible House pilgrims. This protest and denunciation receive the approval and support of the brethren at Alliance.
- 1261 Supplementary Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals are handed to Pope Urban IV, who immediately guarantees them as genuine. 10/15 J. gives up attention to W.F. Hudgings.
- 1268 The papacy emerges victorious in its over 150 years' fight with the Hohenstaufen emperors. 10/22 F.H. McGee works on the charter for the P.B.I., accepting revolutionistic views thereon from P.B.I. leaders, as proper.
- 1269 St. Louis starts the Gallican liberties of the French church. 10/29 F.H. McGee is victorious in his over five months' struggle with the controlling P.B.I. group.
- 1270 Marsiglio is born. St. Louis begins the Seventh (last) Crusade, but dies at Tunis on his way to Palestine. 10/30 J. vindicates and makes prevail the liberty of the ecclesiast. 10/31 J. decides to refute in writing F.H. McGee's Brief Review and Letter of Importance and the whole

1274 The Fourteenth General Council (at Lyons, France) at the pope's direction lays down terms of peace between the pope and the emperor.

1278 A Concordat is made between Nicholas III and Rudolph, king of Germany, making legal the pope's victory over the empire and the Hohenstaufens in a conflict of over 150 years.

1285 Philip IV, the Fair, becomes king of France. Marsiglio begins his study of the relation of the pope to the civil power.

1290 The supplementary Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals receive general acceptance in the Western Church.

1291 Acre, last crusaders' stronghold in Palestine, falls to the Saracens.

1294 Boniface VIII becomes pope.

1295 Boniface VIII and Philip IV, the Fair, of France, quarrel. The latter withholds all Church dues.

wrong stand of the P.B.I. J. makes a final effort to oppose his drafting.

11/4 F.H. McGee and supporters lay down terms of peace between them and the opposing, controlling section of the Committee.

11/8 At the P.B.I. Providence Convention (11/6-11/10) final agreement is reached between F.H. McGee and supporters and the opposing controlling Committee faction on corporation organization, sealing the end of the over 150 days' conflict.

11/15 J. decides to publish a magazine as an occasional publication. He begins to write the first number of *The Present Truth* and gives special attention to the relation of F.H. McGee to the P.B.I.

11/20 The P.B.I. directors sign in duplicate the charter for their corporation.

11/21 W.F. Hudgings' points against the Government's charge are refuted.

11/24 F.H. McGee enters into a more tyrannous course than formerly.

11/25 J. writes in *The Present Truth*, No. 1, on F.H. McGee's justifying the P.B.I.'s refusal to return the demanded proportion of the Philadelphia

Church's contributions and advises discontinuance of contributions to the P.B.I., which many withhold.

11/27 F.H. McGee is forced to make concessions through J.'s arguments and their influence on his supporters.

12/1 B.A. Parkes, as F.H. McGee's messenger to J., denounces J. as busybodying in general Church matters. J. refutes his points in *Present Truth*, No. 1.

12/2 (evening of 1st) The Philadelphia Church, in elders, deacons and other members, almost unanimously approves J.'s opposition to F.H. McGee, etc., and passes a resolution to call a convention for Dec. 20-22 to take up charges against his papistical course.

12/3 F.H. McGee and his supporters greatly resent J.'s criticism of him and them and his call for an investigative convention. F.H. McGee's course toward these two things betrayed the spirit of an unsound mind. From this time forward he and his supporters enter into a waning experience. He sets forth the thought that only the P.B.I. has the right to appoint pilgrims and manage the general Church's work, *i.e.*,

1297 Boniface VIII is forced to make concessions to Philip, on examining his arguments and the reaction of France to them.

1301 Boniface sends by a messenger his bull *Ausculta fili* (Hear, O son), denouncing Philip for busybodying in general Church matters. Philip seizes the bull from the messenger's hand and publicly burns it.

1302 Philip assembles the three estates of France, which, supported by the whole nation, approve Philip's rejecting the bull and his calling for a general council to hear charges against Boniface.

1303 Boniface, bitterly protesting the king's stand and demand for a council, dies, insane. With him the papacy begins to wane. He writes the infamous bull, *Unam Sanctam*, claiming universal civil and ecclesiastical authority and the subjection of the state to the church (the pope). To him a contemporary said "Thou ascendedst [the papal throne] as a wolf, thou reignest as a lion, thou shalt die as a dog"—a correct description of him.

1305 Clement V is forced by Philip's position to remain in France.

1309 Marsiglio, the principal man and a member of the Sardis star, steps forth as reformer against papal control over the State. The papacy moves to Avignon, France, subject more or less to the influence of French kings.

1311 Augustinus Triumphus writes in defense of the pope, against Philip IV.

1312 Marsiglio is rector of the Paris University.

1314 Philip IV, the Fair, dies.

1324-1328 Marsiglio's *Defensor Pacis* (Defender of Peace) appears and defends Louis, the Bavarian, as emperor against the pope in a controversy that involves Italy, France and Germany and greatly compromises the papacy.

he is its actual controller.

12/5 F.H. McGee is forced by J.'s course to occupy himself with J.'s positions.

12/9 Present Truth, No. 1, is mailed (evening of 12/8). It, among other things, repudiates the P.B.I.'s claim of exclusive control of the general Church's work. Its positions force F.H. McGee to move into J.'s sphere of influence.

12/11 H.C. Rockwell writes sharply against J. to the Philadelphia Church, in defense of F.H. McGee.

12/12 J. takes Present Truth, No. 2, to the printer.

12/14 J. consents to the elders' meeting at which the P.B.I. sympathizing Philadelphia elders are to prefer charges against him, to take place Sunday, 12/15.

12/24-12/28 Present Truth, No. 2, appears and in its first article, *The Church Completely Organized*, and in its second article, *In Defense of Peace Among God's People*, defends the P.B.I. rights as against F.H. McGee's theories on its powers, thus arousing a controversy involving the P.B.I. and its supporters and F.H. McGee and his supporters within the Committee and J. and his supporters, much to the detriment of F.H.

1342 Marsiglio vindicates the right of the civil power to dissolve marriages by absolute divorce and its right of sanctioning a remarriage in certain cases.

McGee, as the first article sets forth the Truth on the functions of the Church.

1347-1350 John Tauler, a Sardis star-member, writes and preaches and does other ministerial works at Strasbourg, despite the pope's interdict then resting on the city. He opposes the pope's theories on the interdict.

1/11, 1919 In the beginning of the article on the Youthful Worthies started on this day there is directly implied the right of the Lord Jesus to divorce the Great Company members and of the Lord's servants to announce such divorce.

1365 Pope Urban V demands 1,000 marks (\$3,230.) as quit rent from England.

1/16-1/19 Despite F.H. McGee's and his supporters' disapproval, J. writes the article on The Purposes of the P.B.I. Examined, in The Present Truth, No. 3, in which J. opposes F.H. McGee's theories on such disapproval.

1366 Wyclif, a Sardis star-member, comes out against the payment of this quit rent.

2/3 Instigated thereto by F.H. McGee, the Philadelphia P.B.I. class, claiming to be the original Philadelphia class, demands by letter a part of the Epiphany Ecclesia's property.

1367-1369 Wyclif attacks the begging friars with ever increasing vigor and telling effects.

2/4 J. comes out against granting the demand of the P.B.I. class, on the ground that every sifting movement that might leave the Philadelphia Epiphany class could make a like claim.

1369-1377 Wyclif during

2/5-2/7 J. writes for The Present Truth, No. 6, the article on J.F.R.'s second new view, which was agreed in by his fellows in bonds and which was first suggested by R.H. Barber.

2/7-2/15 J. begins and

these years increases his opposition to the pope, the papal curia and the monks, writing with increasing vigor and popular and royal approval against them.

1378-1384 The great papal schism sets in. Wyclif makes it the occasion of a great attack on the papacy and transubstantiation. He translates the Bible into English, attacks the mendicant orders and dies Dec. 31, 1384.

1391 John Hus, a Sardis star-member, begins his reform work, stimulated thereto by Wyclif's writings.

1400-1412 Hus works progressively by preaching, lecturing, debating and writing against Romanist errors and practices, until in 1411 he is excommunicated, but nevertheless defends his position and orthodoxy until he is in 1412 driven into exile from Prague, where he had been a professor in the University, preacher and priest.

1411 Ferdinand of Castile, Spain, takes the fortress of Antequera and its surrounding country from the Moors.

about  $\frac{3}{4}$  completes writing the article on Revolutionism against God's arrangements for The Present Truth, No. 4, which is a devastating attack on the P.B.I.

2/16-2/22 Great division sets in, in the P.B.I. Committee. J. writes the later parts of the article on Revolutionism, etc., for Present Truth, No. 4, publishes the W.T.B.&T.S. Charter, attacks the P.B.I. as a counterfeit Christ and its partisan agents as spies in the Philadelphia Ecclesia.

3/1 J. answers letters of the Pittsburgh P.B.I. Class attacking him, and begins a reformation work toward it along the lines of the revolutionism article of Present Truth, No. 4.

3/10-3/22 During this period J. writes the article on Salient Points in P.B.I. History, goes on a pilgrim trip to Harrisburg, Duquesne and Johnstown, carries on a controversial correspondence with the Pittsburgh P.B.I. Class, and is cut off from service in certain P.B.I. classes, e.g., Pittsburgh.

3/21 U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, New York, yields to the Society lawyer's arguments to grant bail to the eight imprisoned Societyites.

- 1414-1418 The Council of Constance convenes to reform the church, head [pope] and members, and does away with three antipopes.
- 1415 Hus is martyred by the Council of Constance; and Wyclif is condemned.
- 1428 Wyclif's remains are dug up by Romanists and burned, and their ashes thrown into the River Swift.
- 1431-1449 The Council of Basel, continuing the efforts of the Council of Constance, seeks for 18 years to reform the church in head [pope] and members and cure the Bohemian revolt due to Hus' martyrdom. These are varyingly circumvented by the crafty popes, Eugene IV, 1431-1447, and Nicholas V, 1447-1455.
- 1438 Roman and Greek Catholics discuss reunion at the Ferrara Council.
- 1439 A paper agreement for reunion is made between the Council of Florence and Greek delegates.
- 1440 The Greeks reject the plan of reunion with the Romanists.
- 1452 Savonarola, a star-member of the Philadelphia Church, is bom.
- 3/24-3/28 Great efforts in P.B.I. circles are made to change the evils in their midst, especially in F.H. McGee, the Committee and editorial staff.
- 3/25 J. is "roasted" by the P.B.I. reformers for his attacks on the P.B.I.
- 4/7 P.B.I. pilgrims denounce J.'s strictures against P.B.I. revolutionism as exposed in Present Truth, No. 4.
- 4/10-4/28 Great efforts in continuance of former ineffectual ones are made to reform the P.B.I. adherents, especially F.H. McGee, the P.B.I. directors and the editorial staff, and to win back J.'s supporters, his exposures causing the P.B.I. much trouble. These reform efforts are variously circumvented by F.H. McGee's tactics.
- 4/17 The P.B.I. discusses with representatives of the B.S.C. a working union.
- 4/18 A working agreement is made by the P.B.I. for it and the B.S.C.
- 4/19 At the first meeting of the B.S.C. it fails to agree to a working alliance with the P.B.I., but desires fraternal relations with it.
- 5/1 On this, the 16th anniversary of J.'s renouncing the Lutheran Church and the 15th of his entering the

pilgrim work, he resolves on more effective service.

Here the picture, beginning in 1459, changes in the Little Roman Catholic Church from the P.B.I. and F.H. McGee to the Society and its leader, J.F. Rutherford, and continues in this changed form until the end of the Small Miniature.

1466 The wars between the Christians and the Moors in Spain enter their decisive stage.

1479 John Wessel, the principal man in the Philadelphia Church, lays down the four cardinal principles of the Philadelphia or Reformation Church: (1) the Bible the sole source and rule of faith and practice; (2) justification through faith alone in Christ's merit; (3) Christ the sole Head of the Church; (4) only the truly consecrated are Priests. The announcement of these truths arouses the Cologne Inquisition to seek to apprehend him, but he escapes to Holland.

1480 Mulei Hassan, Moorish king of Granada, Spain, attacks and takes Zahara.

1489 John Wessel dies.

1490-1498 Savonarola does reformation work at Florence, Italy.

5/15 The eight convicted Societyites are freed from their 20-year sentence through the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals.

5/28 J. writes the Questions of General Interest for Present Truth, No. 8, in which he sets forth the four cardinal principles of the Reformation of the Small Miniature Gospel Age, which are similar to those that were used in the Gospel-Age Reformation. These principles struck mainly at Rutherfordism. The Societyites seek to restrain J. in argument on these subjects; but he successfully escapes their arguments.

5/29 Societyites are given a setback in seeking to get the ban removed from Vol. VII and other literature.

6/7 The Post Office requires J. to print a smaller edition of No. 8.

6/8-6/16 J. works on the distribution of No. 6, which was printed in Feb., but withheld from mailing until J.F.R would return to his

1492 The kingdom of the Moors in Spain is finally overthrown, after an existence of 781 years (711-1492).

1498 Savonarola is martyred at Florence, at the instigation of Alexander VI, one of the most wicked of all popes, through the magistracy of Florence.

1511-1512 After discussing matters with Staupitz, his superior, Luther goes to Rome, where he witnesses the unholy doings of the Curia and the lower clergy and becomes clear on justification by faith alone.

1517 Luther, a star-member, nails the 95 theses on the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg, attacking Tetzel's indulgence traffic.

1518 Multitudes give Luther their confidence and support against the pope and his supporters.

1520 Luther burns the pope's bull of excommunication and a copy of the canon law.

1521 Luther at Worms

work, beginning this distribution work with addressing the wrappers.

6/10 Societyites finally gain liberty as to colporteuring with Vol. VII, especially in its vest-pocket edition, after over two years' hindrances thereon.

6/16 J. (and other opposition leaders), at J.F.R.'s instigation, is by Geo. H. Fisher at the New Haven Society Class (evening of 6/15) accused of "betraying" the Society leaders to the Government.

6/29-6/30 R.H. Hirsh and J. discuss Society conditions and Geo. H. Fisher's charge of J.'s alleged betraying the Society leaders, etc., and J. attains clearness on the Society works matters through seeing faith as the justifying element in his anti-Society work.

7/5 J. at the Philadelphia General Convention denounces the Society leaders' course of indulging its adherents' loose conduct to gain their support.

7/6 The Philadelphia General Convention gives J. a vote of confidence and support against J.F.R., etc.

7/8 J. defies J.F.R.'s denouncing him as a member of the Judas class, and repudiates his regulations.

7/9 J. refuses to submit to

refuses to submit to the pope's and demand that he submit to the Society's teachings and practices

1522 Luther's New Testament, the main foundation of his teachings, is published.

1521-1522 Zwingli, a star-member, studies from John Wessel's view the matter of the symbolic meaning of the words of the Lord's Supper: "This is My body; . . . this is My blood," and endorses this view in 1522, as against transubstantiation and instrumentalization.

1523 Hubmaier, a star-member, rejects and preaches against infant baptism, and preaches the baptism of consecrated adults as the sign or symbol of their consecration.

1528 Hubmaier is burned by Romanists at Vienna for Truth preaching.

1531 Servetus, a star-member, writes and publishes his book, On The Errors Of The Trinity.

1532 Servetus writes and publishes his book on Dialogues On The Trinity.

1533 Cranmer, a star-member,

J.F.R.'s and his Board's emperor's demands to recant and submit to papal teachings and practices.

7/10 The first copies of Present Truth, No. 6, which in its article on The Last Related Acts of Elijah and Elisha furnishes the main foundation truths of the Epiphany, is circulated.

7/9-7/10 J. studies the view that the Society is the business channel of the Mahlite Merarites and recognizes that it is not the channel of the Priests, either as mouthpiece or as controller, and as such merely represents and helps Levites and counterfeit priests and their sacrifices.

7/11 J. denounces the Societyites' swallowing without proof the "channel's" teachings, and holds that only such teachings as are understood and proven be accepted.

7/16 J. is "roasted" by Societyites for circulating No. 6.

7/19 J. collects data proving that the Society as a corporation is controller and the I.B.S.A. and P.P.A. are subordinate to it.

7/20 J. continues to collect material on the supremacy of the Society over the I.B.S.A. and the P.P.A.

7/21 J. sets forth the

issues the teaching that the Church is subject to the civil powers, and not vice versa, as Rome teaches.

1534 The Society of the Jesuits is formally instituted by seven members, to defend the Romanist Church and the pope.

1537 Luther writes the Smalcald articles against the papacy. These became a part of the Lutheran Confession of faith, as they embody their main teachings against Romanism.

1540 Pope Paul III confirms and legalizes the Jesuits under the name, Order of the Society of Jesus, and introduces the Spanish Inquisition into Italy.

1547 Henry VIII's death and Edward VI's accession to Britain's throne give Cranmer liberty to further English Protestantism.

1553 Servetus is burned through Calvin's instigation.

1553-1558 Bloody Mary persecutes the English Protestants, re-establishes the Romanist religion, causes at least 286 Protestants (the legal records of other burned ones being lost) to be burned, including four bishops, one archbishop (Cranmer) and many ministers, and allows hundreds of others to die

thought of the Board's controllership in Society affairs and business, as against that of its president.

7/22 The seven released Society leaders bind themselves to stand by the Society and J.F.R.'s direction.

7/25 J. finishes the outline of the article on The Society As Channel, for Present Truth, No. 9, which becomes a material part of the Epiphany Truth against Societyism.

7/28 J.F.R. formally sanctions the band of the seven freed Society leaders as the special helpers of the Society, especially of J.F.R., and introduces executively an espionage system.

8/4 Hindrances giving way, and favorable conditions arising, J. introduces certain reforms in conducting the pilgrim work.

8/10 R.H. Hirsh repudiates J. in certain of his views on the relation of the Society's three corporations.

8/10-8/15 Society pilgrims begin oppressive and persecuting acts against J.'s supporters, from the chiefest to the lowliest of them, "roast" many of them, as well as J., cause the disfellowshipping of those Societyites who read and sympathize with The Present Truth and influence many Societyites to return it to J.

of hunger, exposure and other tortures in prison, and in many other ways oppresses other Protestants, including the forcing of thousands into exile.

1565-1573 Martin Chemnitz, one of the three greatest Lutheran theologians, writes his Examination of the Decrees and Canons of the Council of Trent, in four volumes, the greatest anti-Romanist work of all time. This work, under God's blessing, saved Protestantism from the counter reformation of the Jesuits.

1572 Fearful massacres of Huguenots throughout France occur.

1580-1586 Robert Browne, a star-member, teaches and writes in favor of congregational church government, labors much in its interests, is much persecuted, and ceases preaching and writing on this doctrine in 1586. He protests against the rule of ecclesiastis by elders, pastors, bishops and popes as against God.

1588 The Spanish Armada advances to attack England and is disastrously defeated by the English navy and storms.

1605 John Arndt, the father of the Pietistic movement among Christians,

refused and unopened.

8/22-8/30 J. while on a pilgrim trip writes the article, J.F.R.'s Third New View Examined, divided into four parts, i.e., containing four leading lines of thought, an article that forced J.F.R. to cast aside his third and issue a fourth new view on Elijah and Elisha.

8/29 The least sympathy with J.'s supporters is in the Society squelched.

9/6-9/12 J. writes and speaks much on ecclesiaism in its Epiphany relations, protesting against invasion of ecclesia rights on the part of the Society and other general leaders and on the part of usurping local elders and their sectarian supporters.

9/14 Societyites seek by colporteur attacks to overthrow Epiphany pilgrim work and are severely beaten by Epiphany pilgrim defenses and by God's opposing providences.

10/1 J. writes the Helps For Devotional Service for Present Truth, No. 12.

publishes the first book of his True Christianity.

1612 Lewis Bayly publishes his book, *The Practice Of Piety*, which converts Bunyan, Spener and many others. In 1821 it reaches its 74th edition.

1618-1648 The Thirty Year's War is waged, in which Romanism seeks by force to destroy Protestantism, in which many great battles are fought and in which much devastation is wrought, but whose outcome is to the disadvantage of Romanism and very injurious to the pope's power and prestige; and the legal right of existence is won by Protestantism.

1628-1633 John Gerhard, one of the greatest doctrinal writers of all time, writes his 4-volumed work on *The Catholic and Protestant Confession*, which next to Chemnitz's *Examination Of The Decrees And Canon Of The Council Of Trent* does Romanism more damage than any other anti-Romanist work and closes the main doctrinal battles of the Reformation.

1638 Chillingworth's anti-

10/8 J. writes the last question for No. 12, stressing the kind of heart that keeps one in the Little Flock unto final overcoming.

10/14-11/13 Great strife over questions of policy and arrangement sets in, occasioned by the Society's refusing to let the "Opposition" unmolestedly do pilgrim, colporteur and volunteer work. The conflict is carried on by *The Tower* and *The Truth* (Nos. 12 and 13), by addresses, letters and other means of agitation. J. closes his part in the controversy by writing (11/13) the *Golden Age* article in No. 13. It results in a setback for the Society and J.F.R. and in greater rights being won for the 'Opposition.'

10/24-10/29 J. writes for No. 13 the article on the Epiphany, in four parts, an article that works, next to J.'s article on J.F.R.'s *Third New View* in No. 11, the most damage to Rutherfordism and some other Levitisms and advances toward victory the Epiphany doctrinal and arrangement attacks on Rutherfordism and certain other Levitisms.

11/3 (evening of the 2nd)

- Romanist book, The Religion of Protestants, appears.
- 1648-1691 George Fox, a Philadelphia star-member, carries on during these 43 years his preaching and writing ministry in Britain and America, amid many tribulations and persecutions, which he meekly endures, stressing the thought that true religion consists of supreme love to God and equal love to man.
- 1656-1657 Blaise Pascal writes his Provincial Letters, whereby he deals a crushing blow to the influence of the Jesuits.
- 1658 The Reformation approaches the end of its polemic stage against the papacy and papal doctrines.
- 1669 Spener, the leader of the Pietistic movement, begins to preach heart-searching sermons, especially one July 18 on the vain righteousness of the Pharisees, starting specific Pietism.
- 1676 Spener writes his book, Pious Desires, which gives a distinct impetus to the Pietist movement, because of its calling for a deeper Christian life based on fundamental Christian doctrines and practices.
- 1692 Spener's influence begins to mold conditions at the Halle University favorable to a consecrated atmosphere. The publication
- R.H. Bricker attacks the Society at Pittsburgh, Pa.
- 11/13-12/26 During these 43 days J. concentrates his ministry by preaching, teaching, writing and corresponding on character development. This can be seen in the subjects on which he preaches, teaches, writes and corresponds, the writings appearing in Nos. 14 and 15 of Present Truth.
- 11/21-11/22 J.'s correspondence leads him to write many letters against various views of the Society leaders.
- 11/23 J. by writing No. 14 begins to end the first stage of his polemics against the Society.
- 12/4 (evening of 3, at testimony meeting) J. stresses heart religion as the main thing and encourages the brethren to combine it with true knowledge.
- 12/11 (evening of 10, at testimony meeting) J. stresses certain doctrines, attainments and privileges that Christians should have, which call for a more consecrated life.
- 12/27 J. begins to influence the Polish brethren through the Philadelphia Polish convention, which he addresses this day, and by

- of George Fox's posthumous writings ends the polemic part of the Reformation.
- 1693 Spener's book on The Hope Of A Future Better Time hints at a coming Millennium.
- 1703 John Wesley, a Philadelphia star-member, is born.
- 1713 Arrangements are made for Wesley to begin his student life at the Charterhouse School, London.
- 1720 Wesley enters Christ Church College of the Oxford University.
- 1738 Wesley undergoes what he called his conversion, but what was actually his quickening.
- 1739 Wesley begins outdoor preaching.
- 1740 Bengel, the man on the other side of the river (Dan. 12: 5, 6), does the finishing work on his exposition of Revelation.
- 1741 Bengel hands his work on The Order Of Times to the printer.
- 1741 Wesley and Whitefield disagree on the question of predestination.
- 1742 Wesley arranges for itinerary preaching for laymen, as well as for ordained ministers.
- 1744 Wesley holds his first his lecture on Azazel's Goat ends the polemic part of the little Reformation.
- 12/28 J.'s addresses at Newark throw out hints on the coming Small Miniature Millennium.
- 1/7, 1920 J.'s attention is called to the spread of Olsonism in New England.
- 1/17 J. (evening of 16) arranges to begin to study C. Olson's Ransom and Atonement doctrines.
- 1/24 J. writes on 1 Kings 17: 1-24 and refutes C. Olson's view thereon.
- 2/11 J., aroused by the hypocrisy at the Society's 1920 election, begins the article, Hindrances To Fruitful Service.
- 2/12 J. extends the Epiphany work to the Standfasts.
- 2/13 J. does his finishing work on the Revelation part of Olsonism Examined and arranges for its printing.
- 2/14 J. hands the chronological parts of Olsonism Examined to the printer.
- 2/14 J. and R.H. Hirsh disagree on fixed pilgrim arrangements for ecclesiastas.
- 2/15 J. arranges for B.M. Kittinger to give the Newark Ecclesia a pilgrim visit, as well as arranges for regular pilgrims so to serve.
- 2/17 J. and R.G. Jolly

conference, and takes charge of the lay preachers.

1749 Wesley and Zinzendorf, leader of the Moravian Brethren, and some of the latter's followers whom he stirred up against Wesley, fall out, especially over publication work.

1763 Wesley and Bishop Warburton of Gloucester engage in controversy, the latter deriding the former for sending out preachers.

1764 Wesley's methods and teachings are attacked by William Cudworth through his own and others' writings.

1763-1783 Parliament at George III's instigation for 12 years provoked the American colonies by various oppressive acts, until thereby the American Revolution broke out in 1775, lasting until 1783, when America obtained independence.

1769-1779 Wesley is involved in the Calvinian controversy with Toplady and others.

1772 Barton Stone, a Philadelphia star-member, who emphasized the doctrine, The Bible alone is the creed and center of unity for God's people, is born.

confer on the letter of E.A. Fowler as to elders' and pilgrims' Epiphany services, of which J. takes charge.

2/22 R.H. Hirsh and the latter's sympathizers, Scott and Sarah Chapman, of Jersey City, N.J., on learning from R.H. Hirsh that J. no more uses him on The Present Truth, fall out still more with J.

3/7 R.H. Hirsh criticizes J. for sending out brothers for pilgrim work, especially blaming R.G. Jolly for doing such pilgrim work.

3/8 R.H. Hirsh criticizes J.'s Berean Methods, charging that they drive brethren away from meetings, and are against Bro. Russell's arrangements.

3/7-3/27 A coterie of the Philadelphia elders at R.H. Hirsh's instigation provoked the Philadelphia elders supporting J. by various oppressive steps as to pilgrim, elder and deacon works, until 3/19, when J. and his supporters openly fight back and gain independence.

3/13-3/23 J. is engaged in controversy with R.H. Hirsh and others on fixed arrangements for the work.

3/16 J. emphasizes to R.G. Jolly that the Parousia Truth is the real belief and center of unity of God's people as against R.H. Hirsh's sectarianism.

1779 Wesley ends his part in the Calvinian controversy.

1782 William Miller, the last member of the Philadelphia star, is born.

1789-1799 During this period the French Revolution occurs, overthrowing the absolute monarchy in France, establishing the republic there, defeating the coalition of Europe that sought its overthrow and spreading republicanism over large parts of Europe, with Napoleon instrumental in large part for these effects. Even the French clergy in part submit to, and support the republic.

1791 Wesley dies after making strong appeals to his adherents against clericalistic propensities. The pope begins to oppose the French Republic's principles and advocates a community of nations under papal influence.

1794 Mary Jones begins to save money with which to buy a Bible.

3/23 J. ends the controversy with R.H. Hirsh on God's fixed arrangements.

3/26 J. attains clarity on leading Azazel's Goat to the Gate, on its experience with, and use by Satan, and on Lev. 10.

4/2-4/12 J. and his supporting elders and R.H. Hirsh and B.M. Kittinger and their supporting elders come into sharp debate over ecclesiaism and clericalism practices, also on Epiphany teaching and practices. These things come for debate before the ecclesia 4/11, which passes 3 of 5 of J.'s anti-clericalism and pro-ecclesiaism resolutions, whereby the Hirsho-Kittingerite movement receives a severe defeat in managing the Epiphany work in this ecclesia. Even R.H. Hirsh seconds J.'s motions on these five resolutions.

4/4 In a sermon on Heb. 3: 12-14 J. makes his final appeal to halt R.H. Hirsh and B.M. Kittinger from the evil course that he sees them plotting and taking. J. receives the Apr. 1 Tower, which in the article, Let Us Dwell In Peace, opposes ecclesiaism and advocates union under the Society.

4/7 Sr. A. G. James writes J., asking for The Present Truth and permission to help him in correcting MSS.

- 1795-1804 The French government by discussion and acts attacks the pope's anti-republican theories and practices, whereby the papacy is brought to defeat.
- 1800 Mary Jones walks barefoot 40 miles to Bala, Wales, and return for a Bible.
- 1801 Barton Stone begins to preach the doctrine that the Bible is the creed and center of unity of God's people.
- 1802 Mr. Charles of Bala, Wales (Dec. 8), tells the incident of Mary Jones' barefoot journey for a Bible to a tract society, in an appeal for more Bibles.
- 1803 A tract appears appealing for a Bible society and containing an account of Mary Jones' journey for a Bible.
- 1804 The first Bible society is formed.
- 1805 Napoleon administers a severe defeat on the clergy for seeking to block his recommendations in matters affecting France.
- 1814 Pope Pius VII begins a series of denunciations of the Bible societies, running through many years.
- for The Present Truth or in his other publishing work.
- 4/8-4/17 J. begins to study J.F.R.'s article, Let Us Dwell In Peace, and writes his reply, which overthrows J.F.R.'s pertinent papistical theories and practices.
- 4/13 Sr. James makes a humble request to get further literature and to serve in the Epiphany's literature preparation.
- 4/14 J. in the article, Let Us Dwell In Peace Reviewed, emphasizes the thought that the Parousia Truth is the belief and center of unity of God's people.
- 4/15 J. tells R.G. Jolly and several others of Sr. James' petition for Epiphany literature and for opportunities to help in its preparation for the press.
- 4/16 J. writes of Sr. James' request to a number of friends.
- 4/17 J. writes to Sr. James on coming to Philadelphia to assist him on his MSS.
- 4/18 Through the Ecclesia's passing J.'s 4th and 5th resolutions, J. administers a severe defeat on B.M. Kittinger and his supporters.
- 4/27 J.F.R. begins a series of denunciations against anti-Society publications, especially Present Truth, lasting many days.

1829 William Miller gets the light on the chronology and thus becomes the first of the virgins going forth to meet the Bridegroom.

1831 William Miller delivers his first lecture on the chronology. Newman (helped by Keble and Froude) begins the Romeward movement in the Church of England.

1833 William Miller publishes a booklet of 64 pages on Christ's Second Advent and Reign.

1834 Wm. Miller makes special appeal to Christian ministers, Protestant and Catholic, for cooperation as to Second Advent works.

1843 Millerites' first disappointment.

1844 Millerites' second disappointment

1846 Bro. Miller associates Elder Buckley with him in a preaching and lecturing trip. The Evangelical Alliance is formed.

1849 William Miller dies. Pius IX issues an encyclical asking for Romanist opinion on Mary's immaculate conception.

5/12 J. sees that the Gideon public work, for which preparations begin this day, when Sr. James begins to work at the Epiphany Bible House, is the Small Miniature Millennial-Age work.

5/14 J. tells the Franklin Berean class his findings on the presentation of the antitypical wave-loaves, Oct., 1923 to Oct., 1924. W.M. Wisdom (with others' support) begins a Societyward movement by rejoining it.

5/16 J. tells the Easton, Pa., Ecclesia of the dawn of the Small Millennium.

5/17 J. appeals to the Society and P.B.I. leaders to cooperate with him by publishing pertinent literature for the public work.

5/26 The Society Board disappoints J. by refusing to print literature for him.

5/27 J. is again disappointed by Bro. Jolly's report of getting no auditorium for a public meeting.

5/29 J. associates Bro. Schmidt with himself in a lecturing trip at Detroit, Mich. Representatives of various groups of the "Opposition" meet at the P.B.I. Springfield Convention.

6/1 The P.B.I.'s answer to J.'s request for literature for public work disappoints him. The Society's Bulletin on the big drive for June asks whether the ZG's were ever under the ban.

1852 Bro. Russell is born.

6/4 J. writes the preface to Life-Death-Hereafter and adds a supplement in the form of an outline on the Wages Of Sin to its second chapter, thus beginning a new phase as to the public work.

1854 Pius IX decrees Mary's immaculate conception.

6/6 J.F.R. asserts that the ZG's were never under the ban.

1869 The Vatican Council begins. Bro. Russell starts on his quest for the true religion.

6/21 The Societyites begin concertedly their big drive. Judg. 6 under study becomes clearer to J.

1870 The pope's absolutism and infallibility are declared by the Vatican council. Bro. Russell gets slightly clearer views on what is the true religion.

6/22 In their big drive the Societyites stress J.F.R.'s controllership of the work and of the channel in teaching and practice. J. gets still clearer views on Judg. 6.

1871 Bro. Russell gains light on trinity, immortality and eternal torment

6/23 Judg. 6-8, on trinity, immortality and eternal torment, becomes clearer to J.

1872 Bro. Russell gains a firm hold on Ransom and Restitution.

6/24 J. sees Ransom and Restitution more clearly as taught in Judg. 6-8.

1874 Our Lord's return sets in. Bro. Russell first sees the Lord's Second Advent to be invisible.

6/26 Public work preparations advance. J. gets page proof of Extra No. 1. Management of Metropolitan Opera House writes to discuss a public meeting for 7/18, and announcement of it is written for No. 20.

1876 Various Second Advent truths become reciprocally clear to Bros. Russell and Barbour, and preparations for advance in harvesting begin, including part of the book, The Three Worlds.

6/28 (evening of 27). R.G. Jolly reports on status of public meeting auditorium for 7/18. Philadelphia Ecclesia at J.'s suggestion elects S. Calhoun Captain and S. Bowker Lieutenant of Volunteers. J. begins the article on the Epiphany for The Herald, No. 1.

- 1877 The book, The Three Worlds, is finished. The midnight cry, "Behold the Bridegroom", sets in.
- 1878 Mr. Barbour renounces the Ransom and starts the first harvest sifting.
- 1879 The Watch Tower is begun. Bro. Russell sees the two Sin-offerings and the two salvations as displayed in the Tabernacle pictures.
- 1880 Bro. Russell first writes on the two Sin-offerings and salvations in the Tower.
- 1881 Food For Thinking Christians and Tabernacle Shadows are written and circulated. Mr. Paton opposes the harvest Truth and work.
- 1882-1886 Bro. Russell slowly writes Vol. I and publishes it in 1886, when he begins to write Vol. II.
- 1887-1889 Bro. Russell continues to write Vol. II and
- 6/29 The article on The Epiphany, for Herald No. 1, is finished. The Metropolitan Opera House is obtained for public meeting of 7/18. J. orders folders for it printed. J. gets the rest of the page proofs for the book, Life-Death-Hereafter.
- 6/30 (Mrs.) Sarah Chapman of Jersey City, N.J., renounces the Epiphany movement and starts the separation of the Jersey City Class from J.
- 7/1 J. adds a section on the Parousia to the Epiphany article for Herald, No. 1. J. O.K.'s the page proofs of Life-Death-Hereafter and sees clearly the distinction between the Great Company's and Youthful Worthies' sacrifices.
- 7/2 J. adds the Basileia part to the article on the Epiphany for Herald, No. 1, bringing out the High Calling and Restitution.
- 7/3 Work is continued on Herald, No. 1. Special copies of No. 20 are sent to all the members of the Society's Board of Judgment. R.H. Hirsh makes known his opposition to J. at Jersey City.
- 7/4-7/8 J. gradually works on Herald, No. 1, finishing it on 7/8. Posters for public meeting 7/18 begin to be posted. J. begins to write on Bethel matters in Shearno-Crawfordism.
- 7/9-7/11 J. continues to work on literature and arrangements

succeeds in putting it through the press in 1889 and begins to write Vol. III.

1890-1891 Bro. Russell continues to write Vol. III, finishing it and bringing it through the press. Vol. IV is begun.

1892-1894 The Combinationism sifting is carried on; writing of Vol. IV continues. Review of Parliament of Religions is written and light on "that Servant" comes out. The third call operates 1891-1894.

1896-1897 Bro. Russell publishes That Servant article, March, 1896. Vol. IV is published Oct. 1, 1897. Vol. V is begun.

for public work and on the Shearno-Crawfordism article, finishing rough draft 7/11, and does further work on literature and arrangements for public work before departure, 7/11, for Jersey City.

7/12-7/13 J. works on the Hell and Spiritism booklets and on galleys of Herald, No. 1, for the public work, takes them to printer, advances work for public meeting 7/18, revises and enlarges Shearno-Crawfordism article for No. 21 and begins the Evil Servant article for No. 21.

7/14-7/16 Arrangements for the general public work and the Philadelphia public meeting continue, also on the Evil Servant article. Life-Death-Hereafter, Hell booklet and Extra No. 1 are given to workers and folders for public meeting begin to be distributed 7/16. Remaining details of Gideon type become clear.

7/18-7/19 J. appears in the first Gideon public lecture as the representative and mouthpiece of antitypical Elijah, who, according to the Pyramid, was to reappear 7/18. Increased attendance of brethren at the convention who take much of the Gideon literature home with them for distribution. J. writes up a synopsis of his lecture for the papers. J. continues the Evil Servant article.

- 1898 Bro. Russell pushes the colporteur and volunteer work. Vol. V continued.
- 1899 Vol. V is published and Vol. VI begun.
- 1901-1904 Fourth call and sifting operate. Vol. VI is finished and published. J.'s anointing in the Camp and Russell-Eaton debate in 1903. J. enters the pilgrim work, 1904, as helper of Bro. Russell.
- 1905 J. suggests to Bro. Russell that the New Covenant is operative exclusively after the Gospel Age.
- 1908-1911 Fifth call and sifting operate, the latter beginning with the Vow. Intensified public witness begins, also extension work, 1910. Sin-offerings, etc., controversy ends in 1911.
- 1912 Foreign Missionary Investigation Tour is made.
- 7/20 Follow-up work on cards gathered at public meeting is begun. Many new colporteurs, sharpshooters and volunteers enlist.
- 7/21 The colporteur work goes forward. J. continues the Evil Servant article.
- 7/23-7/26 Herald, No. 1, is circulated. J. writes various articles for No. 21. Advertising matter sent for public meeting at Milwaukee. Many outsiders come to J.'s lecture on Lazarus and Dives. Much Gideon literature is distributed. Sifters cause much debate and trouble. R G. Jolly elected assistant pastor at Philadelphia and assists J. at the Question Meeting.
- 7/27 R G. Jolly suggests to J. that Epiphany Truth will operate after the Small Miniature Gospel Age toward the Levites.
- 7/30-8/2 Resolution to stress the Vow arouses opposition. Many Heralds, No. 1, and Extras, No. 1, are distributed. Standfastism Examined is begun 7/30 by J. Dr. Wiley's sifting letter is circulated. Sifting in Britain spreads. Philadelphia sharpshooters energetic. Many outsiders attend the semi-public meeting on Hope For The Unsaved Dead and Question Meetings. Standfastism Examined is completed 8/2.
- 8/3 J. investigates the propaganda methods and results of the Levites.

1913 Serial public meetings are held, other public work increases.

1914 Photo-Drama work begins. J. sees that the evening of the penny parable as beginning Oct., 1914, implies that the Church will be in the world after that date.

1916 Elijah's and Elisha's last related acts are clarified by Bro. Russell. Bro. Russell's toga scene and death occur, which end the lapping of the Parousia into the Epiphany. J. begins the work of the Epiphany messenger.

8/4 Epiphany work increases toward the Truth and nominal-church Levites.

8/5 No. 21 is begun to be distributed. In studying the Pyramid and antitypical Elijah's reappearance, J. sees that 7/18, the date of the Philadelphia public meeting, is the Pyramid-fixed date for that reappearance

8/7 J. explains the Priests and Amramites' last related acts. He brings to a climax the work of manifesting the Amramites, the last of the Levites manifested under bad leadership, by which the Small Miniature Gospel Age ends.

We have now finished the setting forth of the Gospel Age and its Small Miniature in parallel columns. Only the more important and influential events and persons, particularly as these are related to the Little Flock and its star-members were given. Many others could have been paralleled, but our readers will admit that we have given an abundance of these, which prove conclusively that the Small Miniature is a Divinely marked season of the Epiphany, and thus is one of the seasons implied in 1 Tim. 6: 15. It was in the Lord's plan set aside for the manifestation under bad leadership of the Epiphany Levites, the Great Company, in their three main divisions as these are subdivided into eight groups separate and distinct from the Little Flock. This, then, is the purpose of the Small Miniature: the manifestation under bad leadership of the Epiphany Levites in their three main divisions subdivided into eight groups. Their Levitical character is manifest from the Small Miniature in that they are used in parallels of the nominal church as Babylon. It is for this reason, and not as calling them names, that we have so frequently referred to their divisions as being parts of Little Babylon and

to their totality as being Little Babylon. The parallels also prove that the faithful Epiphany brethren correspond to the Little Flock, J. before Bro. Russell's death, to the special assistants of the star-members, whom until his death Bro. Russell paralleled, and thereafter J. corresponds to the rest of these star-members.

Accordingly, the Small Miniature most powerfully proves by multitudes of parallel facts and persons that the Epiphany movement has since our Pastor's death been the official Priestly movement, while the other movements among the Truth people have been the official Levite movements, among which there have been some bewildered Priests, as in the Epiphany movement there have been some Levites, those keeping themselves away from the Levite movements, and remaining in the Epiphany movement until the manifestation of the good Levites proves them to be good Levites.

But there are, as indicated above, two other Miniatures, the Medium Miniature, extending from the Summer of 1918 until well into the Winter of 1937-1938, and the Large Miniature, extending from Oct., 1914, to Oct., 1954. The Medium Miniature was set aside in God's plan to manifest the good Levites, particularly in their leaders, which began in Dec., 1937. The Large Miniature has been set aside in God's plan to manifest the nominal-church foolish virgins to themselves as such, by varied experiences culminating in their last group's coming into the Truth during 1954-1956. While events in the Large Miniature have reached into the parallel of about 1300 A.D., they are as yet too indefinite for paralleling. Nor will we here attempt to draw up the parallels of the Medium Miniature, and that for several reasons: lack of space, pressure of time and too much repetition required for it, because the events and persons of the Gospel Age would be the same as given above, the events of the Medium Miniature would be the same in character as those given in the Small Miniature, the actors in the Medium Miniature would be largely the same as those in the Small Miniature, with the variations, apart from its dates, not of sufficient

importance to justify so much repetition; for the only real thorough difference would be in the dates in the two Miniatures. And this would hardly justify giving it the necessary space in a book that already bids fair to become too large. What we have, therefore, said in this paragraph on the Medium and Large Miniatures will suffice for the third and fourth Epiphany seasons.

From the three Miniatures follow certain conclusions that are important. The main one of these conclusions is this: Those Scriptures that type the Gospel-Age persons, events, things, etc., have small applications in these three Miniatures. The antitypical persons, events, things, etc., of the Gospel Age may be called the large antitypes, while those of the Miniatures may be called the small antitypes. Thus, e.g., as the Gospel Age had its antitypical Gideon, Jephthah, Samson, David, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Parousia, Harvest, 1260, 1290 and 1335 days, seven churches and angels, five siftings, etc., so have the Miniatures their small antitypical Gideons, Jephthahs, Samsons, Davids, Daniels, Ezras, Nehemias, Parousias, Harvests, 1260, 1290, 1335 days, seven churches and angels, five siftings, etc. The fact that there are such Miniatures demonstrates as a matter of course that there are such small antitypes. Again, types of evil persons and deeds whose antitypes are found in the Gospel Age proper find small antitypes in the Miniatures. Thus as the Gospel Age had its antitypical Esau, Korah, Dathan, Abiram, Abimelech, Saul, Sanballat, Tobiah, Judas, etc., and its antitypical evil deeds, like many typed in the historical books of both Testaments, so do the Miniatures have their small antitypical Esaus, Korahs, Dathans, Abirams, Abimelechs, Sauls, Sanballats, Tobiahs, Judases, etc., and their small antitypical evil deeds typed in the historical books of both Testaments. Without mentioning the fact of their being large and small antitypes, many of such were set forth in the parallels given above. In later chapters we will bring many of such to our dear readers' attention.

Nor will it be necessary here to discuss the fifth, sixth and seventh Epiphany seasons, the Small and Large

Eight Wonderful Days and The Days of Waiting for the Wave Loaves' Presentation, since we have done this in fair detail in Vol. V, Chap. V and Chap. I, to which we refer our readers for these details. There remains for our brief study an eighth Epiphany season, i.e., the parallel in time and event between the activities of the Parousia Messenger and the Epiphany messenger. Exactly 40 years apart these do parallel things. Presumably such a parallel will work between them to the full end of the Epiphany. We will here point out in parallel columns some of these. As J. did not become active as the Epiphany messenger until shortly after our Pastor's death, we are not to look for parallel dates and acts 40 years apart in the Epiphany messenger until after that death. Such dates and events began to set in immediately after Bro. Russell's death.

Nov. 11, 1876 The Centennial Exposition at Philadelphia ending the day before, Bro. Russell began to prepare to leave Philadelphia to supervise the reaping work in America.

April 1, 1877 Bro. Russell leaves home as supervisor of the work and as pilgrim, to announce the message, "Behold the Bridegroom," etc., the main Parousia work, the separation of the Church from Babylon.

Dec., 1878–May, 1879 Bro. Russell, while continuing to write as an assistant editor for the *Herald Of The Morning*, works on the idea of founding the Watch Tower and definitely in May decides to do it and at once begins to write its first number.

April, 1877–Aug., 1880 Bro. Russell wages his first general

Nov. 11, 1916 J. leaves New York for England, preparatory to his supervising the Epiphany work in London and elsewhere in Britain.

April 1, 1917 J. leaves England for America, to be used by the Lord to supervise the main Epiphany work, the separation of the Little Flock from the Great Company, i.e., the Church from Little Babylon.

Dec., 1918–May, 1919 J., while issuing an "occasional" edition of *The Present Truth*, works on the idea of publishing it regularly and definitely in May decides to do it and at once begins to write its first regular number.

April, 1917–Aug., 1920 J. wages his first general controversy

controversy with the nominal church, mainly on her practical aspects.

Nov., 1879 Bro. Russell from more or less unclear ideas on the details of Lev. 16 arrives at clearness on the Lord's Goat.

July, 1878–Sept., 1881 Bro. Russell wages strenuous controversy with Mr. Barbour and his supporters in the first doctrinal sifting of the Parousia.

Sept., 1881–Nov., 1881 Bro. Russell begins the third-hour call of the Parousia, by the circulation first of Food For Thinking Christians and then Tabernacle Shadows.

June, 1882–Oct., 1884 In the third-hour sifting of the Parousia Bro. Russell continues to battle against Ransom denials, in the form advocated by Mr. Paton.

1882-1886 Bro. Russell writes in Studies, Vol. I and in The Watch Tower unfolding Parousia truths.

1886-1889 Bro. Russell writes in Studies, Vol. II and in The Watch Tower further unfolding Parousia truths.

1889-1891 Bro. Russell writes in Studies, Vol. III

with the Society, mainly on questions of its policies.

Nov., 1919 J. from more or less unclear ideas on the details of Azazel's Goat arrives at clearness thereon.

July, 1918–Sept., 1921 J. wages strenuous controversy with the P.B.I. in the first doctrinal sifting of the Epiphany.

Sept., 1921–Nov., 1921 J. begins the third-hour call of the Epiphany, first by public meetings, colporteur and volunteer work and then by the Tabernacle Shadows articles on the Gospel-Age Levites and other Tabernacle articles.

June, 1922–Oct., 1924 In the third-hour sifting of the Epiphany J. continues to battle against the doctrinal and chronological errors advocated by the P.B.I.

1922-1926 J. writes in The Herald Of The Epiphany and The Present Truth unfolding Epiphany truths, corresponding to those of Bro. Russell 40 years before.

1926-1929 J. writes in The Herald Of The Epiphany and The Present Truth further unfolding Epiphany truths, corresponding to those of Bro. Russell 40 years before.

1929-1931 J. writes in The Herald Of The Epiphany

and in The in The Watch Tower further unfolding Parousia truths.

1891-1894 Bro. Russell writes in Studies, Vol. IV and in The Watch Tower further unfolding Parousia truths, through the latter of which and through Studies, Vols. I, II and III the sixth-hour Parousia call goes out.

Nov., 1892-Oct., 1894 The sixth-hour Parousia sifting sets in, which occasions much controversy on Bro. Russell's part against nominal-church and Truth combinationists.

Nov., 1894-Oct., 1897 Bro. Russell writes in Studies, Vol. IV and in The in The Watch Tower further unfolding Parousia truths.

1896, 1897 Bro. Russell suffers much through the falsehoods of local sifters, led by Mrs. Russell.

1897-1899 Bro. Russell writes in Studies, Vol. V and in The Watch Tower further unfolding Parousia truths.

1899-1901 Bro. Russell writes Vol. VI in part and also continues writing Towers, etc.

and in The Present Truth further unfolding Epiphany truths, corresponding to those of Bro. Russell 40 years before.

1931-1934 J. writes in The Herald Of The Epiphany and in The Present Truth further unfolding Epiphany truths, through which and former volunteer issues the sixth-hour Epiphany call goes out.

Nov., 1932-Oct., 1934 The Sixth-hour Epiphany sifting sets in, occasioning J. much controversy against organized and unorganized combinationists.

Nov., 1934-Oct., 1937 J. Writes in The Herald Of The Epiphany and in The Present Truth further unfolding Epiphany truths.

1936, 1937 J. suffers much through the falsehoods of local sifters in Poland, led by Mr. C. Kasprzykowski.

1937-1939 J. writes in The Herald Of The Epiphany and in The Present Truth further unfolding Epiphany truths, corresponding to those of Bro. Russell 40 years before. In 1938 J. commences to write E. J.

1939-1941 J. continues to write The Present Truth, The Herald Of The Epiphany and finishes E. J.

It will be seen from the above parallels that the six volumes of the Studies and the Watch Towers have their parallels in The Herald of the Epiphany and The Present

Truth. The above parallels having been written up to the present, 1941, the parallel cannot now be traced any further. It is a matter of our faith that the parallel will continue to work, up to Oct. 31, 1956, corresponding to Oct. 31, 1916, the date of our dear Pastor's going beyond the vail. In some of the above parallels the days of the parallel years are given, but in most of them we do not possess the data on the involved dates: but we have the assurance of faith that the parallel events began and ended 40 years apart to the day, even if we cannot trace them so closely as that, due to our lack of the involved data. Enough has been given to show that the Parousia and the Epiphany are, not only of the same length, 40 years, as we have shown, *e.g.*, in Vol. V, but are also parallels in their events, persons and dates, which also implies that from certain standpoints the Parousia Messenger and the Epiphany messenger are parallels doing like things 40 years apart.

We have now finished this chapter on the Epiphany Seasons. The facts herein presented, we believe, demonstrate the truthfulness of St. Paul's statement of 1 Tim. 6: 15, that the Epiphany has various seasons. We believe that the second part of the Epiphany (the first being that devoted to the Priesthood's dealing with Azazel's Goat, and the second being that devoted to the Priesthood's dealing with the cleansed Levites) will likewise manifest several seasons, for the opening of which to our eyes of understanding we can quietly and confidently wait upon the Lord. At any rate, what has been said in Vol. V on the two sets of the Eight Wonderful Days and The Time Of Waiting On The Wave-Loaves' Presentation, in Vol. VII on the anniversary parallels and in this chapter on the Miniatures and the Parousia and Epiphany parallels, may well give us a basis for confidence in what will be presented in the rest of this book as being the Divine Truth on the activities and experiences of the Epiphany messenger.

## CHAPTER II.

### SHORTER FORECASTS.

THE ONE AND TWO OF DEUT. 32: 30. THE ANGEL OF REV. 19: 9, 10; OF 22: 10, 11. THE EIGHT PRINCIPAL MEN OF MIC. 5: 5. MEDAD. JONATHAN. ELEAZAR. JEDAIAH. JACOB. AARON. ITHAMAR. ZECHARIAH.

TOWARD the end of the preceding chapter we called attention to the fact that the Miniatures implied secondary and small fulfillments of those Bible types whose primary and large antitypes have belonged to the Gospel Age proper. And most of the rest of this book will bring to the reader's attention such small antitypes. However, the brother who was foreknown by the Lord as about to become the Epiphany messenger was by God given some part in individual prophecies and types applying to the Gospel Age proper. In almost all of such cases he appears in prophecies and antitypes in which Bro. Russell acted as the leader, and in which he played a secondary role as Bro. Russell's supporter or chief supporter. In Vol. IX many antitypes of our Pastor in the Gospel-Age picture were given; and in a subsequent volume of this series many others, *D.v.*, will be presented. As was and will later additionally be shown, whole books of the Bible typing Gospel-Age matters represent him. For the Gospel Age proper, as distinct from the Epiphany, no such extended prophecies and types of J. are given, for the good reason that he played no such leading roles as would justify such a thing. The prophecies and types applying to him in the Gospel Age, as distinct from the Epiphany, are shorter forecasts because of the subordinate parts that were his in the Gospel-Age picture. Other brothers, apart from our Pastor and him, were also used in some Gospel-Age antitypes, as in part were brought out in Vol. IX, and as further will be brought out later on. In this chapter these shorter forecasts of him will be set forth, we trust, to the Lord's glory, and not to self-exaltation. The

motives for such presentations, set forth in the Foreword of this volume, are true.

First, then, we will study some prophecies applying to the Gospel-Age picture that point out J. The first of these is Deut. 32: 30: "How should one [Bro. Russell] chase a thousand [the Parousia Second Deathers], and two [Bro. Russell and J.] put ten thousand [the Epiphany Great Company] to flight, except their Rock had sold them [given them up to defeat], and the Lord had shut them up [restrained them]." The following remarks will serve to clarify and prove our bracketed comments. Moses' oration to Fleshly Israel (Deut. 4-33), one of the greatest to fall from man's lips, is a prophecy of the teachings that Jesus would give during the Parousia and Epiphany to Spiritual Israel. Accordingly, this verse tells of something that would be done in the Parousia and Epiphany. As during the Parousia our Lord used Bro. Russell to refute, and thus to chase from the field of battle the Second Deathers, so during the Epiphany He has used Bro. Russell (in his writings) and J. to refute, and thus put to flight from the field of battle the Great Company. There was no controversy during the Parousia with the Second Deathers but Bro. Russell thoroughly chased them from the field of battle; and during the Epiphany there has been no controversy with the Great Company but Bro. Russell in his writings and J. put the Great Company to flight. Their thus battling for the Lord accounts for their writings containing so much controversial matter. Search the controversial writings of Bro. Russell, and see if they did not thoroughly refute the Parousia Second Deathers' false teachings, and search the writings of, these two brothers and see whether they do not thoroughly refute the false teachings of the Epiphany Great Company. The reasons for their chasing and driving such from the field of battle is that God had forsaken the latter unto their becoming Satan's mouthpieces, and that He had given the two named brothers the Truth by which they were used by God thoroughly to restrain such.

But, one may ask, how do we know that the thousand are Second Deathers and that the ten thousand are the Great Company? We answer: Both the facts of the case and the Bible in the setting of the Deuteronomy prophecy and in Ps. 91: 7 prove this. Certainly, the Parousia facts prove that Bro. Russell, and Bro. Russell alone, refuted all the errors of the Parousia Second Deathers; and certainly, the facts prove that his and J.'s writings, and those of no one else, refuted all the errors of the Great Company. Thus in the end of the Age only these two refuted the errors of the Second Deathers and Great Company. Hence the passage can apply to them only. The setting of the book of Deuteronomy being Parousiac and Epiphaniac, the passage can be applied to these two brothers only, since no one else except them fully refuted the errors of these two classes. And Ps. 91: 7 corroborates this thought. Ps. 91: 1-13 is an address of Jesus in the spirit of prophecy to the Faithful in the end of the Age—in the Parousia and Epiphany. Those who fall away from the true Church are in v. 7 described as the thousand and the ten thousand, the same expressions as Deut. 32: 30 uses. We know that those who fall out of the Little Flock become either Second Deathers or Great Company members. Thus the expressions, thousand and ten thousand, apply respectively to these two classes. Not only are these two classes distinguished from one another by the expressions, "thousand" and "ten thousand," but also by the expressions, "at thy side" and "at thy right hand." The expression "at thy right hand." means place of chief favor: and certainly as between the Second Deathers and the Great Company the latter are in the place of chief favor with the Little Flock which puts the former by contrast at the left hand, which in some passages means place of utter disfavor (Matt. 25: 33, 41). The Little Flock is distinguished from both of these classes by the pronoun *thy* (*at thy* side: *at thy* right hand) and by the fact that the fall of neither of the other two classes will involve it "it [the fall]

shall not come nigh thee." Moreover, Benjamin (*i.e., son of the right hand*) types the Great Company, which fittingly is here shown to be at the Little Flock's right hand. Accordingly, the Bible and facts prove that the one who chased the thousand is Bro. Russell and the two who put ten thousand to flight are he and J.

The second of the shorter forecasts is Rev. 19: 9, 10. The angel who here speaks to John was by not a few of the brethren during the Parousia understood to be Bro. Russell. But the fact that the vision of Rev. 19: 1-10 describes events occurring after his death proves that he evidently is not the messenger of vs. 9, 10, though he belongs to the class symbolized by the messenger of Rev. 22: 8, 9, and thus shared with the rest of that class in giving the reproof and correction of v. 9. We understand the angel of Rev. 22: 8 to symbolize all 49 star-members, from one standpoint viewed as one messenger (Rev. 1: 1; 22: 8, 9), all of whom have been more or less worshipped by the John class, and all of whom have, therefore, given the reproof and correction of v. 8. Not only does the fact that the vision of Rev. 19: 1-10 prophesies things that were to occur after Bro. Russell's death proves that he is not the angel of vs. 9, 10, but also the fact that he never gave the invitation to the Great Company to be present at the marriage supper of the Lamb (v. 9), an invitation that has not yet been given, proves that he is not the one that was to give that invitation. He could not have given that invitation to the Great Company, since there was no Great Company in existence before his death, a fact that he often taught us, though, of course, he taught that there were individual crown-losers in existence then, as well as from shortly after Pentecost onward. The tabernacle shows this; for it shows that all new creatures were in the Holy, priests, and that the court types the condition of the justified; hence before the Epiphany came there was no place in the tabernacle to type Great Company members as such, as New Creatures. A brief synopsis of the vision of Rev. 19: 1-10

proves that this vision refers to the Great Company after our Pastor's death: Vs. 1, 2 symbolize the Society's big drive in Jordan's second smiting, in which they forecast, as vs. 1, 2 show, Babylon's destruction. V. 3 shows that, after ceasing from giving it for a while, they would renew that message, which they did after the release of the Society leaders from prison. V. 4 symbolizes the Epiphany message, and that as one coming (mainly) out of the Old Testament Scriptures interpreted in harmony with God's four great attributes. V. 5 symbolizes the Lord's charge coming, after the Levites will begin to cleanse themselves, to all the Lord's people to proclaim His Word as bringing praise upon Him. Vs. 6-8 prophesy the proclaimers and their proclamation. V. 9 contains a charge that will be given by the Epiphany messenger to the Little Flock, exhorting her to proclaim the blessedness of the Great Company as being invited to the Lamb's Marriage Supper. He further assures the John class of the truthfulness of his message. Then follows (v. 10) the attempt by the John class to worship this messenger, who corrects them for it, showing why they should not so do. Evidently this section treating of Epiphany events, its angel is the Epiphany messenger, which name is largely based on this verse, though other passages also imply it.

The third shorter forecast in the form of a prophecy on the Epiphany messenger is found in Rev. 22: 10, 11. Here he speaks again and that as the last one of the 49 star-members, who are represented in vs. 8, 9 as a Mass symbolized by the angel, as they are also in Rev. 1: 1 so symbolized. That the Epiphany messenger is represented by the "he" of v. 10 is evident from the nature of what is said. Only when he expounds connectedly the entire book of Revelation will it be due to say, "*Seal not* the sayings of the prophecy of this book"; for Bro. Russell refused to expound the book as a whole, and after the early eighties of the last century refused to answer almost all questions asked him thereon. J. has hitherto followed, and for some years yet will continue to

follow, the same course, which he will change toward the end of the Epiphany, when he will begin to expound the book in its entirety connectedly. Another and still stronger reason that J. is the "he" of v. 10 is this: that the message of v. 11 will not be due until Oct., 1954, when the Epiphany begins to lap into the Basileia, *kingdom*; for 1954 is the date that the last member of the Great Company will get his first enlightenment that will bring him into the Truth by Passover, 1956; after 1954 no Youthful Worthies will be won; and after 1954 no more persons will enter the tentatively-justified state. Hence the exhortation: "He that is unjust [the tentatively justified, who are not actually justified, not just, let him be unjust still [remain tentatively justified, and not consecrated; and he that is filthy [the impenitent sinners, who in no sense are clean, let him be filthy still remain in his then condition]; and he that is righteous [Levites of the Great Company and Youthful Worthies, who, being in the Court, are righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy [Priests are holy, since they are in the Holy], let him be holy still." Certainly, when we come to a time when no more consecrations are possible for Gospel-Age purposes, it would be useless to exhort the tentatively justified, to consecrate and sinners to repent, for the tentatively justified and sinners could arise no higher from their standings before God under such a condition; hence only at such a time could the first and second exhortations of v. 11 be given, but, of course, the exhortation for the Great Company, Youthful Worthies and Priests to continue faithful will remain appropriate as long as they are in the earth. Thus the nature of these four exhortations, coming in the order in which they come in v. 11, proves that these exhortations will be given by the Epiphany messenger; for in the order given they will not come until from 1954 onward.

The fourth and last shorter forecast in the form of a prophecy that is here to be given is Micah 5: 5, 6. The

Assyrian (v. 5) of this passage is those who make spoil of God's people by devastating (shall come into) the Truth and its Spirit (our land) and by trampling under foot their chief doctrines (palaces). This the Assyrian has done in each of the seven stages of the Gospel Age. And in these seven stages God's people (we) have raised up against such spoilers the seven angels (seven composite messengers, here called seven shepherds) and eight principal men, one of whom presided in each of the first six Churches, and two of whom preside in the seventh Church. In each of these Church stages the angel (shepherd) was a composite one, *e. g.*, the angel of the Ephesian stage, was the twelve Apostles, a composite angel, accordingly. In each of the first six Churches these angels had among them a principal man. The principal man of the Church's first stage was Paul; of its second stage, John; of its third stage, Arius; of its fourth stage, Claudius of Turin; of its fifth stage, Marsiglio and of its sixth stage, Wessel. The seventh stage, consisting of two similar periods, the second of which containing three Miniatures that duplicate the whole Age and a parallel that duplicates its Parousiac part, has a composite angel of only two members, who are each a principal man. Thus while there are seven composite angels (shepherds), these seven shepherds contain eight principal men. The principal men bore the brunt of the Assyrian's attacks on the Truth and its Spirit and they more than any others of the star-members devastated (waste, v. 6) the teachings and spirit (land) of these spoilers (Assyrian), especially their most public and important ones (entrances thereof). It was through these seven shepherds and eight principal men (thus) that the Lord delivered His people from the antitypical Assyrian. If we look, *e. g.*, at what our Pastor did against the Truth and nominal-church sifters during the Parousia and at what J. has been doing against the sifters of the Epiphany, we will readily see how the Laodicean Church's composite shepherd,

even its two principal men, have wasted the teachings and spirit of these marauders, especially their public and main ones and how thus God by them has wrought deliverance from them for His people in the two periods of the end of the Age, even as by the first six shepherds, including their principal men, the Lord did the same thing for the previous Churches.

Our study so far shows that there are shorter forecasts in the form of prophecies that point out J.'s work, but the same thing is done by shorter forecasts in the form of types, which we will now proceed to study. The first of these to reach its fulfillment is the type of Medad. The story of Eldad and Medad is found in Num. 11: 26-29. In Vol. IX, Chap. I, details on Num. 11 are given; and then there is given a rather detailed discussion of the Gospel Harvest's Eldad and some details on its Medad, to which the reader is referred, but practically nothing on the latter's anointing is there given. A few features of the antitype will, therefore, here be set forth. As a Lutheran pastor J. early in 1903 desired earnestly to have a more fruitful ministry for the Lord. R.A. Torrey's booklet on the baptism of the Spirit as an indispensable equipment for the Lord's service had made a deep impression on his mind on the desirability of having such an equipment. Though consecrated for 15 years, he made a re-consecration of himself, this time, as he thought, for service, an unclear idea that he had imbibed from the said booklet. Among other things, he told the Lord that he was willing to become a doormat on which the church members might wipe their feet, if that should be the Lord's way of making him more effective for the Lord. He arose from his knees fully persuaded that the Lord had given him the desired gift. And from that time onward, despite several errors that he had imbibed from that booklet, he was given a different spirit from that which prevailed in the Lutheran Church, and shortly afterward his study of the Scriptures extending over a period of 2½ months, without human aid,

opened up to him a number of teachings that drew him away from those of the Lutheran Church and into some peculiarly harvest truths.

His prejudice against "Russellism" was so great that he would not read its literature, nor listen to its expounders. The following are the teachings that solely from Bible study without human help became clear to him from about Feb. 23 to May 5, 1903, after which date no further such openings of the Scriptures came to him at that time: (1) the unity of God, as against the trinity; (2) human mortality, as against the deathlessness of the soul; (3) death, not eternal torment, as the penalty of sin; (4) Papacy, the beast, and Protestantism, the image of the beast, constituting Babylon; (5) the identity of the Millennium and the Judgment Day; (6) probation for the non-elect dead during the Millennium; and (7) 1914 the end of the Age. Immediately, while in the nominal church he began to teach and preach some of these things, which led to his renouncing the Lutheran Church and to his coming in among the Truth people. For a full year he did unofficial pilgrim work before the public and a little of it in several Truth ecclesias until on the first anniversary of his renouncing the Lutheran Church, May 1, 1903, he became an official pilgrim under Bro. Russell's appointment. Apart from Bro. Russell and J. none of the Gospel Harvest pilgrims was given his anointing to the pilgrim work until after he had come in among the Truth people (gathered the seventy . . . about the tabernacle, v. 24).

The next shorter forecast in the form of a type to reach a fulfillment in him is given in two places (2 Sam. 21: 20, 21; 1 Chro. 20: 6, 7). This type occurs in connection with some related ones in 2 Sam. 21: 15-22; 1 Chro. 20: 4-8. We gave a brief exposition of 2 Sam. 21: 18-22 and 1 Chro. 20: 4-8 in Vol. IX, 391 (34), to which we refer our readers for the special setting of these passages. Here we will give a few details typed by Jonathan's fight with the twelve-fingered

and twelve-toed giant of 2 Sam. 21: 20, 21 and 1 Chro. 20: 6, 7. This giant types M.L. McPhail, whom J. esteemed as, next to our Pastor, the ablest of the pilgrims. Late in 1908 he became disgruntled and joined the 1908-1911 sifters. J. was appointed to give, April 18, 19, 1909, a pilgrim visit to the Church at Chicago, where M.L. McPhail lived. After much thought and prayer J. decided to make a special effort to win him, and in case of failure to destroy, if possible, his sifting influence in that Church. Accordingly, on the 18th J. delivered such discourses as he thought would tend to secure these purposes. For the next day he planned for a question meeting in the afternoon, well knowing that the questions would be on the burning questions of the hour: Sin-offerings, Mediator, Covenants and Ransom. Further, he planned to invite M.L. McPhail to be his guest for the evening meal, hoping by private conversation to win him, after he would have heard his answers in the question meeting; and the final part of his plan was to discourse at night on the Church as the second Sin-offering. All three things were calculated to win him and strengthen the Church against sifting activities. His great abilities are typed by the twelve fingers and twelve toes, as well as by the great height of the giant. J., however, knowing that he had the pertinent Truth, and believing that he could successfully expound it and defend it against the sifters' attacks, feared not the encounter. The effect of the first two discourses on the Church was very favorable and resulted in putting M.L. McPhail on the defensive, without directly attacking his teachings; particularly was this the effect of the second discourse, in that part of it that dealt on the harvest siftings and trials; for at the end of that talk brethren weeping, pleaded with him to return to the Truth.

His coming to the question meeting too late for J. before the meeting personally to invite him to have supper with him, J. arranged for a deacon to inform him on his arrival that the former desired to see him after the meeting. J. had

in the question meeting a splendid opportunity to explain the Covenants; for, as he expected, almost every question was on the New Covenant, and the controverted aspects of it he covered in fair detail. The question meeting finished, J. took his place at the exit to greet the brethren as they left the hall. Perhaps nearly half of the audience had already left when M.L. McPhail reached J. and asked him what he desired. Thereupon J. invited him to take supper with him, where they could talk over the matters that J. had in mind. M.L. McPhail was much wrought up. He insisted on discussing matters then and there. Knowing that he would go down to defeat before about 125 brethren, if it would there be discussed, and knowing that that would make his recovery harder, J. declined, asking to defer it until they would be at supper. This the former would not allow, and began to attack the Truth. Hence much against his preference, J. was compelled to debate with him before about 125 brethren. At first J. acted on the defensive, refuting the offered objections, and kept reminding him that he was attacking things that up to a short time before he had for years believed and taught.

Toward the end of about 90 minutes' discussion, J. took the aggressive, on the claim that Sarah typed the Oath-bound Covenant to the Christ, especially using Acts 3: 25, where the prospective Church gathered from Israel is called, the *children of the prophets and of the Covenant* that God made with their fathers. M.L. McPhail fairly shouted that this Covenant was not the Oath-bound, but the New Covenant, which the sifters claimed was the Church's mother. J. asserted that it was the Oath-bound Covenant, because it was spoken to Abraham, and was in the very words of the last feature of the Oath-bound Covenant, "saying unto Abraham, 'And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed.'" Quivering with excitement, M.L. McPhail reassured that the covenant of Acts 3: 25 was the New Covenant, claiming that he would prove it by the reading of

the text. He then called for a Bible, which, when handed to him, he could hardly hold, his hands trembling so greatly. His eyes became dimmed by his nervousness, so that for quite a time he could not read. But when his eyes cleared and he read the text, he violently closed the Bible and, crestfallen, immediately went away, exhibiting to about 125 brethren his complete defeat. That debate and that night's talk on the Church as the second Sin-offering put the finishing touches on his sifting influence on that Church. Apart from his wife and one or two others, he utterly failed to win any to his side in that Church of about 400 members. And the next morning the Lord gave J., as a reward for his defending His Truth and people, the understanding of the parable of the penny in those parts fulfilled before its evening. Later, except the meaning of the penny, which the Lord gave to our Pastor first to see, every other part of the parable was given to J. first to see, as due, and our Pastor endorsed his view of it after careful study.

The next shorter forecast of J. in the form of a type to be fulfilled is a triple one and is found in 2 Sam. 23: 9, 10, 13-17; 1 Chro. 11: 12-19. We have already shown in Vol. IX, Chap. VI, how Jashobeam, the mightiest of David's warriors, in the three acts narrated of him in 2 Sam. 23: 8, 13-17; 1 Chro. 11: 11, 15-19 types Bro. Russell as a pilgrim, while David types him as that Servant acting executively in peace and controversy. Briefly, we would say that David's mighty men listed in 1 Sam. 23 and 1 Chro. 11 represent the pilgrims as warriors, five of whom are specially typed by details of their forecast deeds. Since in Vol. IX, Chap. VI, in addition to explaining the Jashobeam type we expounded Abishai in slaying 300 with his spear as typing Bro. John Edgar by his booklet, Where Are The Dead, refuting those who teach the consciousness of the dead, it will be unnecessary for us to go into that type and antitype any further. In that same chapter we showed that Shammah, the third

mightiest of David's warriors in defending and delivering the field of lentils from the Philistine band (2 Sam. 23: 11, 12) types Bro. Barton defending the Truth on the Covenants against the 1908-1911 sifters.

Shammah's part with David's two mightiest warriors in breaking through the Philistine : guard at Bethlehem and dipping from its well water with which to refresh David (2 Sam. 23: 13-17; 1 Chro. 11: 15-19) types Bro. Barton's battle with, and victory over demons, who attempted to sour him against Bro. Russell because of the latter's course toward the leading sifters, and his consequent getting from the well of Truth, the Bible, the Truth on the individual Satan's having been bound (1874-1878), in so far as absolute control over the fallen angels is concerned. The fifth pilgrim whose special exploits are set forth in 2 Sam. 23 and 1 Chro. 11 is J. F. R., the antitype of Benaiah (vs. 20-23), whose killing of the two lionlike men of Moab types J.F.R.'s refuting his antagonist in two debates, whose slaying a lion in a pit in winter types J.F.R.'s refutation in the Time of Trouble (winter) of the nominal church in its slanders against the harvest people, particularly Bro. Russell, in his booklet, A Battle In The Ecclesiastical Heavens, and whose attacking a spear-armed giant Egyptian, with his staff types J.F.R.'s advancing, without any other preparation than his general legal knowledge, to meet the lawyer who was carefully prepared in legal argument to prove that the Society should be taxed, taking the lawyer's own points, and overthrowing him therewith.

We have above briefly set forth the deeds of three of David's four mighty men (the deeds of the fourth being in Vol. IX set forth in detail) as preliminary to a larger exposition of the deeds of Eleazar, David's second mightiest warrior. Three special exploits of his are set forth. In all three he represents J. as a Parousia pilgrim warrior for Truth and against error.

The first of these to be antityped is found in 1 Chro. 11: 12-14. Eleazar means *mighty help*; Dodo, *loving*;

Ahohite, *brotherly* (v. 12), whereby J.'s character as a warrior is set forth. Pas-dammim (v. 13, *field of bloods*) represents the sphere of the two Sin-offerings, in connection with which the hardest battles with sectarian errorists (Philistines) were fought. J. was especially associated with Bro. Russell as that Servant in fighting for the Truth on these two Sin-offerings (was with David at Pas-dammim). The truths (barley) in great abundance (parcel of ground full of barley) specially there defended were on the two Sin-offerings, Mediator, Covenants and Ransom. At the beginning of the sifting most Truth people fled from the field of argument for fear of the sifters (the people fled from before the Philistines). But Bro. Russell and J. (they, v. 14) took a determined stand (set themselves) on these subjects (in they midst of that parcel) and successfully defended them (delivered it) and completely refuted the sifters (slew the Philistines) in a great victory (saved by a great deliverance).

Bro. Russell's share in the fight is here not represented by Jashobeam, *i.e.*: as a pilgrim, but by David, *i.e.*, as that Servant in his executive and warrior capacity. Accordingly, his part in the controversy as conducted in the Tower, beginning with the Jan. 1, 1909, issue, is here pictured, while J.'s part is pictured as performed by himself as a pilgrim warrior (Eleazar). Some facts to clarify his part in the defense of the four pertinent truths will here be given: One of the sifting elders of the Allegheny Ecclesia, a Mr. Read, in Feb., 1909, sent J. a long typewritten discourse, giving the sifters' pertinent views, with copious but misapplied Scripture references as alleged proof of their position. He asked J., after studying his discourse, to give him his thought thereon, and to give book, chapter and verse in disproof, if he disagreed with him. His article was subtly drawn up, calculated to deceive the elect, if that were possible. Realizing that this discourse was one of the first literary guns of the sifters to go off, J. went to the Lord in prayer, asking for His help to defend

His Truth and His people. J. had had difficulty in 1903 in seeing the Church's share in the Sin-offering. Amid that difficulty he had made a vow to God that, if the Church did share in the Sin-offering, and if God would make it clear to him, he would do his utmost to expound and defend it for the good of God's people. Accordingly, often from 1903 to 1909 J. preached on this doctrine, proving it by abundant literal and figurative Scriptures.

When Mr. Reads discourse came to him, J., after studying it carefully, drew up in writing a series of 28 questions and answers, backed by numerous Scriptures on the four involved questions, and sent these to him. Mr. Read, after receiving it, must have concluded to fish in other waters, since he did not reply to J.'s letter, nor ever afterward approach him on the subject, though he was active in seeking to win others. This letter was written to Mr. Read from Detroit, when J. served there as a pilgrim, Feb. 21, 22, 1909. His letter convinced J. that the sifters had begun their doctrinal sifting in full earnest. Remembering his pertinent vow of 1903, he immediately threw himself into the controversy with every power of his body, mind and heart. Almost everywhere he went during the next 15 months, he preached on one or another of the four pertinent subjects, especially emphasizing the Church's share in the Sin-offering, as he recognized it to be the key to the other involved points, particularly to the Mediator and the Covenants. Many a troubled and doubting brother or sister was he enabled to help come out of their pertinent troubles and doubts, and reach solid convictions on the involved matters. His zeal and heavy work on this matter was contributory to his falling into brain-fag within 15 months. But he spared not himself, but "set" himself with all his power to defend these truths and to refute the sifters; and by the Lord's help (the Lord saved with a great deliverance) his efforts were blessed with success in these two respects. The typical episode at

Pas-dammim emphasized J.'s controversial activities as a pilgrim working among and toward the Truth people, as Bro. Russell's special helper in the latter's capacity as that Servant and as a star-member.

The second of the three related typical shorter forecasts now under study types J.'s controversial pilgrim work from Feb. 21, 1909, to May 22, 1910, toward the public, as distinct from his controversial work as a pilgrim, just brought out, among the brethren. It shows, among other things, one of the main causes of his breaking down in brain-fag. The typical episode is given in 2 Sam. 23: 9, 10. Not only did J. occupy himself with the phase of the murmursome contradictionism sifting as this was carried on by the Truth sifters; he also occupied himself with that phase of it as it was carried on by the nominal-church sifters, who during those days not only wrought havoc among nominal-church people, but savagely attacked the Truth. The intensified public work had its beginnings during the 1908-1911 sifting. This phase of the public work was a defiance of the pertinent nominal-church sifters on the part of Bro. Russell, as warrior-executive, and J., both of whom stood together (one of the three mighty men *with David*, when they defied the Philistines that were gathered together to battle, v. 9). The attacks of these nominal-church sifters were so numerous and severe that most of the Truth people retreated from before them (the men of Israel were gone away). J.'s share (Eleazar) in this battle was contemporaneous with his battle with the Truth sifters on the Sin-offerings, etc. In the involved 15 months, during which he spent 13½ months in the pilgrim work, J. held 259 public meetings, an average of nearly 5 a week, and of these 105 were held from Jan. 1, 1910, to May 22, 1910, the date of his breakdown, *i.e.*, an average of 5¼ a week, while during that same time he conducted 611 parlor meetings, an average of 11½ parlor meetings a week, 182 of these being conducted from Jan. 1, 1910, to May 22, 1910,

an average of over 9 a week. In all, during those 13½ months' pilgrim work he conducted 870 public and parlor meetings, an average of over 15 a week, 287 of these between Jan. 1, 1910, and May 22, 1910, an average of nearly 15 a week. During this time he did not spare himself between meetings, for then, too, he was continually helping others. With the possible exception of his 4<sup>1</sup>/<sub>3</sub> months' work in Britain in 1916 and 1917, he never worked harder before or since. He put every ounce of his strength into the meetings and into conversations between meetings.

His pertinent public subjects also were very largely controversial, as against the nominal-church sifters (he arose and smote the Philistines, v. 10). Controversial discourses and writing take a great deal more vitality from one than non-controversial discourses and writing do. In these public lectures all sorts of attacks on the Truth from nominal-church sources were refuted. Under this long-continued and hard work weariness was J.'s constant portion. By March 1, 1910, his exhaustion began to undermine his sleep until, though working at the utmost of his power, only 3 or 4 hours could he sleep in 24. This increased his exhaustion, but did not slacken his work. From about May 10 onward he found it increasingly difficult to concentrate and on the 22nd brain-fag set in (his hand was weary). It was during the second public meeting of May 22 that the collapse came. He was, so weary that he could not stand at the beginning of the lecture, and asked the audience whether it would not permit him to speak seated. After speaking awhile he became oblivious to his surroundings, forgetting that he was delivering a public lecture, his mind wandering off his subject, and he saying nothing for awhile. Then he remembered that he was delivering an address. Catching the thread of his talk at the place where he ceased speaking, he apologized to his audience, and then went on again for a few minutes, when again the same obliviousness to his surroundings overtook

him. This happened perhaps from six to ten times. During these periods of obliviousness he could see a large part of the audience weeping and some of the brethren praying. He struggled along in this manner for about an hour. Not a soul left the auditorium; all seemed to understand and sympathize. They could see his will struggling to control and make subservient an exhausted brain. Yea, his brain, the hand of his New Creature, by which he held his controversial discourses and smote the nominal-church sifters, "was weary."

J. feared that his brain was forever wrecked, and could no more retain hold on his many lectures, which must then have numbered something like three hundred, of which about 45 were public lectures, averaging in length of delivery about 90 minutes. His custom had been, especially as to his public lectures, to build up his addresses on the basis of a large number of Bible proof passages, of which he had perhaps an average of about 125 passages in each public lecture. These he would quote from memory, giving in each case its book, chapter and verse. This method, he believes, was especially blessed by the Lord to the bringing of unusually large numbers of new brethren into the Truth. Having so many public discourses, all so largely supplied with Scriptures, not to forget these it was his custom to rotate his discourses, only then breaking the rotation, if the discourse whose turn was next had already been given in the town where its turn in the rotation came, or when some special need required another discourse to be given. It so eventuated that it would be perhaps once every four months before he could complete going over the whole number of these discourses. J. used the same method of rotation for his parlor discourses. The Lord granted him an exceptionally quick recovery, for in about 3½ months he was able, but with greatly reduced brain power, to renew his pilgrim service. He proved to be mistaken in his fears that his brain power was irretrievably lost, and that it no more could retain his

discourses. The lecture that by rotation was due to be his first public discourse after he re-entered the pilgrim work was on The Wages Of Sin—Is It Eternal Life In Torment, Or Death—Which? This lecture had not been delivered for over seven months and though it contained at least 125 scattered passages, every one of them came promptly to mind, with book, chapter and verse, the first time he ran over it preparatory to its delivery. The same was true of the rest of the 300 discourses. His wearied brain held firmly to all his discourses (his hand clave unto the sword).

The Lord showed His appreciation of the efforts of his weary servant by using him to bring unusually large numbers of new brethren into the Truth through the ministries rendered amid such wearying conditions. A few illustrations will clarify this: Late in Jan., 1910, because of four days' appointments falling out, J. spent six days at Calgary, Alta., Can. There were previous to his visit a colporteur, a brother and sister who had lately come from Toronto and a deeply interested local brother there. J. gave about 8 public lectures during his six days' stay there. Much new interest was thereby aroused, a class was immediately formed; and at the Passover 23 brethren memorialized there. His next appointment was at Vancouver, B.C., Can., where at his first visit of that trip two public meetings were held. Visiting the same place about seven weeks later, he learned that seven new ones had been won through those two public meetings. At Seattle even larger numbers were won for the Truth. The brethren reported that through the four public meetings held on the occasion of that trip, during which he visited Seattle several times, the attendance of new brethren at the regular meetings was increased by about 25. Similar results, but on a smaller scale, marked most of the visits during that trip throughout its course in the state of Washington (the people . . . spoil). J.'s being that Servant's special helper is shown by Eleazar's being *with David* in the first and second episodes.

The third of the three episodes now under study is that of the three mightiest of David's warriors' breaking through the ranks of the Philistines, and getting from the well at Bethlehem's gate the water so ardently longed for by David (2 Sam. 23: 13-17; 1 Chro. 11: 15-19). In Vol. IX, Chap. VI, the antitype of Jashobeam's part was given in some detail, and above was briefly sketched Bro. Barton's part therein. Here will be given some details on J.'s part therein, as the antitype of Eleazar. David's longing for water typed Bro. Russell's longing as that Servant, not as a pilgrim, for Truth needed at those three times. As Bro. Russell's pertinent fight with demons and sifters was along the line of trusting the Lord's ability fully to protect the flock against demons and sifters, and as Bro. Barton's pertinent fight with demons and sifters was against their efforts to arouse him to resent Bro. Russell's way of dealing with the sifters, especially A. E. Williamson, so J.'s pertinent fight was against demons and sifters (the troop of Philistines pitched in the valley of Rephaim [*gigantic, i.e., demons*], v. 13) who sought to make him take a wrong attitude toward Bro. Russell as that Servant. The three coming to David in the harvest time, and that to the cave of Adullam (*vengeance of the people*,—the Hebrew for the Greek *Laodicea*), places the antitype in the Harvest. The 1908-1911 sifters above all others entrenched themselves in the Bible, misinterpreted, of course (the garrison... in Bethlehem [*house of bread*], v. 14).

J. started toward the antitypical well, the Truth (the well of Bethlehem, which is by the gate, v. 15), about April 1, 1910, and soon found himself engaged in the sharpest internal debate of his life. The debate revolved about this question: How in the study and exposition of the Scriptures, as a servant of the Truth, was J. to act internally and externally toward Bro. Russell as *that Servant*? Was he to, abstain altogether from studying and expounding the Bible to the Brethren in each detail until that Servant first expounded it in such detail? Or was he to study and expounded

it in those parts that he thought he understood, even if they had not already been expounded by that Servant to the Church? Or was he to accept that Servant's teachings simply on his authority as that Servant? Or was he to subject them to careful examination? First the subtlest arguments were suggested to his mind to study and expound any part of the Bible, regardless of whether that Servant had expounded it or not. He met all of these arguments and refuted them; for he saw that this course would put him into the position of disregarding Bro. Russell in his office functions as that Servant. Then a series of most subtle arguments was brought to bear on his mind not to study or expound any part of the Bible not already seen by him in the expositions of that Servant. These arguments he also met and refuted, since he saw that this would debar his studying and expounding even the simplest and clearest passages, even historical, hortatory and ethical ones, if he had not first gotten their exposition from that Servant. After this feature of the battle was won, the demons suggested very subtle arguments to convince him that he should accept that Servant's teachings without careful proving, since the latter was God's special mouthpiece. J. met and refuted these arguments with the reason that this would make him bow down on his knees and drink with the 9,700, and not stand erect and lap the water out of his hand with the 300 (*Judg. 7: 2-7*).

This debate, a silent one, carried on in the mind only, lasted about two weeks and was the sharpest by all odds that J. ever had. Verily, he did struggle with demons, whom he found to be the subtlest reasoners; but the Lord stood by him and enabled him to beat back all their subtleties. And he emerged from this struggle with a sober set of ideas that solved the involved questions: (1) he saw that his attitude as a servant of the Church toward that Servant was one that should recognize and act toward him as the Lord's special

mouthpiece, to whom the Lord ordinarily first of all made known the Truth as due, and through whom first of all the Lord made it known to the Church; (2) that his office as such mouthpiece obligated J. to be favorably disposed toward any teaching that he would offer the Church; (3) that he should thoroughly examine, in such a favorable attitude, with a meek spirit, the teachings which that Servant presented, and only if they commended themselves upon thorough study to his mind as true, should he accept and teach them; (4) that in cases where he did not see the matters as that Servant expounded them, he should not dispute such teachings before the brethren, but remembering that the chances were 99 to 1 in favor of that Servant's being right and J. wrong in such a case, he should lay them on the shelf for further study and prayer; (5) that on historical, ethical, hortatory and promissory passages that were clear, as they in almost all cases are clear ("written . . . on the back side," Rev. 5: 1), he might express his understanding thereon to the brethren, even if he was not aware of that Servant's thought thereon, providing his understanding thereon was edifying, and not contrary to any known Truth or teaching of Bro. Russell; (6) that never on new doctrines, types or prophecies, *i.e.*, those not first explained by that Servant, should he express an opinion before the brethren—a thing that in the past he frequently failed to practice; and (7) that if he should get a thought on a new doctrine, type or prophecy, without letting the brethren know anything about it, he should present it to that Servant, and wait on him to endorse and present it to the Church before speaking thereon to the brethren, and if he would disapprove of it, he should remain silent thereon as being in all likelihood mistaken.

As J. studied over these seven conclusions, which became clear to him as the principles applicable to the case, he recognized their truthfulness and practicability and firmly resolved to act accordingly; for they solved for him

problems on which he had not up to that time been clear as to the pilgrims in their duties and privileges on the study and exposition of the Word in their relations to that Servant as the Lord's special mouthpiece. With the end of this battle in the symbolic valley of Rephaim (sphere of demon activity) J. arrived at the symbolic well and dipped into it and drew out a large vessel full of symbolic water, Truth. That is, the Lord rewarded his steadfastness and victory in his battle with the demons with a sudden, unpremeditated insight into the types of the five siftings of the Harvest, as St. Paul points them out in 1 Cor. 10: 5-11. This understanding flashed through J.'s mind with no study at all, by a sudden illumination. Thus it came to him without his indulging in forbidden speculation (Ex. 19: 21-25). Details on this matter are given in Vol. V, Chap. 2. Too trustful, J. told certain [immature] brethren of his sharp fight with demons and of the Lord's giving him as a reward a full insight into truths not yet had by that Servant, of whose nature he told them not a word. These inexperienced brethren, seeing J. in his brain-fag, concluded that he was demonized and insane, and so reported matters widely in the Northwest. Almost immediately after his collapse J. wrote out this matter of 1 Cor. 10: 5-11 in a lengthy paper and brought it to Bro. Russell (brought it to David, v. 16), to whom he explained his experience. The former made an abstract of J.'s article and submitted it to J. for his opinion as to whether it expressed his thoughts. Bro. Russell had overlooked to insert in his synopsis an abstract of the second sifting. This J. added to Bro. Russell's abstract and with a few slight corrections returned it with his approval as an abstract of what he had written, and of what would have filled at least a Tower. Perceiving what a dangerous battle J. had fought before he reached that well, Bro. Russell refused to take any advantage for himself of the situation (in jeopardy of their lives . . . would not drink it). Later, telling the brethren that he had gotten the thoughts from an earnest Bible student, he

published word for word the abstract as J. returned it to him, in the article entitled, These Things Were Types (Z '13, 198-200). His publishing it antityped David's pouring out the water as a drink offering.

In another connection (1 Chro. 27: 4) Eleazar, the Dodoite, an Ahohite, appears as the captain of the second course, *i.e.*, the captain who had charge of the army in the second month. These twelve courses of the army type the brethren from the standpoint of their relations to the individual twelve chief graces used by them controversially in defense of the Truth and against error. The twelve captains correspond to the twelve captains of thousands in Num. 31: 14, 48-54. For details please see Vol. IX, Chap. IV. Jashobeam as the chief captain, and thus as the captain of the first course, typed Bro. Russell as a pilgrim controversialist and the leader of the brethren in spiritual warfare wherein the chief grace comes into chief exercise. Eleazar as captain of the second course types J. as a pilgrim controversialist and the leader of the brethren in spiritual warfare wherein the second chief grace comes into chief exercise, and so with the other captains mentioned in Vol. IX, Chap. IV. Again, Bro. Russell and he are respectively typed as viewed from the priestly figure (1 Chro. 24: 3-19), by the two priests, Jehoiarib (*Jehovah pleads, or strives*) and Jedaiah (*he knows, or confesses, Jehovah*), who headed the first and second of the 24 courses into which the priests were divided by David who in this action types Bro. Russell as that Servant arranging the pilgrims in their priestly ministries. The key to unlocking the historical types connected with David is the fact that he represents in those types that Servant as executive and warrior for the Lord. And the fulfilled facts as given above corroborate this viewpoint.

Another marked type as a shorter forecast of certain events in J.'s pilgrim activities, in his relations to Bro. Russell as that Servant, and in the latter's office as a star-member, is the story of Jacob's wrestling with the angel (Gen. 32: 24-32). The setting of the antitype of the story

will serve to clear matters. Jacob's leaving Laban, taking with him his wives, children and flocks, types Bro. Russell and his five special assistants (J. being the last of these, and serving as such from 1909 onward to Oct. 31, 1916) separating themselves and leaving the nominal people of God (Laban), taking with them the twelve stewardship truths and their crown-lost servants (wives), the Parousia truths (Rachel), unconsecrated sympathizers and the Little Flock (children, also Joseph) and others (flocks).

The pertinent events immediately preceding and accompanying Jacob's meeting with Esau represent pertinent events immediately preceding and accompanying the meeting of antitypical Jacob (Bro. Russell as a star-member and J. as his special assistant in 1910) and the Jews. Jacob's flight from Esau types that of the 12 and 70 during the Jewish Harvest from persecuting Israel. Jacob's long stay with Laban types the 35 Interim star-members' and their 35 special helpers' stay with the nominal church between the Harvests. In discussing this antitype with Bro. Russell J. learned that the fear which Jacob had, found no antitype in Bro. Russell's experience; it had its antitype in J.'s pertinent experiences. The preliminary message sent by Jacob to Esau (Gen. 32: 3-5), announcing his coming back to Canaan with much possessions, represents the first efforts in 1909 on Bro. Russell's part to establish contact with the Jews along Zionistic lines and not along churchianity's lines. The messengers' announcement (v. 6) of Esau's coming to meet Jacob's advance with a hostile host represents the brethren who told, especially Bro. Russell and subordinately J., of the kind of a suspicious response the Jews were making. Jacob's dividing his company into two groups consisting of two classes, nominal and real Spiritual types Bro. Russell's setting forth of Spiritual Israel as such, so as to defend one (real Spiritual Israel) from an attack by the Jews. The antitype of the prayer of vs. 9-12 was offered by J. The five classes of animals (vs. 13-21) divided into as many groups,

sent by Jacob as presents to conciliate Esau, type respectively the first five of the twelve articles on God's Chosen People that appeared monthly (a space between drove and drove) from Bro. Russell's pen in the Overland Monthly, beginning in Feb., 1910, the fifth appearing in the June issue. These articles aroused great curiosity and interest in the Jews (Gen. 33: 8). Bro. Russell and J. during the first few months of 1910 confined themselves to work among Christians (Gen. 32: 21), but in the Spring the former arranged to engage in the work among the Jews along Zionist lines (v. 22).

The meeting of Bro. Russell and the Jews occurred in specially publicized meetings for the Jews, beginning early in June, shortly after his return from a European pilgrim trip, and lasting for years (33: 1). He had prepared his discourses so as first to set forth before these Jews the Christians and Christian teachings in their various kinds and denominations (v. 1), then to present the least sectarian ones and their teachings first (handmaids and their children foremost, v. 2), the most sectarian next (Leah and her children after) and the true Christians and their teachings last (Rachel and Joseph hindermost). His discourses prepared, he then very respectfully presented himself and his mission in a very winsome way to his Jewish hearers (passed over . . . bowed himself . . . came near to his brother, v. 3). His kindly manner won their hearts and they responded with reciprocal affection; for such unaccustomed and unaffected kindliness they had not expected, nor previously experienced at the hands of Christian ministers (v. 4). The Jews' first thought was a resentful one toward Christian teachings and believers; and they questioned him respecting these (first part of v. 5). Then, in a gracious, winsome and tactful manner he presented these three above-mentioned groups of vs. 1, 2 to them, in a way that was deferential to the Jews (vs. 6, 7).

To their question as to the meaning of the five above-mentioned articles in the Overland Monthly, he graciously answered that they were offered to them as a gift of blessing

to make peace between Christians and Jews, as having much interrelations on their main beliefs (v. 8). Naturally at first the Jews declined the gift of the involved truths; and only after considerable persuasion did they accept them (vs. 9-11). To the proposal of many Jews that the Truth people join forces and work for Zionism together with the Jews (v. 12), they joining the latter and the latter them, Bro. Russell gave a negative answer in the last two articles of the series of twelve on God's Chosen People—(1) Must Jews Become Christians In Order To Return To Divine Favor? (2) Should Jews And Christians Unite (vs. 13, 14)? All overtures to a closer fellowship and assistance Bro. Russell declined (v. 15). In the various places where Bro. Russell preached the Zionism message during a number of years the same features marked his meeting with the Jews. Through Bro. Driscoll, Bro. Russell's publicity director, he approached J., asking him to take over the Zionism work, and thus relieve him of some of his heavy burden. But J. pointed out his former relations to the Jews was sure to work havoc to that work, if it were made known, which, if he became very prominently identified with that work would most certainly become known to them. These considerations prompted Bro. Russell to withdraw his offer, so that J., while giving a few lectures to them on Zionism, and that under not much publicized conditions, did not take a prominent part in the meeting of antitypical Jacob and Esau, which privilege was almost exclusively confined to Bro. Russell, in its writing and lecturing features.

J.'s part in the pertinent work was largely in a suffering way, as follows: As soon as he heard of the Jews' advancing inimically toward the work after Bro. Russell's first efforts to arouse a friendly interest in them as to Zionism, he became greatly afraid and distressed (Gen. 32: 7), lest his former relations to the Jews become known, which would make them think that Bro. Russell was using new methods to proselyte them—a thing sure to prove fatal to the work. J.'s

distress was made all the greater when the Portland, Ore., brethren, to whom he was to give a second pilgrim visit, the one scheduled for May 27-29, were planning to have him address the Jews of Portland in a widely advertised public meeting, for which his former relations to the Jews was proposed to be advertised. Against this kind of advertising he earnestly advised, as a sure injury to the whole Truth people's work on Zionism. He, too, knowing that his former relations to the Jews were known through previous advertising for public meetings at Portland, was keenly distressed and earnestly advised the Portland class not to use him, but some other pilgrim to address a meeting for them on Zionism. This experience increased J.'s fears and distress on the fact of his relation to the Truth work and its effect on the approaching work on Zionism. This led him to most earnest prayer for weeks to the Lord that his former relations to the Jews become not a drawback and a stumbling block to the work; and his prayer without his realizing the relationship at the time contained the same thoughts as those expressed in vs. 9-12. But this fear and distress lasted for several weeks and was not overcome until after his breakdown, which to his great relief he felt sure eliminated him from the scene. From v. 13 to v. 23 the antitype of Jacob was enacted in Bro. Russell alone; but that of vs. 24-32 occurred in J.

The distress that J. felt put him into the experience of the sore wrestling pictured forth in these verses. The wrestling consisted in an internal debate over the *pros* and *cons* of his taking part in the Zionistic work as lecturer thereon. No audible words were spoken during this debate, as some to whom we described the experience years later misrepresented it, and therefore claimed that it was a piece of occultism. To his mentally-put objection that his former relations to the Jews would work ruin to it, if he took a prominent part in it, the reply came, Trust the Lord to overrule it. To this the answer was, The Lord desires not that we cast ourselves down from a pinnacle in tempting Him to

certain disaster. This debate lasted for weeks and took on all sorts of angles to which J. made constant replies mentally in ways that seemed to him Truth- and logic-harmonious. It began after the debate of antitypical Eleazar above described and lasted until a little after J.'s breakdown, and was contributory to that breakdown. J. was immovable from his position (He [the Lord] prevailed not against him [J.], v. 25). The Lord was testing him to see whether he would allow himself to be maneuvered into a prominent service, however much prized, that he felt sure would result in injury to the Lord's cause. This conviction made him adamant against being maneuvered into such a service. He had no idea at first that he was wrestling with the Lord. At the time he simply considered it as a weighing back and forth of principles that had relation to the subject on hand. It was as his brain was wearying that the height of the debate was reached, and as it continued brain-fag set in (he touched the hollow of his thigh . . . out of joint, as he wrestled with him, v. 25).

As J. continued the debate, even after his breakdown, the *pro* arguments were giving away before the *con* arguments (Let me go, v. 26); but J. still held on, in the hope of attaining complete clarity on the line of thought under debate. At that stage he became aware that he was debating with the Lord, who was all along merely testing his obedience and his loyalty to His interests. Then he pleaded long and perseveringly for a blessing from the Lord (will not let thee go, except thou bless me). Then, as in a silent conversation, the question arose in J.'s mind, What is your office (What is thy name, v. 27)? and he answered mentally, A pilgrim, a general elder, who loyally will support Bro. Russell—an answer that, unknown to J., but in the Lord's sight, implied that J. was Bro. Russell's special helper in the former's office of star-membership as well as that Servant, as he had been since his encounter with M.L. McPhail, about 13 months before.

To make this office-promotion known to J., the Lord

opened his mind to see that he was made a special victorious warrior leader for God and the Church (Israel, *prince*, or *warrior*, of *God*, v. 28), because of his victorious struggle in his wrestling (host prevailed). The Lord made this known to him by opening his mind to see his recent experiences to be typed by the three exploits of Eleazar, the son of Dodo, the Ahohite, his office-promotion to the antitype of Eleazar's captaincy of David's second course of soldiers and of priestly leadership as antitype of Jedaiah, leader of the second course of the priests. Furthermore, He gave him to understand the antitype of the Jacob, Eldad, Medad and Jonathan types explained above, as well as several other Scriptures. These blessings were antitypical of those with which the Lord blessed Jacob (He blessed him there, v. 29). Before this antitype became clear to J., he sought long to know who his debating [wrestling] antagonist was; for he felt that the discussion that had been going on in his mind was not in the *pro*-arguments thoughts originating in his own mind (Tell . . . thy name). And until the antitype became clear he was given no informative answer, rather questionings as to the motive for his query came into his mind (Wherefore . . . ask . . . name?). However, after J. was blessed, among other ways, by an understanding of this type, he knew that his fellow-wrestler was the Lord Jesus. Accordingly, he considered the sphere of this experience one that brought him face to face mentally with the Lord (Peniel, *face of God*, v. 30), for mentally in this debate he had seen God as it were face to face (face to face). The wonder of it all was that his life was not crushed out, for this and the three Eleazarite experiences took much of his life (and my life is preserved).

When one considers the exhausting character of the hard labors and struggles involved in the three above-described experiences antitypical of Eleazar's three exploits, all of which consumed much of J.'s vitality, and then adds to this the exhausting effects of this wrestling match, is it any wonder that J., as a result, suffered brain-fag? Rather, the

wonder is that he remained alive! Yea, so severe a blow to his brain were these four experiences that brain-fag set in, disqualifying him from pilgrim service for 3½ months, and for some time following made him incapable of hard mental effort; yea, to this day his brain cannot stand nearly the amount of strain that it could stand before those experiences (he halted upon his thigh, v. 31). And the crown-losers hearing of J.'s collapse would not heartily accept his statement of those experiences as antitypes made clear to him just after his collapse, even as Israelites after Jacob's limping and to this day do not eat round steak (the children of Israel eat not the sinew, because of [that of Jacob] shrinking, v. 32) which is on the body of the thigh (because he came against the body of Jacob's thigh, against the sinew that shrank, v. 32, literal translation). Despite the harmony of the above interpretation with the facts and setting of the fulfillment, the Levites (the children of antitypical Jacob) will not heartily accept it. They will fear, as they have done in the past, that the wrestling above described may have been a demonized affair. To give an intelligible setting to the shorter forecast just explained we have been compelled to expound above Gen. 32 and 33.

The next shorter forecast in the form of a type that belongs here is Ex. 19: 24. Here an exclusive privilege granted Bro. Russell as the Parousia Messenger and J. as the Epiphany messenger is set forth; but as the details on Ex. 19: 21-25 pertinent to an understanding of this subject are given in Vol. IX, 126-131, it will be unnecessary to go over it again here.

Another shorter forecast in the form of a type of J. to be presented is that of Ithamar. In Vol. VIII, Chap. II and Vol. IX, Chap. VI, it was shown that Eleazar, the son of Aaron, during Aaron's high-priesthood for the Jewish Harvest types the twelve Apostles and for the Gospel Harvest, Bro. Russell. It was in those same volumes and chapters shown that Ithamar types the 35 star-members who officiated between

the two Harvests, *i.e.*, during the Interim, and the star-member who officiates during the Epiphany. The reason in both sets of cases is that the two respective sets of periods are parallels, *i.e.*, the Harvests are parallels and the Interim and the Epiphany are parallels. The former fact we learned in Studies, Vols. II and III; and the latter fact we have learned from the Gospel Age and its Miniatures. Especially have we learned the latter fact from our study of the twofold antitype of Israel's wandering 40 Years in the wilderness, in Vol. IX, Chap. III. As it pleased the Lord to make Bro. Russell the parallel of the twelve chief star-members, those of the Jewish Harvest, so it pleased Him to make J. the parallel of the 35 subordinate star-members, those of the Interim, and that because of the parallel periods in which each set has ministered. Aaron's two sons, *i.e.*, Eleazar and Ithamar, when not specifically named; type the Under-priesthood; but when they are specifically named they type the persons referred to above. Briefly will here be pointed out the various respects in which Ithamar types J., even as in these same respects he also types the 35 star-members of the Interim. In Ex. 38: 21 his mission as the exponent of every teaching of the Bible is set forth. This implies that he will not only interpret everything in the Bible not interpreted by Bro. Russell, but also that he will vindicate against attacks all of Bro. Russell's teachings as he left them in Oct. 1914. It will take the whole of the Epiphany to accomplish these two works; but so far much progress has been made in these two respects, as can be seen in *The Present Truth* and in *The Herald Of The Epiphany*. Accordingly, when the Epiphany will have been ended, as between Bro. Russell and J. everything in the Bible will have been interpreted (Rom. 15: 4). In Lev. 10: 6, for the Parousia Bro. Russell and for the Epiphany J. have been, the latter still so, admonished not to mourn over the Second Deather's of their respective periods, but to be at one with God's will in their destruction from the Lord.

Lev. 10: 12-15 shows for the end of the Age that the Lord in His justice (the Law) apportioned certain advantages to come to Bro. Russell in the Parousia and to J. in the Epiphany in view of their service, while in vs. 16-18 they are respectively reproved by justice for imperfections in their sacrifices, for which imperfections our Lord as typed by Aaron intercedes and satisfies justice for them, amid this intercession commanding what was commendable in their sacrifice. The mention of the four sons of Aaron by name (Ex. 6: 23; 28: 1; Num. 3: 2; 26: 60; 1 Chro. 6: 3; 24: 1) for the end of the Age is to bring out the idea typically that Bro. Russell in the Parousia and J. in the Epiphany would be much occupied with Second Deathers in their ministries. Num. 3: 4 and 1 Chro. 24: 2 in the mention of Eleazar's and Ithamar's names for the end of the Age types the thought that in the Parousia Bro. Russell and in the Epiphany J. would be the special priestly representatives of Jesus as High Priest (ministered . . . *in the sight* [literally over the face, *i.e.*, the veil through whom Jesus speaks and acts] *of Aaron*). Num. 4: 28 for the Epiphany types the fact that J. would have charge of the Epiphany Gershonites,, and v. 33 types the fact that he would have charge of the Epiphany Merarites in their ministries. On account of their present uncleanness his charge can be executed only in rebukes and corrections; after they begin their cleansing this charge will be complete; for they will recognize it to be the Lord's will for them. Num. 7: 8 for the end of the Age types that the Lord Jesus through J. as His special representative will give the Gershonites two and the Merarites four kinds of organizations for the doing of their Levitical work. This will be after their cleansing begins. Thus the Ithamar (*land of Palms*, Rev. 7: 9) type for the Epiphany gives a number of important items on J.'s priestly ministry, and shows that his ministry is mainly a charge over the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies, though it is toward, not over, the Little Flock.

As the last of the shorter forecasts Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada (2 Chro. 24: 20-22), will be presented. Jesus gives us the key to this forecast in Matt. 23: 35, 36. While all the shed righteous blood from that of Abel to that of typical Zecharias was required from the generation of the Jewish Harvest, all the shed righteous blood from that of antitypical Abel, Jesus, to that of antitypical Zecharias, J., the last of the star members, and the last member of the Little Flock to remain on earth, would be required of the Gospel Harvest's generation. Accordingly, the Zechariah of 2 Chro. 24: 20-22 types J., and that as the main priestly rebuker of the symbolic fornication practiced between the U. S. government and the Romanist Church, typed by the illicit union between Joash and a heathen religion (vs. 17-19). This picture corresponds to a later phase of the illicit union of Herod and Herodias, as typical of a later—the Roosevelt administration's—phase of the working cooperation, the quasi-alliance, between the U. S. government and the Romanist Church. A combination of these two pictures shows that J. is the leader of the John the Baptist class in connection with their rebuking antitypical Herod, and their consequent imprisonment and beheading, as we saw from the Pyramid's symbolism he stood as the leader and representative of the Elijah class over against J.F.R. as the leader and representative of the Elisha class at the time of the separation of the two classes. As for administering his pertinent rebuke Zechariah was stoned to death in the temple, so J. for his part in this rebuke is cut off, with the loss of much of his vitality, but not unto death, from service with Extra No. 121 of the nominal church, particularly by its Romanist leaders' hurling all sorts of disparaging and false accusations, combined with suppressive acts against mailing Extra No. 121. V. 25 shows that with J. the rest of the priesthood are cut off, with the loss of much of their vitality, but not unto death, from the same service, in which they cooperate with him.

## CHAPTER III.

### NEHEMIAH—TYPE AND SMALL ANTITYPE.

THE LARGE ANTITYPE. GRIEF OVER JERUSALEM'S DESOLATION. NEHEMIAH'S COMMISSION. INSPECTION. BUILDING THE WALL. OPPRESSION. OPPRESSION. INTRIGUES. GUARDING THE WORK. VARIOUS PREACHINGS. THE TABERNACLE EXPERIENCES AND SERVICES. BETHEL EVENTS AND EXPERIENCES.

AS BROS. John and Morton Edgar have shown us, in the Parallel Dispensations, Nehemiah types and parallels for the Gospel Age John Hus, they having done similar things exactly 1845 years apart. It was shown in Chap. I that in the Small Miniature, among other things, J. was the parallel of John Hus. But in our study of Nehemiah, type and antitype, in this chapter, it is not as the parallel of John Hus in the Small Miniature that we will study certain features of J.'s work, rather, apart from the parallel, as a smaller fulfillment of the Nehemiah type, of which John Hus was the larger fulfillment. Such double fulfillments need not at all surprise us; for we find other cases of types having several fulfillments, *e.g.*, Jacob sometimes types Spiritual Israel, sometimes the star-members and their special assistants, and at his death our Lord; Esau sometimes types Fleshly Israel, sometimes Christendom and sometimes the Great Company. Later on like phenomena will appear in the judges of Israel, in the parallels and antitypes of the kings of Judah from Rehoboam onward and the kings of Israel from Jeroboam onward, of Zerubbabel, Ezra, etc.

John Hus began his work of building up the powers of the Church in 1391, exactly 1845 years after Nehemiah began to build up the walls of Jerusalem. Hus' controversies with the clergy, the theological professors and the archbishops of Prague correspond to Nehemiah's controversies with the nobles, Sanballat, Tobiah, Geshem and Eliashib. His developing a Christian atmosphere in Bohemia in contrast with the papal one corresponds to Nehemiah's cultivating a

pious Israelite atmosphere in Judea in contrast with the heathen one more or less there rampant. Hus' piety and zeal for the true Church and his giving it a real foothold in Bohemia corresponds to the similar qualities in, and effects wrought by Nehemiah. Hus' blending the character and works of a religious reformer with that of a real patriot finds its correspondence in the same blending of character and works in Nehemiah. While we cannot with certainty trace chronologically Nehemiah's activities after 543 B.C., and while it is certain that, probably years later, he returned to Jerusalem from Babylon and wrought fruitfully in Jerusalem as governor for some time, Hus' death in 1415 probably, but not certainly, sets the date of the end of Nehemiah's work at Jerusalem as in 431 B.C. Thus the times of the Parallel Dispensations as well as acts prove that Nehemiah and Hus were parallels.

It is, however, not the purpose of this chapter to trace in detail the parallels between Hus and Nehemiah. Rather, as the title of this chapter implies, it is its purpose to trace the Nehemiah type in its small antitype, J. in certain of his British activities in 1916 and 1917. The Epiphany antitype of Nehemiah, which is his small one, was the first of the Epiphany antitypes to become clear to J. as fulfilled in him. After having seen in Chaps. I and II the varied uses in parallels, prophecies and antitypes made of him by the Lord, it should be expected that he should be used in the good antitypes belonging to the Epiphany, to which in its small fulfillment the Nehemiah type applies. To prevent this volume from growing entirely too large, our comments in it on the many whole Old Testament books and large parts of others of its books of necessity must be brief. To save space we will usually indicate only the verse (and that but once) on which the antitype is based, unless that would be obscure, in which case a key word or two will be added in parenthesis. To see the run of thought more clearly constant reference to the pertinent text of Nehemiah should be

made. The word *Nehemiah* (1: 1) means, *comfort of Jehovah*, and points out the fact that to both the public and the loyal brethren J.'s British ministry was predominately one by which the Lord poured out comfort. *Hachaliah* means, *whom Jehovah saddens*, and points out the sorrows that J. underwent in Britain for his loyalty to the Lord, the Truth and the brethren; for his experiences there brought upon him, through his devotion to the Lord, the Truth and the brethren at the London Bethel and Tabernacle, much of disappointment, disillusionment and sorrow. While J. was engaged in the Lord's service (palace) toward the end of 1915 and in the first half of 1916, there came to his attention reports and letters from J. Hemery (Hanani, v. 2), the other managers and other British brethren (men of Judah), through whose investigation by J. (asked) he learned of the great affliction and reproaches (v. 3) of our British brethren on account of the war conditions and their conscientious objection to the draft, and the devastation of the British Church (Jerusalem), whose powers (walls) were broken down and whose participants in various branches of the work (gates) were taken away by force (fire).

These reports and letters greatly distressed J., who, though not having seen, yet loved the British brethren (v. 4). These led him to pray to the Lord (v. 5), amid confessions of imperfection (vs. 6, 7), for the British brethren, to ask the Lord to heal the breaches of His people in Britain (vs. 8-10), and to open the way, if it should please Him, for him to go to Britain, and help them in their distress. Particularly did he ask God for favor with the Lord Jesus (king, v. 11), who was administering the harvest work through that Servant, to make a request of whom in that capacity was making a request of the Lord Jesus. At the time that J. made the request of the Lord Jesus he was the chief supporter (cupbearer) of that Servant, who was the cup (mouthpiece) of the Lord (Jer. 51: 7; Gen. 44: 2, 5, 12, 15). It was particularly in the

summer of 1916, while J. was supporting that Servant in the latter's giving as Jesus' mouth the Truth on antitypical Elijah and Elisha, the smiting of Jordan, the penny, etc. (wine . . . the king, 2: 1), that he felt distressed over the British situation. This distress appealed to our Lord, who through His mouth, Bro. Russell, inquired (v. 2) as to its cause and his pertinent petition (vs. 2, 4). This led J., the night of Aug. 26, at the Nashville, Tenn. Convention, to lay before the Lord Jesus in His mouthpiece, his desire to help the British Church in their tribulation (vs. 3-5).

J. was careful to ask for grace from the Lord to present the matter aright (prayed). This happened after the door closed, *i.e.*, Oct., 1914, after God in view of all the faithful being under the call considered them as though already in the Kingdom (queen . . . by him, v. 6; compare 2 Kings 1: 9; 1 Kings 19: 8: for types of the same thing). The journey, it was decided, was to last until April, 1917 (set a time). It was decided that J. should undertake the British pilgrim trip, and handle the situation in the Tabernacle and Bethel, the latter thing being first briefly indicated by Bro. Russell, but being later detailedly expressed by the Lord through the Board acting in its Executive Committee. J. asked that passports (letters, v. 7), be applied for, to expedite his journey from America into Britain (Judah). Later J. asked for credentials, which in the finished picture were Divinely intended mainly for the managers of the Branch offices (Asaph [*gatherer*], v. 8), which empowered him, in addition to doing pilgrim work, to have powers of attorney for the Society wherever outside of America he should go. This put under his charge the Tabernacle situation (beams . . . palace), because of its relation to the Society (to the house), and the general powers of the British Church (wall of the city) and of the London Bethel (house . . . enter into). Regardless of J.F.R.'s and W.E. Van Amburgh's later denials of their bonafide character, the Lord saw to it that such powers

were given J.; otherwise he would have been unable to handle the situation (the king granted me).

The Lord's providence arranged for J. to have all needed secular helps in the way of a properly officered and manned ship to convey him to Britain (captains . . . horsemen, v. 9); and J. showed his papers to the British consul at New York and the immigration officials at New York and Liverpool (governors). But from the outstart, after J.'s powers were made known to Wm. Crawford, one of the three managers (Sanballat [*the moon-god gave life*], the Horonite [*double cave*]), and H.J. Shearn, another manager (Tobiah [*goodness of Jehovah*], the Ammonite [*from my people*]), they were displeased with his mission to better the British brethren's condition (grieved, v. 10). Because of Wm. Crawford's absence from Bethel from Nov. 19 to Nov. 21, J. said nothing of his powers of attorney until the third day after his arrival among the British brethren (vs. 11, 12), when he presented his authorization papers to the three managers at a specially called meeting. Without making his purpose known (arose in the night . . . neither told, v. 12), J. began investigating the British Church immediately after his arrival, *i.e.*, at the home of Bro. McCloy at Liverpool, asking a great many questions of the few brethren there (few men), continuing this with J. Hemery on the train from Liverpool to London and at Bethel until he met with the managers, Nov. 21, this part of J.'s investigations being such only as his pilgrim powers (no beast . . . save the beast I rode upon) warranted. These are typed in vs. 13-15.

Bro. Russell's death occasioned J.'s asking about the British Second Deathers, sifters (gate of the valley [of Gehenna, Jerusalem's dump and refuse-burning place for defiling things] . . . the dragon well [second-death errors], v. 13). The questions led to answers on the 1908-1911 siftlings (dung port), which helped J. to view the powers (walls) of the British Church (Jerusalem) as now laid low and the

various Truth servants (gates) as now largely overthrown from their services through the draft. The questions proceeded to the managers (gate of the fountain) and to Bro. Russell's instructions to them (king's pool), but J.'s pilgrim powers (beast) did not include them, hence he could not press on investigating into their matters (no place . . . to pass). Next the questions, without J.'s letting his purpose therein be known, turned to Bro. Russell's theory (brook [Kidron], v. 15) as to his powers in the London Tabernacle, and studied the fallen powers there manifested (viewed the wall). This ended J.'s preliminary investigation. He drew back from his investigations temporarily (turned back), briefly asking about the managers (fountain gate), Bro. Russell's instructions as to them (king's pool), the siftlings (dung gate), the Second Deathers' errors (dragon's well) and the 1908-1911 Second Deathers as sifters (valley gate), and thus ended his investigation so far as his pilgrim powers allowed it to be pushed (returned). Throughout these three days' investigation, at Liverpool, on the way to London, in which trip J. Hemery was J.'s traveling companion, and at the London Bethel, J. let neither the managers (rulers, v. 16), nor the brethren in general (Jews), nor the chief elders (priests), nor the Bethel leaders less prominent than the managers (nobles), nor the other members of the Bethel family (rulers, rest) know his doings and plans (went . . . did).

On Nov. 21, during a long afternoon meeting with the three managers, J. had his authorization papers read to the managers, and then with them discussed the fallen condition of the work, the Bethel, pilgrim, colporteur, volunteer; Photo-Drama, extension and newspaper work, which was almost entirely at a standstill (Jerusalem lieth waste, v. 17); for these were its main powers, walls, and were thus in ruins; and the pilgrims, colporteurs, volunteers, Photo-Drama, newspaper, etc., workers were in almost all cases inactive (gates . . . burned), due to the draft persecuting the

conscientious objectors, which all the brethren were. For a lover of Zion the situation was indeed distressing. To this J. sympathetically referred (distress). J. encouraged the managers and later others, as he came into contact with them, to arouse the pilgrims, colporteurs, volunteers, Photo-Drama, newspaper workers, etc., to begin zealously their respective spheres of service (build up the walls) and thus would no more be regarded as defeated and subjugated (no more a reproach). J. told the brethren then and afterward much of his experiences at the blessing hand of God, to arouse their zeal, love and energy (told . . . God . . . good upon me, v. 18). He also told them much that the Lord Jesus had spoken to him by Bro. Russell (the king's words)—all this to encourage them. This had its good effect in arousing the faithful to encourage one another to the work (rise . . . build . . . strengthened . . . for this good work).

Wm. Crawford, H.J. Shearn and later F.G. Guard, Sr. (Geshem [*firmness*] the Arabian [*desert waste*], v. 19) were not responsive. After thoroughly seeing J.'s plans and views, these, being crossed in their clericalistic efforts by J., and F.G. Guard being father-in-law to Wm. Crawford, and coming under his influence, began to show hostility shortly after such crossing set in, declaring that J.'s plans and views would not work in Britain, and ridiculed J. and his supporters (laughed us to scorn, and despised us). They declared the work impossible (What . . . ye do?); then they charged it to be against the Lord's arrangements (rebel against the king). J., increasingly as time passed on, claimed the Lord's favor and blessing (He will prosper us, v. 20). We as servants of God will do His work in re-erecting His work in the British Church (arise and build). And by their conduct J. and his supporters, who constituted the great bulk of the British brethren, increasingly told these three that they would have no part, nor right, nor loving remembrance in the British Church (. . . in Jerusalem).

The work of reformation that J. superintended on behalf of the British Church was one that set aside evil and re-introduced good arrangements. It is briefly summarized in type by the removing of the impeding debris and erecting the walls and the gates of Jerusalem, under Nehemiah's direction, in Neh. 3. It will be necessary to give here only briefly the general details of Neh. 3. But by giving such details we believe we will be able to convey a fairly comprehensible view of the work here typed. The building work centered about the various gates. Some of the gates are mentioned in Neh. 3, others in Neh. 12: 31-41 are mentioned as repaired. The gate of Ephraim is implied in v. 7 by the expression, the throne [seat] of the governor, which in Oriental cities usually was set at a gate where the governor as judge would hear cases. The description of the parade in Neh. 12: 38, 39, places the gate of Ephraim between the broad wall and the old gate (literally, gate of the old ones); and the seat of the governor is placed between the same, which fact, with the eastern custom of the judges having their seats in the city gates, favors the identification. The gates expressly mentioned in Neh. 3 as repaired are: the sheep gate, fish gate, gate of old ones (impliedly, as just shown), gate of Ephraim, valley gate, dung gate, Miphkad gate and fountain gate, no repairs being mentioned as having been made on the water gate, horse gate, prison gate and east gate. This seems to imply that these four gates and their adjacent walls were left standing by the Babylonians.

In Bible symbols gates represent those through whom outsiders are given an entrance into the religious government represented by the pertinent city., e.g., the gates of New Jerusalem are the 12 tribes of Spiritual Israel in glory in their capacity of bringing the restitution class into citizenship in the Kingdom of God. Accordingly, the repairing of Jerusalem's gates under Nehemiah's supervision represents how the various classes of the Lord's direct and

indirect servants were reinstated into their respective spheres of service under J.'s supervision. As said before, almost every branch of the British Truth work lay inactive on J.'s arrival, and he did his utmost to resuscitate the work in all its branches. Judging from the order in which these various forms of work were renewed, the gates seemed to type: the sheep gate, the pilgrims; the fish gate, the elders; the gate of the old men, J.'s 8 British counselors outside of, and 6 counselors in London; the gate of Ephraim, the workers toward the public: colporteur, volunteer, extension, Photo-Drama and newspaper workers; the valley gate, the Second Deathers as sifters; the dung gate, the siftlings; the fountain gate, the three managers; the water gate, the conventioners; the horse gate, Berean Lesson teachers; the prison gate, the crown-lost leaders; the east gate, non-manager Bethel workers; and Miphkad (*registry*) gate, name-givers for various forms of service. Apart from pertinent general questions, J. did comparatively little as to the antitypes of the water gate, horse gate and prison gate, as to appointing such to service, which accounts for the fact that nothing is mentioned in Neh. 3 as to the rebuilding of the three gates typical of these. The work mentioned as done after each rebuilt gate until the rebuilding of the next one is mentioned types the work related to the antitype of the foregoing gate leading up to the antitype of the building of the next gate in order.

J. Hemery (Eliashib [*God restores*], v. 1), having been appointed in charge of J.'s pilgrim work by the Brooklyn Executive Committee, immediately (Nov. 21) after J. explained his mission to the managers, made, with the assistance of J. and the classes (with his brethren the priests), arrangements for J.'s pilgrim work, first, toward the ecclesiast, where in all he delivered exactly 100 discourses to the brethren's fortification (tower of Meah [*the hundred*]), and, second, toward the public, before which he delivered 32 lectures, usually to very large audiences, strongly blessed

by God's favor (tower of Hananeel [*favor of God*]). Special arrangements were made for large advertising of the public meetings, which the Society's printers were zealous to prepare (next to him builded the men of Jericho, v. 2). J., mindful (*Zaccur [mindful]*) of the need of extra care on his part for this public work, prepared himself (builded) carefully to speak acceptably to the British public (*Imri [eloquent]*). It might be said that quite a number of times the work of the same brethren is typed as done by different persons in the type. This is done to type the pertinent person's special pertinent quality, etc., as active in the antitype, if another quality operated in a subsequent activity than in a former one. *E.g.*, J. was the one chiefly active in erecting several of the eight rebuilt antitypical gates, and often was active in repairing the antitypical walls between antitypical gates, but is always typed by a different person in each case, because a different quality, etc., were exercised in each case. The same is true of J. Hemery, E. Housden and others. However, it must not be understood that J. was the only one typed by the sheep gate; rather he was the first one erected as such, the antitype progressed to the sending out of others, *e.g.*, follow-up lecturers after his introductory lecture, *e.g.*, the managers, etc., did pilgrim work more zealously.

Next (Nov. 25) the matter of the elders came up for discussion and action (fish gate, v. 3). This required the removal of much rubbish, which took long and laborious discussions and then action by the London Tabernacle, which served as an example for the British ecclesiastas, in establishing a congregational order, as against a presbyterian order of church government. The chief ones who cooperated in this work had to be persistent controversialists (*Hassenaah [thorny ground]*). Besides J., the chief workers on this matter were the seven elders, especially J. Hemery and H. E. Thackway, who refused to sign the Shearno-Crawfordistic resolution, whereby the other 11 elders

sought to frighten Bro. Russell into giving up his pastoral powers in the London Tabernacle. The evils that this group of 11 elders brought together were the main rubbish that had to be removed before the antitypical fish gate could be erected. This having been done, the elders were elected in harmony with the ecclesia's being mistress in her midst. J.F.R., using his high position (Meremoth [*height*], v. 4), wrote a letter controversially upholding (Koz [*thorn*]) ecclesialism (Urijah [*Jehovah's light*]) as against presbyterianism, for which Shearno-Crawfordism stood; and it helped the good work on. J. Hemery, whom the Lord was rewarding (Meshullam [*recompensed*]) and blessing (Berechiah [*blessed by Jehovah*]) and delivering from oppression (Meshezabeel [*delivered by God*]), for his stand against Shearno-Crawfordism, did well in this fight and work. J. righteously (Zadok [*just one*]) and with considerable physical discomfort (Baana [*affliction*]) worked to secure the same results.

So, too, the six elders mentioned above, who sounded the alarm (Tekoites [*trumpeters*], v. 5) on the situation to the ecclesia, did valiant work in this reformation. But the other eleven elders, who, generally speaking, were more prominent (nobles), did nothing to further the good work. The next general work taken up by J. was to secure the wisest of the British brothers to act as, his counselors (gate of the old ones, v. 6) in matters needing attention for the British Church. The Lord gave him the knowledge (Jehoiada [*Jehovah knows*]) to realize that, a stranger in a strange land, he was lame (Paseah [*lame*]) and needed these as crutches to support him by their counsel in his work for the British Church. Especially J. Hemery, who again was rewarded (Meshullam), for the oppression that he underwent at the hands of H.J. Shearn and Wm. Crawford, and who was well advised (Besodeiah [*in the counsel of Jehovah*]) as to who were the wisest in counsel among the British brothers, gave J. the most help, yea, almost alone did, so, in

selecting his counselors, 14 of whom he selected. Thus was antityped the building of the gate of the old ones. The two most helpful of J.'s 14 counselors were J. Hemery (Melatiah [*escaped by Jehovah*; in allusion to the Lord's delivering him from bondage to the other managers], v. 7), who was highly placed (Gibeon [*on a hill*]) in position and ability, and T. McCloy (Jadon [*he judges*; in allusion to his good judgment]), who was a veritable guard (Mizpah [*watchtower*]) for good and against evil in the difficult position in Britain, and whose sober counsel was of much help to J., both in the Bethel and Tabernacle matters.

We pause here to remark that we are not to understand that either in the type or in the antitype the wall at any one place was commenced and completed before the work on the contiguous part of the wall was begun. Rather, both in type (Neh. 4: 19) and antitype, they worked more or less simultaneously on different parts of the far-flung parts of the wall. Now to a continuance of the exposition, beginning with v. 8. J. (Uzziel [*strength of God*], v. 8), to his godly displeasure (Harhaiah [*anger of Jehovah*], v. 8), found considerable error taught by certain leaders, e.g., W. Crawford, as a pilgrim taught many churches that there was no tentative justification, nor an imputation of Christ's merit in the Gospel Age, claiming that the Church is actually, not imputedly purchased, which impinged upon many important doctrines, and made impossible the purchase of the Millennial world, and others taught other errors, e.g., denying the Church's share in the Sin-offering. With all the strength of heart and mind that God gave him (Uzziel [*strength of God*]), J. set himself to purge out these errors (goldsmith; literally, refiner), as he also by God's favor (Hananiah [*grace of Jehovah*]) gave the Truth as a medicine to cure the effects of these errors (son of one of the apothecaries). But the Truth as a whole was generally taught, hence he did not need to labor overmuch in repairing this part of the anti typical wall (unto the broad wall,

whose part from the gate of Ephraim to near the tower of the furnaces types the Truth, and whose southern end to the tower of the furnaces types the Truth arrangements). H.J. Shearn, undergoing for a while repentance (Rephaiah [*healed by Jehovah*], v. 9), and his duties making him one of the two most influential leaders in the British Church (ruler . . . half . . . Jerusalem), did some reformation work, which was, however, very imperfect (Hur [*hole, grave*]), e.g., on the convention; program; but W. Crawford soon dissuaded him therefrom. Even W. Crawford repaired some of Bro. Russell's violated arrangements as to the former's office methods (Jedaiah [*Jehovah knows*], v. 10), and that despite his spirit of de-appreciation (Harumaph [*flattened nose*]). The real reformer among the three managers was J. Hemery, who fought side by side with J. for the restoration of Bro. Russell's arrangements (Hattush [*warrior*]), with whom God reckoned (Hashabniah [*Jehovah reckons*])). J. in his capacity of special representative (Malchijah [*king of Jehovah*], v. 11), in his loyalty to his office (Harim [*devoted*]), wrought continually and consistently for the restoration of the Lord's arrangements everywhere in Britain. H.C. Thackway, who was well thought of in the ecclesia (Hashub [*regarded*]), wrought fruitfully to restore Bro. Russell's arrangements in the London Tabernacle. He was in part influenced thereto through his fear (Pahath [*fear*]) of the autocracy (Moab) that the resolution, if carried into practice, would effect. His course and that of J. created (repaired) a strong defense (tower) against the fiery (furnace) trial that involved the London Tabernacle, the course of the 11 signatory elders. J. Hemery, whom God was now rewarding (Shallum [*recompensed*], v. 12) for the injustices that the other two managers had heaped upon him for years, and who was the most influential of the managers among the British brethren (ruler . . . half . . . Jerusalem), in his winsome way

(Halohesh [*charmer*]) enlisted the service of many of the less able brethren (daughters) to fortify the friends over against the Second Deathers, whom these trials stirred up to sifting activity, the involved typical wall extending from the tower of the furnaces to the valley gate, which types the Second Deathers as sifters.

J.'s opposition to revolutionism, especially to the sifters' part in it, made, as it was, as a gracious ministry (Hanun [*gracious*], v. 13), to the faithful, raised (repaired) the Second Deathers (valley gate, which led from the city to the valley of Hinnom to the south of the city) up to their kinds of activity, sifting (doors, locks, bars). Of course they were zealous to make themselves Second Death sifters (Zanoah [*rejected position*]). J.'s and their pertinent, but far different, activities continued for a long way in the course of adding power to the British Church (1,000 cubits), his positively, by strengthening the faithful in the Truth and its arrangements, and theirs negatively, by severing the siftlings (dung gate) from the others, among whom their presence could only lend weakness. It also fell to J.'s lot, as the special representative (Malchiah [*Jehovah's king*], v. 14), in working for the Lord's cause (Beth-hacerem [*House of the vineyard*]), to force the siftlings (the dung gate) to take their place (repaired) as those through whom the refuse of the Church left the British Church. His course (Rechab [*rider*]) of defending the Truth and its arrangements and of fighting the current revolutionisms forced the siftlings into their position and activities (built it . . . bars thereof). The siftlings were numerous, as the Second Death sifters were comparatively numerous, and the activities of both were prolonged, as the 1,000 cubits' distance between the valley and dung gates, along a large part of the valley of Hinnom, Gehenna, proves. It also fell to the lot of J. to do the reformation work as to the managers (fountain gate, v. 15). In so doing, he promoted J. Hemery to be the chief manager,

deposed the two unfaithful managers and appointed A. Kirkwood as secretary and assistant manager and E. Housden as treasurer and assistant manager at Bethel. Both the promoting and deposing works were a recompense (Shallum [*recompensed*]), of reward to the three and of punishment to the two. In this work J., with others, had to be ever on the lookout (ruler . . . Mizpah [*watch tower*]). He did this as the overseer of “all the business and affairs of the Society” (Col-hozeh [*all-seer*], *i.e.*, the one who having power of attorney in all the business and affairs of the Society in Britain oversaw all things in this matter). At the same time he did all that was needed to fortify the Truth arrangements (pool) that were sent (Siloah [*sent*]) by Bro. Russell to be kept by the managers in the sphere of service, given them by Bro. Russell (by the king’s garden), up to the limit of their deputyship, which stopped at the place (stairs) where further advance would mount in unholy ambition Bro. Russell’s sphere of control (go down . . . city of David).

As special representative (ruler . . . Beth-zur [*house of rock*, *i.e.*, strong house], v. 16), J. had in a work of God’s comfort (Nehemiah [*comfort of Jehovah*]) to reconstruct those of Bro. Russell’s managerial arrangements which had been wholly given up (Azbuk [*wholly forsaken*]). Indeed, H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford had buried in oblivion almost all such arrangements (over against the sepulchres of David); and their reintroduction comforted all Bethelites, especially J. Hemery. This included Bro. Russell’s theory of conducting Bethel (pool . . . made). No exceptions to submission to these Bethel arrangements were made, even in the interests of the managers (mighty ones, plural in the Hebrew). In accord with this reformation, the assistant managers cooperated (Levites, v. 17); A. Kirkwood (Rehum [*merciful*]) reconstructed (Bani [*built*]) the arrangements of the secretarial work, which had been in part set aside and in part changed by H.J. Shearn; and E. Housden (Hashabiah [*Jehovah reckons*]) in a way of

acting in harmony with God's viewpoint did a similar work as to the treasuryship arrangements, which had been in part set aside and in part changed by W. Crawford; and in this work of reform E. Housden had a subordinate (ruler of half) charge of the literature (volumes, etc.) that answered the controversial questions (Keilah [*sling*, symbolic of questions used controversially]) between the Truth and nominal-church error. Other Bethelites (their brethren, v. 18) joined this work of conforming their services to the reformed arrangements, especially R. Cormack, who more or less vacillated at first (Bavai [*boyishness*]), being one of the 11 signatory elders, and one of the 6 penitent ones, and thereafter stood by J. until the end, even after J. had left Britain. He well performed, according to the reintroduced (repaired) arrangements, by Divine grace (Henadad [*grace of the Mighty One*]), his charge, as to the newspaper work, in forwarding the publication of Bro. Russell's sermons and of Controversial Questions (ruler . . . Keilah [*sling*]) and the newspaper publicity for J.'s public lectures. J., in his office as the special overseer on guard (ruler of Mizpah [*watch tower*], v. 19), gave special help (Ezer [*help*]) to the elders as to right and wrong Berean methods as the Lord's means of guarding against mistakes and errors and of a proving of the Truth, by which methods, as a depository of weapons (armory), Jesus (Jeshua [*savior*]) saves from error unto the Truth. From the work of reformation as to Berean methods J. turned (turning of the wall, v. 20), as the blessed of the Lord (Baruch [*blessed*]), to the work of rehabilitating J. Hemery (Eliashib) from the inferior position (house) as manager into which the two usurping managers had relegated him to the place of chief manager (door). J. gave to the involved problems his most earnest (earnestly) and pure (Zabbai; the better reading is Zaccai [*pure*],—margin) thought and effort. J.F.R. (Meremoth [*height, high place*], v. 21), not only sanctioned this as a deed of

Divine enlightenment (Urijah [*light of Jehovah*]), but additionally made J. Hemery his personal representative in Bethel and the Tabernacle (repaired . . . end of the house of Eliashib), though in this act he caused much controversy (Koz [*thorn*]). An interesting sidelight as to J.F.R.'s two parts on the repair of the antitypical wall, typed by Meremoth's two parts (vs. 4, 21) on repairing the typical wall, is this: In both cases he wrote to J. as the Society's special representative to see to it that his two parts were carried into execution—a fact that proves that he then did not consider J.'s British work to be that of a pilgrim only; but that of one who was commissioned to deal executively with Bethel and Tabernacle business and affairs.

Thereupon the work of reformation set in, in the Tabernacle, which was undertaken especially by J. Hemery and J. (priests, v. 22), as brethren of the whole ecclesia (men of the plain) and not as partisans of the elders. J. (Benjamin [*son of the right hand*], v. 23) began this work Dec. 24, in his addresses to that ecclesia, outlining as special representative its relation to the Society as a headquarters' church, and instructing its membership as to their privilege to vote for such elders and deacons as each without influence from others considered it to be the Lord's will. At the same time in Bethel he cautioned the Bethelites to abstain from all electioneering and use of influence, and emphasized the right of each to vote freely as he considered it God's will to do. J. Hemery, respected (Hashub [*regarded*]) as assistant pastor, seconded J.'s course in this matter. Each so acted, as his office required (over against his house), correcting whatever mistakes they made therein. H.C. Thackway (Azariah [*help of Jehovah*]) also gave very good help in the work he did (Maaseiah [*work of Jehovah*]) in this affair, especially showing his part as to the revolutionistic resolution; for at first he was deceived by H.J. Shearn as to the intent of the resolution, but his heart being right, he was

protected by the Lord (Ananiah [*protected by Jehovah*]). His eyes were opened, by the discussion of it in the elders' meetings, to its real purpose; and, as one of the 7 non-signatory elders, he opposed it. Thus his work was a reformation as to his office as elder. Next to H.C. Thackway (Azariah, v. 24) T.M. Seeck, the ecclesia's secretary, was an active builder (Binmui [*building*]) of the symbolic walls, supporting H.C. Thackway's points and carrying them onward to a new turn (turning . . . corner). His records helped to enlighten the brethren on the resolution conspiracy. He gave J. a well documented history of this conspiracy, which was to him a help from the Lord graciously given (Henadad [*grace of the Mighty One*]), in enabling him to see the true situation in the elders' meetings. His documented history proved very helpful in J.'s tracing the parallels between the trinitarian movements of the Gospel Age and of the Small Miniature (see Chap. I).

The work of J. as representative before the ecclesia, Jan. 28 and Feb. 18, as the turning point in the Tabernacle controversy, was led up to by the combined efforts of J. Hemery, H.C. Thackway and T.M. Seeck, on Jan. 21, when H.J. Shearn in the business meeting brought out the trouble on the resolution, seeking to justify himself therein before the ecclesia. At our instruction, if he should so do, J. Hemery uncovered a few things of the real situation, suggesting that the ecclesia invite us the next Sunday (Jan. 28) to address it on the subject. Assuming that he had exposed the situation in detail, J. supposed that the Church knew the full facts, and, therefore, instead of proceeding to an exposition of them he proceeded to judge the case (Palal [*he judged*], v. 25), very severely denouncing H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford for their conspiracy as to the resolution. J. was indeed very strong (Uzai [*strong*]) in this denunciation. This denunciation moved the Church to postpone voting on the two as elders, though it was not convincing, since

the pertinent facts were not yet sufficiently known to the Church. It, therefore, voted that he present the pertinent facts, which he did Feb. 18. This presentation proved to the Church's unanimous conviction that the two had attempted to sever it from the fortress (tower) that Bro. Russell had been to them, in making it a headquarters' church (lieth . . . from king's high house); and this, therefore, reconstructed these two parts of the powers of the British Church. Her position caused the Church to restrain H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford, by not electing them as elders (court . . . prison). Thereupon D.H. Cronk, one of the 7 non-signatory elders, who recognized that his deliverance by the Lord (Pedaiah [*redeemed by Jehovah*]), as well as that of the rest of the brethren, was at the cost of heavy labor on the part of the ecclesia's defenders, especially J., and who was despised as of no consequence (Parosh [*flea*]) by H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford, moved that the Church express its confidence in, gratitude to, and appreciation of J. for his service on its behalf. This motion was passed unanimously by from 600 to 800 assembled brethren; and thus it added some power (part of the wall) to the British Church. The auxiliary pilgrims (Nethinim [*given*], v. 26), who occupied a strong position (dwelt in Ophel [*fort*]), especially in Bethel and in the Tabernacle, did their bit by working to reintroduce Bro. Russell's (tower that lieth out) convention methods (unto . . . over against the water gate). In close connection with these the non-signatory elders, the extension workers, colporteurs, volunteers, conversationalists, etc. (Tekoites [*trumpeters*]), in harmony with Bro. Russell's suggestions (great tower . . . out), reorganized their work, with the strength of the Truth literature (walls of Ophel [*fort*]), e.g., these features were prominent in connection with J.'s public meetings in the previous and follow-up work.

After the Berean leaders (horse gate, v. 28) had been properly arranged for, the main leaders at Bethel, in the

Tabernacle and afield saw to it that whatever was amiss in his office (house) was reformed, and that it was administered in this reformed way. J., mischarged by the two deposed managers, misjudged by some for his sharp attacks, mainly, on H.J. Shearn and less severely on W. Crawford, in the Tabernacle, and considered too talkative (Immer [*talkative, eloquent*], v. 29) by others, proved himself just (Zadok [*just*]) in these matters, especially in the Tabernacle address of Feb. 18 and before various Bethelites. J. Hemery, who according to Bro. Russell's arrangement should have had priority among the Bethelites (keeper of the east gate), had to reform (repair) those of his Bethel practices that flowed from his not asserting with sufficient firmness the exercising of his powers against the oppressive taking from him of some of these by the two mismanagers, despite which weakness he remained in good fame (Shemaiah [*famous with Jehovah*]) with the Lord, who in his oppressed condition retained his relation with the Lord (Shechaniah [*neighbor of Jehovah*]). After J.'s usuratorial recall by J.F.R., J. had, by God's favor (Hananiah [*grace of Jehovah*], v. 30), in Divine peace (Shelemiah [*peace of Jehovah*]), to vindicate (repaired) the controllership of the Board in the Society's affairs, as against the usurpations of J.F.R. in relation to his attempted recall of J. without the consent, yea, even knowledge, of the Board, whose special representative J. was. In this vindication E. Housden (Hanun [*favored, gracious*]) was J.'s chief supporter, who in consequence was violently broken from his Bethel office (Zalaph [*fracture*]), as though he had been an evil-doer (*sixth*). Before the Investigative Commission H.J. Shearn, W. Crawford and certain of their supporters sought to discredit J. Hemery in his office works in which he had the Lord's blessing (Berechiah [*blessed by Jehovah*]), they being envious of his restoration to his former place as chief manager, which God gave him as a reward (Meshullam [*recompensed*]).

He had, therefore, to vindicate himself against these charges as to his office (chamber) being misused. After reasserting his authority as special representative (Malchiah [*Jehovah's king*], v. 31), against opposing acts of J. Hemery, J., amid refining experiences (goldsmith's son) had to vindicate the powers of the auxiliary pilgrims (Nethinim [*given*]) and the right of the lawyers (merchants) to act as to his powers of attorney and to protest against J. Hemery's rifling from his portfolio the registry of the brethren variously qualified as to service (gate Miphkad [*registry*]). This course brought about a marked turn in J.'s British work (corner). The finishing touches on the powers of the British Church J. and E. Housden made, by refining experiences (goldsmiths; literally, refiners, v. 32) and by the assistance of the lawyers (merchants) that J. had to defend his suit to maintain the controllership of the W.T.B.&T. Society against the scheme in favor of the independence and superiority of the I.B.S.A. as a British corporation. So were the powers (walls) of that Church repaired.

But it must not be supposed that the work of removing the debris that the revolutionists against Bro. Russell's arrangements for conducting the British work had accumulated from the ruins that they had made of his arrangements, and that the work of re-erecting his arrangements as to the work and workers were done under peaceable conditions. On the contrary, every step of J. and his supporters in accomplishing these two works was met with stubborn and cunning resistance. W. Crawford (Sanballat; 4: 1), perceiving what was aimed at in the work (buildded), was very angry and ridiculed J. and his supporters, who steadily increased in numbers until at least 95% of the British brethren (the Jews) were in sympathy with it. At first he was certain that the work could not succeed (v. 2). His right-hand man, H.J. Shearn (Tobiah, v. 3), a thorough clericalist (Ammonite), supported him in his ridiculing the work as weak and

unstable (v. 3). J. and his supporters were not long in seeing their attitude and course, and their resistance to their revolutionisms, not words, were a prayer to the Lord that these be defeated in their works, and that they be manifested as of the Great Company (v. 4). These being more or less willful in their conduct, the works of J. and his supporters were at the same time to God a prayer that the sins of these be treated as such, *i.e.*, be not forgiven, for they were angering God by their course (v. 5).

So the work continued until about half finished (half, v. 6); for the British brethren were zealous in the work (a mind to work). At this stage of the work W. Crawford (Sanballat, v. 7), H.J. Shearn (Tobiah), the traitors (Arabians), the clericalists (Ammonites) and the sectarians (Ashdodites) became very angry. They all entered into a conspiracy (conspired, v. 8) to oppose and hinder the reformatory work going on in the British Church (against Jerusalem). J. and his supporters prayed over this situation (prayer, v. 9), and stood on their guard against them continually (day and night). Some became discouraged (strength . . . decayed, v. 10) because of the many evil practices that had been put in the place of the good (much rubbish . . . not able to build). The enemies of the reformers and their reforms conspired to overthrow them by a sudden and unexpected attack, refute (slay, v. 11) them and stop the reforms (work to cease).

Repeatedly (ten times, v. 12) brethren who had been more or less in sympathy with them (dwelt by them), oncoming over to the Lord's side (came), declared that no matter in what way J.'s supporters turned, these adversaries would attack them (literally, from all places where ye turn they are against you). This moved J. to arm with Scriptural, reasonable and factual arguments and citations from that Servant's writings and sayings (swords, spears and bows, v. 13) the brethren in the more responsible (higher places) and less responsible places (lower places) in the various churches (after their families), that thus they might

be able to repel the threatened attacks. All his supporters, regardless of whether they were of the Bethel family (nobles, v. 14), the elders and deacons (rulers) or unofficial brethren (the rest), J. encouraged both in set addresses and private talks not to fear these rebels, but to remember the almighty and allwise God as their Shield and great Reward, and in such a faith to fight for one another and for those strong (sons) and weak ones (daughters) whom they had brought into the Truth, their privileges as companions of God's people (wives) and the ecclesiastas (houses). This course of J. on becoming known to the rebels, as an evidence that their conspiracy was known, and that God had frustrated their plan, discouraged them (enemies heard . . . God had brought to nought, v. 15), and from fighting them the faithful turned again to reconstructing work on the symbolic wall. Repeatedly such things occurred in the London Bethel and Tabernacle and other places.

The rebels, who had largely had their own way in devastating the Lord's ways in the British Church before J. came, put up a stubborn fight to maintain their ground; but after he came on the scene by God's grace the matters changed, and the good work of setting aside evil and revolutionary arrangements and of restoring the Lord's arrangements went successfully on, though through severe and sharp verbal and voting battles. Frustrated and defeated in every fight were these enemies. Thereafter all the faithful returned to their reform work. After several of such fights the work of the brethren closely associated with J. (my servants, v. 16) was divided: some stood armed and fought with offensive (spears; bows) and defensive arguments (shields; habergeons); others did construction work (wrought). The leaders generally supported their brethren in this work (rulers . . . house of Judah). And as for the rest of J.'s supporters, they, too, had to share in the reformation with their strength divided between constructive (one of his hands wrought, v. 17) and combative work (the other held

a weapon). This is true of those who did the more responsible reform work (they which builded) and of those who did the less responsible reform work, those who supported the former (they that bare burdens), and of those who helped the latter (those that laded).

The more responsible workers (builders, v. 18) were prepared with arguments (sword) to fight any attacker, and in such an attitude of mind they worked in the good cause (so builded). Throughout all this fight and work always there came to J. warnings of any threatening danger or of any attack made at any point (sounded the trumpet was by me). J. told the Bethel family (nobles, v. 19), the elders and deacons (rulers) and the non-official brethren (the rest), because of the fact that due to the greatness of the work they had to be scattered (large . . . separated . . . far), that wherever (what place, v. 20) the alarm of an attack was sounded (sound of the trumpet) there go and defend the cause by argument and vote (resort). He always encouraged them with the assurance that the Lord was on their side (God shall fight for us). Under such tension and nerve-racking conditions (so, v. 21) did the work of reformation go on in the British Church. Continually (morning . . . stars) were appeals made to that Servant's writings, in justification of a restoration of his arrangements, which the revolutionists had set aside and did not wish restored. J. likewise advised, as a defense against secret attacks (in the night, v. 22), that the brethren hold themselves within the Lord's arrangements for the British Church (within Jerusalem). The real powers, walls, of the Church will thus be a defense against secret attack (night . . . guard) and a sphere of work openly (day). The faithful colaborers (I . . . brethren . . . servants . . . guard) did not cease exercising their good heart qualities that pertained to their work (clothes), so intent were they in the Lord's work; but they did cleanse them from filthiness of the flesh and spirit (every one . . . for washing). Surely, the reform of the British Church was a strenuous piece of

work, as hard as J. had ever done; but the end was not yet as to this work.

We now come to the study of Neh. 5. This chapter types the spiritual oppressions that certain leaders, especially the Bethelites, W. Crawford and H.J. Shearn, and certain of the leading signatory 11 elders (nobles, v. 7), inflicted upon their subordinate brethren. Against these oppressors the oppressed brethren (people, v. 1) and their churches (wives) cried out. First to cry out were those who were injured by text-bookism, the study of the Bible as a text-book, instead of as a book of texts (we, our sons and our daughters, v. 2). Their receiving spiritual food by text-bookism injured them; and these injuries cried out against their oppressors. Others cried out against the oppressions of clericalism; for the clericalists took away their rights (mortgaged our lands, vineyards and houses, v. 3), as remuneration for the benefits (buy corn) that their services were alleged to give the oppressed. Still others had to surrender their rights to their privileges of service (borrowed money for the king's tribute, v. 4) to the oppressors, *e.g.*, W. Crawford, having charge of the colporteur work, either refused colporteur territory to those who would not support his tactics, or gave them such inferior territory as made it almost impossible for them to support themselves by their sales; and H.J. Shearn, who had charge of the pilgrim and auxiliary pilgrim work, advanced in special service such as became his partisans, and demoted those who would not so do. Again, these two oppressed those elders who opposed their clericalistic schemes and favored those who favored them. It was against these oppressions that the involved conditions and those suffering under them cried out, claiming that their rights were equal to their oppressors' rights (our flesh . . . as flesh of, v. 5), and that those whom they won for the Lord were equal to those whom their oppressors gained for themselves (our children as their children). Despite this, they and theirs were oppressed and made servile to their oppressors (bondage our

sons . . . daughters . . . unto bondage). What grieved the oppressed brethren most was their inability to deliver these, and that because their rights were in others' possession (other men have our . . . vineyards). Repeatedly during J.'s administration of affairs such complaints were brought to his attention.

Of course, these conditions and complaints greatly displeased J. (very angry, v. 6); and he gave much thought to remedy the condition and to relieve the oppressed (consulted, v. 7). First he remonstrated with (rebuked) the two guilty Bethelites (nobles) and the guilty elders (rulers), in an effort to bring them to a reformation of these abuses, charging them with the sin of oppressing their needy brethren (ye exact usury). Failing to secure their reformation by private efforts, he brought the matters out before the British Church, especially before the London Tabernacle ecclesia (set a great assembly against them). The proofs that J. offered "the great assembly," combined with the knowledge that the oppressed and others had on the conditions, turned the great bulk against the oppressors. J. contrasted their course with that of the faithful, who, to win their brethren sold (sold, v. 8) into the bondage of error in the nominal church and in the world (unto the heathen), labored hard (redeemed) with the course of the oppressors, who became spiritual oppressors of such (sell your brethren). He asked if it was right that they tried to put them under oppression to the faithful (be sold unto us).

So strongly were these matters put by J. before the "great assembly" that the oppressors were dumb with silence (held . . . peace), being unable to give reply to the many proofs of their wrong-doing (nothing to answer). This led him to read them a severe lecture (I said, v. 9), showing the disharmony of their course with good principles (not good). He pointed out that the spirit of consecration (fear of our God) should have moved them to act in such a way as to ward off the reproach that the nominal church and the world would heap upon them, if their course became known to

them, while their course, if known to them, was one that would surely bring such reproach. Among other times, a part of the “great assembly” was held Jan. 28 and Feb. 18, 1917, in the London Tabernacle. It was attended, not only by almost every member of the London Tabernacle ecclesia, but by hundreds of brethren from other ecclesias. And it was this part of the “great assembly” that at the end of the meeting of Feb. 18, 1917, unanimously voted J. confidence, thanks and appreciation for his service against the oppressors and for the oppressed of the Church in Britain.

In this battle (for it was undoubtedly a battle royal in defense of the rights of God’s people against their despoilers) J. next contrasted his and his supporters’ unselfish course with the selfish course of the oppressors (I, my brethren and my servants, v. 10), saying that for their services and positions they might have gotten some advantage (money and corn), which, however, they refused to accept. Then he entreated them (I pray you) to cease from their oppressions (leave off this usury). He entreated (I pray, v. 11) them to restore at once (this day) the despoiled rights (lands . . . houses), also to make restitution for the injury wrought, as much as possible (1/100, a fraction of 10, which is the full measure of the ability of natures lower than the Divine, an evidence that the oppressors were crown-losers, which J. more than once hinted, and in some cases expressly affirmed), of their brotherly powers (money), spiritual food (corn), doctrinal attainments (wine), and spiritual attainments (oil). During the part of the “great assembly” in session Feb. 18, 1917, the oppressors, except W. Crawford and H.J. Shearn, were brought to an open confession of their wrong-doing and to a promise of full reformation (said . . . restore, v. 12) in the way of restoring the rights, etc., taken from the oppressed, and to require nothing from the oppressed due to their oppressors, but to sacrifice for them (require nothing). Thus they met J.’s demands for reformation (do as thou sayest). *E.g.*, one after another the

six wronging elders confessed before the part of the great assembly there and then in session their wrongs, asked forgiveness and promised to be subject to the ecclesia, and not to practice clericalism or text-bookism or in any other way oppress their brethren, rather to yield them more than due, *i.e.*, sacrifice their rights for them (require nothing). J. called on the main leaders (priests [in Neh., Ezra and the historical, not genealogical, parts of 1 and 2 Kings and Chro., the priests do not represent crown-retainers, but the main leaders, regardless of whether they were crown-retainers or losers]) to witness their solemn promise, which in the antitype was more a solemn promise than an oath (took an oath . . . do . . . promise).

Then J., stressing before the congregation the thought of his powers of attorney (lap, *i.e.*, the garments [official powers] covering the lap, v. 13), told all that so, by the exercise of these powers, may God shake out of his ecclesia and office, (God shake . . . house . . . labor) every one who would not perform his pledged word. The whole assembly assented to this (said, Amen). They praised God for this ending of the situation (praised). J.'s having been attacked before the ecclesia by H.J. Shearn as a stranger in their midst, to whom no heed should be given, prompted him to have his credentials read to it by the ecclesia's secretary; and it was this that caused him to do and say the things antitypical of the things said and done by Nehemiah in v. 13. Moreover, it caused him to tell the friends of his spirit and works on their behalf. He showed that while the managers (former governors, v. 15) had been supported by the British Church (chargeable), received their support and salaries from British contributions, such was not the case with J. and his secretary, etc. (not I). For during the time (twelve years, v. 14) they served the British Church they took nothing for it (bread of the governor). Yea, some of the managers' assistants at times tyrannized over the people (servants . . . people).

Instead of J.'s and his cooperators' seeking self-advantage (bought land, v. 16), they worked faithfully to erect the powers (work . . . wall . . . work) of the British Church. Added to this was the hard work that he did as a pilgrim among the various ecclesias in parlor meetings for all the brethren and Berean lessons for the elders particularly (table 150 Jews and rulers, v. 17). Again, added to this was the heavy work of his lectures to the public (heathen). These discourses treated of the sacrifice of Jesus (ox, v. 18) and the Church (sheep), and also treated of all other classes connected with God's plan (fowls). Moreover, the public discourses covered many simpler lines of thought (all sorts of wine; literally, all wines abundantly) connected with restitution (once in ten days; literally, for ten days, the Millennium). Despite this, J. did not accept the advantages that his position would have given him (required . . . governor), because of the oppressions (bondage) that the clericalists and power-grasps brought on the brethren (bondage . . . people). J.'s hard work was a prayer that the Lord would remember him for good for it (Thank . . . God, for good . . . done . . . people, v. 19).

Neh. 6 will now engage our study. When W. Crawford (Sanballat, v. 1), H.J. Shearn (Tobiah), F.G. Guard, Sr. (Geshem) and the other confirmed opponents recognized that the powers of the British Church were restored under J.'s supervision (I had builded), and that no part of these powers was in disrepair (no breach), even before the brethren who were the symbolic doors had been put into their separate positions (not set up the doors), e.g., before the two new managers were appointed and J. Hemery was made chief manager, the Tabernacle elders were elected, counselors were inaugurated, Second Death sifters were aroused to their work, etc., W. Crawford and F.G. Guard, Sr., sent J. word (sent unto me, v. 2), asking for a conference with cliques of elders (villages) where the first had influence (Ono [*his strength*]). J. saw through their scheme as intended to injure him (thought . . . mischief). J. excused

himself as being too busy with a large constructive work to accept their invitation (great work . . . cannot), saying that neither he nor they could justify a cessation of the work for such a parley (why . . . cease). This occurred four times (v. 4).

A fifth time it was attempted, and that by W. Crawford through H.J. Shearn's letter of Jan. 12 (open letter, v. 5). Among many other things, this letter claimed in part expressly, in part impliedly, that even outsiders (heathen, v. 6) and F.G. Guard, Sr. (Gashmu, another form of Geshem) were saying that J. (thou) and his supporters (the Jews) were planning rebellion (rebel) against the Lord's arrangements, that this was the reason for J.'s reinstituting certain arrangements (buildest the walls), hoping to control of his own will (mayest be their king) the British work. Moreover, the letter implied that J. had appointed able speaking brethren (prophets, v. 7) in the British Church (Jerusalem) to set him forth as the perpetual controller of the work there (a king in Judah). Then came the letter's threat to report the matter to the Lord (reported to the king) through a copy of this letter being sent to the Board at Brooklyn, with H.J. Shearn's "formal resignation," which two things were not done, the threat being intended to frighten J. into holding a conference with them (take counsel). J. denied the accusations (no such things done, v. 8), telling them that they were fictions of their imagination (feignest . . . heart). All their efforts were intended to make J. and his collaborators afraid (afraid, v. 9) and thus get them to leave off the reform work (saying . . . hands . . . work . . . not done). This led J. to pray God to strengthen him (strengthen).

J. had traveling with him in the pilgrim work, as a private secretary, F.G. Guard, Jr., who was recommended to him as such by all three managers. A few weeks after they had been traveling together H.J. Shearn's and W. Crawford's irregularities moved him to ask his secretary, who had been a member of the London Bethel, some questions

regarding their conduct of their office as managers, pilgrims and elders. Thereupon he gave J. much needed information, which was derogatory to them. Among other things, he told J. that, when it was decided that he should be J.'s traveling companion, H.J. Shearn had asked him to influence J. in his and W. Crawford's favor and against J. Hemery. J. learned by a number of experiences that while with them he sided with them, and while with him he sided with him against them. The episode of vs. 10-13 is an example of his siding with them against J. J. was returning from a short trip on which F.G. Guard, Jr. did not accompany him and was met by him at one of the London R. R. stations, and accompanied by him to Bethel. On the way to Bethel he began to use his sphere of service (house, v. 10), as one to whom God was listening (Shemaiah [*heard by Jehovah*]), whom God promoted (Delaiah [*drawn up by Jehovah*]) to his position, and who had been done good by God (Mehetabeel [*done good to by God*]) in his position, though a crown-loser (shut up). He urged J. to confine (shut the doors) his British activities to pilgrim work with him (us . . . house of God . . . temple), insisting that the two false managers would otherwise destroy him as an executive, (slay), by secret and hidden methods (night). J. insisted that, commissioned with executive matters (man as I, v. 11), it was not for him to flee (flee) from his duty, and that no faithful one so commissioned would limit himself to pilgrim work in the Church (in the temple), to shield himself from the effects of secret intrigues. Hence he refused to follow the suggestion; for he saw (perceived, v. 12) that the advice suggested unfaithfulness to duty (God had not) and was against J. and proceeded from, and was made as a hireling of, the two mismanagers (Tobiah and Sanballat), who had enlisted his service to frighten J. into wrong-doing (afraid . . . sin, v. 13), and thus fault him, since they could not point out wrongs in his work (evil report . . . reproach me).

J.'s pertinent attitude was a prayer (My God, v. 14) that

God might look (think) upon the two mismanagers according to their pertinent plots and acts (works), also upon the elder daughter (Noadiah [*met by Jehovah*]) of H.J. Shearn, who agitated (prophetess), as well as other prominent speakers (prophets) who sought to intimidate J. (put me in fear). It was amid (so, v. 15) such conflicts, agitations, plots, efforts at intimidation and labors that the powers of the British Church were restored (wall was finished; in 52 days). As J. studied over his and his colaborers' reformatory efforts in each of their branches, he learned that it was exactly 52 days after a general feature of it began until it was finished. He traced this in quite a number of particulars and will here present some of them, to clarify the thought of the antitypical wall's being finished in 52 days, placing the beginnings and endings of these general procedures in parallel columns.

## 1916

Nov. 19 (at Liverpool) J. first faintly rebukes J. Hemery at the outstart of his attempting to tell J. of the trouble at Bethel, J. immediately sensing this attempt and the possibility of being accused, if he would listen, of having been thus prejudiced in J. Hemery's favor against the other managers.

Nov. 20 (evening of 19) J. makes his first winsome effort favorably to impress H.J. Sheam and thus to win him, to the end that he might exert an influence for good in the work.

Nov. 21 J. gets his first unfavorable impression of the two mismanagers, received at his first meeting with the

## 1917

Jan. 9 (evening of 8) J. pointedly rebukes J. Hemery in a meeting of the managers for his weakness in allowing the two managers to reduce him from his place of priority among them to being the others' inferior and subordinate.

Jan.. 10 (evening of 9) J. makes his last personal winsome effort by a pertinent letter favorably to influence H.J. Shearn for the good of the British work.

Jan. 11 A firm unfavorable impression of the two mismanagers is made on J. by W. Crawford's self-justifying

- three managers, where they sought to belittle J. Hemery before J.
- Nov. 22 (evening of 21) J. decides on his first answer to W. Crawford on the elders' resolution (his knowledge of which J. conceals from him).
- Nov. 23 The two mismanagers' ill-natured digs at J. Hemery in the second managers' meeting, to belittle him in J.'s eyes, arouse J.'s sympathy in his favor.
- Nov. 24 (evening of 23) J.'s reading of the elders' resolution gives him his first opposition to it in Britain.
- Nov. 25 J. refuses H.J. Shearn's slight compromise on the elders' resolution.
- Nov. 27 H.J. Shearn's threat of resignation arouses the first thought in J.'s mind on his dismissal.
- Nov. 29 J. makes an effort to bring H.J. Sheam into line with ecclesiasm.
- Dec. 1 J. begins a letter and his first report to the Brooklyn Executive Committee in slight disapproval of the two mismanagers and suggests to E. Housden to return to Bethel.
- Dec. 5 J. mails the fore-going-mentioned letter and report.
- and false letter of Jan. 10, written because of the discussion in the managers'. meeting of Jan. 9 (evening of 8).
- Jan. 12 J. decides on his final answer given to W. Crawford on the elders' resolution (which for a while J. conceals from him).
- Jan. 13 The two mismanagers' continued belittling and abasing of J. Hemery moves J. to write the latter that he would restore him as chief of the managers.
- Jan. 14 (evening of 13) The elders' resolution meets J.'s unalterable and persistent opposition.
- Jan. 15 J. refuses the resolution's going before the ecclesia, regardless of any compromise whatever.
- Jan. 17 J. decides to recommend to the Board H.J. Shearn's dismissal.
- Jan. 19 In a letter to J. Hemery, J. leaves a final opening for H.J. Shearn to submit to ecclesiasm.
- Jan. 21 J. writes and sends his last report to the Brooklyn Executive Committee, recommending the dismissal of the two mismanagers, and prevails on E. Housden to return to Bethel.
- Jan. 25 J. mails the fore-

- going-mentioned letter and report. Dec. 14 The mismanagers' course of defiance on the convention program makes J. consider the question of their dismissal as managers.
- Dec. 18 J. first thinks of a successor to H.J. Shearn.
- Dec. 20 J. pointedly opposes them to their faces as to their course on the program for the Manchester Convention. J. proposes to J. Hemery that he take from H.J. Shearn's charge the Manchester program.
- Dec. 24 J. gives the Tabernacle congregation suggestions as to the beginnings of the election.
- Dec. 25 J. makes a loving effort to win H.J. Shearn away from W. Crawford's influence.
- Dec. 28 J. begins a letter of charges against the mismanagers to the Brooklyn Executive Committee.
- Dec. 29 J. reaches the formal charges against the two mismanagers in his letter to the Executive Committee.
- 1917
- Jan. 8 J. begins to prepare the first list of charges against the two mismanagers on their Bethel offenses.
- Jan. 9 J. writes out some more charges against the two mismanagers on their Bethel offenses, and brings going-mentioned letter and report. Feb. 3 J. definitely decides to dismiss, and then actually does dismiss the two mismanagers from their office as managers.
- Feb. 7 J. offers to A. Kirkwood of Glasgow H.J. Shearn's place as manager.
- Feb. 9 J. pointedly to their faces opposes them for remaining at Bethel after he had ordered them to leave Bethel. J proposes to J. Hemery that A. Kirkwood take H.J. Shearn's place as manager.
- Feb. 13 J. gives suggestions to the seven loyal elders as to the finals of the ecclesia's election.
- Feb. 14 J. makes a final loving effort to win H.J. Shearn away from W. Crawford's influence.
- Feb. 17 J. begins to write severe charges against the discharged managers to the Tabernacle ecclesia.
- Feb. 18 J. brings final charges against the discharged mismanagers to the Tabernacle ecclesia.
- 1917
- Feb. 28 J. begins to prepare the final list of charges against the two mismanagers for Bethel offenses.
- Mar. 1 J. begins to write out the final draft of charges against the two mismanagers on their Bethel offenses

a charge against J. Hemery on his subserviency to the other two mismanagers.

Jan. 21 J. brings several charges on Bethel offenses against J. Hemery, in a letter to the Brooklyn Executive Committee, and succeeds in securing E. Housden's consent to be W. Crawford's successor.

and brings a charge against J. Hemery on lording after he learned of J.'s recall.

Mar. 13 J. sends charges against J. Hemery for Bethel offenses to the Board through A. I. Ritchie, and through him also announces to it E. Housden's appointment as W. Crawford's successor at the London Bethel.

The above facts are given merely as samples to show how it took 52 days to remove some of the symbolic rubbish and also to do some of the work of reconstructing the powers of the British Church, in so far as concerns some things of, and some things, connected with the symbolic fountain gate—the managers, and the symbolic fish gate—the elders. But the same thing is true of the things of, and connected with all the other symbolic gates and of the whole symbolic wall. J. was not aware of this remarkable thing until some time late in Feb. or early in Mar., 1917, in other words, until almost every part of the symbolic wall was completed. The effect of the work as a completed thing on the enemies of this reform work and on their unconsecrated sympathizers was thoroughly disconcerting; for they could not but recognize the providence of God as advancing it (v. 16). During those times there was a vigorous correspondence going on between H.J. Shearn and certain prominent British brethren who were not in sympathy with this reform work, while this work was going on (v. 17). For not a few of those who were not so loyal to the work as Bro. Russell directed it, who were partisanly committed to H.J. Shearn (many sworn unto him; v. 18) because of his alliance (son-in-law) with G. MacKenzie of Glasgow, one of J.'s extra-London counselors (Shechaniah [*neighbor of Jehovah*]), who was not so loyal (neighbor, not so close as an approved son) to the Lord as he should have been, but sometimes went into a path (*Arah, path*) that deviated from the right way. It was G. MacKenzie who, hearing of H.J. Shearn's dismissal by J., took a dislike

to J., misrepresenting him to the Glasgow Church and to J.F.R., as his letter in Harvest Siftings, p. 9, shows.

Moreover, one of H.J. Shearn's character-sons, F.G. Guard, Jr. (Johanan [*grace of Jehovah*]), was allied (taken the daughter) in principles to J. Hemery (Meshullam [*recompensed . . . Berechiah [blessed of Jehovah]*]). Just as he had asked F.G. Guard, Jr., J.'s secretary, to speak well of him and W. Crawford to J. and thus persuade him to favor them as against J. Hemery, so did he do to others of his partisans. As a result, not a few of such wrote and spoke to J. complimentarily of him (reported his good deeds, v. 19). Whatever J. said of him, and later on this was not complimentary, they reported to him (uttered my words). They would ask J. about him in order to get him to express his opinion, and before J. saw through their designs he sometimes told them things that he would have left unsaid, had he known their purposes in questioning him. Several of his letters (sent letters) were sent to J. to intimidate him, *e.g.*, those that threatened to send his resignation to Brooklyn. J. feared not.

Next to engage our study is Neh. 7. After the proper arrangements (walls, v. 1), which were actually the powers of the British Church, for doing the Lord's work in each of the separate features of the symbolic wall, were made (built), then the symbolic gates were put in place, *i.e.*, the various brethren who constituted the symbolic gates were put into their positions, *e.g.*, J. Hemery, A. Kirkwood and E. Housden were put into their places as managers properly adjusted to their varying positions. So with the elders, counselors, colporteurs, etc. Likewise were appointed the deacons (porters), the speakers (singers) and the less prominent servants (Levites) of the Truth. Thereafter J. appointed J. Hemery the chief manager (Hanani [*my grace, i.e., the object of J.'s special favor*], even [not *and*] Hananiah [*favor of Jehovah*]. By these two names the same person is meant, not two, v. 2). This gave him the charge of the London Bethel (palace) and additionally put him, under the Lord,

over the general British Church work (charge over Jerusalem). This J. did because up to that time the former was faithful and sought to carry out his consecration above many, to the best of J.'s knowledge (faithful . . . above many).

J. charged (said, v. 3) that the brethren that were the antitypical gates should not do (not . . . opened) their various services until they could safely and profitably do them (until . . . hot), i.e., until they were properly commissioned and providentially indicated to serve, not to run ahead of the Lord, but to wait on His indications to serve, and that they should observe the same principles in ceasing from their work (stand by . . . shut). He likewise charged (said . . . appoint) that the brethren, each in his place (over against his house), be on guard against sin, error, selfishness, worldliness, sifters and sifflings, as intent on injuring the Church; and he also saw to it that elders (watchers) were appointed who would really watch out for the interests of the brethren (inhabitants of Jerusalem). The powers, walls, of the British Church were large, which extended also to conditions and numbers not yet existent, but were in prospect of coming into existence (city large . . . people few . . . houses not builded, v. 4). As in literal Jerusalem the people then dwelt in tents, so in British churches the organization was temporary.

Another activity designed to further the work in all directions engaged J.'s attention: the organizing of the brethren into *groups* (reckoned by genealogy, w. 5) for *group* service all along the line, so that by an increase of workers and their zeal the work might advance by leaps and bounds. Therefore he had various ones, especially J. Hemery, to furnish him *lists* of names of brethren, a registry, *miphkad* in Hebrew, arranged in pertinent groups according to their talents, spirit of consecration and providential situation, so that they might be put to the work for which these three things showed them best able to perform well. Accordingly, there were given him names of a number of brothers qualified for

pilgrims, another list of brothers qualified for auxiliary pilgrims, a third list of brothers qualified for extension workers, a fourth list of brothers qualified for colporteurs, a fifth list of brothers and sisters qualified for sharpshooters, a sixth list of brothers and sisters qualified for pastoral work, a seventh list of brothers qualified as volunteer captains (gather together . . . by genealogy). These lists were stolen out of J.'s portfolio by J. Hemery after the latter's manifestation as a Levite. If we had them, we could trace better the pertinent things in detail as they are presented typically in vs. 7-69. The typical genealogy Nehemiah says he found (found a register). It is recorded in Ezra 2: 1-67. There are some differences in some of the numbers and names in these two passages. They are to be reconciled as mistakes and omissions due to copyists. As God originally gave these two records of this genealogical registry they were, we may be sure, in perfect agreement. But the fallibility of copyists, the decay of MSS. and the fading of ink account for the differences of some numbers and names. In some places (*e.g.*, Nahamani, v. 7 and Ezra 2: 2) names dropped out of Ezra. In a few cases (vs. 22, 36) the order is slightly changed from Ezra 2: 19, 34 and their contents. We will have more to say on this genealogy, when we come in the next chapter to discuss Ezra 2.

We will now take up Neh. 8 for study. In the small antitype this chapter refers in its first part (first day) to the Manchester Convention, which was held Dec. 30-Jan. 1. As we have seen, the water gate represents conventioners. There was a gathering of over 600 brethren at the Manchester Convention (people . . . into the street, v. 1). In the book of Nehemiah Ezra types J. as a *pilgrim* (priest) and *teacher of the Word* (scribe); and Nehemiah types J. as *executive*. Because of his being the visiting pilgrim and the executive J. was given the most prominent places on the program. In addition to his giving the public lecture, he was asked to deliver three discourses and to conduct a question meeting (spoke unto Ezra . . . bring . . . law). To this he responded

with a liberal amount of the Word (Ezra . . . brought the law, v. 2), and was given very good attention (all . . . hear, speaking on each day of the convention (first day). In this chapter the convention's three days correspond to the first day, while the second day (v. 13) corresponds to J.'s nonconvention pilgrim work from place to place. J.'s comparatively large number of convention services was in part due to J. Hemery's prevailing on him to take the former's place in the last address of the convention, on the plea that the British brethren had often heard him and desired to hear J. This much speaking antitypes Ezra's interpreting the law from morning to midday (read . . . midday, v. 3). J. was given the best of attention (ears . . . attentive unto . . . law).

Corresponding to the 14 men (Ezra . . . Meshullam, v.4) were the 14 brothers expressly mentioned by name on the program, all of whom took part thereon (R. G. Burton, named on the last page, having been given an extra service thereon). The 13 cooperated with J. (Ezra stood . . . beside him stood Mattithiah . . . Meshullam) to make that convention a time of blessing according to the program (pulpit [literally, tower] of wood). Thus J. [the others also in their turn, though not detailedly, mentioned here as so doing] expounded the Word (opened the book, v. 5) to the eyes of the conventioners' understanding (sight . . . people); for he was set there to be their teacher (above [for] all); and his expositions of the Word (opened it) were given reverent attention (all . . . stood up). He sought to exalt God by describing before his auditors the majesty of God in His glorious character (blessed . . . God, v. 6), to which the conventioners responded in faith (all . . . answered, Amen, Amen), in concordant works (lifting . . . hands), with humility (bowed their heads) and consecrated and meek séance (worshipped . . . faces to the ground).

In addition to the 14 main services indicated as such on the program, there were 13 subordinate services, whose leaders (and the Levites, v. 7; literally, even the Levites) are mentioned typically in v. 7. A remark made previously

should be here repeated, that in Kings, Chro. (apart from the genealogies), Ezra and Neh., priests type prominent, and Levites subordinate leaders, a different viewpoint from that of the Pentateuch. These 13 services also contributed to the conventioners' (people) edification (caused . . . to understand [taught]), the conventioners occupying the place of learners (people . . . place). Thus the 14 main speakers and the 13 subordinate speakers expounded the Word (read . . . law . . . gave the sense . . . caused to understand, v. 8). On account of the war hardships and persecution of the brethren as conscientious objectors, many of the brethren at the convention were very sad as they listened to the Word (wept . . . heard . . . law, v. 9). This prompted J., as executive (Nehemiah . . . Tirshatha [governor]) and as pilgrim and teacher of the Word (Ezra, the priest, the scribe), and the 13 subordinate leaders (Levites that taught) to exhort the brethren to cease mourning (mourn not, nor weep), because the convention period (this day) was dedicated to the Lord, who exhorts His people to rejoice in tribulations and persecutions. J. exhorted (said, v. 10) the brethren to proceed in joy (Go your way), to appropriate (eat . . . drink) the loving (fat) things and the hopeful (sweet) things and to take of the convention's overflow and give it to the dear stayers-at-home, who had missed the feast (nothing is prepared), for these three convention days (day) are dedicated (holy) to the Lord; let not sorrow distress the heart (neither be ye sorry), the joy that God gives His people through His Spirit, Word and providence will strengthen the heart and mind (joy . . . your strength). Without in any way at the time understanding his relation to the type, J. used in one of his discourses for the brethren's encouragement the thoughts expressed in v. 10 and quoted the last clause verbally. The less prominent speakers (Levites, v. 11) made similar exhortations (stilled . . . saying). These exhortations wrought their intended effect on the conventioners, who put them into practice (went . . . eat . . . drink . . . send portions . . . mirth), and that because they appreciatively understood the good Word

of God (understood the words . . . declared).

As indicated above, the expression, second day (v. 13), types the period of J.'s non-convention pilgrim work from place to place in England, Wales, Ireland and Scotland. Everywhere he went especially the elders (chief of the fathers . . . priests) and the deacons (Levites) came to J. (Ezra), seeking counsel (to understand) on both the theory and the practice (if the Truth (words of the law). The circumstances of the British Truth work and people were such as brought out in discussions (found written, v. 14) the various class standings (booths) of people before the Lord, which were more and more coming to light as the sifting work went on, especially in England and Scotland. Occupying these various standings is the antitype of the Israelites' dwelling in booths during the feast of tabernacles (feast [not fast, *i.e.*, the day of atonement] of the seventh month). These matters were made known (publish and proclaim, v. 15; literally, which [things] they caused [the people] to hear and they caused the voice to pass over) in all the churches (all their cities), as well as in the British Church as a whole (in Jerusalem). They set forth these class standings as follows: Little Flock (olive branches), tentatively justified (pine branches), Youthful Worthies (myrtle branches), Great Company (palm branches) and Second Deathers (branches of thick trees. In each of these five kinds of tree branches the idea of the branches as having leaves is implied).

Members of each of these five classes made preparations to hold their standings during J.'s British work, in the sifting of that time (fetch . . . to make booths [dwelling places]). Not only so, but members of each of these five classes actually took their class standings in that sifting (people went . . . brought . . . made . . . booths, v. 16). Some did this very publicly, in working out their own schemes (roof of his house); others privately, in working out their own schemes (in their courts); others did it before and in the interest of

the Church (courts of the house of God); others did it in connection with services for the conventioners (street of the water gate); and, finally, others did it in connection with services for the public, *e.g.*, colporteurs, sharpshooters, volunteers, newspaper, Photo-Drama and extension workers (street of the gate of Ephraim). So crucial were the sifting movements among the British brethren at that time that all took their class stands (all the congregation . . . made . . . sat . . . booths, v. 17); for Y's British work began the Epiphany work of leading Azazel's Goat to the Gate, as the revolutionists' work in Britain began the sixth sifting—Revolutionism.

Since the last of the reaping's siftings, that from 1908 to 1911 (since the days of Joshua [Bro. Russell] the son of Nun), when there was the last previous sitting under antitypical booths, manifesting those who retained the Holy Spirit (Little Flock, Great Company and Youthful Worthies) as separate and distinct from those who lost it (Second Deathers) and those who never had it (the tentatively justified), there had not until J.'s British activity (unto that day had not . . . done so) been, as a result of a current sifting, an antitypical sitting under booths. It was the complete overthrow of the sifters that occasioned the faithful so greatly to rejoice, when they recognized out of how great danger and mischief they had been delivered (was very great gladness). During that entire time wherein these various standings were being approached and taken, *i.e.*, during the entire British antitypical feast of tabernacles (day by day . . . seven days . . . eighth day, v. 18), the pertinent parts of the Lord's Word were preached by J. and his official supporters (some ancient authorities, according to Ginsburg's notes, read, "*they* read," instead of, "*he* read"; the antitype suggests the former reading as preferable), with special reference to the prevailing conditions (read . . . law). The seven days (seven days) represent the shakings and the resultant taking of the pertinent standings; and the eighth day represents the

resultant activities of each class in its standing, a thing full of solemnity (a solemn assembly) according to the Lord's disposal of the situation (the manner).

Chapter 9 takes us to the happenings in the Tabernacle ecclesia in a series of events that were connected with the revolutionistic resolution and pertinent correspondence coming into the fore, and the confessing preaching of 8 repentant brothers of the 11 signatories of the deceitful resolution. The trouble in the London Tabernacle ecclesia resultant upon the acts of the 11 signatories of that resolution, when the nature of their acts became known to the ecclesia, caused great mourning (fasting, sackclothes, and earth upon them, v. 1). It led to a reformation in many besides the 8 repentant elders (seed . . . separated . . . confessed, v. 2); for the evil qualities that had produced that resolution had defiled others than the 11. There was in that ecclesia much preaching on repentance during those times (read . . . the law, v. 3), taking up part of the ecclesia's meetings (one fourth), business meetings, exposure and confession meetings taking up other parts of its meetings (another fourth), coupled with submission to the Lord (worshipped). It will be noted (1) that in vs. 4, 5, excluding repetitions, 11 different individuals are mentioned. Of these 11 only 8 are spoken of as speaking the language of confession set forth in vs. 5-38. The 11 represent the 11 elders who signed the resolution that implied that Bro. Russell's Tabernacle arrangements were unscriptural, and that sought to dispossess him of his powers as pastor of that headquarters' church. Of these 11 elders 3 did not repent and acknowledge their wrong-doing: H.J. Shearn, W. Crawford and A. Cruickshank; the remaining 8 did repent and acknowledge their wrongdoing and are typed by the 8 mentioned in v. 5, whose pertinent preaching and confessing form the antitype of the preaching and confession of vs. 5-38, two of them doing it in their newly formed ecclesia.

Very briefly will we offer the antitypes of these verses

as the subject-matter of their preachings and confessions. They ascribed and exhorted others to ascribe glory to God (v. 5), whose works of creation and providence and whose angelic subjects are mentioned in v. 6, especially stressing God's love, as typed by Abraham in relation to the Covenant (v. 7) and the promise of victory over their enemies (Canaanites . . . Girgashites, v. 8) and the possession of the Truth and its Spirit to the Seed, Christ (to give it . . . seed). His fulfillment of the parts of the promise already due has taken place (performed) through God's justice (righteous); for God sympathizes with His people oppressed by Satan, sin and death and delivers them in this Age and will deliver the rest of them in the next Age (see . . . Red sea, v. 9), working the antitypical ten plagues on Satan, his representatives and subjects, for their mistreatment of His people (signs . . . them, v. 10), which is resulting and will later increasingly result in God's glory (name). Through justification by faith and consecration made and carried out God delivers His people now from the second death, and by justification by works will deliver the faithful restitutionists therefrom in the next Age (divide the sea, v. 11), while Satan and wicked angels and men, assaying to entice these, will perish in the second death (persecutors . . . into . . . waters).

Furthermore, one or another of these 8 brothers preached on the Word and Spirit of God as the Leader of God's people in the Harvests and Interim (leddest . . . day by a cloudy pillar . . . night by a pillar of fire, v. 12). They stressed the thought that He will give the world the New Covenant in the next Age (Thou . . . Sinai . . . gavest . . . commandments, v. 13). Detailedly did they speak of the Millennium as a period of rest from the curse (known . . . sabbath, v. 14), when God by Christ (Moses) will give the world the Truth on doctrine and life (commandedst), now giving the Church and then the world the Truth (bread from heaven . . . water . . . out of the rock, v. 15), and promising for both classes the heritage of the Truth and its Spirit (land . . . sworn). Despite these

promises in both Harvests many disobeyed (harkened not . . . refused to obey, vs. 16, 17), made siftings (appointed [literally, sought to appoint] a captain), for which amid mercy they wandered (pardon . . . forsookest them not) the 40 antitypical years. Even their making creed gods (molten calf, v. 18) did not move God utterly to abandon them (in mercies, forsookest them not, v. 19), but continued to lead them by the Truth and its Spirit (pillar . . . pillar) and to give them the Truth as food and drink (manna . . . water, v. 20) throughout the Interim (40 years, v. 21), supplying the Faithfuls' need (lacked nothing), keeping their graces uncorrupted (clothes waxed not old) and conduct spiritually healthful (feet swelled not).

Moreover, God gave them as spheres of the Truth and its Spirit (kingdoms and nations, v. 22) the spheres once occupied by the general doctrines of error (Sihon [*rooting*] . . . king of Heshbon [*device*], of the particular errors of eternal torment and human immortality (Og [*giant*] king of Bashan [*fruitful*, as source of error]), which errors they overthrew. Yea, God in their posterity (multipliedst, v. 23) gave them the entire Truth as due and its Spirit (possessed the land, v. 24), as they overcame sin, error, selfishness and worldliness (subduedst . . . Canaanites) in their strongholds (strong cities, v. 25), but their prosperity (fat land . . . delighted) did not move all of them to be loyal to God (disobedient . . . wrought great Provocations, v. 26), which resulted in God's giving them up (deliveredst, v. 27) to spiritual slavery and masters (enemies) that mistreated (vexed) them; yet when they repented and cried unto the Lord He delivered them through the reformers, especially Bro. Russell (saviors). These fallings away and forgivings occurred repeatedly (again . . . many times, v. 28), God repeatedly seeking by His teachings (testifiedst, v. 29) to reform them, and they as repeatedly proving intractible (would not hear). All these times (many years, v. 30) God exercised longsuffering, sending His mouthpieces (testifiedst . . . by . . . prophets)

to expostulate with and teach them. Yet they would not obey (not give ear), which moved God to give them up to the antitypical Assyrian and Babylonian captivities in Catholicism and Protestantism (gavest . . . people of the lands). Yet in these God did not destroy nor forsake them (consume . . . nor forsake, v. 31).

Then the 8 repentant elders justified God (the great . . . mercy, v. 32) in His dealings with His people, and pleaded for His mercy upon them and others who were with them guilty, and thus subject to spiritual slavery (trouble seem little . . . upon us . . . people), while Gad had all along dealt aright with them, the guilty ones (just in all . . . we . . . wickedly, v. 33). They continued to acknowledge the evils committed by all (kings . . . fathers, v. 34) as more or less wilful (didst testify against them); and in the face of great benefits (kingdom . . . fat land, v. 35) they had not repented (neither turned . . . wicked works). Then the 8 acknowledged that their and the others' wrongs made them slaves of evil (servants, v. 36) and were not walkings as sons in the enjoyment of the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit (the land . . . eat the fruit . . . and good), but as servants, not enjoying such (servants in it). The benefits of the Truth and its Spirit were accruing to their oppressors (kings, v. 37) whom God had allowed to bring them into subjection (put over us). They recognized that it was deservedly in punishment of their sins (because of our sins) that they were oppressed (dominion . . . pleasure), as they also acknowledged their sorrow for their part in the wrong as to the resolution (distress). Six of the 8 repentant elders at J.'s last appearance in the Tabernacle ecclesia's business meetings individually arose and acknowledged their wrong-doings in connection with the pertinent elders' resolution and its correspondence; the other two, as before stated, had formed a new ecclesia, and were no more members of the Tabernacle ecclesia. Not only so, but they made a solemn promise (a sure covenant, v. 38), recorded by the secretary (write it), and asked it to be

witnessed (seal) by the Bethelites (princes), including also the nominees and electees as elders and deacons (Levites and priests).

Chapter 10 also treats matters in the Tabernacle ecclesia connected with the troubles incidental to the resolution, to the nominations and election of elders and deacons and the resultant reformation of arrangement and life in that ecclesia. In vs. 1-8 names of 23 persons are given; in vs. 9-13 those of 17 others occur; and in vs. 14-27 still other 44 names are recorded—a total of 84 names. These 84 persons represent the 84 brethren who were connected with the nominations for elders and deacons, including the 18 elders of the ecclesia who held office until the election in its two parts was completed. There was a printed list of 77 nominees, which served as ballots in the election. From this list by an oversight the name of R. Cormack was omitted, who was among the nominees and was later elected, which brought the list to 78. Later the names of the two managers whom J. appointed, A. Kirkwood and E. Housden, were added as nominees. Two of the 18 elders were also omitted from the list of nominees because they formed another ecclesia, their names being C.J. Cotton and W.P. Frazer. The name of J.F. Rutherford (Meremoth, v. 5) was also omitted from the ballot, who later was nominated and elected the chairman of the ecclesia, its board of elders and its executive committee, he being ordinarily represented as such by J. Hemery. J. was a witness and participant also, because of his office, though not a nominee. The first 23 names represent the 18 old elders of the ecclesia, the chairman of the deacons, the two new managers, J.F.R. and J. The next set of names represents the 17 deacons who were, according to the schedule of the Tabernacle ecclesia, for April to June, 1917, given classes to lead. There were 31 leaders of such ecclesia meetings, of whom 13 were elders and 1 the chairman of the deacons, and the rest were the involved 17 deacons antitypical of the Levites named in vs. 9-13. The 44 of vs. 14-27 type the

rest of the nominees, 4 of whom, besides the 17 deacons and their chairman above-mentioned, were also elected deacons, and 40 of whom failed of election. But all of these 84 witnessed the solemn promise of the repentant elders before the church.

But the reformation did not merely affect these repentant elders. It affected the 7 non-signatory elders (priests, v. 28), the rest of the deacons (Levites), the evangelists, *i.e.*, colporteurs, sharpshooters, volunteers, newspaper, Photo-Drama and extension workers and conversationalists, whose ministry was to open an entrance (porters) into the Truth to responsive ones, those in the ecclesia who gave discourses (singers) and the auxiliary pilgrims (Nethinim [*given ones*]). Additionally, the bulk of the ecclesia cleansed themselves (separated themselves) from filthiness of the flesh and spirit (people of the land), and re-dedicated themselves to the Lord (unto the law of God), and all in communion with them (wives) and all that they could influence, whether strong (sons) or weak (daughters), even those who were wise (knowledge . . . understanding). They held (clave, v. 29) to the Bethelites (nobles) and vowed to the faithful in their consecration (entered . . . oath . . . law . . . statutes), promising that they would not defile, themselves by subjecting their faults to those of others (daughters . . . people of the land, v. 30), nor subject others' faults to their own (daughters . . . sons). They also agreed that if speculators would offer them their speculations (bring ware . . . victuals, v. 31) on subjects as to which their minds should rest and not work (sabbath), or in any other feature of the Christian life (holy day), leaving the work of studying out such things to the mouthpiece priest, they would not accept their speculations (not buy).

They also agreed to forgive their wrongers (leave the seventh year) and to be merciful to their wrongers' (exaction . . . debt). All agreed faithfully to sacrifice in the interests of the Church (ordinances . . . yearly . . . for house . . . God, v.32), the truths that strengthen the brethren in every

good word and work (shew-bread, v. 33), the preaching and teaching, of the Word (continual meat offering), teachings as to justification (sabbaths), the exercise of the graces (new moons), other Christian experiences (set feasts), other features of consecration (holy things) and the atonement relations of the consecrated humanity of Christ and the Church (sin offerings . . . atonement), for the Church (house of God), all of which was done as an exhibition of the manifest acceptance, by God, of Christ's sacrifice (continual burnt offering). The various preaching and teaching servings (priests . . . wood offering, v. 34) of the elders and the various teaching servings (Levites . . . wood offering) of the deacons and the servings (people . . . wood offering) of meeting places at the Tabernacle, private homes and halls, were arranged by votes (cast the lots), all for the service of the Church (bring . . . house . . . God), according to the varying needs and developments of the brethren (houses . . . fathers), for regular meetings (times appointed . . . year), for the service of sacrifice (burn . . . altar . . . Lord), according to the Divine arrangements (as . . . in the law). Moreover, all the brethren promised to make their New Creatures (firstfruits, v. 35) further the interests of the Church sacrificially at the regular meetings (bring . . . year . . . house . . . Lord). Yea, this was to include the New Creatures and humanity of the Little Flock and Great Company (firstborn . . . firstlings, v. 36). This included these New, Creatures from the standpoint of the Pentecost type (firstfruits of our dough, v. 37).

Consecrations as the antitypical tithes were brought for the various pertinent offices (chambers) of the elders (priests) and the deacons (Levites), pledged for the work of the Church (bring . . . to . . . house of our God). The chief elder, J. Hemery (priest, v. 38), as the brethren's (Aaron) leader, was to supervise the work of the other elders and deacons in their leading new ones to consecration (when . . . take tithes); and these subordinate elders and deacons

were to bring those newly consecrated ones, in their relation to the main leaders, the priests (tithe of the tithes), to the offices (chambers) of the; priests' ministries in the Church (house . . . God . . . chambers . . . treasure house). This was done by J.'s making it clear to the Church that some brothers by reason of superior qualifications should be put into more responsible services than those of inferior qualifications, for which reason J. recommended J. Hemery for the most responsible services in the Tabernacle, others according to qualifications to appropriate services, some being assigned to preach, some to preach; and teach, and some to teach and not preach; and J. exhorted the members of the ecclesia so to arrange matters (children of Israel . . . Levi shall bring the offering, v. 39), *i.e.*, put the higher qualified ones into higher offices (chambers) for ministering various uses of the Word (vessels), those of the lowest qualifications into the offices to which their qualifications fitted them (porters) and those of medium qualifications (singers) into positions to which their qualifications fitted them. And all pledged themselves to be loyal to the Church (not forsake the house of our God).

Chapter 11 continues to describe the work of reformation, both as to the London Bethel and Tabernacle, especially showing how this reformation affected the officials of these two parts of the British Church, which in its entirety was affected by the reforms at the workshop and sample church for the British churches. The leaders (rulers, v. 1) naturally were in Bethel (Jerusalem) and the brethren everywhere favored those who were there (cast lots), as representatives of the whole (one of ten). Naturally the others spoke well of (blessed, v. 2) those who became Bethelites (Jerusalem). At Bethel (Jerusalem, v. 3) there were some brethren (Israel) who were the helpers of their more able brethren (Levites) and of their most able brethren (priests), as there were there also some auxiliary pilgrims (Nethinim) and special supporters of J. (Solomon). At Bethel (Jerusalem, v. 4) at this time were the main (Judah) leaders,

J. Hemery (Athaiah [*whom God made*]) and J. (Maaseiah [*work of Jehovah*], v. 5). The pertinent characteristics and uses, endowments, etc., of each are set forth in the meanings of the names of their typical forebears, *i.e.*, as to J. Hemery: Uzziah—*strength of Jehovah*, Zechariah—*remembrance of Jehovah*, Amariah—*sayings of Jehovah*, Shephatiah—*judgment of Jehovah*, Mahalaleel—*praising God*; as to J.: Baruch—*blessed*, Colhozeh—*all-seer*, *i.e.*, *overseer of all*, Hazaiah—*Jehovah sees*, Adaiah—*Witness of Jehovah*, Joarib—*Jehovah strives*, Zechariah—*remembrance of Jehovah*, Shiloni—*my messenger*. Their main supporters were in the Bethel and Tabernacle (sons of Perez . . . valiant men, v. 6). The secondary (Benjamin, v. 7) leaders at Bethel were A. Kirkwood (Shallu (*promoted*, in allusion to J.'s promoting him to managership]), whose qualities, uses, endowments, etc., are indicated in the meanings of Sallu's forebears, and E. Housden (Gabbai [*collector*, in allusion to E. Housden's being the treasurer], Sallai [*promoted*, in allusion to J.'s promoting him to managership], v. 8). They had many supporters (928). J. (Joel [*Jehovah is God*], Zichri [*my remembrance*], v. 9) was the overseer of these; and J. Hemery (Judah [*praised*], Senuah [*bristly*]), while J. was at Bethel, was next in power in Bethel.

Next the picture goes over from Bethel to the Tabernacle, which with Bethel throughout this book is included under the idea of Jerusalem; indeed, the same holds true of the entire British Church. On account of his being the Society's special representative J. was considered an official of the Tabernacle, though he never was elected as an elder or deacon. Here, again, the priestly, Levitical and Israelite picture is used as elsewhere in this book, and not as in the Pentateuch. J., because of his office, is here mentioned first (Jachin (*established, faithful*), son of Jedaiah [*Jehovah knows*], son of Joarib [*Jehovah strives*], in allusion to the knowledge Jehovah gave J., enabling him to strive against the Tabernacle evils and for its good,

v. 10). Regularly the chief one (ruler, v. 11) in the Tabernacle was J.F. Rutherford, as he was chairman of the elders (Seraiah [*prince of Jehovah*]), whose characteristics, uses and endowments as to his Tabernacle office are indicated in the meanings of Seraiah's forebears: Hilkiah—*Jehovah's portion*, Meshullam—*recompensed*, Zadok—*righteous*, Meraioth—*heights*, Ahitub—*my brother is good*. J. and J.F.R. had very large support in the reformatory work (their brethren . . . 822, v. 12). J. Hemery was the assistant chairman and ordinarily, *i.e.*, in J.F.R.'s absence, acted as chairman (Adaiah—*witness of Jehovah*, Jeroham—*he is merciful*, Pelaliah—*Judges of Jehovah*, Amzi—*my strong one*, Zechariah—*remembrance of Jehovah*, Pashur—*splitter*, Malchiah—*king of Jehovah*). He also had abundant supporters (brethren . . . 242, v. 13). T.M. Seeck, who, as secretary, furnished J. with the elders' minutes, well documented, covering the meetings during and through which the conspiracy on the revolutionary resolution to oust Bro. Russell from his pastoral powers in the Tabernacle was going on, was re-elected the ecclesia's secretary (Amashai [*burden-bearer*]). His qualities, uses, etc., are indicated in the meanings of his type's forebears. He and the treasurer had many supporters (their brethren . . . 128, v. 14). Who was elected treasurer (Zabdiel [*God's gift*]) we have forgotten; but he had chief influence (overseer) among his and the secretary's supporters.

Six of the deacons (Levites, v. 15), F.J. Pett, C. Guiver, T.J. Ensol, A. Barnes, S.H. Martin, and H.D. Headland, were not given classes to lead, but were given purely deacon work to do, as antitypes of the six Levites mentioned in vs. 15-17. The first three had external business matters of the Church as their charge (oversight . . . outward business . . . house, v. 16). The other three had to do with non-preaching and non-teaching parts of the services (thanksgiving in prayer, v. 17). All of these had many supporters (Levites . . . 284, v. 18) in the Tabernacle (city). Two of the deacons (porters, Akkub, Talmon, v. 19) were especially

commissioned to serve toward outsiders and had a goodly number of supporters (172). In other churches there were also main leaders, as elders (priests, v. 20), deacons (Levites) and non-official brethren (Israel). The auxiliary pilgrims (Nethinim, v. 21) were members of Bethel, though not in all cases resident there (dwelt in Ophel [*tower*]). Their leaders were A. Kirkwood (Ziha [*dry*]) and E. Housden (Gispa [*caressing*]). The Tabernacle deacons had a leader (*Uzzi [my strong one]*, v. 22), whose name we have forgotten. His qualities, etc., are indicated by the name meanings of his type's forebears (son of . . . Micha). The leaders of the meetings (singers) were the ones who were charged with the real work of the Tabernacle (over . . . house). J. Hemery (*Pethahiah [Jehovah opens up]*, v. 24), whose pertinent qualities, etc., are indicated in the meanings of the names of his type's forebears, had charge of the general work toward the brethren in Britain (king's hand . . . the people). In vs. 25-35 are the names of 31 towns, 17 (vs. 25-30) in Judah and 14 in Benjamin. As mentioned above, there were, according to the Tabernacle ecclesia's schedule for April-June, 1917, 31 different Berean class leaders. The brethren as gathered in the meetings, led by these 31 leaders, correspond to these 31 towns, the 17 towns of Judah corresponding to the 17 more influential of these, and the 14 towns of Benjamin corresponding to the 14 less influential of these. There were deacons (Levites, v. 36) among these 31 Berean leaders; some of them had charge of the more important' classes (divisions in Judah) and the others of the less important classes (Benjamin).

Our study brings us now to Chapter 12. Zerubbabel (v. 1) has J. as his small antitype, from the standpoint of the latter's organizing the Epiphany work as to building the Great Company into the Epiphany Court. Accompanying him, of course unconscious of the nature of the work, were 23 who took a prominent part in this work, and who correspond to the 23 priests mentioned in vs. 1-7. They were the following: (1) the 7 Board members of the Society, who

decided to send J. to Europe in harmony with Bro. Russell's plan on this subject; (2) J.'s 8 extra-London British counselors; (3) the 3 British managers; (4) J.'s 3 assistant counselors (A. Kirkwood, E. Housden and R Cormack); (5) J.'s private secretary, F.G. Guard, Jr., and Pilgrim Bro. Smedley. The six non-signatory elders (J. Hemery not here included, as belonging to the previous list) are the antitypes of the six Levites mentioned in v. 8. The two Levites mentioned in v. 9 represent two of the leading Tabernacle deacons as supporters of the non-signatory elders; *i.e.*, F.J. Pett and F. Lardent. Various phases of activities, qualities, etc., of J. Hemery are typed in the meanings of the six high priests' names mentioned in the history in vs. 10, 11. J. Hemery's activities, qualities, etc., as a supporter of J. in the fight against H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford, are typed by Joiakim (v. 12); and the 20 chief priests of the days of Joiakim (vs. 12-21) represent the same persons as were typed by 20 of the 23 priests of vs. 1-7; the omitted 3 of the 23 are J.F.R., H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford, who did not support J. in the involved conflict. There was, of course, a record (recorded, v. 22) kept of all the Tabernacle deacons (Levites) in the secretary's minutes and in the ecclesia's Berean studies' schedules all the times of J. Hemery's varied activities (Eliashib . . . Jaddua). This was the case until the renewal of the work on the temple as the Lord's people in America, in 1917 (Darius, who authorized the renewal of the work), the pertinent work done in England from Nov. 21, 1916 to March 30, 1917 being the antitype of the building of the altar and foundation of Zerubbabel's temple. More will come on this when expounding the book of Ezra. H.C. Thackway, G.T.R. Swain and T.M. Seeck (chief of the Levites, v. 24) were the 3 leading non-signatory elders, who served in the Tabernacle ecclesia in conjunction with the other 3 (with their brethren over against them) in the fight for Bro. Russell's Tabernacle arrangements (commandment of David) against H.J.

Shearn and W. Crawford. Only 6 of the signatory elders were re-elected in the Tabernacle ecclesia, though two others were elected elders in the Crouch End, London, Church. These 6 are represented by the 6 Levites of v. 25 (porters). V. 26 summarizes what is said, type and antitype, in vs. 12-25, with the exception that it adds that these served in the days of Nehemiah (J. as special representative) and Ezra (J. as pilgrim). And the facts of the case prove that these were the days of conflict with and over H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford.

This conflict from the standpoint of its steady progress toward and in victory is set forth typically in the procession of the two companies on Jerusalem's finished walls. The first work on the antitypical wall began Nov. 19, 1916, in starting arrangements for J.'s pilgrim work, and in the delivery of his first discourse that afternoon to the Liverpool ecclesia. Within 52 days the first phase of J.'s pilgrim work was finished, with his night meeting in Sheffield, Jan. 8, 1917; and, as shown, every other phase of the British reformatory work took 52 days from its start to its finish. Hence the procession began in both of its phases after the evening of Jan. 8. The work as soon as completed in each of its features was given (dedication of the wall, v. 27) to the Lord, beginning with Jan. 9, when J. started out on the second phase of his pilgrim work. To insure the benefit of this work to remain with Bethel and the Tabernacle the election of the Tabernacle elders and deacons was undertaken (sought the Levites), so that they might be assigned to their several services in preaching, teaching and testimony meetings (thanksgivings and singings), at which they used Tabernacle Shadows, the Volumes (psalteries), Mannas (cymbals) and Bibles (harps). The leaders (singers, v. 28) of other ecclesiast than the Tabernacle came to this dedication, which occurred especially, but not exclusively, on the Sundays, Jan. 14, 21, 28 and Feb. 4 11 and 18. Particularly was this true of elders from the Crouch End and Forest Gate and other neighboring churches (plain country

... Azmaveth, v. 29). For a number of ecclesiasties were developed in and near London by the elders and deacons (singers ... villages ... Jerusalem). There was a general purifying work going on in those days by the leaders in Bethel (priests, v. 30) and in the Tabernacle (Levites) and these helped cleanse the non-official brethren in the various forms of Truth servants (gates) and the various powers (wall) of the British Church. Seldom anywhere else was there such a purifying work done in the Epiphany.

In the type one of the companies started just east of the valley gate, marching first eastward (toward the dung gate, v. 31); the other started just west of the valley gate (from beyond the tower of the furnaces, v. 38), marching westward first. The company marching eastward first types the brethren of Bethel and the Tabernacle ecclesia and other ecclesiasties who supported the non-revolutionists; and the company marching westward first represents the brethren of Bethel, the Tabernacle ecclesia and other ecclesiasties who opposed the revolutionists. Our reasons for saying this are as follows: (1) The latter stood still in the prison gate (v. 39), which represents the Great Company in restraint; and (2) J. (I ... with me, v. 40), as Nehemiah's antitype, supported such resisters of revolutionists; for Nehemiah represents him here as the leader under Christ in forcing Azazel's Goat to the Gate and fit man, while Ezra, who was in the other company, types J. as pilgrim, not as the Lord's representative in leading the Goat to the Gate. The eight nobles of vs. 32-34 represent eight Bethelites. Hoshaiyah types the Bethelite J. Hemery, whose qualities, acts, etc., in this matter are represented by the name meanings of his type's forebears. The 9 priests of v. 36 type 6 non-signatory elders (J. Hemery, the other non-signatory elder, being typed by Zechariah in v. 35, is here, in v. 36, omitted), A. Kirkwood and E. Housden as managers and J., who as pilgrim took precedence over the others (Ezra ... before them, v. 36). These were loyal to,

and advocated the use of Bro. Russell's writings (musical instruments of David). These acted aright toward the managers (fountain gate, v. 37), to whom they stood in intimate relations (over against them). They proceeded in their advancing to higher positions along the lines of Bro. Russell's arrangements (went up by the stairs . . . David . . . wall . . . David) and were faithful, even to standing for Bro. Russell's arrangements for conventions (unto the water gate). The other company had many hard experiences (tower of the furnaces, v. 38), beginning shortly after they began to work against the revolutionists. They opposed the revolutionists against the workers toward outsiders, *i.e.*, colporteurs, sharpshooters, evangelists, volunteers and newspaper, Photo-Drama, extension and conversationalist workers, etc. (gate of Ephraim, v. 39), against the work of the counselors (old gate), against the faithful elders (fish gate), against J.'s public pilgrim work (tower of Hanantel), his parlor pilgrim work (tower of Meah) and against the other pilgrims (sheep gate), and they continued this fighting against revolutionism until they brought the revolutionists into proper restraint (prison gate). Apparently the prison gate was near the water gate, between it and the horse gate; for both companies stood at the house of God (v. 40), which types that the two antitypical companies did their good work of praising God in the Tabernacle (stood . . . thanks . . . house of God, v. 40). The 7 non-signatory elders are typed by the 7 priests of v. 41. These certainly did trumpet the wrongs connected with the 11 elders' resolution, etc. The 9 singers of v. 42 type the 9 deacons who were elected at the first election and who took charge of Berean lessons, the other 4 deacons chosen at the first election not taking charge of such F. Lardent was their leader (Jezrahiah, v. 42).

During that symbolic parade there were many self-denials and sacrifices made (offered great sacrifices, v. 43) by the brethren, as there was great rejoicing in the deliverance effected from the machinations of the revolutionists

(rejoiced). This was experienced not only by the Bethelites and Tabernacle ecclesia's chief sacrificers (they . . . them), but also by their supporters and dependents (wives . . . children); and many brethren of other ecclesiastas observed this joy (heard even afar off). It was at this period (at that time, v. 44) that J. appointed A. Kirkwood and E. Housden managers (appointed), who were charged with caring for various features of the general work: E. Housden to look after the orders for literature (treasures) and the contributions (offerings), and A. Kirkwood to look after pilgrim, convention, etc., matters, as these concerned New Creatures (firstfruits), and consecrations (tithes), as these pertained to the main and subordinate workers (priests and Levites). The brethren rejoiced with and in these and gladly helped them. The Berean teachers (singers, v. 45) and those (porters) supporting the serving brethren faithfully served newcomers (kept the ward), and sought to purify themselves and others (ward of the purification) as Bro. Russell (David) and J. (Solomon) arranged (according to the commandment). Such ministries were conducted in Bro. Russell's times (v. 46). Indeed, in J.'s times in his twofold work (days of Zerubbabel . . . of Nehemiah) the brethren stood for Berean teachers and supporters of the Truth servants, and carried out their consecrations (sanctified) in support of the subordinate (Levites) and main leaders (children of Aaron), giving needed help.

Our study now proceeds to the 13th, the last chapter of Nehemiah. During the period (that day, v. 1) of the antitypical procession much was preached and spoken against clericalists (Ammonite) and autocrats (Moabite), the leader of the former being H.J. Shearn, and of the latter W. Crawford, both of whom were by J. announced before the Tabernacle ecclesia, Jan. 28, as forever cut off from the Little Flock (not come into the congregation of God forever). Such did not refresh the Little Flock in its British wilderness journey (met not . . . with bread and water, v. 2), but

used elders who were greedy (Balaam [*greedy*]) for personal gain to speak evil of them (curse them); but the Lord turned their evil-speaking into good-speaking by the efforts of the faithful British brethren. The pertinent preaching and teaching was listened to (heard, v. 3) and produced fruit; the faithful supported it; and those who were contaminated with the spirit of clericalism and absolutism and would not sever themselves from these were alienated (separated) from the other brethren, first internally, and then externally, *e.g.*, H.J. Shearn, W. Crawford, A. Cruickshank (none of the three were re-elected elders), and C.W. Cotton and W.P. Frazer, the signatory elders who left the ecclesia and formed another, and their partisan supporters; and those (the 6 penitent signatory elders) who were contaminated with the spirit of clericalism and absolutism, but who cleansed themselves, though losing some of the appreciation of the ecclesia, yet retained their fellowship. The antitype of the episode described in vs. 4-9 concerns the scheme (see Vol. VI, 51-60) that J. Hemery, H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford as managers concocted, to make the W.T.B.&T. Society a money and books providing and a guaranteeing corporation and the I.B.S.A., an independent and controlling corporation in the British work. This scheme would have made H.J. Shearn (*Tobiah*, v. 4) the chief manager, yea, almost the controller of the British work. The antitypical procession commenced before the first election, that of Jan. 21. It was before this procession (before this) that the three managers, especially J. Hemery and H.J. Shearn, concocted the scheme, for the letter of the Society's auditors that outlined the scheme in detail was written Jan. 22, 1917, the day after that first election, and it shows in the third par. that the managers had requested the auditors to suggest a way to carry out the scheme; and in the first par. it states that the latter's various suggestions were in their letter being confirmed. The scheming took some time before the managers unfolded it to the auditors. Very

likely the scheming started sometime before Jan. 8, when J. heard J. Hemery's charges against the other managers in his last meeting with the three.

Accordingly, sometime before Jan. 14, 1917 (a Sunday), when the procession began publicly, the scheme was concocted by the three managers, especially by J. Hemery and H.J. Shearn (allied); consequently before that date J. Hemery (Eliashib), the chief manager and the leader of the ecclesia (oversight . . . house) cooperated in concocting that scheme. That scheme, if put into effect, would by J. Hemery's intention have given H.J. Shearn a great position of responsibility in the British work (he had prepared for him a great chamber, v. 5), a position that would have put into his control the main parts of the British work, *i.e.*, the pilgrim, auxiliary pilgrim, extension, Photo-Drama and pastoral work (meat offerings, the frankincense) and the colporteur, newspaper and volunteer work (vessels), as well as the persons engaging in these works (tithes of corn, new wine and oil . . . Levites), as well as all of the leading brethren (priests). Before this he acted as a deputy of the Society toward these works and persons, *i.e.*, a distinct subordinate; but that scheme, put into effect, would have given controllership to the I.B.S.A. as a British corporation, as against the W.T.B.&T. Society, and hence would have made H.J. Shearn the almost exclusive controller of the British work. The scheme was unknown to J. until March 12, not only until after his recall, but later than after the week in which he erroneously believed that his recall was valid (not at Jerusalem, v. 6). For a week the adversary (Artaxerxes, king of *Babylon*; not our Lord, Artaxerxes of *Persia*) deceived J. into believing that J.F.R. had the right to recall him; and thus during that week J. unknowingly, by submitting to the recall and by ceasing to act as special representative, was furthering Satan's schemes operating through J.F.R. against the British work (I came unto the king). At the end of the week (March 6), by a strong mental struggle

(I earnestly requested,—*margin*), he came very definitely to the conclusion that without the Board's authorization J.F.R. could not recall him, who was the Board's, not J.F.R.'s special representative. Hence J. resumed his duties as special representative toward the British work (I came to Jerusalem, v. 7). Thereafter (March 12) J. learned of the scheme and J. Hemery's part therein (understood . . . Eliashib . . . Tobiah . . . chamber . . . house). For details please see Vol. VI, 51-60. That J. was much grieved at this treachery of J. Hemery goes without saying (it grieved me sore, v. 8). By the ensuing suit, authorized March 14, J. destroyed the scheme, whose exposure made it impossible to put it into effect, though he lost the suit through J.F.R.'s fault (cast forth . . . stuff of Tobiah . . . chamber). The suit also was a command to end all such and similar power-grasplings (commanded . . . they cleansed). It also resulted in deputy powers exercised by Society authority being restored (brought . . . vessels . . . frankincense).

Vs. 4-9 are a parenthesis. V. 10 goes back to the period of the procession dealt with in the second part of the preceding chapter and in vs. 1-3 of this chapter. In Bethel, in the Tabernacle and afield not a few of the subordinate workers (Levites, singers, v. 10) under H.J. Shearn's and W. Crawford's administration were circumscribed in, or withheld from opportunities of service (portions) that belonged to them, when they would not lend themselves to the schemes of these two. As a result the work in all three spheres lagged and in some cases was left undone, and other work was undertaken (fled . . . field). This caused J. to argue (contended, v. 11) with these two against their causing without right the work to be neglected (Why . . . forsaken?). He then changed this evil condition and encouraged each to resume his service in his special sphere of work (gathered . . . set . . . place). This resulted in a widespread increased participation in the Lord's service in activities and contributions (brought all Judah the tithe . . . treasuries,

v. 12). It was also during the antitypical procession that J. appointed the two new managers (whose appointment is described, but not by name, in Neh. 12: 44). Here they are described by name: E. Housden (*Shelemiah [peace of Jehovah]* the priest, v. 13), treasurer, and A. Kirkwood (*Zadok [just]* the scribe), secretary, both of whom were charged with responsibilities over the symbolic treasuries, *i.e.*, goods of the Lord. J. similarly favored the election of the ecclesia's secretary, T.M. Seeck (*Pedaiah [ransomed of Jehovah]*), and treasurer, perhaps R. Cormack (*Hanan [grace]*). They were faithful in their service (faithful . . . distribute . . . brethren). J. by his conduct asked that God remember his labors on behalf of the Church and its offices (v. 14). One of the many evils that J. sought to correct was textbookistic methods in Bible study, which was very prevalent in Britain (I testified against them, v. 15). Great were the speculative products (sheaves . . . wine, grapes, figs) that these exchanged (sold) with one another. Because the Lord Jesus is the only Interpreter of the Bible, and uses a special mouth through whom to speak to the brethren, the latter should rest (sabbath) from speculative study. Hence J. disapproved of such textbookism.

Another evil against which he wrought was the practice of influential brethren to study books of nominal-church writers and to circulate them among the brethren (men of Tyre . . . fish . . . ware . . . sold, v. 16), which increased speculating among the brethren (children of Judah), who should have kept a rest (Sabbath) from such activities. This was done even in Bethel and in the Tabernacle ecclesia (in Jerusalem). J. rebuked the Bethelites (nobles) and others for practicing this evil (contended . . . nobles . . . evil thing . . . profane . . . Sabbath, v. 17). J. pointed out the evils that came in former days through such a course (fathers . . . bring evil, v. 18), leading to taking up nominal-church errors. He stressed as more deadly the speculative habit (wrath . . . profaning the Sabbath). He took practical methods to break up such speculations in Bethel, in the

Tabernacle and in the churches afield. By church action he had the churches banish textbookistic studies, on account of their speculative nature, from the churches' schedules, especially that of the Tabernacle ecclesia (commanded the gates . . . shut . . . not be opened . . . sabbath, v. 19), by stirring up the involved servants to shut such things out of their spheres of service.

He had trustworthy brethren see to the squelching of such speculative studies (servants set . . . gates . . . no burden . . . Sabbath). Some sought to continue this evil practice (merchants . . . ware lodged . . . twice, v. 20). Against this J. protested (testified against them, v. 21), threatening to denounce them by name, if they did not desist (do again, I will lay hands on you). This ended their open efforts at speculation (came they no more on the sabbath). J. charged the deacons and other less prominent brethren to rid themselves of speculations (Levites . . . cleanse themselves, v. 22) and to seek to hold back various serving brethren (keep the gates) from speculating (keep the gates to sanctify the Sabbath). For this J.'s conduct, by ill health from heavy labor, asked the Lord to remember him in mercy (Remember . . . spare . . . mercy). During the time of the procession J. also saw that not a few leaders had the qualities (wives, v. 23) of sectarianism (Ashdod [*stronghold*]), of clericalism (Amnion) and of autocracy (Moab). Their supporters (children, v. 24) were neither wholly in the Truth nor wholly in error (spake half . . . speech of Ashdod . . . Jews' language). They were confusing both. This was especially true of the supporters of C.W. Cotton, W.P. Frazer (Ashdod), H.J. Shearn (Amnion) and W. Crawford (Moab), though others had like qualities. For this J. argued with them (contended, v. 25) and spoke against all of them (cursed them). He laid a very heavy hand on H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford before the Tabernacle ecclesia, Jan. 28 and Feb. 18 (smote certain of them), and dismissed them from Bethel as managers and moved the Church not to elect them, taking away their powers (plucked off their hair).

J. required of the penitent signatory elders a solemn promise to cleanse themselves from, and not to practice these qualities (made them swear . . . not give your daughters . . . take their daughters). He pointed out how the leading siflers in the Harvest (Solomon, v. 26) fell (sin) from their steadfastness through developing such unholy qualities (outlandish [foreign] women cause to sin), and that they fell, despite the high positions (no king like him . . . God made him king over all Israel) that they reached, and despite God's special favors (beloved of his God). Their examples J. held before the leaders, etc., as a warning to them, if they imitated such (hearken . . . evil . . . God . . . strange wives, v. 27). J. Hemery (one of the sons of Joiada [*Jehovah knows*] . . . Eliashib [*God returns*], v. 28), after J.F.R. recalled J. and denounced him as a fraud, showed a character much like that of W. Crawford (son-in-law of Sanballat [*the moon god gave life*] the Horonite [*double cave, i.e., doubly secretive*]). Details on this phase of his doings and character are given in Vol. VI, Chap. I. His evil course gave J. his last unpleasant work in Britain; and it resulted in J.'s suspending him as manager, and in bringing the suit in part against him to protect the Society against his scheme (I chased him from me). Against all three of the managers who held office as such on J.'s coming to England did his resistance of them become in God's sight a prayer, because they had defiled themselves as the main leaders in Britain (priesthood, v. 29) and had defiled their office obligations (covenant) as these respected them and their subordinates (Levites) in Bethel and the Tabernacle. The first clause of v. 30 summarizes for the type what was given above as the antitype of vs. 15-27, as the second clause of v. 30 and the first clause of v. 31 summarize for the type what was given on Neh. 9: 1-12: 47 as the antitype. J.'s whole-hearted service on behalf of the British Church in defending it against its exploiters, in giving it the Divine arrangements for carrying on its work and in seeking its real prosperity was a prayer to God to remember for blessing his labors (Remember . . . for good, v. 31).

## CHAPTER IV.

### ZERUBBABEL AND EZRA—TYPE AND SMALL ANTITYPE.

THE COMMISSION. SIXTY GREAT COMPANY GROUPS. ALTAR AND FOUNDATION. STOPPAGE OF BUILDING. RENEWAL AND COMPLETION OF BUILDING. TEMPLE MINISTRIES. EZRA'S COMMISSION. HIS FELLOW-TRAVELERS AND JOURNEY. HIS ATTITUDE AND ACTS TOWARD THE SINNING.

TWO other phases of J.'s Epiphany work are presented as a small antitype by Zerubbabel's (*born in Babylon*) and Ezra's (*help*) works, as these are presented in the book of Ezra, Zerubbabel and Ezra having their large antitypes in Marsiglio and Wyclif respectively. Whereas Nehemiah types him as the small antitype in the work of his British mission as executive, Ezra in Nehemiah typing him as the small antitype in his British pilgrim work, the antotypical viewpoint of Zerubbabel in the small antitype is J.'s worldwide work as executive for the Epiphany, doing a constructive work for the Little Flock, Great Company and Youthful Worthies as to their being built up into the Epiphany temple of the Lord, in contrast with the Gospel-Age picture of the temple of the Lord; and the antotypical viewpoint of Ezra in the book of Ezra as the small antitype is that of J.'s worldwide work as the Little Flock executive and teacher for the Epiphany, doing a reformatory work for the Little Flock, Great Company and many Youthful Worthies; as the second and third classes just mentioned, while being a consecrated, are more or less a defiled people. While J. as Nehemiah antitype did his executive work in Britain alone, both the Zerubbabel and the Ezra antitypes trace his work as beginning in Britain, progressing in America and reaching its climax throughout the Truth world. The facts given in the preceding chapter prove the first part of the foregoing statement to be true of his work as executive in the small antitype of Nehemiah; and in this chapter the facts will be

given in proof of the other two statements of the preceding sentence. In the preceding chapter the statement was made that the book of Nehemiah was the first set of the peculiarly Epiphany antitypes to become clear to us; and we now make the statement that the second set of the peculiarly Epiphany antitypes to become clear to us were those of the book of Ezra.

Bro. Russell (Jeremiah, v. 1), from the Spring of 1915, which was in the first year wherein our Lord (first year of Cyrus [*sun*, or *lord*]) used force to overthrow mystic Babylon, increasingly laid stress on the separation of the Little Flock and the Great Company, and of the latter's appearing separate and distinct from the former. At the same time our Lord removed restraints (*i.e.*, untied Azazel's Goat) from the Great Company, leaders and led ones, as to their having more or less opportunity to come on the stage of manifestation as such. Moreover, during that time He caused the announcement of the smiting of Jordan (*i.e.*, the second one, which the Great Company mistook for the first one) to be made worldwide, inviting those who desired to share in it to indicate their qualifications for various features of the work, unto which the Great Company gave especial heed as desiring it. These three things, especially: forecasting the separation, giving more freedom of action to the Great Company and stressing the desirability of Jordan's (second) smiting, constitute our Lord's giving the proclamation antitypical of that of vs. 1-4. Jehovah aroused Jesus (Lord stirred . . . Cyrus) while acting as mystic Babylon's conqueror (king of Persia) to make the worldwide proclamation, and to put it in writing through that Servant, as just shown. While at the time the full intent of this proclamation was not understood by His agents this side of the vail, subsequent clarifyings of the Truth caused them to understand, in as different measures as their differing heart's attitudes allowed, that this proclamation called for the development and manifestation of the Great Company and

Youthful Worthies as the Court of the Epiphany and the Epiphany Little Flock as the temple proper (Cyrus . . . me to build Him an house, v. 2).

In the finished picture the Epiphany temple differs from the Gospel-Age temple, as typed by the tabernacle. In both the Most Holy is the Spirit-born condition. In the Gospel-Age picture the Holy is the condition of all embryo New Creatures, regardless of whether they are crown-retainers or crown-losers, while in the Epiphany picture as a finished work the Holy is the condition of crown-retainers only. The Gospel-Age Court is the condition of the faith-justified, and its 60 posts are the 60 groups of the faith-justified, while in the Epiphany picture as a finished work the Court is the condition of the Great Company and Youthful Worthies; and its posts are these two classes combined into 60 groups. The Gospel-Age Camp is the condition of the unjustified people of God, while the Epiphany Camp in the finished picture is the condition of truly repentant and believing, but not consecrated Jews and Gentiles. The foregoing proclamation called upon all who desired to respond (Who . . . go . . . build the house, v. 3) to participate in what was a building of the Epiphany temple for the Lord, as it also promised ultimate success on their labor (his God be with him). Those not going at first to the sphere of this work (Jerusalem, v. 4), *i.e.*, the majority of the Little Flock, were encouraged to help this work on with Divine Truth (silver and gold, v. 4) and providential helps (goods . . . beasts) and self denying service (freewill offering). This invitation was especially a charge to some Little Flock brethren to help the Great Company and Youthful Worthies unto their being properly built into the Court of the Lord's Epiphany sanctuary. As a matter of fact, in the beginnings of each stage of the construction work, regardless of whether they were crown-retainers or crown-losers, the participants were always Little Flock members, *i.e.*, priests, and only later did various of them

become manifested as Great Company members, Levites; for we are not to forget that God counts all New Creatures priests, Little Flock members, until and unless any of them are manifested as Levites, or Great Company members. *E.g.*, those that assisted J. in the British part of the temple building (for, as will be shown, the foundation of the Epiphany temple was built in Britain) were priests, some of whom later became manifested as Levites, *e.g.*, J. Hemery.

Again, the superstructure of the Epiphany temple was built first in America, and then worldwide, starting from shortly after J.'s return from Britain until the 1918 Society election in its first part, and thereafter in its other parts, as these came into it; and those that mainly assisted him in this first phase of the superstructure, the four Directors, Menta Sturgeon and F.H. McGee, were later manifested as Levites. All of those who decided to take part constructively in the good work are the antitypes of the actors of v. 5. And the other Truth people assisted them (all . . . about them strengthened, v. 6), as was typically charged in v. 4. The Lord Jesus (Cyrus, v. 7) saw to it that J. (Sheshbazzar [*honorer of fire*, in allusion to J.'s honorably presenting the tribulations, fire, of the Great Company, as atoning for the wilfulness in the world's sins], v. 8) received the charge of the full Truth literature of the Parousia (all the vessels . . . 5,400, v. 11); for He caused to be put into J.'s credentials the statement, "He is also *the* fully accredited representative of the Society, to lecture on and teach the Bible and to preach the Gospel in any country of the world," a statement that also shows that the rest of the Bible truths, the Epiphany Truth, were put into his charge. His charge as to the Parousia Truth, as a thing already manifested, was to explain and defend it against attacks, and as to the Epiphany Truth, as a thing yet to be manifested, to reveal and defend it. The Parousia truths (vessels of the house of the Lord, v. 7) onward from the toga scene (Oct. 30, 1916, corresponding in the

Smallest Miniature to 539 A.D.), went into little mystic Babylonian captivity at the hand of Satan (Nebuchadnezzar). The whole Parousia Truth our Lord caused the Board (Mithredath [*devoted to the sun.*, i.e., devoted to our Lord]) in the above quoted language of his credentials to give into J.'s charge, through the Executive Committee's credentials; for in giving these to J. it acted as the agent of the Board, which legally and morally made the Board give them; for what one does through an agent, he does himself.

The description (numbered) that the Lord through the Board gave of the Parousia truths is in the language above quoted. It will be noted that there are four kinds of temple vessels mentioned: (1) chargers (both of gold and silver); (2) knives (used at the altar to cut the sacrifices, and thus to type the same as the cups, doctrines, rightly dividing (cutting) the Word of Truth, v. 9); (3) basins, bowls with covers (of gold and silver) and (4) other vessels (v. 10). Here are typed the four kinds of teachings of the Bible: (1) corrections; (2) doctrines; (3) reproofs, *i.e.*, refutations; and (4) instructions in righteousness (2 Tim. 3: 16, 17). The gold of these vessels symbolizes the Divine, and the silver, Truth, *i.e.*, both combined represent Divine Truth. There is a discrepancy between the totals of the distributed numbers of these vessels given in vs. 9, 10 and the total given in v. 11, due to some errors of copyists, whom to correct we do not have at hand the materials in the form of variant readings. The antitypes of the 5,400 vessels are the number of articles in Bro. Russell's [his own and others' articles] Towers, Volumes, booklets, tracts, sermons, magazine articles, etc. With the exception of a few of the older and less important tracts, four sermons and some of the 1911 Overland Monthly articles, all that Bro. Russell ever published is in J.'s possession. If those that he lacks (which he would be very glad to get) never come to him in the above-mentioned forms, it would mean that they have been reprinted in

something that he has, or that they are not counted among the above. We are inclined to think that he has them printed in some other publication than in their mentioned lacking form, except the missing 1911 Overland Monthly articles. It will be noted that the vessels were given to Sheshbazzar. This is another name for Zerubbabel, given him by the Babylonians in addition to his Hebrew name, even as they gave Daniel and his three companions Babylonian names in addition to their Hebrew names. That Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel are one and the same person is manifest from the fact that under both names the founder of the temple is mentioned (Ezra 5: 16; 3: 8); and under both names the governor is mentioned (1: 8; 5: 14, 16; 2: 2; 3: 2, 8; 4: 3; 5: 2).

Chapter 2 treats of the main leaders, of the families of those who returned from Babylon and of their offerings for the temple, typing the coming out from little Babylonian captivity of crown-retainers, of the main leaders, of the 60 divisions of the Levites and of the offerings that these would make. At the time of such comings out all the New Creatures were priests; only later the Levites appeared as such. V. 1 sets forth these matters, apart from the offering, in a summary, as the finished picture. The rest of the chapter gives the details, which we will now proceed to elucidate. It will be noted that v. 2 gives us 11 names, while Neh. 7: 7 contains another, Nahamani, which the antitype proves to be correct. Zerubbabel, the governor, types J. as executive (*e.g.*, as typed by Ithamar, the son of Aaron) as to Merarites and Gershonites, who as a whole, and that as distinct from the Little Flock, are the first and second groups of the 60 Levite groups, as we have seen in Vol. VIII, Chapter II. Jeshua, the high priest, represents J. as chief of the lecturers, or preachers (pilgrims), and writers, who as such is over the Kohathites. The other ten mentioned are Nehemiah (*comfort of Jehovah*, Menta Sturgeon), Seraiah (*head, leader, of Jehovah*, A.I. Ritchie),

Nahamani (*my comforted one*, J. Hemery), Reelaiah (*a reeling of Jehovah*, H.J. Shearn), Mordecai (*worshipper of Mars*, J.F. Rutherford), Bilshan (*talkative*, I.F. Hoskins), Mizpar (*number*, C.E. Heard), Bigvai (*gardener*, Carl Olson), Rehum (*merciful*, R.H. Hirsh) and Baanah (*son of affliction*, R.G. Jolly). Of these ten, eight have been leaders of the eight subdivisions of the three Levitical groups; one, J. Hemery, of the British Societyites; and one, R.G. Jolly, of the good Levites. So far we note that the leaders of ten of the Levite groups and the executive and leading lecturer (pilgrim) and writer are mentioned.

Moreover, in vs. 3-35 and Neh. 7: 15, 24, 25, 28, are 45 other groups. The four sets of priests (vs. 36-39) representing the main leaders in various groups, the ten sets of Levites (vs. 40-42) representing the subordinate leaders in various groups, the 35 sets of Nethinim (vs. 43-54) representing auxiliary pilgrims and the 10 sets (vs. 55-57) of Solomon's servants representing the 10 groups of Epiphany friends, distributed in four continents, do not count as so many groups among the Great Company, but vs. 59, 60 give its three other groups. The following groups cannot, but individuals of them will show their Truth pedigree: Truth people Concordant Versionists, Rutherfordites, as distinct from antitypical Elishaites, and Kuehno-Sadlackites; for individuals of them will leave their reprobate leaders and movements controlled by these leaders. Thus 60 groups of Great Companyites or Levites are here indicated: 12 (v. 2)+41 (vs. 3-35)+4 (Neh. 7: 15, 24, 25, 28)+3 (vs. 59, 60)=60. The three sets of unfrocked priests (vs. 61, 62) type the three sets of pilgrims, etc., that have been the leaders of the three groups of vs. 59, 60. These three sets of leaders will be cast off from leadership in these three respective groups. It will be noted that Ezra gives one group (Magbish) that Nehemiah does not give, and Nehemiah gives four that Ezra does not give. Some have tried to make these four different

Nehemiah names the equivalent of four names in the Ezra list, because three of the two sets have the same numbers in them. This does not cover the difference in the numbers of the fourth set; moreover, two that are certainly different, "Elam" and "the other Elam," have the same number, 1254. Our view we believe to be better, because it shows 60 groups, which is in harmony with the pertinent Scriptures quoted in Vol. VIII, Chap. II, on this point. The totals in Ezra are: Of the men of Israel, 24,144; of priests, 4,289; of Levites, 341; of Nethinim and Solomon's servants, 392; of polluted priests, 652; all together, 29,818; according to Nehemiah: 25,406; 4,289; 360; 392; 642; totaling 31,089. These differences and that as stated by them as a whole, 42,360, are to be accounted for in part by adding to them the unnamed totals of the 12 leaders' followers (v. 2), by Ezra having a group not given by Nehemiah, the latter four not given by the former, and by copyists' mistakes.

In addition to the 15 antitypical groups mentioned in the preceding paragraph, 12 in connection with their 12 leaders and the three whose pedigree is now in doubt, there are, as between Ezra and Nehemiah, 45 others mentioned. We now submit a list of 45 that we tentatively suggest as the antitypes of these 45 typical groups. This list may need some slight changes, but in the main it is, we believe, substantially correct: (1) The Thompsonites (the group that has recently usurped control of the P.B.I. organization); (2) the Dawnites; (3) Watchers of the Morning (Hoskinsites); (4) Bible Student Committeeites; (5) Berean Bible Instituteites (Australia); (6) Bolgerites; (7) Old Pathites (W. Crawford); (8) Lardentites; (9) Saphoreites; (10) Dagningenites or Basunenites (of Sweden); (11) Zion's Watch Towerites (of Denmark); (12) Kuehno-Sadlackites; (13) Lauperites (of Germany and Switzerland); (14) Freitagites (of France); (15) Kostynites; (16) Vorsteherites (Germany, etc.); (17) Zion's Messengerites; (18) Riemerites;

(19) Heardites; (20) Edwardsites; (21) Elijah Voiceites; (22) Clemonsites; (23) Korahites (1908-1911 siftlings, etc.); (24) Harvest Bulletinates; (25) Logosites (Greek brethren); (26) Iconoclast Bible Students; (27) Universal School of Prophets; (28) Hawesites (England); (29) Anti-Sectarian Societyites (of Mexico); (30) Sacred Service Bureauties; (31) Oleszynskiites; (32) Kasprzykowskiites (of Poland); (33) Chomiakites; (34) Zabarowskiites; (35) Adam Rutherfordites; (36) Olson Olsonites; (37) Offstad Olsonites; (38) Gunther Olsonites; (39) Madras Tamil Bible Students; (40) Free Brethren (of Germany and Switzerland); (41) Senorites; (42) Kittingerites; (43) Brickerites; (44) Eagleites; and (45) Isolated Independent Ecclesias. We are as yet not able to identify all typical and antitypical groups as type and antitype with one another.

In an address given Dec. 24, 1916, to the London Tabernacle ecclesia, J. (Tirshatha, v. 63), while speaking against speculating and accepting speculations as to new views, cautioned speculators and others not to partake (not eat) of new lines of thought until the Lord (Priest with Urim and Thummim) would speak through another special mouthpiece priest, and thus make known new things. The entirety of the Truth section of the Great Company and Youthful Worthies is typed by the 42,360 returned Israelites with priests intermingling in each group (v. 64). Mingling with these were also some who were tentatively justified and some not even tentatively justified (servants . . . maids . . . 7,337, v. 65). Some of these (200) have been zealous to tell (singing) out the Parousia Truth especially. The beasts of burden mentioned in vs. 66, 67 seem to type the providential helps that the Lord places at the service of the brethren who return from little Babylonian captivity. Their large numbers type the great number of such providential helps. The difference in the amounts of drams, darics, between the Ezra and Nehemiah accounts is to be harmonized as

follows: the words, twenty thousand and, fell out before the words, one thousand, in Neh. 7: 70. The right translation of the last part of Neh. 7: 70, as the present Hebrew text reads, is: 500 pounds of silver and 33 priests' garments; but the pure text evidently had 800 pounds of silver, which harmonizes the two accounts on the amount of silver, 5,000 pounds, given by all. That Zerubbabel did not give 530 priests' garments is evident from the fact that he and all the rest gave only 100 of them. The reading ought to be that he gave 33 priests' garments, which harmonizes the two accounts on the number of priests' garments as being 100 in all. Certainly, in the figures of Ezra 2 and Neh. 7 the copyists have made a considerable number of mistakes, which doubtless was due to decay and faded ink in the MSS. J. as executive (Tirshatha, Neh. 7: 70) will have given 21 books or the equivalents of some of the 21 books not printed as books (21,000 darics), 800 magazine articles (800 pounds of silver), a refutation of the errors of 50 of the 60 Levite groups (50 basins) and 33 pilgrim authorizations (33 priests' garments) toward the Epiphany temple by the time his ministry is over. By that time all the rest of the leaders and certain nonleader individuals will have given 40 books or the equivalent of some of the 40 books not printed in book form (20,000 darics, 20,000 darics, Neh. 7: 71, 72), 4,200 articles, including tracts, etc. (2,200, 2,000 pounds of silver) and 67 pilgrim authorizations (67 priests' garments) toward the Epiphany temple. And the main leaders (priests, v. 70), the subordinate leaders (Levites), meeting leaders (singers), workers toward outsiders (porters) and auxiliary pilgrims (Nethinim) will have been in their spheres of service (cities) and all the rest of the crown-losers and Youthful Worthies will have been in their sphere of service.

We now will take up the study of Ezra 3. Just as the Parousia in its lapping into the Epiphany had ended and the Epiphany apart from its lapping into the Parousia had set

in, *i.e.*, early in the Epiphany as such (seventh month, v. 1), the Lord's people came to the sphere of service as to the Truth and its arrangements (gathered . . . Jerusalem) to build the Epiphany temple. In point of time this was from Oct. 16, 1916, the day that Bro. Russell left Bethel for the last time, to Nov. 21, 1916, the day of J.'s first meeting with the British managers, when arrangements were made by J. (stood up Jeshua [*savior, i.e., deliverer of the Great Company*], Jozadak [*Jehovah is righteous*], v. 2) and the three managers (priests) as to his British pilgrim work, and of his first acting in Britain as the Society's special representative, executive (Zerubbabel . . . Shealtiel, [*asked of God*]), in conjunction with the three managers (brethren) who had certain executive functions in their separate offices. At the time all four of these were priests in the wilderness tabernacle sense of that word (though later three of these were revealed as Levites) and, therefore, were qualified to set up and did set up in teaching (buildded) Jesus and the Church, as viewed in their humanity by non-priests, as the Altar of the Epiphany temple, for only upon that Altar is any sacrifice acceptable and manifested as burnt offerings acceptable to God (to offer burnt offerings), according to the Lord's Word (law of Moses). This Altar was built (set, v. 3) upon the fourfold foundation (bases) of the Word, Spirit, arrangements and providences of the Lord. And this was done in carefulness (fear), because enemies of the four principles (people of those countries) sought to work injury to that Altar and to that for which it stood, *i.e.*, sacrifice.

But in the previous chapter what the machinations of such enemies were was to some extent described. Upon that Altar the Lord's people did offer (offered) as executives, pilgrims, auxiliary pilgrims, evangelists, colporteurs, volunteers, sharpshooters, newspaper workers, extension workers, elders, deacons, meeting advertisers, conversationalists, etc.,

their regular sacrifices, upon which God by Christ's merit manifested His acceptance (burnt offerings). This they did by faith in Jesus' sacrifice (morning, Num. 28: 3-8) and in works of their own sacrifice (evening). In the sifting that occurred in connection with J.'s British building work, as shown in the preceding chapter, all the British brethren took their places as members of either the Little Flock, the Great Company, the Youthful Worthies, the tentatively justified or the Second Deathers, thus dwelt in antitypical booths during the antitypical Feast of Tabernacles (kept . . . feast of tabernacles, v. 4). During that antitypical Feast of Tabernacles (as in every other one) there was an ever decreasing amount (daily . . . by number . . . custom . . . every day required) of acceptableness manifested by God for Jesus' merit *in the offerings of the people*, as increasingly more of the people were manifested as in one or another of the non-Little Flock four classes mentioned in the preceding sentence. This is typed by a daily decrease by one in the number of the burnt-offering bullocks sacrificed during the 7 days of the typical feast of tabernacles (Num. 29: 13, 17, 20, 23, 26, 29, 32). During J.'s British trip there was a continuing of the sacrifices manifesting Jehovah's acceptance of Jesus' sacrifice (continual burnt offering, v. 5) connected with cultivating the 12 chief graces (new moons) and all other features of Christian faith and practice (set feasts . . . consecrated), especially in matters of consecration (freewill offering).

On Nov. 21, 1916, at J.'s first meeting with the British managers (first day . . . month, v. 6), such sacrifices (burnt offerings) as manifested Jehovah's acceptance of Jesus' merit were begun, and from then on were continued. But at that time the foundation of the Epiphany temple was not yet laid, *i.e.*, the truths and their arrangements and the servants loyal to these of the Epiphany temple as such, especially in its Court aspects, were not established. These truths were the Parousia truths, and these arrangements

were the ways and means whereby God through that Servant ordained that His work should be done. No stressing of these two things and their loyal servants, especially not in contrast with revolutionisms against them, was made on Nov. 21, 1916, when J. and the three British managers began to arrange for J.'s pilgrim service toward the public and toward the brethren. Thus the sacrifices manifesting God's acceptance of Jesus' sacrifice began to be offered before any work at all was done as to the Great Company in the Epiphany temple. The brethren gave support (gave money, v. 7) to all laboring on the work (masons and carpenters). This support consisted, especially, of local ecclesiastis' arranging for public and parlor meetings, providing for the necessary meeting places, their announcement and advertisement, etc. In the public meetings more or less of hard (meat) and easy (wine) teachings, presented in the Holy Spirit of understanding (oil), were given to consecrated or consecratable outsiders (Zidon [*fishers*] . . . Tyre [*rock*]), to win them as such (cedar trees) from among the justified (Lebanon [*white*]) and the sinful rebellious world (sea) to come among God's people (Joppa [*beautiful, or famous city*]). This was done according to the word of our Lord (according . . . Cyrus), who at the time was in that phase of His kingdom which by force was displacing mystic Babylon's ways (Persia [*horse sphere*])). The second stage of the work of building the Epiphany temple was reached when (second year . . . month, v. 8) the time came for selecting new officers (Levites from 20 years . . .) for the London Bethel and the Tabernacle. This work was arranged for by J. as executive (Zerubbabel) and pilgrim (Jeshua) and by his main (priests) and subordinate (Levites) leader supporters, as well as by the rest of the qualified brethren (all . . . come . . . Jerusalem). Their election was, of course, though unknown to them, to advance the good work of building the Epiphany temple for and by the Lord (set forward . . . house of the Lord).

A. Kirkwood (Jeshua, v. 9; not the high priest, but the head of a Levite group), after being appointed assistant manager and secretary, and his supporters (sons) did their part to forward their charge in this work of erecting the true foundation, the Truth and its arrangements and their loyal servants. So did E. Housden (Kadmiel), as assistant manager and treasurer, and his supporters (sons). Their sphere of service was at Bethel for the general work there and throughout Britain. The six of the non-signatory elders (sons of Judah [*praised*], i.e., Hodaviah [*praise Jehovah*], of 2: 40; J. Hemery is counted among the priests, main leaders, of v. 8) were the first of the Tabernacle elders to begin to work on the foundation, the Truth and its arrangements and their loyal servants, in the Tabernacle, in connection with the election of the ecclesia's officers (set forward the workmen). Later the six repentant elders (sons of Henadad [*grace of the Mighty One*]) and their supporters (sons . . . brethren) joined in this good work of laying as a foundation of the Epiphany temple the Truth and its arrangements and their loyal servants. Great insistence was laid upon everything about Bethel and the Tabernacle, and impliedly in all the other British churches, being done and on everyone being in harmony with the Truth and its arrangements. These principles and servants were on all sides stressed as the foundation of the building in Britain (builders . . . foundation . . . temple of the Lord, v. 10).

Upon this foundation the elders (priests) were as such by their election invested with their powers (apparel) and the message of the high calling and restitution (trumpets), and subordinate meeting leaders (sons of Asaph [*gatherer*], singing Levites) were furnished with Berean studies (for the antitypical singing) and the Manna (cymbals) for testimony meetings, even as Bro. Russell had arranged (after . . . David). These led their meetings (sang, v. 11) in the order designated by the ecclesia (by course), in holding up

(praising) the attributes of God and in gratitude (giving thanks) for His continual goodness and mercy (good . . . mercy . . . ever) toward His people (Israel). This course of founding the Epiphany temple (that it was the foundation of a new temple was not understood by the participants) upon the Truth and its arrangements and their loyal servants, and of conducting the services by those in harmony therewith (praised . . . foundation . . . was laid) won the hearty approval of the brethren (all . . . shouted). However, not all rejoiced. The enemies of this work, some of the British leaders (priests . . . chief . . . fathers . . . ancient men; literally, ancients, *i.e.*, elders, v. 12) who desired the old corrupt ways (the first house, *i.e.*, when corrupted in its later times), saw the work go on (foundation . . . laid before their eyes) with sorrow, *e.g.*, H.J. Shearn, W. Crawford, F.G. Guard, Sr., etc. (wept with a loud voice), while the great bulk (many) of the brethren greatly rejoiced (shouted . . . joy). But the joy (noise [literally, voice] . . . joy, v. 13) over the victory of the Lord's Truth and arrangements and loyal servants as a foundation of the Lord's people was so great that the sorrow of some could not be heard as a separate thing from it, *i.e.*, the bulk heeded not this sorrow (not discern . . . shout . . . from . . . weeping). The declarations of the faithful were heard throughout Britain (shouted . . . loud . . . noise [voice] was heard afar), where comparatively slight heed was given the sad claims of the clericalists. This symbolic voice of joy was especially heard at the conclusion of J.'s address on the clericalists' evils, Feb. 18, 1917, and, among other things, expressed itself in a unanimous vote of thanks, appreciation and confidence for his work, as its import was reported from church to church.

Ezra 4 will now engage our attention in the small antitype. In the large antitype, as proven by the Parallel Dispensations and suggested above, Zerubbabel types and parallels Marsiglio, both of whom did parallel things exactly

1845 years apart; 537 B.C. and 1309 A.D. and 522-518 B.C. and 1324-1328 A.D. Apart from the parallel Zerubbabel as the temple builder in the largest sense of the type represents our Lord, the Builder of the Church as God's Temple. But our study passes these large antitypes by and concentrates itself on the small antitype. Those who opposed the work of conforming the foundation of the Epiphany temple to the Parousia Truth and arrangements and their loyal servants were enemies (adversaries, v. 1) of the leading brethren (Judah) and the led brethren (Benjamin). These at first were H.J. Shearn, W. Crawford, F.G. Guard, Sr., and their supporters. On learning (heard) what was going on in this work, they desired to cooperate therein (let us build with you, v. 2), but according to their ideas as to how the work should be done (we seek your God . . . sacrifice unto Him). Their acts, not words, showed that Satan (Esar-haddon [*sharp restrainer*]) set them into a sphere antagonistic to the Truth and its arrangements and their loyal servants (brought us up hither). Their request they made to J. and his main supporters (Zerubbabel . . . chief of the fathers, v. 3). Seeing that they desired other than the Truth and its arrangements and their loyal servants as a foundation to the Epiphany temple, J. as executive and pilgrim (Zerubbabel and Jeshua) and his main supporters (chief of the fathers) in the work of God's true people (Israel) declined by word and act (nothing . . . to build). This declining stretched over a considerable period of time, as is evident from the description given of it from another standpoint in the preceding chapter. Had the above-mentioned been in harmony with the proper building as the Lord directed (as Cyrus . . . commanded us), their cooperation would have been welcome; but they set themselves against such building, and wanted their own kind done. Hence by word and act they were informed that only builders in harmony with the Divine purpose therein would be

permitted to participate (ourselves . . . build). Then those dominated by clericalism, textbookism, sectarianism, absolutism, etc., in their leaders (people of the land, v. 4) put all sorts of obstacles in the way of the leading brethren (weakened . . . Judah) and caused them much trouble in their work (troubled . . . building). They engaged advisers (hired counsellors, v. 5) to undo or impede the work, which continued a long while (all the days of Cyrus . . . until . . . Darius).

Some explanations are here needed on the Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes of vs. 6, 7. Nominal-church writers claim that the Ahasuerus of v. 6 is the Xerxes who reigned over Persia from 484 to 474 B.C. and that the Artaxerxes of v. 7 is the Artaxerxes who reigned over Persia from 474 to 425 B.C., and who commissioned Ezra and Nehemiah in 468 and 455 B.C. respectively. This cannot be true, for the letter of the Artaxerxes (vs. 23, 24), which stopped the building on the temple shortly after its foundation was laid, and just as the Jews were about to start work on the superstructure, was written about 13 years before 522 B.C., when Darius commanded that the work on the temple be renewed (Ezra 6: 1-12). Hence this letter was written about 40 years before the Artaxerxes who reigned from 474 to 425 B.C. was born, who, accordingly, is not the Artaxerxes of vs. 7-24. The Artaxerxes who reigned from 474 to 425 B.C. did command Ezra, 468 B.C., to do some building, *i.e.*, repairs, on the temple (Ezra 7: 27), for which reason his name in Ezra 6: 14 is associated with that of Cyrus and Darius as commanding the temple to be built. A word on the Ahasuerus of v. 6: That the Ahasuerus of Esther is not the ten-years reigning Xerxes (484 to 474 B.C.), despite the nominal-church writers' claim, is evident from the fact that Ahasuerus, Esther's husband, reigned at least 13 years, yea, much longer (Esth. 3: 7, 13; 9: 15-10: 1-3). Hence he was not the Xerxes of 484-474 B.C., who reigned but ten years. He was doubtless the

Artaxerxes of 474-425 B.C., who had Esther as his wife and Mordecai as his prime minister, which will account for his friendliness to the Jews, among other ways, in sending Ezra and Nehemiah as governors to Judah to prosper the Jews.

That the Ahasuerus of v. 6 cannot be the ten-years reigning Xerxes (484-474 B.C.) is evident from the fact that the latter was born 519 B.C., three years after the rebuilding of the temple set in, while the Ahasuerus of v. 6 received the letter there spoken of before the work on the temple was stopped, which was about 536 or 535 B.C. Accordingly, this Ahasuerus and the Artaxerxes of vs. 7-24 received their letters from about 536 to about 535 B.C., while Cyrus was yet king of Persia. How, then, can they be called kings of Persia? Perhaps the following is the explanation: Inasmuch as Belshazzar is called king of Babylon (Dan. 5) while acting as the vicegerent of Nabonidus, his father, the real king, and Darius the Mede (Dan. 5: 31; 6; 9: 1) is called king of Persia while acting as Cyrus' vicegerent, and inasmuch as Cyrus, the real king, was frequently absent in war, he likely appointed each one of these two as vicegerent during his absences on two of his many military campaigns. Indeed, there is reason for believing that the Ahasuerus of v. 6 is Darius the Median, or Mede, of Dan. 5: 31; 9: 1, and that Ahasuerus was his family name, while Darius was his first name. These things will harmonize all the involved facts of the case.

The mischief-makers in Britain wrote to J.F.R. (Ahasuerus [*lion-king*, or *king of heroes*], v. 6), who was at that time a special representative of the Board, which was Jesus' (Cyrus) representative in the Society, very soon after his election as president (beginning of his reign), which resulted in J.F.R.'s cautioning J. and through him his supporters (Judah and Jerusalem) to move carefully, but which indicated no dissent from his work. Accordingly, Ahasuerus types J.F.R. as friendly to J. and his work.  
Artaxerxes (*son*

*of the great king*, v. 7) represents him as becoming and being inimical to J. and his supporters, and that while J.F.R. was a special representative of the Board as the representative of Jesus. At the instigation of their supporters (their companions, or societies—*margin*) F.G. Guard, Sr. (Bishlam [*in peace*]), W. Crawford (Mithredath [*consecrated to the sun's sons, i.e., stars*]) and H.J. Shearn (Tabeel [*goodness of God*, same in meaning as Tobiah, *goodness of Jehovah*, his equivalent type in Nehemiah]) wrote letters, which were not Little Flocklike, true (Hebrew), but Great Companylike, false (Syrian), and which were falsely (Syrian) interpreted. It was through these letters that J.F.R.'s opposition was first stirred up. But it was greatly increased by the letters of J. Hemery, the chief manager (Rehum [*merciful*], the chancellor, v. 8), two of which appeared in Harvest Siftings, which, while seeming to be merciful (Rehum), contained 71 falsehoods, and the I.B.S.A. secretary, H.J. Shearn (Shimshai [*sunny*], the scribe). Just as the typical letter was full of falsehoods, e.g., that the Israelites were building the city of Jerusalem, whereas they merely built the temple, so was the antitypical letter—the totality of the managers' pertinent communications.

Their Great Companyish falsehoods are typed by the fact that the letter was written in Syriac, *i.e.*, Aramaic, not in Hebrew. These were supported by nine classes, of whose course the Lord disapproved: Dinaites (*judges*, v. 9), those of the members of the investigative committee who, in spite of finding in J.'s favor, at J.F.R.'s and J. Hemery's denouncing J. as a fraud, took the side of those two, as their letters in Harvest Siftings show; Apharsathchites (*dividers*), those who worked divisions in the British Church; Tarpelites (*large ones*), those pilgrims and auxiliary pilgrims who partisanly took the side of J.F.R. and J. Hemery after they learned of their opposition to J.; Apharsites (*renders*), the sifters; Archevites (*delayers*), J.F.R.'s

and J. Hemery's British lawyers, who delayed matters, to win the suit; Babylonians (*confusionists*), those who mixed Truth and error, as not a few did in Britain, especially along the line of textbookism; Susanchites (*lily ones*), the Bethelites; Dehavites (*villagers*), sectarians; and the Elamites (*age, elders*), clericalists. Supported in their misrepresentations by these nine classes, who were disapproved by God, J. Hemery and H.J. Shearn wrote the grossly misleading pen products of which J. Hemery's two pieces in Harvest Siftings are samples. These and other associates (rest of the nations, v. 10) were put into the condition (Samaria) of opposing the Lord's priestly work on the Epiphany temple by Azazel (Asnapper [*great prince*], the same as Esarhaddon). They professed great loyalty (thy servants, v. 11) to J.F.R. (Artaxerxes).

They misrepresented the temple building work as the building of a separate religious government (city, v. 12), e.g., that J. plotted to seize control of the British work and to publish an oppositional English Tower (building the rebellious and bad city), and was making considerable progress therein (walls . . . foundations), which misrepresentation they set forth as being intended to break away from the headquarters at Brooklyn (not pay toll . . . revenue, v. 13). The two (with W. Crawford cooperating), who were caught redhanded as concocting the scheme (see Vol. VI, Chap. I) that was a rebellion of the character which they misrepresented J.'s and his colaborgers' work to be, then with hypocritical unctuousness represented themselves in this matter to be animated by loyalty to the Society, to which they claimed to be indebted for its supporting them (v. 14). They referred to real past siftings as of the same character as the work of J. and his supporters, asking J.F.R. to examine and compare them with it (v. 15). They then indicated that if J.'s and his supporters' work were not stopped, the Society would lose its British field (v. 16). We are not

to understand that all these thoughts were sent at one time in the antitype, for the type sums up the whole of the correspondence in one letter, whose antitype consisted of a long-drawn-out correspondence. Their letters were of the character that would arouse the envious opposition of a power-grasper like J.F.R. (the king, v. 17).

His pertinent letters to J. Hemery, H.J. Shearn, etc., stretching over a considerable time, are typically summarized in vs. 18-22. He stated that he had given attention to their letters (the letter . . . read, v. 18). He professed to have studied (search . . . made, v. 19) the siftings of the Harvest as rebellions (city . . . insurrection . . . rebellion . . . sedition . . . therein), that these siftings were led by able men (mighty kings, v. 20), who held sway over many (countries), and received support from them (toll . . . paid unto them). He then commanded that no further progress be allowed to the misrepresented work of J. and his collaborators (cause . . . cease . . . city [?] be not builded, v. 21), unless he should say so (another commandment shall be given from me). He cautioned them not to fail in doing his command (heed . . . fail not to do this, v. 22). He considered the work damaging to him and the Lord (Cyrus), whom, as represented in the Board, he, its executive, represented in a certain sense (why . . . hurt of the kings). Thus the work was ordered to be stopped, under gross misrepresentation as to what it really was, which misrepresentation J.F.R. believed. The charge was that it be not allowed to proceed. The work already done was not undone, either in the type or antitype, though J.F.R. sought to undo it to the extent of reinstating the two mismanagers, who, however, would not submit to J.'s Bethel arrangements, *i.e.*, that J. Hemery be the directing manager, and, therefore, left Bethel as managers shortly after returning there as such, and to the extent of seeking, but in vain, to persuade the Tabernacle ecclesia to elect the two as elders. One of the misrepresentations was

that J., who dismissed them as managers, had dismissed them as Secretary and Treasurer of the I.B.S.A. corporation, which he never did, nor intended to do, as that could be done only by the I.B.S.A. shareholders; another was that he dismissed J. Hemery a dozen times in one day, and a third was that he presumed to dismiss the six signatory elders after their repentance and reelection.

As the antitypical correspondence was a long-drawn-out affair in various stages, so was the stopping of the work a long-drawn-out affair in various stages, but in each stage the pertinent part of the correspondence preceded the corresponding part of stopping the work. The first feature of the command to stop the antitypical work was J.F.R.'s falsely denouncing J.'s work as "absolutely without authority" and the second, his usuratorial recall of J. The latter's response was a week's cessation therefrom, while he was under the misimpression that J.F.R. had the right to recall him. It was J. Hemery who immediately (in haste, v. 23) forwarded J.F.R.'s absolutely-without-authority cable and recall cable to J., and at Bethel for a week treated J., to use his own words, as a "discredited representative of the Society." On receiving the first of these two cables, J. Hemery acted out its intent, immediately cabling to J.F.R., among other things, "I resist [him] as your representative." Seeing on March 6 (J. received the recall cable, Feb. 28) that J.F.R. had no right to recall the Board's representative without the Board's order, which J.F.R. usuritorially presumed to do, J. resumed his work as special representative, which led to certain struggles, in part described in Vol. VI, Chap. I. The outcome of it all was a final stoppage of the work in Bethel by force (force, v. 23), through J. Hemery's guards in Bethel, and by power, through his, W. Crawford's, H.C. Thackway's and others' denunciations of J. in the Tabernacle, where he was by J. Hemery, who had charge (power) of J.'s pilgrim work, refused an opportunity to speak. Indeed,

these (Rehum . . . companions, v. 23) hastened (in haste) to the sphere of the Truth work and arrangements (Jerusalem) against the servants of the Lord (Jews) and made them “cease by force and power.” Thus the work of building the Epiphany temple, for its Great Company aspects especially, could proceed but very little, if any, beyond the foundation (ceased . . . house . . . Jerusalem, v. 24) until the time Jesus (Darius) caused the Board as His representative in the Society in its majority to see matters aright. But that foundation was laid firmly, *i.e.*, that the Lord’s people must work in harmony with the Parousia Truth and its arrangements and their loyal servants. Despite the years’ long efforts of power-grasping and usurping Great Company leaders to ignore that foundation, and to build another temple on another foundation, the foundation that was laid in Britain will remain, and upon it will come every group of the Great Company, and become a part of the Epiphany temple. Various groups of the Kohathites have built upon that part of the foundation implied in the expression, the Lord’s arrangements, and many of them have built on that part of it implied in the expression, the Parousia Truth. And some of the other Levite groups, *e.g.*, the Dawnites, the Hoskinsites, etc., are feeling their way back toward the Parousia Truth and its arrangements as a foundation; and before long, thanks be to the Lord, all of them will do so in harmony with their loyal servants.

Next Ezra 5 will engage our attention. While the foundation of the Epiphany temple was laid in Britain, the preliminaries toward beginning the superstructure were made in America, which work began about May 1, 1917. After J. found out that his protest and his two petitions were by J.F.R. not allowed to come before the Board, he gave them to the three Board members who had not yet seen them, *i.e.*, J.D. Wright, I.F. Hoskins and R.H. Hirsh. He discussed them from time to time with all three, and by about June 1

convinced the last of them, J.D. Wright, of their correctness. Later on he convinced A.N. Pierson of the correctness of these. Thus 5 of the 7 Directors took J.'s view on the situation. J.'s part in this preliminary work of arousing the Board's majority to the real situation is typed by the prophesying of Zechariah (*remembrance of Jehovah*, v. 1), the son of Iddo (*time*, or *timely*). Then the 5 Board members (Haggai [*festive*]), one after another, agitated the matter among themselves until they had gotten themselves a unit on the matter of making the Church work (neither they nor J. at the time understood that the work that they were doing was an erecting of the Epiphany temple) conform to the foundation laid down for it in Britain. The Directors also discussed the pertinent points with certain other reliable brethren. These discussions were the antitype of Haggai's and Zechariah's prophesying. Presently these matters were told to still other sympathetic leading brethren (Jews that were in Judah and Jerusalem), and the message of these was God's mind and work on the subject (in the name . . . God). Like other antitypes these were long-drawn-out matters. In his Bible-expounding capacity in this transaction J. is represented by Zechariah; in his executive capacity, by Zerubbabel (v. 2) and in his being the leading priest therein, by Jeshua. In all three of these capacities he aimed at conforming (build the house) the entire work to the foundation already laid, an insistence on the general work's being done, not only in harmony with the foundation, but according to the charter and will as respects the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit (Jerusalem). This led to an attempt to correct the injury to the work done through J.F.R.'s unauthorized meddling in the British work of the Board's representative, J., first through a review of that work by the Board, which J.F.R. violently opposed, then compromised on four of the Board members at Bethel to conduct the investigation; for J. had gotten the four to sign a petition for a Board meeting to

examine the British matter, which petition J. handed to J.F.R., June 14, 1917. This apprized him (Tatnai [*gift, bribe*, v. 3]), his special helper, W.E. Van Amburgh (Shethar-boznai [*star of splendor*]) and their supporters, of what was going on, and they demanded to know by whose authority the work went on (Who hath commanded you?).

The Directors and J. answered by a question put by their stand, Who has the right to direct the work of the Society, the Board, its controller, or J.F.R., the Board's representative as executor? (What are the names [office powers] . . . make this building [literally, build]? v. 4). These, being the Board's majority, by right stood for the Board. That being the case, they as such had the legal right; and J. being the Lord's appointed executive for the building purpose, of course, together they had the right to build this Epiphany sanctuary. So this building work was sanctioned by Divine and human law. But this matter of right was the point of dispute, which involved the validity of J.'s British work, as well as what was being then done in America, and, therefore, could be decided for the Board by an investigation only. But until this investigation could be made God watched over the pertinent matters so that the building could go on (eye of their God . . . not . . . cease, v. 5), until the Lord by the Directors made the investigation and gave their report (matter came to Darius . . . returned answer). J.F.R. (Tatnai, v. 6), W.E.V. (Shetharboznai) and their division-making co-workers (Apharsachites [*dividers*], v. 6), by the Board's accepting J.F.R.'s contention that the whole Board do not examine the question, but that the four Directors do so, sent word (letter, v. 7) to the Board as Jesus' (Darius) representative to investigate through its committee the British matter and its aftermath in America.

For this investigation the Board's minutes, the reports of the British investigation committee, etc., were given the Board committee by J.F.R. and W.E.V., which were

what constituted the antitypical letter. (Additionally J. gave it a five hours' report on his British work.) This antitypical letter implied that a great work was going on (with great stones and timber, v. 8), that its builders were asked on whose authority they built (who commanded, v. 9), and what the office powers of the leaders (chief, v. 10) were. The materials for investigation given the four also implied that the builders claimed to be doing the Lord's work (servants of God, v. 11), that they were continuing the temple of God which our Lord built (a great king of Israel builded), which fell into ruin (destroyed, v. 12), because of sins that provoked God (provoked . . . unto wrath), at the hand of Satan (Nebuchadnezzar) in Little Babylon, resulting in God's people going into a little Babylonian captivity (carried . . . Babylon; in the Smallest Miniature Oct. 30, 1916, corresponds to 539 A.D.). The genuineness of J.'s credentials, dictated Nov. 10, 1916, and signed and sealed the next day, according to the British Investigative Commission's findings, proved that by the Board, Jesus (Cyrus, v. 13) using it as His hand, the building work had been authorized to go on, and was made the justification of J.'s work by the reports furnished the four, and by the materials given the four for their investigation. These reports showed that these builders claimed that they were given the true teachings (vessels, v. 14) to preserve for the temple (v. 15), according to J.'s credentials, after bringing them out of little Babylonian captivity, and that these were by those credentials given into J.'s charge (Sheshbazzar [*i.e.*, Zerubbabel], v. 14). Finally, these reports stated that the builders said that J. laid the foundation of the work in Britain, but that the work was not yet finished (v. 16). Thus the various materials that J.F.R., W.E.V. and their sifting associates put into the hands of the Board's committee for their investigation gave the committee a fairly accurate description of the British work; and the main materials so put into the committee's hand, as the antitypical letter, consisted of the

reports of J.F.R.'s investigative commission, which decidedly favored J.'s British course. Hence the accurate description of the true situation and claims of J. and his colaborers in the typical letter. Hence J.F.R., W.E.V. and their associates, by furnishing such materials for investigation, asked that there be an investigation into the full facts connected with J.'s powers, commission and British work (search . . . treasure house . . . decree . . . of Cyrus . . . build this house . . . Jerusalem, v. 17). They thus also asked for a report on the results of the investigation (king send his pleasure . . . matter).

We now come to the study of Ezra 6. The Board, as Jesus' (Darius, v. 1) hand, ordered (made a decree) the investigation (search) into J.'s credentials, commission and British work. The committee investigated especially J.'s commission in the record of the pertinent acts of the Executive Committee (house of rolls), wherein the powers (treasures) of the Board lodged (laid up) in this matter, in the Board's domain (in Babylon). The committee found the minute (Achmetha, or Ecbatana, *i.e.*, in a coffer; see margin; v. 2) of the Board (palace . . . province of the Medes [earthly hand of Christ]), to be the authorization of J.'s British work. It also found that the Executive Committee in carrying out the Board's authorization arranged to give J. credentials (a roll; Vol. III, 412-414). The antitypical roll's being in the antitypical coffer implies that what the Executive Committee did in carrying out the Board's authorization was impliedly included in that authorization, *i.e.*, that the giving of J.'s credentials was the Board's act. The powers given J. in the credentials were by the Lord given him through the Board as Jesus' (Cyrus . . . made a decree, v. 3) representative acting in the Executive Committee. From the standpoint of the Lord, the real Giver of those powers, these invested J. with the office of superintending (*i.e.*, executive work), as the Lord's eye, hand and mouth, the erection of the Great Company and Youthful Worthies as the Court of

the Epiphany temple. That this is true can be seen from the specifications in vs. 3, 4: It was to consist in its Court buildings of the Great Company and Youthful Worthies divided into 60 groups (height . . . breadth thereof threescore [60] cubits), which will be subdivisions of three main divisions (three rows of great stones [corresponding to the Gershonites, Merarites and Kohathites], v. 4), which three main divisions would compose one new class (a row of new timber). Further, the Lord designed these credentials to imply that the Epiphany temple (house of God) be built as one wherein service (sacrifice) could be rendered the Lord, and to imply the charge that its foundations, the Parousia Truth and its arrangements and their loyal servants, be strongly made. All these things are implied according to the Lord's intentions in J.'s credential-given executive powers.

In J.'s being authorized, as his fourth power, to be "also the fully accredited representative of the Society to lecture on and teach the Bible and to preach the Gospel *in any country of the world,*" the Lord gave him the authority to bring forth from the Bible the Epiphany Truth and to refute every little Babylonian error that Satan would attach to any truth (golden and silver vessels . . . Nebuchadnezzar . . . brought to Babylon, v. 5), and restore it to its original purity (brought again . . . Jerusalem . . . in the house of God). This made him the Epiphany messenger in a worldwide teaching ministry. All these powers are implied in the credentials, and were by the Lord intended to be given to J. The report of the Board's committee set forth these credentials as genuine; for A.I. Ritchie, its leading member, also a member of the Executive Committee that as the Board's agent gave J. these credentials, knew that they were bonafide. J.F.R.'s envious and self-interested denial of their genuineness is contradicted by every fact connected with their giving, by J.'s 3½ months' exercise of them as bonafide and by J.F.R.'s cooperation for 3½ months in such exercise. In a later chapter it will be Biblically shown that it was his

unholy ambition and envy that made him repudiate J., his credentials and his credentials-sanctioned work. The five members of the Board (A.N. Pierson later joining the four) maintained their genuineness, as their report shows; but as the Board's compromising resolution shows, for policy's sake they did not do so with sufficient positiveness. This feature of their actions is omitted in the type, which passes from the committee's report to what the five did after the four were ousted. The five were by God counted as the majority of the Board and thus the real Board until the election, Jan. 1918, as the Smallest Miniature shows. Their pertinent declarations after the four's ousting are set forth typically in vs. 6-12.

The Lord in the Board's letter to the Church dated July 27, in Light After Darkness, in Facts For Shareholders and in some of their oral utterances warned J.F.R. (Tatnai, v. 6), W.E.V. (Sheharboznai) and their division-making supporters (Apharsachites) to refrain from interfering with the work that (unknown to them) was a building of the Epiphany temple (be ye far from thence). Indeed, the report on J.'s credentials, commission and British work implied the same charge to refrain from such interference. But it was emphasized (let the work . . . alone, v. 7) by the part that the five took in the movement of "the Opposition," which emphatically, by repudiating J.F.R.'s, W.E.V.'s, etc.'s, revolutionisms against the charter and will of Bro. Russell, was a forbidding of them to interfere with the work of building the temple, which was carried forward by the Opposition's work under the leadership of J. (governor), the five Board members and F.H. McGee (elders of the Jews) in their preachings, letters, conversations and writings. Jesus by the five Directors (I, v. 8), as the Board's majority, and thus the rightful controllers of the work, as it affected the Society as such, decreed that J.F.R., W.E.V., etc., yield the things needful to the work led by the above-mentioned seven brothers (elders of the Jews), as out of the

powers of the Board's majority (king's goods), whatever service (tribute) they needed for the work. How was this service rendered? By the revolutionists' making a division whereby they had to yield up to the seven many of the revolutionists' former supporters, who became supporters of the seven, and rendered them service (tribute) that they would have rendered the Society, had the revolutionists not made the division. This, of course, furthered the work that the seven led (they be not hindered). In a similar sense the revolutionists were by Jesus through the five Directors required to yield to them the sacrifices, etc., needed for the service of the Epiphany temple, *i.e.*, the memorials of the sacrifice of Jesus (bullocks and rams, v. 9) and the sacrifices of the Church (lambs), which were withdrawn from the revolutionists' uses, and were devoted to the good of the Epiphany temple, all of these being indicated by God as manifesting the acceptableness of Christ's sacrifice (burnt offerings). They were by the Lord through the five required to yield to the opposition hard Bible teachings (wheat), Bible passages (salt), easy Bible teachings (wine) and the Lord's Spirit of understanding (oil), a thing that the controversies of that time occasioned. This was required of them by Jesus through the five, according to the Word (according to appointment) on matters of leaders (priests) in the sphere of the Truth and its arrangements (Jerusalem). This was required without fail daily (given them day by day without fail). How did the revolutionists do this? By their opposition to the right and by their mistakes and errors these things all were yielded to the so-called "Opposition," because their evil acts turned brethren who had these privileges, truths, etc., away from the revolutionists' side to the side of "the Opposition," which made the revolutionists give them up to "the Opposition." The Lord's intent through the five Directors by this requirement was that acceptable sacrifice (sacrifices of sweet savors, v. 10) be offered to God, and that the brethren pray for the preservation of the

Directors, as God's representatives in the Society and their helpers (pray . . . king . . . sons).

Furthermore, the Lord through the five Directors forbade anyone's altering these matters (alter, v. 11) on pain of his position's (house) being refuted (pulled down) and by its own materials of thought his being publicly set forth as an evil-doer (hanged thereon). This He did by their threatening an exposure of the matters at controversy between them and J.F.R., W.E.V., etc. While the type does not show the carrying out of this threat, since it designs to show how these had to yield up the above-mentioned things, yet we know that the revolutionists did try to alter these matters and received the tearing down of their theories on whose materials they were publicly proven evil-doers, *e.g.*, taking J.F.R.'s view that the directors had to be annually elected, and, if not, their office was vacant, it was thereby proved that he would not have been a director at the time of the 1917 election, because not annually elected, and hence he could not have been elected as the Society's president, since, according to his view, he was no director, and the charter required that only directors be elected officers of the Society. Thus a scaffold was erected from symbolic beams of his own symbolic house, his theory of the situation; and he was symbolically hanged thereon, *i.e.*, publicly proven to be an evil-doer. And his symbolic house, his theory of the situation, was made a symbolic dunghill, *i.e.*, proven to be corrupt refuse (house . . . dunghill). Finally, the Lord Jesus through the Directors by their pertinent work, not in words, prayed that God destroy (God . . . destroy, v. 12) Satan and the fallen angels (kings) and those wholly given over to them, Second Deathers (people), who would persist (put their hand) in efforts to alter the determined things (alter) and to destroy God's temple (destroy this house of God), which is in the sphere of the Truth and its arrangements (Jerusalem). These things He uttered as antitypical Darius through them, the Board acting as Christ's hand in Society matters

(I, Darius . . . decree), as He also desired the work to be done quickly (done with speed).

And the course that J.F.R. (Tatnai, v. 13), W.E.V. (Shethar-boznai), etc., took made them give up to the builders, the so-called "Opposition," the very things (mentioned above) that the position and acts of the Lord by the five Directors required (according . . . Darius . . . sent . . . did). This was done speedily (did speedily). Shortly after June 20, 1917, it became known in Bethel that there was trouble between the four Directors and J.F.R. over the British matter and over his usurping controllership over the Board. J.F.R.'s, etc.'s, divisional course in Bethel in this situation, his (allegedly) ousting the four Directors, his evicting first J. and then the four Directors from Bethel, his letter to the class secretaries of July 18, his circulating Harvest Siftings, his campaign of defamation and misrepresentation against J. and the four Directors, his straw vote campaign, his course as to the election—one and all turned many from him to the side of the symbolic builders. And thus he and his supporters gave speedily to the builders these as sacrifices, and what they had of the Spirit, Word, etc., for the good work, even as typed in vs. 8-10. The leaders (elders, v. 14) of the faithful (Jews) worked on. They were helped (prospered) through the oral and written teachings (prophesying) of the five Directors (Haggai the prophet) and J. (Zechariah), the latter giving the meat in due season (Ido [*seasonal*]), e.g., The Last Related Acts of Elijah and Elisha, Calls, Siftings and Slaughter-Weapons, That Evil Servant, The Foolish And Unprofitable Shepherd, etc. And they brought the work to a completion (finished it), according to the Lord's Word (commandment of the God of Israel), the charge of Jesus (Cyrus) acting in the Board to J. in his credentials and the proper stand of the five Directors as representatives of Jesus (Darius), as later J. as Ezra's antitype repaired matters at the Lord's charge (Artaxerxes).

The work on building the superstructure of the typical

temple lasted from the 24th of the 6th month (Elul) of Darius' 2nd year (Hag. 1: 14, 15) to the 3rd day of the 12th month (Adar) of Darius' 6th year (v. 15), *i.e.*, 4 years, 5 months and 8 days. This time seems to type the entire time of developing the Great Company and Youthful Worthies as the temple's Court into their 60 groups, a thing that seems to have come to a beginning of an end in Dec., 1937 to Feb., 1938, when the 60th group appeared in its leaders. It seems that in principle at each of the 60 groups' taking and keeping a right stand against erroneous opponents, its building into the temple is finished, the type ignoring their various aberrations as no part of the picture, but symbolizing their cleansing (vs. 19-22). The first group of the unorganizational Great Company and Youthful Worthies which began to come into the temple's Court superstructure was the manifested Sturgeonites and Ritchieites, beginning in Jan., 1918. The dedication of the temple and the court in its beginning (v. 16) seems to represent the separation, in the sense in which it began, June 27, 1917, as between J. and J.F.R., as respective representatives of the Little Flock and the Great Company, and proceeded in these two forms in the sense that it affected other crown-retainers and crown-losers who sided with the four Directors and J. (beginning about July 5 and showing itself markedly from July 17, 1917 onward) and the manifested crown-losers as antitypical Elisha who sided with J.F.R. Those crown-losers who sided with the Board's majority, and who from fear of the effects of J.'s unpopularity more or less held aloof from J., especially after Harvest Siftings appeared, for the most part later at various times in various movements became manifest as parts of the Court. At this separation all New Creatures faithful to the Parousia Truth and arrangements, the charter and will, and to the four Directors and J., came into apartness unto the Lord as the Holy (dedication, consecration) in the conditions then prevailing, as the Elishaites came into apartness as the first part of the Court. The main

leaders (priests) and subordinate leaders (Levites) rejoiced (with joy) that they could take their stand on the true principles involved in the controversy as the Holy (kept the dedication). In principle the same thing was repeated in the others of the 60 separations.

At that separation in 1917 the main leaders (priests), subordinate leaders (Levites) and the others (children of Israel) made large sacrifices of burnt offerings (100 bullocks, 200 rams and 400 lambs, v. 17), whereby God manifested His acceptance of Christ's sacrifice, first in the ministries of the crown-retainers among them done for the Epiphany temple, and secondly in the ministries of the unmanifested pertinent crown-losers done for the Epiphany temple. The pertinent sacrifices of the crown-retainers then made were very large, as sharing in the antitypical second Sin-offering for the world (sin offering for all Israel, twelve he goats). These had to sacrifice their former spheres and forms of service and the fellowship of many an one near and dear to them, and to bear much reproach, innocently, as wrong-doers. As the Little Flock leader and as executive and main teacher in this matter, J. suffered and sacrificed the most of all for his stand for Truth and righteousness. Of *popularity among Truth people* he sacrificed more perhaps than any other Truth servant throughout the entire Age, though others suffered more of such loss than he from non-Truth people. But all the crown-retainers, whether they remained with, or left the Society at that time, sacrificed much, and among these were members of all the 12 tribes of Rev. 7 (according to the number . . . Israel). These things were done in the other divisions as each came into existence.

At these separated brethren's organizing ecclesias, they elected elders as main leaders (they set priests in their divisions, v. 18) and deacons as subordinate leaders (Levites in their courses) for their ministries (service of God) in the sphere of the Truth and its arrangements (Jerusalem), according to the Lord's Word (as . . . in the book). This also

was done in the case of each of the others of the 60 divisions. These brethren kept the antitypical Passover, partaking of justification and sharing in consecration (passover . . . 14th day . . . first month, v. 19), as this was also done in each of the others of the 60 divisions. The purging of filthiness of flesh and spirit is something that will take place in all 60 groups shortly, as a contemporaneous work of all of them (purified together, v. 20). It will occur in the main leaders (priests), the subordinate leaders (Levites) and in the rest (children of the captivity); and all will in faith appropriate the merit of Jesus (killed the passover) to cover their unwilling faults (for all). We have for years looked longingly forward to this cleansing. All these New Creatures (children of Israel . . . out of captivity, v. 21) and all the Youthful Worthies (all separated . . . filthiness of the heathen) will in this cleansed condition feast on Jesus' merit (did eat). Henceforth they will live the consecrated life, enjoying its privileges, with joy (kept the feast . . . seven days with joy, v. 22); for the Lord made those who were severed from the Society rejoice (Lord . . . joyful), by making Himself in the four Directors helpful to them (heart of the king . . . unto them), and that to strengthen them in the Lord's work (strengthen . . . work). The same thing has been done in all the others of the 60 groups by the Lord, through Jesus in their leaders. Summing up: All New Creatures who stood for truth, righteousness and holiness in each one of the various 60 movements, regardless of whether they were crown-retainers or losers remained in the Holy as priests from the standpoint of the wilderness tabernacle, though subsequently the crown-losers in the Lord's due time became manifest as Levites in the Court, *i.e.*, when they stood for error or unrighteousness or unholiness, things that occurred in every one of the 60 movements, in which the priests appeared as the Holy and the Levites appeared as the Court of the Epiphany temple, the Youthful Worthies by their stands demonstrating their places in the various groups as good or

as unclean Youthful Worthies in the Court, as the case has been, and the priests remaining in the Holy.

The second part of the book of Ezra treats of Ezra's work of repairing the temple, arranging for its service and overseeing a reformation in matters of conduct, especially of marriage with foreigners. Chap. 7 treats of his commission and of certain things connected with it. For the small antitype it emphasizes a different phase of J.'s work as the Lord's special representative, both as executive and teacher toward the Great Company and Youthful Worthies, especially along the lines of their cleansing themselves from filthiness of the flesh and spirit, while for the large antitype it emphasizes similar things done by John Wyclif, which will not be treated here. The facts of the fulfillment of the small antitype in J.'s experiences prove that Ezra types him from the above-mentioned standpoints. The expression, "after these things," as in the case of John's experiences in Revelation, suggests not the chronological sequence in the pertinent events, but that after J. saw the general antitypes of Ezra 1-6, he saw the general antitypes of Ezra 7-10. The antitypes occur during the Epiphany reigning period of Jesus (Artaxerxes [*son of the great king, i.e., Son of God*] king of Persia [*horse sphere, i.e., the king of the sphere of true doctrine*], v. 1). Various of J.'s qualities, experiences, powers, etc., are typed by the meanings of the names of those of Ezra's forebears that are given here (Ezra, *help*; Seraiah, *warrior of or prince of Jehovah*; Azariah, *help of Jehovah*; Hilkiah, *portion of Jehovah*; Shallum, *recompense*; Zadok, *righteous*; Ahitub, *brother of goodness*; Amariah, *saying of Jehovah*; Azariah, *help of Jehovah*; Meraioth, *height, or high position*; Zerahiah, *rising of Jehovah*; Uzzi, *my strength*; Bukki, *my rejected one*; Abishua, *father of riches*; Phinehas, *mouth of brass*; Eleazar, *God is help*; Aaron, *enlightener*, vs. 1-5; not the names of all of Ezra's forebears are here listed, but only such as type J.'s pertinent qualities, powers, experiences, etc., e.g., in Ezra's genealogy given in 1 Chro. 6: 3-15 occur six names not given in Ezra 7: 1-5).

J. left Little Babylon in spirit first in Britain (Ezra . . . Babylon, v. 6). He was a ready teacher (ready scribe) of the Bible, the Divine revelation given through Jesus (law of Moses . . . God . . . given). The Lord Jesus gave him (king granted him) all the things, known and unknown to him, implied in his request to serve his brethren (all his request), according to the office of Epiphany messenger that God had, unknown to him at the time, given him (hand . . . God upon him). In addition to J.'s leaving Little Babylon for the clarified sphere of the Truth and its arrangements (Jerusalem, v. 7), some of spiritual Israel (Israel) did likewise, *i.e.*, some of the main leaders (priests), of the subordinate leaders (Levites), of the teachers of the Word (singers), of the workers with new ones, like evangelists, colporteurs, volunteers, pastoral workers, newspaper workers (porters), and auxiliary pilgrims (Nethinim) in the Epiphany period of the Laodicean Church (seventh year . . . king). He reached the sphere of the Epiphany Truth and arrangements in their clarification (Jerusalem, v. 8) in the earlier part (fifth month) of the Epiphany period of the Laodicean Church (seventh year of the king). This journey began Dec. 22, 1916 (began to go up, v. 9; literally, the going up was founded), when H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford failed through F.G. Guard, Jr. to persuade J. to let them have their way as to the Manchester Convention program (first . . . first month . . . from Babylon). That night all three managers agreed to work in harmony with J. on Manchester Convention matters; and according to the Lord's prospering him in his office work he came (came) to clearness of understanding on matters as to the sphere of the Truth and its arrangements (Jerusalem) in their relation to J.F.R.'s power-grasping, April 19, 1917, when Menta Sturgeon explained to him some of the former's power-grasping acts while J. was in Europe, which, with certain pertinent Scriptures, made clearer certain pertinent teachings and arrangements of the Lord. Both the typical and small antitypical journey lasted 119 days.

1st month = 30 days	Dec. 22-31 = 10 days
2nd " = 29 "	Jan. 1-31 = 31 "
3rd " = 30 "	Feb. 1-28 = 28 "
4th " = 29 "	Mar. 1-31 = 31 "
5th " = <u>1</u> "	Apr. 1-19 = <u>19</u> "
119 "	119 "

This four months' journey was one of the weariest and saddest experiences of J.'s entire life, and certainly was beset with many dangers and difficulties. It started two days after the time on Dec. 20 when J. met the challenge of the three managers to set aside his decision on the Manchester Convention program. He had asked that it be changed in two particulars from what it had been made before his arrival in Britain; for that program arranged for the convention baptismal service to be conducted *the day before the convention began*, which J., in harmony with Bro. Russell's custom, to give the candidates previous convention uplifts, had asked to be changed to come on one of the days of the convention. Again, the only pilgrim on the program was J. Hemery, while 13 elders were appointed to give discourses. J. had asked that the three managers and Bro. Smedley, the only non-manager British pilgrim, be given talks on the program, with a corresponding removal of elders from the program. On Dec. 14, while on a pilgrim trip, J. received a letter from the three managers to the effect that his alterations of the program could not be accepted. Remembering Bro. Russell's disapproval of the managers' refusing to observe his arrangements, J. recognized the managers letter as a challenge to his executive powers in the British work. After five days of prayerful meditation over the situation, J. came to realize that his whole British executive work would be nullified, if he should permit this challenge to go unaccepted, since if he would weaken on that point, he would be all the weaker to meet their next challenge, sure to come.

Therefore he accepted the challenge, determining, Dec. 19, to insist on his suggestions' being put into effect. On

Dec. 20, immediately after his return to Bethel from a pilgrim trip, in a specially called managers' meeting, in no uncertain terms J. rebuked their attempted usurpation, and insisted that they revise the program exactly as he had asked. On H.J. Shearn's saying that it would have to be discussed, J. replied, "Not one word of discussion; do as I have asked, for I asked it as the Society's special representative." Thereupon W. Crawford said that he did not understand that J. had such authority, a statement that belied his previous actions up to the time J. left Bethel on the aforesaid pilgrim trip. Thereupon J. read to them his credentials, and almost immediately afterward left the room, refusing to return, though repeatedly asked so to do by W. Crawford. Before leaving the room J. discharged H.J. Shearn from his charge of the program, and put it into J. Hemery's charge to carry it out in line with his changes, which were in line with Bro. Russell's pertinent arrangements, as the original program was contrary thereto, which J. had shown H.J. Shearn from convention programs that Bro. Russell had arranged for British conventions.

That afternoon J. left Bethel for pilgrim visits at Oxford and Hull, returning to London the afternoon of Dec. 22, and was met at the R. R. station by his private secretary, F.G. Guard, Jr., whereupon the experience typed in Neh. 6: 10-14, as explained in the foregoing chapter, took place. J. then and there, the afternoon of Dec. 22, 1916, by his decision not to yield to the two mismanagers on that program matter, started out from Little Babylon, unconscious of the significance of the step, on the four months' symbolic journey. That night, in a managers' meeting, after H.J. Shearn had acknowledged that he did wrong in refusing to follow J.'s changes in the program, J., as an evidence of forgiving him, gave him charge of the program again, which seemed to please the other two managers, and thus they joined in on the symbolic journey with J. From time to time others joined in with him thereon amid very trialsome experiences; for this

journey was away from the captivity in Little Babylon to the sphere of the Truth and its arrangements in ever clearer comprehension as against the revolutionists, until April 19, 1917, when J. became quite clear on the meaning of the acts of the chief of all the revolutionists, J.F.R., whose power-grasping as such stood out clearly to J. as against the sphere of the Truth and its arrangements, a Little Babylonish effort to lead God's people captive. We have given more than usual details on this matter, because of the importance of the dates and events connected with the period from Dec. 22, 1916 to April 19, 1917.

J. (Ezra, v. 10) had for years, through his study and practice of the Lord's Word (seek the law . . . do it), been prepared by the Lord to teach the entire Church the ethical (statutes) and doctrinal (judgments) parts of God's Word, and was thus by the Lord qualified, at Bro. Russell's passing beyond the veil, to become the Epiphany messenger. In vs. 11-26 J.'s commission as the Epiphany messenger is given. This commission was given to J. by Jesus (Artaxerxes, v. 11), in part, in his credentials and, in part, in the Word as applying to the providential situations into which he was placed (copy of the letter). It was given to him because he had been a prominent and faithful Truth leader and teacher (priest, the scribe) in the Parousia. His place as a prominent and faithful teacher of the Truth in that period was emphasized by the uses made of him by the Lord Jesus under that Servant's direction, both in doctrinal (words of the commandments) and ethical (statutes) respects (even a scribe). Realizing the office to which He was promoting J., our Lord Jesus (Artaxerxes, v. 12) in the Epiphany period of His Second Advent (king of kings) addresses J. (Ezra) as the main leader (the priest) and teacher (a scribe) of the Word of God (the law), wishing him full peace (perfect peace), so necessary for him to have in order properly to fulfill his ministry amid the especially troublesome conditions of the Epiphany (*and at such a time*). Artaxerxes' letter was written in

Aramaic, to symbolize that J.'s ministry was one of supervision over the Great Company and Youthful Worthies, and not one of supervision over the Little Flock; for had it been one over the Little Flock, the commission would have been written in Hebrew, though as a star-member he has a charge toward, but not of the Little Flock. J.'s commission and its implications were made a matter of a Divine decree (I make a decree, v. 13) designed to facilitate the return of all of the Spiritual Israelites (all . . . Israel), all of their main leaders (priests) and all of the subordinate leaders (Levites) who acknowledged allegiance in true consecration to Jesus (in my realm), and who acted in the matter of their own free will, from Little Babylon to the sphere of the clarified Truth and its arrangements (go up to Jerusalem), under the direction of J. (with thee).

He was commissioned by Jesus (the king, v. 14), through the seven Directors (seven counsellors), (1) to make investigations as to the state of the Lord's people (Judah) and the sphere of the Truth and its arrangements (Jerusalem), in harmony with the principles of the Word (law), which was placed in his stewardship (in thine hand). V. 14 proves that both Jesus and the Board [through the executive committee] gave J. bona fide credentials. J. was commissioned (2) to minister the Epiphany Truth (carry the silver and gold, v. 15) that had been put into his charge by Jesus and the seven Directors (which . . . freely offered)—“the fully accredited representative of the Society to lecture on and teach the Bible and to preach the Gospel in any country in the world,” which power was given him by Jesus and the seven Directors for the honoring of God by appropriate service of His people (offered unto the God of Israel) in the sphere of the Truth and its arrangements. J. was commissioned (3) to minister the Parousia Truth (silver and gold, v. 16) in so far as it needs exposition and defense (that thou canst find in . . . Babylon), with freely suggested confirmations of the Parousia Truth (freewill offering), regardless of whether they were

offered by the led (the people) or by the main leaders (priests), provided they would advance the interests of God's people as the Epiphany temple (for the house of their God), and were used in harmony with the sphere of the Truth and its arrangements (Jerusalem), J. being particularly exhorted to use these truths to gain (buy speedily with this money, v. 17) brethren who, in reliance upon Christ's merit (bullocks), as to which God expresses His acceptableness of Christ's sacrifice (rams), will use their consecrated humanity (lambs), by presenting hard truths (meat offerings) and easy truths (drink offerings), to carry out their consecration (offer them upon the altar) amid the Lord's people as the Epiphany temple (house of your God), in the sphere of the Truth and its arrangements (Jerusalem), J. being also exhorted to use other truths than those adapted to arousing brethren to carry out their consecration in the form of service for developing the Lord's people, as shown in v. 17, for other upbuilding purposes according to the Lord's will (v. 18).

J. was further commissioned (4) to minister the doctrinal, refutative, corrective and ethical teachings (vessels, v. 19) entrusted to his stewardship (given thee) for the good of the Epiphany temple (service of the house) and to do so as in the very presence of God (deliver . . . God), whose was the sphere of the Truth and its arrangements (Jerusalem). He was also commissioned (5) to use (bestow, v. 20) anything in the Bible (king's treasure house) needed (whatsoever . . . needful) to fulfill his mission toward the Epiphany temple (for the house of thy God). The commission (decree, v. 21) likewise authorized J. (Ezra) (6) to require (shall require) from all teachers (all the treasurers . . . the river) to present at J.'s requirement whatever teachings he should ask of them, and that promptly, a power that proves that these were to teach under J.'s supervision the things that he directed them to teach (scribe . . . of God), and that for the furtherance of his work for the Great Company and Youthful Worthies, they adding such further confirmations to such

teachings as they could find in the Bible. These teachings which he was to give them, which they were to set forth as he directed, and for which they might furnish further Biblical confirmations, were matters pertaining to natures lower than the Divine class, *i.e.*, matters respecting the Great Company, Youthful Worthies, the tentatively-justified and the world, both in the latter's present condition of the curse and in the restitution times (100 . . . 100 . . . 100 . . . 100 [the number 100, being the square of 10, *i.e.*,  $10 \times 10$ , stands thus for matters pertinent to natures lower than that of the Divine], v. 22). These teachings are those of the pertinent Bible doctrines (talents; Rev. 16: 21) containing things hard (wheat) and easy (wine) for the Spirit of understanding (oil), backed by an unlimited number of Bible passages (salt without prescribing how much). Thus is shown that the Storehouse for Epiphany purposes is put into J.'s charge. An earnest exhortation is then given to all (let it be done, v. 23) earnestly (diligently) to fulfill God's Word in the interest of the Epiphany temple (for the house . . . heaven). Otherwise there would come wrath from God upon the Lord's people, as a domain (realm) of Christ (the king) and His supporters (sons).

Then the commission contains a prohibition of power-grasping and lording (not impose toll, tribute or custom, v. 24) over any of the main leaders (priests), subordinate leaders (Levites), teachers and speakers (singers), workers seeking to interest new ones, *i.e.*, public-preaching pilgrims, evangelists, extension workers, colporteurs, volunteers, pastoral workers, newspaper-workers, etc. (porters), auxiliary pilgrims (Nethinim) and conversationalists, letter-writers, headquarters' workers, etc. (ministers of this house of God). J. was commissioned finally (7), according to the Divine wisdom given into his care (wisdom . . . in thine hand, v. 25), to appoint for Epiphany, *not for Parousia*, purposes auxiliary pilgrims (magistrates) and pilgrims (judges), to assist the Lord's people in teaching ways

(judge), along the lines of things old (know the laws) and new (know them not). Thus in the decree there were seven powers given to J. for his exclusive use, which shows his membership in the Little Flock. Additionally there were three others that he, but not he exclusively, was to use. The first of these three is set forth in v. 18, the second in v. 24 and the third in v. 26, which will shortly be explained. Whatever of these three things concerns the whole Epiphany temple were for J. to administer, *e.g.*, withdrawing general priestly fellowship from leaders and their partisan supporters, others joining with him therein after he would do it; and whatever withdrawal of priestly fellowship concerned local leaders and ecclesiastas was in the hands of the local ecclesiastas to administer, J. whenever desired by them cooperating with them therein. The fact of these three duties' being partial charges of J. makes his duties tenfold, a proof that his pertinent ministry is toward those of natures lower than the Divine class. The Youthful Worthies are a part of the Court of the Epiphany temple. As a rule they mingle among the Great Company groups as members of the same groups, *e.g.*, Elisha types both classes in the Society group, and they as such are, both of them, parts of the Court of the Epiphany temple. Violators of the Parousia (law of thy God, v. 26) and Epiphany (law of the king) teachings and arrangements (will not do) are summarily to be dealt with (executed speedily). The sentence (judgment), as the case may require, is to be to the Second Death (unto death), if they have already been manifested as Levites, and for years persist in defiling the brethren with error (1 Cor. 3: 17), or to disfellowshipment, if guilty of gross unrepented sin (banishment), or deposition from office (confiscation of goods), or withdrawal of priestly fellowship (imprisonment), with pertinent restraints as to the antitypical lampstand, table and golden altar, laver and brazen altar.

While, like the rest of the leading brethren, under the misimpression held by Bro. Russell at the time of his death,

that he had not given the penny (and hence after his death these brethren, including J., drew the conclusion that, while he was that Servant, he was not the steward of the penny parable), J., in Britain, seeing in general outlines the powers given him in Ezra 7: 14-26; Neh. 2: 7, 8 and elsewhere, concluded that he was the steward of the penny parable. Under the aforesaid misimpression this conclusion was the natural one to draw under the circumstances; but later, seeing that Bro. Russell had given the penny in both distributions, J. withdrew this thought, but did not, when making that withdrawal, repudiate the thought that he was made the priestly executive and teacher in charge of the special work of the Lord after Bro. Russell's death, but continued to consider himself as such, in harmony with the pertinent Scriptures. But as time went on, what was not clear to J. at first as to the meaning of the special office given to him by the Lord became clear to him. And as this became increasingly clear to him, increasingly he blessed the Lord therefore (Blessed be the Lord God, v. 27), who thus was continuing graciously to deal (our fathers) so as to have moved our Lord Jesus (put . . . king's heart) to arrange for necessary repairs and improvements (beautify) on the Epiphany temple (house of the Lord) in the sphere of the Truth and its arrangements. As J. also did the same to God for His extending kindness to him (mercy unto me, v. 28) before our Lord Jesus (the king), the seven Directors (counsellors) and all other leading brethren (king's mighty princes), God's power (hand of the Lord) rested on J. (upon me), and strengthened him for his work. He, therefore, proceeded to gather leaders to go with him (gathered . . . chief men . . . with me) to the sphere of the Truth and its arrangements. It would here be in place to stress the fact that revolutionists, who have been proven to form the majority of the Lord's people, have refused to accept J.'s Divinely-given commission, and to act in harmony therewith; on the contrary they have positively rejected it and fought

him, falsely charging him with that of which they, according to the Bible, have been guilty—power-grasping, lording and false-teaching—and of none of which he has been guilty. But it is a matter of great joy that shortly these Levite groups will cleanse themselves of these evils and come into harmony with the Lord's commission to J. and thus with the Lord.

This brings us to Ezra 8, which will now be explained in its small antitype. As pointed out in the preceding chapter, the beginning of J.'s journey out of Little Babylon was connected with his firm refusal, Dec. 22, 1916, to give up his right stand taken on the Manchester Convention program; and the first ones who started out after him were the three managers, and, naturally, the rest of the speakers at that convention (v. 1). All of these (apart from J.) correspond to the 18 heads of the people mentioned in Ezra 8: 2-14; for, apart from him, there were exactly 18 brothers who took (including the participants in the two symposiums) *speaking* parts in the convention program. Additionally there were nine others who took part on the program in subordinate services, like praise, testimony and Bethel services, as we saw while expounding Neh. 8: 4-7. Believing that the order in which the speakers appear on the program follows the order of the names given in vs. 2-14, we submit the following as the types and antitypes: (1) Gershon (*stranger there*, v. 2), J. Hemery; (2) Daniel (*mighty judge, or judge of God*), F. Linter; (3) Hattush (*warrior*), Morton Edgar; (4) Zechariah (*remembrance of Jehovah*, v. 3), W. Harrison; (5) Elihoenai (*unto God are mine eyes*, v. 4), C. Hansson; (6) Jahaziel (*seen of God*, v. 5), E. Housden; (7) Ebed (*servant*, v. 6), H. Hemsley; (8) Jeshaiah (*safety of Jehovah*, v. 7), H.J. Shearn; (9) Zebadiah (*endowed by Jehovah*, v. 8), W. Crawford; (10) Obadiah (*servant of Jehovah*, v. 9), W.O. Warden; (11) Josiphiah (*added to by Jehovah*, v. 10), W. Williams; (12) Zechariah (*remembrance of Jehovah*, v. 11), S. Smith; (13) Johanan (*Jehovah is gracious*, v. 12), Bro. Greenlees;

(14) Eliphelet (*God delivers*, v. 13), Bro. Smedley; (15) Jeiel (*removed by God*), Bro. Kilkain; (16) Shemaiah (*heard by Jehovah*), G.T.R. Swain; (17) Uthai (*aided by God*, v. 14), R.G. Burton; and (18) Zabbud (*endowed*), T. McCloy. The last two named were given special parts on the program not mentioned thereon. We have forgotten the initials of Bros. Greenlees, Smedley and Kilkain. The numbers of the males given after the names of the 4th to the 18th represent the strong supporters of these 15 brothers.

J. (I, v. 15), as the leader of the Epiphany movement, gathered these speaking brothers, as well as the other conventioners, to the Truth (river) given at that convention, which Truth merged into the Parousia Truth (runneth [literally, entereth] to Ahavah [*water*], *i.e.*, at the juncture of these two rivers; see vs. 21, 31). This convention lasted three days, Dec. 30-Jan. 1 (three days), in a transient condition (abode in tents). Here J. made a special study (viewed) of the brethren (people), especially the main leaders (priests), concerning whom he made many inquiries from various brothers recommended to him by J. Hemery as well acquainted with the brethren, especially their main leaders. J. recognized (found) that there was a dearth of subordinate leaders (Levites) among the brethren there. The eleven men named in v. 16 correspond with J.'s eight counselors outside of London and the three at London—the three managers. The eight extra-London counselors were Bros. Tait (Eliezer, *my God is help*, v. 16), Warden (Ariel, *lion of God*), Black (Shemaiah, *heard of God*), Barnes (Elnathan, *God gave*), McKenzie (Jarib, *he strives*), Robinson (Elnathan, *God gave*), McCloy (Nathan, *he gave or gift*) and Smedley (Zechariah, *remembrance of God*). The three London counselors were the three managers, J. Hemery (Meshullam, *recompensed*), W. Crawford (Joiarib, *Jehovah strives*) and H.J. Shearn (Elnathan, *God gave*). Please note the distinction made in the text between the first ten and the last two (*i.e.*, *chief men; also for*). These eleven were J.'s

counselors (men of understanding [literally, wise ones]) for British Church affairs. J. charged them (sent them with commandment, v. 17) to pray to the Lord (Iddo [*time*, or *timely*]), who is the Head of the Kingdom (chief . . . Casiphia [*white, righteous*]), specifically charging them (told them what they should say [literally, I put words into their mouth]) to make their prayer to the Lord (Id do) as to His brethren (literally, as to his brethren; not, and to his brethren), auxiliary pilgrims (Nethinim), that He be pleased to give (should bring [literally, to cause to come]) to the Church (us) brethren who had the spirit of service (ministers) for the temple (house of our God).

By God's special providence for the Church (hand . . . upon us, v. 18) a number of brethren recommended to the Church (they brought [literally, caused to come to] us) a specially sober-minded brother, whom later J. found to be one of the finest and most dependable of British brethren, though he was then but a subordinate leader (son of Levi), *viz.*, E. Housden (Sherebiah [*warmth of Jehovah*]), who had a number of supporters (his sons and his brethren), thus making him the twelfth of J.'s counselors. They did the same as to A. Kirkwood (Hashabiah [*reckoning of Jehovah*], v. 19) and R. Cormack (Jeshaiah [*safety of Jehovah*]). Both of these also were at that time subordinate leaders (Merari), who also brought their supporters with them (his [their] brethren and their sons, twenty). Thus J. acquired 14 counselors in British matters. Additionally, auxiliary pilgrims (Nethinim, v. 20) were nominated, whose ministry Bro. Russell (David) and the leaders (princes), had arranged (had appointed) to be a subordinate service (for the service of the Levites), and were expressly mentioned by name (all . . . expressed by name) in one of the lists that later J. Hemery surreptitiously took out of J.'s portfolio. J. solemnly exhorted the conventioners, particularly those of his counselors who were present at the Manchester Convention (at the river of Ahava, v. 21), to practice self-denial

(proclaimed a fast) in carrying out our consecration (afflict ourselves), as a thing connected with the Lord's matters (before our God), assuring the brethren that without it we could not count on the Lord's exercising His providences on our behalf, but that with it we could confidently look to Him to protect the well developed (for us), as well as the babes (little ones), as well as our Truth and Spirit of the Truth (all our substance), in the narrow way (right way). Having assured Jesus (the king, v. 22) of his faith in God's providential care over the pertinent Truth people in full protection of His own against the enemies (enemy) of the high calling, asserting (saying) with that assurance that God's power (hand of our God) works in the interests of those who diligently seek Him (for good that seek Him), while His power and wrath (power and His wrath) work against all that prove disloyal to Him (forsake Him), J. felt ashamed (I was ashamed), as a thing that contradicted such assurance, to ask (require) for earthly favors in the way of protection by earthly organizations (band of soldiers and horsemen).

The conventioners, particularly J.'s counselors, there present entered into the advised self-denial in consecration (fasted, v. 23); additionally, they prayed ardently of the Lord His protection and help for this desert journey; and in harmony with His promise He heard and answered the self-denials and prayers (He was entreated of us). As in the case of the twelve typed in Ezra 2: 2, so J., as executive (Sherebiah, v. 24) and as lecturer and writer (Hashabiah), and the ten main leaders (chief of the priests) of ten leading groups, who in eight of them are set forth here anticipatorily, *i.e.*, each as he came on the scene of activity, the beginning of this work being set forth here typically as in almost all cases of antitypes, were given by J. a special charge as to presenting the Divine truths (silver and gold, v. 25) and the doctrinal, refutational, corrective and ethical teachings (vessels). All of these J. detailedly explained, defined and described (weighed) as he committed these to the ten, for as group

after group arose its main leader stood antitypically for one of them in the type and the teachings were, accordingly, given him as each case required, so that the sum total of the teachings as they are severally applicable to the various groups are represented by the silver, gold and the vessels. Actually, at the Manchester Convention only two of these ten, J. Hemery and H.J. Shearn, were present. Thus the beginnings of this work were at that convention. The Lord Jesus (the king), the seven Directors (his counselors), other leading brethren (his lords) and the brethren in general (all Israel present) had provided some Divine Truth (silver and gold) and doctrinal, refutative, corrective and ethical teachings (vessels).

The numbers attached to these are in all cases multiples of ten, except two, which are made exceptions, because they refer to two Parousia doctrines (two vessels of fine copper, precious [literally, desirable] as gold, v. 27), *i.e.*, the Sin-offerings and the New Covenant, treated of against the pertinent errors of F.H. Robison, the P.B.I. and J.F.R., and hence not doctrines peculiar to the Great Company, the Youthful Worthies, the faith-justified and the world, all of whom are of natures lower than the Divine, teachings pertinent to them, therefore, being symbolized by the number ten, its multiples or its fractions. These teachings were true (silver, v. 26) and also were in their fullness for the Great Company and Youthful Worthy Gershonites (10), Merarites (10) and in part for the Kohathites (5), who not having corporations needed no obligatory teachings thereon, all of whom are more or less evil, contaminated (6). Thus  $650 \div 10 = 65$ , and  $65 \div 10 = 6.5$ . The weight of the gold, apart from that in the vessels, is not given; but such gold is repeatedly mentioned (7: 15-18; 8: 25, 28, 30, 33); the words referring to the weight of such gold must have been lost out of the text. It was doubtless given in a multiple of ten; perhaps the figure was 650 talents, like the weight of the silver not in vessel form, *e.g.*, like the similar weights of the gold and silver

vessels. These constitute Divine truths (silver vessels . . . gold) and were a full set of doctrines, refutations, corrections and instructions in righteousness (vessels 100 talents . . . 100 talents) for the four above-named classes lower than the Divine class (100 . . . 100). And to stress the fact that very much of J.'s writings directly dealing with the Great Company and Youthful Worthies, etc., are controversial, they are set forth as such as Divinely sanctioned (20 basons of gold, of 1,000 darics [all figures multiples of 10]). The two vessels of *copper* were such because they, as viewed from the standpoint of the Court, are Divinely approved (precious as gold).

J. appealed to the twelve bearers of these truths as consecrated to the Lord (ye are holy unto the Lord, v. 28), as to the doctrinal, refutative, corrective and ethical teachings as dedicated to the temple (vessels are holy) and the Divinely true teachings (silver and gold) as freely given to the same Lord as received the Parousia truths (God of your fathers), as the reasons why they should take special watch care (watch ye, and keep, v. 29) over these teachings until they would finish their stewardship thereover, which would be when they would have defined, described and limited them (weigh them) before the chief, the subordinate (chief priests and Levites) and the other leaders (chief of the fathers) among God's people (Israel) in the sphere of the Truth and its arrangements (Jerusalem), according to their offices (chambers) in the Epiphany temple (house of the Lord). These twelve brothers, accepting J.'s definitions, descriptions and limitations (took the priests and Levites the weight, v. 30), undertook this mission (to bring them to Jerusalem unto the house of our God). These things had merely their start during the Manchester Convention, Dec. 30-Jan. 1. Like all pertinent antitypes, the antitype here continued to run on for all the Levite groups. Hence it is still fulfilling. The Manchester Convention ending the night of Jan. 1, 1917, Jan. 2, God's time, the departure therefrom occurred Jan. 2, 1917,

which was exactly the 12th day after the start of the symbolic journey, on Dec. 22, 1916 (departed . . . Ahava on the twelfth . . . first month, v. 31; Ezra 7: 9), led by the Lord prosperously on this symbolic trip to symbolic Jerusalem (to go . . . our God). It has been a very toilsome and trialsome journey in its sixtyfold form, beset with Satan's opposition and traps (enemy . . . lay in wait by the way), as the preceding, present and subsequent chapters show, but the Lord delivered His own out of all of these in complete safety.

As shown above, J. came to clearness on the matters of certain ones' relations to the Truth and its arrangements on April 19, 1917, just four lunar months to the day from the outstart of the trip (came to Jerusalem, v. 32; Ezra 7: 9). J. spent April 19-21 studying over the situation as it became clear to him during his conversation, April 19, with Menta Sturgeon (abode there three days). On April 22 (fourth day, v. 33) J. began to describe, explain and limit (weighed) various features of Truth that the Lord had made clear to him in Britain. That afternoon he explained the main features (silver and gold) in the two parts of Ezra to J.F.R. (Meremoth, *heights*; Uriah, *light of Jehovah*), who had his Bible open, following J.'s explanations, and who assented to certain facts connected with his pertinent activities typed in Ezra 4. That evening J. explained, etc., (weighed) certain features of 1 and 2 Kings and 2 Chro. to I.F. Hoskins (Jozabad, *Jehovah endowed*; Jeshua, *savior*). The next evening, that of April 23, J. explained (weighed) certain features of Nehemiah to R.H. Hirsh (Noadiah, *met by Jehovah*; Binnui, *built up*); and the afternoon of April 24, J. explained parts of Ezra and Esther to Menta Sturgeon (Eleazar, *God is help*; Phinehas, *brazen mouth*). Later on he explained various of these matters to A.I. Ritchie and his wife, and later still, under earnest solicitation from F.H. McGee, J. explained certain of the above-mentioned things to him. Thus as to the symbolic gold and silver J. limited the explanation of these to the above-mentioned seven friends. But as to the

doctrinal, refutative, corrective and ethical teachings (vessels), he, as need arose, published them broadcast, especially in The Present Truth; some of the symbolic gold and silver, partly given J. in Britain and partly given him since, is presented in this book. As indicated above, in a type a single act in each matter is performed, but in the antitype usually the act is a general act, hence is a long-drawn-out matter, often taking years to finish the separate acts that constitute the general act of the finished picture. According to their nature (number, v. 34) and description (weight) these things were set forth to the seven above-mentioned brethren by J. And all of them at that time made a mental record of these things (all the weight was written at that time). The antitype worked on in the other 59 movements.

These things were followed by much sacrificing on the part of those who were coming out of Little Babylonian captivity (which were come out of captivity, v. 35). These had, through qualities formerly had, but no more controlling (children), been taken into such captivity (that had been carried away). These offered sacrifices whereby God manifested His acceptance of Christ's sacrifice for all twelve tribes of Spiritual Israel (twelve bullocks), in services that Jesus performed through them on behalf of that part of the priesthood that was still remaining in Little Babylon (96 rams; not 144 [12 × 12], but 96 [8 × 12],  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the whole, as indicating in a general way the proportion of those in Little Babylon to those coming out of it). But these sacrifices were made by the bulk of the priesthood beyond and this side of the veil (77 lambs [11 × 7]; not 84 [12 × 7], the whole of the Divine priesthood both sides of the veil). All participating in this sacrifice represent the entire priesthood, which will ultimately share in the sacrifice, partaking in the Church's share in the Sin-offering (twelve he goats for a sin offering). God looked upon this service, and through it manifested His acceptance of our Lord's sacrifice (all this was a burnt offering); for we are to remember that the

service performed on behalf of delivering the priestly brethren, which all New Creatures are, unless and until manifested as Levites, from any part of Little Babylon, is a priestly sacrifice; and such is the nature of every one of the 60 separations from their various quarters of Little Babylon. The first of these separations was that of priestly brethren from the British Gershonites, who later became manifest as Libnite Gershonites, *i.e.*, Shearno-Crawfordites. And very shortly such delivered priests for the most part entered into the captivity of the Merarites in Britain. The scene described in v. 35 refers primarily to the services in the Spring and Summer of 1917, connected with the general separation between antitypical Elijah and Elisha in the Summer of 1917, and secondarily to all of the other 58 separations coming later. During this whole Spring and Summer more or less stress was laid upon J.'s various commissions as coming from the Lord and its connected requirements (delivered the king's commissions, v. 36) to the Board members (the king's lieutenants) and to the Society's three officers (governors), who in the various ways explained in our comments on 6: 8-15, some directly as positive service, *i.e.*, J., the five Directors, etc., and some indirectly, by forcing the ripened faithful from their midst into supporters of J., the five Directors, etc. (furthered the people and the house of God).

Ezra 9 types the grief and resultant prayer of J. at the misconduct of four members of the Fort Pitt Committee and their partisan supporters, who together broke up that Committee and formed the P.B.I. as a corporation. See Vol. VII, Chapters III and IV. The primary fulfillment of Ezra 8: 35, 36 was from about May 1, 1917 to Jan. 8, 1918, though, as shown in principle above, its fulfillment was re-enacted as the brethren arose in resistance to revolutionism in the groups to which they had adhered, and from which loyalty forced them to separate themselves. Just so, while the primary fulfillment of Ezra 9 occurred as stated in the

opening sentence of this paragraph, it was re-enacted in J.'s subsequent revulsions against revolutionism in the other revolutionary groups as they became so. We will describe the experience as it occurred in connection with the revolutionists in the Fort Pitt Committee, the P.B.I. and the partisan supporters of these revolutionists. Accordingly, the primary fulfillment of Ezra 9 follows chronologically the primary fulfillment of Ezra 7 and 8 (when these things were [had been] done, v. I). The four Fort Pitt Committee members, F.H. McGee, I.F. Hoskins, I.I. Margeson and J.D. Wright, more or less supported primarily by Menta Sturgeon, A.I. Ritchie, H.C. Rockwell and R.E. Streeter (princes), by their various evil characteristics, not by their words, told J. that the adherents of the Fort Pitt Committee (Israel), the main leaders, *i.e.*, the eight above-named (priests), and subordinate leaders (Levites), who included not a few local elders, had not cleansed themselves from filthiness of the flesh and spirit (not separated themselves from the people of the lands), but were acting out fleshly and not spiritual characteristics (according to their abominations), *i.e.*, were acting out the spirit of selfish and worldly compromises (Canaanites [*merchants*]), of fear (Hittites [*fear*]), of sectarianism (Perizzites [*villagers*]), of sifters (Jebusites [*threshing floor*]), of clericalism (Ammonites [*of one's people*]), of autocracy (Moabites [*from the father*]), of worldliness (Egyptians [*fortress*]) and of sin (Amorites [*highlanders*]).

This evil spirit began to show itself first in Menta Sturgeon and in A.I. Ritchie, in Jan. 1918. It received a large impetus when I.I. Margeson joined the Committee. Next I.F. Hoskins became infected with it; later the rest of the eight above-named. It is not necessary to go here into detail on this matter, since it was with sufficient detail explained in Vol. VII, Chapters III and IV. Suffice it here to say that, like an unholy contagion, it spread from the leaders to the led, until it had infected the majority of the so-called Opposition (they have taken of their daughters, v. 2).

This evil spirit in them was mixed with their Holy Spirit, making them double-minded (holy seed have mingled . . . people of those lands; Jas. 1: 8; 4: 8). But it is true that the main leaders (princes and rulers) were the chief evil-doers in this iniquity (chief in this trespass). From Jan. 24, 1918, when Menta Sturgeon and A.I. Ritchie resigned, the former first, the latter later, claiming that they did so because of J.'s alleged control of the Committee, and Jan. 27, when Menta Sturgeon in J.'s presence preached against him to the newly formed "Opposition" church, onward until July 29, at the Asbury Park Convention, these fiends by their misconduct kept telling J. of their evil deeds (when I heard this thing); and their misconduct affected him antitypically as the typical misconduct affected Ezra. During those six months and five days J. spent at least as distressed a time as he ever did in any other like space of time in his life. This misconduct put J. into such straits for some weeks as moved him in times of weakness to do violence to his graces (rent my garment, v. 3), to deny the thought that he was clothed with executive authority in the Lord's work (my mantle), to deny that he had the office powers of special teacher to the Lord's people (plucked off the hair of my head) and, at the Committee's insistence in its padlocking resolution on its members' not interpreting types, prophecies and symbols not interpreted by that Servant, to submit for a month on the subject, and thus to give up exercising his office of interpreting such Scriptures for a month (beard). Their misconduct astounded and, figuratively speaking, paralyzed J. (sat down astonished) until the Asbury Park Convention (until the evening sacrifice, v. 4).

J., however, was not alone in experiencing a sense of horror, etc., at these unholy qualities blighting the guilty brethren. Others were in spirit and for the same reason drawn to him therein (assembled . . . trembled [revered] at the words of God, v. 4). First among these were R.H. Hirsh and R.G. Jolly, fellow committeemen. Then members of the Philadelphia Ecclesia, learning of some of these

evils through the Committee's Secretary's and others' mishandling the matter of J.'s lecture on that evil servant there, Feb. 18, 1918, gathered themselves to J. as the one in the right. The news of certain Committee evils reaching some in the New York, Jersey City, Boston and Newark ecclesiastis, some of the members of these likewise assembled to J., so that before the troubles in the Committee were unrighteously and dishonestly by I.F. Hoskins, H.C. Rockwell, etc., sprung upon the Asbury Park Convention, July 27, a considerable number of conscientious brethren assembled to J., as to the one protesting against the group's wrongs. The prayer of vs. 5-15 refers to J.'s discourse, set forth with much humiliation (upon my knees . . . my hands, v. 5), and his prayer, longing, thereafter, the morning of July 28, at the Asbury Park Convention (at the evening sacrifice). The *defiling* and murder of the Fort Pitt Committee the day before became clear to J. very early, July 28, as the small antitype of the rape and murder of the Levite's concubine (Judg. 19: 22-28)—a thing that will be explained in a later chapter. This made J., who was to speak on, The Organization of the New Creation, at the convention that morning, change his subject, and, partly as an agonizing confession of the evils in the Committee, and partly as an expression of an ardent desire for the forgiveness and cleansing of the guilty, expose before the convention the unholy course of the four erring committeemen, J. humbling himself by blaming himself for not having been tactful enough and for speaking perhaps too much in the Committee meetings in his opposition to the wrongs of the four (I arose from my heaviness . . . fell upon my knees and spread . . . my God). J. felt much ashamed at the guilt of these wrong-doers (ashamed and blush . . . our iniquities . . . our trespass, v. 6)—sins dating back into Bro. Russell's times (days of our fathers . . . great trespass unto this day, v. 7), sins that led to chastisements in his day on the executives (kings) and main leaders (priests) among Truth people, resulting in their oppression under the tyranny of Satan and sin (kings of the

lands) in error, selfishness and worldliness (sword, to captivity, and to a spoil) in Little Babylon, where much mixture of Truth and error was received (confusion of face). Nevertheless, J. said, God for a while, since the last summer (a little space, v. 8), gave the come-outers some favor (grace hath been shewed from . . . God), in delivering them from Little Babylon (a remnant to escape) and giving them the first parts of the Epiphany Truth as a stay in the Church (a nail in his holy place), as an instruction to enlighten them by the advancing Truth (enlighten our eyes) and to revive the brethren from their captivity in Little Babylon (reviving in our bondage).

In this convention lecture J. expatiated on the condition in which they had been in Little Babylon (were bondsmen, v. 9), yet despite this God, he showed, was with them (not forsaken us) and by Jesus (kings of Persia) had extended kindness to them, to re-ekindle their spiritual life (to give us a reviving), to set them up as the Epiphany temple (to set up the house of our God), as well as to do repairs on parts of it needing them (to repair the desolations thereof) and to give them a defense (wall) in the sphere of the Truth and its arrangements (Jerusalem) and its sphere of service (Judah). J. then set forth the excuseless condition (what shall we say, v. 10) that, after obtaining these good things (now . . . after this), the brethren, especially the leaders, should forsake the precepts of God's Word (forsaken Thy commandments), who had told them by His mouthpieces (by Thy servants the prophets, v. 11) that their natural hearts and minds were defiled (land . . . is an unclean land) by all sorts of filthiness of the flesh and spirit (filthiness . . . abominations) that have defiled every faculty of the mind and heart (filled it from one end to another [literally, from mouth to mouth, *i.e.*, by a whispering campaign of slander, which broke out into public slander at the convention]) unto external sin (uncleanness). Furthermore, he stressed the fact that they should not in double-mindedness unite their weak graces (daughters, v. 12) with the strong faults of the flesh (their

sons), nor their strong graces (sons) with their weak faults of the flesh (their daughters); nor should they seek to prosper their faults (nor seek their peace [literally, prosperity]), nor ever seek their supposed blessings (wealth); for, J. assured the brethren, if they would obey the teachings of the Lord's mouthpieces, they would become robust in character (strong), and would appropriate the Truth and its Spirit (eat the good of the land), and leave the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit in perpetual possession (inheritance . . . for ever) of their graces (your children).

J. then reasoned with the brethren, as though reasoning with God (seeing that Thou our God, v. 13), who had withheld much of deserved punishment (punished us less . . . deserve), and who had, despite their sins, delivered them from Little Babylonian captivity (given us such deliverance as this), asking them whether these great goodnesses of God should be requited with such acts of disobedience (Should we again break Thy commandments, v. 14), by mixing in double-mindedness the Truth and graces of the holy mind and heart with the errors and disgraces of the natural mind and heart (join in affinity with . . . abominations?). He asked them whether God would not be displeased with them (be angry with us) even unto destroying in the Second Death their New Creatures, if they persisted in these evils (consumed us . . . no remnant nor escaping?). V. 15 gives a brief summary of J.'s prayer at the end of his discourse, a typical summary of which in its main points is given in vs. 6-14. In that prayer he pleaded that God might touch the hearts of all with repentance and restore them to a clean condition. He acknowledged that in all pertinent matters the Lord had done aright and was not blameable (Thou art righteous, v. 15), and not only righteous, but through the merit of our Lord Jesus He was also merciful, gracious and long-suffering, otherwise they would have been cast off entirely from his favor (for we remain yet escaped), which did not take place (as it is this day). Then he cast himself and all the brethren upon the Lord's mercy, pleading that it

might be exercised toward all His people, who enjoy His favor (behold, we are before Thee), though laden with sin (in our trespasses). He humbly acknowledged for all that they had no righteousness by which they could have a standing before Him (cannot stand before Thee), because of their sins (because of this), unless His grace for Christ's merit should forgive.

The effect of J.'s discourse, which in part was delivered in tears, and prayer was arresting (prayed . . . confessed, weeping and casting himself down before the house of God, 10: 1). Some partisans of the eight mentioned above were put into doubt as to their position; many who were not convinced either way hitherto swung over to the view advocated by R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and J.; and their previous supporters were greatly strengthened in their stand. Many were greatly distressed at the evils that J. in his discourse clearly exposed as existing in the Fort Pitt Committee (the people wept very sore [literally, with a great weeping]). It might here be said that J.'s exposures of the evils of error or of conduct or of both in each of the various Levite groups, when the exposures will have reached their climax, will enact the same scene as was enacted by the penitent at the Asbury Park Convention. As it was, that discourse and the debate before the convention held that night, *i.e.*, the night of July 28, between I.F. Hoskins and J. swung almost the whole convention away from the eight into temporary sympathy with J.'s stand (there assembled unto him . . . great congregation), who were so horror-struck by the exposures of J.'s discourse and the complete discomfiture of I.F. Hoskins on the debated questions of having corporations to control the priests' work (the latter said later of this and their debate before the Philadelphia Church a few weeks later: "Every time I debate with Bro. Johnson, he makes me look like thirty cents"), that on J.'s motions the convention defeated almost unanimously every proposal that the eight brought before the business meeting of that convention on July 29. Thus many gathered to J.

This gathering continued until several thousand left the P.B.I. movement and came into the Epiphany movement. Especially did this gathering to him set in at the Philadelphia Church when the bulk of its members who attended the Asbury Park Convention reported to the stayers-at-home the convention's events.

This church's pertinent reaction in J.'s favor was by the few P.B.I. supporters in that Church reported to the Committee, who charged that J. had misrepresented them to the Philadelphia Church, and who demanded that their secretary be given an opportunity to explain their view of the situation. The church decided that, not one, but both sides be heard in a debate, since J., apart from a brief incidental reference to the trouble, had not yet told it his side. The afternoon's debate was between I.F. Hoskins and J.; the evening's debate was between about five on the Committee's side and the three former Committee members on the other side. The Committee's side left Philadelphia a crushed group; and, except about ten, the whole church of about 175 members accepted the view of the three. From Philadelphia the assembling to J. continued world-wide—a great multitude. This assembling later took the form of an investigative convention, called to meet at Philadelphia, Sept. 8-10, 1918. But the P.B.I. Committee had had its fill of investigations, which it knew would lead to the further exposure of its iniquitous course; so its members boycotted this convention among themselves and their partisans. This convention appointed an investigative committee that was to put itself at the disposal of any ecclesia that requested its help to investigate evils of the kind typed in Ezra 9: 1.

Aug. 11, at Jersey City, N. J., R.H. Hirsh (*Shechaniah [neighbor of Jehovah]; Jehiel [God lives]; Elam [concealed]*, v. 2) encouraged J. to go on with the pertinent exposures, after J. had shown him the uncorrected MS. of the paper, *Another Harvest Sifting Reviewed*, as a suggested exposure. He reasoned that the cleansing was needed and should set in, since there was hope of reformation (hope in Israel). He

urged that all agree (make a covenant, v. 3) to put away the bad qualities (put away all the [strange] wives) and all acts resulting from these qualities (such as are born of them), according to J.'s counsel (counsel of my lord), as well as that of other reverencers of God's Word (tremble at the commandment of our God). He urged that it be done according to the Word (according to the law). He then urged J. to initiate this matter as coming properly within the sphere of his work (Arise; for this matter belongeth unto thee . . . and do it, v. 4). He promised him the support of all the involved faithful brethren (we will be with thee) and encouraged him to go ahead. The Philadelphia Church later, in its main and subordinate leaders and in its other members, at J.'s suggestion and R.G. Jolly's motion promised so to act as J. proceeded to this work (arose Ezra, . . . swear, v. 5).

Immediately after the Asbury Park Convention, *i.e.*, July 30 or 31, 1918, J. began to prepare a paper entitled, Another Harvest Sifting Reviewed, in which especially the office (chamber, v. 6) of I.F. Hoskins (Johanan [*Jehovah is gracious*]; Eliashib [*my God returns*]) in its misuses was severely exposed. His working on this paper gave him no refreshment (eat no bread, nor drink water); for he was inexpressibly pained at the evils that had been committed in the Committee and at the Asbury Park Convention, and that he had to expose in that paper (mourned . . . transgression). The Philadelphia Church, Aug. 18, 1918, passed a resolution asking J. to call a General Convention to meet in its hall, Sept. 8-10, as a sphere of the Truth and its arrangements, after the P.B.I. Committee had unanimously refused its request to call a General Convention at that place and time, especially to diagnose the evils in the Church and to suggest remedies. Accordingly, this convention was announced (proclamation . . . unto all . . . gather . . . unto Jerusalem, v. 7). In the last clause of that resolution it was decided to withdraw priestly fellowship from any "who individually or collectively attempt to prevent, pervert, thwart or oppose the purposes of this convention"

(v. 8). A week after this resolution was passed, Aug. 25, 1918, the above-mentioned debate before the Philadelphia Ecclesia took place. This debate convinced the bulk of the church that the four members of the Committee and their partisan supporters were guilty as charged by the other three. Three days before this debate, Aug. 22, the paper, *Another Harvest Sifting Reviewed*, appeared. It pointed out, among other things, 150 parallels between J.F.R.'s and the four recalcitrant Committee members' acts; it also contained a copy of the Aug. 18th resolution of the Philadelphia Church and the announcement of the Mizpeh (*watch tower*) Convention at Philadelphia, Sept. 8-10 (vs. 7, 8).

The P.B.I., by its directors, editors and membership, as said above, boycotted the Mizpeh Convention, which met at the announced time, Sept. 8-10 (within three days [literally, for three days], v. 9), as they later boycotted the Hebron Convention (Dec. 20-22), which they were personally invited to attend through the first number of *The Present Truth*, mailed about 8: 30 P.M., Dec. 8—God's time, Dec. 9. The leaders (men of Judah) and the led (men of Benjamin) met in the Mizpeh Convention (gathered themselves), within the sphere of the Truth and its arrangements (Jerusalem), for the announced three days. At the night session of Sept. 10, the last of the three days (ninth month, on the twentieth day), the conventioners, as representatives of the general Church, sat publicly before the general Church (people sat in the street of the house of God), quite fearful (trembling), because of the exposures of the evils (because of this matter) and because of the advancing Truth then being given on the condition (for the great rain). At that final session J. (Ezra, v. 10), speaking to the conventioners as representatives of the general Church (said unto them), charged that the brethren in general (ye) had sinned and cultivated the above-mentioned disgraces (transgressed, and have taken [literally, caused to dwell (with you)] strange wives), and thus caused iniquity to increase among God's people.

He exhorted the guilty to acknowledge their wrongs to the Lord (make confession unto the Lord God of your fathers, v. 11) and do what He charges, *i.e.*, make reformation (do His pleasure); this would require them to put away (separate yourselves) their affinities with evil (people of the land) and the aforesaid faults (strange wives). By a resolution all repudiated these evils and promised betterment (all . . . said . . . we do, v. 12). They further by the resolution affirmed that, in view of the advancing Truth (much rain, v. 13) and the many transgressors (people are many), the matters could not then and there be settled (not able to stand without), since the work was one that would take a long time (neither . . . a work of one day or two), since there were many cases calling for attention (many . . . in this). A resolution was then offered which proposed that, at the invitation of the churches (cities, v. 14) that desired an investigation made and a cure offered, such diagnosis and cure be offered in previously announced sessions (appointed times), with their elders and deacons (elders and judges) and guilty members (strange wives) present, who should be examined by the general elders of the Church (rulers of all the congregation), that the Lord's wrath be stayed until the matter be settled (be turned from us until this matter [be done]—margin).

Only four stood up openly and spoke against (were employed about [literally, stood against, see margin and A. R. V.], v. 15) this motion: three of the Philadelphia elders, *i.e.*, Dr. S. N. Wiley (Jonathan [*Jehovah gave*]; Asahel [*made by God*]); B.A. Parkes (Jahaziah [*seen by Jehovah*]; Tikvah [*hope*]); and R. Rogers (Meshullam [*recompensed*]); and one of the Philadelphia deacons, J. Laird (Shabbethai [*sabbather, or restful*] the Levite). The main objectors were the first two named; the other two assisted them (helped them). About four others, without speaking against it, joined them in voting against the resolution. Otherwise the motion passed unanimously (the children . . . did so). The convention then nominated a diagnosal and curative committee of three:

F.H. McGee, J. and H.J. Newman, with R.H. Hirsh, I.F. Hoskins and Wm. Hollister as their respective alternates, to serve in their places in case one or more of the first three did not serve (*Ezra . . . with certain chief of the fathers . . . by their names, were separated*).

Continuing its boycotting course, the P.B.I. sympathizers, F.H. McGee, H.J. Newman and Wm. Hollister, refused to serve. This left R.H. Hirsh and J. as the active members of the committee. On Sept. 15 the Philadelphia Ecclesia at R.G. Jolly's motion invited the committee to begin its work in its midst, which it started to do on Sept. 22 (sat down in the first day of the tenth month); and the P.B.I. boycotting the Hebron Convention, Dec. 20-22, it did no more work as such after Dec. 19, the day it made out its report for the convention, given Dec. 20, that there was no more work to do, unless the P.B.I. would alter its course, to secure which the convention sent it a special messenger—but in vain (made an end . . . by the first day of the first month, v. 17). It is remarkable how, undesignedly on man's part, the typical and antitypical committees acted out their commissions in the same number of days, as follows: the tenth, eleventh and twelfth months had 29, 30 and 29 days respectively, and the end came the first day of the next month, *i.e.*, 89 days. The antitypical investigation's months had for the investigation, which began Sept. 22 and ended the day it made out its final report, Dec. 19: 9, 31, 30 and 19 days, *i.e.*, 89 days. Moreover, from the time that the Investigative and Curative Committee was appointed, after 6 P.M., Sept. 10 (God's time, Sept. 11) there were 11 days until it began to investigate, *i.e.*, Sept. 11 to Sept. 22, just as was the case in the type from the 20th of the ninth month (v. 9) until the 1st of the tenth month (v. 16). This is in line with the 119 days in the lunar time from the 1st day of the first month to the 1st day of the fifth month and from Dec. 22, 1916 to April 19, 1917, in the journey, type and antitype (*Ezra 7: 9*).

The experiences set forth typically in Ezra 9 and 10 had

their small Epiphany antitypes in the experiences given above as the antitypes of these chapters so far presented, and in the rest of the antitypes of Ezra 10: 18-44 in the reformation of conduct that set in with the investigations from Sept. 22 to Dec 19, 1918, both among Epiphany and P.B.I. friends. We pass by these details of the small fulfillment as to the cleansings typed in vs. 18-44, to give the generalities of the large fulfillments that are just ahead of us, and that will involve all the unclean of 60 Truth groups; for, as just indicated, the 1918 experiences set forth in Ezra 9, 10 are the small Epiphany antitype of these chapters, while those just ahead are the large Epiphany antitype of Ezra 10, while the antitype of Ezra 9 has been successively fulfilling as each group has arisen and become unclean. We note first the divisions of the type: (1) the cleansed of the priests (main leaders, vs. 18-22), (2) the cleansed of the Levites (subordinate leaders, vs. 23, 24) and (3) the cleansed of Israel (the non-leaders, vs. 25-44). We note that the priests are set forth as in four groups: (1) Jeshua's (*[savior]*; Jozadak [*Jehovah is righteous*])—J., v. 18) two sons (Maaseiah [*work of Jehovah*]—Epiphany pilgrims; and Eliezer [*God is helper*]—Epiphany evangelists) and Jeshua's two brethren (Jarib [*he strives*]—Epiphany sympathizers among the leaders in the two organized groups [Merarites and Gershonites] of the Levites; and Gedaliah [*greatness of Jehovah*]—Epiphany sympathizers among the leaders of the one unorganized group [Kohathites] of the Levites). These will shortly after this book is issued recognize their evil qualities (strange wives, v. 19) and will pledge (gave their hands) to put these away (put away) and turn in faith to Christ's merit for their cleansing (a ram . . . for their trespass). The other three sets of priests correspond to the non-Epiphany sympathizers among the main leaders of the three groups of Levites: (2) Immer's (*[talkative, or eloquent]*)—the Merarites, v. 20) two sons (Hanani [*my favor*]—the main Society leaders, not the *Rutherfordite* ones, but those of antitypical Elisha; and Zebadiah [*endowed by Jehovah*]—

the main Standfast leaders); (3) Harim's ([*flatnosed*])—the Gershonites, v. 21) five sons (Maaseiah [*work of Jehovah*]—the main P.B.I. leaders; Elijah [*my God is Jehovah*]—the main Dawn leaders; Shemaiah [*heard of Jehovah*]—the main leaders of the Watchers of the Morning [*Hoskinsites*]; Jehiel [*God lives*]—the main leaders of the Berean Bible Institute of Australia; and Uzziah [*strength of Jehovah*]—the main leaders of the Bible Students Committee of Britain); and (4) Pashur's ([*prosperity everywhere*])—the Kohathites, v. 22) six sons (Elioenai [*unto God are my eyes*]—the main leaders of the Sturgeonites; Massieiah [*work of Jehovah*]—the main leaders of the Ritchieites; Ishmael [*God hears*]—the main leaders of the Olsonites; Nethaneel [*gift of God*]—the main leaders of the Hirshites; Jozabad [*Jehovah endowed*] —the main leaders of the Kittingerites; and Elasar [*God made*]—the main leaders of the good Levites).

It will be noted that there are ten groups of the subordinate leaders (Levites, vs. 23, 24). These ten groups of subordinate leaders are those leaders in the ten Levite groups whose respective chief leaders are typed by the ten who came out of Babylon and went to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel and Jeshua (Ezra 2: 2; Neh. 7: 7), also by ten of twelve leaders who with J., as executive and teacher, carried the antitypical gold, silver and vessels to antitypical Jerusalem (Ezra 8: 24-30). In each of these ten groups there are subordinate leaders (Levites) who will begin to undergo cleansing shortly after this book appears. It will be noted that in vs. 25-44 there appear 86 names of the sons of ten heads of families. These ten heads of families correspond to the ten leaders just referred to in the third preceding sentence, from the standpoint of their relations to the led ones (Israel), as distinct from the main and subordinate leaders referred to in vs. 18-24. The 86 antitypical sons of vs. 25-44 consist: (1) of 56 of the general Levite groups (the antitypical Levites as a whole and their three main divisions, which four count in among the 60 Levite groups, being here ignored,

are not counted in); (2) of the 20 groups of Youthful Worthies not associated with any of the 60 groups of Levites consisting of Great Company and Youthful Worthy brethren (in Cant. 6: 8, 9 the 60 queens are the 60 parts of the Great Company in these 60 Levite groups; and of the 80 concubines of these verses, 60 are the Youthful Worthy parts of these 60 groups of Levites, and the remaining 20 are Youthful Worthy groups that are not combined with any of the 60 Levite groups); and (3) of the ten groups of good Levites (Benjamin's ten sons [Gen. 46: 21] in the Epiphany picture type these, as will be shown in Chapter IX). Thus  $56 + 20 + 10 = 86$ . Seemingly, the first-named sons, the firstborn, of the ten heads of Israelite families mentioned in vs. 25-44 stand for the ten fathers and the ten chief sons in these 86 sons, even as we have seen the firstborn to be the *pe shenaim*, two family classes, fathers and sons, of which the firstborn consist. Otherwise, if we should add the ten fathers as groups we would have 96, which figure, so far as we know, does not enter into any picture of the Levite groups, either in type or antitype. It will take up too much space, as well as be largely a matter of repetition, here to name all the 86 as type and antitype individually. We have already given 56 of them in our exposition of Ezra 2. The 20 above-mentioned Youthful Worthy groups not affiliated with any of the above-mentioned 56 groups will consist of 20 groups of Youthful Worthies, without any Great Company brethren in any of them. Quite a few of such groups, e.g., in Germany, Poland, France, Brazil, India, etc., are in existence. The ten good Levite groups are the Epiphany-Truth-adhering crown-losers in the ten nations among which the Epiphany movement has a number of adherents: (1) the U.S.A., (2) Canada, (3) the American Tropics, (4) Britain, (5) Norway, (6) Sweden, (7) Denmark, (8) French-speaking countries, (9) Poland and (10) India. The cleansing of these is a thing devoutly to be hoped for.

## CHAPTER V.

### MORDECAI AND ESTHER—TYPE AND ANTITYPE.

TWO PUBLIC FEASTS. TWO CALLS. A WICKED PLAN. COUNTERACTIVE EFFORTS. TWO PRIVATE FEASTS. THE CONSPIRACY OVERTHROWN. THE FINAL BATTLE. THE AFTERMATH.

UNLIKE Nehemiah, Zerubbabel and Ezra, who have had large and small antitypes, Mordecai and Esther have only one set of antotypical fulfillments. The antitypes of the three chief actors of the book are our Lord (Ahasuerus [*lion-* or *hero-king*]), the Parousia and Epiphany Church (Esther [*star*]) and the Laodicean Messenger (Mordecai [*humble*, or *warrior*]). Apart from Esther 1: 1-4, and parts of vs. 5-9, chapters 1 and 2 treat of Parousia matters and the rest of the book treats of early Epiphany matters. Without any further introductory remarks we will now proceed to the interpretation of the book of Esther, type and antitype, which is unique among Biblical books, since it does not contain the words, God and Jehovah.

The opening verse of the book by several things suggests our Lord to be the antitype of Ahasuerus (Artaxerxes, 474-425 B.C.; see preceding chapter's comments on Ezra 4: 6-24): first, because the latter was a king of Medo-Persia, which represents God's Kingdom while part of it is in the flesh and part of it in the spirit; second, because he was the universal ruler in that kingdom (reigned from India to Ethiopia—in both parts of the latter: the part in Arabia and the part in Africa); third, because of the three symbolic numbers involved in the number 127, *i.e.*, 7, 12 and 10: thus,  $127 \div 12 = 10$ , with 7 as a remainder, 7 standing for God, 12 for the Little Flock and 10 for natures (Great Company, Youthful Worthies and faith-justified ones) lower than the Divine; and fourth, because of the statement that Ahasuerus' throne was in Shushan (*lily*), the nominal church, which until 1878 was our Lord's headquarters (palace) for His kingly work.

Vs. 1 and 2, by their reference to the second universal empire, set the antitype in the Gospel Age. Just when in the Gospel Age its antitype occurs is gathered from the facts of the antitype (in the days . . . in those days, vs. 1, 2). We get our first time-hint as to when the antitype started by the statement on the book's first act in the third year of Ahasuerus' reign (third year, v. 3). Broadly speaking, from a certain standpoint, but not from others, we can view the pre-Parousiac reign of our Lord in the Church as occurring during three periods: (1) that of the Primitive Church, *i.e.*, from Pentecost to about 230 A.D., (2) that of the Catholic (Greek and Roman) Church, from about 230 until the ministry of John Wessel, about 1480 A.D., and (3) that of the Protestant Church, from about 1480 to about 1881. It will be recalled that it was in 1871 that Bro. Russell's anointing as the Parousia executive and warrior, antitypical David, began (Vol. IX, 518-524). Regarding these three periods as being respectively the first, second and third periods of our Lord's reign in the Church (typed by the first three years of Ahasuerus' reign), this setting would put the antitypical feast (feast [literally, drinking]) during the period of the Protestant Church, *i.e.*, some time between about 1480 and 1881 A.D., as will shortly be shown.

The facts now to be presented prove that this feast began in 1691, through Jacob Spener, one of the leaders in Germany of the movement antitypical of the depositing and keeping of the antitypical Ark in antitypical Kirjath-jearim, who then, in Berlin, brought out the long-forgotten doctrine of Christ's Millennial reign. This feast was not for the public, but for the new-creaturely leaders (princes) and the other New Creatures (servants); for others took no interest in these subjects. Besides Spener, brethren like Franke, Lange, Lead, Bengel, (Sir Isaac) Newton, Wesley, Stone, Miller, Storrs, Stetson, etc., feasted as symbolic princes, while the other New Creatures feasted as symbolic

servants. The former were the strong ones of the embryo kingdom (power of Media and Persia). Crown-lost leaders (princes) and their special helpers (nobles) as less honored ones (of the provinces) partook of the feast as also officers of our Lord (before him). Jesus, especially through the above-named brethren, showed forth the glory of His Millennial bounties (riches of his glorious kingdom, v. 4) and the honor of His greatness' beauty (honor of his excellent majesty [literally, of the beauty of his greatness]), a thing that a true description of His Millennial reign must do. This feast continued (many days) with the New Creatures for 180 years (180 days): from 1691, from Spener's bringing forth this truth, until 1871, when Bro. Russell's anointing as antitypical David began. The facts of the case prove that it was through Spener's bringing forth truth on the Millennium in 1691 that the antitypical feasting began. Hence for New Creatures exclusively it must have ended in 1871.

Other considerations confirm this thought. Bro. Russell's anointing in its beginning started giving the Millennial Truth to others than New Creatures, even as it was done in the presence of his brethren of all classes of professed believers, typed by that of David occurring in the presence of his father (the whole people of God) and of his seven brothers (three of them typing the three groups of the Gospel-Age Levites, the faith-justified, three of them typing the three groups of anticipatorial Epiphany Levites, and the seventh typing the Little Flock, 1 Sam. 16: 3). Thus his anointing followed immediately on the end of the 180 years' feasting, *i.e.*, 1871 (when these days were expired, v. 5). Beginning with it, Jesus for seven years, Spring of 1871 to that of 1878 (seven days), gave an enlarged feast (feast [literally, drinking]) on the Kingdom to all, great and small, in the nominal church as Jesus' headquarters (all the people . . . Shushan the palace . . . small). This was done, not privately, as in the 180 years' feast, but with great publicity

(court of the garden . . . palace). This feast consisted especially of ever-increasing light on the ransom, the object, manner and time of our Lord's Second Advent, the chronology, our Lord's second presence occurring in 1874, election and free grace, etc. Its setting was amid teachings on justification (white, v. 6), everlasting life (green) and faithfulness (blue) sustained by our Lord's righteousness (cords of linen) and royal authority (purple), which are truly (silver) guaranteed by His Divine nature and powers (marble pillars). The feasters reclined on teachings Divinely true (gold and silver), as symbolic couches (beds [literally, couches]), which rested upon the foundation that, despite sin and death (black marble), the ransom (red) and fidelity (blue) and the righteousness (white) of Christ were the upholders of the teachings and the feasters. Divine (gold, v. 7) truths were those on which they feasted, presented in doctrinal, refutative, corrective and ethical forms (vessels being diverse). Truths on the Kingdom (royal wine [literally, wine of the kingdom]) were given out in very large and liberal measures (abundance), as should be expected from such a great King and liberal Giver as our Lord is (according to . . . king). Sharing in the feast of wine had to be done in harmony with the Lord's arrangements (according to the law, v. 8), i.e., according to each one's humility, meekness, thirst, honesty and goodness, as they were large or small, was he given to drink. None were forced to accept these truths (none did compel); for Jesus charges (king had appointed) His servants (officers) that they should offer the Truth to each in harmony with his preference and not in any degree force it upon him.

While Jesus was thus offering all in the nominal church a rich feast of Kingdom truths, something else (also, v. 9) was going on. The nominal church (*Vashti [beautiful] the queen*), which in a sense was the Lord's Bride, since all professing to be His are recipients of the invitation to consecrate (proposal of marriage), and which

in its main representatives, especially its leaders, accepted the proposal, also made a feast (feast [literally, drinking]) for the various churches (women) on the subject of the Millennial Kingdom, while she was yet the Lord's mouthpiece and queen, as above described (in the royal house . . . king Ahasuerus). This feasting was on the pre-Millennial advent of our Lord, whose reign, they taught, would bless the then living only, and after it would be over the dead would be awakened and judged, in the nominal church's sense of the word, sentenced, some to eternal life, the rest to eternal torment. These views were championed by men like Alford, Gummeling, Seiss, Craven and many evangelists, like Moody, etc. The seventh day (seventh day, v. 10) types the year from April, 1877 to April, 1878. We recall that in April, 1877, the midnight (the time of the end is Scripturally called a night, *i.e.*, Oct., 1799 to Oct., 1954, whose exact middle was April, 1877) cry, Behold the bridegroom, started. This cry, especially announcing our Lord's presence in the Second Advent as having come, was a truth that made our Lord's heart happy (king merry with wine); and that was His charge to the nominal church (*Vashti*, v. 11) to take her place beside our Lord in gracing the festivities then going on, *i.e.*, to accept and announce this doctrine with its accompanying messages. He used seven special servants (seven chamberlains [literally, eunuchs] that served . . . the king) to bring her this invitation and to bring her to Him in response to the invitation. These special servants were Bros. Russell (Mehuman, *steadfast*), Keith (Biztha, *a eunuch*), Barbour (Harbona, *ass-driver*), Paton (Bigtha, *gardener*), Rice (Abagtha, *gardener*), Storrs (Zethar, *a star*) and Stetson (Carcas, *an eagle*). The nominal church, having been developed by the crown-lost leaders, had much of their qualities, and thus was adorned with much of the beauty (beauty . . . fair to look on) of holiness. In her being brought forth before the Lord (before the king),

it was to be as the Lord's queen (with the crown royal), and the purpose was to prove her by tests of character, to show the world and the Lord's special servants that she was adorned with the beauties of holiness (to shew the people and the princes her beauty). Humility amid humiliations was one of the special features then to be tested in her.

This invitation to appear as the hostess at the better of the two feasts, given and repeated during the year April, 1877 to April, 1878, was not only refused once, but was also repeatedly refused during that year (Vashti refused . . . commandment by his chamberlains, v. 12). This insult to our Lord so publicly and repeatedly made greatly displeased Him (king very wroth, and his anger burned). As always, when desiring to give advancing Truth to His servants, the scribes instructed unto the Kingdom (the king's manner [custom] toward all that knew law [matters of conduct] and judgment [matters of doctrine], v. 13), so here, the Lord raised pertinent questions in the minds of such scribes as understood prophetic times (king said to the wise men who knew the times), which scribes were the leaders closest to the Lord (and [even] the next unto him, v. 14). These seven brothers as wise men (the seven princes) were the same individuals as from the servant phase of their office work were the antitypes of the seven eunuchs of v. 10. But the order seems to be changed from that of their enumeration in v. 10, for the seventh one indicated in v. 14 is Bro. Russell (Memucan [*established, i.e., steadfast*, meaning the same as Mehuman, the first of the eunuchs]). The other six also seem to be given in different order from that of v. 10: Bros. Barbour (Carshena, *black*), Storrs (Shethar, *star*), Rice (Admatha, *human*), Paton (Tarshish, *breaking subjection, i.e., rebellious*), Keith (Meres, *worthy*) and Stetson (Marsena, *lofty* [*in character*]). These were the ones most favored by our Lord in the Church on earth at that time (saw the king's face) and were by Him

put in the chief places in the Church on earth (sat first in the kingdom). The question that He raised in the minds of these students of the time features of God's plan was: What did God's plan (according to law, v. 15) teach in its time features should be done to the nominal church for refusing to show forth the beauties of holiness under testful conditions of humiliation, as required by the Lord; for a proper response would have required her to repudiate her errors opposed to the advancing Truth then given and to accept these instead—a test of humility especially, as well as of other graces. But she refused to give the proper response under those conditions to the Lord (not performed . . . king . . . by the chamberlains).

Bro. Russell (Memucan [*steadfast*, established, *i.e.*, faithful], v. 16) answered the question before the Lord and the six brothers above-mentioned (before the king and the princes) as follows: The nominal church by refusing to exhibit the beauties of holiness under the test of humiliation, not only offended against the Lord, in refusing Him wifely obedience under conditions of self-abasement, but in so doing sinned against all leaders (princes) of the Church who as Truth servants had conveyed the invitation, and had given an insult to all of the members of the true Church and a bad example to every ecclesia in the real and nominal Church (all the people . . . provinces), all of whom should have received a proper example from her. Her course, he further added, would undoubtedly be made known (deed . . . shall come, v. 17) to every separate denomination, sect and ecclesia (all women), all of which, influenced by the nominal church's bad example, would despise and consider Jesus as one to be ignored and disobeyed (despise their husbands in their eyes), when they would consider the matter (when . . . reported) of her disregard of the Lord's charge (Ahasuerus commanded . . . but she came not). Even Truth ecclesias (ladies of Persia and Media, v. 18) would by her example be tempted to

despise the leaders (say . . . king's princes) of the Lord's flock, which would result in evil (contempt and wrath). Proper measures must be set into operation to meet the evil, advised Bro. Russell, which meant that the Lord Jesus be pleased to make an unalterable law (please the king . . . a royal commandment . . . written among the laws of the Persians . . . not altered, v. 19), that the nominal church be cast off from the mouthpieceship and favor that made her Jesus' queen (Vashti come no more before the king) and that the position of special mouthpieceship and favor be given the true Church (king give her royal estate unto another [literally, her companion] that is better than she).

Our Lord's decree (king's decree, v. 20), Bro. Russell further declared, should be made to be heard (shall be published) throughout Christendom (throughout all his empire) as a judgment of the Lord Jesus as to both the nominal church and the real Church, which would have the tendency of making all denominations and true and nominal ecclesiastas (all wives), large and small (great and small), honor the Lord Jesus (give their husbands honor). Bro. Russell gathered from the Scriptures, particularly from the casting off of nominal Fleshly Israel in 33 A.D. for its rejection of our Lord, that the parallel required the casting off of the nominal church in 1878 A.D. for her rejection of our Lord. This answer was acceptable to our Lord and the other six princes (saying pleased the king and the princes, v. 21). Accordingly, our Lord executed the counsel of Bro. Russell in both of its parts (the king did according to . . . Memucan), *i.e.*, He set aside the nominal church from mouthpieceship, and caused this fact to be announced everywhere in Christendom. He caused this proclamation to be made both orally and in writing (sent letters [literally, books], v. 22) throughout all denominations and ecclesiastas, true and nominal (into all the king's provinces), and caused it to be made known in the teachings of each of these (into every province according to the writing . . . after

their language), setting forth the thought that our Lord, as the Head of the Church, and thus as the professedly acknowledged Head in each denomination and true and nominal ecclesia, should be regarded and acted toward as the ruler in His own house (every man should bear rule in his own house), *i.e.*, that every denomination and every ecclesia should obey His rule as its Head. He further ordained that this should be taught as a part of every denominational doctrine and as a part of every local church's doctrine (published language of every people). This charge was carried into effect, as the history of the Harvest testifies.

Whereas Esther 1 treats of the Lord's dealing with the nominal church in its Protestant part, Esther 2 treats of the true Church beginning early in the Parousia. We will now by the Lord's help proceed to the study of Esther 2. The casting off of antitypical Vashti from special favor began April, 1878, and was completed by Oct., 1881, just as in the parallel Israel began to be cut off from special favor, April, 33 A.D., and was completely cut off from it, Oct., 36 A.D. While the Lord's wrath against her subsided (wrath . . . appeased, v. 1), He always remembered against her what she had done, and what He had decreed against her (what . . . against her). In the meantime the Lord's servants in their ministries of Him (king's servants, v. 2) taught that the truly consecrated should be sought for the Lord (said . . . fair young virgins sought for the king). Further, they taught and prayed that the Lord would send out friends of the Bridegroom to win a Bride for Him (king appoint officers . . . gather together all the fair young virgins) and to bring them into the Truth movement (Shushan the palace [now changed from the nominal to the true Church]), among the Truth people (house of the women), under Bro. Russell's care (Hege [*eunuch*]) as that Servant (chamberlain), who as such had charge of the household (keeper of the women) and storehouse, in which were the things for the purifying of the consecrated,

ministered to them by him (things for purification be given). Finally, they taught that those who would pass their trial successfully to the Lord's approval (the maiden which pleaseth the king, v. 4) should and would be made the Lord's Bride instead of the nominal church (be queen instead of Vashti). This was acceptable to our Lord (thing please the king), who acted accordingly (he did so).

Here the Laodicean Messenger in his first member, Bro. Russell, is introduced (a certain Jew . . . Mordecai [*humble, warrior*], v. 5) as being among Truth people (Shushan the palace). He was a teacher of Truth (Jair [*he enlightens*]), a Truth student (Shimei [*hearing, studying*]), an expert user of the Bible as a bow (Kish [*bow*]) with which to shoot the arrows of Truth against error, and on earth the favorite of God, his Father (Benjamite [*son of the right hand*]). In his condition in antitypical Kish he had gone into Babylonian captivity by accepting nominal-church errors in his Bible-student boyhood days (carried away, v. 6), in the captivity that preceded the final, the Epiphany one, (Jeconiah [*Jehovah establishes*]), inveigled therein by Satan (Nebuchadnezzar [*messenger of the god of fire*]). Bro. Russell nourished (brought up [literally, nourished], v. 7) Youthful Worthies (Hadassah [*myrtle*], Neh. 8: 15) who later became New Creatures (Esther [*star*]) after the new-creaturely nominal-church leaders (uncle's), who had brought them to consecration, as their symbolic father, were as antitypical Saul rejected and the nominal church, as their symbolic mother, as the Lord's mouthpiece was rejected (she had neither father nor mother). After leaving the nominal church as Youthful Worthies, from 1878 onward, and coming into the Truth, these were as a class taken by Bro. Russell as a symbolic daughter. It should here be remarked that Mordecai in the book of Esther represents both members of the Laodicean Messenger, his first member acting as the antitype of Mordecai up to and including v. 18; then for a while in this

book first one and then the other acts as such antitype up to and including Esther 3: 5; thereafter the second member of the Laodicean Messenger acts exclusively as such antitype. As said above, at Mordecai's first appearance (v. 5) and, in fact, in all his appearances up to and including v. 18, he types the Laodicean Messenger in Bro. Russell alone. Returning now to the antitype: After their begettal this Esther class, of course, became the Church probationarily. This begetting and becoming the probationary Church set in with its first members in 1881 and progressed as such up to 1914; and, of course, this class was beautiful in holiness (fair and beautiful [literally, of fair form and good appearance]), for we are to keep in mind that after she was crowned Esther represents the overcoming Church in the flesh after Sept. 16, 1914. The pertinent facts that will be brought out as we go on prove that after Sept. 16, 1914, the door of the high calling was closed to consecrators.

Accordingly, the gathering typed in v. 8 is that which occurred after the general call ceased, *i.e.*, that which occurred under the special calls from Oct., 1881 to Oct., 1914; for it took place after the complete cutting off of the nominal church from special favor; because, as in the Jewish parallel, while the nominal house as a whole was cast off, April, 33 A.D., exclusive favor was limited to Israel in their faithful remnant until Oct., 36 A.D.; so, while the nominal church as a whole was cast off, April, 1878, favor was limited to her in her faithful remnant until Oct., 1881, when her casting off from special favor was completed, even as that of Israel was completed in Oct., 36 A.D. The special calls, therefore, began Oct., 1881 (king's commandment . . . was heard, v. 8) and many responded to the calls (many maidens were gathered together) and came as New Creatures into the Truth (unto Shushan the palace) under Bro. Russell's charge (custody of Hegai). Among these were those who later made their calling and election sure (Esther), entering among the

Lord's people (king's house) under Bro. Russell's charge, as the one who had charge of the household (custody of Hegai, keeper of the women). The spirit of this class pleased him (maiden pleased him, v. 9); and it effected favors to be given them from him (obtained kindness of him). He zealously gave them the corrective and ethical teachings of the Word as the means of their sanctification (speedily gave her . . . purification), as well as the doctrinal and refutative teachings needed by them (things as belonged to her [literally, her portion]) and all needed consecrated companions (seven maidens [crown-losers and Youthful Worthies]) that were proper for them to have (meet to be given her), from among the Lord's people (out of the king's house). He assigned these and their companions (her and her maids) to the best place among the consecrated (best place . . . women).

Their humility, as well as Bro. Russell's teachings (Mordecai charged her, v. 10), prevented their claiming for themselves Little Flockship (not shewed her people), nor even Spirit-begettal (kindred), for as yet neither of these things were certain, hence could be held only as a matter of faith, not of knowledge, since from 1881 onward these things were not certain in individual cases, because all consecrators were not accepted into the high calling. All through the years (every day, v. 11) of the special calls, 1881-1914, Bro. Russell very zealously approached (walked . . . house) these faithful ones, to learn (know) of their prosperity (how Esther did) and of their experiences (what should become of [literally, what was done with] her). Before each consecrated one's (maid's, v. 12) time would come for each of his testings (turn was come to go in) by the Lord (king Ahasuerus), he had to undergo a sufficient preparation (after she had been twelve months), as was customary with the consecrated. In the type naturally the full preparation preceded any of the testings, but in the antitype the preparation and the testing are intermittent things,

*i.e.*, one is prepared in each point of character separately and is then tested on that point separately, then the preparation on the next point is made, to be followed by its testing, and so on, until all the preparations are each in turn made and all the testings are pertinently in each in turn made. This manner of the antitype's fulfilment occurs in all long-drawn-out progressive antitypical experiences. By experience all the consecrated know that this is true. The purification is a twofold one: (1) a cleansing from filthiness of flesh and spirit, which occurs through the refutative teachings of the Word cleansing from error and through the corrective teachings of the Word cleansing from sin, selfishness and worldliness (six months with oil of myrrh), and (2) a development in grace, knowledge and service through the doctrinal and ethical teachings of the Word (six months with sweet odors), all of these backed by suitable Divine providences and the Divine Spirit (for the purifying of the women).

Before undergoing trial each consecrated one may take with him anything that he desires into the trial, with the result that often he takes things of self and of the world, of sin and of error, that prove fatal to him in the trial (thus came every maiden . . . whatsoever she desired . . . to go . . . unto the king's house, v. 13). The testing time (evening . . . Morrow, v. 14) was spent under the direct supervision of the Lord Jesus (she went . . . she returned), as one not successful when tested was remanded to the Great Company (second house of the women), and was put under Bro. Russell's (*Shaashgaz [servant of the beautiful]*) supervision for stricter and restrained care (kept the concubines), as crown-losers. As such, those failing under test could not appear with the Lord except by special favor (king delighted in her) and express mention (called by name). When the faithful came under test (turn of Esther, v. 15) they came in strength of character (*Abihail [my father is strength]*) that was akin to that of Bro. Russell (uncle of Mordecai), and

that had been developed all the more under Bro. Russell's fatherly care (who had taken her for his daughter); they took nothing of wilful or mixed sin, error, selfishness and worldliness with them into the trial (required nothing); but they did take the Truth and its Spirit, as Bro. Russell, as the caretaker of all the consecrated, had taught them to have with them in their trial (what Hegai . . . appointed). Their graces of the Spirit made them very winsome and ingratiating (obtained favor) to all with whom they came in contact (all them that looked upon her). The final testings of these (Esther was taken unto king Ahasuerus, v. 16), as to whether the Lord would see in them a character that would prove faithful, was from 1908, when the fifth harvest call and sifting set in, until 1914 (tenth month . . . seventh year), the gleanlings being here ignored, since the class as such came as antitypical Elijah to the mount of God by Oct., 1914. This period from 1908 to 1914 is the special antitype of Esther's testing time. Its being in the end of the Harvest is typed by the 10th month of Ahasuerus' seventh year as king. We saw above that the Protestant Church's period (about 1480 to 1881) corresponded to his third year. The seventh is reached as follows: The period, 1881-1891, from the beginning of the second to that of the third harvest call and sifting, corresponded to the fourth year; the period 1891-1901, from the beginning of the third to that of the fourth harvest call and sifting, corresponded to the fifth year; the period, 1901-1908, from the beginning of the fourth to that of the fifth harvest call and sifting, corresponded to the sixth year; and the period, 1908-1914, from the fifth harvest call and sifting to the end of the Harvest, corresponded to the seventh year.

This class faithfully endured the testings and thus won our Lord's special favor (the king loved Esther, v. 17) far above all nominal-church denominations (above all the women) and all other consecrated classes (more than all the virgins). Accordingly, in the late Summer of 1914

Jesus accepted this class as His Bride (set the crown royal upon her head, and made her queen), and made it clear, by beginning in the World War partially to destroy, among others, the nominal church, that they were taken as such instead of the latter (instead of Vashti). A special feast of Truth—that given between Oct., 1914 and Nov., 1916—especially in the very numerous conventions and Towers of those years, was by our Lord given the leading (princes, v. 18) and other servants of the Truth (his servants). This was especially the feast of the overcomers (Esther's feast). It was especially along lines of the Little Flock (Esther's) in its relations to the Great Company. He likewise eased (made a release [literally, rest]) matters sacrificially for the Great Company and Youthful Worthies (whose Truth sections then gleaned, whereas the Little Flock then smote Jordan, etc.), both in the Truth and in the nominal church (to the provinces), and gave the public through the Photo-Drama, the newspaper, the pilgrim, the colporteur and the volunteer work many gifts of Truth, especially such as showed the signs of the times in the World War, etc. (gave gifts), and that according to His power and judgment as to each class (according to the state of the king).

In v. 19 for the first time J. appears as the second member of antitypical Mordecai in the scenes of this antitype. From about Oct., 1911 onward, shortly after the fifth harvest call ended and when the intensified public work set in, there was a gathering of very many crown-losers and Youthful Worthies into the Truth from the nominal church; among others, these are typed by Lot's and his elder daughter's leaving Sodom just before the destruction of the cities of the plain (virgins were gathered together the second time, v. 19). This gathering was from the Fall of 1911 to that of 1916. It was during this whole period, more particularly from 1914 to 1916 and most particularly during 1916, that J. came into ever-increasing prominence as

a Truth servant before the Lord and the Church (Mordecai sat in the king's gate), for during those years, next to Bro. Russell, of all the Truth servants he did the most responsible Truth work. The language of v. 19 cannot fit Bro. Russell, for all through the Harvest he had been sitting at the antitypical King's gate, place of prominence in the Lord's affairs, and not only after the Fall of 1911 (when the virgins . . . the second time, then Mordecai sat in the king's gate). As was the case with antitypical Esther in earlier periods of the Harvest (v. 10), so at the end they did not definitely claim Spirit-begettal (Esther had not yet shewed her kindred, v. 20) nor Little Flockship (nor her people), even as Bro. Russell had taught as to its uncertainty (as Mordecai had charged her); for they after the pertinent testing practiced his teaching as faithfully as before their Spirit-begettal (Esther did the commandment . . . as when she was brought up [literally, nourished]).

As a member of Bethel, where he was manager (kept the door, v. 21), E.W. Brenneisen (Bigthan [*a gift*]) developed an exceedingly autocratic spirit. So much so was this the case at Bethel that practically the whole Bethel family of 250 members stood in fear of, and trembling at him, and their spirit of fellowship and cooperation in the Lord's service was thereby much curtailed, with the result that both the Spirit and service of the Lord suffered, there, by way of repression. This in ultimate analysis was in effect displeasure with (wroth), and an attempt to do violence (sought to lay hand) to the Lord (Ahasuerus). For a number of years his course was such, with ever-increasing unrest resulting in the Bethel family. So marked an exhibition of such an autocratic spirit came, in June, 1914, at the Columbus, Ohio, Convention, under the observation of J., who for several years had known of the pertinent conditions at Bethel (the thing was known to Mordecai, v. 22), that he felt it to be the Lord's will to tell it to Bro. Russell as a representative of the Church (told

it unto Esther . . . certified . . . in Mordecai's name). This led to an investigation (inquisition was made, v. 23) and resulted, to the great relief of many Bethelites, in E.W. Brenneisen's being set aside from his office of manager at Bethel, a thing that could not be done without publicity, at least at Bethel (hanged upon a tree). G.B. Raymond (Teresh [*severe, austere*], v. 21), who was also at Bethel, where he worked in charge of certain business matters of Bro. Russell connected with the Lord's work, and who was a pilgrim, developed over a number of years a very severe way of preaching to, and denouncing the *brethren*, somewhat in the same fierce manner as Billy Sunday denounced sinners. This was, of course, no way of speaking to the Lord's prospective Bride. His course in this respect in the pilgrim work had an effect on the Church similar to that of E.W. Brenneisen's on the Bethel family, and was in the Lord's sight a displeasure with, and in effect was an attempt to do violence to, the Lord. J. knew of this condition for years, learning of it in his pilgrim work from the brethren's pertinent complaints. A marked case of such severe preaching on G.B. Raymond's part to the brethren came in Sept., 1914, at the Santa Cruz, Calif., Convention, to the attention of J., who told it to Bro. Russell as a representative of the Church. This led to an investigation, with the result that G.B. Raymond was relieved both from his position at Bethel and in the pilgrim work. Without doing anything special for J. at that time for his part in the affair, the Lord caused it to be recorded in His memory (written in . . . chronicles before the king).

Esther 3 treats typically of the Conspiracy of H.J. Shearn (Haman [*Mercury*, the messenger of the heathen gods]; Hammedatha [*given at the time*]; Agagite [*giant*, Agag being the royal title of the Amalekite kings, as Pharaoh was that of the Egyptian kings], v. 1) to gain control of the British Church, a conspiracy similar to that of J.F.R. to gain

control of the whole Church. In the Fall of 1914 the Lord (Ahasuerus), through certain arrangements of Bro. Russell, enlarged H.J. Shearn's managerial powers (did . . . promote [literally, made very great]); and, through J. Hemery's lack of aggressiveness in maintaining his place of priority among the British managers, He permissively gave the chief executive place in the British Church to H.J. Shearn as a manager (set his seat above all the princes), which in effect made him chief among the three British managers and the British pilgrims and elders who were his associates in places of power in the British Church (that were with him), in fact gave him more executive authority than any others of our Pastor's appointees anywhere else in Britain. Thus all the Lord's servants in prominent places of service as to the British Church (king's servants, that were in the king's gate, v. 2) subjected themselves (bowed) to him, and gave him obeisance (reverenced Haman); for by the Lord's permissive providence he was put into a place where this was the thing for the Truth servants to do (king had so commanded). The only exception to this course was the Laodicean Messenger, first in the person of Bro. Russell, and later in the person of J. (Mordecai bowed not, nor did him reverence). In many ways H.J. Shearn changed Bro. Russell's Bethel arrangements; but Bro. Russell refused to be subject to him in these changes, and did not show deference to him in his pertinent desires; and when J. appeared on the scene he followed Bro. Russell's example as to these revolutionisms. Some of these revolutionisms against Bro. Russell's arrangements, are listed in Vol. VII, 35, 36.

To none of these usurpations would either of the two brothers submit, nor in relation to these would give him respect on their account. Those prominent ones (the king's servants . . . in the king's gate, v. 3) who did support him therein faulted, first Bro. Russell, and later J., because of their pertinent course (said unto Mordecai, Why transgressest thou?), alleging that it was the Lord's will

(the king's commandment), whereas it was not a charge given to them, for they were not included among such prominent servants of the Lord who should so do. His partisan supporters were the ones who continually faulted the pertinent stand of the Laodicean Messenger (they spake daily unto him, v. 4). But these would not submit to their advice to agree to his usurpations (he harkened not unto them). They then encouraged H.J. Shearn to enter into combat with the two non-conforming brothers (told Haman, to see whether Mordecai's matters would stand). The Laodicean Messenger in both of its members by their acts gave his partisan supporters to understand that they belonged to the true people of God (told them that he was a Jew). Their refusal, observed by H.J. Shearn (Haman saw, v. 5), to be subject to him, or to stand in awe of him (bowed not, nor did him reverence) greatly displeased (Haman full of wrath) so autocratic a character as H.J. Shearn, to whom we will from here on refer by his initials.

H.J.S. in pride and unholy ambition despised the thought as insufficient for his ambitions that he should destroy Bro. Russell alone as to his controllership of the Bethel arrangements (thought scorn to lay hands on Mordecai alone, v. 6). Additional to this he decided that, by the introduction of a presbyterian order of church government, clericalism, he would uproot the congregational order of church government, ecclesiaism, and thus destroy the Church as to ecclesiaism, *i.e.*, as to its right by its vote to control its own affairs in the Lord. He would make a beginning of this in the London Tabernacle, then spread it throughout the British and Irish Church, and from there hoped it would become worldwide, and thus overthrow the Laodicean Messenger in his teachings on ecclesiaism by subjecting him to his own views (shewed him the people of Mordecai [the ecclesiasts] . . . destroy all the Jews . . . whole kingdom of Ahasuerus, even the people of Mordecai). For about eleven months (first . . . to the

to the twelfth month, v. 7) in elders' meetings and in the ecclesia's meetings, as well as more privately, the matter was unanswered, discussed and voted upon resultlessly (cast . . . lot before Haman), to bring this matter into a movement to abrogate Bro. Russell's Tabernacle arrangements, and to introduce a presbyterian order of church government. H.J.S.'s letter, whose pertinent parts appear in Vol. VII, 39-46, shows that the subject was first discussed in an elders' meeting, Oct. 22, 1915, and that it was thereafter, from time to time, discussed until the elders' meeting of Sept. 1, 1916, passed H.C. Thackway's resolution to discuss it in detail the afternoon and evening of Sept. 16, 1916, when the resolution of H.J.S. to dispossess our Pastor from his Tabernacle powers and lodge them in the hands of the elders was passed. Thus it was discussed about eleven months (Nisan . . . Adar).

We will not give details here, having done that in Vol. VII, Chapter I. H.J.S.'s presenting this resolution, Sept. 16, 1916, was in pantomime a request from him of the Lord to destroy the Laodicean Messenger as to his pastoral control of the London Tabernacle arrangements and the brethren as to ecclesialism (Haman said unto king Ahasuerus . . . a certain people . . . not for the king's profit to suffer them, v. 8). The resolution implied that our Pastor's Tabernacle arrangements were not Scriptural (neither keep they the king's laws), as it also implied that they were different from those of other ecclesiases, which was true in itself; for in headquarter ecclesiases our Lord desired to use His headship through Bro. Russell, His hand, eye and mouth, as free from subjection to any ecclesia, which his subjection to an ecclesia would have prevented (laws diverse from all people). Hence our Lord arranged in the headquarter churches to have Bro. Russell as His special representative control their arrangements. H.J.S. reeled off many arguments in favor of his resolution; among others, he claimed that the Lord would obtain many advantages (pay [literally, weigh]

10,000 talents of silver [\$20,000,000.00], v. 9) through the increased service of the elders (those that have the charge of the business), who would thus enrich the Lord (bring it into the king's treasuries). The elders', Sept. 16, 1916, passing the resolution was our Lord's permissively in pantomime granting H.J.S.'s request; for that resolution in view of its ultimate purpose put the elders into H.J.S.'s control (the king took his ring . . . gave it unto Haman, v. 10). Thus seemingly the enemy of the Lord's people was given power to kill them in their rights as to ecclesiaism (the Jews' enemy). The resolution so passed was the Lord's permissively giving H.J.S. the benefits of the elders' increased fruitage, as well as the Church's controllership privileges (silver . . . people . . . do . . . seemeth good to thee, v. 11); for through the resolution H.J.S. not only designed to take away the Church's rights of self-government by lodging its government in the elders, but also to secure for himself control of the elders, and thus ultimately make himself the full controller of the British Church.

There were four formal meetings of the elders after that of Sept. 16, 1916, when the resolution was passed, and before that of Oct. 20, to get the resolution and a report into a shape acceptable to all the elders, that thus all the elders might sign it, which four meetings were held Sept. 20 and 29 and Oct. 6 and 13. However, they failed of accomplishing this purpose. The resolution, finally signed by but 11 out of the 18 elders, with its report and covering letter was sent to Bro. Russell probably on Oct. 23, 1916, the earliest possible time, since the letter was written and then mailed to the London Bethel Saturday, Oct. 21, and was thus not received there until Monday, Oct. 23. Thus it was dispatched to Bro. Russell some time during the week of Oct. 22-28, 1916, quite probably Oct. 23, a month and about a week after the resolution was passed, which implies that the request was made (v. 8) about the 6th of the 12th month (were the king's scribes

called on the 13th day of the first month, v. 12). This correspondence having been sent to Bro. Russell, who as such was both the Lord's and the Church's representative, it was thus in him in reality sent to, the whole Church (written . . . Lieutenants . . . governors . . . rulers . . . every people). Since it claimed to set forth the pertinent Biblical teachings, it was written in the Lord's name (in the name of king Ahasuerus); and it was authorized by the elders' vote (sealed with the king's ring). These three writings—the resolution, the report and the covering letter—were posted to Bro. Russell, as our Lord's and the Church's representative (letters were sent by posts, v. 13), and in reality asked for the death of the Lord's people in so far as their rights to control their own matters by their free vote were concerned (destroy, kill and cause to perish, all Jews), and the destruction of Bro. Russell's controllership in the British Church; for in this way would the aim of H.J.S. go into effect, if it should succeed. This would be accomplished the day the resolution would go into effect (one day . . . 13th . . . Adar [11 months after the first month of v. 12]), and would make their rights a spoil to all supporters of its going into effect (the spoil of them for a prey). The sending of this correspondence to Bro. Russell as the Lord's and the Church's representative was a publication of it to all Truth people (writing . . . was published unto all people, v. 14), and was an exhortation (for a commandment) to them to support the fatal work (ready against that day). Fast trams and steamers hastened the correspondence to America (posts . . . hastened by the king's commandment, v. 15); and by the conspirators at the London Bethel and Tabernacle it was regarded as effective (decree was given in Shushan the palace). The Lord Jesus and H.J.S. (king and Haman) continued to appropriate the prerogatives of their offices (sat down to drink). But the Lord's people in Britain who knew were in perplexity (perplexed).

Apprised beforehand (Mordecai perceived all that was

done, Esther 4: 1) of the coming of this correspondence by J. Hemery, Bro. Russell decided toward the end of September to send J. to Britain on account of the situation there; and about 10 P.M., Oct. 21, at Dallas, Texas, he gave J. to understand that he wanted him to do something connected with the recalcitrant managers, of whom he spoke in, disapproval and anger as setting aside his arrangements and introducing their own instead. He did not give details as to what he desired him to do, declaring that he would give him these at Brooklyn between Nov. 6 and 11, when J. was to be there before he sailed for Europe. Bro. Russell did not live to see this correspondence, which he desired to see before giving J. details as to how he wished him to handle the situation. But it was given to J. by A.I. Ritchie, late in the afternoon of Nov. 8; and that night and the most of the next day he made a careful study of it, and saw through its iniquity. At this juncture and onward J. alone, and that as the second member of the Laodicean Messenger, functioned as the antitype of Mordecai. As such he began and continued for several months in great grief (cried with a loud and a bitter cry), which did violence to his graces of habitual faith, peace and joy (rent his clothes), and was for a while symbolically clothed with and in mourning (sackcloth with ashes). With much distress he mingled with the Bethel family (went into the midst of the city). When with them he concealed from the Bethelites (came even before the king's gate, v. 2) as such the reason for his distress, feeling that it would be inappropriate to show grief there (none . . . the king's gate clothed with sackcloth).

Everyone of the Lord's people everywhere, on hearing of this conspiracy, permitted by the Lord (whithersoever the king's commandment and his decree came, v. 3), was plunged into keen distress (great mourning . . . fasting, and weeping, and wailing . . . in sackcloth and ashes). J.'s distress increased with the sense of responsibility of handling the situation executively given him by his

commission. Knowing from Ps. 91: 6; Ezek. 9: 2, 5-10 (the sixth slaughter man) and several brethren's description of the situation in various European countries, just lately given him, that he was to face a sifting in Europe, J. was so weighed down that he could not make a connected speech of comfort and farewell to the Bethel family at the breakfast table just before leaving for Europe. All that he could do was to utter a few disconnected sentences at intervals. A.I. Ritchie, G.W. Seibert and A.H. MacMillan (maids and chamberlains, v. 4) told something of the situation to J.F.R. and W.E.V., who with A.I. Ritchie were the Executive Committee, and thus representatives of the Church, which thus heard of it in them (Esther's . . . her). This greatly grieved them individually and in their capacity of representing the Church (queen exceedingly grieved). Noting J.'s grief, they sought to comfort him and remove his grief (sent raiment to clothe Mordecai, and to take away his sackcloth from him), but their words failed of their purpose (he received it not). Before this correspondence arrived Sr. G.W. Seibert had gotten a letter from J. Hemery, revealing the situation to her and asking her to speak with Bro. Russell over it; but the letter reached her too late for her to speak to him about it, *i.e.*, it reached her after he had left Bethel, Oct. 16, for the last time. But she told it to A.I. Ritchie and A.H. MacMillan. This, among other things, prompted A.I. Ritchie, who had not read it yet, to put the correspondence, as a forearming of him for his British trip, into J.'s hands for study, after which he was to report on it to the Executive Committee. Then he told his fellow committee members of it, and they sent him to J. to ask him details (Then called Esther for Hatach [*verity*] . . . to know what it was, and why it was, v. 5). The night of Nov. 9 he explained to, and discussed with, the Executive Committee the situation; and, knowing that J. could not handle the situation, if he went merely as a pilgrim,

which would have made him subject to the managers, the Executive Committee told J., that they were making valid the powers that the letter of appointment, given him to obtain passports, fictitiously offered him, and decided to give him bona fide credentials actually conferring the powers that the letter of appointment had fictitiously offered, which credentials were dictated the afternoon of Nov. 10 and signed and sealed the morning of the 11th, just as J. was leaving for the steamer on which he sailed to England. Thus A.I. Ritchie's putting the correspondence into J.'s hands (Hatach went forth to Mordecai unto the street of the city, v. 6) was an asking of him to report on it to the members of the Executive Committee (before the king's gate), who as such acted therein as the representatives of the Church, antitypical Esther.

As indicated above, J. made the report, first to A.I. Ritchie (vs. 7, 8), and then through him to the rest of the Executive Committee. It was, first of the Executive Committee, the night of Nov. 9, after they had told him to handle the British situation with pertinent powers, and then of the Bethel family, at the breakfast table, Nov. 11, that J. asked for their special prayers for the Lord's grace to help him bear his burden and to prosper his endeavors on behalf of the endangered brethren (that she should go in unto the king, to make supplication . . . request before him for her people). A.I. Ritchie, as above stated, told what J. had told him to the other members of the Executive Committee (Hatach . . . told Esther the words of Mordecai, v. 9). At first timid, these two again sent A.I. Ritchie to J. with a message (Esther . . . Hatach . . . Mordecai, v. 10) to let him know that they were afraid to offer such a prayer, having misgivings of its displeasing the Lord, as asking amiss (whosoever . . . shall come . . . not called . . . death . . . except . . . may live, v. 11), and as thinking that the Lord had not showed them favor for a long period (not been called . . . thirty days). It was the fear of a sifting, of whose coming

J. had warned J.F.R. and W.E.V., that made these the first to have such fear. Hence their attitude suggested that A.I. Ritchie speak further with J., which was done, Sr. G.W. Seibert also joining in so doing (they told to Mordecai Esther's words, v. 12). Thereupon J. said that the sifting would test all, that its success would symbolically kill as to their power of voting even the faithful who were close to the Lord (Think not . . . thou shalt escape in the king's house, more than all the Jews, v. 13), that if the most shielded would not do their part (holdest thy peace, v. 14), they and theirs would lose their privileges as to ecclesiaism (thou and thy father's house shah be destroyed), and that the Lord would raise up others to do the work of enlarging and rescuing His people (enlargement and deliverance . . . from another place). He raised the question as to whether the Executive Committee and the Board, whom it represented, yea, all of them being representatives of the Church, were not given their present position as representatives of the Church for the very purpose of praying and laboring for this deliverance (art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?). J. and the three members of the Executive Committee during their discussion of the situation the night of Nov. 9 were the main actors in the antitypes of vs. 6-14.

Several times during the day of Nov. 9 J. met the three members of the Executive Committee individually and all of them individually asked him, in addition to pilgrim work, to investigate the business and affairs of the Society, call for the reports from the Society's managers at the branch offices visited and make reports on the secular and religious aspects of the work. No express mention was during the day made as to J.'s having powers of attorney. That night (God's time, Nov. 10), after J. had made his report on the above-mentioned correspondence to the Executive Committee, after they saw that with mere pilgrim investigating and reporting powers he could not handle the situation at

the London Bethel and Tabernacle, since these would still leave him a subordinate of the three British managers, and after the Committee told him to handle it, he asked each one of them separately, but in one another's presence, whether they intended that he should use all the powers that the letter of appointment fictitiously offered him, and each one of the three answered, yes. No mention was made of any exceptions in the powers. None of them was mentioned specifically. They were, therefore, all included in both the questions and the answers. J. knew that that night all were meant, especially that on his exercising powers of attorney, because only with such powers could he handle the Tabernacle conditions, and it was these that they expressly commissioned him to handle. J.F.R.'s self-serving claim, made after 3½ months of his hearty cooperation with J.'s exercising such powers, that his powers were fictitious, have been sufficiently refuted in Vol. VI, Chapter I.

The Committee ordered J.F.R. to prepare pertinent credentials, which were dictated by J.F.R. the afternoon of Nov. 10 in J.'s presence and signed and sealed the morning of Nov. 11. Please note that the acts involved in the giving of these powers, from the out start of the acts of giving them, during the daytime of Nov. 9, until the completion of their giving in the acts of signing and sealing the credentials that stated the conferring of them, stretched over a period of three days, Nov. 9-11. These are the three days of antitypical fasting on the part of all concerned at the headquarters (all . . . in Shushan, v. 16)—the seven Board members, who acted as representatives of the Church, the Committee itself, the manager and assistant manager, all as representatives of the Board and the Church (Esther, v. 15) and J. It was a symbolic fast for them, inasmuch as the Board and the Executive Committee as their agent denied themselves the use of such of their powers as they conferred on J.; it was a symbolic fast for J., because the acceptance of the pertinent

commission involved much self-denial for him; and it was a symbolic fast for A.H. MacMillan, as manager, R.J. Martin, as assistant manager, and the brother in charge of the pilgrim department, all of whom surrendered some of their prerogatives to J. for his mission (fast ye . . . I also and my maidens will fast). After giving up such prerogatives on the part of antitypical Esther and J. and those cooperating with him in his involved sacrifice (Jews . . . in Shushan), the involved brethren, one and all: as representatives of antitypical Esther, were in spirit prepared to appear before the Lord in intercession on behalf of the endangered brethren (so will I go in unto the king). This would be done regardless of failure or of success in the attempt (if I perish, I perish). Thus all concerned, including, among others, J. (Mordecai . . . did, v. 17), accepted the proposed self-denials according to the suggestion of the Executive Committee, as representatives of the Church (Esther) and the Board, which, as representatives of the Church, acted therein through its agent, the Executive Committee.

It has above been shown that the three days of the antitypical fasting were Nov. 9, 10, 11, 1916. But the facts of the fulfilment prove that the third day was enlarged from the 24-hour days of Nov. 9 and 10 to a day lasting from Nov. 11 to about Dec. 10 (on the third day, 5: 1). This, on its face, seems strange; yet the facts of the fulfilment, as will be presented, demonstrate this to be true. As we saw, from the case of Bro. Russell and that of the Executive Committee in their executive capacities, that representatives of the Church are in Esther 2: 22 (Bro. Russell) and 4: 4, 5, 8-17 (the Executive Committee) set forth as antitypical Esther, so as soon as J. accepted executive authority (Esther put on her royal apparel) for his European work according to his credentials given him Nov. 11, he in such executive capacity acted representatively for the Church, *i.e.*, in the pertinent events the Church acted in him and thus in this capacity he stood at

times as the antitype of Esther. This is the case in Esther 5 and 6. It might here be remarked that Esther's putting on her royal apparel on the third day proves that on Nov. 11 J.'s credentials were bonafide, and were so recognized by him; and Esther's maids assisting her to dress, represent the individual members of the Executive Committee treating his powers as bonafide Nov. 11, 1916. So empowered, J. entered into closer contact with the Lord Jesus than hitherto (stood in the inner court) as to His Church (of the king's house), directly in matters pertaining to the Church (over against the king's house). Our Lord was then administering the affairs of His Kingdom in Divine authority (sat . . . throne in the royal house) in a public manner (gate of the house). This scene started Nov. 11, immediately on J.'s leaving the Tabernacle, as soon as W.E.V. as secretary signed and sealed the credentials, A.I. Ritchie having signed them as vice-president, just before J. left Bethel to go to the Tabernacle for the secretary to sign and seal them. From that time onward until J. arrived at the London Bethel the night of Nov. 19, 1916, J. was in constant meditation and prayer over the situation created by the elders' resolution, etc. (stood). This activity of J., as the Church's representative, was noted by our Lord (king saw Esther the queen standing in the court, v. 2), and as such he was favorably regarded by the Lord (obtained favor in his sight). Accordingly, the Lord graciously extended His right to rule, which was in His power, toward J. as the Church's representative (king held out to Esther . . . sceptre . . . hand). J. as such, recognizing the Lord's favor, approached closer to the Lord in faith in, and submission toward our Lord's right and power to rule (Esther drew near, and touched the top of the sceptre). By the Word, as applicable to the situation, the Lord raised in J.'s mind, as the Church's representative, the questions as to what his concern and petition were (said . . . What wilt thou? [literally, What to thee?]

*i.e., What is giving you concern?] . . . what is thy request? [literally, what do you seek for yourself?], v. 3).* Through the Word the Lord Jesus assured J. as the Church's representative that for the Church as the Lord's joint-heir he might have her share as the Lord's partner in the Lord's bounty at request (given . . . half of the kingdom). As the Church's representative J. requested that our Lord and H.J.S. might during the enlarged third day partake together in a discussion of the principles applicable to the case as these would be presented by J. as the Church's representative (let the king and Haman come this day unto the banquet [literally, the drinking] that I have prepared for him, v. 4). By His providences connected with the correspondence coming into J.'s hands, as shown in Vol. IV, Chap. III, 184-189, particularly by its coming into J.'s hands in London, our Lord brought it about that He ordered H.J.S. to attend this symbolic feast of wine, which was a literal discussion of the principles underlying the matters treated of in the correspondence (Cause Haman . . . do as Esther hath said: v. 5). H.J.S. put his side of the correspondence into J.'s hands, to secure from him as the Society's special representative the sanctioning of his plan to introduce a presbyterian order of church government, a plan to secure for the elders "the control of all its [the ecclesia's] services and activities," as against the congregational order of church government, while J. Hemery put his side of the correspondence into J.'s hands as the Society's special representative, to secure from him the defeat of H.J.S.'s plan, both doing this on Nov. 23.

Beginning Nov. 23, this discussion between our Lord, acting through J. as His mouth, and H.J.S. continued until into the night of Nov. 28 (29, God's time). During these seven days which were still a part of the third symbolic day, the discussion went on, usually at H.J.S.'s and J.'s 9 P.M. dinners, but also in the managers' meeting of Nov. 25 (king and Haman . . . banquet). As J. spoke to H.J.S.

he found himself in a wholly different attitude of mind from that in which he was while listening to H.J.S. During the former times he found himself to be affable and trustful toward H.J.S., but as soon as he ceased speaking, and H.J.S. began and continued to speak, he became very suspicious of him, watching his every word, intonation, facial expression and gestures. In the former attitude he was acting as Jesus' mouth; in the latter attitude he was acting as the representative of the Church. Thus in these conversations and discussions our Lord was present and spoke to H.J.S. by J. as His mouth, and the Church was present, but silent in J. as its representative. Before coming to understand the antitype of this scene J. often wondered how he could pass so quickly from one into the other of these two mental attitudes toward the same person; yea, more than once he chided himself that he could have been so affable and trustful toward H.J.S. one second and the next second become so deeply distrustful and suspicious of him. Only after he came to see the double uses that the Lord was making of him in the antitype of "the drinking" scene could he see that there was no hypocrisy in his course. H.J. S. is by heredity very crafty. He has what physiognomists call a fox-face. J. noted this at his first look at his face on meeting him at the London station where he and several other Bethelites came to meet and greet him on his arrival at London from America. While the New Creature can overcome such an inherited handicap, H.J.S. was in his double-mindedness living in this quality. J., who naturally is trustful and unsuspicious, never could have check-mated this man in his craftiness at every turn, as he did, had not the Lord taken him in his craftiness through J.

Again, and that during this first symbolic wine-banquet (at the banquet of wine, v. 6), the lord Jesus raised the question in the mind of J., as the Church's representative (king said unto Esther), as to what her petition and request were, assuring her of a favorable response to

both (What . . . ? . . . granted . . . what . . . ? . . . performed). J. as the Church's representative did not yet know what to ask, for the conditions had not yet sufficiently clarified before his mind as the Church's representative as to just what should be requested. Accordingly, he as such asked (my petition and my request, v. 7) for a delay and a further discussion of the subject (king and Haman come to the banquet, v. 8), promising at the second discussion to tell her petition and request, as the king asked (I will do tomorrow as the king hath said). During the first discussion the Lord Jesus, speaking through J., gave not the slightest hint to H.J.S. as to His decision on the subject, nor was J. as the Church's representative able to do this, on account of his uncertainty, as just indicated. As a result, H.J.S. by Nov. 29, after on Nov. 28 at J.'s request he acted as his chairman at J.'s two Croydon meetings, was very happy in the thought that all was well with him, and that his plan would succeed (Then went Haman forth . . . with a glad heart, v. 9). He felt sure of having the Lord's and the Church's [in J.] favor, despite J.'s disapproving Nov., 28, H.J.S.'s convention program, and charged him to revise it as J. indicated; but on Dec. 2, before leaving Bethel for his Forest Gate appointment, J. as the Society's special representative (in the king's gate) told H.J.S. that he could not yield sanction to his plan, as it was presbyterianism and clericalism, and as the Truth view of church government was ecclesiaism, *i.e.*, the congregational form of church government. Thus in this chief matter J. refused to submit to H.J.S.'s arrangements, which H.J.S. noted (Haman saw Mordecai . . . stood not up, nor moved for him). Despite H.J.S.'s reasons for his plan, J. would not in the least submit to him therein. Thereupon he ceased arguing, but J. plainly perceived that he was both disappointed and displeased (full of indignation against Mordecai). Despite his disappointment and displeasure, he forcibly controlled himself externally

(refrained [literally, forced] himself, v. 10). Returning to his habitual state of heart and mind (came home), he assembled his friends and his special helpers (friends, and Zeresh [*golden*] his wife).

To these he declared his honorable abundance of official powers (glory of his riches, v. 11), his many influential like-minded elder supporters (multitude of his children) and the promotions that the Lord had given him (promoted him) and how the Lord had advanced him to the chief position among His leaders and servants (advanced him above the princes and servants of the king). Then he boasted that the Church in J. had not honored anyone else to come with the Lord to a discussion of the matters of the Tabernacle (the queen let no man come in with the king unto the banquet . . . but myself, v. 12). He also boasted that further discussions on the subject would be had by the Lord and him alone, at the invitation of the Church acting in J. representatively (tomorrow am I invited unto her also with the king). Then he told them that he got no real benefit from these things as long as he saw J. as the Society's special representative in a prominent position in the Lord's service (all this availeth me nothing . . . I see Mordecai . . . at the king's gate, v. 13). Thereupon his special helpers (Zeresh his wife, v. 14) and trusted supporters (friends) advised him to collect pertinent facts on J.'s alleged evil deeds. (let a gallows be made), deeds surely proving him to be an unclean Great Company member (50 cubits high [50 is a multiple of 10, the number of natures lower than the Divine nature, and 5, as a fraction of 10, implies an unclean member of a nature lower than the Divine nature, *i.e.*, here an unclean Great Company member]), and before the second period of discussion would begin (tomorrow [literally, in the morning]) secure from the Lord permission that J. be publicly set forth as an evil-doer (Mordecai may be hanged thereon [literally, that they hang Mordecai thereon]). J.'s alleged evil deeds so far

committed were his disapproving of H.J.S.'s Manchester Convention program, his revising it in harmony with Bro. Russell's arrangements and his refusing to bend in submission to H.J.S.'s presbyterianizing plan. The advice given H.J.S. struck him as just the thing to do. So with these three materials he began to construct his gallows and added to them from time to time other acts of J. that disapproved of his revolutionism, summing them up in the long self-justifying letter that was in large part quoted in Vol. VII, Chap. I (caused the gallows to be made). They assured him that after getting the permission to prove J. guilty of wrong-doing, he could merrily join the king in feasting (king unto the banquet).

Next Esther 6 will engage our attention. Our Lord's ceaseless activities (could not the king sleep [literally, the king's sleep fled], v. 1) enter into every nook and corner of His office functions, and one of these is keeping in memory the various events of His reign (book of records . . . read before the king). At this time, *i.e.*, between Dec. 3 and 11 (that night). He recalled J.'s warning as to E.W. Brenneisen's autocratic, and G.B. Raymond's severe treatment of the brethren as an attempt against our Lord (Mordecai had told of . . . keepers of the door . . . to lay hand on the king, v. 2). No reward (honor and dignity, v. 3) had been given J. for this act (done to Mordecai). Doubtless it was the spirit-being angels who dealt with our Lord in the matters of vs. 1-4, typed by those who read to the king, of whom the king asked the questions of vs. 3, 4, and who, as the servants of vs. 3, 4, answered the king's questions. It will be recalled that it was on Dec. 2 that J. announced to H. J S. his disapproval of his plan to presbyterianize the Church. Thereafter came the latter's boasting, his charge against J. and the conspiracy with some of his main and subordinate supporters to have J. proven to be an evil-doer. The first part of the symbolic gallows that H.J.S. erected was his position taken in his letter of Dec. 11

to J., declining to revise the Manchester Convention program as J. had asked. This refusal was in effect: (1) a denial of J.'s executive authority and (2) a charge against J. of usurpation of authority; for if he had not had the pertinent authority, it would have been a usurpation on his part to require the managers to revise that program as J. had asked. The writing, sending and journey of this letter, Dec. 11-14, therefore, was a going to our Lord with a charge of usurpation against J. and a request openly to prove his charge. It was during these three days that H.J.S. waited for the Lord, to see Him on his plan to have J. proven an evil-doer (court of the king's house, to speak . . . hang Mordecai on the gallows, v. 4).

J. received this letter Dec. 14, and most carefully and prayerfully considered it until the morning of Dec. 19, when he saw clearly that he must, if he would maintain his duty as executive, insist on the program's being revised as he had asked. While J. was, Dec. 14-19, considering and praying over this letter, the scene of vs. 4-9 was antityped, and that in pantomime, of course. The situation created by H.J.S.'s course as to the Manchester Convention program was this: H.J.S. thereby made a bid to secure the chief executive authority in the British field as against that of J. His course therein was a going to our Lord with the request that meant an attempted proof of J.'s unfitness for that authority. When that letter reached J., and he began to meditate and pray over it, our Lord stepped upon the scene to decide as between the two on this question. His first step was to inquire as to who was in waiting to ask a petition of Him (Who is in the court?). The angels (king's servants) declared that H.J.S. was so waiting; for he was longing to get from the Lord the power to set J. aside, not only as a public evil-doer, but also as one unfit to have executive charge of the British general work. Thus the situation was an open one, which H.J.S. desired would result in his getting chief executive authority in the work

in general and in the Manchester Convention in particular. The Lord, ready to honor J. in an exemplary way at this time, caused the situation to suggest to H.J.S.'s mind the question, What honors should he have whom it is the delight of the Lord to honor? (What shall be done unto the man whom the king delighteth to honor? v. 6). As this question came providentially to H.J.S.'s mind repeatedly, as these circumstances continued to suggest it, H.J.S. held the thought, as desirable (thought in his heart), that he had been the one chiefly using executive authority in Britain, and that, therefore, he was undoubtedly the one whom it was the Lord's delight to honor especially (whom . . . honor more than to myself?). His heart's and his act as to the convention program, not likely his mouth, answered this question (answered the king, v. 7). The answer was: that the Lord's authority (royal apparel, v. 8) which He exercised in the British Church, the teaching (horse) as to that authority (the king rideth) and the evidence of that authority (crown) be put into the power of one of the chief leaders of the British Church (delivered to the hand . . . king's most noble princes, v. 9), and that His servants (they) may impart as the Lord's agents these powers executively (array the man) and publicly support him upon this teaching (bring him on horseback . . . street of the city) and proclaim that so the Lord will continue to do to the one whom He delights to honor (done . . . whom the king delighteth to honor). H.J.S.'s striving to control the Manchester Convention program and his reasonings and desires thereon meant that all this be done to him.

In every encounter that J. had with H.J.S. the latter created such situations as put him firmly into a trap; and here we have a marked example of this. The Lord turned the tables about from what H.J.S. had expected, and required of him that he be the one to minister these very honors to J. at the Lord's command (haste, and take the apparel and the horse . . . do so to Mordecai . . . let

nothing fail, v. 10). It happened in this way: The principles of the Word requiring J., to accept H.J.S.'s challenge of his executive authority in the British Church, by his course of attempted disregard of J.'s revisions of the convention program, declared in his letter of Dec. 11, J., as shown above, at the Lord's direction, forced him to revise the program as he had asked and then gave it to him to carry out as revised. In Chap. III the facts connected with this program matter were given in considerable detail, so they will not be repeated here. It will here suffice to say that J., in a managers' meeting called by him, Dec. 20, unchangeably insisted on the program's being revised as he had charged. Then, as a reprimand to H.J.S., he took the revision of the program and its carrying out from him, and gave these to J. Hemery to do; but when, on the night of Dec. 22, H.J.S. made an half-apology for his course, as a sign of forgiveness J. gave it to him to carry out, and required of all three managers that they cooperate in J.'s solution of the situation. In this matter the Lord acted through J. as His eye, hand and mouth. Thus the three managers were required to accept J. as the Lord's authorized executive (that they may array the man withal); and H.J.S. had to go before him publicly, before and during the convention, proclaiming by act the teaching (horse) that the Lord was pleased to give J. His delegated executive authority (royal apparel), with the sign of their validity (crown) in his credentials, read on the occasion to the managers. Thus was fulfilled v. 11 in detail. But, as we may conclude from Haman's course as described in v. 12 that he did it with ill grace, so H.J.S. performed his part with ill grace and a murmuring heart. It hurt him to see J. given by the managers and the conventioners the attention that was a result of the proclamation.

After the convention, where J. was received and treated with the respect that the Society's (Lord's) special representative should have, and that in view of the antitypical

proclamation of him as such representative, J. went about his pilgrim work as, before (Mordecai came again to the king's gate, v. 12), until he came again to Bethel, Jan. 8, 1917. But H.J.S. left the convention for his position, office (hasted to his house), much crestfallen, deeply hurt and full of sadness (mourning), wearing the emblems of defeat, a defeated and an ashamed spirit (having his head covered). Burning with chagrin, shame and resentment, he told his chief supporters (Zeresh his wife, v. 13) and his subordinate supporters (all his friends) all the pertinent events, and that with untruthful details. His counselors (wise men) and his main supporters (Zeresh his wife) recognized in these events the Lord's providence as indicating the eventual defeat of H.J.S. in his encounters with J. (Mordecai . . . before whom thou hast begun to fall . . . not prevail against him, but shalt surely fall before him). H.J.S. arrived in London Jan. 2 from the Manchester Convention, and the scene of his telling his supporters of his recent experiences and their making the unfavorable forecast occurred some time between Tuesday afternoon, Jan. 2, and Saturday night, Jan. 6; for he received word during that time that he was wanted at the business meeting of the London Tabernacle to be held Sunday afternoon, Jan. 7 (while . . . talking with him . . . chamberlains . . . bring Haman unto the banquet that Esther had prepared, v. 14).

To this symbolic drinking our Lord and H.J.S. came (king and Haman came to banquet with Esther, 7: 1). While Pastor Russell's passing beyond the vail had somewhat altered the externals of H.J.S.'s conspiracy, its heart remained, *i.e.*, presbyterianizing the British Church. And the banquet of the second symbolic day finds its antitype in how this matter was discussed and acted upon from Jan. 7 to Jan. 28, 1917, inclusive. J.'s previous investigations and experience as to the London Bethel and Tabernacle matters convinced him that a fell attempt had been begun

to presbyterianize the British Church. Therefore when on Dec. 24, 1916, as the Society's special representative, he addressed the Tabernacle congregation, he stressed ecclesiaism as the proper form of church government, as against presbyterianism, exhorting the brethren as a church to hold in their own hands the controllership of all the church's activities and business, and not to delegate this control to the board of elders or to anyone else. J. did not then expose the conspiracy, of which the ecclesia was not yet aware, but the points that he made were by both sets of elders, the 11 who shared in the conspiracy and the 7 who opposed it, recognized as opposed in principle to the conspiracy's resolution. The contents of this address moved H.C. Thackway, who was one of the seven non-signatory elders, to prepare a set of resolutions calculated to destroy before the church the presbyterianizing of its form of government. He desired to confer with J. on these resolutions, but the latter declined to discuss them, because he had put himself under the same restriction as that under which he had put the entire Bethel family after his address of Dec. 24, *i.e.*, in no way to seek to influence the ecclesia's election, apart from each Bethelite's vote. In other words, so far as the Bethel family was concerned, it was to do no campaigning or electioneering, in order that the ecclesia might be left entirely to its own free volition to conduct its election along congregational lines, without any Bethelites' influencing it one way or another. Therefore J. told H.C. Thackway to use his own free judgment on anything that he desired to present or leave unpresented to the ecclesia at its business meeting on Jan. 7. Had H.J. Shearn kept the above-mentioned charge given the Bethelites, his course in the matter, so far as J. was concerned, would not have been brought before the ecclesia. But during the discussion of the aforesaid resolutions, in which there was made a slight exposure of the conspiracy, H.J.S. began to defend himself before the ecclesia, without,

however, divulging his part in the conspiracy. This moved J. to warn him, the night of Jan. 8, that if his pertinent course became known his influence would be destroyed in the British Church. Thereupon J. cautioned him against any further attempt at self-justification and at influencing the election.

The aforesaid resolutions were passed on Jan. 7, and on Jan. 14 the nomination of elders and deacons occurred, and the election was set for Jan. 21. H.J.S.'s course of Jan. 7, in disregard of J.'s restriction on Bethelites' attempting to influence the election apart from their individual votes, made J. fear, after he had received on Jan. 13 H.J.S.'s long letter, reproduced in part in Vol. VII, Chap. I, that he would attempt it again. Therefore he wrote to J. Hemery, asking him, in case H.J.S. would attempt it, to, tell the church, as J.'s mouthpiece, of the details of the conspiracy and of J.'s disapproval of it. On Jan. 21, before the election, H.J.S. again before the church sought to justify himself. Thereupon, as charged by J., J. Hemery told a little—too little to clarify matters—of the course of H.J.S. (and W. Crawford) as to the conspiracy, and announced to the church that J. as the *Society's commissioner* disapproved of this conspiracy. This led to a motion to postpone voting on H.J.S. (and W. Crawford) for eldership until J. had been heard from; and J. was by resolution requested to be at the business meeting of the ecclesia on Jan. 28, and as the Society's commissioner to give his view of the matter. Accordingly, J. addressed the ecclesia on the situation, and while addressing it he learned, through a series of questions, that H.J.S., by quoting an incomplete part of a statement from a letter of Bro. Russell, had deceived 9 of the 11 signatory elders into believing that our Pastor desired to be relieved of his pastoral control of the activities and business of the London Tabernacle, whereas the next sentence, which H.J.S. withheld from the elders, showed that unless the ecclesia would relieve the Society of all its

financial obligations as to the Tabernacle, *e.g.*, the mortgage, he would continue to control its affairs, the connection showing that he had been asked to give up that control. His answer showed under what conditions he was willing so to do. He further told the managers to find out whether the ecclesia desired to assume all the financial obligations; and, if so, he was willing to place in its control all its activities and business; if not, he would continue to control these. The parts of the letter that stated these conditions H.J.S. concealed from the elders, under the plea that they were confidential. Thus he deliberately deceived the elders on the real situation. Under the impression that J. Hemery had the previous Sunday, Jan. 21, told the detailed facts of the conspiracy, J., on discovering this deception, proved publicly before the meeting that H.J.S. was a deliberate deceiver of 9 of the signatory elders, and thus a gross evil-doer, and gave him before the church one of the severest rebukes that he has ever administered to any Levite. The above facts are the antitypes of the facts of Esther 7: 1-10, which antitypical facts will now be connectedly set forth as the antitypes of those of vs. 1-10.

As said above, the discussions and acts as to the London Tabernacle election and its related matters from Jan. 7 to Jan. 28 are the antitype of the banquet scene of vs. 1-10. In the second banquet J. is no longer alone, as in the first banquet, used to represent the Church (Esther, the queen, v. 1), but others also are joined to him in this representative capacity. The first of these others was H.C. Thackway, with his resolution acts of Jan.' 7. Then the other six non-signatory elders, particularly J. Hemery, then increasing numbers of the ecclesia's membership, until by Jan. 28, at the end of J.'s address, the vast bulk of the ecclesia, some being yet in doubt, not knowing as yet the full essential facts, which J. had supposed they had heard from J. Hemery on Jan. 21. All of these who joined in condemning H.J.S. also acted therein as representatives

of the whole Church everywhere. Our Lord through the events, beginning Jan. 7, asked the Church (second day, v. 2) again, in its representatives (said again unto Esther), what things she desired (petition . . . request), assuring her that as His joint-heir they would be granted her (performed . . . half of the kingdom). The actual petition was preceded by a tactful introduction (found favor . . . please the king, v. 3). Then it was expressed in H.C. Thackway's resolutions, which in effect asked as her petition (petition) that the Church's life as to controlling, by her vote, her affairs be granted, and that the same right, as the life of the Truth people, *i.e.*, to control in her affairs, everywhere may be granted, as her request (request). Then the exposure of the conspiracy followed. This had its first beginnings in the discussions on the above-mentioned resolutions, Jan. 7, a larger expression by the exposure through J. Hemery's address on Jan. 21, as expressing J.'s opinion on the conspiracy, and its blunt and forceful exposure through J.'s address on Jan. 28 (sold, I and my people . . . to perish, v. 4). It was said that if a measure of power to have a voice in the control of the Church by her vote had been left her, she would not have brought out the matter (sold for bondmen and bondwomen, I had held my tongue), even though the evil-doer could not prevent some injury to come to the Lord's cause (enemy . . . king's damage).

The discussion on H.C. Thackway's resolution, Jan. 7, was by the Lord manipulated in a way to raise faintly the question in the minds of some of the brethren of the ecclesia as to who sponsored the movement that would have killed the Church and others of the Lord's people as to their right to control by their vote their church matters. This question was raised more clearly through J. Hemery's above-mentioned address as J.'s representative, Jan. 21, and was most clearly raised in the minds of all the ecclesia by J.'s address, Jan. 28 (king . . . said . . . Who is he, and where . . . presume [literally, whose heart

filled him] . . . to do so? v. 5). With increasing clearness, beginning Jan. 7, proceeding through Jan. 21 and culminating Jan. 28, the informed brethren, as representatives of the Church (Esther said, v. 6), pointed out H.J.S. as the guilty one, whose guilt as an opponent, ill-wisher and evil-doer was increasingly brought out between Jan. 7 and 28 (adversary and enemy is this wicked Haman). Fear before the Lord and the Church seized on H.J.S. on his exposure's coming out faintly, on Jan. 7, increasingly, on Jan. 21 and culminatively, on Jan. 28 (Haman was afraid before the king and the queen). At each stage of H.J.S.'s fear, the Lord withdrew Himself from the discussion in displeasure with him (king . . . banquet of wine in his wrath, v. 7) and occupied Himself with other features of the work (garden). Thus the subject was by the Lord dropped from Jan. 7 until Jan. 21, and then was again dropped until Jan. 28. In the meantime H.J.S. made a faint plea for himself with the Church on Jan. 7, and came out more clearly in self-defense as a plea for his standing to the Church on Jan. 21 (stood up . . . for his life to Esther . . . evil determined . . . by the king). This moved J. Hemery, at J.'s direction for such a contingency, to make the statement above-mentioned, which was a return to the scene by the Lord (king returned . . . place of the banquet of wine, v. 8). H.J.S.'s self-defense was in reality the offering of an insult to the Church in their representatives who accused him, for it implied broadly that the views of his accusers were false (Haman was fallen upon the bed whereon Esther was). The returned Lord (king returned) was made most indignant at this impudent self-defense of H.J.S., who should have heartily pleaded guilty and humbly asked for mercy, instead of making a defense, which was actually an attack upon the Church in her representatives, an aspersion upon her honor. This indignation was, first, expressed by a resolution, passed Jan. 21, asking J. to appear on Jan. 28 as the

Society's special representative, and as such give on the situation his thought, which J. Hemery had in his statement assured the ecclesia was an adverse one; and it was, secondly, expressed by J.'s making that appearance as an accuser of H.J.S. (Will he force the queen also before me in the house?). The passing of that resolution, Jan. 21, and J.'s appearance before the ecclesia, Jan. 28, were the Lord's sentence on H.J.S. (word . . . covered Haman's face).

J. studied H.J.S.'s self-defensive and deceitful letter to him, of Jan. 11, received Jan. 13, at Glasgow, Scotland. It was while J. (Harbonah [*ass-driver*, i.e., doctrine-teacher], v. 9), one of our Lord Jesus' servants (chamberlains), was preparing to address the ecclesia, Jan. 28 [In some way this event was mistakenly dated Jan. 21 in Vol. VII, 42. J. was about 300 miles away from London, at S. Shields, England, on Jan. 21, and was at London on Jan. 28, the proper date for this event], that he discovered, by a comparison of a part of a quotation in H.J.S.'s letter of Jan. 11 to J. with part of a smaller section of that quotation in the report that the elders wrote to Bro. Russell accompanying the conspiracy resolution, that H.J.S. had made an incomplete quotation of a part of a letter of Bro. Russell, of Oct., 22, 1915, to his fellow elders. H.J.S.'s letter of Jan. 11, quoted in large part in Vol. VII, 39-46, was a part of his theory of the Tabernacle situation—his theory being the symbolic gallows on which he desired to prove J. a public wrong-doer. J.'s noting the above-mentioned difference in the two quotations a few hours before he addressed the Tabernacle congregation the afternoon of Jan. 28 was the antitype of Harbonah's stating before the king that Haman had prepared a gallows on which to hang Mordecai and that this gallows was in Haman's house (v. 9). Immediately the thought arose in J.'s mind, Was it by this incomplete quotation that H.J.S. made the elders think that Bro. Russell wanted to surrender his control of Tabernacle arrangements? He decided to

find this out at the afternoon's meeting by inquiring of the elders: (1) whether that incomplete part of the quotation had convinced them that Bro. Russell wanted the change; (2) whether they knew that the rest of the quotation as it was given J. in H.J.S.'s letter to him, of Jan. 11, immediately followed what H.J.S. had read to them; and (3) whether they would have believed that Bro. Russell was by the full quotation expressing a desire to be relieved from control of the Tabernacle arrangements. When J. appeared before the ecclesia, after a few introductory remarks, he put these three questions to the seven signatory elders present (two having already left the church to form a new church; and, of course, J. did not ask them of H.J.S. and W. Crawford), reading the full quotation after asking the second question and before it was answered. To the first all seven answered, Yes; to the second all seven answered, No; and to the third all seven answered, No.

By the series of the above-mentioned acts, beginning just after the discovery of the discrepancy between the two quotations, proceeding through the drawing up of the three questions and ending with the answer to the third question, our Lord charged J. to prove publicly before the assembly of perhaps from 700 to 800 brethren, H.J.S. to be a gross wrong-doer: (1) in seeking to presbyterianize the church; (2) in deceiving nine of the ten elders (W. Crawford, the 10th, was not deceived; he was privy to the deception) into believing that Bro. Russell favored ridding himself of the control of the Tabernacle arrangements, as a step precedent to the presbyterianizing of the church and (3) in trying to justify his course (the king said, Hang him thereon). Backed by the knowledge, of H.J.S.'s Bethel and Tabernacle wrong-doings, J. was filled with righteous indignation at the discovery of his trickery against the elders; and he proceeded publicly and very severely, but tersely to prove H.J.S. a willful wrong-doer in the above

three respects. The symbolic hanging was most unceremonious; but it was complete; and it was done on his theory of the situation, which he had prepared to prove publicly J. to be a wrong-doer (hanged Haman on the gallows that he had prepared for Mordecai, v. 10). Not having sufficient knowledge on the matter, some in the audience showed marked disapproval of J.'s course that afternoon; and some others, though recognizing that H.J.S. had been guilty of wrong-doing, feared that he had been too severely dealt with; but the bulk of the audience saw enough of the nature of the wrong-doing to give hearty approval to J.'s course that afternoon. J., however, knew that he had the Lord's approval in what he had done; and v. 10 shows that his course satisfied the Lord, and that the punishment inflicted by J. upon H.J.S. that afternoon satisfied our Lord's sense of justice (king's wrath pacified).

H.J.S.'s public exposure was not the end of the fight. There were other but less sharp battles to follow. But the events of Jan. 28 ended in our Lord's putting the whole movement of H.J.S. into the Church's control (that day . . . Ahasuerus give the house of Haman . . . unto Esther, 8: 1). The bulk of the Church that day owned its oneness with J. in Christ (Esther had told what he was unto her). This gave J. a still more favored standing with our Lord (Mordecai came before the king), who gave him in the Church's support the proof of his having chief charge in the Lord's work, as our Lord's special representative (king took off his ring . . . taken from Haman, and gave it unto Mordecai, v. 2). Moreover, the Church in its London Tabernacle representatives put J. ahead of the signatory elders (Esther set Mordecai over the house of Haman). But there yet remained the work of destroying the whole clericalistic movement in the Church; and this work the faithful set themselves to do by entreating the Lord to put an end to H.J.S.'s clericalistic movement against the Church's right to rule under the Lord in her midst (Esther spake . . . king

. . . at his feet, and besought him . . . put away the mischief of Haman . . . against the Jews, v. 3). To this petition the Lord Jesus showed the favor of His power (king held out the golden sceptre toward Esther, v. 4). Thus encouraged, the Church appeared before the Lord for the matter at hand (arose, and stood before the king). With expressions of her desire to be favored by the Lord (please the king . . . found favor . . . right before the king . . . pleasing in his eyes, v. 5), the Church asked that the subject be disposed of by reversing the permission gotten by H.J. S: to take away the right of the Lord's people to rule under the Lord by vote in her midst (reverse the letters . . . wrote to destroy the Jews); for she could not endure seeing these rights abolished from the consecrated, especially from the Little Flock (endure . . . evil . . . my people . . . destruction of my kindred, v. 6). This petition came from the hearts of the brethren after H.J.S., following J.'s proving him a wrong-doer, asked the Church that afternoon to disregard J., "this stranger in our midst." Instead of following H.J.S.'s advice, the Church, encouraged by the Lord's Word and providence, secured from the Lord the power of prescribing ways and means to overthrow H.J.S.'s scheme.

Accordingly, the Lord's providences, pointing back to the work already done (king said . . . have given Esther the house of Haman, and him . . . upon the gallows, because he laid his hand upon the Jews, v. 7), indicated that the Church and J. by the Lord's authority institute decrees that would unchangeably empower His people to defend their right to control their affairs by their free vote (Write ye . . . as it liketh you, in the king's name, and seal it with the king's ring . . . which . . . no man may reverse, v. 8). Accordingly, suitable motions, at J.'s suggestions, were passed, the voting on H.J.S. and W. Crawford as elders was delayed, and word was sent to the churches by these motions [for many members of many churches were present at this

meeting who acted as messengers therein] for the brethren to stand for their involved rights (were the king's scribes called . . . was written . . . all that Mordecai commanded . . . according to their language, v. 9). This news was carried by letter and word of mouth (v. 10), informing the brethren everywhere that the Lord had granted them the right to stand refutatively for ecclesiaism as against clericalism (king granted the Jews . . . to gather . . . stand for their life . . . to slay . . . all . . . that would assault them . . . the spoil of them for a prey, v. 11). This they should do at their elections (one day . . . 13th. . . . of Adar, v. 12). The statement of this permission for their elections was circulated (commandment . . . was published, v. 13) in every church in Britain by word of mouth or letter (posts . . . hastened . . . by the king's commandment, v. 14). Thus the happenings at the Tabernacle business meeting of Jan. 28 were made an example for all churches (decree was given at Shushan the palace). At the end of the service that night, after J.'s credentials were read to the congregation and after J. preached to a congregation of from 750 to 800 brethren, J. in actuality and in the belief of the congregation left the scene clothed in full executive authority as the Lord's special representative, found faithful and righteous (royal apparel of blue and white, v. 15), as the Lord's authorized mouthpiece (great crown of gold [Rev. 4: 4]), and as a royal priest—one who had maintained his priesthood until after the door was closed (with a garment of fine linen and purple), amid the rejoicing of the Tabernacle ecclesia, which had witnessed his fight against, and victory over the chief of the clericalists (city of Shushan . . . was glad). Especially were the faithful glad, enlightened and honored at this turn of affairs (Jews had light and gladness . . . honor, v. 16). The same things occurred among the faithful in all the British churches where the message of the Lord's pertinent dealings came (whithersoever the king's commandment . . .

came, v. 17). Yea, not a few of H.J.S.'s sympathizers were by the facts of his guilt turned into supporters of ecclesiaism as against clericalism (became Jews; for the fear . . . fell upon them).

On Jan. 28 it was decided to go on with the affairs of the Church as against presbyterianism so as to give the supporters of ecclesiaism the opportunity to crush the former and firmly establish the latter. This decision, as shown above, was antitypical of the decree of 8: 10-13. Chapter 9 shows how this decree was carried out in two parts: (1) on Feb. 4 and (2) on Feb. 18. On Feb. 4 the defenders of ecclesiaism gathered in large numbers for a business meeting of the Tabernacle, according to the motion of Jan 28. The defenders of ecclesiaism on Feb. 4 were not only encouraged at the utter discomfiture of H.J.S. on the previous Sunday, but were greatly increased in numbers by defections from H.J.S.'s former supporters. Hence as the determined day approached (day . . . drew near, v. 1) when the Shearno-Crawfordite clericalists hoped to have the victory over the ecclesiaists (the day that the enemies . . . hoped to have power), it turned out exactly the opposite (turned to the contrary), for the ecclesiaists had complete power over the clericalists (Jews had rule over them). In courage the ecclesiaists assembled (Jews gathered themselves together, v. 2), intent, not only on destroying (1) presbyterianism, the rule of elders in their midst, but also on destroying (2) the revolutionistic practices that the clericalists had been advocating and partially had introduced, *i.e.*, (a) dividing the London Tabernacle congregation into a large number of small and uninfluential ecclesiastas, of which they had already formed two from its members, (b) setting aside Berean lessons, (c) introducing textbookism, *i.e.*, the study of the Bible as a textbook, (d) filling the Tabernacle pulpit with amateur preachers, contrary to that Servant's arrangements, and (e) setting aside J. Hemery as assistant Pastor, despite Bro. Russell's arranging

for him to be such. Of these evils presbyterianism and textbookism were the worst. By the ecclesia's resolution of Feb. 4 all six of these things were overthrown in its midst; and when the other churches were apprised of the situation, they were likewise overthrown in their midst. Everywhere the ecclesiaists swept everything before them by overwhelming majorities (in their cities . . . no man could withstand them), for their enemies were put into abject fear of them (such as sought their hurt . . . for the fear of them fell upon all people).

The elders and deacons in other ecclesiasties (rulers . . . lieutenants . . . deputies and officers, v. 3) furthered ecclesiaism as against presbyterianism (helped the Jews); for what they saw and learned of J.'s powers and acts made them fear to oppose the reforms that were being advanced (fear of Mordecai fell upon them). The reading of J.'s credentials by the London Tabernacle's secretary, at J. Hemery's suggestion, to the from 750 to 800 brethren from many ecclesiasties, at the night meeting, of Jan. 28, to show what powers "this stranger in our midst" had, greatly increased J.'s influence wherever his powers became known, which was in all the churches (Mordecai was great in the king's house, and his fame went . . . provinces . . . Mordecai waxed greater and greater, v. 4). The ecclesiaists routed in the debate every opponent of ecclesiaism who dared raise his voice even weakly in defense of presbyterianism (Jews smote all their enemies with . . . destruction, v. 5) and did to the defenders of presbyterianism what they thought right required (did what they would unto those that hated them). In the Tabernacle ecclesia they refuted and defeated all new-creaturely and other revolutionists, who were thus in a class lower than the Divine class (in Shushan . . . Jews slew and destroyed 500 [500 is the product of 10, 10 and 5; the two tens stand for Great Company and Youthful Worthy revolutionists and the five stands for their being unclean],

v. 6). Moreover, the ten signatory elders were thoroughly refuted in their course as to the resolution, report and covering letter, the main part of the revolutionists' correspondence sent to Brooklyn. Not only so, but those of them that had been re-elected Jan. 22 were required to promise to submit to the ecclesia's arrangements in the six above-mentioned particulars of revolutionism, of which they were varyingly and unequally guilty. These ten elders are, in vs. 7-10, set forth typically as slain (refuted), in addition to the 500 of v. 6. These ten were J. Gentle (Parshandatha [*given forth to light*], v. 7), T. Hart (Dalphon [*dropping*]), R. Cormack (Aspatha [*given by the horse-doctrine*]), J. C. Radwell (Poratha [*ornament*], v. 8), W. Crawford (Adalia [*bulky*]), E. J. Doe (Aridatha [*strong*]), F. B. Edgell (Parmashta [*strong-fisted*], v. 9), A. Cruickshank (Arisai (*lion-like*)), C. J. Cotton (Aridai [*strong*] and W. P. Frazer (Vajezatha [*white*])). These ten elders, who submitted to H.J.S.'s program of presbyterianizing the Church (ten sons of Haman . . . enemy of the Jews, v. 10), the brethren in the meeting of Feb. 4 refuted in their theory and practice (they slew), but the anti-clericalists in their victory took no advantage of them, e.g., they did not expel from the eldership those of them who were re-elected, and who promised to submit to the ecclesia's arrangements (on the spoil laid they not their hand). And during that day (on that day, v. 11) a description (number) of the refuted ones among the elders, deacons and unofficial members of the ecclesia (slain in Shushan) was made (brought . . . king).

By His providences the Lord Jesus made clear (the king said, v. 12) to the faithful (Esther) that the measurably faithful were refuted (slain . . . 500 men) in the Tabernacle (Shushan the palace), including the signatory elders (ten sons of Haman). He raised in their minds the question as to what the true ones had done in the other British churches (what . . . rest . . . provinces?). His providences in the meeting of Feb. 4, connected with the

brethren's desire for more information on the conspiracy, and with what should be done with the elected signatory elders, also suggested that the faithful present their further wants for themselves (petition) and for their brethren thy request further), He pledging to grant these. To meet the desires of the brethren in these two particulars, the faithful (Esther, v. 13) asked that, the Lord being willing (please the king), the facts exposing the details of the conspiracy be presented to the Church by J., on Feb. 18, that the Church may pass its judgment thereon (let . . . Jews . . . Shushan to do tomorrow also . . . this day's decree) and do to the signatory elders what the evidence may require (Haman's ten sons be hanged). The Lord, through the passing of the pertinent motions, Feb. 4, charged that these two things be done Feb. 18 (king commanded . . . done, v. 14). Accordingly, the ecclesia requested J. to appear before it Feb. 18, to give it the details of the conspiracy and to suggest the final disposal of the matters pertinent to the ten signatory elders. Accordingly, the afternoon of Feb. 18 J. appeared before about 800 brethren of the London Tabernacle and other ecclesias (Jews . . . Shushan gathered . . . 14th . . . Adar, v. 15), and for two and one-half hours exposed the conspiracy in detail, as a cesspool of iniquity.

He had beforehand prepared in outline the facts of wrong-doing under the subject, Objections To The Election Of H.J.S. (and W. Crawford) to eldership in the London Tabernacle. The following seven general charges were presented as reasons against their being so elected: I. They engineered the entire project of the resolution. II. They were disloyal to their fellow elders. III. They were disloyal to the assistant pastor (J. Hemery). IV. They were disloyal to the ecclesia. V. They were disloyal to Bro. Russell. VI. They were disloyal to the Truth. VII. They were consciously disloyal to their office. In proof of each charge, every one of which contained a number of specifications,

some of them as many as seven, J. read extracts from the correspondence sent to Bro. Russell, from the minutes of the elders and from some of the documents that the ecclesia's secretary gave him, as well as called on many brethren present, especially elders, for their evidence as to the facts. Incidental to these matters and their proof, the ten signatory elders were, proven wrong-doers (hanged Haman's ten sons). Six of the ten had been re-elected as elders. Under J.'s questioning that afternoon they acknowledged their wrongs, expressed their regrets and asked the ecclesia for forgiveness. Up to Feb. 18 there was quite a number of H.J.S.'s sympathizers in and out of the ecclesia who were incensed against J. for his exposure and sharp rebukes of H.J.S. on Jan. 28. Some who were not his sympathizers, and who knew but little of the facts, felt that J. had dealt H.J.S. too hard blows on Jan. 28. But after his charges and proofs were heard on Feb. 18, even H.J.S.'s sympathizers who were present were convinced that H.J.S. richly deserved what he received (slew 300 men at Shushan). None of the brethren took advantage of the refuted ones (on the prey they laid not their hand). This entire assembly of about 800 brethren thereupon unanimously voted J. thanks and appreciation for what he had done for the Church, and confidence in his character as a servant of the Lord. H.J.S. and W. Crawford were nearly unanimously defeated as elder candidates.

The pertinent happenings at the London Tabernacle were reported to the ecclesiastas throughout Britain and Ireland by mail, as well as by verbal statements, mainly of brethren from other ecclesiastas who were present at the pertinent London Tabernacle business meetings. These reports gave a death-blow to the clericalists and their supporters at the subsequent elections of the extra-London ecclesiastas throughout Britain and Ireland (Jews . . . provinces gathered . . . stood for their lives . . . slew . . . 75,000, v. 16). So complete was the victory of ecclesiaism over

presbyterianism that in such churches the defeat was complete at but one set of meetings, whereas at the London Tabernacle two sets of meetings had to be held before clericalism was slain (rest from their enemies). Accordingly, they fought for their right to rule by vote at but one set of meetings (13th day . . . Adar, v. 17). These, like the London brethren, did not take advantage of the defeated clericalists (laid not their hands on the prey). From then onward they had rest from the clericalists (14th day . . . rested). Of course they joyously feasted on the Word and the pertinent privileges that it conferred on them (made it a day of feasting and gladness). After their two sets of meeting periods when they fought for their right to rule by their vote (Jews . . . Shushan assembled . . . 13th . . . 14th, v. 18), the London brethren had rest from their struggles (15th . . . rested). They then feasted on the Word and the pertinent privileges that it gave them (made it a day of feasting and gladness). The victory was followed in the extra-London churches (villages . . . unwalled towns, v. 19), on the antitypical 14th day, by joy and Truth feasting (gladness and feasting), a holiday (a good day [to this day the Jews call a holiday by the words, a good day]), and they made it the occasion of exchanging the good things of Truth as gifts (sending portions one to another). J. by his teachings, preachings, letters and conversations everywhere sent the message that the brethren should maintain in teaching and practice ecclesiaism as against presbyterianism (Mordecai wrote . . . letters . . . Jews . . . nigh and far, v. 20), and to fix the matter thus at all their meetings and elections always (establish . . . keep the 14th . . . and the 15th . . . yearly, v. 21). These meeting and election times should be held as such, because they mean congregational liberty enjoyed as the fruit of victory over clericalism in the form of Presbyterianism (rested from their enemies, v. 22), the victory that turned sorrow into joy (month . . . turned . . . sorrow to joy), bereavement into rich possession (mourning into a good

day). He exhorted them to make such days times of enjoyment of the Truth and gladness (days of feasting and joy), bestowing the good things of the Truth on one another (sending portions one to another) and offering the Truth to the Truth-hungry who did not have it (gifts to the poor).

The properly disposed (Jews, v. 23) accepted the privilege, which they ‘had exercised immediately after the victory, as a perpetual thing (undertook to do as they had begun), even as J. charged them (as Mordecai had written), in commemoration of the overthrow of the dangerous conspiracy started and directed by H.J.S. (Haman . . . devised, v. 24), the enemy of the faithful (the enemy of all the Jews), the vote-casting maker (had cast Pur . . . lot), in seeking the injury of the ecclesiaists (consume . . . destroy them). But the wicked conspiracy (wicked device, v. 25) against God’s people (against the Jews) was by our Lord Jesus’ command (he commanded) turned against him (return upon his own head), resulting in the public proof of his and his ten co-conspirators’ guilt as wrong-doers (he and his sons . . . hanged). Hence the church business and election meetings are made voting affairs whereby each ecclesia under the Lord regulates her own matters (called these days Purim [votes] after the name of Pur, v. 26). This the Lord’s people do because of the teachings of J.’s message (all the words of this letter), because of what they witnessed in this matter (had seen concerning this matter) and because of what they had experienced therein (had come unto them). Accordingly, the Lord’s people obligated themselves (took upon them . . . seed, v. 27) and all who would come into the Truth (joined themselves [literally, were joined] unto them) as an unalterable thing (should not fail) to maintain this right to regulate their business affairs and their elections (would keep these two days) according to the Truth always (according to their writing and . . . time every year). The keeping of this matter was repeated and stressed as a memorial and an observance

(these days . . . remembered and kept, v. 28) always (every generation), in each elect class (family), in every ecclesia (province), in every sub-class (city), in order that their managing of their business affairs and elections by their votes cease not among the various Truth people (day of Purim should not fail from among the Jews), nor its remembrance be forgotten in any class of them (their memorial perish from their seed).

J.F.R. ordered an investigation of J.'s London Bethel and Tabernacle work, appointing thereto an investigative commission of five influential and able British brothers: Bros. McCloy, Warden, McKenzie, Robinson and Housden, all members of J.'s special advisers in British Church affairs. This made in addition to J.'s investigation a second investigation of both the Bethel and Tabernacle matters. Here we will present only those matters that concern the Tabernacle. Various brethren of the ecclesia appeared before this commission and witnessed against H.J.S. and the ten signatory elders. J. also appeared before them affirming that the Lord had justified his work, protested against the investigation as not right, because his work was done as one with power of attorney and as the one whom the Lord had appointed in charge of the priestly work [which by a very natural misunderstanding, already explained, he thought to be that of the steward of the Penny Parable] and refused to give testimony further than to say that his investigations completely proved the guilt of all eleven signatories, especially that of H.J.S. The faithful's and J.'s making these appearances with their reassertion of the propriety of their course in this matter was a reaffirmation of their ecclesialism as against the presbyterianism of the eleven (Esther . . . Mordecai . . . this second letter of Purim, v. 29). The representatives of the ecclesia as representatives of the general Church gave powerful testimony on this subject (daughter of Abihail [*father of power*]). The witness of the ecclesia's representatives, as that of the Church, and J.'s statement and protest, as that of the Lord's

special representative, were with full authority (wrote with all authority), in confirmation of another message (he sent letters, v. 30) that went forth everywhere in Britain and Ireland among the churches (all the Jews . . . provinces of the kingdom). With these J. united words of prosperity (peace) and Truth (truth), to add strength on the subject of the churches' control, under the Lord, of their business and election matters (confirm these days of Purim, v. 31), as J. (Mordecai) and the Church (Esther) had charged (enjoined them), as matters on which they obligated themselves and all of like mind (decreed for themselves and for their seed) and for which they had sacrificed (fastings) and suffered (cry). The London Tabernacle, as a representative of the Church (Esther, v. 32), fixed these matters firmly by refusing to elect H.J.S. and W. Crawford even as deacons, though the investigative commission recommended this latter thing (decree . . . confirmed these matters of Purim). And the matter was recorded in the ecclesia's minutes (written in the book).

In the trialsome experiences preparatory to, associated with, and following after the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha from about May 1, 1917 to Jan. 8, 1918, our Lord Jesus (king Ahasuerus, 10: 1) demanded obedience to the principles of the Lord's Word pertinent to these experiences (laid a tribute) of all Truth people throughout the earth, both of the Elijah class (the land) and of the Elisha class (the isles of the sea). Our Lord's post-Pentecostal Gospel-Age acts—throughout the whole Gospel Age, even until the Great Company and Youthful Worthies leave the earth (all the acts of his power and might, v. 2)—are recorded in various Bible books, particularly in those on the types and prophecies (written in the book . . . kings of Media and Persia). Additionally, in these books there is written in the types and prophecies the explanation of the high offices that He gave J. (declaration of the greatness of Mordecai), which implies repeated promotions from the Lord (whereunto

the king advanced him). J. has frequently been ridiculed as "seeing himself in the Scriptures." This chapter and the three preceding ones are witnesses of the fact that he also sees others in the Scriptures. Here is a passage that proves him right on this point. In some Scriptures he appears in the large Gospel-Age picture. Some of these cases are mentioned in Chapter II. In the book of Esther and in another that will be explained later, he also so appears in the large Gospel-Age picture. Again, as seen in the three Gospel-Age miniatures, he appears from the death of our Pastor on as the star-members of the last five churches in the small, as those of the last six churches in the medium, and of the last six in the large miniature. This fact implies that in every type where the work of the star-members is expressly or impliedly represented and in every prophecy where their work is set forth literally or symbolically, his work is typed or set forth literally or symbolically in the large, medium and small pictures, e.g., wherever Bro. Russell is typed or foretold in the large, J. is typed or foretold in the three small pictures. What this implies can be seen from the fact that Jehovah has declared that He will do nothing in the outworking of His plan and its agents that He has not prefigured in the types and forecast in the prophecies of the Bible (Amos 3: 7). The Lord has been pleased to make him in the Epiphany His prime-minister on earth (next unto the king, v. 3), prominent among his brethren (great among the Jews), and will shortly cause him to be received as the Epiphany messenger and executive by the bulk of the Truth people (accepted of the multitude of his brethren), ambitious not for himself, but to advance the welfare of the Lord's people (seeking the wealth [literally, the good] of his people), and as the Lord's mouthpiece blessing them with the Truth unto their prosperity (speaking peace [literally, prosperity] to all of his seed). For these and all other blessings may thanks, glory, praise and honor redound to God alone, through Jesus Christ, our only Savior and Lord!

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE SMALL PARALLELS OF JUDAH'S AND ISRAEL'S KINGS.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS, EARLIER KINGS OF ISRAEL. EARLIER KINGS OF JUDAH. THE MIDDLE KINGS OF JUDAH. THE LATER KINGS OF ISRAEL. THE LATER KINGS OF JUDAH. THE LITTLE JEREMIAH.

"BROTHER Rutherford, I know you; I know you like a book; I know not only what you have done [officially from Nov. 3, 1916, to June 23, 1917, when this remark was made], but I also know what you will do [officially from June 23 to Aug. 8, 1917]." This remark J. made to J.F.R. at Bethel the morning of June 23, 1917, in the course of a conversation in which, among other things, J. pleaded with J.F.R. to cease from his power-grasping usurpations and lordings, the causes of the trouble among the leaders at Bethel. To that statement he replied with a question, "How do you know it?" J. answered, "Three books of the Bible and parts of others give an accurate description of your official acts [from Nov. 3, 1916, to Aug. 8, 1917]." Thereupon he asked J., "What books are they?" J. replied, "I decline to tell you." Nor did he tell him. He did tell the five Directors and F.H. McGee of the pertinent books and expounded to them some of their pertinent past and future features, among others, that on July 19 J.F.R. would meet a complete defeat by a lawyer on legal (secular) grounds, which occurred before the Philadelphia Church during a debate between J.F.R. and F.H. McGee, at that time an assistant to N.J.'s attorney general, and that on Aug. 8 J.F.R. would be brought under control. Beforehand J. had thought that the controlling agency would be the five Board members, while it actually occurred as a consequence of four of them being expelled from Bethel that day, which resulted in J.F.R., thereby no longer restrained by the Divinely-approved Board, falling completely that day under

the control of Azazel; for on that day these (unconsciously) abandoned him to Azazel. The three books in question are 1, 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles, in their parts following Solomon's death, reinforced by parts of Isaiah and Jeremiah and a very small part of Daniel.

In *The Present Truth*, beginning with the Dec., 1940, issue, there appeared a serial article on The Large Parallels of Judah's and Israel's Kings. In the first installment of that article a reconciliation was made between the chronologies of the kings of Israel and those of the kings of Judah, as necessary to work out the details of the 2520 years' parallels, *i.e.*, those from 1000 to 607 B.C., on the one hand, and those from 1521 to 1914 A.D., on the other hand. In that article it was shown that while for the harmony of these chronologies in the 2520 years' parallel those of the kings of Israel had to be adjusted to those of the kings of Judah, no such adjustment is required between the two sets of chronologies for the small, the Epiphany, parallel—for it was actually fulfilled in its British feature in exact harmony with the chronologies of Israel's kings as these are expressly given in 1, 2 Kings, and in its American feature in exact harmony with the chronologies of Judah's kings—and that the Lord evidently gave the years in the reigns of Israel's kings as He did in 1, 2 Kings in order to fix the dated events for the little parallel as He desired them to be fulfilled, the differences for the lengths of Israel's kings in the two parallels being due to God's marking the dates of certain events near the beginnings and endings of those reigns as their beginnings and endings for purposes of the Epiphany parallel. Thus in no sense is there a contradiction in these apparent differences in the lengths of the reigns of Israel's kings.

The British feature of this small parallel began to operate Oct. 16, 1916, the date that the fixed refusal of the seven non-signatory elders of the London Tabernacle to sign the resolution that the eleven had signed became clear to H.J. Shearn and W. Crawford (henceforth to be designated

by their initials); and it ended April 1, 1917, the day that J. Hemery (henceforth to be designated by his initials) denounced the Board's commissioner and his benefactor, J., before the London Tabernacle, and the day that J.'s steamer left Liverpool for America. The American feature also of the small parallel began to work Oct. 16, 1916, just after Bro. Russell, before leaving Bethel the last time, through which he finally relinquished his personal control at headquarters, failed to reconcile A.H. MacMillan, his headquarters' special representative and manager, and J.F. Rutherford, on the one hand, and H.C. Rockwell, on the other hand (to all of whom henceforth we will refer by their initials); and it ended Aug. 8, 1917, when J.F.R. drove the valid Society Directors away from Bethel. The fulfilled facts prove the operation of certain features which require some explanation: Generally speaking, a year in the chronology of Israel's and Judah's kings from 1000 to 607 B.C. stands for a day in the small parallel. We just said that *generally speaking* such is the case. Fulfilled facts show that there are two modifications to this rule.

The first of these modifications is this: the last year of a king's reign and the first year of his successor's reign count in the small parallel as covering one day only, *e.g.*, the last full year of Rehoboam's reign and the first full year of his successor's (Abijah's) reign in the small fulfillment find their counterpart in but one, not in two, days, *i.e.*, Nov. 1, 1916. This is in harmony with the Hebrew custom on giving date matters, *e.g.*, Hebrews count a period that begins late Friday afternoon and ends early Sunday morning as three days, as can be seen in the case of our Lord's resurrection in three days, whereas actually he was dead only about 39 hours, not 72 hours. This Hebrew method of counting, so different from ours, enables us to reconcile the statement of two of the evangelists, one of whom says in the Hebrew manner that the transfiguration occurred on the eighth day after Jesus forecast it,

and the other of whom states in the Greek manner that it was after six days. Another example illustrative of this Hebrew way of counting is seen in counting from the 7th to the 9th year of Hoshea's reign 3 years (2 K. 18: 9, 10), whereas our way of counting makes them 2 years. This way of counting will therefore make in the small parallel as many days less than the 293 days for the years from 1000 to 607 B.C. as there were to Rehoboam successors who reigned at least one year in Judah.

The second modification consists in this fact: that in order to show the double mindedness and thus the Great Companyship of certain ones acting as the small parallels of certain of Judah's and Israel's kings, there is a double covering of certain periods of days by two character aspects of J.F.R. in the little parallel of certain of Judah's kings and by two character aspects of J.H. in the little parallel of Israel's kings. As said above, this is done to bring out synchronous periods in which the two parts of their double mindedness worked predominantly in certain acts during those periods as these features of double mindedness were typed by different kings, *e.g.*, the synchronous days of J.H.'s double minded acts are brought out in days corresponding to the years of the reigns of certain of Israel's kings, the years of the first three of these kings corresponding to the days in which, generally speaking, the good part of J.H.'s mind worked, and the years of the next five kings and part of the years of the sixth king, generally speaking, corresponding to the days in which the evil part of J.H.'s mind worked, the latter set of days covering the same days as the first set of days, *i.e.*, the days from Jan. 14 to March 13, 1917, in which, generally speaking, the good part of J.H.'s mind worked, correspond to the years of Jehu's, Jehoahaz's and Jehoash's reigns; and these days are the same as the days typed by the years covered by the reigns of Jeroboam II, Zachariah, Shallum, Menahem and Pekahiah and by a part of Pekiah's reign, through which

days, generally speaking, the bad part of his mind worked. The fulfilled facts show this to be true. The same synchronous phenomenon appears in the double mindedness of J.F.R.: for the days from Jan. 6 to March 27, 1917, generally speaking, correspond to the years of the Judah kings Jehoram, Ahaziah, (Queen) Athaliah, Joash and Amaziah from the standpoint, generally speaking, of certain bad traits of J.F.R.'s double mind working; and the same days, generally speaking, correspond to the years of Judah kings Uzziah, Jotham and all the years except the last of Ahaz, during which days, generally speaking, the good part of J.F.R.'s double mind worked. The fulfilled facts prove this point to be true. With both J.H. and J.F.R. the good mind passes over into the bad mind in the last ones of the two good sets of kings—Jehoash and Ahaz. These two modifications must be kept in mind, if we are to see daylight in this matter.

It might here be in place to show how early in March, 1917, this matter began to open up to J. Having in Feb., 1917, explained to a number of the London Bethel brethren the small antitype of the building of Jerusalem's walls in 52 days by Nehemiah, among which brethren was E. Housden, the latter asked J. whether the fact that Uzziah's 52 years of reigning (2 Chro. 26: 3) were not in some way related to the 52 days occupied in building Jerusalem's walls. J. replied that he thought not, but the question set him to thinking, inasmuch as he noted that just as Uzziah busied himself in the priests' work by offering incense, so J.F.R. busied himself in the work of J. and other priests in England. He further noted the fact that, just as Uzziah had reigned 52 years, so it was exactly 52 days from J.F.R.'s election to be president of the Society, Jan. 6, 1917, to the date that J. received from J.H. J.F.R.'s "absolutely without authority" cable at Liverpool, England, Feb. 26, 1917, the date that J.F.R. sent J. the recall cable, the sending of which brought to a climax J.F.R.'s power-grasping course as to the Board and J., since

it usurpatorially presumed to set aside the authority of the Board as to J.'s British and European mission, which with some of J.F.R.'s previous pertinent acts was gross busybodying in the work of priests, to whose number he no longer belonged. J. was strongly impressed by these correspondencies and, therefore, began to study the whole matter of Israel's and Judah's kings carefully from this standpoint. The question arose in his mind, Can it be that there is operating a small parallel in which a day stands for a year in the large parallel, *i.e.*, in the 2520 years' parallel in its first member, 1000 to 607 B.C.? Reasoning that if there was such a small parallel operating, it must have begun with Bro. Russell's last exercise of his Bethel powers, which occurred Oct. 16, 1916, the day he last left Bethel alive, and the day he left matters at Brooklyn in the charge of A.H.M., his personal representative and manager at headquarters. J. further noted that the controversy among the London Tabernacle elders came to a stalemate Oct. 16, 1916, over the matter of the usurpatory and revolutionary resolution and its pertinent correspondence, as was explained in EF and EG, Chapters I, and that from that date H.J.S. became the leader of the revolutionists. The above-mentioned date and events at Brooklyn and London, with the correspondence of the events for the next five months, convinced J. of the fact of such a small parallel operating and of the two above-mentioned modifications. Then he recognized the wisdom of God in withholding the knowledge of such a parallel operating until after the second modification was in its American and British operation almost over; for this modification in its American feature required the death of the little parallel's Jehoshaphat and the accession to the throne of its Jehoram and its Uzziah to occur Jan. 6; and a consideration of these facts and the facts of the death of the little parallel's Jehoram and the accession of its Jehu and Jeroboam II on Jan. 14, 1917, forced on his attention the second modification, as the various reigns'

endings and beginnings forced upon his attention the first modification. Had this matter come to mind, say in Dec., 1916, J. would have had a very baffling puzzle to solve. As it was, the solution of the matter was easy from the main facts of the case.

If the author were to write on each verse of 1 and 2 Kings and of 2 Chronicles involved in the little parallel even as condensedly as he has written on the large parallels involved in the same Scriptures, it would make this chapter between 250 and 300 pages—a thing that the spirit of a sound mind forbids as disproportionate, considering other chapters that are to form parts of this book. Moreover, even such condensed details would doubtless be too great a trial on the patience of its readers. Accordingly, he has decided to touch briefly on the more important features of the small parallel in both its American and British phases, but in all cases the things in the two phases, merely alluded to, will be summarized so that the reader who is so disposed can put in the details, if he is acquainted with the pertinent facts. Just as the reigns of Rehoboam and Jeroboam I began in the same year, and that only a few days apart, in 1000 B.C., so, as shown above, in the small parallel the ascendancy of A.H.M., the small parallel of Rehoboam, and H.J.S., the small parallel of Jeroboam I, began the same day, Oct. 16, 1916, in the events indicated in the preceding paragraph. This date, Oct. 16, 1916, the day on which the Parousia ceased to lap into the Epiphany, as it had been doing for 25 months, *i.e.*, from Sept. 16, 1914, the date of the last Spirit-begettal, signalized by the Parousia Messenger's ceasing to function as such at headquarters, which he left the last time that day, is, as fitting for the first sole Epiphany day, the day on which the little parallel began to operate. And the object of this little parallel is to show the events by which the Mahlite Merarite leaders in America and Britain would be manifested as such and fall into Azazel's hands, and to show the events

by which the Libnite Gershonite leaders in Britain would be manifested as such and fall into Azazel's hands. And while it was not until a year later that the Shimite Gershonites were to undergo the same set of experiences, and while, therefore, they do not come as such under the compass of the small parallel's *days*, it is yet not without significance that Oct. 16, 1916, witnessed the irreconcilable attitudes of A.H.M., the Divinely-chosen leader of the American Mahlite Merarites, who was displaced as such by the usurping J.F.R., and H.C.R., the Divinely-chosen leader of the American Shimite Gershonites, who was displaced as such by the usurping I.F. Hoskins; for it was Bro. Russell's last work at Bethel to attempt a reconciliation between A.H.M. and H.C.R., J.F.R. also being involved in the quarrel between the two, taking A.H.M.'s side against H.C.R.

Believing that a bird's-eye view of the beginning and ending dates in the small parallels will be helpful to a better understanding of such details as will later be given, these will here be presented as a summary, giving the years of the kings of Judah and the days of the little parallels first, and that in parallel columns, and then the years of Israel's kings and the days in the little parallels afterwards, and that in parallel columns.

JUDAH'S KINGS		LITTLE PARALLEL'S KINGS	
Rehoboam,	17 yrs. (2 C. 12: 13)	A.H.M.,	Oct. 16 to Nov. 1, 1916
Abijah,	3 yrs. (2 C. 13: 2)	W.E.V.,	Nov. 1 to Nov. 3, "
Asa,	41 yrs. (2C. 16: 13)	J.F.R.,	Nov. 3 to Dec. 13, "
Jehoshaphat,	25 yrs. (2 C. 20: 31)	J.F.R.,	Dec. 13 to Jan. 6, 1917
Jehoram,	8 yrs. (2C. 21: 20)	J.F.R.,	Jan. 6 to Jan. 13, "
Ahaziah,	1 yr. (2 C. 22: 2)	J.F.R.,	Jan. 13 to Jan. 13, "
Athaliah,	7 yrs. (2 C. 22: 12; 13: 1)	The J.F.R. party,	Jan. 13 to Jan. 19, "

Joash,	40 yrs. (2 C. 24: 1)	J.F.R., Jan. 19 to Feb. 27, "
Amaziah,	29 yrs. (2 C. 25: 1)	J.F.R., Feb. 27 to Mar. 27, " Note the doubling of the days to Mar. 27.
Uzziah,	52 yrs. (2 C. 26: 3)	J.F.R., Jan. 6 to Feb. 26, 1917
Jotham,	16 yrs. (2 C. 27: 1)	J.F.R., Feb. 26 to Mar. 13, "
Ahaz,	16 yrs. (2 C. 28: 1)	J.F.R., Mar. 13 to Mar. 28, "
Hezekiah,	29 yrs. (2 C. 29: 1)	J.F.R., Mar. 28 to Apr. 25, "
Manasseh,	55 yrs. (2 C. 33: 1)	J.F.R., Apr. 25 to June 18, "
Amon,	2 yrs. (2 C. 33: 21)	J.F.R., June 18 to June 19, "
Josiah,	31 yrs. (2 C. 34: 1)	J.F.R., June 19 to July 19, "
Jehoahaz,	¼ yr. (2 C. 36: 1)	J.F.R., July 19 to July 19, "
Jehoiakim	11 yrs. (2 C. 36: 5)	J.F.R., July 19 to July 29, "
Jehoiakin,	¼+ yr. (2 C. 36: 9)	J.F.R., July 29 to July 29, "
Zedekiah,	11 yrs. (2 C. 36: 11)	J.F.R., July 29 to Aug. 8, "
ISRAEL'S KINGS		LITTLE PARALLEL'S KINGS
Jeroboam,	22 yrs. (1 K. 14: 20)	H.J.S., Oct. 16 to Nov. 6, 1916
Nadab,	2 yrs. (1 K. 15: 25)	H.J.S., Nov. 6 to Nov. 7, "
Baasha,	24 yrs. (1 K. 15: 33)	H.J.S., Nov. 7 to Nov. 30, "
Elah,	2 yrs. (1 K. 16: 8)	H.J.S., Nov. 30 to Dec. 1, "
Zimri,	7 days (1 K. 16: 15)	H.J.S., Dec. 1 to Dec. 1, "
Omri,	12 yrs. (1 K. 16: 23)	H.J.S., Dec. 1 to Dec. 12, "

Ahab,	22 yrs. (1 K. 16: 29)	H.J.S., Dec. 12 to Jan. 2, 1917
Ahaziah,	2 yrs. (1 K. 22: 51)	H.J.S., Jan. 2 to Jan. 3, "
Jehoram,	12 yrs. (2 K. 3: 1)	H.J.S., Jan. 3 to Jan. 14, "
Jehu,	28 yrs. (2 K. 10: 36)	J.H., Jan. 14 to Feb. 10, "
Jehoahaz,	17 yrs. (2 K. 13: 1)	J.H., Feb. 10 to Feb. 26, "
Jehoash,	16 yrs. (2 K. 13: 10)	J.H., Feb. 26 to Mar. 13, Note the doubling of the days.
Jeroboam,	41 yrs. (2 K. 14: 23)	J.H., Jan. 14 to Feb. 23, 1917
Zachariah,	½ yr. (2 K. 15: 8)	J.H., Feb. 23 to Feb. 23, "
Shallum,	1/12 yr. (2 K. 15: 13)	J.H., Feb. 23 to Feb. 23, "
Menahem,	10 yrs. (2 K. 15: 17)	J.H., Feb. 23 to Mar. 4, "
Pekahiah,	2 yrs. (2 K. 15: 23)	J.H., Mar. 4 to Mar. 5, "
Pekah,	20 yrs. (2 K. 15: 27)	J.H., Mar. 5 to Mar. 24, "
Hoshea,	9 yrs. (2 K. 17: 1)	J.H., Mar. 24 to Apr. 1, "

The matters stated in the events of Judah's and Israel's kings find their parallels in events of the little parallel in the minutest details, but, as stated above, to give all of these details would not only not serve the author's present purpose, but would interfere with it, since it would prevent his readers from seeing the woods for the trees. It will be noted that the ones represented in the small parallel by the kings of Judah are A.H.M., W.E.V. and J.F.R., indeed, the latter almost exclusively, though in one case he and his party are represented by a queen, and that the ones represented in the small parallel by Israel's kings are H.J.S. and J.H. In the American phase of the small parallel usually J. is represented by the prophets who prophesied

in Judah and in the British phase of the small parallel J. is usually represented by the prophets who prophesied in Israel, though often his British acts are ascribed to the contemporaneous Judahite king, because done in his interests. He, therefore, in both phases appears as the corrector, restrainer and opponent of evil little kings and the instructor, encourager and supporter of the good little kings. But as the Board's special representative what he did executively he did in a sense as a representative of J.F.R., a Board member and its executive. Hence some things that J. did in Britain are ascribed to J.F.R. as one of Little Judah's kings. This is what should be expected of the uses that the Lord would make of him as the Epiphany messenger as teacher and executive, the first parts of his activities as such appearing in this picture. It is proper from the standpoint of Israel's kings to speak of the events of the first member of the little parallel as belonging to the little parallel, because its years as given in the chronologies of Israel's kings are fewer than those given for them in the large 2520 years' parallel, as was shown in the Dec., 1940, *Present Truth*. With these general remarks we are ready to take up the most instructive details of these little parallels.

As the large parallel was preceded by the evils of the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches, particularly those of the papacy, typed by the evils of Solomon as related in 1 Kings 11, so both in America and in Britain there were evils preceding the little parallel, as was shown in Chapter I, in the Little Gospel Age; for there was a misdevelopment in America of the little Roman Catholic Church with J.F.R. as the little pope, and in Britain of the little Greek Catholic Church, both typed by the evils of Solomon as described in 1 Kings 11, preceding the little parallel, which in its second member began, as suggested above, on Oct. 16, 1916. It will be noted that as the first member of this parallel began with the revolt of the northern, the ten-tribe kingdom, under Jeroboam I, from the united kingdom,

leaving the latter a diminished kingdom, that of the south, so its second member began with the revolt of H.J.S., supported by the ten signatory elders, against what was the united kingdom of Truth people, leaving the latter with a diminished set of supporters. And as Jeroboam I committed various evils to make the separation all the more fixed, so did H.J.S. Moreover, informed by Bro. Russell of the evils of H.J.S. and his supporters, A.H.M. took a defiant stand toward H.J.S.'s movement and, like H.J.S., committed various evils between Oct. 16 and Nov. 1, 1916, but was by Bro. Russell's instructions restrained from wrecking matters by an open conflict with the H.J.S. movement, even as a prophet restrained Rehoboam from warring on Jeroboam I, for which he had made preparation. As a prophet from Judah testified against Jeroboam I and his idolatrous work, but was later deceived into disobedience and destroyed, so at Bro. Russell's suggestion J.H., *as his representative, and thus a little Judahite prophet*, testified against H.J.S.'s evils and resolution's idol, but was later prevailed upon in disobedience to enter a course of self-interest and misfellowship by his six supporting elders, and was destroyed as a mouthpiece of the Lord. And as Jeroboam I sent his wife to inquire of the prophet as to the survival of their sick son, so H.J.S. by the ten signatory elders sent word to Bro. Russell to inquire, if the resolution movement would survive; and just as the prophet declared that the child's death would take place when Jeroboam's wife would enter his house, so Bro. Russell declared the death of that movement when the answer would be brought back. The end of the 17 days' reign of A.H.M. came Nov. 1, 1916, on word coming to the Bethelites early Nov. 1 of Bro. Russell's death, which, of course, meant that A.H.M. could no more be the special representative and manager for Bro. Russell, now beyond the need of such an official.

The succession of W.E.V. occurred as follows: A.H.M., Nov. 1, 1916, called a meeting of the Board, attended

also by some other prominent Bethelites, among whom was A.H.M.; and in this meeting A.H.M., ignoring the fact that A.I. Ritchie, the Society's vice president, should be given charge, very insistently urged that W.E.V., the Society's secretary and treasurer, be put in charge. The Board agreed to this. W.E.V., hearing from A.H.M. of the revolt in Britain, opposed it with arguments, to the refutation of H.J.S. and his supporters, even as Abijah thoroughly defeated Jeroboam I in battle. But his ascendancy was to be one of but three days, as Abijah reigned but three years. The transition of the ascendancy to J.F.R. occurred as follows: The latter had left Bethel Oct. 29 on a business trip to the Society's printer at Akron. J. having a pilgrim appointment at Oakland, Md., Oct. 30, and there being a very close brotherly friendship between J.F.R. and him, the former stopped over at Oakland to be with him a while, which they spent in intimate brotherly fellowship apart from the meetings. The next morning J.F.R. continued his trip to Akron and J. proceeded to Washington, D.C., for his pilgrim appointment there, Oct. 31, the day Bro. Russell died. J. served the Baltimore Ecclesia Nov. 1, much sadness marking the services because of the news of our beloved Pastor's death. Both J.F.R. and J. arrived at Bethel Nov. 2. J. had many a time told J.F.R. of typical matters yet to come to pass, which later came to pass as J. had told him, e.g., without telling him the type on which he based his thought, J., who based it on his understanding of Benaiah's acts (2 Sam. 23: 20-23), told him that he would be victorious in two debates, would defend Bro. Russell and the Church against slanders, and would without special preparation meet a worldling, perhaps a lawyer, and defeat him, taking his points away from him, and by them defeating him. The third of these came to pass in the Spring of 1915, through J.F.R.'s pamphlet on, *A Battle in the Ecclesiastical Heavens*. These fulfillments gave J.F.R. considerable confidence in J.'s

understanding of prophecies and types. And in such confidence J.F.R., on his first seeing J., Nov. 2, at Bethel, called him aside, and then asked him the question, "Will Bro. Russell have a successor?" J. answered, "I do not know." Showing an inordinate interest in the subject, J.F.R. pressed the matter, asking J., "Do you not know of some prophetic or typical Scripture on the subject?" J. answered, "No; for I have never thought on the subject; but I will study it; if I find out anything, I will tell you."

J. awoke very early Nov. 3, the death of Bro. Russell pressing heavily upon his heart and mind. It must have been about 3 A.M. when he awoke, and could sleep no more that night. As he kept thinking of Bro. Russell's death, the thought occurred to him: "Bro. Russell did not give the penny that he and the brethren expected him to give!" Immediately the thought came to him, "Then, though that Servant, he could not be the steward of the parable, since the steward of the parable gave the penny. Here I have the answer to Bro. Rutherford's question: Bro. Russell is to have a successor, the steward referred to in the parable of the penny." All conversant with the pertinent facts will recall that Bro. Russell had believed for years that he was the steward of that parable, and had expected to give the penny; and yet he believed up to his death, and the rest of the leading brethren also believed, that he had not given the penny. With that belief, of course, the conclusion logically to draw from the parable was that he was not that parable's steward, and that he was to have a successor. It was this thought that moved J., in view of what is given in Chapters II-V, especially in Chapters III-V, to conclude in Feb., 1917, that he was that successor, which would have been logical, had Bro. Russell not given the penny. However, when he later came to see that Bro. Russell had given the penny in its twofold distribution, he gladly withdrew that thought and rejoiced in Bro. Russell's having had that privilege. Since the office of that Servant was intended

for the Parousia work only, that office ceased with the completion of the Parousia work; there could, thereafter, have been no successor to that office, just as the apostolic office ceased with the completion of the apostolic work, and thereafter could have no successors therein. The office that the Lord gave J. was not a successorship of Bro. Russell's office; for the offices of the Parousia Messenger and of the Epiphany messenger are separate and distinct; for to the former belonged charge of all new creatures and the unbegotten consecrated as such during the Parousia, and to the latter belongs charge of the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies during the Epiphany, but as respects the Little Flock Bro. Russell not only had a charge *to*, but also *of* it, during the Parousia, while during the Epiphany J. has a charge *to*, but not *of* it.

Immediately after breakfast, Nov. 3, 1916, with the above-described thought that Bro. Russell had not given the penny, and hence was not the steward of the penny parable, and, accordingly, was to have a successor, J. approached J.F.R. in the Bethel dining room, whispering to him, "Do you recall your question on whether Bro. Russell was to have a successor and of my promise to study the question and to give you the answer, if I would get one?" On his answering, "Yes," J. told him that he had gotten an answer. Betraying extraordinary interest, J.F.R. said, "Come with me," and immediately walked rapidly out of the dining room, J. following on his heels, upstairs to his room, whose door, as soon as he and J. had entered, he closed and locked. Then turning to J., he asked what the answer was. J. reminded him of the thought that all the leading brethren, as well as Bro. Russell, had, that the latter as the steward of the parable was to have given the penny, but that he had died without giving it. To this J.F.R. replied, "That is so." Then J. said, "He, therefore, is to have a successor who will give the penny; for he, having died without giving it, was not the steward of the parable." Again J.F.R. replied, "That

is so." Then he eagerly asked, "Who is to be the successor?" To this J. answered, "I do not know, but whoever he is, we may be sure that he is a brother full of deep humility and loving zeal, deeply versed in the Scriptures and trusted and loved by the Church." Then J. added, "We do not need to worry as to who he is. Whoever he is the Lord will bring him forward in due time, without any of our manipulations." Pausing a moment, J. added, "Let none of us seek to grasp that position; for woe unto him who seeks to 'set' himself in the Body of Christ."

In view of coming events and of the fact that without any real or seeming Scriptural ground J.F.R. was about to commit the greatest usurpation ever attempted among the Lord's people, to grasp the position of the penny parable's steward, doubtless our Lord put these precautionary words into J.'s mouth as a deterrent to J.F.R. from such power-grasping. And because J.F.R. heeded not the warning, he has been experiencing the woe that Jesus put into J.'s mouth to utter as a deterrent to him (Zech. 11: 15-17; Matt. 24: 48-51. Let the reader please mark the date of this conversation—Nov. 3, 1916. It was the day that W.E.V. finished his part as the little Abijah, and that J.F.R. began to fulfill his part as the little parallel of all the rest of Judah's kings! From that day onward for over two months he acted out the part of the chief member of the Executive Committee in the Society, and from Jan. 6, 1917, onward the part of the sole executive of the Society, to obtain which he plotted with certain associates to put it over on guileless brethren. He had made himself believe that he was the penny parable's steward, which accounts for his envious course toward J. as an alleged rival, and his publishing Vol. VII on his sole authority, without the Board's knowledge, as the penny, a picture of which he had printed on the dedicatorial page of the earlier editions. He fairly raved at J., for his believing that he was the steward, while under the impression of Bro. Russell's having

died without giving the penny, because from certain Scriptures he knew that the Lord had given him charge of the priestly work that remained to be done, which proved to be supervising the work toward the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies, whereas J.F.R. encouraged C. Woodworth to preach and publish a tract to the effect that J.F.R. was the steward. Yea, the latter even stooped to arrange to have J.'s thought brought up by a trick at the Bethel table, in order to disparage J. J.F.R. had in his pride concluded that he was the only one of the Truth people capable of managing and executing the work of the Society, and with this thought permeating him he did the self-pushing that made figureheads of the other two members of the Executive Committee from Nov. 3, 1916 until Jan. 6, 1917, and thereafter by trickery got the work of sole manager and executive in the work and business of the Society, he took advantage of the guilelessness of all concerned.

But we are not to think of him as altogether bad. We are to remember that as a crown-loser he had a double mind; and at first the better part of that mind worked mainly, a fact that his course as the little parallel of Asa and Jehoshaphat brings out. Apart from his making more or less figureheads of W.E.V. and A.I. Ritchie, his fellow Executive Committee men, his work on the executive committee was good; so, too, were his articles in the Tower, his arousing the brethren to the public work and his putting away evil from the Church and the headquarters (1 K. 15: 9-13; 2 C. 14: 2-7; 15: 16-18). His preparing the Bethel leaders, etc., for the case whereby certain lawyers of the Brooklyn municipal department sought to put an unjust and large tax on the Society, and his successful fighting of that case had the Lord's support and approval unto the defeat of the chief opponent (2 C. 14: 8-15). The pilgrims encouraged him and the brethren unto love and good works; and he put away abominations and did constructive good (2 C. 15: 1-19); but he took the side of some

of the radicals in Britain against H.J.S. and his supporters, and his partiality toward these radicals drew from J. a partial correction, which aroused some resentment in J.F.R.; there is also a parallel in his oppressing some of the Bethelites (1 K. 15: 16-22; 2 C. 16: 1-10). These are the chief matters of the small parallel as to the little Asa, in which respect J.F.R. ceased to act predominantly Dec. 13. It should be remarked that the times of the kings' reigns signify the periods in which the qualities and acts of the respective phases were *predominant*, yet their ends do not mean the ends of the such activities, but of their predominance.

Dec. 13 was the day that he began to act out the Jehoshaphat phase in the little parallel, which he continued until Jan. 6, 1917. In this aspect, too, generally speaking, he did well, though toward its end, beginning Dec. 28, 1917, the evil part of his mind began to work, typed by Jehoshaphat taking his son Jehoram as his co-regent in his reign's 16th year, at the time that the latter began to negotiate with Ahab on their entering into an alliance to fight Ben-hadad of Syria. But more on this later. J.F.R. allowed certain sectarian work to go on during these 25 days, but removed evil-doers from their works (1 K. 22: 41-46; 2 C. 20: 31-34). He certainly encouraged the brethren to zeal and good work and to defend the Truth (2 C. 17: 1-6). He backed the pilgrim work vigorously (2 C. 17: 7-9), and subdued opponents (2 C. 17: 10, 11). J.F.R. always was more or less controversially inclined; and he encouraged the brethren, especially the pilgrims, to be the same (2 C. 17: 12-19). His taking the side of H.J.S. against radical brethren in Britain (1 K. 22: 1-6; 2 C. 18: 1-5) met J.'s opposition (1 K. 22: 7-28; 2 C. 18: 6-27), and resulted disastrously (1 K. 22: 29-38; 2 C. 18: 28-34). For J.F.R.'s cooperating with H.J.S. in this matter J., Dec. 30, wrote him in disapproval, while praising him in other respects (2 C. 19: 1-3). But for the rest J.F.R. in this phase did well

for the Church, restoring not a few erring ones, and through the pilgrims' service did much good, encouraging them to faithfulness in their ministry (2 C. 19: 4-11). He made another misadventure with H.J.S., for which J. again corrected him, but the miscarriage made him give up the adventure (1 K. 22: 44, 48, 49; 2 C. 20: 35-37). In J. he made an attempt with H.J.S. against the autocracy of W.C., which resulted in the latter's defeat, but in no permanent good results (2 K. 1: 1; 3: 4-27). His ascendancy in the Jehoshaphat phase came to an end Jan. 6, 1917 (1 K. 22: 45, 50; 2 C. 20: 34; 21: 1-3). Almost in all ways the 25 days of his Jehoshaphat phase were praiseworthy engaged. The unpraiseworthy things of this period belong to the co-regent phase of Jehoram.

To help to clearness it should here be again remarked that what J. did in a teaching, correcting, etc., capacity is typed by the teachings, corrections, etc., of the prophets who appear in the records, and that what he did executively as the Board's special representative in Britain comes under the acts of J.F.R. as a Board member and its executive, in his capacity of the kings of Little Judah. We will now leave the kings of Little Judah for a while and return to those of Little Israel. Above we gave the main acts of H.J.S. as the little Jeroboam I, extending from Oct. 16 to Nov. 6, 1916. On Nov. 6 and 7 the confirmation of the news of Bro. Russell's death made him all the more wilful to carry through to a completion his plans as to the London Tabernacle arrangements (1 K. 15: 25-31 [Nadab, *wilful*]). He was then engaged in fighting divisional movements in London, but decided that he must squelch his wilfulness and let courage come to the fore in his course (Baasha, *courageous*) on controlling the British work; and in this he acted out for 24 days (Nov. 7-30, 1916) the Baasha phase of the little parallel. In this phase he exhibited the clericalistic and sectarian spirit, just as he had been doing since Oct. 16 in the Jeroboam and Nadab phases (1 K. 15: 33, 34).

It was during this Baasha phase that J., Nov. 21, presented his credentials to the British managers, received from them, Nov. 23, the correspondence on the Tabernacle affair, thoroughly examined them thereon Nov. 25, took away from them their points, and constructed for the Society, and thus for J.F.R., a power and a sphere of investigation there (1 K. 15: 17-22; 2 C. 16: 1-6). J., Nov. 30, quite cautiously rebuked H.J.S. and W.C. and the other nine signatory elders for their Tabernacle course, telling H.J.S. that his Tabernacle plans seemed unacceptable (1 K. 16: 1-7). On Nov. 30 and Dec. 1 H.J.S. entered the Elah phase, and on those days he heard part of J.'s decision against his Tabernacle resolution as a presbyterian scheme, and this caused H.J.S. to give up his pertinent general plan as futile (1 K. 16: 8-14). He then sought for a few minutes, Dec. 1, to induce J. to make some small concession for the elders, which J. refusing to do, he with W.C.'s cooperation entered into a plan to challenge J.'s authority, which put him into the Omri phase, Dec. 1-12, which was an evil one.

From here on we will for several Bible chapters at the introduction of each phase cite as a whole the Scriptures that apply to it, and then, without specific Bible references, will point out the main features in both members of the parallel for each phase, leaving it to the reader to connect the specific verses with our applications, just as we did above as to Rehoboam's and Jeroboam's acts in relation to those of the little Rehoboam and Jeroboam. H.J.S., after finding out J.'s opposition to the eleven elders' resolution, in the first half of the Omri phase (1 K. 16: 21-28) vacillated on the matter of what his attitude toward J. should be, but in the second half, at W.C.'s insistence, decided to challenge in executive matters J.'s authority. This he did by deciding to reject J.'s revisions of the Manchester Convention program, and, Dec. 12, mailed to J. a letter to that effect, and thus by these two attitudes he fulfilled in the little parallel the two ruling

positions—capitals—that Omri had. Dec. 12-Jan. 2 he fulfilled the Ahab phase and during this time, like Ahab, he became guilty of the worst opposition that he made to J., both in the latter's teaching, etc., office, as the little parallel of Elijah, and in the latter's executive phase, as representing the Board, and thus in a sense as representing J.F.R., *i.e.*, as a member of the Board and its executive. After sending word, Dec. 12, declining in the name of all three managers to revise the convention program as corrected by J. (W.C. [and his followers] here standing as the little parallel of Jezebel, and J.H., the straddler [and his supporters], here standing as the little Obadiah, who protected the prophets and yet served Ahab and Jezebel, half-heartedly, of course), he entered the Ahab phase (1 K. 16: 28–22: 40). Actually H.J.S. and W.C. were the real deciders on this challenge. As the small Ahab H.J.S.'s first great wrong was in becoming one with the W.C. party as the little Jezebel.

And certainly W.C. did during this period oppose J. and those who took his side, as Jezebel through the hierarchy persecuted Elijah and his fellow prophets. J. and his supporters during this time had to work rather secretly, as did Elijah and his supporting prophets. H.J.S.'s and W.C.'s challenge corresponds to the persecuting attitude of antitypical Ahab and Jezebel from 539 to 1324 A.D. And, corresponding to these about 9 centuries, it was about 9 days from the time that H.J.S. sent his challenging letter until J., Dec. 20, in a managers' meeting met the challenge. From the day Dec. 13 or 14, when J. received the letter, until Dec. 19, when he decided that faithfulness to his mission required him to call the managers' challenge, J. gave this matter the most earnest and prayerful consideration. Satan plied him with all sorts of compromises, all of which he set aside, recognizing that it was God's will that he be faithful to his credentials-charged powers, else, if he compromised, his whole British work would be compromised;

for if he should weaken in the face of this challenge, he would do so in the face of others. Hence, as Elijah challenged the Ahab-and-Jezebel-supported priests and prophets of Baal and Astaroth, J. challenged the whole leadership supporters of H.J.S. and W.C. in the managers' meeting of Dec. 20. In Chapter IV the details of this encounter are given.

J. took, Dec. 20, the Manchester Convention program out of the hands of H.J.S. as its executive, and put it into the hands of J.H. to carry out, leaving immediately thereafter the managers' meeting and refusing at repeated request to return. Then he went to Oxford for a night meeting and the next day to Hull, and returned to London and met the managers the evening of Dec. 22. In this meeting H.J.S. softened and apologized for his course, just as Ahab softened toward Elijah (and in the large antitype just as about 1550, over two centuries later, the civil powers softened toward the Reformers). But W.C. was very defiant to J. at that meeting, just as Jezebel through the hierarchy remained very defiant to Elijah. As an expression of forgiveness J. at that meeting gave back to H.J.S. the privilege of carrying out executively the convention program, and in other ways encouraged him to reform, particularly during a walk in Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens Dec. 25, just as Elijah feasted Ahab. (In the large antitype the Reformers gave the civil powers great feasts from the 16th into the very late 18th century, corresponding to the over 2½ days that J. was encouraging by the principles of the Lord's Word H.J.S. to reformation, which the latter promised.) Never did J. make a more earnest and loving effort to rescue an erring brother than he did with H.J.S. during those over 2½ days, particularly during their walk the afternoon of Dec. 25 in Kensington Gardens and Hyde Park. But W.C. persuaded H.J.S. to go back on his promised reformation, just as antitypical Jezebel by the hierarchy dissuaded antitypical Ahab from reformation during the 19th century in the large

antitype of typical Jezebel and Ahab in this matter. H.J.S. cut off brethren from service at W.C.'s plotting, because they favored Bro. Russell's arrangements, for which J. very severely denounced both of them, as Ahab at Jezebel's plotting had Naboth stoned, for which Elijah severely denounced them. (It will be noted that in this phase W.C. corresponds to the Romanist hierarchy in the large antitype, while he and his supporters correspond to the hierarchy and the Romanist Church, which usually acts through the hierarchy.) As during the Ahab period there were three wars that Ahab had with Ben-hadad, Ahab being victorious in two of them, so H.J.S. had three conflicts with the radicals. Those with the two radical churches that separated from the London Tabernacle resulted in victories for H.J.S.; but in his third conflict, which occurred during the Manchester Convention, the radicals from outside of London worsted him completely, in the reports against him that they gave J., so that J. as the Board's representative (and thus in a measure J.F.R.'s representative as a Board member and its executive), who for a while supported him against these radicals, had to give up that support, even as Ben-hadad defeated and slew Ahab, and compelled Jehoshaphat to leave the conflict defeated. And certainly from every standpoint of his opposition to J. as the Board's special representative, H.J.S. (and W.C. too) left the Manchester Convention, Jan. 2, 1917, thoroughly defeated and frustrated, even as Ahab left the first battle of Ramoth-gilead defeated and mortally wounded. It was during the little Ahab phase of H.J.S. that J.F.R. began to build his religious government, which proved to be a little Babylon, represented by Hiel of Bethel rebuilding Jericho (1 K. 16: 34); and thereby he underwent the little antitype of the curse that Joshua put upon the builder of Jericho (Josh. 6: 26), *i.e.*, in making power-grasping and lording the foundation to his religious government J.F.R. alienated J. and thereby lost him as his

chief supporter among those closest to him; and in putting the kind of persons into the chief offices of his religious government that he did, J.F.R. alienated M. Sturgeon, and thereby lost him as his least supporter among those nearest to him. Later on it will be shown that J.F.R. in his little Jehoram phase as co-regent of the little Jehoshaphat started to build his little Babylon (Jericho), Dec. 28, 1916, by preparing the resolutions that were designed by him to give him control in the Society; thus, his little Jericho's start was in the days of the little Ahab, as typed, even as in the large parallel the papacy began to develop its Jericho, great Babylon, during the days of autocracy, great Ahab.

Next H.J.S. for two days, Jan. 2, 3, 1917, entered the Ahaziah (of Israel) phase (1 K. 22: 49–2 K. 1: 18). During these two days H.J.S. continued his lording and sectarian ways, encouraged therein by W.C., as Ahab did, encouraged thereto by Jezebel. He tried to induce J.F.R. representatively in J. to let him join with him in I.B.S.A. and W.T.B.&T.S. works that would subordinate the latter to the former, which J.F.R. in J. refused to do. In H.J.S.'s "political" venture against the Lord's arrangements in the Tabernacle he came to a great fall, and sought betterment by power-grasping, for which J. rebuked him and twice refuted his letters and finally sent him word of his complete defeat, even as Ahaziah fell, injured himself, sought pertinent word from Satan, for which he was rebuked by Elijah, who destroyed his two captains with their fifties and finally gave him the Lord's sentence of death for his sin. H.J.S. fulfilled the Jehoram (of Israel) phase, Jan. 3-14, 1917 (2 K. 3: 1–9: 26, intermittently). The miscarrying of his power-grasping, lording and combinationistic plots moved him to give them up, even as Jehoram gave up Baal and Ashtaroth worship. But he and W.C. entreated J. to allow them to stand for election as elders, even if they should not serve, because they wanted exemption from the draft. The night of Jan. 8, at a meeting

of J. with the managers, J.H. brought charges against them for their Bethel revolutionisms. J. severely rebuked them therefore, after which they made the above-mentioned request. It showed that they had given up their small Baal and Ashtaroth worship, but that they still were contaminated with some clericalism and sectarianism, as will appear later. Very shortly after H.J.S. entered his Jehoram phase the British military party sought to force conscientious objectors to take up arms. This course of that party led H.J.S. to enlist J.F.R. (in J., the Board's and thus in a sense J.F.R.'s representative) and nominal-church conscientious objectors to enter an agreement to oppose this purpose and in the resultant difficulties these three were nearly defeated. J. (as teacher), when their discouragement was at the lowest ebb, assured them of victory, through arguments that he furnished them, despite H.J.S.'s evils, because God would regard J.F.R.'s position (represented in J. as executive). The military party thought the others were in helpless conflict with one another and charged on them in full hope of victory, but its arguments were refuted, and it was driven from the field of debate, as Jehoram, Jehoshaphat and the king of Edom, discouraged, were ready to give up, when Elisha encouraged them and helped them to defeat the attacking Moabites.

J.'s transition from the Elijah aspect of his British work to its Elisha aspect occurred Jan. 3, 1917. On Jan. 3 there occurred in J.'s mind various discussions *pro* and *con* on certain questions as to the British situation, corresponding to the last related acts of Elijah and Elisha. And amid these he changed from the Elijah aspect of a sterner to the more lenient view of the Elisha aspect as to the British situation, which resulted gradually in his more public opposition to H.J.S. and W.C., whereas in the Elijah aspect his sterner opposition was exercised in private. Some urged him to return to the sterner opposition, from which he sought to dissuade them. He finally told

them by the conditions to seek to restore it, but they failed, as the sons of the prophets sought and did as to Elisha on searching for Elijah. He did his part in making the Society's work in Britain more appreciable and fruitful, as Elisha healed Jericho's waters. He gave his attention to the Tabernacle situation, for which he was derided by the Shearno-Crawfordites, for whom he forecast evils, which came through the contentions between the two groups rallying about the two sets of Tabernacle elders, even as was the case of Elisha, the mocking children and the two she-bears. After a fruitful trip in Ireland and at Sheffield, England, J. returned to London, where Tabernacle policies required his attention, as Elisha returned by way of Carmel to Samaria. By this time J.'s work was gaining in the hearty support of the British churches, as the Shunammite provided for Elisha. He forecast a vigorous public work movement for them, which set in, but due to H.J.S.'s and W.C.'s whispering campaign against it and him, it withered for a while. J.H. sought in vain to restore it to vigor, but J., laying hold on the situation, was enabled to restore it to life and present it as an energetic thing to the British churches, these things being the small antitype of 2 K. 4: 8-37; while the small antitype of 2 K. 4: 1-7 occurred in connection with J.'s suggesting measures that ameliorated the severity of the situation created by conscription and conscientious objection in Britain. Various errors circulated among the British brethren which caused spiritual illness. J. prescribed refutative and constructive teachings that healed the evil (2 K. 4: 38-41). He was also privileged to set before the ecclesias various teachings on the harvest siftings and gatherings, to which J.H. opposed some objections, but J.'s course thereon prevailed, to the blessing of the ecclesias in the small antitype of 2 K. 4: 42-44. The story of Naaman (2 K. 5: 1-27) had its small fulfillment in the radical leaders' demanding of H.J.S. that he provide remedies that would heal certain radical public workers

from faults that injured their public work and the subsequent pertinent events. These radical leaders were referred to J., who showed them that by showing more of a spirit of helpfulness and friendliness for the public they would cure this evil. At first rejecting, then under persuasion acting out this advice, they received the cure, and desired unduly to honor and empower J., who rejected the effort, and then advised them on the course that their obligation to their party required of them in their individual ecclesiast. But in connection with this episode J.H. showed a power-grasping spirit that took to himself some of the powers that the radical leaders offered J., a thing that brought a rebuke upon J.H. from J. This rebuke was especially emphasized Jan. 8, 1917, at a managers' meeting, when J.H. brought charges against H.J.S. and W.C.

The episode of 2 K. 6: 1-7 had its small antitype in the desire of some to engage in public work along pilgrim, colporteur, volunteer and newspaper work; but due to the war the instruments of this work were lost to the brethren. J. offered suggestions to improve the condition, which was thereby remedied. 2 K. 6: 8-7: 20 found its antitype in a sharp fight between the radical party and the conservative party among the British brethren. There were three parties among the British brethren: a radical party, headed by a number of London elders; a conservative party, led by H.J.S. and W.C.; and a middle-of-the-road party, led by J.H., J. siding mainly and at first with the last as against the conservative party, but supporting both of these against the radical party. Because of J.'s counseling the conservative party against the radical party's moves, to the defeat of these, the radical party, convinced that J. was bringing about their various frustrations, sought to gain him over to them by capture through fear and power. Their maneuvers frightened J.H., who was calmed by J.; and then J. led them into the position of the conservatives, who, desiring to do them severity, were restrained by J. This resulted in

a conciliatory course being followed, with better feelings resulting on both sides. Thus was fulfilled the small antitype of 2 K. 6: 8-23. However, this did not end the strife among the radicals and conservatives, the strife beginning among these two parties of the 11 signatory elders, from them then proceeding to their partyites in the London Tabernacle and from these spreading among the supporters of these two parties throughout Britain. The matter of the nomination and election of the Tabernacle elders and deacons set off the explosion. On account of the conservative party's being curbed and cramped by the middle-of-the-roadsters, they were put to great disadvantage in their conflict with the radicals, and were reduced to great straits in their battlings. Various of their adherents entered into compromise with one another, and in one case after one of the parties thereto had fulfilled its part of the agreement, the other refused, and they complained to the party as a whole, which exposed the situation to all the more grief. H.J.S. blamed J. for the situation and planned to destroy his influence, which he, among other things, attempted by his protest on J.'s pertinent course in the ecclesia's business meeting of Jan. 7, 1917. J. expressed his thoughts on this to J.H. and his own private secretary.

This was followed by the managers' meeting of the night of Jan. 8. While in this meeting most of the time was devoted to a consideration of the charges that J.H. brought against the managerial offenses of the other two managers, some of the time was devoted to a discussion of their standing for eldership, against which J. advised, because of their sins against the ecclesia. They asked J. to let them stand for election, agreeing, if elected, not to occupy the pulpit. They desired such election so that they could claim exemption from military service as elders [pastors] of the ecclesia. And for them not to be elders endangered their pertinent position. J. felt that their wrongs against the ecclesia being so flagrant, they did not deserve the office,

and at first declined to consent to withdraw his pertinent advice, but upon reconsideration decided to withdraw it, if they would admit their wrong and promise amendment. This relieved the situation of their being crowded to the wall by the radicals, who, thinking they would not be elders, and thus be unable to help themselves, let alone others, opposed them; but on hearing that these would have J.'s support, and thus the support of the middle-of-the-roadsters, as well as of the conservatives, the former fled from the field of conflict, deserting all their positions and arguments. There were four groups of British brethren who were outside of the conflict, but much pressed by it, who decided to fall away to the radicals, but found them to have given up the siege of the conservatives. After being themselves refreshed they broke the news to H.J.S., who with his supporters were, after some skepticism, assured that relief had come. When J. had assured him of the coming of relief, his main supporter, W.C., doubted it. J. told him that he would see it, but would get no good from it, which happened in this way: The brethren in their eagerness to obtain relief crushed him while he was superintending the work of supplying the others with refreshment. In these ways the events of 2 K. 6: 24-7: 20 had their small antitypes.

The episode of 2 K. 8: 1-6 received the following as its small antitype. J.'s conflict with H.J.S., who had charge of the colporteur, volunteer, newspaper and pilgrim work (except J.'s), influenced H.J.S. to cease a zealous prosecution of these branches of service. J., seeing that this presaged a diminishing of opportunities of service, advised the British brethren to seek fields of service as best they could until this condition would be fully ended. Under J.'s vigorous resistance to H.J.S.'s pertinent course opportunities of service through the Bethel family's cooperation set in. At that time J.H. and H.J.S. were discussing J.'s public work and H.J.S. desired information thereon.

J.H. praised J.'s work as exceptionally successful, instancing his resuscitating a public work movement among the British brethren. In the meantime their sphere of service had fallen into disuse and other activities supplanted it. They began at the time of the above-mentioned conversation between J.H. and H.J.S. to demand the opening up of their former methods and opportunities of service. On being apprized by J.H. that these were those who were aroused to the public work by J., H.J.S., on inquiry being satisfied of the facts, arranged for the public work to go ahead at full speed.

The radical movement contained two parties: a more unwise one and a less unwise one. The former had lost considerable ground, especially since their disastrous retreat from their encounter with H.J.S. typed in the preceding chapter. This conflict occasioned J. to give more attention to these more unwise radicals, who, hearing of J.'s pertinent activities, sent some of the less unwise radicals, with expressions of honor and respect, to inquire of him whether they would recover from their weakness. J.'s answer was that they could, but would not. Then, realizing that a sifting was on, and that in this sifting the wiser of the radicals would work much havoc on the other brethren, J. was greatly saddened by the prospect, and foretold the evil course of these less unwise radicals, who protested against the forecast. These returned to the more unwise radicals, promising recovery, but shortly suppressed these from controllership among the radicals. Thus was fulfilled the small antitype of 2 K. 8: 7-15. The rest of 2 K. 8, together with 2 C. 20: 1-20, will now be explained in the small antitype, for which we will now return to a consideration of certain of the kings of Judah, as well as of certain of the kings of Israel, so far as concerns their small parallel.

Above it was remarked that in the case of J.F.R. the good parts of his mind, generally speaking, were expressed in his acts as the little Asa and Jehoshaphat. It was

also remarked that the bad side of his mind showed itself, and that in a doubling of both of these parts of his mind. The bad part began to work markedly at the time, Dec. 28, 1916, typed by the beginning of Jehoram's co-reign with his father, Jehoshaphat, nine years before the latter's death, *i.e.*, in the year 16 of Jehoshaphat's reign and two years before Ahab's death. It was on Dec. 28, 1916, after J.F.R. knew that he had enough proxies to insure his election as the Society's president, that he began to prepare such resolutions as, if passed by the Board at the recommendation of the voting shareholders, would give him executive and managerial powers in the Society's business and affairs. This self-exalting ambition—a sore temptation—was yielded to, just as the big pope in great Babylon yielded to self-exalting ambitions. Accordingly, J.F.R. drew up these resolutions and, additionally, planned every detail of the procedure of the voting shareholders' meeting. Eight days before the time of the shareholders' meeting, which was held Jan. 6, 1917, he sent a *report* of its proceedings, including his unanimous election, the appointment of a resolutions committee to present resolutions to the meeting (recommending the resolutions that he drew up), the names of his nominators, etc., to various papers, *e.g.*, the New York World, the Los Angeles Times, etc. Among J.F.R.'s published falsehoods was the following: He said that the resolutions were by A.I. Ritchie, as if they were his own, taken to Pittsburgh and recommended by him to the resolutions committee, whereas A.I. Ritchie stated that W.E.V. took them there. One of the members of the resolutions committee, its chairman, I.I. Margeson, corroborated to the writer A.I. Ritchie's account to the following effect: After the resolutions committee, consisting of Bros. Bricker, Ostrander and Margeson, was appointed, they asked one another as to what was expected of them. As they were so engaged, W.E.V., as if by accident, sauntered up to them, and they asked him as to what

was expected of them. Taking from his pocket a copy of the resolutions that J.F.R. had drawn up, he handed them to the committee, remarking that they might recommend these to the voting shareholders.

Retiring to a room to study these resolutions, they found that they were calculated to make a one-man affair of the Society, and proceeded to revise them in a way that the Board should not be ignored. This took some time; and, impatient at the delay, and suspecting that the committee desired to revise his resolutions, J.F.R. presumptuously stopped them as they were about to report to the meeting, and asked them, if they had revised them. They told him that they found that the resolutions would make a one-man affair of the Society, and that, opposed to this, they had revised them. Thereupon J.F.R. held them up for an hour, insisting that they must report those resolutions just as drawn up, or he would fight them before the full meeting of the voters. Instead of telling him in a polite way not to busybody in their, but to attend to his own business, and let them attend to theirs, they tamely submitted and recommended those power-grasping and lording resolutions as by-laws to the shareholders' meeting. These passed, J.F.R. was elected; but since the Society's charter empowered the Directors alone to make by-laws, J.F.R. had to leap over another hurdle, *i.e.*, get the Board to pass them and spread them over their minutes, which would give them the force of valid by-laws. He accomplished this feat of his power-grasping by intimidating the Board with the thought that the voting shareholders having passed the resolutions, they were duty bound to accept them, a claim that was untrue. Under this threat the Board meekly and wrongly submitted to his power-grasping, a thing that should have influenced them to reject his by-laws; and thus he became legally the executive and manager of the Society's business and affairs, as long as the Board did not rescind those resolutions. Any sober-minded and Biblically informed

new creature at once must, on these facts being presented to him, recognize the pertinent course of J.F.R. as power-grasping; yea, they were little Hiel building further his little Jericho. But he did not leave matters at giving him executive and managerial authority. That was not enough for the evil part of his double mind. He must magnify his executive and managerial authority into controllership, so that he would have the same power and authority in the Lord's work as our Pastor had. It is this evil part of his mind that in its first 17 days of operation, 9 contemporaneously with the Jehoshaphat phase and 8 after that phase ended, acted out the little parallel of Jehoram of Judah.

The general details of the last 8 of these 17 days will now be described, as typed in 2 K. 8: 16-24; 2 C. 21: 1-20. The resolutions were by J.F.R. intended to nullify the other six Board members as such and other prominent brethren, which their passing and their subsequent misuse by J.F.R. accomplished, even as Jehoram on becoming king killed his six brothers and certain Judahite princes. He was autocratic, as the house of Ahab was, because he became one with certain autocratic organizational arrangements, his resolutions, etc., and thus did evil before the Lord as Jehoram did; but for Bro. Russell's sake the Lord did not set him aside in this phase at once, as the Lord for David's sake bore with Jehoram. The British nominal-church conscientious objectors fell away from subordination to the Society as represented by J.F.R. and never returned thereto, despite discussions with them in which they were worsted by J., as the Board's and thus in a sense J.F.R.'s representative, as explained above, as the Edomites did to Judah. Certain clear-seeing priests also turned against him, as did Libnah, a priestly city. He misled the brethren by a union of religious and secular, particularly legal views, as Jehoram did with the high places, etc. For at this time J. wrote J.F.R. letters in the little Elijah, not in the little Elisha spirit, remonstrating with him for his

wrong course, and warning him of evils coming as a result thereof, as Elijah by his letter did to Jehoram. It should be here remarked that events of an earlier phase coming to knowledge and leading to action during the time of a later phase are referred to typically as occurring in the earlier phase. The act just referred to is one of many coming under this explanatory remark. As a result J.F.R. suffered from sectarian and treacherous brethren who despoiled him of power, supporters, arrangements and internal order, as Jehoram suffered the types of these things. This phase of him was not desired or respected at its end, as Jehoram was not desired or respected in death.

Let us not forget that, beginning with the sole Jehoram (of Judah) phase, Jan. 6, 1917, as pointed out above, we have a series of phases of J.F.R. as the little parallel of the following kings of Judah: Jehoram, Ahaziah, Athaliah (a queen), Joash and Amaziah, who represent, generally speaking, the evil part of his double mind, while they operated contemporaneously with, generally speaking, the good part of his double mind, represented by the Judahite kings Uzziah, Jotham and Ahaz, the last going over into the bad part of his mind. We first will discuss his evil-minded acts as represented by the second of the first set of the foregoing kings (2 K. 8: 25-29; 9: 21, 22, 27, 28; 2 C. 22: 1-9), having already discussed his acts as the little Jehoram of Judah. We will here begin with Ahaziah, who co-reigned one year with his father, and reigned one year alone, typing Jan. 12, 13, in the little parallel. On Jan. 13 he sided with H.J. S, in his conflict with the wiser radicals; and he ended this phase as J.H. girded himself to fight H.J.S. in the matter of the election of elders. During this time he was under the influence of the party that advanced him to his place as executive and manager, and that led him into an autocratic course; and this brought him to begin what eventually resulted in a clash between him and J.H. in the Jehu phase,

which brought him to the end of this arbitrary phase.

H.J.S.'s and W.C.'s course on the resolution and J.'s opposition thereto became known to many in the ecclesia during H.J.S.'s Jehoram (of Israel) phase, Jan. 3-14, 1917. J., by letter, as well as by conversation, had aroused J.H., and the latter his fellow non-signatory elders, into opposition to H.J.S.'s and W.C.'s election as elders (2 K. 9: 1-10); and this was done secretly; and secretly these worked against their election among those of the ecclesia who knew of the resolution. This aroused more or less criticism in the meeting held for the election. H.J.S. briefly protested his loyalty to the ecclesia, which led to more sentiment being aroused, still secretly, against him. The first election occurred Jan. 14, 1917, resulting in the election of all the non-signatory elders and the defeat of several of the signatory elders, including H.J.S. and W.C. Thus this election proved to be J.H.'s revolution, as the little parallel of Jehu's, against H.J.S., as the little parallel of Jehoram (of Israel), and against W.C., as the little parallel's leader (the hierarchy) of the little Jezebel (2 K. 9: 11-37). This defeat ended the little Jehoram (of Israel) and Jezebel phase, and turned H.J.S. and W.C. and their followers from little antitypical Israelites into little antitypical Syrians; and the group became subjects of little Hazael and later of little Ben-hadad, H.J.S., the leader of the radicals, who included quite a number of brethren. These fought J.H. and his supporters for a long time, in fact throughout the five phases of the little Jehu dynasty (Jehu, Jehoahaz, Jehoash, Jeroboam II and Zachariah). Thus Jan. 14, 1917, witnessed the overthrow of the last phase of H.J.S. as the little parallel of certain of Israel's kings and the beginning of J.H.'s course as the little parallel of the rest of Israel's kings. It is also significant that it was on Jan. 14, 1917, that J. withdrew priestly fellowship from H.J.S., but at the time he knew nothing about the little parallel, in fact did not at the time, Jan. 14,

1917, when he gave H.J.S. up as an unhelpable case, realize that this act meant J.'s withdrawing priestly fellowship from, and delivering him to the fit man. It was about that time, perhaps a day or two before, that he reacted toward W.C. in the same way. In both cases it occurred after they, following J.'s repeated efforts to reclaim them, had turned down with hypocritical letters his above-mentioned offer on their standing for election, without his protesting it, if they would acknowledge their pertinent wrong and would reform.

Now J.H. appears as the little parallel of Israel's kings from Jehu onward to Hoshea, their last king. As everyone of these kings did evil with here and there some good, so they typed J.H.'s usually bad course with some good interspersed: for J.'s experiences with him revealed him to J. as one of the most cunning hypocrites with whom he ever dealt. So completely successful was he as a hypocrite that J. did not suspect this of him until after J.F.R. threw J. down, when J.H. threw off the mask and acted out his real character. It is true that several times previously J. had to correct him, especially when he suggested to J. that he, J.H., be made pastor of the London Tabernacle, and when he acknowledged that he had succumbed to H.J.S.'s and W.C.'s power-grasping him out of his place as chief manager, without persevering resistance, into almost a figure-head among the managers. He, with his supporters, by their election tactics, brought to an end J.H. S. as the little parallel of certain Israelitish kings, and also brought to an end W.C. as the little hierarchy representing little Jezebel. In his Jehu aspect his acts are typed in 2 K. 9; 10; 2 C. 22: 8, 9. By his course in the election he also brought to an end J.F.R. as the little Ahaziah who supported H.J.S. and W.C. for eldership. During the 28 days, Jan. 14 to Feb. 10, 1917, J.H. cooperated to set aside every feature of H.J.S.'s and W.C.'s control in the Bethel and Tabernacle, destroying their lording and power-grasping and

those of their supporters. As the little parallel of Bidkar and Jehonadab J. supported him throughout therein. Learning that H.J.S. had made some defense of himself to the ecclesia, Jan. 14, before the vote on officers, J. wrote to J.H. that if at the second election, which gave the defeated ones a chance of standing again for election, and which was to occur Jan. 21, he should seek to justify himself, J.H. should as J.'s mouthpiece express to the church J.'s disapproval of H.J.S. J. also wrote that he stood ready to appear before the church to give his opinion on the resolution, if desired.

On Jan. 21 H.J.S., contrary to J.'s urgent advice, did seek to justify himself as faithful to the church. Thereupon, as requested by J., J.H. made a statement to the ecclesia as J.'s mouthpiece on J.'s opposition to H.J.S. He was to give the reasons for J.'s view, but failed so to do. However, the church voted that J. be requested to give, as the Society's commissioner, his view of the resolution's movement. In the preceding chapter the details of what occurred on Jan. 28 are given. This led to the extirpation of the little Baal worshippers in the house of little Baal; for it exposed and blasted the whole Baalistic course on the resolution's movement. J.'s severe handling of H.J.S. before the London Tabernacle Church was in a sense premature, for J.H. failed to state J.'s reasons for disapproving the resolution movement, as asked by J. to do; and J., assuming that he had done it, spoke on the matters in a way that presupposed that the church knew the facts, which warranted J.'s rough handling of H.J.S. on Jan. 28 before the church. This condition resulted in some members of the ecclesia and in some members of other ecclesiastical bodies who were present taking H.J.S.'s side as being seemingly unjustly treated; and some of these showed their dissent emphatically. Many of these dissenters remained so, and influenced others to be the same, with the result that the H.J.S. party was formed, and took away

from J.H. quite a number of supporters. This result is the small parallel of Hazael's taking the whole territory east of the Jordan from Jehu and doing him other mischief. When J. left Bethel Feb. 10 for his Edinburgh pilgrim visit, J.H. ended his phase of the little Jehu, in which he did well in helping to overthrow the Baalism and Ashtarothism of H.J.S. and W.C.; but he acted out in the little parallel certain clericalistic and sectarian principles, typed by Jehu's serving the calves at Bethel and Dan.

We now return to the parallel of Judah's kings. On Jan. 13, 1917, the little parallel of Athaliah set in; and it lasted until Jan. 19, 1917. This period was the time of the co-reign of J.F.R. and a clique of his supporters, hence represented by a queen; it ended when the Board, Jan. 19, adopted the by-laws voted on by the shareholders Jan. 6. These seven days witnessed the murder of the democratic policies by which the charter directed that the Society's work should be done, except the one that the Board retained, *i.e.*, its controllership in Society matters. Its passing the shareholders' voted by-laws put an end to the joint rulership of J.F.R. and his clique, and established the principle of the Board's supremacy in the Society, with J.F.R. as its authorized executive and manager. And with this J.F.R. entered the Joash phase of the little parallel. It was an energetic action of the Board, led on thereto by our Lord, that put an end to the little Athaliah and let a democratic feature operate without the union of J.F.R. and a clique in control (2 K. 11: 1-20; 2 C. 22: 10-23: 21). In the Joash phase (Jan. 19-Feb. 27), which, generally speaking, was evil, J.F.R. did well exceptionally for a while. He encouraged the brethren to build up the breaches in the Church. He enlisted the service of the main and subordinate leaders in this work, and, despite the zealous response, succeeded in the end in arousing a genuine zeal in the work (2 K. 11: 21-12: 16; 2 C. 24: 1-14). But A.H.M. and W.E.V. in America and H.J.S., W.C. and

F.G. Guard, Sr. (Geshem), pretending great subserviency to J.F.R., moved him to enter into a forbidden alliance with these clericalists and sectarians against the reform work that J. was doing in England. This led to J.'s protesting and to J.F.R.'s ordering him cut off from his work by recalling him, which recall was sent Feb. 26 and reached the London Bethel Feb. 27, 1917, on which date J.F.R. ceased to act in the Joash phase. J.F.R.'s course in this matter led H.J.S., W.C. and their followers to do immense damage to J.F.R.'s interests in Britain, even as Hazael did Joash much damage, while the pertinent course that J.H. and A.H.M. took killed him in his Joash aspect (2 K. 12: 17-21; 2 C. 24: 15-27).

There remains yet of Judah's kings that in the doubling picture forth the evil side of J.F.R.'s mind mainly, but one more, Amaziah, whose little parallel will be presented before we return to the little parallel of Israel's kings (2 K. 14: 1-19; 2 C. 25: 1-28). J.F.R. made large preparations for public work against the nominal-church conscientious objectors in America, and enlisted certain ones who proved to be sifters in Britain, against whose cooperation J. advised, even as Amaziah made preparations against Edom, and arranged for certain Israelites to cooperate, against which the prophet advised. In both cases the advice was followed, though the rejected warriors avenged themselves for their alleged injury. This American public work prospered in its refutations and in its winning of many new ones for the Truth, especially opponents of war, nominal-church conscientious objectors. But J.F.R. from this campaign took over nominal-church methods, which displeased the Lord, who raised up a protesting brother, as Amaziah took Edomite idols as his gods and incurred God's disapproval, expressed by a prophet. J.F.R. charged him with busybodying and ordered him to be silent, which the brother did, with the remark that the Lord would cut him off from that phase, even as was done in the

large part of the parallel. J.F.R.'s course toward J. was in reality an interference with, and a challenge of J.H. in his stand against H.J.S. and W.C.J.H. tried to dissuade him from that part of this course, which in reality favored H.J.S. and W.C. as against J.H.'s purposes. J.H. finally accepted this challenge in the battle before the Investigative Commission that J.F.R. appointed to investigate the Bethel and Tabernacle situation, and therein thoroughly defeated J.F.R.'s purpose, which was to secure J.'s condemnation and H.J.S.'s and W.C.'s exoneration. However, in taking up the challenge and in defeating J.F.R.'s purpose he entered into a course that undermined J., with J.F.R., to the great injury of the powers of the Society, for which J. stood in Britain, even as Amaziah challenged the unwilling Joash, was defeated by him and suffered the overthrow of 400 cubits of Jerusalem's walls. In Britain the Investigative Commission planned measures against him, because of his wrongs against J. as the Society's special representative, and sent him a report that refuted him on the matter and justified J. in his work as done in harmony with his credentials, and thus on these carried him as a symbolic corpse to the Society. With the Amaziah phase of the little parallel the doubling of the little kings of Judah ends. The successor phase, Uzziah, also called Azariah, returns to Jan. 6, 1917.

But we will now return to the little parallels of the Israelitish kings. Having finished with the Jehu phase, we will now take up the Jehoahaz phase: Feb. 10 to Feb. 26, which is typed in 2 K. 10: 35; 13: 1-9, 22, 23. Throughout the Jehoahaz phase J.H. continued to practice sectarianism and clericalism, and in this displeased the Lord. The little Hazael, led by H.J.S., gained considerable ground against him the first week of J.H.'s Jehoahaz phase, pressing, as they did, the thought that J. and J.H., especially the former, had done him wrong on Jan. 28 before the Tabernacle church; and many of those who were not present, Feb. 18,

and thus had not seen him proven before the whole Tabernacle congregation a gross wrong-doer, were deceived into taking his part, which led to not a few, but by no means a majority, siding with him against J.H. and J. The latter was absent from London for a three days pilgrim trip at Edinburgh and Darlington, from which he returned to London Feb. 13. That day W.C. with his wife left Bethel, disgusted after failing to persuade J. to alter his decision on his leaving Bethel. The next day, because J. would not alter his decision that H.J.S. and his family leave Bethel, H.J.S. became quite saucy to J. The latter, seeing the uses that H.J.S. and W.C. were making of his severity with the former before the Tabernacle congregation on Jan. 28, determined by God's grace to deliver the brethren from their deceitful propaganda. And the Lord raised him up as a savior by whom He delivered the bulk of the brethren from their deception.

On Feb. 4 the London Tabernacle congregation, some of whose members were more or less disturbed by J.'s course against H.J.S. on Jan. 28, passed a resolution asking J. to appear before it on Feb. 18 and give it the details on the situation that mistakenly he had supposed J.H. had given it on Jan. 21, and, therefore, on Jan. 28 had proceeded on the assumption that the ecclesia understood the details, which resulted in his giving them facts for which their previous imperfect knowledge left many of them unprepared to digest fully. After returning from Darlington to London on Feb. 13, J. devoted part of his time to preparing the seven charges against H.J.S. and W.C. on which he was to speak before the business meeting of the Tabernacle congregation. This speech and its effects were described toward the end of the preceding chapter. It effected the deliverance of the real little Israelites from the oppression of the little Syrians (2 K. 13: 3-5), even as J.H. had ardently hoped. But there remained yet some evils among the British brethren: clericalism, sectarianism, textbookism

and some other nominal-church connected practices, all of which weakened J.H. in his Jehoahaz phase. These things prepared him for his fall into the evil of turning against J. the night of Feb. 25 (God's time, Feb. 26), when he wrote a condemnatory postscript to his favorable letter to J., after J.F.R.'s "absolutely without authority" cable reached him, which course ended his Jehoahaz phase and began his Jehoash phase, which lasted from Feb. 26 to Mar. 13, 1917, whose type is found in 2 K. 13: 10-19, 25.

Like H.J.S. in all his little parallel phases, J.H., as in all his little parallel phases of Israel's kings, was in the Jehoash phase guilty of sectarianism and clericalism, but more concealedly than H.J.S. was in these evils. While treating of J.F.R. as the little parallel of Amaziah, the conflict of the latter with J.H. in his Jehoash of Israel phase was described. Therefore here will be described the other features alone of the little Jehoash. The last episode of J. as the little Elisha parallel occurred here. J. received J.F.R.'s recall cable at Manchester, Feb. 28, and, under the mistaken impression that J.F.R. had the right to recall him, immediately ceased functioning as special representative, and returned from Manchester, whose church he served as pilgrim, Feb. 27, 28, to London, Mar. 1. The scene of 2 K. 13: 14-19 occurred during the sessions of the Investigative Commission, Mar. 3-5, 1917. Thus this was within the week that J. considered himself no longer special representative, and ceased from his pilgrim activities, Feb. 28 to March 6, the latter being the date that, recognizing that he was the Board's, not J.F.R.'s special representative, he came to see that J.F.R.'s recalling him without the Board's knowledge, let alone its consent, was itself "absolutely without authority." Therefore J. resumed his duties as special representative. But it was between Feb. 28 and Mar. 6, *i.e.*, Mar. 3-5, that J. fulfilled the little parallel of Elisha in vs. 14-19. Hence he was in a symbolically sick condition and actually dying in the Elisha phase

of his British work; for to have allowed himself for a week to believe that J.F.R. without the Board's authorization could recall him was a sick condition.

Sunday morning, March 4, J.H. and J. were together speaking of the work of the Investigative Commission. At that time J.H., in the better part of his double mind, deeply sorrowed over J.'s plight as the Society's recalled and thus discredited special representative, who had fathered J.H., who had been a deliverer of the British Church and J.H. in sore trials, and whose recall made J.H. worry over the Society and the Society leaders then being in special trial (v. 14), and expressed to J. his sympathy with him. Then it was that J. handed to J.H. a paper on which he had listed a number of sharp points against H.J.S. and his party. One of these sharp points J. told J.H. to shoot, with the help of his party, out of privacy into the publicity of the Investigative Commission, as especially destructive of the position of H.J.S.'s party, J. assuring him that thereby he would gain victory over the H.J.S. party. This J.H. did. J. then told him to strike with the other points the foundations of H.J.S.'s whole position; but J.H. used only three of these points against that position. Learning of this, J. was displeased, for he saw that the total defeat of the H.J.S. party would not ensue as a result of J.H.'s partial effort. J. died as the little Elisha toward the end of the sessions of the Investigative Commission. There were some British brethren who stood not for J.H. as against H.J.S., but were strongly inclined toward the latter. Among these was Gilbert Mackenzie, of Glasgow, one of the five members of J.F.R.'s Investigative Commission, who sharply disapproved J.'s dismissal of his friend, H.J.S. This party sought to do J.H.'s cause some mischief through the investigation by the Commission. As the evidence piled up against H.J.S., Gilbert Mackenzie gave up his sympathy with the H.J.S. party, and was by his former partisans cast off. Thus he gained a

proper focus as to J.'s acts as special representative, which put him solidly upon his feet aright; and he decided that the facts warranted the dismissal of H.J.S. and W.C. as managers and their non-election as elders. He with the other four members of the Commission signed the report that vindicated J.'s course of opposing the resolutions movement and the re-election of H.J.S. and W.C. as Tabernacle elders, and that approved of his course of dismissing the two as managers. This course of events caused H.J.S. to die from his strong position as the little Hazael and to take up a decidedly weaker position as the little Benhadad, who as such was thoroughly defeated in three fields of battle by J.H. as the little Jehoash, *i.e.*, in Bethel, in the Tabernacle and in the extra-London churches, which resulted in J.H.'s recovering from H.J.S. the advantage that the latter got in the churches as the little Hazael (2 K. 13: 24, 25).

With Jeroboam II the doubling of the little type sets in, in order to bring out the evil part of J.H.'s mind more prominently. Accordingly, the little Jeroboam II covers the same periods as those covered by the little Jehu and Jehoahaz, except the last three days of the latter's 17 days, *i.e.*, the periods of Jan. 14-Feb. 10, and of Feb. 10-23. During the little Jehu's period (Jan. 14-Feb. 10) two features were prominent: J.H.'s victory over H.J.S. as the little Jehoram and the extreme power-grasping of the latter's party, and J.H.'s setbacks by H.J.S. as the little Hazael in radicalism's conflicts with J.H.'s clericalism, resulting in some in the Tabernacle and in other ecclesiast falling away from J.H. to H.J.S. On Feb. 3 H.J.S. and W.C. also attempted to take the first and second steps of Matt. 18: 15-18 with J., for official acts as the Society's special representative, even arranging for the second step before taking the first step which consisted of short notes written by each and as per plan separately handed to J., by the second as soon as the first left him. After reading each one J. was asked if he were ready to apologize. He

replied that he would answer in writing. Each one immediately withdrew, after delivering his note and hearing J.'s reply, not making the least effort to "win" the supposed offender. These acts of theirs, done but a few minutes apart, and by them prearranged, were a mere pretense at the first step, so that they could take the second step, which consisted of each bringing separately to Bethel two groups of the signatory elders and at least one elder of the Forest Gate Church, W.C.'s father-in-law, F.G. Guard, Sr. (little Geshem), now an advocate of the 1908-1911 sifters' errors. J.H. was also included in the "first" and "second step," the second step being taken with J.H. and J. at the same time and place.

J. replied to H.J.S.'s witnesses that his course was that of the Society's commissioner and an official act and, therefore, did not come under the scope of Matt. 18: 15-18, that as J. was not a member of the church of which H.J.S. was a member, the case could not be covered by the expression, Tell it to the church, and that the only one who could review his pertinent acts was the Board. He then read his credentials to the witnesses, who, recognizing the propriety of J.'s position, gave up being witnesses. J.H. answered to the following effect: that the whole procedure was farcical, for neither the spirit nor the letter of Matt. 18: 15-18 had been followed by their so-called first step and by their arranging for the so-called second step before taking the so-called first step. Then J. turned to H.J.S. and called attention to the fact that he had added another blunder to the many that he had already committed, and asked him whether his succession of blunders were not a sure evidence that the Lord was taking him in his own craftiness. H.J.S. turned to his witnesses and said, "You see, brethren, the spirit that he shows." But his witnesses by act, apart from little Geshem, gave up the job. For quite a while W.C. and his witnesses stood in the doorway listening and waiting their turn, but they seemed to have heard

enough; for they did not come to J.H. and J., but left with the other witnesses. J. kept his promise of answering their notes in writing, which consisted of a notice of their dismissal as managers. J.H., with whom J. counseled over the subject, and to whom J. read his dictated note of dismissal, suggested the addition of a clause ordering them to surrender all implements of their office and with their families leave Bethel at once. The events set forth in this paragraph occurred Feb. 3, 1917. Thus ended H.J.S.'s and W.C.'s authority in Bethel and in the Tabernacle.

On Feb. 23 the little Jeroboam II ceased to act as such, the arrival of J.F.R.'s cable appointing the Investigative Commission that day gave J.H. a slight change of attitude, which lasted about a half-day and in which he acted out the little parallel of Zachariah (2 K. 15: 8-12). This half-day was, like the days of his preceding four aspects, one which, in general, was evil, since it was characterized with some clericalism and sectarianism. Thus in all five of these aspects of J.H. we see his double-mindedness exhibited. Feb. 23 was a fateful day for J.H., for not only was he then acting out the end of the little parallel of Jeroboam II and of Zachariah, but for a couple of hours that of Shallum, and began to act out that of Menahem (2 K. 15: 13-22). He had learned about that time that J.F.R. had cabled J., Feb. 19, to restore H.J.S. and W.C. as managers. J. received this cable perhaps Feb. 21, and J.'s pertinent letter reached J.H. probably Feb. 23; and these things probably made J.H. experience the mental states figured forth by the four kings' pertinent experiences. In the little parallel of Menahem (Feb. 23-March 4) J.H. continued to act out the evils of clericalism and sectarianism. The most noteworthy event of this phase of his work was the matters connected with the Investigative Commission, appointed Feb. 23, through which Azazel as Pul, king of Assyria, made a preliminary attempt to seize J.H. To straighten himself out with this Commission, under the pressure of

its questionings, he made immense drains on the help, cooperation and influence of his ablest supporters, which resulted in Azazel through that Commission ceasing to press him hard (March 4). This made him come to the end of his being the little parallel of Menahem. Thence he took on the Pekahiah aspect, March 4, 5 (2 K. 15: 22-26). During these two days he continued his clericalistic and sectarian activities, in maneuvering his partisans to testify in his favor before the Investigative Commission, whose sessions ended the night of March 5. And it was late that day that he altered his course into a fiercer fight before the Commission against H.J.S.'s party.

This started his part in the little parallel of Pekah, March 5-24 (2 K. 15: 27-31, 37; 2 C. 28: 5-15), in which J.H. continued his clericalistic and sectarian course. In this period came the main parts of his opposition to J. During the week (Feb. 28-March 6) that J. believed that J.F.R. had the right to recall him and cancel his credentials, he refrained from all acts as special representative; but, coming about midday of March 6 to the conclusion that his being sent by the Board excluded him from J.F.R.'s authority, and hence from his power to recall him without the Board's authorizing it, he also concluded that without the Board's authorization J.F.R. could not cancel his credentials. That night J. discussed these two matters with J.H., who at the time made no objections to the argument. Hence J. informed him that he was taking charge again, and would take his former place at the head of the table at meals as long as the Board did not recall him. Within a few days tension set in between J.H. and J. because of the latter's reassumption of his powers as special representative. It was during this time that the Bethel Family divided into two parts: 11 who stood with J. and 4 who stood with J.H., his wife and his stenographer being 2 of these 4, that the injunction suit was started, its second hearing held and the case postponed, that J.H. through

H.C. Thackway denounced J. as a fraud before the Tabernacle congregation and, that J.H. appointed guards in the Bethel, who used force against E. Housden and J., locking up the former in his room, forcibly searching him and taking his keys from him, and barricading J. in his room, J. leaving Bethel March 22. After this he stopped at a hotel until March 31, when he left London for Liverpool, whence he sailed for America, April 1. Details on this are found in EF, Chapter I, pp. 42-48, 50-65. The culmination of J.H.'s evil-doings as the little parallel of Pekah is found in the small antitype of 2 C. 28: 5-15. Contrary to his fighting the H.J.S. party in the little parallels of Jehu, Jehoahaz, Jehoash, Jeroboam II and Zachariah, he joined in with them in fighting J. as the Society's special representative, and hence in fighting J.F.R. as the little Ahaz; for since from March 6 to March 24 J. was defending the Society's interests, what J.H. and H.J.S. and their parties did against J. was done against the Society and J.F.R. as a Board member and the Board's executive, despite the fact that J.F.R., with J.H. and H.J.S., was fighting J. And the setbacks given J. by the two sets of British leaders backed by J.F.R. were such to the Society and him.

If the reader will turn to J.F.R.'s *Harvest Siftings* I, pp. 5-8, he will find there a letter of J.H., dated March 24, the day that he came to the culmination of his Pekah aspect. This letter together with the summary of his April 1 address before the Tabernacle congregation, given in J.F.R.'s *Harvest Siftings*, pp. 20-22, contain 71 falsehoods. This letter, combined with the letters of H.J.S.'s party, in their attacks on the real interests of the Society, represented by J., and of J.F.R., are the small parallel's antitype of the attacks of Pekah of Israel and Resin of Syria upon Jerusalem and Ahaz (Is. 7: 1). The fearful slaughter of the 120,000 men of Judah in one day by Pekah corresponds to the many Society adherents who were by that letter cut off from standing for its real interests against the little Pekah.

and Resin, and the 200,000 captives that Pekah carried away from Judah correspond to the crown-losers who, deceived by J.H.'s letter of March 24, heartily espoused the side advocated by J.H. against the Society's real interests espoused by J. But many British brethren acquainted with the facts, knowing that J.H.'s letter of March 24 literally swarmed with falsehoods, opposed him so sharply that J.H. threatened to resign unless the Tabernacle congregation gave him a vote of confidence; but his desired majority thereby was so slim that he got little comfort from it, and was forced to take a course that released his captives from his control; but their liberation meant their going back to the Society now turned into little Jericho, a Great Company institution, even as J.F.R. during the time that H.J.S. was in the Ahab aspect (Dec. 12-Jan. 2) began to rebuild this little Jericho, little Babylon, as shown above. Jericho (*city of palms*) primarily represents the nominal church as built up by crown-losers (Matt. 7: 26, 27; Rev. 7: 9), and J.F.R. rebuilt it in the sense of building another, a little Romanist Church, a little Babylon (1 K. 16: 34). J.H.'s Pekah aspect was so far his most evil aspect. J.H. in his acts against J. thought that he triumphed over him; and externally he seemed so to do; but the price that he paid for it was a falling of many of his supporters and of much of his sphere of influence into Azazel's hands, even as Pekah lost many of his Israelitish subjects and much of Israel's territory to Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria (2 K. 15: 29).

J.H. was by Divine foreknowledge marked as having but one more aspect as a little parallel of Israel's kings, that of Hoshea, March 24-April 1. In the Hoshea aspect (2 K. 17: 1-7; 18: 9-12) J.H. did evil, yet not so much of it as in his former kingly aspects, nor as H.J.S. in his kingly aspects. But he fell during this time progressively into Azazel's hands, beginning in a partial way early in this aspect, as the type shows that while Hoshea year by year until the sixth or seventh year had paid tribute to the

Assyrians, and then ceased, he had been serving Azazel partially, and then ceased to do so, for which, during March 30, Azazel made a special attack on him and for three (Hebrew) days (two of ours), March 30-April 1, pressed him sorely and at the end of that time took him into his full control, April 1. The circumstances of this were twofold: (1) those connected with J.'s leaving England and (2) J.H.'s preparing and delivering his attack on J., his benefactor, before the Tabernacle congregation, before which J. had very self-sacrificingly delivered him from the greatest trial of his life, as he told that congregation on Feb. 18, after J. had finished his long address of that afternoon, described above. J. made his final preparations to leave England, March 30; he left London March 31 for his boat at Liverpool, and left Liverpool about 7 A.M., April 1. J.H. began to work on his denunciatory speech probably March 30, continued with it March 31 and delivered it April 1, about 3 hours after J. sailed out of Liverpool's harbor. We say that he began to work on it *probably* March 30, because that is the date corresponding to the beginning of Samaria's siege and it was in connection with that speech's delivery that J.H. fell fully into Azazel's hands. This speech is given in a synopsis in J.F.R.'s Harvest Siftings, pp. 20-22. It is full of misrepresentations and its delivery marks J.H.'s complete falling into Azazel's hands, as J.'s leaving England was his final abandoning of J.H. unto Azazel, just as the Board's majority's leaving Bethel (Aug. 8, 1917) marked the priesthood's abandoning J.F.R. to Azazel, a point briefly shown above and to be shown fuller later.

But J.'s leaving Britain April 1 meant more than the priesthood, in him, abandoning J.H. to Azazel; it also meant its abandonment of all his new-creaturely partisan supporters to Azazel; for as the bulk of the American new creatures have been proven to be crown-losers, so have the bulk of the British new creatures been proven to be such.

The crown-lost British brethren have, like the captive Israelites in Assyria, been scattered into three main groups, *i.e.*, the Shearnites, Crawfordites and Hemeryites, and into many subordinate groups and independent ecclesiastas, because during their preceding trial time they had violated in many ways the Lord's Word given by Jesus through that Servant, as the ten-tribed kingdom of Israel had done as to the Mosaic covenant, and walked in many evils of the nominal churches. A summary of the evils of the British brethren is given in type in 2 K. 17: 9-18, which will be briefly given with verse reference to the type. In their crown-lost hearts they misdeveloped their characters and built their classes into little nominal churches, in harmony with their elders and the general British Church (v. 9). They formed various wrong combinations of Truth and nominal-church arrangements, like elders practically controlling the ecclesiastas, thus practicing clericalism, and textbookism (v. 10). They used their choice human powers, that should have built up Zion, in the sectarian service of parties (v. 11). They devoted their consecrated powers to the furtherance of their speculations, a thing that God forbids (v. 12; Ex. 19: 21-25). Yet the Lord remonstrated with them, particularly through J.'s ministry among them from Nov. 19, 1916, to April 1, 1917, who everywhere encouraged them to repent and be faithful to the Truth teachings, *i.e.*, throughout the reigns of the little kings, beginning with the little Baasha and ending with the little Hoshea (v. 13). But they refused to mend their ways, and in the phase of each little king set themselves in evil ways (v. 14). They were disloyal to God's teachings and arrangements given through that Servant, and followed various errors, conforming in many ways to the nominal church, contrary to the Lord's charges (v. 15). Among their chief sins was clericalism and sectarianism, which they set up contrary to God's Word. They made illicit combinations of Truth and nominal-church matters, bowed

down to the clericalists in worship of angels and, worst of all, practiced power-grasping and lording ways (v. 16). The leaders used fear of the Second Death to control their supporters: preached error and enslaved themselves for symbolic hire to practice wrong in relation to God's matters, unto provoking Him to displeasure (v. 17), all of which moved God to deliver them up to Azazel, before doing it to American crown-losers (v. 18).

But the American crown-lost brethren, especially the pilgrims and elders, as can be seen by our Pastor's article in Z '16, 327-331, on The Hour of Temptation, did not faithfully practice God's Word, but did more or less like their British crown-lost brethren (v. 19). This moved the Lord in a sense to reject from special favor all of them, the British and American crown-lost brethren, the day Bro. Russell left Brooklyn the last time, Oct. 16, 1916, at which date the partial rejection was evident by the division of the little kingdom into its two parts. The leaders of both parts made spoil of their followers for their own aggrandizement, even until they and their crown-lost followers were delivered over to Azazel. God's displeasure occasioned the rending asunder of the Lord's people as shepherdized by Bro. Russell into two parts, so that there began with a small start a real division between the American and the British crown-lost leaders and their followers, Oct. 16, 1916, which widened, until on April 1, 1917, the British crown-losers fell into Azazel's hands and on Aug. 8, 1917, the American crown-losers experienced the same evil (v. 20). In this separation the Lord allowed H.J.S. to become the British leader of crown-losers; and he led them away from the Lord into great sin (v. 21). The British crown-losers walked in the evil of clericalism and sectarianism and did not give them up (v. 22), not even by April 1, 1917, when God delivered them to Azazel, as God repeatedly warned, especially through J.'s ministry in Britain.

Hence they were delivered to Azazel, in whose hands

they have remained until the present (v. 23). Azazel has since brought into the British ecclesiast five sets of sifters who severally have sifted them with the five harvest errors: no-ransomism, infidelism, combinationism, reformism and contradictionism (v. 24). These did not reverence God, who sent, permissively, among them devouring errors, which destroyed them (v. 25). This led them to seek, really of Azazel, a reformation of their errors through teachers better informed on the Truth (v. 26). Azazel raised up such teachers for them (v. 27), who in clericalism taught them a corruption of the Truth (v. 28). The five sifter classes retained their errors, as well as added to them the above-mentioned corruption of the Truth (vs. 29-31). They have continued this doubly-compounded confusion until the present time, forgetful of all the Lord's favors to them and the Biblical truths that He gave them, and despite admonitions given them even unto the present (vs. 32-41). As J. writes this and recalls his loving and strenuous efforts on behalf of the British brethren, his heart bleeds for them as buffeted by Satan, but he rejoices that ere long the Lord will deliver them, penitent, out of Azazel's hands for their cleansing and reinstatement into His favor.

We now return to J.F.R. and study him, first, as the little parallel of Uzziah of 2 C. and Azariah of 2 K., as which he acted the 52 days from Jan. 6 to Feb. 26. Here, as the first date shows, the better side of the doubling set in. We say, the better side of the doubling set in, because, as a rule, while the evil doubling was during Jan. 6-March 27, there was more good than evil done by J.F.R. in the better side of the doubling period, even as there was more evil than good done by J.F.R. in the worse side of the doubling period. Note the dates Jan. 6, 1917, the day of J.F.R.'s first election as president of the Society, and Feb. 26, the day his "absolutely without authority" cable, sent Feb. 24 to London, where J.H. got it the night of Feb. 25, reached J. at Liverpool Feb. 26, and the day that he presumed without the Board's knowledge, let alone its consent, to recall J., its

special representative. Fateful period for J.F.R., these 52 days of the little parallel of the 52 years of Uzziah's reign! After his election by the large majority of shares, his election by acclamation was made unanimous (2 K. 14: 21; 2 C. 26: 1). He worked to make the Society a one-man affair, by having his resolutions passed by the voting shareholders (2 K. 14: 22; 2 C. 26: 2); but therein he was mothered by his self-pushing thought that it was God's will so to have it (2 K. 15: 2; 2 C. 26: 3). In the Uzziah phase, generally speaking, and apart from his busybodying with J.'s priestly work in Britain, he did well (2 K. 15: 3; 2 C. 26: 4), though he did not overthrow little sectarianism and its service among the Lord's people (2 K. 15: 4). Through J.'s letters, which in some ways expounded the Bible, he was encouraged to greater zeal for God, in which God prospered him (2 C. 26: 5). By J. he fought the three groups of sectarians in Britain, and thus established the churches there in harmony with Bro. Russell's arrangements (v. 6). Thus the Lord helped him against the British sectarians and traitors (v. 7). The American and British clericalists were subdued under him; and he made himself felt among worldlings in the trial in which he beat the lawyer who sought to increase the Society's taxes in Brooklyn (v. 8). He strengthened the chief powers of the Society, in its pilgrim, colporteur and volunteer features (v. 9). He fortified the brethren, wrote Truth articles, and made the work fruitful, especially toward the public (v. 10). By the assistance of W.E.V., A.H.M. and M. Sturgeon he developed the pilgrims and elders into a fighting force of large numbers and power (vs. 11-13). He furnished them with Truth equipment for defense and offense, unto making nominal-church people fear him (vs. 14, 15).

But alas! these achievements aroused his pride; and in his pride he presumed to exalt himself above the Board, which was controller of the Society's business and affairs, whereas he was its subordinate as its executive, by busybodying in, and attempting to control J. in his priestly work as the Board's, not his, special representative in Britain; for

this busybodying and attempting to control J.'s priestly work as the Board's special representative was a usurpation of, and a busybodying in an office that did not belong to him, since his pertinent course implied that he was the Board's superior and controller, not its inferior and subordinate, and that he had the right to busybody in J.'s priestly office, which it was not J.F.R.'s office to do, since he as a crown-loser was by God no longer regarded as a priest (v. 16). His busybodying in J.'s priestly work is typed by the incense offering in v. 16. His busybodying began when, as a result of a Shearno-Crawford engineered campaign of letters and cables sent him from England, he on Feb. 19 ordered J. to reinstate the two managers, which both J. and J.H., after discussing the matter thoroughly, agreed should not be done. His next busybodying act was his appointment of an Investigative Commission to examine and report on the Bethel and Tabernacle trouble, a lawless thing, since J.'s solution of it was made by one having powers of attorney in all the Society's business and affairs in every country to which he was sent. His third great act of busybodying in J.'s priestly work was his "absolutely without authority" cable; and his culminating act of such busybodying was his presuming without the Board's authorization and even knowledge to recall J., who was the Board's, not his, special representative. This culminating act of busybodying was additionally a gross usurpation, since it implied that he had the power to annul an act of the Board. The busybodying features of his acts are the small parallel of Uzziah's presuming to exercise an exclusively priestly function, offering incense (v. 16). The wicked character of this act from the Divine standpoint becomes manifest when we remember that it was committed against the Divinely-arranged act of the Epiphany messenger acting as Jesus' special representative in leading certain crown-losers from the door of the Tabernacle to the gate of the Court, delivering them to the fit man and abandoning them to Azazel. Even though none of the participants understood it to be such, the principles applicable to the situation

required J. to do what he did to H.J.S. and W.C. in the Bethel and Tabernacle matter; and had J.F.R. not exalted himself in pride (v. 16), he would have been kept back from his usurpation over the Board and his busybodying in J.'s priestly work in these matters. But "vaunting ambition, overleaping itself," brought him into this evil course.

Our High Priest and His cooperating underpriests protested against and resisted this busybodying and usurpation. This resistance, of course, began with our Lord, by obstacles put in J.F.R.'s way, by J.'s reports, which rebuked his course as unsuitable, then by the direct protests that He made, first through J. as His mouth and hand in the matter, then by other priestly brethren who ordered him away from his course, charging him with sin and consequent shame (vs. 17, 18). This made J.F.R. angry, amid which busybodying he showed this anger; and in this anger his Great Company uncleanness, partial leprosy in a spot or spots typing such uncleanness, broke out in manifestation on him. It was during this time of busybodying, Feb. 19-26, that J.F.R.'s acts manifested him as a Great Company member, coming to a head on Feb. 26, which is the day that to J.'s attention his act revelatory of Great Companyship became manifest, the day J. received his "absolutely without authority" cable. He performed these busybodying acts and his act of usurpation *in anger* (Jas. 1: 20), and the day J. received that cable is the day that J.F.R. presumed in gross usurpation to recall J., without the knowledge and consent of the Board, whose, and not J.F.R.'s, special representative he was. The marked appearance of J.F.R.'s uncleanness is represented by the leprosy coming out on Uzziah's forehead, rather, *e.g.*, than breaking out in a part of his body hidden by his garments. Also the erroneousness of his whole pertinent course is thereby typed (v. 19). Our Lord and His underpriests observed his (Great Company) uncleanness, *e.g.*, J. recognized this early in March, 1917, as also did E. Housden, while the Investigative Commission, in contradiction

of his "absolutely without authority" cable, bluntly reported to him that J. had acted in harmony with his credential powers and fruitfully. Increasingly other priests did this as time went on. Here, as in many other cases, things beginning in one phase progress into many subsequent phases, without express mention under subsequent phases.

J. as Jesus' mouthpiece, beginning March 3, 1917, when he drew up his first written protest against J.F.R.'s course of meddling in, and muddling the British situation, which shortly he came to see was busybodying and usurpation, continued to oppose J.F.R.'s revolutionisms, so much so, that on July 31, 1917, in a meeting of the People's Pulpit Association, after a protest of J. against J.F.R.'s gross injustice in using proxies sent only for the annual meeting held early in the year, to oust I.F. Hoskins and R.H. Hirsh from that Association, J.F.R. said to J., "About the only thing you have been doing since your return from England is to say, 'I protest.'" Now we will tell the friends why J. protested after every revolutionism of J.F.R. It was because this type required him as the High Priest's mouth to voice Jesus' protest thereat; and J.F.R., ignoring such protests, was ignoring Jesus' protests! These protests and their pertinent priestly acts were Jesus' and His cooperating priests' driving J.F.R. out of the Holy into the Court as a manifested Levite; and by his continued revolutionisms, springing from his Great Company uncleanness, he hastened his exit from the former into the latter; yea, even before the end of this phase, Feb. 26, 1917, he co-reigned with the qualities of his next phase, the Jotham phase (2 K. 15: 5-7; 2 C. 26: 20-23). As described above, the facts of the type and the 52 years of Uzziah's reign, corresponding so exactly to the facts of the first 52 days of J.F.R.'s presidency (Jan. 6-Feb. 26), gave J. the start of enlightenment on the little parallel of the kings of Judah and Israel. It was early in March, 1917, that J. saw this little antitype. Hence this made him all the more resolute in resisting J.F.R. as an antitypical leper, whom he continually regarded and treated as such, until in

1920 J. saw J.F.R.'s gross power-grasping and hypocrisy at the 1920 voting shareholders' meeting to be the antitype of Gehazi's course with Naaman (2 K. 5: 20-24) and his and his special helpers' (W.E.V., A.H.M., J.H., C.J. Woodworth, W.F. Hudgings and R.J. Martin) perpetual uncleanness to be the antitype of that of Gehazi and his seed. Hence since 1920 J. has been much more severe with him and them than during the three former years, when he still hoped for his and their cleansing, a hope that since Jan., 1920, is unrealizable (2 K. 5: 25-27; Heb. 6: 4-8).

J.F.R. next lived out the little parallel of Jotham, Feb. 26-Mar. 13 (2 K. 15: 7, 32, 33; 2 C. 26: 23; 27: 1). His course in this phase is mainly like that of the good part of Uzziah's course; and he did not interfere by new general acts with the priestly work during this period, though corruption was found in many brethren, with which he did not interfere; and he still appointed special helpers in the work and fortified his powers (2 K. 15: 34, 35; 2 C. 27: 2, 3). He developed churches and strong teachings in the main parts of America (2 C. 27: 4), opposed clericalistic leaders and made them and their followers subject to his arrangements (v. 5); and in this phase he prospered to March 13 (2 K. 15: 36-38; 2 C. 27: 7-9).

Next came his Ahaz phase, one of his wicked phases, March 13-28; and unlike Bro. Russell he was therein (2 K. 16: 1, 2; 2 C. 27: 9; 28: 1). In it he acted out the evil spirit of H.J.S. and J.H., roasting J. and his supporters and certain ones in America, and acted autocratically and sectarianly (2 K. 16: 3, 4; 2 C. 28: 2-4). On March 13 he received J.H.'s cable announcing J.'s resumption of control of the British work on March 7 and J.'s convincing the bulk of the Bethel family on March 12, in his pertinent debate with J.H., and thus moving them to accept J. as the Society's special representative. This made J.F.R. return to his evil ways, and started him out as the little Ahaz. The next day, March 14, he sent J.H. the following roasting cable: "Johnson insane. Proof forthcoming. Spending money recklessly cabling. Do

not temporize further. Deprive him of all money and authority. *Arrest and incarcerate him.* Cable action." On March 27, the day before he symbolically died as the little Ahaz, he sent the following roasting cable to J.H.: "Greenup oppose injunction. Johnson does not represent Society *in any capacity. Sealed revocation of his credentials mailed 15th. Insane usurper.* Restrain him by law." All italicized parts in these two cables were omitted by J.F.R. when he quoted them in his Harvest Siftings. Without the Board's knowledge and consent he presumed to cancel J.'s credentials, March 15, according to the second cable. In roasting his main helper he did many other acts of autocracy, clericalism, sectarianism, serving them in the British matter. As a punishment from the Lord there came upon him the defeats that he suffered at the hands of J.H. as the little Pekah and H.J.S. as the little Rezin, as described under the Pekah phase of J.H., explained above on 2 C. 28: 5-15. H.J.S. and W.C. took from him office powers in the London Bethel and displaced J.'s appointed assistant managers, E. Housden and A. Kirkwood, and their supporters, from Bethel (2 K. 16: 6). He summoned what was actually Azazel to help him against J.H.'s and H.J.S.'s advantages over him, giving him therefore Church and executive powers; and Azazel made H.J.S. a captive (2 K. 16: 7-9; 2 C. 28: 16, 20-23). The Lord punished him still more for his wickedness, arousing the nominal-church conscientious objectors and sectarians against him. The latter got as a result control of six British churches (2 C. 28: 17-19).

J.F.R. took the radical stand of H.J.S., which was a compromise with Azazel. In that stand he saw the radicals, a false-religion-serving group, and decided to pattern the Society's religion-serving group accordingly (2 K. 16: 10). He persuaded A.H.M. to mould American Bethel brethren after the same pattern by the time he could attend to Society matters (v. 11). Supported by these pseudo-brethren of Bethel in America and with the partial displacement of true brethren

in the American Bethel as sacrificers, he served part of the time radicalism and part of the time the Truth (vs. 12-15). A.H.M. carried out his charge (v. 16). J.F.R. withdrew Truth supports from the Bible (v. 17). He perverted the restraints on speculation, and the course that he should take as to the Church, because of Azazel (v. 18). He perverted various Truth teachings and arrangements, and by his evil prevented an entrance into the justified state (denial of tentative justification); he set up classes as independent of the Lord's arrangements as to the Pastoral work (2 C. 28: 24). In all the churches he used the brethren to pass out his written tracts (printed and circulated contrary to Bro. Russell's will, which restricted Society tracts to his publications); and thus he provoked the Lord (v. 25). The Ahaz phase was one of the worst of his phases. Throughout its entire period he fought J. in the latter's power and mission; and because J. did a Divinely-ordered and sanctioned work that J.F.R. opposed, one of his worst wickednesses was his course against J. from March 13 to March 28. So dishonorable was his Ahaz phase that the Lord did not allow it to be respected with the others (2 K. 16: 19, 20; 2 C. 28: 26, 27).

His next phase, March 28-April 25, was the little parallel of Hezekiah, and was one of his best phases (2 K. 18: 1-3; 2 C. 29: 1, 2). He began immediately to reform the church evils that he had committed in his Ahaz phase (2 C. 29: 3), called the main and subordinate leaders to separate themselves for the work of cleansing the sanctuary (vs. 4, 5), acknowledged the past evils (v. 6), especially those of stopping bringing new ones into the Truth and ceasing teaching one another and sacrificing to the Lord (v. 7), recited how this led to the Lord's punishing the American brethren and the Society with spoliation, defeat and captivity in various errors (vs. 8, 9), proposed to renew his consecration in order to avert the Lord's threatening wrath (v. 10), and affectionately admonished the main and subordinate leaders to be faithful in the Lord's service (v. 11). The subordinate leaders of the three Bethel groups, into which the crown-losers

later divided, each group containing two subordinate leaders, besides two each of the four subordinate groups of speakers: pilgrims, auxiliary pilgrims, extension workers and discoursing elders, responded to this call and gathered their fellows, and set themselves aside to the cleansing work (vs. 12-15). The chief leaders undertook to cleanse the most sacred things, and cast out the uncleanness to the subordinate leaders to dispose of into an unclean condition (v. 16). They took an equal time for cleansing the most sacred and the less sacred things (v. 17). They reported to J.F.R. that they had cleansed the sacred things as God and new creatures viewed them and as the justified viewed them (v. 18). They also reported that they had restored all the neglected teachings and that they were ready for the Lord's altar (v. 19).

This was then immediately followed by J.F.R.'s gathering the leaders to avail themselves, by faith, of the acceptableness of Christ's sacrifice by God for forgiveness and spiritual blessings, and to set forth the atoning sacrifice of the Church for the non-new creatures (vs. 20, 21). Then he requested Jesus and the Church to do their pertinent work as to these two kinds of sacrifice. This was done for the faith of the bringers of the sacrifices, first with the burnt offering of Jesus as manifesting God's acceptance of Christ's sacrifice in forgiveness and bestowal of spiritual blessings in a threefold emphasized way (v. 22). Then the sacrificing of the Church's humanity followed, as done for the non-new creatures as their part in the finished picture, even as J.F.R. charged (vs. 23, 24). He then set the subordinate leaders to serve, in volunteering, colporteuring and teaching, according to Bro. Russell's arrangements, sanctioned by the Parousia deeper discerners of the Word and the pilgrims, even as God had given these arrangements (v. 25). The subordinate leaders served with the Volumes, Towers and tracts, while the main leaders served with discourses (v. 26). At J.F.R.'s charge the acceptableness of Christ's sacrifice to God was emphasized by the proclamation of the Song

of the Lamb by the speakers and the literature distributors (v. 27). Even outsiders joined in this service; the pilgrims discoursed; the literature distributors spread it, while by faith the manifested acceptableness of Christ's sacrifice to God was held (v. 28). All participated in this service (v. 29). J.F.R. and the other leaders charged the subordinate leaders to set forth the Divine attributes with Bro. Russell's and the deeper discerners' teachings (v. 30). This was a renewal of consecrations by God's people.

J.F.R. stressed this, and on its basis exhorted the brethren to renew their consecrations, which the brethren did with thankful and appreciative hearts in great abundance (vs. 31-33). The main leaders being too few to help the people present their consecrations, the subordinate leaders assisted them, in fact were more willing thereto than the main leaders (v. 34). It was a time of abundant consecrations with pertinent simple teachings, as an evidence of God's manifestation of His acceptance of Christ's sacrifice; and thus was an orderly service set up in the Church (v. 35). J.F.R. and all the brethren rejoiced for these blessings; for this service was done very quickly. All this was in full swing before J. had returned to America, where he arrived April 9, 1917, 13 days after the Hezekiah aspect began. Our comment on 2 C. 30 will be very brief. The Passover feast there described, being kept the 14th of the second month, did not represent the same things as one kept on the 14th of Nisan. In the large picture the Passover kept the 14th of the second month represents the Millennial privileges of restitution. In this little picture it represents a Passover that the Divine foreknowledge recognized as a crown-losers' Passover. And such it was, as is readily concluded from the fact that it was under the direction of the chief crown-loser, J.F.R. It was attended by large reconsecrations of many crown-losers in America and some in Britain; many of the British crown-losers would not respond to J.F.R.'s invitation to partake in its deliverance features of the 14th nor in its joys of the Christian life features of the 15th to the 21st, because of loss.

of confidence in him. But some of these, from three tribes, corresponding to some of the British prospective Kohathites, Merarites and Gershonites, responded, and very many in America responded, and kept the best Passover that crown-losers ever kept, with much faith in the Lamb of God, many consecrations of new brethren (Youthful Worthies) and reconsecrations of old new creatures.

Many present were unclean, yet offered quasi-consecrations and quasi-renewed consecrations, *i.e.*, some Youthful Worthies and some of the three prospective groups of Levites. The main and subordinate leaders were very busy with such consecrations. They even doubled their joys as to the Christian life. This was the greatest renewal of consecration since that which accompanied J.'s ministry in England up to Feb. 28, 1917. This led to a putting away of the idols of selfishness and worldliness, of combinationism and little nominal-church ways, after which the reconsecrated ones betook themselves to their ordinary pursuits (2 K. 18: 4; 2 C. 31: 1). J.F.R. continued this course of arranging for the various general services of the Lord's people, in assigning the main and subordinate leaders their work (2 C. 31: 2), and in putting his human all at the service of God's people as to justification, consecration and holy living (v. 3); and he exhorted the people to consecration, to which they generously responded (vs. 4-8). He inquired as to these consecrations and their expression, and arranged for their proper care and use in the Lord's service, through the stewardship of appointed brethren at Bethel and in the ecclesiastas (vs. 9-19). He refuted false views and practices as to the ransom, calling them brazen, not copper (2 K. 18: 4). He was in the Hezekiah aspect better as an executive than in any of the little Judahite kings' aspects before or after it, doing the Lord's work heartily and prosperously (vs. 4-7; 2 C. 31: 21). He fought against Azazel and smote the sectarians (2 K. 18: 8).

Before studying 2 K. 18: 13-19: 37; Is. 36: 1-37: 38 and 2 C. 32: 1-21, we will first take up the story of Hezekiah's

sickness, as relating an event contemporaneous with it. After J.H. was delivered into Azazel's hands, April 1, 1917, Azazel made efforts to lay hold on J.F.R., whose spiritual malady showed itself on April 10, paralleling the 14th year of Hezekiah, the same as the year of the Assyrian invasion (Is. 37: 1; 39: 1), at J.'s first so-called "hearing before the Board" (EF 67-69); and J. told him that his present phase must cease and that he should reform his conduct (2 K. 20: 1; Is. 38: 1; 2 C. 32: 24). This led J.F.R. to pray for mercy (2 K. 20: 2, 3; Is. 38: 2, 3; 2 C. 32: 24). J. left that Board meeting and mingled with the Bethel brethren, when the little parallel showed him that J.F.R.'s Hezekiah phase had yet 15 days to run, and he told him so, assuring him that the Society would be delivered from Satan for Bro. Russell's sake (2 K. 20: 4-6; Is. 38: 4-6). This assurance had some mellowing influence on J.F.R. toward arranging for a second so-called "hearing before the Board," the night of April 11, God's time April 12, on the British matter, at which it was not discussed at all! J. advised that sweetening parts of God's Word be applied to J.F.R.'s great fault manifested April 10, and said that a healing of his malady would set in (2 K. 20: 7; Is. 38: 21), and that he would do good in the Church (2 K. 20: 8; Is. 38: 22).

J.F.R. asked for a proof of this. J. asked whether the proof should be given by opening the Bible correctly on things that were future or past as to the Lord's choice of His present messenger. J.F.R. asked for past proofs, which were furnished by J.'s expounding the Eldad and Medad type and that of David's nine mightiest men, particularly Eleazar, the second mightiest, as probability proofs that J. was the Lord's chosen messenger, which J. at that time mistakenly thought meant that he was the steward of the penny parable (2 K. 20: 8-11; Is. 38: 7, 8; 2 C. 32: 24), J.F.R.'s prayer for recovery is typed by Hezekiah's in Is. 38: 9-20. But J.F.R. was not grateful, rather filled with pride and envy at J.'s exposition, and abruptly brought the meeting to a close, without giving J. the chance to finish

the probability proofs, let alone to proceed to the proofs from Neh., Ezra and Esther; and this brought wrath from God upon him (2 C. 32: 25). At that time J.F.R. received speculations from emissaries of Azazel and showed them his powers, prerogatives, etc. (2 K. 20: 12, 13; Is. 39: 1, 2). J. made inquiry as to their nature and sphere of thought and action, and what he had shown them; and J.F.R. answered, his full powers (2 K. 20: 14, 15; Is. 39: 3, 4), which he alleged were the same in the Society as Bro. Russell's. Then J., from the little parallel, told him that such power claims would bring him and all his into Satan's control (2 K. 20: 16-18; Is. 39: 5-7). This had an humbling effect; and J., in answer to his question, assured him that it would not come for a long while, but was a test to him (after the Hezekiah phase; 2 K. 20: 19; Is. 39: 8; 2 C. 32: 26, 31). After this J.F.R. prospered, increasing in resources, honor and stores for Divine truths, graces, truth appetizers, Truth-defense writings and teachings, as well as stores for nourishing hard and easy teachings and understandings and secure places for the humanity of the Lord's people, ecclesiasties and greater and less justified brethren in abundance under God's blessing (2 C. 32: 27-29). He brought truths into the Society and greatly prospered (v. 30).

We now return to the parallel of the Assyrian invasion, which in the beginning of the second preceding paragraph we said we would not discuss, until we had treated on the little parallel of Hezekiah's sickness. We changed the order because of the better clarifying of both the stories, particularly because that order will throw better light on the little parallel of the invasion. The invasion is described in the passages cited in the beginning of the second preceding paragraph. In this story Hezekiah in the small parallel types J.F.R. in the good part of his mind on April 10; Sennacherib, Azazel; Eliakim, A.H.M.; Shebna, M. Sturgeon and Joah, W.E.V.—the last three in the good parts of their minds. Tartan, Rabsaris and Rabshakeh type the bad parts of A.H.M.'s, W.E.V.'s and

J.F.R.'s minds, in the order mentioned; all three had by J. while yet in England been put into the fit man's hands. Isaiah in this scene represents in the little parallel J. in his office as God's Epiphany mouthpiece. J. knew that J.F.R., A.H.M. and W.E.V. were then crown-losers. All six of these so far mentioned acted out their respective parts on April 10, three of them, their double minds that day, at the first so-called "hearing before the Board." Besides these, J.D. Wright, I.F. Hoskins and R.H. Hirsh, three Board members, were present. A.I. Ritchie and A.N. Pierson were the only two Board members not present at that meeting. A.H.M. and M. Sturgeon were not Board members, but were asked by J.F.R. to be present. Thus it was not exactly a Board meeting, though five of its seven members were present. The entire scene as presented in the chapters cited at the beginning of the second preceding paragraph types in the little parallel Azazel's effort prematurely to seize possession of J.F.R. and his partisan supporters. But as long as the priesthood does not abandon crown-losers, Azazel cannot possess himself of them. J. knew the three to be crown-losers, though four of the seven mentioned above knew it not of these three, and none of these five had abandoned the three to Azazel. Hence Azazel could not get them fully into his control. We are not to understand that the antitypes of the speeches were made by words, but by the acts, looks and spirit of the little parallels.

Briefly will we give the little parallels of the generalities of this episode. The course of J.F.R. in the Uzziah and Ahaz phases shows that he was fast ripening for falling into Azazel's hands. Of course the brethren desired to give no room or aid to Satan, prevented it as far as possible and encouraged one another therein (2 C. 32: 2-8). J.F.R. made concessions to him to ward him off (2 K. 18: 14-16). This did not satisfy Azazel, who roused the evil side of A.H.M.'s, W.E.V.'s and J.F.R.'s minds to coerce J.F.R. and his partisan supporters into Azazel's hands, while the good side of J.F.R.'s mind sought by the help of the good

parts of A.H.M.'s, W.E.V.'s and M. Sturgeon's minds to circumvent what proved to be the planned capture (2 K. 18: 17, 18; Is. 36: 2, 3; 2 C. 32: 9). The grossly unjust, insolent and cruel course of J.F.R.'s evil mind (EG 67-69) at that meeting is the little parallel of Rabshakeh's unjust, insolent and cruel speech (2 K. 18: 19-25, 27-35; Is. 36: 4-10, 12-20; 2 C. 32: 10-16, 18, 19). A.H.M., M. Sturgeon and W.E.V. through the good part of their double-mind by their looks and manner remonstrated with him against his course, asking him to change his manner, as having an unfavorable effect on the others present (2 K. 18: 26; Is. 36: 11). The others present, apart from J., said nothing (2 K. 18: 36; Is. 36: 21). By manipulating certain things that J. had written or cabled, J.F.R.'s evil mind was intimidating his good mind in that meeting (2 C. 32: 17). A.H.M., M. Sturgeon and W.E.V. were deeply saddened, their faces showing deep distress, which showed to the better side of J.F.R.'s mind how the course of his evil mind had impressed them (2 K. 18: 37; Is. 36: 22). This had the effect of saddening him and making him seek the Lord's mercy among His people, which moved him and J. to long for deliverance from the evil condition that "the hearing" revealed (2 K. 19: 1; Is. 37: 1; 2 C. 32: 20). The look of distress that J.F.R.'s good mind made come over his face at the evil situation that his evil mind had created influenced all the brethren present by their grieved looks to appeal longingly to J. to seek to relieve the situation (2 K. 19: 2-5; Is. 37: 2-4).

This J. noted and by his subsequent words and manner indicated that the Lord would work deliverance from the evil that J.F.R.'s evil mind threatened, and would beat back Satan's efforts to gain control, and frustrate him in his sphere of teaching and spirit (2 K. 19: 6, 7; Is. 37: 6, 7). Thus for a little while J.F.R.'s evil mind stopped being in the ascendancy (2 K. 19: 8; Is. 37: 8). But when J. presented the "scheme" of the managers to devitalize the Society and vitalize the I.B.S.A., as an argument against the course of the

managers and J.F.R.'s support of them, the evil part of J.F.R.'s mind showed itself again in the ascendancy, in boastful and intimidating manner and speech (2 K. 19: 9-13; Is. 37: 9-13). Again his good mind was distressed by this expression of his evil mind; and his longings went out to God for deliverance (2 K. 19: 14-19; Is. 37: 14-20). J., perceiving his changed attitude, in love assured him that, if he would set aside his wrongs, his pride and his insolence, and would act as a Christian, the Lord would deliver him and His people from Satan's power (2 K. 19: 20-34; Is. 37: 21-35). The severe rebukes that J. administered to J.F.R. for his evil course at that meeting subdued him toward the end of that meeting and, while he was withdrawn from the evil part and wholly given over to the good part of his mind, the host of fallen angels that were arrayed against him to take him into Satan's control departed, utterly defeated; and Azazel, while at his work, influenced thereto by two fallen angels, gave up the effort for a while, to the deliverance of all concerned (2 K. 19: 35-37; Is. 37: 36-38; 2 C. 32: 21, 22). This was followed by increased prosperity for J.F.R., even to this phase's end (2 K. 20: 20, 21; 2 C. 32: 23, 32, 33).

During most of the next phase, the Manasseh phase, April 25-June 18 (2 K. 21: 1-18; 2 C. 33: 1-20), J.F.R.'s evil mind was as much in the ascendancy as in the Hezekiah phase his good mind was usually in the ascendancy (2 K. 21: 1, 2; 2 C. 33: 1, 2). The operation of his evil mind began to show itself markedly in connection with the visit of Captain Smith of Liverpool at Bethel, about April 25. Envy moved him to seek to discredit J. on the steward matter, since J.'s confounding the office that the Lord had given him as the Epiphany messenger with that of the steward made him think J. to be grasping for the office of steward, which office J.F.R. imagined himself to have. His bringing this matter up before the Bethel family is described in EF 39-42. This was the beginning of a series of envious acts of humiliation that he during his Manasseh phase heaped in rapid succession on J., not the worst of which was to give J. the

least important work at the Tabernacle, e.g., dusting off books and similar things, requiring him to wear overalls, while doing his assigned tasks. J.F.R. served the evils of envy, power-grasping, lording, autocracy, combinationism and many other evil qualities, and did this as an alleged service of God (2 K. 21: 3-5; 2 C. 33: 3-5). His cruelty made him roast before the Bethel family some of its most prominent members. Usually he would begin this course of action by roasting J., then A.I. Ritchie, then M. Sturgeon. J.F.R.'s inexact knowledge of, and uncleanness on intricacies of the Truth astounded J., who had repeatedly to give a view differing from J.F.R.'s, whose oft contradiction of Bro. Russell's teachings hurt J. These differences, politely put, greatly angered J.F.R., who would then proceed to roast J.; but usually A.I. Ritchie, M. Sturgeon, etc., agreed with J. against J.F.R.; and thereupon he would roast them. Thus he taught errors and mistreated those teaching the pertinent Truth (2 K. 21: 6; 2 C. 33: 6). His Truth and error he set up as creed images in the Church against Bro. Russell's teachings and J.'s corroborations (2 K. 21: 7; 2 C. 33: 7).

For example, during this phase the question was brought up at the Bethel table as to what covenant was meant in Is. 55: 3: "I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies [literally, kindnesses] of David." J. was given the first opportunity to answer and, in harmony with our Pastor's thought, replied, The Sarah Covenant, and, like our Pastor, gave as the proof: (1) the run of thought in the context and (2) the fact that the covenant is defined as the sure [oath-bound] kindnesses that God has promised to the Christ, Head and Body, the antitypical David. To J.'s surprise J.F.R., without asking for other comments, as was the custom at Bethel with questions, very combatively, dictatorially, dogmatically and overbearingly blurted out the direct contradiction, "That is not so! It is the New Covenant!" Both his ungentlemanly manner and claim evoked considerable opposition, so much so that at the next meal A.I. Ritchie,

with the backing of M. Sturgeon, etc., read a Tower comment to the Bethel family directly contradicting J.F.R.'s view and corroborating that which J. had expressed. This is merely a sample of many errors that J.F.R. taught at the table; and J. for his defense of Bro. Russell's views was roasted. Despite J.F.R.'s combining Truth and error in the Church as represented by the Bethel family, God spared J.F.R. and the brethren as the Church, because of its support by our Pastor and J.; for God, as long as they even measurably kept the Lord Jesus' teachings given through that Servant, would not take from them the Truth and its Spirit (2 K. 21: 8; 2 C. 33: 8).

But the Bethel brethren (and in spirit the generality of the extra-Bethel brethren later) did not submit to proper principles, were misled by J.F.R. into various evils of teaching and practice, and continued in this evil course despite the Lord's speaking to them through J. (2 K. 21: 9, 10; 2 C. 33: 9, 10), for which reason the Lord through J. warned the brethren, first the four directors and then others, that, because of J.F.R.'s glaring sins in misleading the brethren, the Lord would bring punishment upon the Society and its supporters of the same general kind as that meted out on the British managers and their partisan supporters (2 K. 21: 11-15). Moreover, during this time, e.g., by refusing to permit the British matter to be examined by the Board as such, despite its majority's petition, he symbolically killed it and J. and all who sided with them at Bethel (2 K. 21: 16). His attitude toward this matter was so evil that Azazel got him for some time into his clutches (2 C. 33: 11, 12), on June 13, the day that the petition was handed to him, which was by him in great ill-temper denied, and instead he appointed the four directors a committee to examine the British case and report to the full Board. But he recovered himself and until June 18, when he ceased as the Manasseh phase, sought to undo his evils and to do good for the brethren in the Lord's work (vs. 13-16). But the brethren sectarianly served the Lord (v. 17). J. kept an accurate record of J.F.R.'s acts. Indeed,

ever since his gaining the light on the small parallel, J. very closely watched his movements, sayings, etc., constantly viewing them from the standpoint of the little parallel (2 K. 21: 17, 18; 2 C. 33: 18-20).

Next J.F.R. appears in the Amon phase, June 18, 19. The evils of his Manasseh phase he committed in his Amon phase, *e.g.*, learning that Sr. Edith Hoskins had transcribed on the typewriter in her spare time the handwritten outline that J. had prepared as the points desired by him to be presented to the Board's committee on his British activity, J.F.R. rebuked her for it. He faulted the Board for taking so long to examine the case, and demanded that it report at a time when J. had not yet appeared before it, and despite the fact that he had not yet appeared before it, which J. did for five hours during its two sessions on June 19. At the table he continued his mistreatment of J. by word, look and act, and did not in this phase reform himself of his evils, as he had in the Manasseh phase (2 K. 21: 19-22; 2 C. 33: 21-23). His evil course led the Board committee to draw up, June 19, a report that condemned his and justified J.'s course in the British matter, which symbolically killed him in the Amon phase. This led to his Board supporters' repudiating this committee's report and to their supporting J.F.R. in what became the Josiah phase, one of the best of J.F.R.'s phases as the little parallel of Judah's kings from that of Asa onward (2 K. 21: 23-26; 2 C. 33: 24, 25). This phase, June 19-July 19, described in 2 K. 22; 23 and 2 C. 34; 35, represents his acts as a pilgrim away from Bethel, out on the road, since most of his 31 days were spent by him in the pilgrim work; for as a pilgrim he did much better work for the Lord than as an executive. The shady things of this time, those of an executive, not those of a pilgrim, are therefore here not typed, not coming under the head of pilgrim work: his attempts, June 20, to send J. away from Bethel to his home, under the guise of a pilgrim trip, and to send I.F. Hoskins on a long trip to the West Coast, to break up a Board majority and thus prevent its rescinding his by-laws at the proposed

Board meeting, July 20; his securing what he knew was a dishonest and illegal opinion from a Philadelphia lawyer, to the effect that there were four vacancies on the Board—the Board's majority who were intent on rescinding the by-laws giving him executive and managerial authority; his appointing pseudo-directors subservient to him; his ousting the four legal directors; his publishing Vol. VII without the knowledge and consent of the Board and the Editorial Committee; his slandering and misrepresenting the Board's majority and J. to his pseudo-directors, to influence them to accept pseudo-directorship; and his sending out his false statement, July 18, to all the churches on Bethel conditions, asking for the churches' support, a letter published later as an insert in his Harvest Siftings, etc. On his Josiah phase we will be brief. On June 26, while on his way back to Bethel from his pilgrim visit to Lansing, he made resolutions of bettering his disposition, as Josiah decided to seek the Lord. On June 30 he began to cast out his evils, on his way to his Omaha appointment, as Josiah destroyed idolatry in Judah and Israel; and on July 6 he began to work reformatarily on the Church and to develop it, as Josiah did to the temple (2 K. 22: 3-7; 2 C. 34: 3-13).

The Lord's teachings, hitherto much neglected, were brought to his attention, July 6, in so marked a way as to have produced great contrition in him and sorrow for others, leading to a general inquiry from him of many servants of God, including J. The reply was to the effect that such wickedness was to bring retribution, which J. from his understanding of the little parallel said would not come until a later than the Josiah phase (2 K. 22: 8-20; 2 C. 34: 14-28). This led, beginning July 6, to a declaration of these Truth principles to all, and to a covenanting by all to live in harmony therewith, resulting in a setting aside of loved evils and a performing of good (2 K. 23: 1-3; 2 C. 34: 29-33). J.F.R. exhorted the brethren to remove from the Church all teachings tending to autocracy, combinationism and clericalism, refuted and cast them out into an unclean condition,

using the memory of them to make dishonorable sectarianism, autocracy and clericalism and their leaders in Britain, overthrowing the servants of these, those who as leaders defiled themselves with other leaders in such places as combinationism was developed, all of which persons and things he set forth as vile, and secured the setting aside of such evil leaders and things all over America, many of these evil leaders reforming themselves, but not coming into harmony with the Society; and he also set forth the whip of fear by which these lashed the brethren into subserviency as a vile thing (2 K. 23: 4-10). In fact, he preached against all the evils that had been taught and practiced by the Truth people since shortly before Bro. Russell's death and secured a hearty setting aside of them, including the evil persons and things that H.J.S. had introduced, and defiled them with the memories of their evils; and, sparing J.H. and his six non-signatory elders for their pertinent parts against Shearno-Crawfordism, he made this reformatory work include the whole British field, refuting the evil leaders and setting forth as vile their supporters and work (vs. 11-20).

J.F.R. did another commendable work as a pilgrim during this phase, beginning it also on July 6 (2 K. 23: 23; 2 C. 35: 19). As Josiah caused the greatest passover celebration since the times of the judges (2 K. 23: 22; 2 C. 35: 18), so J.F.R. introduced a period, beginning July 6, wherein not only justification through Christ's merit and consecration unto death were preached, but this blessed merit was by faith very generally appropriated, very many new consecrations were made, very many old consecrations were renewed and the joys of the Christian life were experienced by very many, some serving, others being served in these matters (2 K. 23: 21; 2 C. 35: 1-17). By word and deed he set aside false teachers, false teachings and evil conduct, all this to establish the Truth teaching; and in this pilgrim work he surpassed the pilgrim activities of A.H.M., W.E.V., H.J.S., J.H. and his own former pertinent efforts, though this did not effect the removal of God's displeasure with the

practices of the American crown-losers in general and of the Society and Bethel in particular, whom God was determined to deliver over to Azazel (2 K. 23: 24-28). As in Josiah's life there is a blank in the Biblical record from his 18th to his 31st year, so from July 6 to July 19 there is a blank in J.F.R.'s record.

On July 19, in a quasi-pilgrim trip to the Philadelphia Ecclesia he, assisted especially by A.H.M., W.E.V. and quite a number of that church, sought to defend himself against the charges of I.F. Hoskins and R.H. Hirsh, made there the Sunday night before, and the charges that all four directors, supported by F.H. McGee, made against him then for ousting the four on July 17. Actually it was an effort of these five and certain of their supporters in that church to resist Azazel; and they sought, through J. as mediator between the four directors and J.F.R., to dissuade him from interfering with what was their actual purpose. But hypocritically J.F.R. entered the fray with them before that church on the legal questions that he raised on the Society, and he was thereon by F.H. McGee so badly worsted that he called on A.H.M., W.E.V. and other supporters to transfer the question from the Society to the People's Pulpit Association, through which he claimed absolute control of the Society. They transfer of the argument did him no good, for on this F.H. McGee as thoroughly refuted him. J.F.R. broke out in tears, weeping loudly at his complete defeat, and as a result hardly 5% of that large church believed in his view when the debate ended. J.F.R. returned that night from his quasi-pilgrim trip so completely defeated that he ceased acting any more in the Josiah phase. Wherever the report of this encounter penetrated the Societyites were pained. J. was pained to the extent that he disapproved of this Philadelphia affair and told the four directors so, since he desired to keep the trouble at Bethel from being noised abroad, and since he saw that that discussion would make his work as mediator much more difficult, if not entirely impossible. It was for these reasons that he refused to go to that meeting, though urged to do so (2 K. 23: 28-30; 2 C. 35: 20-27).

For a short time on July 19 F.H. McGee's arguments in the debate forced J.F.R.'s followers to persuade him to assume another, an evil short lived and lamented aspect (the Jehoahaz aspect); and again, still on that day, the same one's arguments forced him into still another, also an evil aspect (the Jehoiakim aspect), the end of the former one driving him to a different legal, secular, position, where he remained to the end (2 K. 23: 30-34, 36, 37; 2 C. 36: 1-5; Jer. 22: 6, 10-12), while he in the Jehoiakim aspect, July 19-29, had to yield to F.H. McGee the legal points, Divine and human, that he had held, by which he greatly impoverished his supporters of pertinent arguments (2 K. 23: 35). J., who had since July 1 been acting as the little parallel of Jeremiah, *i.e.*, since the 13th day of J.F.R.'s Josiah aspect, in the fourth day of J.F.R.'s Jehoiakim aspect, July 22, while mediating between the latter and the four directors, reminded them and others that as the Lord's mouthpiece he had been faithfully seeking to draw the brethren at Bethel away from the exercise of evil qualities, but that no favorable response had been made (Jer. 25: 1-7). J., therefore, forecast that some crown-losers on July 29 and others on Aug. 8 would come under the control of what proved to be Azazel, that after their human minds (10) had been destroyed and their new creatures (7) would be cleansed ( $10 \times 7 = 70$ , the two things symbolized by the 70 years' captivity), and that after they would be away from the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit until this symbolic desolation would be completed, these crown-losers would return to the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit, with desolation perpetual coming on Azazel's power over the Great Company, these untoward experiences coming upon the Great Company for their sins (vs. 8-14). On that day, July 22, J. drew up some charges against the evils committed in Bethel, in the hope that these, told them, might bring them to repentance (Jer. 36: 1-3). Because his office as mediator bound him to withhold a personal giving of these to the Bethelites, he gave them to the directors, asking them

to declare these to them and to all that in the time of sore self-denial would come to Bethel; for after J.F.R. on July 18 sent out to all the classes the pseudo-Board's false declaration of Board conditions, which also appeared as an inset in J.F.R.'s Harvest Siftings, not a few distressed brethren came in the spirit of self-denial to Bethel to inquire into the trouble (vs. 4-6). J. gave this message in the hope of effecting a reformation that would avert God's displeasure (v. 7).

The four directors delivered this message on July 23, especially in the sphere of R.J. Martin, who reported it to the leading Bethel brethren. These asked the directors to tell them these things. This was done, and on inquiry they said that J. had set these things forth. Warning them that they and J. protect themselves, they told the matter to J.F.R., who asked to be given the charges. This done, J.F.R. despised them, though remonstrated against by certain leading brethren. He also desired to take these captive by arguments, but the Lord shielded them against these (vs. 8-26). Led on by proper principles, J. summed up these charges again and added to them other thoughts, *i.e.*, that J.F.R., for faulting J. for setting forth these facts, would on July 29 measurably be brought under control of what proved to be Azazel, with none of his character acting as executive thereafter, and that his memory would be cast out, with none of his supporters escaping the Lord's displeasure; and he put these into the mouths of the directors (vs. 27-32). On July 27 there was held a meeting of the members of the People's Pulpit Association, to adjust, if possible, the trouble between J.F.R. and the four directors. Just previously and on that day he had appointed four different bodies as executives in certain respects at the Tabernacle and Bethel, and these made very much devastation there from the Lord, for the many sins of J.F.R. (2 K. 24: 2-4). Failing at that meeting to get the four directors to submit to his rule and accept his pseudo-Board, he declared war on them, after refusing to allow J. to speak for them. That afternoon he used physical violence against J.,

and was prevented by A.H.M. from adding more of it; and under his and J.'s eyes he caused the latter's bags to be put out of Bethel; and the basement door was slammed shut, striking him hard on the chest, in fulfillment of J.F.R.'s order not to allow him to return to Bethel from a visit that he had made (EF 79-83). The way J.F.R. acted that afternoon in the Bethel dining room ought to convince any wide-awake Truth brethren that he was then almost entirely under Azazel's control. All the while J. was mediating J.F.R. was preparing his Harvest Siftings; and its being sent through W.F. Hudgings to Boston, July 29, during whose evening it was read to the Boston elders and deacons, was J.F.R.'s last wicked act in the Jehoiakim phase, leading him in that aspect to fall (partially as a person, but wholly in the Jehoiakim aspect) into Azazel's hands; and with him went certain teachings of truth and righteousness into Azazel's defiling power (2 K. 24: 1, 5-7; 2 C. 36: 6-8).

A few hours of July 29 J.F.R. was in the Jehoiachin, or Coniah, or Jeconiah phase, three various names Scripturally given the son of Jehoiakim. It was an evil aspect in which he was especially engaged in giving up to Azazel Truth teachings on belief and practice given by J., as J.F.R. had done also in the Jehoiakim aspect under Azazelian pressure (2 K. 24: 8-13; 2 C. 36: 9, 10). With him his main cooperators fell in an increased capacity into Azazel's hands, so that only the less gifted remained in the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit (2 K. 24: 14). J., learning of his perversity, forecast his going into Azazel's hands, his having no posterity, his losing more and more of the right teachings and practices and his being properly overthrown (Jer. 22: 24-30). And surely Azazel did get him in this aspect under his control, with all his supporters in that aspect (2 K. 24: 15, 16). On the same day, July 29, he changed into the Zedekiah aspect (July 29-Aug. 8, 1917), his final aspect as the little parallel of a Judahite king. While in the former two aspects he fell partially into Azazel's hands, even in the forms of evil of which he was guilty in them, at the end of this final

aspect he fell totally into Azazel's hands, and went to his sphere of teaching and spirit, where he has been ever since; whereas in the Jehoiachin aspect, 37 days after he in that aspect fell into Azazel's hands, *i.e.*, Sept. 3, he received some relief, but no deliverance (2 K. 25: 27-29; Jer. 52: 31-34). The Zedekiah aspect was akin to that of the Jehoiakim aspect (2 K. 24: 17; 2 C. 36: 10), hence full of evil. The Lord, in Jer. 24: 1-10, contrasts the comparatively good Israelites who went into captivity with Jehoiachin and the very bad Israelites who were to go into captivity with Zedekiah, as He also contrasts their future: the former returning to God's favor after the 70 years and the latter not doing so, as pictorial of their little parallels: those going into Azazel's hands partially, July 29, and these going into his hands wholly, Aug. 8. Certainly, J.F.R. in the Zedekiah phase did evil, as he had evil qualities as his controllers, even as he did in the Jehoiakim phase; for he, his servants and certain extra-Bethel brethren wrought great evil, and did not humble themselves as to J.'s ministry (2 K. 24: 18, 19; 2 C. 36: 11, 12; Jer. 52: 1, 2; 37: 2). It was during this time (July 31) that, despite the protests of J. and six other brothers, he most unjustly and hypocritically put I.F. Hoskins and R.H. Hirsh out of the People's Pulpit Association with unauthorizedly used proxies, circulated Harvest Siftings, the factually falsest piece of literature ever circulated among Truth people, grossly wronged the four directors and J. at the Boston Convention, Aug. 1-5, and drove the directors out of Bethel, Aug. 8, through which act he, no longer restrained by them, fell totally under the control of Azazel, an event that J. two months before had forecast, without understanding the exact agent of the control, to the directors as coming on that day.

As indicated in Jeremiah the experiences of J. in relation to J.F.R. during this Zedekiah aspect will be given. J. and the four directors, with hundreds of other brethren, left Brooklyn by boat the night of July 31, for the Boston Convention. J.F.R.'s Harvest Siftings having been given out, of course J. was at this convention a gazing stock and

a reproach. There, Aug. 1, A.H.M. forecast to J. in others' presence that on Aug. 2 matters would be made right and the wrongs exposed (Jer. 28: 1-4). In the presence of these friends J. replied that this was his desire, but that the event would prove whether A.H.M. were right (vs. 5-9). Then A.H.M. took J.F.R.'s Siftings, which was an enslaving burden, a yoke, to J., and gave it to the assembled friends, saying that this would vindicate the right and expose the wrong, freeing from Satan's power God's people within two days, at which J. left him (vs. 10, 11). The principles of the Lord's Word made clear to J. an appropriate reply, that while A.H.M. had given out J.F.R.'s Siftings, which was an enslaving burden, a yoke, to J., it was full of the weakness of error, falsehoods, but that God would give the pertinent Truth, which would prove with power that the crown-losers would go into Azazel's hands, and that A.H.M., who was making the brethren believe a lie, would be refuted that day, which took place; for that day witnessed the start of the directors' preparing the matter which appeared in a leaflet passed out at the Boston Convention, and which was published on page 23 of Light After Darkness, and on that day J. began to gather his materials for a reply to J.F.R.'s Siftings, both of which publications refuted A.H.M.'s claim (vs. 12-17). Through J.F.R.'s Siftings, E. W. Brenneisen was moved to converse with J., with questions, on the dangers that the Society trouble held over God's people. J. told him that J.F.R.'s weapons would be overthrown; for God was fighting against him and his Society-controlled position, and that those who supported that Society position would be preys to Satan, but that those who would abandon that position would gain deliverance, while that position would be overthrown (Jer. 21: 1-10). Induced by J.F.R.'s Siftings, several brethren at Brooklyn asked J. to pray for the brethren in the Society, then undergoing besieging by Azazel. This was at a time that secular lawyers used by the four directors were offering what was intended as help for J.F.R. as to a way out of his

difficulties. But this relief was short-lived; and Azazel pressed J.F.R. to continue in his crooked way, which he did. J. again, as the Lord's mouthpiece, stated this outcome and forecast J.F.R.'s defeat as sure by what proved to be Azazel (Jer. 37: 3-10). J. gave a message to the effect that famine for Truth and a pestilence of error would be the lot of those who supported the Society's wrong course, while those who would forsake it would be delivered, for the Society would surely fall a prey to Satan. Hearing this, A.H.M., W.E.V., W.F. Hudgings and R.J. Martin, at their request of J.F.R., were given permission to intensify the circulation of J.F.R.'s Siftings, and to plan the immense number of conventions of the Summer and Fall of 1917 to slander J., which was done (Jer. 38: 1-6). But certain worldlings, Aug. 7, by J.F.R.'s sufferance gave J. help and advice how to gain deliverance from the pit of slander, in which he found no refreshment, but sank deeper and deeper into the mire of misrepresentation (vs. 7-13). J.F.R. mentally queried at this time as to J.'s statements on the Society conditions and got from these statements the answer that, if J. answered, J.F.R. would seek to cut J. off from the friends, and if he counseled, J.F.R. would not comply with his counsels. On J.F.R.'s mentally deciding not to do these things, his further contemplation of J.'s positions gave him the thought that they implied that if he would give them up, he would yet be spared, but if not, the Society's position would be overthrown and J.F.R. would fall into the control of Satan (vs. 14-18).

The evils continued in Bethel and in brethren outside of Bethel led by J.F.R., until God finally decided to abandon them to Azazel (2 K. 24: 20; 2 C. 36: 13; Jer. 52: 3). Azazel, by J.F.R.'s and his supporters' wickedness, brought them into especial wrongs and resultant besieging, Aug. 6-8 (2 K. 25: 1; Jer. 39: 1; 52: 4). During these three days J. repeatedly gave the above-mentioned forecasts of calamities and ruin coming at Satan's hands upon the Society and J.F.R. (Jer. 34: 1-3); especially did he do this on Aug. 7 (Jer. 32: 1-5),

as he also indicated that J.F.R. would not cease to exist in the Zedekiah phase with the fall of the Society and himself into Satan's control, J. speaking these things while yet the Society, the I.B.S.A. and the People's Pulpit Association remained out of Azazel's hand (Jer. 34: 4-7). The symbolic siege continued until Aug. 8, when the forecast calamity befell J.F.R. and the Society; for no relief came, and the breach in its powers came with the expulsion of the Board's majority from Bethel, which resulted in scattering before Azazel its defenders between the powers of the Society and the People's Pulpit Association, because of J.F.R.'s evil works (2 K. 25: 2-5; Jer. 39: 2-4; 52: 5-7). But in vain was the attempt to escape Azazel by those so steeped in wrong; for J.F.R. and his supporters were scattered as new creatures, were captured in Great Company condition and were by Azazel condemned (2 K. 25: 5, 6; Jer. 39: 5; 52: 8, 9). Azazel cut off J.F.R.'s chief supporters and other leaders in his sight, blinded his eyes of understanding, especially his right eye with ever-increasing darkening, and confined his service and conduct in bonds under great restraints (2 K. 25: 7; Jer. 39: 6, 7; 52: 10, 11). Azazel's chief supporter, J.F.R., wrought desolation in the Society and its Great Company and Youthful Worthies, as well as in the Society's powers, taking into Azazel's powers practically all of those who supported J.F.R. (2 K. 25: 8-11; Jer. 39: 8, 9; 52: 12-15).

Moreover the despised "Opposition" did not fall into Azazel's hands, but were left in the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit as laborers for the Lord (2 K. 25: 12; Jer. 39: 10; 52: 16). Azazel has, beginning then, ever since been devastating the Lord's people who fell into his hands, despite those who had enlightened, strengthened, comforted, encouraged them, devastating the special leaders and the doctrinal, refutational, correctional and ethical teachings of the Society, diverting these corrupted leaders and teachings into Azazel's service, continually belittling the faithful and fruitful Parousia and Epiphany Messengers, and corrupting

the Old and New Testament teachings pertaining to cleansing from filthiness of the flesh and spirit (2 K. 25: 13-17; Jer. 52: 17-23). The five chief Society leaders at Bethel and the fullness of their outside supporters were by Azazel's chief lieutenant, J.F.R., brought to Azazel, where they were cut off from the Lord, and thus the Societyites went into captivity in three groups, some on July 29, some on Aug. 6 and the rest on Aug. 8 (2 K. 25: 2; Jer. 52: 26-30). J.'s great grief over, and his pertinent statements on the terrible desolations of the Societyites and of the Truth and its practices among them are the small parallel of Jeremiah's Lamentations (Lam. 1-5).

A severe indictment of the involved Great Company wrong-doings, done despite faithful warnings, which were despised, is set forth typically in 2 C. 36: 14-21, with the consequent calamities, and the evildoers' remaining in Azazelian captivity until their cleansing, even as J. had forecast. As a leader and teacher, J. was by J.F.R.'s evil course enabled to remain in the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit, though J.F.R.'s evil course was calculated to bring him into Azazelian captivity (2 K. 25: 22; Jer. 40: 2-6). The four directors gathered to J. as a leader, who assured them of the Lord's protection while Satan was busy among God's people, and while they were living in the Truth and its Spirit, within which limits they could fearlessly work (2 K. 25: 23, 24; Jer. 40: 7-9). J. declared that he would maintain watch over and manage matters under the pertinent restraints, while they should be fruitful for the Lord in the churches to which they had access. Many brethren who had been captives of the autocrats, clericalists and the nominal-church conscientious objectors rallied to J. and became fruitful for the Lord (Jer. 40: 10-12). A.I. Ritchie was by F.H. McGee through R.H. Hirsh reported to J. as influenced by the clericalists to be seeking to sever J. from the others, which J. did not believe. F.H. McGee offered to sever A.I. Ritchie from them, but J. thought him to be misrepresenting A.I. Ritchie (vs. 13-16). But A.I. Ritchie and all his

human sympathizers, following his wife's suggestion, "We must get rid of J.," did cut him off from their comradeship and made the cause of the four directors separate and distinct from J. and his supporters, in the sense that, whereas before they regarded him as an associate, they now severed themselves from him, and in this sense wrote, "Light After Darkness," which, as a result, fell flat (2 K. 25: 25; Jer. 41: 1-3). This severance was not recognized for a while (Jer. 41: 4). Sympathizers with J., with certain exceptions, were likewise treacherously cut off from them and were covered with the ignominy with which J.F.R. in the Asa phase through J. covered H.J.S.'s course, as shown above (vs. 5-9). Then A.I. Ritchie took the others into clericalistic captivity. F.H. McGee and his supporters pursued these and recovered them, A.I. Ritchie escaping by plausible fugitive arguments (vs. 10-15). Thereafter F.H. McGee and those with him, *e.g.*, I.F. Hoskins, R.H. Hirsh and J.D. Wright, first betaking themselves to Biblical positions, later took up a secular, *i.e.*, a legal position (2 K. 25: 26; Jer. 41: 16-18).

These brethren, under F.H. McGee's lead, came to J., pointing out their deplorable condition, contrasted with their former condition, and asked him to pray to the Lord for guidance, promising to follow the principles of the Divine Word that the Lord would send in answer, regardless of whether it would be favorable or not (Jer. 42: 1-6). In fullness of time the principles were clear to J., who declared to the leading and other sympathizing brethren that they should stand for the principles of truth and righteousness on which the Board made its stand before the ousting (and not take up a purely secular position), which, if they would do, the Lord would be on their side in defense and relief, and he urged them not to fear Satan, who had gotten the upper hand in the sphere of the Truth (vs. 7-12). J. warned them against disobediently forsaking their Truth position and taking up a purely legal one, where they expected peace and prosperity (vs. 13, 14). Further, he warned them that if, self-willed,

they would rely upon a legal position, the evils that they feared would overtake them, as they had overtaken the Society (vs. 15-18). J. told them that this was the Lord's mind on the subject, and that they had deceitfully acted against their interests in asking him to declare to them the Lord's mind, which they had decided not to follow, if against their desires (vs. 19-21). But J.'s response was not accepted, rather he was charged with giving a false answer, being told that the four directors evidently were influencing his allegedly false answer; and thus F.H. McGee and all the others disregarded his word and took up a secular, *i.e.*, a legal, instead of a Biblical position, carrying the four directors and J. along with them (Jer. 43: 1-7). J., while in this position, carried the pertinent teachings of God's Word, which he hid in the fiery furnace in which they were, and showed that on the basis of these Azazel would establish his power over the sphere of the legal-worldly-arguments and over those who rested upon them, smiting these and overthrowing the worldly mighty ones, overpowering all of them in his conquering power (vs. 8-13).

Beginning Aug. 8, 1917, and continuing until Dec. 24, 1918, when the second number of *The Present Truth* was mailed, the Lord sent another message by J., respecting the three groups of Levites, whose position was a worldly one (Jer. 44: 1). He reminded them of all the evils that had been committed by the American brethren and of the resultant Divine displeasure and punishment on their false services to their faults in the Society (vs. 2, 3). Despite these evils God faithfully sent protesting teachers, who feelingly protested against these things so hateful to God (v. 4). They refused to obey the Lord speaking through these teachers; hence God wasted them by the troubles in the Society (vs. 5, 6). God now by J. pleaded that "the Opposition" cease from their wrongs, else all of them would be cut off from God's favor, because of their serving their evil characteristics in worldly ways (vs. 7, 8). He reminded them of the evils coming on the Society for their bad qualities, who repented not, nor

obeyed the Lord's Word (vs. 9, 10), for which God threatened to cut them off as the remnant of the Truth people who took up worldly positions, for which they would be overthrown (vs. 11, 12). This punishment would be of the same general character as that undergone by the Societyites, and would not permit them, except a few, to return to the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit (vs. 13, 14). But those who knew that their evil qualities served concordant works, even all three groups of uncleansed Levites, in their worldliness refused to hearken to God's message at J.'s mouth, and by their acts proved that they were determined to continue their evils, especially the evil of combinationism, as of yore, when they claimed all went well with them in the Society, alleging that evil came upon them only after they set in to resist the Society evils, and claiming that they practiced combinationism without their leaders (vs. 15-19). J. replied that the evil qualities of Society times, before the trouble there, were the very things that moved God to wrath and to punishment in bringing desolation upon the wrongdoers and the Society, even to the present (vs. 20-23). Moreover, J. said to all the revolutionists that, as they were determined to do, so let them do as to these evils (vs. 24, 25). He called upon them to hear God's most solemn word—that they were no longer of the Little Flock and of its vows (v. 26), but would be the objects, not of His blessings, but of His punishments, in their worldliness, by controversy and lack of Truth (v. 27). Only a few of those who took up the worldly position would return to the Truth and its Spirit, and all would experience whether the Lord's or their word would stand (v. 28). God's punishments would be the proof that God's pertinent word would prevail (v. 29). As a pledge God declared that He would deliver F.H. McGee wholly to Azazel, as He had J.F.R. (v. 30). Our exposition of Jer. 40-44, it will be seen, applies their teachings to "the Opposition" from Aug. 8, 1917, to Dec. 24, 1918, during which time J. published "Another Harvest Sifting Reviewed" and Truths, Nos. 1 and 2, summing up the evils, and forecasting the

punishments of the involved 16½ months (EJ 89-146).

The little parallel of Jer. 29: 1-14 was fulfilled in J.'s writing to the Society friends, especially in the articles, The Last Related Acts of Elijah and Elisha, Calls-Siftings-Slaughter Weapons, The Society as a Channel and Azazel's Goat, wherein J. counseled the Azazelian-bound Societyites to make the best of their condition, to seek Levitical fruitfulness for the Lord, to be on their guard against their false teachers, and to look for deliverance after they would begin to cleanse themselves; for God had thoughts of prosperity, not evil, for them when that time would come. Then they would return to seek the Lord whole-heartedly; and He would be found by them. He would then deliver them from Azazel's hands and bring them back to the Truth and its Spirit. This is a summary of the little parallel of Jer. 29, found in J.'s pertinent teachings in the above-mentioned articles. And in 2 C. 36: 22 and Ezra 1: 1-11 is given a typical prophecy of the return of the 60 groups, started by their revulsion at the evils in the groups from which they successively separated themselves, followed in each case by a long captivity in Azazel's hands setting in, which would end by their cleansing and reinstatement in the Truth and its Spirit. In Chapter IV we showed this in detail in respect to the first separation of the so-called Opposition, then mentioned how the type had or would have its fulfillment in the other 59 groups, in each of which there would follow an Azazelian experience, passed over in this Ezra type, and then a cleansing, typed in the Ezra picture. Thus God will work good out of the evil. He will have compassion on His people and will return the New Creatures, after their fleshly minds are destroyed, to the sphere of His Truth and its Spirit. Hallelujah! What a Savior!

In The Present Truth the large 2520 years' parallel has been given; and here the small one has been given. How marvelous is God's wisdom that in Kings, Chronicles, Isaiah and Jeremiah gave both of them with such wondrous detail! O, praise our God, all ye His people!

## CHAPTER VII.

### THE ANTITYPICAL JUDGES, LARGE AND SMALL

GENERAL REMARKS. OTHNIEL. EHUD. SHAMGAR. DEBORAH AND BARAK. GIDEON. ABIMELECH. JEPHTHAH. SAMSON. MICAH. THE LEVITE AND THE BENJAMITES.

THE FIRST and second chapters of Judges give us, antitypically considered, a bird's-eye view of the large Gospel Age and the three miniature Gospel Ages, the first recording the triumphs and failures to triumph over evil, and the second recording the main evils that the professed people of God did during those times. Hence there are four applications to the things presented in these two chapters; indeed, this is true of all the succeeding chapters of this book. In our study of Judges, in harmony with the subject of this volume, generally speaking, we will stress its application to the Small Miniature, and but briefly indicate the applications to the Gospel Age proper. Our comments necessarily will be brief, to keep this chapter within reasonable size in relation to the others of this volume. In Judg. 1 Judah in the large application represents the Little Flock from Pentecost until the end of the Parousia, and in the Miniatures he represents it during the Epiphany; while Simeon for the large application represents the crown-losers from Pentecost to the end of the Parousia and for the Miniatures, the Great Company. And because Simeon here stands for the Great Company as a whole, he also seems to be used to represent one of the eight subdivisions into which the crown-losers are divided during they Gospel Age *as crown-losers* whom God viewed as the anticipated Great Company Levites and during the Epiphany as such actually, *i.e.*, the Societyites, even as Elisha types both of these; for it will be noted that, apart from Judah and Simeon, there are but seven other tribes mentioned in Judg. 1, corresponding to the other seven Great Company, Levite, groups, *i.e.*, Benjamin

(v. 21), Manasseh (v. 27), Ephraim (v. 29), Zebulun (v. 30), Asher (v. 31), Naphtali (v. 33) and Dan (v. 34), all eight of whom are represented as failing so to run as to win, and as being overcame by one or more of the *disgraces*, whereas in Simeon as joined with Judah (v. 17) they are represented as finally overcoming. The house of Joseph (vs. 22-25) represents the star-members from Pentecost to the end of the Epiphany, as overcoming, before the Epiphany, great Babylon and, during the Epiphany, little Babylon, by the assistance of crown-losers (v. 25) who were allowed to go on building up, first great, then later little Babylon, while Israel (v. 28) represents the Little Flock as supporters of the above-described star-members.

The preceding paragraph gives a mere outline of the generalities of Judg. 1. For the Judah antitype general details in the two applications will now be briefly given. God answered the question of His people in both applications as to who would be more than conquerors over self, by answering, the Little Flock (vs. 1, 2). The Little Flock desired the cooperation of the crown-losers for overcoming self, promising them their help for their overcoming, which desire was granted (v. 3). The Little Flock went forth, conquering both self and the world, especially in the fight against error, misnamed light, and defeated the leading error teachers of the two Babylons (vs. 4, 5), who were by the Little Flock deprived of their power to serve and act out their teachings, who by their deceptions had deprived the two Babylons' counterfeit teachers from real ability to serve truth and practice righteousness, and compelled them in great subserviency to partake of the small bits of Truth falling from the leading error-teachers' table, and who thus suffered a similar punishment. These error-teachers were in their teachings brought to the Truth people, and in their teachings were refuted (vs. 6, 7). The Little Flock delivered from both Babylons the embryo kingdom, after refuting and demolishing them (v. 8). It fought against the high, the medium and the low teachings and practices of both Babylons (v. 9).

It fought against the fourfold organism of evil: sin, error, selfishness and worldliness, and overcame the devil, the flesh and the world (v. 10). It likewise attacked and overcame the creeds of both Babylons (v. 11). The large Parousia and the little Parousia Little Flock assured the large and little creed-conquerors, the Parousia and Epiphany messengers, that they would have the Bible as their special study, as made one with them (vs. 12, 13). The Bible secured from the Parousia and Epiphany Little Flock's possessions pertinent truths on the elect and non-elect classes for these two messengers, as it had also secured from this Little Flock through these messengers a field of service for them (vs. 14, 15). The great and little Jews escaped from the clutches of the great and little nominal churches, and found comfort and refuge in the Little Flock, especially along the lines of Zionism (v. 16). The Little Flock has assisted in both Babylons the crown-losers against their false viewpoints there, and together they utterly destroyed these (v. 17). The Little Flock has overthrown the great and small Greek and Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches (v. 18). The Little Flock by God's help refuted the nominal great and small embryo kingdom, but could not destroy their organizations as such, because of their great power (v. 19). To the large and small Parousia Little Flock the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit was given, where they conquered the three powers of evil: the devil, the flesh and the world (v. 20). The summaries that were given on vs. 21-36 in the first paragraph will suffice for the purposes of this chapter.

As indicated in the first paragraph above, Judg. 2 points out the main sins of which God's people became guilty during the Gospel Age and its Miniatures, and is thus a summary of such sins, their consequences and the Lord's pertinent acts, and thus sums up what the rest of the book gives in detail. In every crucial period of the Gospel Age and its Miniatures it was found that there had been apostacies from truth and righteousness among God's people; and, accordingly, God raised up messengers of

the Truth to preach repentance to His people. They reminded these of God's having delivered them from Satan's kingdom, and of his having translated them into the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit sworn to their predecessor brethren by an irrevocable covenant (v. 1), and binding them not to enter into a covenant with sin, error, selfishness and worldliness as the unlawful natural inhabitants of their hearts and minds, which should be the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit, but to overthrow the heart and mind qualities that would serve evil; but they did not obey the Lord's Word, for which God demanded to know why (v. 2). Hence God said that He would not drive such evils out of their hearts and minds, that they might be a torment to their doers, and that the objects of these bad qualities would ensnare them into evil (v. 3). The effect of this teaching of God's messengers has always been contrition in the hearts and tears in the eyes of God's people (v. 4). Hence this condition has been called repentance (Bochim [*weepers*]); and thereafter God's people renewed their consecrations (v. 5). Our Lord in the Gospel Age or in the Miniatures put each of His professed people into his pertinent class, *i.e.*, justified, crown-retainers and crown-losers, Youthful Worthies, Campers, Out-of-the-campers and Second Deathers, as the case called for, and each one went to, and received his assigned place (v. 6). During the Harvests and in the lapping of the Parousia into the Epiphany, during which times the leaders saw God's great works toward God's people, His people served the Lord (v. 7). But at the end of the reaping and gleaning Jesus ceased from harvesting and entered into a different work (v. 8).

He was greatly reverenced for His exaltation in His office as the Inspirer of the Bible in large and little Christendom, and as the Overthrower of large and little Jewry and Christendom (v. 9). As old times and dispositions changed into new ones in the great and little nominal church, the brethren got dispositions that did not experience the Lord's dealings as of former times and dispositions (v. 10).

Beginning in the large and small Smyrna epochs and continuing throughout the rest of the large and small epochs the Lord's people apostatized by doing various evils, especially serving ecclesiastical autocracy and clericalism (v. 11), forsaking the Lord that they had loved and served in the two Harvests, and that had delivered them from the present evil world, and following after the gods of leaders, of creeds and of the disgraces that remained in their hearts and minds, even yielding to these their consecrated all unto provoking the Lord (v. 12). Thus the large and small people of God forsook the God of perfect wisdom, power, justice and love and served ecclesiastical autocracy, clericalism, and a combination of secularism and religionism (v. 13). Naturally, this displeased God with His great and small peoples. As a result He abandoned them to such evil qualities as devastated them of the Truth and its Spirit, and allowed them to become the purchased slaves of power-grasping and lords over God's heritage and their perverters as to truth and righteousness, against whom they were powerless to offer effective resistance (v. 14). No matter what they did or whether they turned, the Lord's power opposed them unto their injury, as God had by word and oath forewarned them, all of which greatly straitened them (v. 15). Nevertheless, in great and little Babylon God raised up star-member leaders, who by God's Word and Spirit delivered them from the power of their spoilers (v. 16). But they refused in both Babylons to heed their Divinely raised-up star-member leaders; for they inordinately followed their sinful, selfish and worldly desires, to which they devoted themselves, and which they obeyed and served, turning quickly away from the Truth and its Spirit, in which their better dispositions had formerly walked in obeying the Lord's commandments, which now they refused to do (v. 17).

In both Babylons God raised up star-member leaders, whom He supported, and caused them to deliver His large and small people from the power of their injurers all the

days of such star-member leaders' activities; for the Lord in compassion changed His procedure with His wandering peoples on account of their distress wrought on them by their oppressing and vexing evil qualities and misleaders (v. 18). But when the star-member leaders' activities ceased God's two peoples apostatized and corrupted their faith and character structures more than formerly, walking after the evil characteristics of their fallen dispositions, gratifying and serving these, and not ceasing from their evil practices and their wilful characteristics (v. 19). Therefore God's displeasure burned against both of His peoples; and in this displeasure He declared that because they had violated the covenant into which they had entered with Him, at His invitation made with them formerly, and had refused to fulfill obediently their consecrations to Him (v. 20), He would not enable them to overcome the faults that our Lord's previous (uncompleted) ministry had left in their dispositions (v. 21). This He designed as a test on His two peoples, in order that it might be demonstrated as to whether they would observe the Lord's Word, Spirit and providences, to live according to these as they had formerly done, or not (v. 22). It is for this reason that God allowed these faults to remain in them and not to be extirpated entirely by Jesus' former ministries (v. 23). Truly in Judg. 2 a brief summary of the Lord's dealings with His apostatizing and repenting peoples in great and little Babylon after the Harvests is given, as students of Church history and of the Epiphany history can readily see.

The Lord proceeds to tell of the evil qualities and leaders that the Lord left in the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit as a test to His peoples living after the Harvests, when the battles were against the errors and faults there existing (Judg. 3: 1). The sole design of leaving these was to afford His peoples of these two post-Harvest times opportunities to fight and overcome them, since otherwise they would not know the good fight of faith (v. 2). The special evil leaders

were the autocratic and clericalistic leaders in the five chief sects—Greek, Roman, Lutheran, Calvinistic and Anglican Churches. It will be seen that in v. 5 six nations are listed; and six, the number of full evil or affliction, here means the totality of evil, and the six nations there, therefore, represent the totality of the disgraces as contrasted with the graces. Thus more or less imperfection is in every faculty of fallen humans. But in v. 3 three nations are mentioned apart from the five lords of the Philistines and in their order they represent the flesh, the world and the fallen angels, the latter being in harmony with Satan's empire, stretching from its religious to its secular aspects (v. 3). All these were by God designed to test His peoples between the Harvests and during the Epiphany as to whether they would be loyal to the truths and the spirit of the two Harvests (v. 4). And stronger New Creatures became one with weaker disgraces and weaker New Creatures became one with stronger disgraces; and in such oneness they yielded their consecrated powers to the fallen angels and their own faults (v. 6). Accordingly, in the Interim and in the Epiphany the Lord's people wrought evil in exercising the disgraces and serving the interests of fallen angels, and forgot the Lord and their consecration vows (v. 7). The sins that are here referred to are those resulting from the apostacy beginning in the early Smyrna periods, resulting in the Church's going in the large and miniature 539's into symbolic captivities, *i.e.*, captivity to the great and miniature papacies.

To make this clearer we will make a few explanations: There are four progressive oppressions referred to in Judg. 3–8, from each of which the Lord progressively sent deliverance through antitypical judges in the Gospel Age and its three Miniatures. Knowing for the Gospel Age that there have been four corresponding progressive deliverances, we should have no difficulty in locating these oppressions and deliverances. This remark on four progressive oppressions and deliverances must not be taken to mean that there have

been only four typical and antitypical oppressions and deliverances, for more than that many are recorded in Judges, but it should be taken to mean just what it says: there have been only four antitypical *progressive* oppressions followed by four of such deliverances. The others are detached from one another as to time succession. We know that the first oppression began in 539; and the first deliverance therefrom occurred during the earlier part of the Sardis period, *i.e.*, during the period of the reformation by individuals. This one corresponds to the oppression and deliverance of Judg. 3: 8-11. We further know that the next deliverance was the one in the Philadelphia Church, through the reformation by sects; accordingly its oppression was that which set in after the death of Hus, when persecution greatly increased until Luther and Zwingli began their reformations. This corresponds to the oppression of Judg. 3: 13-31. The next deliverance was that of the cleansed sanctuary and Parousia, whereby God's people were called out of Babylon. Consequently, their oppressions were those endured in the sects from 1522 onward to 1846. This corresponds to that of Judg. 4, 5. These three oppressions were by the nominal churches. The fourth set of our oppressions was from the secular and religious Gentile powers during the Times of the Gentiles. And the deliverance is during the Epiphany. This corresponds to that described in Judg. 6-8: 32. Briefly it should here be remarked that as the large antitypical judges were the star-members from the large Sardis onward and as during the corresponding Miniatures J. corresponds to these star-members, he has been privileged to act as the three miniature sets of judges, the small one being entirely in the past, the medium one now drawing to a close, and the Sardis part of the large one now operating. In tracing the corresponding times in the Gospel Age and its small Miniature it is suggested that the reader make a constant use of the comparative time and thought tables of them in Chapter I.

The first great and small apostasies began in St. Paul's

and Bro. Russell's days respectively (2 Thes. 2: 7) and continued long. They consisted in God's people forgetting the Lord in His truths and arrangements and in yielding themselves up to the service of clericalistic autocracy and union of themselves with the large and small world, combinationism (v. 7). This, of course, displeased God with His justified and consecrated great and small peoples; and in 539 and Oct. 30, 1916 (the date that Bro. Russell in the toga scene gave up his office as that Servant), the Lord gave them up to religious and political oppression for a long time in great papacy and in little papacy (first in the Society and then in the P.B.I. features of the little papacy; Cushan [Ethiopian] -rishathaim [*double fraud, i.e., in state and church, large and small*], v. 8).. Under these oppressions, which made God's great and small peoples groan, the large and small Adelbert of France (the small one in J.'s appeals to the Board), Claudius of Turin (the small one in J.'s Harvest Siftings Reviewed), Ratramnus (the small one in J.'s pertinent lectures), Berengar of Tours, Peter Abelard and Arnold of Brescia (the small ones in J.'s activities in the Fort Pitt Committee), Peter Waldo (the small one in the earlier preparations for Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed) and like-minded supporting brethren made unavailing protests, which moved the Lord to compassion; and He raised up in the Sardis star-members judges: large and small Marsiglio, antitypes of Zerubbabel (the small one in The Present Truth, Nos. 1, 2), large and small Tauler (the small one in Truth, No. 3), Wyclif, large and small antitypes of Ezra (the small one in Truth, No. 4) and Hus, the large and small antitypes of Nehemiah (the small one in Truth, No. 5), whose writings not only thoroughly refuted great and little papacy, but freed not a few from their bondage, which resulted in their resting from evil for a full trial period (vs. 9-11).

Just after the large and small Hus' end another large and small apostacy set in, in the two 1459's. The Lord allowed the great and small papacies (the latter in the

Society) to arise in another oppression through a line of large and small very wicked popes (in the small pope different aspects in the one, J.F.R.; Eglon [*frisky, careless*], v. 12). These great and little autocratic popes gathered to their side the clericalists and the wicked, and attacked the large and small leaders and led of God's people, like the large and small John Wessel, John Wesel, Savonarola, etc., and got possession of crown-losers (v. 13). The result was that the Lord's people were for some time oppressively enslaved to the great and small popes, who ruled in autocracy and wickedness, *e.g.*, the large and small Innocent VIII and Alexander VI (v. 14). Under this oppression God's two peoples groaned for the oppressions and repented of their evils, *e.g.*, Luther's worries under Romanist errors on "good works" as the means of justification. God, therefore, compassionately raised up both Luthers as deliverers from both oppressions (Ehud [*strength*], Gera [*grain*]), who were strong in refutative Truth, through whom supporting brethren sent a gift of service to the great and little popes, the large Luther bearing this gift of service as an active monk, priest, theological professor, preacher, author and vice-vicar-general of his monastic order, and the little Luther bearing this gift of service as pilgrim, editor and letter-writer (v. 15). From 1512 onward the large Luther developed the doctrine of justification by faith, as a two-edged sword that worked constructively as to truth and destructively as to error, but held this doctrine unobservedly under his graces; and the small Luther, beginning June 30, 1919, developed secretly by certain of his graces the work of preparing to send out the Truth on the separation of Elijah and Elisha in Truth, No. 6, which as a double-edged sword cut constructively as to truth and destructively as to error (v. 16). Each Luther, supported by his brethren, brought the gift of service to his respective pope, who respectively reveled in self-indulgence, on which they had fattened in power (v. 17).

When both Luthers, cooperated with by their supporters,

had rendered their respective services, they sent their supporters away, in the sense that they entered into a secret mental work of which their supporters were unaware (v. 18). The secret mental work is described typically in vs. 19-26, and it consisted in their studying unto clarity the questions belonging to a refutation of the pertinent views of the great and little popes. When we look at the pertinent histories of the two Luthers, we see that the contacts between them and the large and small popes were not personal, nor, until the activities typed in v. 28, by the printed page. In the large Luther this study covered the question of justification by faith, including the related questions on sin, sin atonement, the Savior's pertinent offices, repentance, faith justification and good works, *i.e.*, the relation of the two classes, the sinners and the justified, and their distinctions. It was in 1516 that he became clear on these subjects. Not only the facts of the large Luther's life up to the time that he issued his first publication, in 1516, which he would not issue until clarity was reached on the pertinent subjects, prove that from 1512 to 1516 he did this secret fighting of the pope's views on the above-mentioned subjects, but also the four Universal Empires' parallels prove it. In these parallels Alexander the Great in his conquest of the Persian empire, 334-330 B.C., parallels Luther's mental conquest of the papal empire in its main teachings, 1512-1516. In the small Luther this study, June 30-July 4, 1919, as secret fighting of the little pope, was along the lines of the last related acts of Elijah and Elisha, particularly stressing the sins of antitypical Elisha leading up to and connected with the separation, the justification of antitypical Elijah therein and the distinction between the two classes, thus the study and overthrow of the main errors of the little papacy, led by the little pope, J.F.R. This secret study and conquest is the key that unlocks vs. 19-26 and shows how their events preceded the publication of both Luthers' 95 theses, Oct. 31, 1517, and July 5, 1919, typed by the blowing of the trumpet of v. 27.

With these prefatory remarks we are ready to study vs. 19-26 fruitfully, type and antitype. Both Luthers not only did certain things that served both popes, but they also after meditating on their creed idols turned at a crisis in their lives from these back to their respective popes for what proved a hostile study and refutation of these creed idols, which was secretly done, only the popes' being present to their minds as they so studied, the popes' attitude telling both of them to keep their thoughts in silence and to their minds ordering all others away (v. 19). The thought of both Luthers considered the two popes in their luxurious privacy, and they told them in thought that they had a message from God for them, which to their minds made the two popes arise from their seats of authority to give attention (v. 20). Their refutative powers seized upon the pertinent thoughts and mentally drove these refutations deep into the pertinent papal theories, so deep that nothing could withdraw them; but they made the corruptions associated with these theories become manifest (vs. 21, 22). All this was done in the secrets of the two Luthers' minds and was kept there secretly (v. 23). Both Luthers in mind, after the refutations were clear to their minds, saw how the papal supporters would be in oblivion of the actual refutation of the two popes for some time, and think them certainly to be in security and comfort (v. 24). They further in mind saw them as ashamed of their long waiting and finding no suggestion of the popes' pertinent activity; furthermore the two Luthers in mind saw the papal supporters in mind coming to the two secluded popes in their theories, and, finding them completely refuted (v. 25). Both Luthers mentally saw themselves safe during the delay, and passing by the papal creed idols, and in safety reaching the position of those who proved to be good crown-losers whom they thought to be of the Little Flock (v. 26).

After the pertinent study of both Luthers was finished (1516 and July 4, 1919), they sent forth as by a trumpet blast their respective calls to war with the two popes: the

large Luther in his 95 theses against indulgences nailed to the doors of the Castle Church at Wittenberg, Oct. 31, 1517, the small Luther in his answers to the questions in the Question meeting at the Philadelphia Convention, July 5, 1919, attacking the Society's indulgence of the wrongs of its adherents and its strictly holding "the Opposition" as Second Deathers, both blasts going out to their respective Christendoms, and both Luthers leaving off their respective support of their Christendoms, and leading their supporters to battle: the large Luther starting this in 1518 as increasingly multitudes gave him their confidence and support, and the small Luther beginning this on July 6, after the Convention had the day before voted him confidence and support in his battle with J.F.R. (v. 27). Both Luthers by act told their supporters to follow after them, because the Lord had delivered their enemies, the strongest examples of autocracy, into their hands. Following the lead of the two Luthers, they got control of both fords of the Jordan, in the sense that they held the Truth on access for the peoples of both Christendoms to be in the respective two involved classes in dispute, which prevented any but Truth peoples from access (v. 28).

Verbally and by pertinent writings the two Luthers, the large Luther, *e.g.*, by many sermons and lectures and by his first Commentary on Galatians, his books, An Address to the German Nation's Nobility, The Babylonian Captivity of the Church, etc., the small Luther by the circulation of No. 6, thoroughly smote all the defenders of the two popes, especially the more powerful and able ones among them; and none of them escaped these refutations (v. 29). Thus the Romanists and Societyites were subdued at the pertinent times under the power of the two Luthers and their supporters; and the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit was freed from the oppressing Romanists and Societyites (v. 30). And after this conflict of the two Luthers the large and small Zwinglis, the large Zwingli with the Truth on the Lord's Supper as

against transubstantiation, and the small Zwingli with the Truth on the murmurers of the parable of the penny, published in Truth, No. 9, against the transubstantiation of the Great Company into the Little Flock that C.J. Woodworth attempted by his interpretation of the murmurers, overthrew by the pertinent truths, as spurrers-on of the sacrificed humanity, the two counterfeits, and thus delivered the two Israels from the tyranny of the two errors (v. 31). The large and small Lutheran and Zwinglian reformations are here mentioned, because they were the main ones of the large and small reformations, the former turning into the large and small tribes of Ephraim and the latter into the large and small tribes of Judah.

We now come in Judg. 4 and 5 to the study of the third progressive deliverance of God's two true peoples from, what is otherwise called large and small Babylon in both its large and small Romanist and Protestant sections. The two peoples of God, after the deliverance of the two reformations, which even for both Romanisms themselves made not a few reforms in certain of their teachings and, especially, practices, sinned especially after each reform of the two reformations in failure to carry out their consecration and by living selfishly and secularly and more or less sinfully (Judg. 4: 1). Hence the Lord gave them up to the large and small sectarianisms; and the leaders of their armies were large and small anti-millennialist clericalism, which was active in all the large and small nations (v. 2). These things made God's people "howl" (Is. 52: 5); for doctrines like the large and small trinity, immortality, eternal torment, absolute predestination and numerous other contradictory teachings, as well as the tyrannous services in both sectarianisms and clericalisms, made God's two peoples greatly sigh and cry for the prevailing abominations, while the strong sectarian and clericalistic organizations added to their strong and long oppressions (v. 3). God's real Church, first, as the large and small cleansed sanctuary, respectively from 1846 to 1874

and from May 29, 1920 to June 26, 1920, and, secondly, as the large and small Parousias' Churches, respectively from 1874 to 1914 and from June 26, 1920 to Aug. 5, 1920, industriously in true thinking and light taught the brethren of the real and nominal churches (v. 4). These were, somewhat in the fellowship of the large and small crown-losers associated with them, occupied between high character development and activities toward the two Christendoms; and in this condition God's large and small people came to both Deborahs for instruction and direction (v. 5). These two phases of the Church called upon the large and small acceptable Russells, the Parousia and Epiphany Messengers as light-givers in the large and small Parousias, in their consecrated condition away from the two nominal peoples, reminding them that the true God had charged them to advance toward the heights of Christian life and warfare and to draw to their standards all the responsive warriors of Truth (v. 6).

Furthermore, the two Russells were to draw toward the developing Truth as to a battle-field the large and small anti-millennialist clericalists as the leaders of large and small sectarianism, together with their large and small sectarian organizations and their large and small armies, which God pledged to deliver into the power of the large and small Russells (v. 7). The large and small Russells by their acts said that they would not undertake the fight, unless God's real large and small peoples would go with them to the conflict (v. 8). Humbly God's large and small real peoples by their acts indicated that they would be in truth with them, but that their going with the two Russells and their warriors would detract from their prestige; for it would be said that the large and small Church led them in the two battles, and that by these the Lord delivered the two sets of clericalistic anti-millennialists into their power. Accordingly, the two Deborahs, the Lord's two Parousias' Little Flock, accompanied the two Russells to the consecrated battle-field (v. 9). Therefore the large and small Russells called the large and

small crown-retainers and crown-losers to the holy battle-field, and the totality of the enlightened of these responded to the two calls to battle, as also did the two real peoples of God as the Church (v. 10). The large and small pre-millennialist foolish virgins who remained in both Babylons severed themselves from the large and small non-pre-millennialist foolish virgins who remained in both Babylons; and they drew near and pitched their battle position near that of the two Russells in the holy battle under strong but erroneous leaders, like Dr. Seiss in great and Carl Olson in little Babylon (v. 11). The two anti-millennialist sets of clericalists learned that the large and small Russells had taken up their position on the two Millennial kingdom positions (v. 12). Both anti-millennialist clericalistic leaders summoned all their strong organizations to battle, as well as all their warriors active in the large and small denominations, to the developing Truth of the large and small Parousias (v. 13). Both Deborahs encouraged the large and small Russells to betake themselves to the conflict, declaring that these two times were the periods when the Lord would deliver, the two sets of anti-millennialist clericalists into heir power, assuring them that the Lord, with the necessary Spirit, Truth and providences, would go before them. Accordingly, they went down from their position with all their fellow-warriors with them (v. 14).

In the ensuing controversy, carried on during the large Parousia by the pertinent literature, in Dawns, Towers, tracts, sermons, etc., and by lectures and conversations and in the small Parousia with Present Truths, No. 19, on Azazel's Goat, No. 20, on The Court, Type and Antitype, Reviewed, on J.F.R.'s Bearing False Witness and on Shearno-Crawfordism Analyzed, Part I, and No. 21, on That Evil Servant and Shearno-Crawfordism Analyzed, Part II, as well as with lectures and conversations, the Lord utterly overthrew the two sets of anti-millennialist clericalists (we should here explain that a small millennium of 1,000 days set in with the small Parousia and that this was

denied by the Levites of all classes; hence we call their leaders small anti-millennialist clericalists) and all their organizations and warriors, by the controversial truths contained in the above-mentioned literature, etc., as these truths were given through the two Russells; and the anti-millennialist clericalists, leaving their organizational helps, fled by their conduct from the field of battle (v. 15). Both Russells pursued after the fleeing organizations and warriors unto the large and small nominal churches' fields of service, and utterly refuted all the warriors of the anti-millennialist clericalists by their controversialist truths, so that none were left of them to fight back (v. 16). But the large and small anti-millennialist clericalists fled by their acts, unaccompanied by any controversial activity of theirs, to the shelter of the large and small foolish virgin pre-millennialists, who were a part of the large and small nominal-church foolish virgins; for there was no controversy between these large and small nominal-church foolish virgins and the large and small sectarianism (v. 17). The large and small pre-millennialist foolish virgins went forth to greet the defeated and fleeing large and small anti-millennialist clericalists; and the former gave the latter an urgent and fear-disarming invitation to seek refuge with them, since they were more sympathetic with them than with the two Russells and their co-warriors. This invitation was accepted; and the former protected the latter by such teachings as they had at hand applicable to the case (v. 18). Athirst for some Truth that both Siseras lacked, and that both Jaels had, the former asked for such mild truths to drink. The latter opened to their understanding stronger truths than were requested; both Siseras drank them and again were given protection (v. 19).

But fearful of the pursuers, each of the Siseras asked the respective Jael to assure any of the two sets of pursuers that the two Siseras did not occupy their doctrinal views (v. 20). But remembering that both Siseras rejected their respective foolish-virgin large and small pre-millennial views, the two Jaels laid hold on their pertinent views,

quietly advanced against them, and controversially and oppositionally drove these completely through the two Siseras' anti-millennial understandings, while they unsuspiciously and wearily rested, and thus utterly and completely refuted them (v. 21). This was done in the large Parousia, *e.g.*, by such works as that by the pre-millennialist standard-bearer Dr. J. Seiss, in his three-volumed work on Revelation, and by the twelve-volumed work entitled, *The Fundamentals*, written by various able foolish-virgin pre-millennialists, among which writers were P. Mamo, C.G. Trumbull, H.A. Kelly, R.E. Spear, R.A. Torrey, James Orr and A.T. Pearson, and in the little Parousia by Carl Olson, Menta Sturgeon, A.I. Ritchie, R.H. Hirsh, etc. As the two Russells pursued after the two Siseras, these two sets of foolish-virgin pre-millennialists in their writings or sayings presented themselves before them, and by their acts told them to make a mental journey with them, and they would show the two Russells the mental condition of those whom they pursued; and, following the suggestion of these, the large and small Russells saw in the writings and sayings of these the two Siseras refuted with Biblical passages and teachings thoroughly overthrowing their understandings (v. 22). It was God who during these two Parousias utterly overthrew under His peoples' blows the two sectarianisms respectively in the large and small Parousias (v. 23); for the power of God's people advanced progressively and strongly against these two; sectarianisms, until they had cut them both off by the strength that God gave them, the truths of the two Parousias (v. 24).

In Judg. 5 we have one of Israel's earlier poems. This one was preceded by a poem of Jacob (Gen. 49: 1-27) and four poems of Moses (Ex. 15: 1-19; Deut. 32; 33; Ps. 90). It gives in poetic form a summary of the teachings of the two Deborahs in their respective Parousias; and as such we submit the following brief double explanation. It will be noted that the poem gives quite a few particulars omitted in

Chapter 4. This poem is the pertinent messages delivered by the two Deborahs and Russells during the two Parousias (Judg. 5: 1). In both Parousias they called for a declaration of Jehovah's glorious attributes for freeing God's people and for the latter's carrying out their consecration (v. 2). Great ones and leaders were exhorted to hear the message that reflected credit upon God for His glorious attributes ascribed in their witnessing to the Jehovah of real Israel by His two Deborahs and Baraks (v. 3). When God left the two Babylons and Christendoms, society in both of them was greatly agitated; the Christ beyond the veil and tribulatory experiences issued forth pertinent truths (v. 4). The Kingdom in its three peaks (the Little Flock, the Great Company and the Ancient and Youthful Worthies [these two here considered as one]) flowed down with Truth (v. 5). In the days when the two sets of reformers as mouthpieces began their work and when the two sets of pre-millennialist foolish virgins set out, the ways of truth and righteousness had been obliterated; and pilgrims to heavenly Canaan found only crooked paths for their feet (v. 6).

Members of the two sets of small gatherings ceased among God's people: They ceased in each set until each Deborah arose as a covenant nourisher among God's people (v. 7). In apostacy they chose new creed idols and leaders in both Babylons; in both Babylons controversies were publicly waged against God's people. No defensive arguments or controversial writings were found among God's two peoples, who should have been warriors in those two periods before the two Parousias (v. 8). But the two Deborahs wished for the two messengers of God's Word, who offered themselves willingly in sacrifice. Then the two Deborahs exhorted the brethren to reflect credit upon God by proclaiming His Word (v. 9). Both sets of Truth teachers, leaders and travelers of the narrow way were exhorted to speak forth the message (v. 10). The proclaimers of the Word, taking their stand beside the Old and New Testaments, and from their declaring God's

acts as harmonious with His character, even in the ecclesiastical assemblies of God's people, during the two Parousias, ministered publicly with the Word as God's people (v. 11). These encouraged the two Deborahs to sing the song of Moses and the song of the Lamb and the two Russells to capture what had captured them (v. 12). These two Russells, as the main ones whom the enemies could not win over from the Church's leaders, God gave a charge as to His two Parousias' peoples and to the two Deborahs (v. 13).

It will be noted that, apart from Zebulun and Naphtali, who, as we saw above, represent the Little Flock and the Great Company in the large Parousia and the Epiphany-enlightened saints and the good Levites in the small Parousia, there are eight tribes mentioned in vs. 14-18, understanding Machir, a son of Manasseh, to stand for Manasseh and Gilead, the country of the tribe of Gad, to stand for Gad, on the principle of the container standing for the thing contained. These eight stand in the large Parousia for the large Parousia crown-losers in the Truth as the anticipatory eight main subdivisions of the Epiphany Levites; and in the small Parousia they stand for those crown-losers in these eight groups who in the small Parousia came into the Epiphany Truth and fought with the priests and good Levites already in the Epiphany Truth against little Babylon. The Zebulunites, mentioned twice (vs. 14 and 18), are so, mentioned for the sake of emphasis, since they are the priests of both Parousias; the Naphtalites are, of course, implied in the other eight, but mentioned only once as such, since their antitypes are lower in class than the antitypes of the Zebulunites. Seemingly the Ephraimites correspond to the Amramites and the Benjamites to the Izharites, both of them fighters against sin, and the Manassehites to the Hebronites as teachers, while the priests (Zebulun) used especially the writings of the Parousia and Epiphany Messengers (v. 14). The leaders of the antitypical Issacharites, as doctrinal, ethical and apologetic Bible students, especially

stood by the two Deborahs and Baraks and were sent out by the latter into the position of chief place in the battle. The groups of antitypical Elisha (Societyites, antitypical Reubenites), Mahlites, in both Parousias had great plans of aggrandizement (v. 15) that raised the question as to why they were amid constant divisions in their aiming to draw disciples after them; and that led to great self-examinations ere they were freed from both Babylons (v. 16). The antitypical Gaddites (inhabitants of Gilead), as antitypical Mushites, in both Parousias occupied themselves with the Lord's people as away from the peoples of great and little Christendom, while the antitypical Shimites (Dan) busied themselves with organizations and the antitypical Libnites (Asher) were nearest the rebellious world and its peoples (v. 17). It was the two Parousias' Little Flock and good Levites who exposed their lives in the two Parousias' battles as against the large and small denominations in the two Christendoms (v. 18).

Now comes the description of the two battles: The leaders of both Christendoms advanced on the two Russells and their supporters, and fought them in their doctrinal fortresses, especially on the teachings as to death as the penalty of real or imagined sin, but they got no gain of Truth (v. 19). Christ and the Church beyond the veil and the Truth teachers of both Parousias fought against the two sets of anti-millennialist clericalists (v. 20). The two Truths, the Parousia and the Epiphany Truths, even the old theology of the Scriptures, swept the two Siseras' armies into symbolic destruction, yea, the very being of both Deborahs crushed victoriously the strength of the armies of the two Siseras (v. 21). Then, indeed, their self-contradictory teachings crushed one another in their activities, set into operation by their strong leaders (v. 22). The two Deborahs and Parousia Messengers charged their supporters to denounce with severe reproofs those who as cowards hid themselves far safety, and came not forth to the help of God's cause, to the help of the Lord's cause against the leaders of great and little

Babylon (v. 23). To be praised above the large and small nominal churches are the two sets of foolish-virgin pre-millennialists, above the associates of all other foolish virgins, yea, above unorganized sects of both Babylons (v. 24). The anti-millennialist clericalists in their thirst for some truth asked it of them, and these gave them stronger truths than they requested; they set forth still heavier truths in a doctrinal vessel of the two nominal churches (v. 25). They powerfully laid hold on Scripture passages and doctrines on the two sets of pre-millennial doctrines, and strongly laid hold on them controversially. With these controversially they struck both sets of anti-millennialist clericalists; they struck the anti-millennial theories of both of them; again they did this; and their Scripture passages and doctrines completely overthrew their theories (v. 26). Down emphatically they lay between the progressive steps of their arguments, falling and lying down in defeat under their blows. In the position that was overthrown they lay defeated (v. 27).

The two nominal churches, as the mothers of the two Siseras in expectation of their sons' victory, looked forward through their views of the positions to the coming back of their sons in victory and triumph; but as time went on they even cried out in apprehension, as they looked through the openings of their views long and wearily, exclaiming, Why do not their victorious organizations come into sight after so long a delay? Why have the advances of their organizations lingered so long? (v. 28). The leading, most learned nominal churches of the two Parousias replied, yea, the two entire nominal churches gave the same reason to themselves for the long delay (v. 29): Are they not discovering more booty, which takes them a long time to divide, an ecclesia, yea, two for each warrior? Booty of fine characters won for the two Siseras! Yea, booty of characters with especially fine graces, carefully developed, yea, doubly finely developed characters, as ornaments for those who win such captives (v. 30)! Then the real people of God, the two Deborahs,

tell the story, the tale which speaks of the defeat of God's enemies, and declare that thus—by refutation—all opponents of Divine Truth must be overthrown, completely refuted, while God's faithful people—those who love Him supremely—are, like the beautiful, full sunset that gilds the clouds with glory and beauty, unforgettable! So far the poem; and the story ends with the antitypical statement that on the subjects at controversy God's people rest undisturbed, freed from the oppression of the large and small sectarianisms and clericalisms. And let all God's faithful people say, "Praise God from whom this blessing flows!"

We now come to the study of Judg. 6–8, which treats of Gideon. As EE 183-262, treats of Gideon as he in the large picture represents our Lord in Judg. 6–8: 12, and as in P '40, 121, brief comments were added on vs. 13-21, thus covering the large picture up to the place where Gideon ceases to represent our Lord, in this study the small picture only of Judg. 6–8: 21 will be given; thereafter both the large and small pictures will be given to the end of Chapter 8. In Chapter I it was shown that the Gospel Age was enacted in the small Miniature on the scale of a day for a year. From that standpoint the date corresponding with our Lord's birth, Oct., 2 B.C., is May 9, 1915. For the clarifying of the small antitype of the Gideon picture it should here be remarked that the Miniature goes back into the Old Testament a day for a year. And from this standpoint the small Times of the Gentiles, corresponding to the seven years' oppression of the Midianites (Judg. 6: 1), began Sept. 11, 1913. In this small picture J.F.R. corresponded to the heads of the four universal empires and to the heads of papal Rome until the end of the Age, while from the little 962 A.D. to the little 1459, when the reign of the double little papacy was in operation, F.H. McGee acted with J.F.R. as one of the two concurrent little popes. In this small picture H.C. Rockwell acted as the head of the successive main kingdoms in opposition to the small Babylonian, Persian, Grecian and Roman

empires during the small Jewish Age and during part of the small Gospel Age, until I.F. Hoskins superseded him in the little Holy Roman Empire. In this small picture E.W. Brenneisen corresponded to Judah's kings, and J.F.R. to Israel's kings, onward from Rehoboam and Jeroboam, 1,000 B.C., corresponding to Aug. 15, 1912 in the little Jewish Age. The above are the viewpoints of these leaders on matters of practice. On matters of teaching E.W. Brenneisen stands for the priests and Levites as teachers during the period of Judah's kings and after the exile, J.F.R. for the false priesthood and idolatrous priests in Israel, afterward in Babylon, etc., as well as the more strict school of scribes after the exile in Israel, and H.C.R. for the Egyptian priests and for the less strict school of scribes in Israel. During these Old Testament times J. stood for those through whom God spoke, the prophets. During this part of the little Jewish Age Bro. Russell acted as the little Logos.

Understanding the matter in this way, the beginning of the times that the Little Israelites sinned according to v. 1 was concurrent with the beginning of the reigns of the little Rehoboam and Jeroboam, Aug. 15, 1912; and they continued not only until little Israel went into the little Assyrian captivity, April 26, 1913 (corresponding to 739 B.C.), but also until little Judah went into Babylonian captivity, Sept. 11, 1913 (corresponding to 607 B.C.). During this year and 28 days not a few evil qualities manifested themselves executively and doctrinally in the three little leaders above mentioned; and these contaminated their partisan supporters. Among these were envy, power-grasping, rivalry, efforts to checkmate one another, unholy ambition, strife, etc., which acted through the bad part of their double minds; and their many sympathizers more or less showed the same qualities. At Bethel especially these three leaders had their partisan supporters; and naturally this partisanship reached beyond Bethel, not only at New York, but also elsewhere, especially in Photo-Drama matters. The result was that God gave His

little Israel over to afflictions; and, as many did not respond fully, He gave them over to the spoliations of the little Times of the Gentiles at the hands of errorists, especially on lines of theories of practice, as distinct from doctrinal theories (Judg. 6: 1). These policy errorists, at the hand of J.F.R. and his supporters, overcame little Israel; and the latter sought shelter in various secret subterfuges (v. 2). Error, sin, selfishness and worldliness greatly interfered with the spiritual results of their spreading the Word as seed (v. 3), and actually restrained and largely destroyed its fruitage everywhere, even to the bounds of the nominal church, so that they failed to win many to justification, sanctification and the Truth (v. 4). These four great forms of evil increased over little Israel with their possessions and spheres of thought and activity, as devouring and multitudinous errors as to practice came individually and as organized evil and wrought great havoc to the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit (v. 5). Of course, this impoverished spiritually the Lord's people, whose poverty made them cry unto the Lord.

This was the condition until about June 8, 1915 (corresponding to 29 A.D.), when J. as the small John the Baptist began to preach on reformation of conduct, reminding the brethren of God's delivering them out of the dominion of Satan, out of the hands of all having his spirit, from their spiritual enemies, the works of the flesh, giving them the Truth and its Spirit, telling them that the Lord had charged them not to fear the creed idols of the errorists, whose spheres of teaching and spirit they had occupied, and ending his pertinent preaching with the charge that the brethren had failed to obey the Lord in their consecration (vs. 8-10). While he was performing this *preaching* aspect of his ministry the Lord's Word in immediate connection with this activity attracted his (Gideon's [*mighty warrior*]) attention in the *student* aspect of his work as the little Jesus of God's people in God's little embryo kingdom; for as vs. 11-24 in the large Gospel Age describe our Lord's preparation for,

and execution of His ministry in the flesh, so in the small Miniature do they refer to J.'s preparation for and execution of a small corresponding ministry, as he was, unknown to himself, preparing amid trying experiences the Faithful for the Epiphany conditions, while shielding them from the influence of errorists (v. 11).

This Word assured him that as a Truth warrior God was with him (v. 12). But God's permitting so many evils among God's people puzzled him as to how the Lord could be the special helper of His evil-oppressed people, as He had been when first bringing them into the Truth (v. 13). The Word then encouraged him to go in his strength to help as a Truth messenger the brethren out of the grasp of errorists in practice (v. 14). J.'s humility suggested that he could not do much to deliver the brethren from their oppressions (v. 15). Thereupon the Lord assured him of His help, and that He would enable him to refute completely the errorists (v. 16). Then J. studied the Truth for a gracious indication that it was really commissioning him to help, the brethren as never before (v. 17). J. then asked that the pertinent Truth remain until he dedicated himself to more zealous efforts on behalf of the brethren, which it assured him it would do (v. 18). Thereupon in his heart silently J. rededicated himself to the Lord for the pertinent work of giving the harder and easier truths through his human powers, and that in connection with his ministry of preaching reformation among the brethren (v. 19). The Word instructed him to make the offering upon the basis of Jesus' sacrificed humanity, in the merit of which his humanity was to be used in serving with hard and easy truths. This he did (v. 20). Then the Word applied its energizing parts to the offering, which quickened J.'s humanity in the service of the pertinent truths. Thereupon the Truth ceased giving this line of instruction to J. (v. 21).

Then J. perceived that this Truth was a sure messenger of God to him; and he greatly feared the severe straits into which it put him, especially on June 12, as a sharp, unfairly reproving, yea, crucifying letter came to him from

C. B. Shull, from Columbus, O. (v. 22). But the Lord comforted him, assuring him that he need not fear, for his New Creature would not die (v. 23). He in that spirit in the little helpful embryo kingdom erected his humanity in the peace of God for sacrificial purposes, for which, praise God, it yet abides (v. 24). The Lord exhorted him to enlist in the reformatory and character-building sacrificial work responsive and mature brethren from among the Lord's people, and to tear down every self-exalting and combinationistic characteristic among the Lord's people, and in its place present the brethren as pure sacrificers to the Lord (v. 25). To fulfill the Lord's pertinent work there charged (v. 26), the fulness of the humanity of brethren needed to do this work was given J. for overcoming these two evil qualities and for their making a pure offering of themselves to the Lord for such reformatory and character-building work, even as the Lord's Word teaches; but he did it quietly, because of enemies (v. 27). When power-grasping, lording and combinationistic characters among the Lord's people saw clearly what was done (v. 28), they inquired of one another as to who had done it; and they learned that J. as supported by God had done it (v. 29). These desired of the brethren to cut off J. from such activities (v. 30). The brethren demanded of these power-grasping lords and combinationists who were seeking to combine good and evil ways of doing the Lord's work whether they would defend and deliver these two evil qualities. If so, they should be cut off at once from their places as leaders among God's people. They also demanded that these qualities, if strong, should justify themselves, if they were not refuted qualities (v. 31). This characteristic of struggling against power-grasping and combinationism marked J. from that time on, because he had not only in himself overcome these two evil characteristics, but had fought against them on behalf of the brethren (v. 32). This brings us up to the end of the little Jewish Harvest, June 8-July 18, 1915. This little Jewish Harvest

had thus two main features: J.'s dedicating himself to the Lord for a new campaign (1) of overcoming as to himself in true character-building and (2) of helping the brethren to do the same, especially against power-grasping, lording and mixing of good and evil.

With v. 33 the small Miniature following the little Jewish Harvest sets in. First of all, the little great apostacy is very briefly described: All the errorists, sinners, selfish and worldly ones among God's professed people gathered and entrenched themselves in the condition summed up in the little union of state and church, *i.e.*, combining worldly trickery with Truth ways (v. 33). J., moved by the Spirit, gathered together responsive brethren to combat the four above-mentioned sets of evil-doers among God's people as they expressed themselves in power-grasping, lording and combinationism in the little union of state and church during the Pergamos period of the small Miniature, as well as against these evil qualities themselves (March 22, 1916-July 17, 1917, corresponding to the years 317-799). This is typed in v. 34. J. aroused four further movements against these evil-doers and evil qualities. By the first call, with the aid of the four ousted directors and F.H. McGee, J. aroused many brethren against Rutherfordism from July 17 to Oct. 16, 1917, when J. completed his supplement to Harvest Siftings Reviewed, corresponding to the years 799 to 890. By the second call, with the aid of R.H. Hirsh and R.G. Jolly, Mar. 24-Aug. 22, 1918, corresponding to the years 1049-1200, J. aroused a movement against Rutherfordism in the Fort Pitt Committee, to which others joined themselves. Here, again, the same forms of evil were attacked. By the third call, issued through the first five numbers of The Present Truth, J., with the aid of R.H. Hirsh and R.G. Jolly, aroused a third movement against the same forms of evil exercised by the P.B.I., Dec. 9, 1918-Mar. 22, 1919, corresponding to the years 1309-1412.

By a fourth call, issued in The Present Truth, Nos. 8 and 9, J., with the aid of R.H. Hirsh and R.G. Jolly, started to

arouse a fourth movement, and that against the Society, May 28-June 16, 1919, corresponding to the years 1479-1498. These four movements correspond to the four sets of men responding to Gideon's call in v. 35. But J. desired further evidence from the Lord that He would use him to overthrow the main evils of the power-graspers, lords over God's heritage and combinationists, and his acts, not words, asked that the Lord might grant this, first by His giving Truth in the various little sect-like movements of the little Reformation period (July 5, 1919-Mar. 27, 1920, corresponding to 1517-1844, from Luther's beginning the Reformation to Miller's ending it in the Advent movement of 1829 to 1844). These little Reformation truths were given in Truths, Nos. 6, 9-13, and were circulated broadcast among the little sect-like movements. These, but no others, absorbed considerable of these truths, while the water wrung out represents the gathering of these truths into a summary in the small cleansed sanctuary in Truth, No. 18 (vs. 36-38). J.'s course longing for the little Parousia's truths (June 26-Aug. 5, 1920, corresponding to 1874-1914), as set forth in Truths, Nos. 19, 20, was a factual, not a verbal request that the Lord indicate to him by the non-absorption of these truths by the little sect-like movements, but by their acceptance in Truth circles outside of these sect-like movements, that He desired him to overwhelm the power-graspers and the combinationists and their theories. This was granted.

In Judg. 7: 1-8 for the small Miniature the Lord's separation of the Epiphany-enlightened brethren from the good organized and from the good unorganized Levites is typed, as in the large Gospel Age He separated the Little lock from the justified and the crown-losers. Just as throughout the Gospel Age there was in general such a separation, yet in particular it occurred in the period from 1846 to 1914, so in the small Miniature there had been progressively, first with the Gershonites, then with the Merarites, such a separation, and after prior Kohathite separations it came to

a head in the separation from Mar. 29 to Aug. 5, 1920, of the Amramite Kohathites from the Epiphany movement as the priestly movement. J. and his supporters took their position on the Truth which makes for trembling, reverence, for God, while the errorists took their position in the little Babylonian kingdom, where sharp sayings were shot forth by figurative archers (*Judg. 7: 1*). The number of good organized and unorganized crown-losers who at first sympathized with J. were so many that they would take the glory of victory over the errorists themselves, and not give it to God (v. 2). Hence the Lord allowed fear-inspiring experiences, the shaking experiences in the British Church during J.'s ministry there in 1917, in the Society after J.'s return to America in 1917, in the P.B.I. and in the Standfests in 1918; and these experiences frightened the bulk of J.'s sympathizers away from him; but there were left with him as sympathizers some, but not many, Sturgeonites, Ritchieites and Olsonites and all Hirshites, as well as real Epiphany-enlightened friends. These together constituted the little 10,000 (v. 3). But by various untoward experiences the Lord gave J. to understand that even these were too many, and that they should be tested by their attitude toward the unfolding Truth by which God would indicate to him who would and who would not go with him to the battle with the errorists (v. 4). J. led them all to the unfolding Truth; and the Lord indicated to J. that those who would show the proper spirit in the study, spread and practice of the Epiphany Truth should be set aside by themselves, and those who would bow down in human servility while partaking of the Truth, not making it their own by a proper study, spread and practice of it, should be set aside by themselves (v. 5). Only the true Epiphanyites stood this test; and the Sturgeonites, Ritchieites, Olsonites and Hirshites fell under it (v. 6).

It was in the Amramite sifting, which set in, in June and July (corresponding to the Parousia's five siftings), that the Lord indicated to J. who were the little 300 that would

overcome the errorists and who were the little 9,700; for that shaking thoroughly shook away from sympathy with the Epiphany movement not only all the Hirshites, but also all the Sturgeonites, Ritchieites and Olsonites (v. 7). Thus all the Epiphanyites took powerful hold on the Truth as their symbolic food, also as their means of proclamation, while the others by the sifting were sent each one fixedly to his place: some as Sturgeonites, some as Ritchieites, some as Olsonites and the rest as Hirshites. J. by the power of the Truth kept with him the little 300, while the theoretical position of the errorists was below him, in the condition of error (v. 8). The Lord by His providences charged J. in secrecy to go mentally on a scouting expedition among the errorists, assuring him that He had delivered their position into his power (v. 9), but assured him that if he feared to do this alone he should take with him R.G. Jolly, his special helper (v. 10). The Lord charged him to study the viewpoint of the errorists and assured him that this would strengthen his power against them. Accordingly, J. and R.G.J. went mentally among the Amramites, who were now a part of the errorists, but the part nearest the Epiphanyites (v. 11). The errorists, the sinners and the selfish and worldly were spread out in a low condition of heart and mind, everywhere contaminated with innumerable errors and multitudinous combinations of organized evils of heart and mind, and seemed numberless, like the fallen race (v. 12). As J. studied the position of the errorists, particularly that of their Amramite section, he heard the Kittingerite section of these explaining and discussing their fears of the opposition that the errorists were meeting in Truths, Nos. 18-20, and that seemed fraught with threats to the errorist position. The Hirshite section of the Amramites answered that the Truth in those three issues was nothing less than the controversial arguments of J., a servant of God, who had delivered into his power the errorists (vs. 13, 14).

On hearing this discussion and the interpretation placed

upon it, J. thanked and praised God and returning to his position and co-laborers, encouraged them to arise to the fray, asserting that the Lord had surely delivered the errorists into their hand (v. 15). The time was the afternoon of Aug. 5, 1920, which corresponds to Oct., 1914, for early that afternoon Truth, No. 21, which contains the Evil Servant article and the second and more trenchant part of the Shearno-Crawfordism article, was delivered by the printer to the Bible House; and J. immediately gave copies of it to the Bible House staff and some Truth visitors, and then the work of wrapping and mailing the first copies of it occurred already that afternoon, including mailing that afternoon a copy of it to each member of the Society's Board of judgment that Bro. Russell had appointed to try evil teaching and doing editors, *i.e.*, excluding J.F.R., he mailed copies of it to the other six directors, the other four Tower editors and the Sisters' committee which held Bro. Russell's voting shares. This started the little antitypical Gideon's First Battle. Note the date and the hour! They correspond to Oct., 1914, when antitypical Gideon's First Battle began. J. then arranged the participants of this little battle into three companies: speakers, Truth distributors and conversationalists, equipped all of them with the pertinent message, which was one of Truth in their earthen vessels, emptied of controlling sin, error, selfishness and worldliness (v. 16). He exhorted them to watch how he presented the matters and imitate him, and as he would do, when they would reach the enemy's position, so should they do (v. 17).

Finally, and when he and all with him in his company would sound forth the message then all the rest of the other two companies everywhere among the errorists should sound forth the message, and should act out the battle's motto: For God and J., the latter since the peculiar circumstances of little antitypical Gideon's First Battle required a vindication of J. to be made (v. 18). When J. and the pilgrims and lecturing elders, as the first set of warriors, reached the position

of the errorists, it was just at the end of the little Parousia and the beginning of the little Epiphany, when a change of watchers was due the errorists; and they began to proclaim the message, even by their power sacrificing their humanity, which caused the fight of Truth to shine out amid the darkness against the little Divine right of executives, of teachers and of the assistants of these, *i.e.*, they exposed the evils of the Merarite and Gershonite executives, pilgrims and elders and the assistants of both of these; for they were claiming that their powers were of Divine right; and by pointing out their many evils, as, *e.g.*, the two above-mentioned articles do, the Epiphanyites disproved their Divine-right claims (v. 19). Yea, all three sets of warriors sounded out the same message, sacrificed their humanity and with their lesser powers held up the pertinent Truth, their greater powers sounding forth the factual exposures of wrong-doing, all of them announcing the pertinent controversial arguments of the Bible and the facts that J. adduced (v. 20).

Each of these warriors under J.'s direction kept himself active in his form of fighting all about the errorists, with the result that, as errorists and evil-doers or as supporters of such, the Merarites and Gershonites ran about in confusion, cried out in dread and terror and fled in complete rout, unable to answer the charges brought against them (v. 21). But the little three hundred kept emphasizing the disproofs of the little Divine right ("the channel" was one of these!) and the Lord set the controversial arguments of the two sets of Divine-rightist executives, teachers and their assistants against one another, the Merarite spokesmen refuting the Gershonite spokesmen and *vice versa*; and then dividing into radicals and conservatives throughout the whole host, the entire host fled in these two divisions of radicals and conservatives from the field of controversy (v. 22). Then the Kohathites, especially in the Olsonites, Kittingerites and Hirshites, joined in the pursuit of the retreating errorists, Merarites and Gershonites (v. 23). J. sent messengers to

all the recently-won Youthful Worthies to join in the pursuit and to take the ways of escape that the errorists would seek to reach in order to evacuate the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit. These brave Youthful Worthies responded, and cut off the two ways of retreat that the errorists were taking (v. 24). And thereby they overthrew the sectarianism and clericalism of little Babylon by argument, as well as overcame the spirit of these two evils in their own hearts. They refuted little Babylon's sectarianism by its own arguments and refuted little Babylon's clericalism amid its trying experiences by Biblical arguments and continued perseveringly the fight against the errorists. The refuted theories of little Babylon's sectarianism and clericalism they brought to J. as they described to him the ways in which they accomplished the refutation, and that, when he was getting ready to pass the peoples of little Christendom in his pursuit of the king errors of little Babylon: the dread threats of the Second Death and the thereunder conscience torments of these which the little Babylonians were constantly holding over their opponents, especially over the Epiphany-enlightened brethren (v. 25). Thus we have finished the study of the small Miniature of Judg. 7.

Now we will take up the same viewpoint of Judg. 8, *i.e.*, its application to the small Miniature. Remembering that in this Miniature the Youthful Worthies spoken of in Judg. 7: 24, 25, were those who had but recently been called as such into the Epiphany movement, we are prepared to see how, shortly after seeing the Epiphany teaching that it was too late to become of the little 300, and thus take part in the little antitypical Gideon's First Battle, they came to blame J. very severely for not having called them in time therefore (v. 1). But he praised their belated work above his timely work, and showed them that he had not yet overthrown so great systems of error as they had, which calmed them (vs. 2, 3). Thereupon J. and the Epiphanyites, Aug. 11, 1920, started in pursuit of little Zebah and Zalmunna, going beyond the

peoples of little Christendom (v. 4). J.'s attack on J.F.R. and his supporters and upon H. J. S. and W. C. and their supporters, reaching in Truth, No. 21, Aug. 11, the Hirshites and Kittingerites, was a request for them to help in the little antitypical Gideon's Second Battle; but both groups refused the request made by this act (vs. 5, 6 and 8). Thereupon J. declared that after he would finish with the Merarites and Gershonites in their leaders and ledlings he would chastise the Hirshite and Kittingerite leaders and refute their entire position (vs. 7, 9). Some Merarites and Gershonites, particularly the former, the bulk of their followers having been refuted by the thoughts of Truth, No. 21, used their expressed sentence of the Second Death upon the Epiphanyite leaders and some of their supporters and the conscience torment of such against them while under the supposed Second Death sentence as their two main doctrines as fortresses to keep by fear their supporters in subjection to them, pivoting both of them on error as to the New Creature (v. 10).

J. and the little 300 passed by without the support of the disapproving friends of the Epiphany movement and attacked in little antitypical Gideon's Second Battle the two named doctrines, that seemed safe, and that were just mentioned as the means of subjecting by fear the adherents of these (v. 11). Their believers were scattered abroad; and these two false doctrines were captured in their flight from the controversy. Early after this controversy J. returned, and in the article on Amramism Revealed by Scriptural principles and facts gave a thorough chastisement to the two branches of Amramism, especially in their leaders, and leveled the position of the Kittingerites, as well as refuted their leaders, several of the Jersey City brethren describing to J. R.H. Hirsh's sifting activities there and his leading supporters therein (vs. 13-17). The character-murdering effects on new creatures of little Zebah and Zalmunna having been learned by J., and after J.'s supporters showed insufficient development to destroy them, J. did it himself, taking away

all of the misapplied passages with which they had decked their organizations (vs. 18-21). Thus the Truth errorists were subdued and peace prevailed for the Epiphanyites, among whom J. remained (vs. 28, 29).

From Judg. 8: 22-27, 30-9: 57 a wholly different type sets in, which has had a large and a small antitype. We will very briefly sketch the large antitype, whose details can be seen from our more detailed explanation of the small antitype, to be given after that antitype is given. The large Gideon of this section represents the twelve Apostles, whom the Jewish Harvest brethren desired to rule over them as a composite king, and after them the subsequent leaders as such, which the former refused to do, pointing out to them that the Lord through the principles of His Word was their Ruler (vs. 22, 23); but they asked that the Jewish Harvest brethren put at their disposal certain booty of their campaigns, which included especially their converts. Of these the Apostles constructed the order of the Church, general and local, insofar as the leaders were concerned. But soon the Lord's people, while yet some of the Apostles lived, perverted these leaders into lords over God's heritage (2 Thes. 2: 7; 3 John 9, 10), which became a sore hindrance to the Apostles and a trap to the Church (vs. 24-27). By the Apostles' teachings arose the 70 general teachers of the Gospel Age, the 35 star-members and their 35 special helpers (v. 30). But the Apostolic contacts with some leaders became through the latters' abuses the occasion of their misdeveloping themselves into the falling away (2 Thes. 2: 7), until out of this falling away the popes as a succession of false teachers and practitioners developed (v. 31), after the Apostles fell asleep in the best repute in the Church (v. 32). Then developed the falling away rapidly marked by power-grasping and lording ones becoming the bond of the Church's unity (v. 33), when the Truth that reminds of God became lost, and the true God and His Apostles and their delivering works were forgotten (vs. 33-35). The popes by intrigue and the support of

erroneous partisans got control of matters by false teachings gotten from the power-grasping apostacy, whereby they cut off the star-members and their special helpers from influence in the Church, except only one of these, John the Apostle (Judg. 9: 1-5). This falling away in time enabled the apostates to make the pope supreme in the Church, which reached its full in 539; then they gave him full power in the state by 799 (v. 6).

John's teachings speaking through the Thyatira star-members on this subject characterized the process as a degeneracy from (1) star-members to (2) the episcopate, (3) the patriarchate and (4) the papacy (vs. 7-14), the papacy as a devourer of all opponents (v. 15), and the whole trend, especially the popedom, as opposed to Apostolic teaching and practice (vs. 16-18). If this was right, they declared, good would come to all concerned thereby (v. 19), but if not, evil would proceed from the popes to church and state and from state and church leaders to the popes (v. 20). This said, the star-members, speaking by John, retreated to the Lord's Word for fear of the popes (v. 21). The popes thus reigned from the sixth into the eighth century more or less unmolested (v. 22). In the late eighth century strife arose between certain state leaders and the popes, which God manipulated to punish the popes and such leaders. The latter sought to take from the former their powers; and the king of Lombardy joined them in this purpose while they worked to make it succeed (vs. 23-27). The Lombard king repudiated the pope's and his state supporters', especially Charlemagne's, claims and advocated the cause of their opponents, hoping himself to rule all Italy, and by his conduct challenged the pope to battle (vs. 28, 29). Charlemagne learned of this, became angry and betrayed the matter to the pope, telling him to work secretly and attack his opponents by surprise (vs. 30-33), which the pope did, by the four sets of forces sent him by Charlemagne (v. 34). The Lombard king arose to battle and, seeing these companies, was by Charlemagne deceived as to their intention until they had

surrounded him, when Charlemagne turned openly against him as a reviler of the pope, and in the ensuing battle the Lombard king was defeated, while the pope seemed detached from the matter (vs. 35-41).

Informed by his supporters, the pope assaulted the Italian civil powers, by means of ecclesiastical, civil and military parties, and by the aid of Charlemagne got possession of a large part of Italy as a gift from Charlemagne after the latter had defeated the Lombard king (vs. 42-45). But the civil rulers of the pertinent parts of Italy took refuge in their ancient prerogatives as firm state arrangements. This was told the pope (vs. 46, 47), who armed himself and his followers with false legal points, and told them to use them as he did, by which he overthrew his opponents and their prerogatives in 799 and 800, through Charlemagne's help (vs. 48, 49). Then the pope waged war to bring into subjection to him the opposing parts of the Holy Roman Empire that Charlemagne had organized and in a more-than-century fight subdued the bulk of it to his influence (v. 50). But the papal degradation of the pomocracy period, 904-963, was fatal to the popes, for the strong position of some of the papal opponents in Germany gave them a vantage point upon whose pinnacle they stood (v. 51), which the pope sought to destroy (v. 52); but the German Church, standing back of the Emperor, Otto I (936-973), broke up this phase of the papacy, which for a long time afterward subjected the pope to the empire; and thus ended a very evil phase of the papacy, which, under the wounds that the German Church, in cooperation with the emperor, gave it, had its own theologians invent a doctrine that implied the subjection of the pope to the emperor. This brought peace to all for a while (vs. 53-55). In this way the Lord punished the favorers of the popes and the popes also, for their evils against the star-members and their helpers (vs. 56, 57).

The above very concise interpretation of the large picture of Judg. 8: 22-27, 29-9: 57 will serve as a foundation of making clear the small Miniature application; for the

events just briefly given will be found in both applications to be those given in the parallels of the Gospel Age and its small Miniature in Chapter I. As the basis for the small Miniature we would remark that Bro. Russell is the antitype of Gideon in Judg. 8: 22-27, 29-9: 57. By his and his associates' Parousia victories over the errors of the Divine right and over eternal torment and the consciousness of the dead, he and they got much spoil from the errorists, which, among other things, was the embryo organization of the Church in the Parousia and its lapping into the Epiphany, and this includes the pilgrims and elders as a teaching staff. His victories moved the brethren to desire to make him, and after him the pilgrims, symbolic kings over the Church (v. 22). This he positively declined for himself and them, assuring them that only the Lord should be their Ruler (v. 23). But this Bro. Russell by his acts and teachings did ask that the pilgrims and elders, who were won by them from the errorists, should be made the teaching staff of the Church, this, among other things, being done by his appointing the pilgrims to their service in the Church and by his arranging for the classes to elect elders in their midst (v. 24), to which request the brethren heartily acceded (v. 25). Bro. Russell, therefore, arranged for these to be the teachers, some in the general Church and some for the local churches.

But these, the teaching staff in the general Church and local churches, became a sore trial to Bro. Russell and the pilgrims, *e.g.*, the experiences that led Bro. Russell to write the article on The Hour of Temptation, in Z '16, 327-331, and the experiences that the pilgrims had with one another, and that the elders had with one another and the ecclesiæ; and by the brethren the resultant conditions became a great trial, even as all trialsome experiences present snares to God's people (v. 27). The seventy pilgrims were in a special sense Bro. Russell's symbolic sons, developed by his many Truth teachings (v. 30). But his corporational work involved secular law, by which he developed a legalistically-minded

pilgrim, J.F.R., one who later claimed the powers of a symbolic king, allegedly derived from his supposed possession of all of Bro. Russell's powers in the work (Abimelech [*my father is a king*], v. 31). But as soon as Bro. Russell went beyond the veil, in the full respect of the Church, the brethren went after the strange gods of power-grasping, lording and combinationism and made lording by agreement, or covenant, their real god (vs. 32, 33). The bulk of the brethren forgot the Lord's past deliverances, nor did they remember our Pastor's sacrifices on their behalf, to the degree of following his teachings (vs. 34, 35).

J.F.R. suggested to various legally-minded brethren in the Society, *e.g.*, A.H.M. and W. E. V. and some other voting shareholders (Judg. 9: 1), that they agitate the question with the Board members as to which would be better: to have all the pilgrims direct the general work or one of them to do it, reminding them that they should have him as very close to them therefore, and that they induce the Board to favor his directing the general work of the Society (v. 2). His supporters, especially in the voting shareholders' meeting on Jan. 7, 1917, by passing as by-laws the self-exalting and power-grasping resolutions that J.F.R. had begun to prepare, Dec. 28, 1916, to lodge executive and managerial powers in the Society in the new president, which he knew he would be, induced the directors to stand for him, because they considered him a genuine brother of theirs (v. 3). Surrendering their charter-powers, they put these coveted powers into his hands; and by these powers he won over certain vain supporters as thorough partisans of his, *e.g.*, A.H.M., W. E. V., W. F. Hudgings, R. J. Martin, C.J. Woodworth, etc. (v. 4). Then, armed with these powers, he subjected to his authority his 70 pilgrim equals, and thus voided their equal powers as such, upon the basis of the powers conferred by the Board, except the most guileless one of them, J., who by virtue of his Board-given powers was as the Board's special representative outside of his

jurisdiction, and who by refusing to accept J.F.R.'s recall of him protected himself against being symbolically killed (v. 5). Thus the directors of the Society and the directors of the Peoples Pulpit Association made J.F.R. the executive and manager, the former by adopting his by-laws and the latter by electing him president with the assumption that this gave him controlling powers for life, whereas the Peoples Pulpit Association's charter gave such to that president alone who was elected at its first meeting; and they did this as setting him up as quasi-equal of Bro. Russell (v. 6). When J. learned of this action, in the exercise of his office as the Epiphany messenger he reviewed the connected matters in the hearing of the Board, desiring that God might hearken to them (v. 7).

J. pointed out that a movement had been launched to elect him president of the Society (v. 8), but that he had refused to leave the service that God had given him to become president of the Society (v. 9). Next a movement had been afoot to have the Board act, not only as controller, but also as executive and manager in the Society (v. 10), and it refused after trying it for about a week (v. 11). Then its executive committee was asked to take the executive and managerial authority as a fixed matter (v. 12), and at the end of the two months it likewise refused (v. 13). Then the offer was made from Jan. 7 to Jan. 19 to J.F.R. (v. 14). Then he by act told the brethren that they must not only accept, but be subject to him as, controller, executive and manager, else destruction would go out from him against all who were leaders (v. 15). Recounting what the two Boards had done as to J.F.R., and what they had thereby done as to the arrangements of Bro. Russell, who deserved much of them because of his great sacrifices for their deliverance from error (vs. 16, 17), and what they had done to Bro. Russell's pilgrims on the basis of that power-granting by-law (v. 18), J. said that if these things were faithful and sincere dealings with Bro. Russell and his pilgrims, then they, the two

Boards, and J.F.R. would have reason to rejoice in their mutual benefits (v. 19); but if not, then destructive trouble would come out from J.F.R. to the injury of the two Boards, and destructive trouble would go out from them to his injury (v. 20). Thereupon J. betook himself to the Lord's Word pertaining to these conditions, as a refuge from J.F.R. (v. 21).

For about three months of J.F.R.'s reign, *i.e.*, Jan. 19-April 10, there was comparative peace between J.F.R.'s control of matters and the attitude of the two Boards thereon (v. 22). On the afternoon of April 10, 1917, J.'s so-called first hearing before the Board was held; and one of the results of that so-called hearing was that several members of the Board became sympathetic with J.'s viewpoint of the British situation. This started the difference between J.F.R. and the Board (it was really the Lord who, through that afternoon's happenings, started that difference); for J.D. Wright, I.F. Hoskins and R.H. Hirsh, Society Board members, and Menta Sturgeon, a member of the Association's Board, began to see the real light on the British situation; and from that time onward, unconsciously at first, they began to react against J.F.R. (v. 23), the Divine purpose thereby being to render retribution for the wrong done Bro. Russell's pilgrims by both J.F.R. and the Board members, the first named as the actual wrong-doer and the others for aiding and abetting the wrong by voting him the powers wrongly desired and used by him (v. 24).

The Board members and certain of their sympathizers watched him in all his official acts to detect usurpations; and they took advantage of those whom they found aiding him therein, and this was made known to J.F.R. (v. 25). J. and certain sympathizers of his, Menta Sturgeon, Srs. Hamilton, Ritchie, (Edith) Hoskins, etc., took up Society conditions and the Board's majority trusted him (v. 26). These Board brothers went about their work, gathering in the fruitage of their labors, and made it available for teaching matters joyously; and, entering into their plans for

obtaining for the Board controllership against J.F.R.'s usurpations, they appropriated whatever came to hand for their purpose, and copiously spoke against J.F.R. among themselves (v. 27). J. joined with individual Board members, never in any of the four directors' meetings, in this denunciation of J.F.R.'s usurpations, calling in question his right to control, and advocating the right of the Society through its Board by unanimity or majority to control in the Society's affairs. Of J.F.R. he said that he had no more claims on Society control as by right than any other pilgrim. Likewise he claimed of A.H.M. that he had no more right to authority than as a representative of J.F.R. He advocated that the Society's representative should be subject to the charter as the state source of the Society, declaring that there was no reason for the Board and the brethren to be subject to J.F.R.; the abrogation of his executive and managerial powers he advocated, because J.F.R. used them to usurp control (v. 28). Knowing from Ezra and Esther that the Lord had given him the executive and teaching office in the Society's affairs, J. desired this, and said that when he would get it he would remove J.F.R. from his executive powers; and by his course he challenged him to battle on the points at issue (v. 29).

Some one, before J. had, early in June, 1917, requested to be sent back to England to finish his work there, brought to A.H.M., as J.F.R.'s manager and right-hand man, a report of J.'s views and attitude, which angered the former (v. 30). Accordingly, he sent word to J.F.R. to the effect that J. and his supporters were giving their attention to Society matters, and were stirring up the Society in its directors against J.F.R. (v. 31), advising him to take measures secretly to set a trap to catch J. (v. 32), and suggesting that it be done quickly, as soon as J. and his supporters would take an oppositional stand toward him, and that he do what seemed the best way to meet it (v. 33). Accordingly, J.F.R. took secret measures and laid a trap to catch the Society as

represented in the Board, by appointing the four Board directors instead of the full Board to examine J.'s British work, and by opposing to J. (1) three members of the Board, (2) "the present management," (3) certain workers at the Tabernacle and (4) certain workers at Bethel (v. 34). It was while the four directors were investigating the British matter that the fourfold combination under J.F.R.'s lead arose to oppose J. (v. 35).

J. noted the start of the Board's pertinent movement, and called thereto the attention of A.H.M., who told J. that he misunderstood as its movement an unclear course of it on another subject (v. 36). Then J. perceived the activities of "the present management" in trying to send him away on a pilgrim trip, to land him at his home, where he would then be safely shelved away from Bethel, and to send I.F. Hoskins on a lengthy pilgrim trip, so as to break up the majority of the Board at the proposed July 20 meeting, where the vote was to be taken on canceling J.F.R.'s bylaws granting him executive and managing authority. At this A.H.M. made no reply. Later J. perceived the Tabernacle and Bethel workers massing against him (v. 37). Then A.H.M. rebuked J. for his attitude and words against J.F.R. and told him that all the brethren at headquarters had been set at naught by him and told him defiantly now to go out and contend with them (v. 38). J. met this challenge that noon, June 22, by asking J.F.R. that they have a brotherly discussion of their differences, reminding him of their former good relations. It was agreed to have this conference at 3 P.M., but at that time J.F.R. sent his secretary to J., telling him that it could not be held then, because he was then to see some men on repairs at Bethel. The next A.M. they had a brief conversation, which resulted in J.'s leaving him as holder of the field and in J.'s supporters being scattered (vs. 39, 40; for details please see EF 76, 77).

J.F.R. took a high position as his; and A.H.M. saw to it that no more newly arranged work was given J. in the Society after his pilgrim appointment on the afternoon and

evening of June 24 was filled and the report thereon given, June 26, which also was done a little later with his supporters (v. 41). Thereafter J.F.R.'s supporters went about their work at Bethel, and informed him of everything that they could against those who were now being called "the Opposition" (v. 42). He divided his followers into three groups: (1) "the present management," (2) Tabernacle workers and (3) Bethel workers, all of whom watched for opportunities to pounce upon "the Opposition"; and when the four directors' and J.'s supporters went to their various activities J.F.R. and his supporters arose against them and gave them verbal beatings (v. 43). J.F.R., with the rest of "the present management," took control of the public part of the battleground; and the Tabernacle and Bethel workers pounced in a more private way upon "the Opposition," and cut them off from brotherly privileges and service (v. 44). All that period, June 26-July 6, J.F.R. was assaulting the Society: he left in J.'s room the night of June 26 the Board's resolution that cast a shadow upon J.'s British work; he stirred up his headquarters' partisans against J. and his supporters, and manipulated them against what actually was the Society, since the four as the Board's majority really were the Society representatively. Thus J.F.R. fought against the Society, took control of it, cut off from their places in it "the Opposition," in fact dissolved and gave over the Society to desolation as represented in its charter and its Board acting as a majority (v. 45). When the four directors, who as the majority were the Board actually and stood for its charter, learned of what J.F.R. was doing, they entered into and took their stand in the sphere of power, the charter (v. 46). This stand was told J.F.R. (v. 47). Then he and his supporters resorted to the realm of ambiguous law (Salmon [*unclear, shady*])); and, taking as a refutative instrument a law which expressly stated that it was not retroactive, and therefore did not apply to the previously-granted Society's charter, by his legal arm and

that of his hireling lawyer, who later in effect acknowledged that he knew his points were not legal, but who said he formulated them as J.F.R., his client, desired, J.F.R. cut down an opinion from the tree of this law that, if valid, undid his directorship and consequently nullified his election as president, and laboriously carried it to the sphere of the Society, urging his supporters to do likewise (v. 48), which they did, following him in applying this to the charter, and destroyed it in its directorship-appointment and officer-election features, and thus ousted the Board's majority and annulled the rights of their supporters, (v. 49).

Then he betook himself to overcome the exposures (*Thebez [brightness]*) of his power-grasping of control in the Society, by issuing his grossly untrue letter of July 18 (later made the inset of his *Harvest Siftings*) to the ecclesias, by his two grossly mendacious papers, *Harvest Siftings* (Part I and Part II), his illegally using proxies not intended for such a purpose to oust I.F. Hoskins and R.H. Hirsh from the Peoples Pulpit Association, his country-wide convention campaign of misrepresentation of "the Opposition," his straw-vote campaign, his demanding that the shareholders' proxies be sent to the Society before election, Jan. 6, 1918, and his encouraging C.J. Woodworth to preach his silly interpretation of the penny parable with J.F.R. as its steward—all of which reeked to the heavens with wickedness, and which, however, externally triumphed (v. 50). But "the Opposition" resorted to the strength of truth in various publications, like the two brief legal and factual statements of the Board's majority: one late in July and the other early in August, at the Boston Convention, *Light After Darkness*, *Harvest Siftings Reviewed and Facts For Shareholders*, on which they took their stand (v. 51). But J.F.R. fought these, seeking to effect an entrance so as to destroy this tower of truth (v. 52). While he was so engaged, a paper which consisted of an open letter and a petition to J.F.R. and the four ousted directors, signed by many members of

the New York Temple, Brooklyn Tabernacle and a few other brethren, in all 156 in number, which made it practically a Church action, was widely circulated. The petition asked that a committee be appointed as follows: three to be chosen by J.F.R., three by the ousted directors, which six were to elect a seventh and the seven elect eight others, these constituting a committee of 15 who should give a searching and impartial investigation of all of the involved matters of the Society since the death of Bro. Russell and report their findings to the voting shareholders' meeting of Jan. 4, 1918, so that these might have the report for their guidance in the election of Jan. 6. This letter and petition, lighting upon J.F.R.'s theory of things from the height of the applicable true principles, cracked irretrievably his view of the situation, *i.e.*, that his arbitrary decision should stand (v. 53). It began to have this effect Dec. 1, 1917, and completed this effect by Dec. 28.

An investigation was the last thing J.F.R. desired, since he knew that he would under it have been proved the gross wrong-doer, though the Board would have had to be censured for voting his suggested by-laws into effect and thus giving him unjustly coveted and plotted-for powers, which can, from the parallels of the Gospel Age and its small Miniature, proving his acts to be the parallels of the popes up to 963, be seen to have been evilly gotten and used. Sensing that his view of settling the matter was utterly broken by the proposal of the petition, he appealed to A.H.M. to invent an argument that would refute his view, in order that he might be saved the disgrace of being refuted by what was in effect and later actually became a Church; and A.H.M. did this by claiming that the [deceived] shareholders had gotten sufficient information to decide, which, of course, was untrue, since a very large majority of them had not gotten to read "the Opposition's" replies to J.F.R.'s misrepresentations, their addresses being unavailable to "the Opposition," who had only 17,000 of the more than 55,000 Tower addresses to which Harvest Siftings had been mailed.

However, in God's view the blow of this open letter and the theory thrust of A.H.M. ended the primary little popedom's career of J.F.R. for over a year (v. 54). And from God's and facts' standpoints the change in the small Miniature, occurring gradually from Dec. 1 to Dec. 28, from J.F.R. as the primary little pope to F.H. McGee as such made J.F.R.'s partisan supporters recede into his own obscurity, he only occasionally appearing as a little anti-pope until the picture reverted to him as primary one (v. 55).

Thus God recompensed upon J.F.R. his wickedness in power-grasping and lording, despite the arrangements that God gave through Bro. Russell, against his fellow-pilgrims, Bro. Russell's symbolic sons, in making them subordinate to himself, *i.e.*, in exalting himself above them as their controller (v. 56); and thus God recompensed upon the seven directors the evil that they committed in making J.F.R. the ruler in the Society. It will be noted that no condemnation is passed on J. for his part in this matter; rather in teaching respects, as typed by Jotham, he is represented as being the Divine mouthpiece in announcing punishment upon the wrongs of both sets of wrong-doers; and, so far as his executive functions are concerned, he, like his large parallel, Desiderius, king of the Lombards, in his unsuccessful fight against the involved popes' power-grasping against the star-members, whose small parallel J. was, led an unsuccessful fight against the power-grasping little pope, J.F.R. In this type also J.F.R. is represented as committing the evils with which J. in EF, Chapter I, charged him. This type further proves that J.'s statement of the situation in that chapter is thoroughly true in those parts of it that treat of the evils of J.F.R. The other parts of that chapter are proven to be true by other types, some of which, those of Nehemiah, Ezra, Mordecai and Judah's and Israel's kings, have already been given and others of which will be given in types yet to be presented. The Board in this type is blamed for its weakly having yielded to J.F.R.'s unholy ambition the powers enumerated in

his own invented and by the Board's passed by-laws. Thus God has given us in Judg. 8: 22-25, 27-9: 57 an inspired and, therefore, true forecast of the troubles at the Brooklyn Tabernacle and Bethel from the death of our Pastor, Oct. 31, 1916, to the end of the first phase of J.F.R.'s primary little papacy, Dec. 28, 1917.

Judg. 10 immediately connects in time with the events of Judg. 9, a fact evident in the type and in the large and small antitypes; for as in the large antitype the powers of the pornocratic popes began to end with the accession of Otto I as the Emperor of the Holy German Roman Empire, in 936, through the reformatory efforts of the German clergy, and completely ended in 963, so J.F.R.'s primary little papacy gradually came to an end from Dec. 1 to Dec. 28, 1917. We must look for the large and small antitypes of Tola (*purple, royal*) the son of Puah (*mouthpiece*), the son of Dodo (*love*), as arising sometime within these periods, which would make their rise occur after the symbolic stone struck the symbolic pate of the large and small symbolic Abimelechs. The facts prove that the large Tola was the star-member, Dunstan, of England, who in 949 began a great work of reformation in the British Church by preaching and acting against great papal abuses there. He was a *thorn* (*Shamir*) in the flesh of wrong-doers, and acted as a true mouthpiece full of Divine love; and the special reformatory part of his ministry was from 949 to 972, when he humbled the wicked Eadgar, king of England. His memory was honored, because he was a thorn to the wicked (vs. 1, 2). After him arose, 972, Hugh Capet, who had since 956 been Duke of France, who in 987 became the first king of France, and who in 994 established institutions helpful for the empire.

It was in the period, 972-994, that his work of ordering a reformation, in France went on both in state and church and also toward the Holy Roman Empire, of which France was then no longer a part. His policy was one of special righteousness and truth (*Jair [he shines, gives light]*). He had

under him thirty feudal lords, all insisting on exercising the ordinances of feudal lords, and maintaining, thirty separate principalities, which owned him as their sovereign, and which for centuries remained feudal principalities (vs. 3, 4). The facts of the small antitype prove that J. became the little Tola, Dec. 14, 1917, which was after the gradual loss of J.F.R.'s absolutism set in, Dec. 1, and continued as such until 10 A.M., Jan. 6, 1918. During this period, beginning with J.'s going to Philadelphia, Dec. 14, to strengthen "the Opposition's" supporters there, J. preached at Philadelphia, Pa., Hampton, Va., Norfolk, Va., Brooklyn, N.Y., and Pittsburgh, Pa., on The Last Related Acts of Elijah and Elisha, Calls-Siftings-Slaughter Weapons, etc., and thereby greatly strengthened the opposition to J.F.R. and confirmed faith in the cause of "the Opposition." This he did as a member of the royal priesthood (Tola), the Lord's Epiphany messenger (Puah), in much love (Dodo), proving a thorn in the flesh of the partisan Societyites (Shamir), and was thereafter respected as such (vs. 1, 2). In his set debate before the Fort Pitt Convention the morning of Jan. 6, 1918, with M. Sturgeon, on the separation of Elijah and Elisha, he as small parallel of Hugh Capet so seriously worsted the latter in causing the Truth to shine forth (Jair [*he gives light!*]) as to raise him in the estimation of the conventioners to the degree of displacing M. Sturgeon as the teaching leader of "the Opposition." That afternoon thirty brethren, a list of whose names and addresses F.H. McGee gave J., and which is yet in his possession, appointed the Fort Pitt Committee. These thirty exercised their prerogatives as such appointers, and through the Committee formed thirty separate groups, which for a while remained loyal to J., who ceased acting in this capacity on Jan. 28, when he gave the Fort Pitt Committee his draft of the letter to the Bible Students worldwide that it had commissioned him to draw up, and that, after A.I. Ritchie and M. Sturgeon had, because of J.'s greater influence in the Committee, resigned therefrom (vs. 3-5).

The rest of the chapter in the large picture types the evils in church, state and society that set in with the closing years of the tenth century and continued until and into the long-drawn-out repentance from the 13th to the 16th centuries. The power-grasps of the pope and his hierarchy and of the emperor and his court, the intrigues and chicanery that marked these, the unholy alliance of state and church, the hatreds and envies of the leaders, resulting in many terrible wars, including the crusades, the autocracies of the leaders, the clericalisms of the higher and lower clergy and the party spirit of all of these, involving, of course, their followings, marked these centuries (v. 6). This resulted in the Lord in displeasure giving up His people into the power of the church and state partisans and of the clericalists (v. 7). This resulted in much grief and weight coming upon the Lord's people, especially upon those who were reformatorily inclined, led by Berengar of Tours, Peter Abelard, Arnold of Brescia, Peter DeBrys, Henry of Lausanne and Peter Waldo (v. 8); and it even reached those who were not so inclined (v. 9). The reform movements started repentance and confession of sins among the Lord's people in various branches of Christendom (v. 10).

But God refused them speedy deliverance, reminding them of His past deliverances from the worldlings, errorists, clericalists, sectarians, avaricious, sinners and disfellowshipped (vs. 11, 12), despite which they had forsaken Him (v. 13), and ironically suggested by their experiences that they seek deliverance at the hand of their evil qualities (v. 14). But they persisted in their confession of sins and expression of submission to His chastisements, pleading for deliverance (v. 15). Beginning early in the 14th century, and continuing to the late 15th century, through the ministries of Marsiglio, Tauler, Wyclif, Hus, Wessel and Savonarola, the Lord's people set aside from themselves the evil qualities mentioned above and served truth and righteousness which, appealed to God's compassion on their sufferings (v. 16).

Then the clericalists, beginning 1459, entered a new feature of oppression, led by the wicked popes of the second half of the 15th and the early part of the 16th centuries; for they made an invasion into the sphere of the reforming brethren; and these, under the lead of Wessel and Savonarola, rallied about watchful teachings (v. 17). The reforming brethren discussed the question as to who should battle for them against the papal clericalists as a suitable one at their head (v. 18).

The small picture of vs. 6-18 had its fulfillment in the period from Jan. 21, 1918, when M. Sturgeon attacked J. before the Brooklyn "Opposition" Ecclesia, to June 30, 1919. Here envy marked M. Sturgeon's and A.I. Ritchie's course toward J., prompting them to resign from the Fort Pitt Committee. Soon power-grasping, strife, power-bartering, autocracy, clericalism and partisanship began to set in among four members of the Committee, who constantly accused J. of what they themselves were guilty. As a result, divisionism set in, in the Committee and power-grasping on the part of the four; and they introduced the same spirit among the majority of their followers, agitating against J. verbally and by mail (v. 6). For details please see EG 89-131, 225-268. This moved the Lord to displeasure; and He allowed His people to fall into oppression, captivity to these evil doings and evil leaders, from the standpoint of this picture from Jan. 21, 1918, to June 30, 1919 (v. 7), which oppression affected the reforming brothers, R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and J., who had very stormy experiences with the others during most of this period (v. 8). The clericalistically minded group in the Committee went beyond the reforming brethren and oppressed the pilgrims, elders and ecclesiasts, and thus distressed all the brethren (v. 9). This led the faithful to confession of their recognized sins, especially their share in power-grasping and lording (v. 10). Thereupon the Lord by the circumstances reminded them of His having delivered them at their repeated prayers from the present evil world, from the errorists, from the clericalists, from the

partisans, from the bargain-compromisers, from the sinners and from the disfellowshipped (vs. 11, 12). He further reminded them of the fact that; despite all these mercies and goodnesses, they nevertheless, not only ceased living in harmony with His principles, but also became guilty of the evils of power-grasping, lording, combinationism, envy, strife, selfish compromises, absolutism, clericalism and partisanship; hence He was no more delivering them, which answer He gave them by His acts, not by His words (v. 13).

Then by leaving them a long time without relieving them of their oppressions, He ironically told them, by act, not by word, to get relief through the evil qualities that they had developed and exercised (v. 14). Of course, they knew that this was impossible, which led them to a renewal of their acknowledging their sins; and they pleaded with Him to mete out to them any punishment for their wrong-doing that He thought necessary for their correction, only they pleaded for immediate deliverance from the tyranny of their evil qualities and the oppressions and oppressors that these brought upon them (v. 15). A reformation set in, beginning in its first phase at the Asbury Park Convention, July 28, 1918, and lasting until late November, and then in its second phase running on through the following months until early in May, 1919, *i.e.*, until the fifth number of *The Present Truth* appeared and had its effect. This moved the Lord to mercy; for He felt deeply with His people. This oppression in its first two phases lasted through most of the period of the ascendancy of the Fort Pitt Committee and that of the P.B.I., *i.e.*, from Jan. 21, 1918, until May 8, 1919 (v. 16); and its third phase began May 8, 1919, when the small Miniature changed from the papal primacy of F.H. McGee back to that of J.F.R., who began to assemble his forces against the reforming brethren, and oppressed them until the period of June 30-July 6, when the Lord's people prepared to and actually did assemble at the Philadelphia Convention in watchful waiting to counter-attack J.F.R. (v. 17).

From May 28 to June 30 search was made on the part of the Epiphany and certain non-Epiphany leaders and friends for a leader against the Society, whom they would make their warrior and teaching leader (v. 18).

We now will take up the study of Judg. 11 and will very briefly give its large antitype and thereafter will give its small antitype in a little more detail. The reformers who were cast out by their Romanist brethren were, in their capacity of being cast out, especially Marsiglio, Tauler, Wyclif and Hus, all Sardis star-members, as expounders (Jephthah [*he opens, expounds*]), and their special helpers, who were mothered by certain truths that were foreign to the Romanists. It should be here remarked that the word *zonah*, translated *harlot* in v. 1, may mean an harlot or an inn-keeper, an hostess, a store-keeper; and here it evidently does not mean an harlot, for it was the Truth that mothered the Sardis star-members and their special helpers. Inn-keeper here, as in Judg. 16: 1, is evidently the right translation. These reformers were able controversialists, developed by certain anti-papal truths through God's people (v. 1). God's people also developed others, like the hierarchy, civil rulers, clergy, monks, professors, etc., who as they matured cast out the reformers, the Sardis star-members and special helpers, declaring that they were not to enjoy the blessings of the Lord's people, for they were developed by foreign teachings (v. 2). Therefore the anti-papal reformers fled from their Romanist brethren and dwelt in a good sphere of the Truth and its Spirit; and certain unprofitable ones, like the humanists and doubleminded theologians, associated with these; especially later representatives of these, like John of Goch (1401-1475) and John Wesel (1402-1481), joined themselves with them and contended for their principles (v. 3).

Beginning with 1459, under Pius II, the Romanist Church in their popes started a war on the reforming brethren, using their theologians, politicians and inquisitors as their chief warriors, *e.g.*, when John Wesel had attacked indulgences and the corruption of the hierarchy

the inquisition laid hold on him, Feb., 1479, and compelled him to recant. The same inquisition sought a few weeks later to seize John Wessel, who later became the principal man of the Philadelphia Church; but from Germany he fled to Holland, where in safety and fruitfulness he spent the rest of his life, dying Oct. 4, 1489. In 1490 Savonarola began his reformation in Florence and in 1498 he was strangled and burnt by order of Alexander VI, perhaps the most evil of all popes (v. 4). And this war continued. The reforming brethren, seeking for a leader, hit in turn upon the Philadelphia star-members, Luther, Zwingli, Hubmaier, Servetus, Cranmer, Browne and (George) Fox (v. 5), asking them in turn to lead them in the fight against the clericalists (v. 6). After discussion between these and the reforming party leaders as to each one's rejection or acceptance as leader, each agreed to lead the fight, under solemn assurance of loyalty to him (vs. 7-10), was accepted by all the reforming party, and spoke as in the Lord's service (v. 11).

Thereupon each one of these star-members in turn preached and published to the hierarchy expostulations against their invasion of the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit (v. 12). The hierarchy replied that the reform party had invaded, captured and possessed itself of its sphere of teaching and spirit and had perverted these, and, therefore, demanded a restoration of these (v. 13). The star-members in their publications, preaching, etc., denied this, by proving that their doctrines and practices were taught in the Bible and were distinctly different from those of Christendom and the papacy (vs. 14-18), as they were antagonistic to Satan and sin in victorious battles against them (vs. 19-22); hence they declared that they would maintain what the Lord had given them (v. 23), and told the hierarchy to keep within their own sphere, and that they should keep what their God had given them (v. 24). Furthermore, they disparagingly contrasted the hierarchy's pertinent course with Satan's autocratic course in leaving the Truth and its Spirit with the Lord's people in

the Jewish Harvest, when the falling away did not take it from the Lord's people (vs. 25, 26). Hence the star-members reasoned that they had not wronged the hierarchy, but that it had wronged them in warring upon them, and that the Lord would decide the issue, to which expostulation it gave no heed (vs. 27, 28).

Thereupon God's Spirit moved the star-members to enlist the reform party in church and state with watchfulness to fight the hierarchy and its supporters (v. 29). These star-members vowed to give anything of their dearest possession to the Lord in acceptable sacrifice after victory (vs. 30, 31). Then the fight set in on the Bible as the sole source of faith and main rule of practice, justification by faith alone, the sole headship of Jesus to the Church, the sole priesthood of the consecrated, the Lord's Supper as a symbolic feast, baptism for adult believers only, the unity of God, the Church subject in earthly matters to the state, the ecclesia under Christ the sole mistress in her midst and true religion as consisting mainly of supreme love to God and equal love to man. While these were the ten main doctrines in dispute, there were ten others involved with these also in dispute, and the star-members and their supporters prevailed (vs. 32, 33).

As the seven star-members returned from their part in the conflict, which lasted from 1512 to 1692 (Judg. 12: 7, where the six years stand for six prophetic months, or 180 years, *i.e.*, from the year that Luther at Rome saw justification by faith as distinct from works righteousness, his first assault on Rome, until the year following the death of George Fox, the last of the above-mentioned seven star-members, whose works progressed until his posthumous writings appeared, 1692), the victory acquired an undue influence for them over the brethren; and, distressed over its loss, yet seeing the danger of its abuse, from the example of power-grasping crown-lost leaders, they yielded this up in sacrifice to the Lord, after a wise delay, amid the sorrow of the brethren (vs. 34-40). But various crown-lost leaders, in envy at the

star-members' victory and resultant prominence, withheld them for not giving them a commanding share in the battle, and by their sectarian activities threatened to destroy their work (Judg. 12: 1). The star-members expostulated with these that they were in great strife, and these had refused to help them (v. 2); and noting this, they had risked the encounter without them; and, therefore, they demanded as to why they fought against them (v. 3). They then gathered their supporters against these, because these accused them as having been Romanist fugitives in Rome and in the Protestant sects (v. 4). The reforming party took possession of the truths that were fads for the people over Christendom, and required as a sign that one had the right to pass over it his holding the Truth, which the errorists were unable to present, and they, a huge multitude, were refuted by the reforming party (vs. 5, 6). All of these star-members remained to the end in the sect into which their movements were perverted (v. 7).

The next star-member to arise was John Wesley, who had in the fulness of his supporters strong and weak ones; the former he increased from among outsiders and the latter he dismissed to outsiders, both of these things occurring during the many siftings of the Wesleyan movement, which he ruled unto a Divine completion, ending his ministry in Biblical teachings and good influence (vs. 8-10), while crown-lost leaders perverted this movement into the Methodist Church. The next star-member to arise was Thomas Campbell, who aroused a movement which Alexander Campbell perverted into the Disciple Church. His ministry was fruitful, but he yielded chief place in it to the sectarian leader, Alexander Campbell, and his memory as a teacher was eclipsed by the high regard in which Campbellites held their leader (vs. 11, 12). The final one of the Philadelphia star-members to arise was William Miller (v. 13). He had trialsome strong supporters and a fulness of humans who were not so strong supporters, all of these being accustomed to foster views of their own (v. 14). He ended his

ministry fruitfully, despised by sectarians (v. 15).

Now for the small antitype of Judges 11, 12. J. was one of the reforming party and a warrior of the Truth, but the Epiphany Truth that developed him was not the same as the teachings that the reforming party as a whole used to develop most of its other leaders, who after developing as P.B.I. leaders cast J. out as one who should have no part nor lot with them, because thoughts strange to those that developed them had developed him (Judg. 11: 1, 2). J. fled from these and occupied the goodly sphere of the developing Truth and its Spirit; and certain pilgrims, like R.H. Hirsh and R.G. Jolly; and certain elders, like B.M. Kittinger and E.D. Mellow, gathered to and supported him (v. 3). Shortly after the Society leaders were released from prison, the Society by them, beginning May 8, 1919, started to press its claim that it was the channel of the Lord's Truth and work, and demanded of the reforming party that it surrender what was actually the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit to the Society, claiming these as their own. It was at this date that the little primary papacy changed from F.H. McGee to J.F.R. (v. 4). The leaders of the reform party concluded that J. was the one best qualified to lead it against the Society's clericalistic course and demands; and they sought to bring him back to them in the sense that many had left the P.B.I. who while there opposed and rejected J., but now desired his association and leadership in the controversy (v. 5). This effort began shortly after Present Truth, No. 7, appeared, announcing the Epiphany Convention for Philadelphia, July 4-6, 1919. This issue, delivered May 28, began to be mailed the evening of May 29 (30, God's time), and by the middle of June J. was receiving many requests by mail and orally from leading brethren to resist the Society clericalists' attacks. These requests increased when it became generally known that Bro. G.H. Fisher, at New Haven, Conn., the evening of June 15, 1919, charged the seven

"Opposition" leaders with betraying the Society leaders to the U. S. authorities (v. 6).

J.'s reaction by act, not by word, questioned these requesters as to whether they did not remember that they had in dislike rejected and cast him out, and as to why in their need they turned to him (v. 7). Their reply was that they desired to reverse their rejection of him by making him their leader as warrior and executive (v. 8). Remembering his former experiences at their hands, J. required more assurance that they would make him the executive of the reform party, if as warrior he would lead them to victory over the Societyites (v. 9).. Thereupon these leaders of the reform party solemnly pledged their support and loyal cooperation (v. 10). These matters were finished before June 30, when J. agreed to undertake as leader a defense of the reform party against the Society attacks; and the appointment of him as such by the brethren, generally, occurred just before he began to conduct the Convention Question meeting, Saturday afternoon, July 5, as follows: R.G. Jolly asked for the floor and addressed the Convention, briefly telling of the Society claims and proposed a vote of confidence in J. as a defender of the Truth and a promise of support of him as long as he remained humble and loyal to the Truth. Thereupon the Convention of several hundred brethren, assembled from at least a dozen states, gave J. a unanimous standing vote of confidence and support in his defense of the Truth. J. made a short speech of acceptance of the vote, and did this as a service of the Lord, in a time of watchfulness. This date corresponds to 1517, the year that Luther published his 95 theses (v. 11). The first copies of Present Truth, No. 6, were mailed on July 10. Its main article, The Last Related Acts of Elijah and Elisha, by its proving that the Little Flock had officially been separated from the Great Company, was a demand on J.F.R., in view of the separation of these classes as such (the words, "What hast thou to do with me," should read, "What is there [in common] between me

and thee), as to what right J.F.R. had to invade the sphere of the Little Flock's Truth and Spirit (v. 12). J.F.R.'s reply was his doctrine that to his party as the channel belonged the sphere of the Little Flock's Truth and Spirit, which he claimed had been usurpatorily taken by the reform party from his party (v. 13).

This claim J. had answered in the same article (v. 14), denying that the reform party had taken any of the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit from the Society autocrats or Society clericalists (v. 15), and explaining that when the Lord's people in the Parousia came out of the world and lived separate from it and beyond the Second Death siftings in the consecrated condition (v. 16), they desired a free unmolested passage through Christendom and the religious autocrats and were refused this while in the consecrated condition (v. 17). Hence they skirted their sphere of teaching and spirit, and pitched in spheres of teachings and spirit other than theirs (v. 18). They also sought a peaceable passage through the realms of error (v. 19), which Satan refused to give, but fought with them and was refuted, so that his possession of that sphere was ended, so far as crowding out of it the Truth and its Spirit was concerned (vs. 20-22): God having given the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit to the Little Flock, should J.F.R., as the Great Company leader, be allowed to take it (v. 23)? The article suggested that J.F.R. possess the sphere of teaching and spirit that Azazel had given him, and that the Little Flock keep what the Lord through their battles had given them (v. 24). Speaking of J.F.R. in terms that implied that he was the little pope of little Babylon, the article asked whether he was to be superior to the autocratic great pope of Great Babylon, who did not seek to possess himself of the Little Flock's sphere of the Truth and its Spirit in the Parousia (v. 25). The article also asked, Why during the Parousia did not the (new) channel argument assert itself to get control of the Little Flock's sphere of Truth and its Spirit (v. 26)? It clearly proved that the Little Flock had

done the Society no wrong, but that J.F.R. was wronging it in its leader. And, finally, the article appealed to the Lord as the Judge of the issues between the Little Flock and the Great Company (v. 27). Of course, J.F.R. paid no heed to J.'s arguments in that article, which resulted in the controversy breaking out between the two and lasting from the writing of the Sixth Sifting and Slaughter Weapon sections of the main article in Present Truth, No. 9, until the mailing of Present Truth, No. 14, whose articles on Confessing The Sins Over Azazel's Goat and Some Channel Claims ended the reformation phase of that controversy.

While this controversy lasted 180 days, the Jephthah type stresses mainly, but not exclusively, its earlier part, even as the large Reformation historians stress its earlier part mainly, but not exclusively. Energized by the Lord, J. encompassed matters relating to the Little Flock and the Great Company in a watchful attitude, and thus came into touch with the clericalists (v. 29). He promised the Lord, if He would make him victorious, to sacrifice to Him whatever new privilege or advantage that would accrue to him from his office work (vs. 30, 31). The chief feature of his controversy against the clericalists was the article in Present Truth, No. 9, whose part on the Sixth Sifting and Slaughter Weapon was written the evening of June 29 (God's time, June 30), corresponding to Luther's attaining light on faith justification, at Rome, in 1512, and using it for several years in his heart against Rome's doctrine of works righteousness. In this article 20 positions of the Society as set forth in its Vol. VII on Ezek. 9, and on Matt. 20: 1-19 as set forth by C.J. Woodworth's tract on the penny parable, were attacked; and these 20 positions are refuted in the three sets of general remarks, *i.e.*, those on Matt. 20: 1-16; Cor. 10: 1-14 and Ezek. 9, in the five calls, in the six siftings and in the six slaughter weapons:  $3 + 5 + 6 + 6 = 20$ . The article also refuted 20 special details of C.J. Woodworth's penny parable tract. Thus the clericalists were thoroughly defeated. Various details on

these 20 points were from other standpoints stressed during the controversy, in the articles, The Church Completely Organized, The Society As A Channel and A Protest Against Misrepresentation, in No. 10; in the article, J.F.R.'s Third New View, in No. 11; in the article, The Time of Reaping, in No. 12; in the articles, The Epiphany, Tentative And Vitalized Justification, The Golden Age and Elijah And Elisha—Priests And Levites, in No. 13, and in the articles, Confessing The Sins Over Azazel's Goat, and Some Channel Claims, in No. 14. With the mailing of No. 14 J.'s part in the controversy against J.F.R. and his supporters came to a victorious close, the Societyites having been thoroughly vanquished (v. 33).

The facts of the episode as to Jephthah's daughter (vs. 34-40) in their small antitype are given in P '20, 147, under the subhead, A Subtle Trial. Here we will set them forth as the small antitype of vs. 34-40. As this controversy was drawing to a close J. in the spirit of watchfulness in his office work found that his successful overthrow of the Society's 20 positions was so greatly approved by the Epiphany-enlightened brethren as to cause them to invest him with power to make pilgrim appointments for Parousia conditions among them, the only personal power to accrue to him in his pertinent office work from the above-described controversy (v. 34). In his watchfulness over his disposition, thoughts, motives, words, acts, surroundings and influences operating upon him connected with R.H. Hirsh's pertinent acts toward his exercise of such power, J., who had made some use of this power, and who did it with joy as a privilege of service, had an internal conflict as to its further possession, which caused him some grief and doubts, because he gradually came to see that a further use of it would not be right, and, therefore, saw that his promise to the Lord to sacrifice to Him any personal advantage that would come to him from his pertinent office work, if the Lord would give him victory in his prospective controversy with J.F.R. and his supporters, required him to refrain from

further use thereof (v. 35). He first confronted this situation in thought through R.H. Hirsh's snubbing him in the matter of his exercise of it as to a pilgrim trip that they had mutually agreed that J. should arrange for him. And the latter's ignoring J. in the matter and arranging for his trip himself brought J. face to face with the question as to whether he had the right to use such a power, which during two weeks' grief and doubts J. came to see he had no right to do, and was by his promise obligated to sacrifice to the Lord, inasmuch as God had given him the desired victory in the controversy (v. 36). This struggle lasted two weeks—the time R.H. Hirsh was serving on this pilgrim trip, Dec. 20, 1919-Jan. 3, 1920; and the next day, Jan. 4, 1920, the day R.H. Hirsh returned from it, J. fulfilled his promise by refusing to make henceforth pilgrim appointments for Parousia conditions and by refusing to take exclusive charge of making pilgrim appointments for any ecclesia. J. had not hitherto misused this power, but during the two weeks he suffered grief, and for his other powers he also suffered grief during these two weeks (vs. 37-39). The churches suffered grief over the fact that whereas J. had previously arranged for them monthly pilgrim visits whereby they received pilgrim ministries, he no more did this (v. 40).

The episode of Judg. 12: 1-6, in both the large and the small antitypes, was fulfilled while yet the antitypical controversy with the large and the small Romanist Churches was going on. Above this was shown as to the large antitype; here it will be shown as to the small one. While J. was supported by the ever-growing numbers of Epiphany-enlightened brethren in this controversy, Levites, like the remnants of the Sturgeonites and of the Ritchieites and all of the Olsonites and the bulk of the P.B.I., faulted him for not carrying on the controversy in a way in which cooperation with them could have been had, *i.e.*, along such doctrinal lines as they approved; and, therefore, they threatened to overthrow his office work (Judg. 12: 1). J.

replied that he had asked for their cooperation by sending them the pertinent literature, which call they heeded not, and the urgency of the Society's attacks gave him no time to wait on them; hence at his personal risk he undertook the controversy without their aid, which was not forthcoming, God Himself giving him the victory. Hence J. demanded why they had come out against him in controversy (vs. 2, 3). With the cooperation of the Epiphany-enlightened brethren J. prepared and issued the article on The Epiphany, in No. 13, which, among other things, thoroughly refuted J.'s non-Society attackers, whom he counter-attacked, because they accused him and his supporters as being renegade crown-losers from among the Society and the P.B.I. (v. 4). The Epiphanyites took the teachings that opened a passage for them over the peoples of little Christendom as to whether the attempters to pass over them were Little Flock members or Great Company members, and allowed none to make those teachings a passage-way between these two classes who was unable to state clearly the pertinent truths, which in the controversy revealed whether one was a Great Company member or not, but refuted their erroneous views, which resulted in the refutation of all of these many crown-losers (vs. 5, 6). The little Jephthah served as such from June 30, 1919, to Dec. 27, 1919, when the first copies of Present Truth, No. 14, were distributed, and his memory was cherished, particularly in connection with the doctrine of the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha, as one of the reforming party (v. 7).

J.'s next activity as a little star-member of the little Philadelphia period was as the little parallel of John Wesley (v. 8). He was supported by genuine Epiphany brethren; but at this time—that of the Amram sifting—he was opposed by ungenuine Epiphany brethren, from whom he withdrew priestly fellowship, sending them away to become associates of Levites; and through Truth articles he was blessed with winning others to take their places; and these became the

associates of the genuine Epiphany brethren. J. acted in this capacity from Feb. 10, 1920, to April 4, 1920, and was in it held in memory as giving the Word to the brethren (vs. 9, 10). Next J. acted as the small parallel of Thomas Campbell, stressing the Truth of the Bible's being the strength and center of unity for God's people, being active in this work from April 14, 1920, until May 10, 1920. It was during this time that J. wrote the article in *Present Truth*, No. 18, "Let Us Dwell In Peace" Reviewed, wherein he refuted the Society's position on, the strength and unity of God's people as being the "channel," and proved that the Truth was such. And he was in this aspect remembered as holding this doctrine (vs. 11, 12). Finally, as a star-member of little Philadelphia, J. worked as the little parallel of Wm. Miller (v. 13). As such he had genuine Epiphany supporters in the Epiphany movement and certain partial supporters in other movements; but all of these set forth their own personal views of the Bible to others. In this aspect J. labored more particularly from May 12 to May 27, 1920, and during this time he stressed chronology as proving that the little Parousia was near at hand, pointing to the royalty of the Kingdom class, and was remembered as such, but was by the Amramites, who increasingly became antagonistic at this time, regarded as a gross sinner (vs. 14, 15). This ends the consideration of Judg. 10-12, which, apart from Judg. 10: 1-15, the facts of the large and small antitypes prove, type the large and small Philadelphia star-members, while Judg. 10: 6-15 treats of features preparatory for the Philadelphia period.

In studying Judg. 13-16 we will consider it as typing the large star-members and their special helpers, *i.e.*, the rest of the Interim's 70, from about the middle of the Pergamos period to the end of the Laodicean period, and J. in the small Miniature's parallel periods, as Samson also types him in the medium and large Miniatures. We might here remark that it is not due now to expound these two Miniatures; hence we

have in the study of this book limited our view of it to the large antitype and the small Miniature. It should also be stated here that in the multiplied wisdom of God Samson is used to type also the entire Church from about the middle of the Pergamos period in all four Gospel Ages, because it has faithfully cooperated with the star-members and their special helpers, and thus has shared in their achievements. Not as a type, strictly speaking, but as an illustration, Samson also pictures forth in his last act Conservative Labor pulling down Christendom as now constituted. First the large antitype will be shown, and that very briefly. Toward the end of the fifth century, thus shortly before the middle of the Pergamos period, the warnings of members of the Elijah class against the revolutionisms of the hierarchy forecast to the Truth and its arrangements as these energized certain responsive brethren that they would produce brethren, the star-members and their special helpers, *i.e.*, the rest of the Interim's 70, whom the Lord would use to begin to deliver His people from sectarians (Judg. 13: 1-5).

The Truth and its arrangements made this thought clear to the leading members of the Elijah class (vs. 6, 7). These entreated that the warnings become cleared as to their work therein (v. 8); and these warnings came again to the Truth and its arrangements, which then appealed to the leaders of the Elijah class to give heed to them (vs. 9, 10). These inquiringly studied these warnings, in order to cooperate (vs. 11, 12), and were told that the Truth and its arrangements must be kept pure, free from all alien admixtures (vs. 13: 14). These desired to overserve the warnings in their bringers, which in them forbade it, telling them to serve the Lord (vs. 15-18). This they did, and the warnings in their bringers showed God's acceptance of their sacrifice, which filled them with adoration; (vs. 19, 20). This last part of the episode occurred about 550 A.D. And the Truth and its arrangements and the chief members of the Elijah class recognized the warnings as sent by God, which

made them fear that the Lord would cut them off (vs. 21, 22). But the Truth and its arrangements dissipated these fears (v. 23), and in due time the pertinent star-members and their special helpers began to appear, *e.g.*, Adelbert Desiderius, in France and Germany, about 745, who was more or less occupied in matters of the Greek and Roman Churches' corruptions, and Clement, an Irishman, who was the former's special helper (vs. 24, 25).

Claudius of Turin, a star-member of Thyatira and its principal man, ministering from 799 to 839, was very desirous of oneness with the anti-papal absolutism and idolism reform party in the empire, against which leading members of the Elijah class and certain truths and their arrangements counseled; but it was from the Lord that he should so do, to help against the sectarians (*Judg. 14: 1-4*). He, accompanied by these, while engaged in anti-papal absolutism and idolism was attacked by the pope and his mouthpieces, and with the Truth thoroughly, in writing, refuted them, but told not the Elijah leaders nor the Truth and its arrangements thereof (vs. 5, 6), though he communed agreeably with the reform party (v. 7). Ratramnus, the next star-member, studying the papacy thus refuted, set forth (850) the doctrine of two classes as separate and distinct, the saintly and the mixed overcomers, as involved in predestination, and drew joy therefrom and imparted it to others, but told not of its origin (vs. 8, 9). The Elijah leaders cooperated with the reform party; and Dunstan, the next star-member, gave them a feast of Truth (951-972), a full group of the reform party joining therein (vs. 10, 11).

The attitude of the star-member, Dunstan, and Hugh Capet, his special helper, in giving meat in due season was a riddle to the reform party, for whose solution their attitude promised full powers to that party, and asked for the same, if it were not solved (vs. 12, 13). Their attitude could not be solved within 21 years (972-993), when the leaders of the reform party threatened it with ruin, unless the conduct of

the star-members and their special helpers were solved, accusing it of working for their injury (v. 15). The reform party desired from the French king, Robert, Hugh's son and successor, a solution, which was not given until about 1014, when the anti-pope Gregory was severely denounced by supporters of Henry II, the emperor, and by pope Benedict VIII, when also Canute of England began to fight clericalism. Within seven years (by 1021), the leaders getting the solution, the reform party saw that the star-members' and their special helpers' attitude was one exercising the special teaching office in getting sweet truths from refuted papacy; and this party then set about to take such power away from the star-members and their special helpers, by binding them to silence unless the leaders of the reform party agreed to their speaking forth such new truths, to which the French king replied that they had intrigued therefore with the reform party (vs. 14, 16-18). Berengar of Tours, the next star-member, whose ministry was from 1049 to 1079, overthrew the full number of the papal party on transubstantiation and offered their papal authority to the leaders of the reform party; but he became estranged from them while the reform party was given into the control of the emperor (vs. 19, 20).

Peter Abelard, the next star-member, whose ministry was from 1113 to 1141, by teaching a purer theology, made overtures to re-win the reform party, but was rejected and condemned by the emperor, the French Church and the pope, who desired to restrict him to traditional theology (Judg. 15: 1, 2). This aroused him in refutation to write his book, *Sic et Non* (*So And Not* [So]), in which, apart from setting forth in his introduction and conclusion seven contradictions in the writings of the Fathers, he heaped up in antithesis one to the other 300 propositions, 150 of them directly contradictory to 150 others of them, as his proof that the traditional theology, as distinct from his Biblical theology, was untrustworthy. He circulated this book among theological students ripe for papal reaping, which

destroyed them as such (vs. 3-5). When the papal party learned of these they destroyed the reform party and their leaders in France (v. 6).

The excesses of the papal party moved Arnold of Brescia, 1141-1155, the next star-member, to wage a destructive battle against the secularization of the hierarchy, clergy and church (vs. 7, 8). Waldo (1173-1220), the next star-member, with the cooperation of many French and Italian brethren, took his stand on preaching the Word as in the Apostolic times. The Romanist sectarians resented this, because the former lacked papal ordination. Some of the reform party, learning of this, desired to curtail Waldo in this and to bring him over into the Romanist position as a captive of the hierarchy, which he allowed on their pledge to do him no harm (vs. 9-13). When the Romanist sectarians thought they had him in their control, he overthrew the ideas of submission to the pope and to the councils by which the reform party sought to hold them, and utterly, by the Biblical teaching of evangelical freedom in contrast with Romanist sectarian authority, refuted the views of the two councils held against him, and gloried that by the newly found Truth on evangelical freedom he had refuted the totality of his foes, and then ceased using this argument, calling the position, Height of Truth (vs. 14-17). After this struggle Waldo thirsted much for Truth, and, fearing that without it he would fall a prey to papal hatred, he called upon the Lord for it, and got enough of it out of the doctrine of evangelical liberty to mould the Waldensians into a preaching people and perpetual reform movement (vs. 18, 19). The period of these star-members and their special helpers as antitypical Samson was not the whole Gospel Age, which is designated as lasting the antitype of 40 years, but it is the antitype of part of it, 20 years (v. 20).

Marsiglio (1309-1343) is the next large star-member whose activities together with those of Occam, his special helper, are typed by Samson (Judg. 16: 1-3), particularly his work from 1309 to 1328. They first associated themselves

with the French anti-papal reform party, 1309-1324 (v. 1), and then went to the German anti-papal reform party, in connection with both of which they were very closely watched by their papal enemies, who sought to refute them (v. 2); but in 1324 with certain colaborers they appeared at the Court of the German Emperor, Louis the Bavarian, with Marsiglio's epoch-making book, *The Defender of The Peace*, whereby they laid hold on the entire papal hierarchy by their grasp of Truth; and by their efforts and those of Tauler, Wyclif and Hus, the rest of the Sardis star-members, and their special helpers, they forced the entire papal hierarchy into terms of peace and friendship with the empire and France (v. 3). Vs. 4-21 treat of ten Philadelphia star-members as a whole and their special helpers, just as vs. 1-3 do with the Sardis star-members and their special helpers, without individualizing any one of them, inasmuch as all of them had similar experiences from the standpoint of the four sets of typical experiences there set forth. Delilah represents the ten Protestant sects, with a distinctly different one of which each of the pertinent ten star-members and special helpers had to do (v. 4). The crown-lost leaders as sectarians in each denomination sought to have its pertinent star-member and his special helper made captives and slaves of theirs, for which they by the promise of mouthpieceship and executive authority enlisted the help of the pertinent sect (v. 5). The attitude of each star-member and his special helper gave the thought to the pertinent sect that if new strong doctrines were urged against their Divinely-given doctrines, they would be made helpless; but when this was done, they easily by refutations destroyed their power to make them helpless, despite the opponents who waited to pounce upon them in that sect (vs. 6-9). Again, the attitude of each one of the star-members and his special helper gave the pertinent sect the thought that if new arrangements were urged against their Divinely-given arrangements, they would make them helpless; but when

this was done, they easily by refuting them destroyed their power to make them helpless, despite the opponents who waited in the sect to pounce on them (vs. 10-12).

Again, the attitude of each set of them gave the thought to the pertinent sect that if they would interweave their doctrines and arrangements as their powers with their strong errors, they would thereby make them helpless; but when this was done they easily overthrew the errors and freed themselves from the intended trap, despite their opponents in each sect waiting to pounce upon them (vs. 13, 14). Still insistent on securing their capture in each sect, each sect pressed upon the pertinent star-member and his special helper to reveal wherein their great strength day. This insistence presently wearied each set into showing by their attitude that as the special mouth, hand and eye of the Lord they had from the outstart been faithful, and that if they could be induced to be unfaithful their strength would be lost (vs. 15-17). Thereupon each sect called its crown-lost leaders, apprising them of the fact revealed it by its star-member and special helper. Those came with their promised rewards. Then each sect lulled its star-member and his special helper into non-carefulness, and therein brought helpers to induce them into some relaxation of their faithfulness, which made them helpless, despite their efforts to exercise the strength which departed from them by the Lord's unsuspectedly leaving them weak and helpless, and which resulted in their becoming captives of the sectarians, who by their wrong practices deceived and made them as prisoners slave in teaching and practice ways for the sectarians in Protestantism (vs. 18-21). These four things occurred in each sect after the pertinent star-member's Little Flock movement was perverted into a sect, beginning with Luther and Melanchthon, his special helper, the first of the Philadelphia star-members and their special helpers to undergo these four sets of experiences, and ending with Miller and Wolff, the last of them so to do.

The last scene (vs. 22-31) covers the experiences of the

two star-members of the Laodicean Church, the Parousia and Epiphany Messengers. In both of these faithfulness set in, in all their relations to the nominal church (v. 22). The crown-lost leaders, both in Romanism and Protestantism, sectarianly sought to honor the God-man theory above the Father, in elaborate services, especially to glory in their victory over the Philadelphia star-members, which they ascribed to their God-man theory (v. 23). In this their adherents joined (v. 24). This began in 1846, in Protestantism by the formation of the Evangelical Alliance, and in Romanism by the movement to raise Mary by an authoritative doctrine to the dignity of immaculate conception, and has lasted deep into the Epiphany. Amid these celebrations they offered much indignity, not only to the memory of the Philadelphia star-members, but also publicly by personal slanders, misrepresentations and ridicule against the Laodicean Messenger, first, upon the Parousia, and, later, upon the Epiphany messenger, whose pertinent indignities have not yet reached their full climax, both Protestantism and Romanism setting the Laodicean Messenger between them and thus offering him such indignities (v. 25). The Laodicean Messenger asked the most faithful of the crown-losers (the same antitypes as those of Jonathan under the David type), especially in their writings, to expose to him the real inwardness of contemporaneous Protestantism and Romanism, as an alleged resting place for him (v. 26), and that, while the millions of their adherents were in their festivities enjoying the indignities cast upon him. (v. 27).

The Laodicean Messenger in both members, mindful of the blinding of the Philadelphia star-members by the sectarian Protestants, prayed God to vindicate (not avenge) him from such blindness by one prolonged refutation of the foundation doctrines of Protestantism and Romanism—The Divine right, the consciousness of the dead, eternal torment and the union and cooperation of state and church (v. 28). Seizing upon these two parts of the nominal church to break

them loose from these foundation doctrines, first the Parousia Messenger and then the Epiphany messenger applied all their strength to the pertinent refutation, the main pressure being applied to the Protestant section of the nominal church by the Parousia Messenger, and the main pressure being applied to the Romanist part of it by the Epiphany messenger (v. 29). By the act of setting themselves to do this work of refutation, through which they would bring to a close their ministry toward the nominal church, they by act, not word, asked that they might come to an end with the sectarians in their pertinent ministry; and then using all their strength they pulled down in doctrinal and practical ruin the whole nominal church as a system of error, utterly refuting its four foundation errors, to the refutation of all the crown-lost leaders, their assistants and their partisan supporters, and by this wrought more ruin on the nominal church than had all the preceding star-members from about the middle of the Pergamos period until the end of the Philadelphia period (v. 30). By their brethren the memory of the star-members will be honored as of God's servants, and their deeds will be held in honor as effecting the two parts of the nominal church (v. 31).

We now turn to the small antitype of Judg. 13-16. The facts of the fulfillment show that the small antitypical events of this section began Sept. 17, 1916, when J.H. sent his first letter to Bro. Russell, revealing to him the conspiracy of H. J. S. and W. C. with the majority of the London Tabernacle elders to set aside Bro. Russell's control in its affairs and to substitute in its place that of the elders (presbyterianism), which brought to a climax the evils in Britain and America among the brethren, leading them into sectarian bondage (Judg. 13: 1). This letter (the angel) in its appeal for help in effect told the Truth and its arrangements (Manoah's wife) as these were energetic in Bro. Russell's mind that the Truth and its arrangements would develop J., whom Bro. Russell had frequently used to reunite divided classes, into

qualification measurably to deliver the Lord's people from divisionism and to handle the British situation measurably to free the captivity of the Lord's people from the divisionists (vs. 2, 3). This letter also in effect suggested to the Truth and its arrangements as these were active in Bro. Russell's mind that for J.'s proper development they must remain free from error in teaching and arrangement (v. 4), that he must be faithful in doctrine, arrangement and life for the office to which God was appointing him, which proved to be that of the last star-member of the large antitype and the small parallel of all the star-members and their special helpers (the Parousia Messenger's not included and the Epiphany messenger not having any) from 539 to 1956, and that as such he would begin to deliver the Lord's people from the sectarians (v. 5). The Truth and its arrangements, by Bro. Russell's arranging for J. to go to Britain for pilgrim service and for handling the Tabernacle situation and by his publishing the announcement of the former work in the Nov. 1, 1916, Tower, in part informed the directors of J.'s mission, without giving a clear understanding of the import of the messenger to the directors (v. 6); but the Truth and its arrangements told the Board as it acted through its executive committee of the need of the Truth and its arrangements to be kept free from errors of doctrine and practice and of J.'s preserving in faithfulness the same, in order to be such a properly qualified servant of God; the Truth and the brethren (v. 7). The Board authorizing, Nov. 2, 1916, its committee to arrange for J.'s European trip, and appointing, Nov. 7, the executive committee, empowering it to arrange for J.'s trip, the Board in this committee desired more pertinent information (v. 8).

God responded to these longings, and caused the correspondence of the J.H. group on the London Tabernacle condition, which came by the same mail as the pertinent correspondence of the H. J. S. group, to come to the Truth and its arrangements as these were active in J.'s mind while he studied that correspondence, Nov. 8 and 9, apart

from the Board's presence (v. 9). Digesting this correspondence, first in the afternoon of Nov. 9 to J.F.R. and in the evening to the full executive committee, *i.e.*, A.I. Ritchie, W. E. V. and J.F.R., the Truth and its arrangements as these operated on J.'s mind informed the Board in its representatives, the executive committee, that another message had come bearing on their developing J. for the European trip (v. 10). The directors in their representatives, the executive committee, asked if this message was of the same trend as the former one on the nature and needs of the British situation, and the relation was affirmed by a comparison of the two messages (v. 11). Next the Board in its committee, longing for a proper solution, studied the message as J. gave it, to find out as to what arrangements should be made respecting J.'s powers as required in particular by the British situation, and in general by the situation throughout the world outside of America (v. 12; here is another Biblical proof that J.'s credentials, dictated Nov. 10 and signed and sealed Nov. 11, 1916, were *bona fide*, and that, therefore, they made the letter of appointment, dictated Nov. 2, retroactively *bona fide*). The Board in its committee was by the correspondence of the J.H. group made to understand that the Truth and its arrangements were to be maintained in purity, inviolate (vs. 13, 14). The Board in its committee was inclined to give the message more honor than was due, which it in its contents forbade; but it suggested that the Board and its committee offer sacrifice to God in that it authorize J. to be the Board's special representative with powers of attorney and devote to the financial support of J.'s trip enough money, as well as yield him in service for the trip. All this was done, even though the Board in its committee did not understand the full import of the message (vs. 15, 16).

Its inquiry as to the exact character of the message was not at that time disclosed as one coming from the Lord (vs. 18, 19). The directors, in their committee, then made the implied sacrifices, described above in the explanation

of v. 16, offering them upon the Truth and its arrangements, the message working wonders in these matters, as the directors in their committee and the Truth and its arrangements in J. took note of these things (v. 19). While God was manifesting His acceptance of the Board's pertinent sacrifices, the message in J., by his showing the Board in its committee from Ezek. 9: 2, 5-10 and Ps. 91: 6 that the sixth sifting was coming, beginning in Europe, was demonstrated as one coming from the Lord, which made the Board in its committee and the Truth and its arrangements in J. yield honor to the Lord (v. 20). No more messages came from the J.H. group, for the reason that J., leaving for England Nov. 11, laid his commission before the three British managers Nov. 21; and henceforth both sides to the dispute laid their views before him; and the Board in its committee recognized that the two messages were Divinely provided (v. 21). This knowledge frightened the Board in its committee; and it in them feared that it and the Truth and its arrangements might be cut off, *i.e.*, through the coming sifting (v. 22). But the Truth and its arrangements made it clear that such would not be the case, since the Lord by the messages and the revelation of the coming sifting in connection with its offering manifested His acceptance thereof (v. 23). The Truth and its arrangements developed J. in the Holy Spirit unto fitness for his office as the second member of the Laodicean Messenger, and as the small parallel of the star-members and their special helpers from about the middle of the Pergamos period to nearly the end of the Laodicean period (*Samson* means *sunny*, in allusion to the light that the star-members and their special helpers shine forth). Under the Lord's blessing J. developed increasingly in these two aspects of his office (v. 24). The Lord's Spirit worked upon him from time to time as the little Samson in his combat relations to the Merarite and Gershonite Levites (v. 25).

This brings us to a study of Judg. 14. At the time of the separation in the Society in 1917 J. went to the sphere of

the division, and there became attracted to the reform party among the "Opposition" (v. 1), and desired from the four directors and the Truth and its arrangements to be united as leader with this reform party. These interposed obstacles, telling him to seek oneness with those of his own spirit, but J. persisted in his determination, since he believed that the reform party was desirable (vs. 2, 3). The directors and the Truth and its arrangements did not recognize that this matter proceeded from the Lord, who by it designed to interfere with the sectarians, since these then had control among the "Opposition" (v. 4). In cooperation with the directors and the Truth and its arrangements J. occupied himself with the separation matters; and while he was so doing the Society, as the little Romanist Church, through its mouthpiece, J.F.R., and his partisan supporters roared fiercely against him in Harvest Siftings. God's power coming upon J. enabled him to seize hold on J.F.R. and his partisan supporters as the mouth of little Babylon and easily rend them in J.F.R.'s Harvest Siftings unto complete refutation through Harvest Siftings Reviewed, alone, without any special outside assistance; for until it was about to be published, several months after it was written, he showed his MS. neither to the directors nor to the Truth nor its arrangements in any one of the brethren (v. 6). Thereafter he fellowshipped with the reform party to his delight (v. 7). But while about to bring it into closer relation with himself, his thoughts, busy in meditation on the refuted Society, saw connected with it the sweet doctrine of the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha (v. 8); and he accepted its sweetness, especially appropriating its heart-refreshing thought that the faithful among the "Opposition" were antitypical Elijah; thereafter he offered this teaching to the four directors, and to the Truth and its arrangements operating in other brethren in the sense of incorporating this doctrine among them, but did not tell them how and where he came to find it (v. 9). Toward the end of the shareholders' meeting the

four directors and the Truth and its arrangements, with certain brethren, including J., assembled in the Fort Pitt Convention, at which J. in a debate with M. Sturgeon feasted the conventioners with his explanation of the last related acts of Elijah and Elisha, giving his thought, as was customary, apart from debating, in such brethren to do at conventions (v. 10).

That afternoon, Jan. 6, 1918, 30 brethren assembled, a list of whose names F.H. McGee furnished J. at the end of this convention (and it counts exactly 30 in number), as a convention of the "Opposition," and elected seven brothers to be the Fort Pitt Committee, to look out for the spiritual interests of the entire "Opposition," whom they were to sound as to whether a regular pilgrim and magazine service should be established for them (v. 11). J.'s attitude, as leader in offering as new Truth the comforting teachings of the Last Related Acts of Elijah and Elisha and of the Calls-Siftings-Slaughter Weapons, was in effect a propounding of a riddle to the "Opposition," which, if not mastered, would mean that the powers of the reform party would be acceded to him, and which, if mastered in full time, which proved to be within seven weeks, would make him accede to them the powers of the reform party. The attitude of the others asked for a putting forth of the symbolic riddle (vs. 12, 13), which was done by J.'s stressing the two subjects above mentioned; and in the third week the real underlying situation (J.'s having executive and teaching leadership, implied in his giving the Truth gotten in the Society's refuted condition) could not be mastered (v. 14). M. Sturgeon and A.I. Ritchie tried to solve it by charging that J. had too much influence in the Fort Pitt Committee; therefore, before the third week was over, *i.e.*, the night of Jan. 22 (God's time, Jan. 23), they offered their resignations from the committee. As the sixth week was ending, the afternoon of Feb. 17, J. delivered at Philadelphia his lecture on J.F.R. as the evil servant of Matt. 24: 48-51; and this was construed by the majority of the committee during

that week to mean that J.'s giving discourses on new truths implied that he claimed to control both the teaching and executive functions of the committee—a thing that was implied in J.'s powers as the Epiphany messenger, but a thing that J. never expressed in words.

They were confirmed in this thought by the report given them by certain members of the reform party on J.'s attitude at Philadelphia in delivering the discourse on The Evil Servant, as implying to some of his hearers among the reform party that he claimed to control the committee as teacher and as executive. Thus the riddle that J.'s giving the advancing sweet Truth coming out of the condition presented in the refuted Society was answered by the committee's passing, the night of Feb. 23 (Feb. 24, God's time), the last day of the seventh week, the resolution forbidding committee members to give new thoughts in their preaching on types; prophecies and symbols without the thoughts first being approved by the committee unanimously. These facts showed that they had gotten the answer from the report of members of the reform party in Philadelphia. This fact, in reproof of their implied threats to these informers, J. brought to their attention.

J.'s course told the informers that he had not explained the riddle even to the four directors or to the Truth and its arrangements acting in various other brethren, much less to them as members of the reform party (vs. 15-18). J. reluctantly yielded to the papal and unscriptural resolution of the committee, after a long discussion, ending nearly midnight, Feb. 23 (Feb. 24, God's time). In the meantime there appeared J.F.R.'s article on Elijah's and Elisha's Separation, in Z '18, 51-55, in which he sought to answer an incomplete report of J.'s lecture on The Last Related Acts of Elijah and Elisha, sent him by one of his Norfolk, Va., partisans, and in which he sought to bend the facts of the separation to make the Societyites antitypical Elijah and "the Opposition" antitypical Elisha—a view completely refuted in J.'s published lecture on the subject. J.F.R.'s article, widely read by

"the Opposition," was causing some of them to fall away to the Society, and was troubling the bulk of the others—those who had not heard J. on the subject. This situation mightily laid hold on J.'s spirit as an appeal to help the brethren out of their difficulty.

Among others, those at Jersey City and Newark, N.J., were troubled about this matter; and when J. visited the Jersey City Ecclesia, and the friends there asked him questions on the subject, he decided that he would repudiate the papal resolution and preach the Word due at the time, which steadied the brethren in the two ecclesiastical bodies. This act of J. was in effect a symbolic slaying of the 30 who constituted the Fort Pitt Convention and a giving to the committee of their powers and authority (v. 19). The upshot of the affair was that from then on J. ceased to be the chief influence in the committee and in what developed into the group, F.H. McGee, I.I. Margeson, J.D. Wright and I.F. Hoskins, giving the latter the chief executive place in the committee (v. 20).

In the committee, especially after May 8, 1918, when the government arrested the Society leaders, there was, from fear of prosecution from the government, particularly by I.F. Hoskins, I.I. Margeson and J.D. Wright, effort after effort made to delay the publication of *The Bible Standard and Herald of Christ's Kingdom*, the name chosen for the paper that the committee had decided to publish. For some time J., being so often sat down upon by the committee, said and did practically nothing in the committee, but was chafing under the procrastination exercised in the committee and recognized by him as coming from the spirit of fear. J. determined that this procrastination must be ended; hence in the committee meeting of June 22 he offered a series of resolutions covering the details of the following points: (1) that *The Bible Standard* be published as soon as it could be gotten ready and put through the press, and that, before the convention that had been decided to be held July 26-29, 1918, at Asbury Park, N.J.;

(2) that stated salaries of certain amounts be given I.F. Hoskins and R.H. Hirsh, so that their entire time might be given to the work, the former as secretary and the latter as managing editor; and (3) that headquarters be established at Brooklyn, N.Y.

These motions were passed, which implied that J., who offered them, desired a more intimate union between himself and the reform party—a thing that I.F. Hoskins, I.I. Margeson and H.C. Rockwell blocked, by their efforts as editors to prevent the appearance of *The Bible Standard*, until the Fort Pitt Committee could be dissolved and a new organization be formed (*Judg.* 15: 1), the group, by its involved acts covering some months, alleging that it believed that J. had given up the reform party, and that it had, therefore, put I.F. Hoskins in charge of it; and by its acts it suggested that he become one with another party associated with the group and more appealing to J. (v. 2). These acts, gradually developing for several months, reached their culmination at the Asbury Park Convention; and the involved great wrongs in these gradually developing arid culminating acts, committed especially at the instigation of H.C. Rockwell, I.F. Hoskins and I.I. Margeson, moved J. to counteractive steps, which he believed would be recognized as making him less blamable than the sectarian group, though displeasing them, (v. 3), and which had their culmination in his gradual preparation of the material that some time later appeared in *Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed*. In this publication, apart from an introduction and a conclusion, he set forth in the form of a deadly parallel under 12 headings 150 evils of Rutherfordism in the Society of which J.F.R. had been guilty, and 150 evils of Rutherfordism in the Fort Pitt Committee of which the individually varyingly responsible group of four mentioned above had been guilty (v. 4). Some time later J. published this paper so constituted, and circulated it among the friends whom the group had expected to reap as the harvest of their intrigues, both as classes and individuals, together with their doctrinal and

practical efforts (v. 5). On investigation the sectarian group and its partisans traced this matter to J., and in revenge destroyed every vestige of the reform party and the group as such as the representatives of it, alleging that J. had done what he did in retaliation of the group's depriving J. of the reform party (v. 6).

Therefore J. by his acts declared that of what evils the sectarian P.B.I.'s had accused him he would vindicate clearly himself, by calling for an investigative and curative convention, at Philadelphia, Sept. 8-10, 1918, after the Philadelphia Ecclesia's petition of Aug. 4 to the P.B.I. to arrange for such a convention for that ecclesia, Sept. 8-10, had been curtly denied by that committee, and that thereafter he would let the P.B.I. go its way (v. 7). The committee, apprized by some of its partisans in the ecclesia of its attitude, on Aug. 6 refused the ecclesia's petition in a letter that threw the blame of the situation on R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and J., and demanded that its secretary be given the opportunity to clarify the situation before that ecclesia. The church, knowing that the three accused pilgrims had told it the next thing to nothing of the troubles in the committee, and recognizing the unfairness of letting the committee have the whole say through its secretary, arranged for I.F. Hoskins to have 50 minutes to present his side, J. to have 50 minutes to answer and then each to have 10 minutes for rebuttal. Despite the fairness of this proposal the P.B.I. objected, but, of course, the ecclesia, being mistress in her midst, saw to it that her decision on the program was carried out. This debate was held the afternoon of Aug. 25 and was the second occasion in which I.F. Hoskins and J. met in debate, the first being the night of July 28, at Asbury Park. Of these debates I.F. Hoskins expressed himself in the following language to a Norfolk, Va. brother who asked him why he and the rest of the committee refused to appear and debate the issues at the Philadelphia conventions of Sept. 8-10 and Dec. 20-22, 1918: "Every time I have a debate with Bro. Johnson he

makes me look like thirty cents." Well! Poor I.F. Hoskins looked and felt like thirty cents the afternoon of Aug. 25; for just the day before for the first time he saw and read Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed (EG 89-131); and when the time for debate came he had by no means recovered from the shock. Shifting his weight in rapid succession from one leg to the other, for 45 of his 50 minutes he did not touch the committee conditions, which were the subject of the debate; and in the remaining five minutes he said very little of consequence to the point. His difficulty was with his side, whose exposure in Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed had been read by practically everybody in the church, since it was mailed the night of Aug. 21.

The impression of the debate on the church that afternoon was very unfavorable as to the merits of the group's side; it was also badly impressed by its mouthpiece's presentation. The church, therefore, requested that the debate be continued in the evening, with three speakers on each side having 20 minutes each, the afternoon debaters having the last speeches, I.F. Hoskins and J. in turn ending the debate with ten-minute rebuttals after their twenty-minute speeches. But the second debate went still worse for the group, which left the field of battle greatly worsted. Its and its adherents' interrupting J. with questions and his asking them questions resulted in their being thoroughly refuted; and they left the meeting hall looking like beaten dogs hiding their tails between their hind legs. Thereafter J. retired to the strength of his position (v. 8). But the P.B.I. was not satisfied. They sought to stem the tide that Another Harvest Siftings Renewed was raising against them. Their August, 1918, Committee Bulletin came out just after the debate, at the time that F.H. McGee received Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed, to which he published two replies: an undated one published about Sept. 1, entitled, A Brief Review Of Bro. Johnson's Charges, and one dated Sept. 10, entitled, A Timely Letter Of Importance To All The Brethren. It was

by the Aug. Committee Bulletin and the Brief Review, etc., that this committee made an invasion among the guileless brethren along the lines of the necessity of forming a corporation (v. 9). These two publications roused the guileless brethren to ask why the sectarian P.B.I. had made an invasion among them; and they received the answer, to restrain J. and retaliate on him (v. 10).

These guileless brethren came to J. in his strong position and demanded whether he did not know that the P.B.I. was in charge of General Church matters, and what was the meaning of what he had done. J. replied that he had vindicated himself against their misdeeds on him (v. 11). They told him that they were intent on restraining and delivering him to the sectarian P.B.I. He asked them to give him the assurance that they themselves would not cut him off (v. 12), which they promised, and then proceeded to restrain him with H.C. Rockwell's article in the August Committee's Bulletin on The Necessity Of An Organization (Corporation) and F.H. McGee's Brief Reply To Bro. Johnson's Charges and brought him down from his position (v. 13). But when they came to the subject of forming a corporation the P.B.I. sectarians just before and during the Philadelphia Convention, Sept. 8-10, cried out loudly H.C. Rockwell's arguments against them. At that convention God's Spirit and Truth seized powerful hold on J., and he burst with ease the restraints with which the brethren sought to make him defenseless (v. 14).

Then, laying hold on H.C. Rockwell's points at the last session of the Philadelphia Convention, the evening of Sept. 10, J. refuted their every argument so thoroughly that he carried the entire convention with him, except a few very partisan P.B.I.'s, and thus overthrew all the corporation advocates of the P.B.I. (v. 15), J. recognizing and stating that he did it with all their points (v. 16). Then J., ending his address, repudiated the position of the P.B.I. on corporations controlling priestly work, and called the position the height of the corporation claims (v. 17). But

after that convention J. was much athirst for some further, enlightenment from the Word, and earnestly requested it of the Lord in connection with the investigative committee that the convention appointed after hearing J.'s refutation of the P.B.I. corporationists' claims, fearing that otherwise he would fail and fall a prey to the evil-doers in the Church (v. 18). And God opened up the full Truth to him on corporations among God's people, while he occupied his position of repudiating them for priestly work; and this refreshed him; and he regarded the true position the source of Truth revealed in answer to his prayer. And this is the position maintained unto this day by the Epiphany brethren (v. 19). The incompleteness of J.'s work of deliverance in his little Samson phase is indicated here by the *twenty* years of its length, not *forty* years (v. 20).

In the Fall of 1918 J. began to occupy himself with P.B.I. matters in the investigative committee, especially in view of F.H. McGee's two above-mentioned papers against him (*Judg. 16: 1*; the Hebrew word *zoneh*, here translated *harlot*, should have been translated *inn-keeper*, or *hostess*). During this time the P.B.I. leaders, hearing of his occupying himself with their affairs, lay in wait for him, hoping to get him into their power, and through their main leaders refute him (v. 2). J. kept his counsel, and at a time unexpected (Nov. 15-Dec. 10, 1918) wrote *Present Truth*, Nos. 1, 2, the former of which was mailed the evening of Dec. 8 (9th, God's time) and the latter mailed Dec. 24. To these he added during February, March and April Nos. 3-5. By these five issues J. laid hold on the leaders of the P.B.I., the powers that held them up and the theories that kept them secure and by the support of his full powers carried them away into a sphere of friendship which lasted for over a full year, this corresponding to the Sardis period and J.'s work therein corresponding to that of Marsiglio, Tauler, Wyclif and Hus and their special helpers. The next pictures bring us up to the Little Reformation, in which Delilah corresponds to the

good Levites in the Epiphany movement, J. to the Philadelphia star-members and their special helpers and the Philistines to the various Levites in the manifested Levite groups, particularly in the Society and P.B.I., while the end of these pictures, when Samson is brought forth, even to his end corresponds to the little cleansed Sanctuary and the little Parousia and Epiphany movements.

Now will come the particulars of the small Miniature. J., unaware that the bulk of the Epiphany brethren were crown-losers, considered the bulk of them Little Flock members and loved them accordingly in the Little Flock condition, in which they were until manifested as crown-losers (v. 4). Increasingly Levite sectarian leaders sought to bribe these crown-losers to find out the source of J.'s unusual powers with the Truth and its arrangements and to betray to them how they could restrain and oppress him, promising as a large but imperfect reward, if this were done, to recognize them as God's authorized mouthpiece (v. 5). This betraying in ever-increasing numbers these Epiphany brethren crown-losers sought to do (v. 6). And J. by his attitude seemed to them to indicate that if a complete number of new views on religion (errors, of course) were skillfully presented, they would restrain him into the weakness of the ordinary man (v. 7). These new views, complete in number, were presented, mainly by J.F.R. for the Society, and by R.E. Streeter for the P.B.I.; and the Epiphany crown-losers put them upon J. as a restraint (v. 8), all the while there were sectarian crown-losers of the various groups lying in wait in these Epiphany crown-losers' sphere of work; and they warned J. that by these new (erroneous) views the sectarian crown-losers were pouncing upon him; but J. refuted these new views very easily, as witness his articles in the Summer and Fall of 1919 and the Winter of 1919-1920 in *The Present Truth*, with the result that the source of J.'s strength was not discovered (v. 9).

Thereupon an ever-increasing number of good crown-losers in the Epiphany Truth by their acts chided J. as not

having really shown the source of his unusual strength in Truth matters, and again pleaded by their acts for the pertinent information (v. 10). By his acts J. gave these the impression that if new (revolutionary) arrangements for doing the Lord's work were used as restraints upon him, he would be in strength as to these matters like the ordinary man (v. 11). Then these good crown-losers in the Epiphany Truth took the new methods of work introduced into the Society and P.B.I. and put them as restraints upon J.'s services, and said to him that the sectarian crown-losers, busy in this sphere of work, were pouncing upon him so restrained; but J. by his refutations easily destroyed these restraints of new (revolutionary) arrangements on doing the Lord's work (v. 12). In a third way these crown-losers in the Epiphany Truth sought to betray J. to the sectarian leaders among the crown-lost movements. By their attitude they expressed their longing (*Delilah—longing*) to know by what J. could be effectually restrained; and a third time J. by his attitude gave them a wrong impression, to the effect that if his powers of Truth and arrangement be interwoven with error and wrong arrangements, he would thus be restrained, and would in strength as to the Truth and its arrangements be like other men (v. 13). These betraying Epiphany crown-losers took the errors, *etc.*, of Levite leaders and wove them about J.'s Truth and arrangement powers and fastened them, they thought, very securely. Thereupon they indicated that the sectarian false teachers were pouncing upon him. J. had been oblivious to the situation, but, aroused out of this obliviousness, he laid hold on these errors, and not only made away with them, but with all the arguments with which they were buttressed. These refutations, as well as those on arrangement, will be found in the Truths of the Summer and Fall of 1919 and those of the Winter of 1919-1920 (v. 14). Thus on the matter of teaching and practice they were unable to meet J. in the field of discussion, but were in every such case refuted fully.

Now came the fourth test wherein J., like ten of the twelve Philadelphia star-members and their ten special helpers, failed; and this was from an overweening carefulness to spare the sectarians from feared stumbling of weak brethren; to such a degree as to have made him fail to be strictly faithful to the Word in dealing with these; for these ten star-members and their ten special helpers feared that these weak ones would stumble, if they were as strict with them as they should have been, e.g., Luther feared to stumble certain new creatures who turned out to be crown-losers, if he were as strict against Romanist practices as he should have been; and J. to prevent like weak ones from stumbling was not so strict against Great Company revolutionisms as he should have been, though all the while the revolutionists thought him too strict. With these few explanatory words we will now expound the rest of Judg. 16. Epiphany crown-losers, longing for the powers implied in the offered symbolic bribe, beset J. time and again in each of the ten Little Flock movements of the little Reformation, later perverted into little sect-like movements by the crown-losers who were the liars in wait in the sphere of activity held by the Epiphany crown-losers, until J. gave way and told them by acts and words that he was the little stars of the Epiphany, as well as the second and last star-member of large Laodicea, that as such he had been faithful; but if in any way he would prove unfaithful through false doctrine or wrong arrangement or the misapplication of a true doctrine or arrangement, he would have no more power than any other leader in that matter (vs. 15-17). The Epiphany crown-losers in this statement recognized that the real situation was brought into the light; and by their acts they summoned the crown-lost leaders of the various Levite groups, telling them that J. had revealed the real secret of his supernatural strength.

Eagerly the crown-lost (Levite) leaders, including R.H. Hirsh, B.M. Kittinger, E.D. Mellow, as well as others in the Levite groups, set forth the pertinent activities prepared

to give the Epiphany crown-losers the promised powers on making the real betrayal. As each of the ten small Little Flock movements of the little Reformation was given a sectarian bent in that respect J. was made a captive of the little sectarians, even as in the large picture this was done to the large Philadelphia star-members and their special helpers, as each two's Little Flock movement was perverted into a large sect (v. 18). The Epiphany crown-losers by their course threw J. off guard, and called for the class who applied to him the teaching that we are not to stumble the weak, in such a way as called upon him to relax the strictness toward revolutionisms that he should have applied; and when he had complied, the Epiphany crown-losers began to oppose him; and he retained not the strength that had been his in opposing their attacks along pertinent lines, but not on teaching and arrangement lines (v. 19). These Epiphany crown-losers again told him that the sectarian crown-losers in the various movements were pouncing upon him; and he was aroused out of his inattention, and acted as though he would treat this attack as the former ones, unaware that the Lord was not supporting him therein (v. 20). But these Epiphany crown-losers deceived him on the situation, and made him a slave under restraint to prepare teachings, etc., for the sectarians, furthering them in sectarianism.

This was in a mild manner reenacted ten times, once after each small Little Flock movement that he started was perverted into a sect-like movement. This began about July 10, 1919, and lasted until May 29, 1920, corresponding to 1846, the year of the cleansed Sanctuary (v. 21). But during the period of the little cleansed Sanctuary, May 29, 1920–June 26, 1920, J. recovered himself from this lapse into too great leniency with weak but to him unknown crown-losers, and thus recovered from his measurable unfaithfulness in not dealing strictly with these (v. 22). At this time the crown-lost leaders of the Levite groups set themselves to work in what was the actual interests of a

counterfeit view of Jesus, a blending of the Divine energy and human compromise, hence in a service of Azazel; and they gloated over what they thought was a fact, that their counterfeit of Jesus had delivered J. into their power (v. 23). Their followers joined them in such gloating over J.'s being delivered into their power, whom they considered their enemy, the enemy of their teaching and spirit and their refuter (v. 24).

In their rejoicing they desired to bring J. forward, to gloat over and to make him appear ridiculous as between the organized Merarites and Gershonites (v. 25). J. asked R.G. Jolly, who was given J. as a helper by the sectarians, to help him recognize these two principal supports of Levitism, to obtain some easing of his standing position (v. 26). The temple of Levitism was full of sectarian Levites, strong and weak, as well as their main leaders; and in special prominence there were great multitudes of these that noted J.'s being ridiculed (v. 27). Beginning June 26, 1920, the beginning of the little Parousia, and continuing until Aug. 27, 1920, J. prayed that the Lord might strengthen him that one time, to vindicate him for the deceptions that he had undergone at the hands of the sectarian crown-losers (v. 28). All of those 61 days that he prayed he laid hold on the Merarites and Gershonites as the supports of Levitism, his chief power being exercised against the Merarites in the Society and Standfasts through the July, Aug., Sept. and Oct. Truths, and his subordinate power being exercised against the Gershonites in the P.B.I. and the B.S.C. in the July and Aug. Truths, with the Kohathites coming in for part of his activity in the Sept. Truth. J., praying that the Lord would end the pertinent phase of his work for the small Miniature with the refutation of little Babylon, exerted all his strength against the current Levitism and utterly refuted it and its leaders and all their followers. And this did more havoc among them through the pertinent articles of the July-Oct. Truths than he had wrought against them in all his previous work,

beginning with his British work (v. 30). His cooperating and sympathizing brethren and all who really held in truth with the abler brethren rallied to him and respected the memory of his work as wrought toward the Merarites and the Gershonites. His leadership was not one covering the entire small Miniature, Bro. Russell having had the leadership until Oct. 30, 1916, corresponding to 539 in the Gospel Age (v. 31).

The preceding is the antitype, in the small Miniature, of Samson, which shows him as working the complete refutation of Levitism in the end of the small Miniature. And while the medium Miniature as a whole is not yet due to be explained, it would not be out of place here briefly to expound J.'s part as its Samson in its last feature. Here again R.G. Jolly is typed by the little Philistine boy and as such was given as a helper to J. in so far as his being deceived required one to help him find his way about. Here the Philistines represent the sectarian Levites; the temple, Levitism as a religious body; the Philistines mocking Samson, the Levites reviling and slandering J.; the two pillars, the increased Merarites and Gershonites; Samson's right hand exerted against one pillar, J.'s main strength applied against the Merarites and Samson's left hand applied against the other pillar, J.'s subordinate strength applied against the Gershonites; Samson's prayer, J.'s prayer for strength to vindicate his mission especially in view of his deception; Samson's bending himself with all his might, overthrowing the pillars, pulling down the temple, working havoc upon his enemies, and ending his career, J.'s bending all his strength of heart and mind in and to the writing of this book to overthrow the revolutionism of the Society and P.B.I., as the pillars of Levitism, completing refuting the sectarians of the medium Miniature and ending the first of the two phases of his Epiphany work, *i.e.*, this side of the vail supervising the work of leading Azazel's Goat to the Gate, delivering it to the fit man and abandoning it in its last parts to Azazel. Thereafter the Lord's people of all groups will rally to J.,

and will hold in honor his memory, and the work that he has done as the medium Miniature's Samson.

Samson is the last judge described in the book of Judges. But apart from judges there is an account of two episodes appended to the book yet to be set forth. This chapter has already grown so large that we will give only their small antitypes, reserving their large antitypes for treatment, *D. v.*, in some future issues of *The Present Truth*. The small antitype of both episodes centers in the Fort Pitt Committee. It is given in such detail, because the history of that committee is very closely related to, and connected with the rise of the Shimite Gershonites as the P.B.I. J. held a prominent place among the Truth leaders, and stood for the observance of the Lord's teachings and arrangements (*Judg. 17: 1*). He declared in 1917 to his enlightened and supporting brethren of the Church (who had had in Bro. Russell a Divinely authorized teacher and executive, and who by his death had lost such a teacher and executive, as to which the brethren had vowed [not cursed] and spoken in J.'s hearing) that he had received (the Hebrew word here means *receive*, not *take*) the office of being such a teacher and executive. On hearing this the enlightened and supporting brethren of the Church prayed God's blessing upon him (*v. 2*). But under the pressure of opposition from "the Opposition" J. disclaimed such office powers during the Fall of 1917, in favor of his enlightened and supporting brethren in the Church.

They declared that they had yielded J. powers for the Lord to advocate making a committee and pertinent officers, and declared that they would again yield it to him, (*v. 3*). Despite this, J. surrendered these office powers to his enlightened and supporting brethren in the Church, who devoted a part of these powers in the Fort Pitt Convention, Jan. 6, 1918, to the Convention to form the Fort Pitt Committee, and who through that committee organized its officers; and these were in the sphere of J.'s work (*v. 4*). Under the misimpression that Bro. Russell's having formed

the W.T.B.&T. Society proved that corporations could be used to manage the priestly general work, and not until two months later coming to see that by Divine intention corporations were intended to manage the general work of Gershonite and Merarite Levites, J. at the Fort Pitt Convention advocated the formation of a corporation having the Society's Charter as its basic law, and having the name, I.B.S.A. The Convention, not willing to take this step, appointed the Fort Pitt Committee, to which J. agreed. It was not until after the Asbury Park Convention, July 26-29, 1918, that a review of the history of the Fort Pitt Committee, in the light of Judg. 17: 18, convinced J. that committees likewise were not Divinely sanctioned to manage the general work of the Priesthood, and were, like corporations, typed by wagons given the Levites. It was about March 1, 1918, that J. came to see that the wagons given to the Levites typed corporations controlling the work of the antitypical Levites. The Lord's not making clear to our Pastor the place of corporations in relation to His work, and he and the rest of the brethren assuming that after his death the Society as a corporation was to control the priestly work, allowed the mistaken thought to prevail among the brethren immediately after his death that corporations could by Divine sanction control the priestly work. Hence J.'s temporary error on this subject and on that of committees' controlling such work.

Connected with J.'s work were the individual members of the Fort Pitt Committee and pilgrims, as mighty, ones among the brethren; and J. presented motions that the committee establish a magazine and a pilgrim service, on which subjects he had prepared a paper, revised by other members of the committee, calling on "the Opposition" to support the magazine and its editors, the magazine receiving the name, *The Bible Standard And Herald Of Christ's Kingdom*; and J. also presented a motion that R.H. Hirsh be elected managing editor, which motion passed (v. 5). This was at a time when among "the Opposition" there was

no one controller of the work, and each one did as he thought was good (v. 6). I.F. Hoskins had been occupying himself in certain Biblical matters in the Fall of 1917, as a sojourner therein (v. 7), which he gave up, seeking some other occupation among the Truth leaders, and as such came into closer touch with J.'s work, as he was seeking that other occupation (v. 8). On J.'s learning of his qualifications and purposes (v. 9), he suggested him as secretary of the Fort Pitt Committee, and that he be given full powers as such, which he accepted (v. 10), and was pleased with his office; and J. treated him as a beloved supporter (v. 11). Later on J. presented a motion to put him on a stated salary, which was given him, and he was thereby set aside to do religious work exclusively for the committee connected with J.'s work (v. 12). J. felt sure the Lord would be pleased with and bless the work through I.F. Hoskins, fully devoted to the work (v. 13). So matters stood in June, 1918.

At that time there was no brother who controlled the Lord's work among "the Opposition." And at this time quite a few of the dissatisfied Societyites and ambitious Oppositionists desired stable conditions and settled work, both among themselves and toward the public, for as yet neither of these conditions had fallen to their lot, which they thought they could secure through forming a corporation for these purposes (Judg. 18: 1). They, therefore, encouraged five able brothers: F.H. McGee, L.L. Margeson, J.D. Wright, H.C. Rockwell and R.E. Streeter, to explore the situation and report on the feasibility of forming a corporation to secure these two purposes. These were brothers formerly with the Society and now leaders of "the Opposition"; and as such they came to J.'s sphere of work among the leading brethren and remained there in thought (v. 2). Having been intimate with I.F. Hoskins before he took the position that required him to devote all his time to the committee's work, which from the Divine standpoint was J.'s special work, and being not in full sympathy with it,

they began to inquire as to who secured his appointment, as to what his work was, and as to what advantages came to him thereby (v. 3). His acts replied what J. was doing to him and how he served as to him (v. 4). Then they asked I.F. Hoskins to use his office to ask the Lord whether their twofold purposes would be prospered through the formation of a corporation (v. 5). He gave answer that they should go on with their designs, which, he said, were in God's service (v. 6).

Thereupon they went about their design to explore those members of "the Opposition" who, strong in their opposition to the Society, yet as more or less timeservers, were careless and satisfied to let things run as they might, without requiring them to be made conformable to the principles of truth and righteousness among "the Opposition" leaders. There were none who had as leaders the courage to rebuke them for their remissness, though they kept themselves far away from the little nominal-church traffickers in the Society, and, in fact, did nothing in the Lord's work (v. 7). Observing these, the above-mentioned five brothers were ready to report on the conditions of these careless ones to those who, desiring more stable conditions and settled work, had sent them out from among dissatisfied Societyites and ambitious Oppositionists to spy out the conditions among "the Opposition." These then requested them to make their report (v. 8), which was one of encouraging their senders to take advantage of the careless ones, whose condition was favorable for their purposes. Not finding a ready response, they urged their senders to cease from their inactivity and slothfulness and possess themselves of these favorable conditions for more stable ways and steady work (v. 9). They dilated on the ease of overcoming the careless as to matters of corporational control in the Lord's work, and praised the favorable conditions, which they claimed God had provided for them, and in which everything needed for their purposes was at hand (v. 10). Thus encouraged, a goodly number of new creatures, the bulk of whom were crown-losers, consisting

of dissatisfied Societyites and of ambitious Oppositionists, armed with arguments supposed to overcome opposition to corporations' controlling priestly work, which later H.C. Rockwell elaborated in an article in the August, 1918, Committee Bulletin and which J. refuted in detail in EG 146-182 (v. 11), set out to realize proposals of the above-mentioned five brothers. They took and yet hold a stand against congregational church government which allows no central authority to control ecclesiastis (v. 12).

Next they came in thought to J.'s sphere of work, in the hope of overcoming his objections to forming a corporation to control priestly work or the general work of the ecclesiastis (v. 13). The above-mentioned five brothers called the attention of their supporters to, the fact that the existence of the Fort Pitt Committee, its officers, its magazine and its pilgrims in J.'s sphere of work afforded them an opportunity to consider plans as to what they should do with these four things (v. 14). First they worked on I.F. Hoskins in his relation to J.'s sphere of work (v. 15), while their supporters stood prepared for controversy without, but near this sphere of work (v. 16). The five endeavored by argument, especially from about the beginning of June to about the middle of July, 1918, to divert (*to take*, not *took*) the Fort Pitt Committee, its officers, its magazine and its pilgrims from J.'s sphere of work into their own control; all this time I.F. Hoskins was engaged with their panoplied supporters just outside J.'s sphere of work (v. 17). As the five at first sought to divert from J.'s sphere of work the committee and its officers, magazine and pilgrims, I.F. Hoskins objected (v. 18). They told him to cease objecting and become an associate of theirs; and they would accept him as devoted to their service, alleging that it would be better for him to give his whole service to a large body of the Lord's people than to be devoted wholly to J.'s sphere of service (v. 19). This gave his self-seeking and ambitious heart joy; and he, therefore, led the movement of diverting the committee, the magazine and the pilgrims to

the new organization [the officers of the Fort Pitt Committee having been changed, no mention of their diversion (molten image) is made in the actual diversion at the Asbury Park Convention (v. 20)]. Thereafter they left J. and his sphere of work, taking care to protect their weak supporters and other effects from the efforts of J. and his supporters to recover the Fort Pitt Committee and its magazines and pilgrims from them (v. 21).

These efforts were begun on July 28 and 29, at the Asbury Park Convention, by J.'s and his supporters' exposures of the committee's conditions, by J.'s debate with I.F. Hoskins on corporations' controlling the work of the priests and ecclesiast and by the business meeting that voted down the committee's proposals. It was continued by the publication of *Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed*, and was completed by the Philadelphia conventions of Sept. 8-10 and Dec. 20-22, called to discuss the Fort Pitt Committee and the involved course of the five and I.F. Hoskins (v. 22). These efforts moved the six and their supporters to turn on J. and blame him that he had something wrong with him in setting such things into operation against them, some of them intimating that he was insane (v. 23). J., whose course in forming the committee, nominating its officers and furthering a publication and a pilgrim service for Little Flock work, was Divinely disapproved, as setting up false gods, by his acts setting them forth as such, though up to that time he did not recognize them to be a symbolic wagon and its belongings to be idols, blamed the five and their supporters for stealing them and I.F. Hoskins from him, complaining that he was bereft of all that he had, and that they questioned his sanity (v. 24). By their Committee Bulletin, F.H. McGee's "Reply to Bro. J.'s Claims" and, "Letter of Importance" and by their pilgrim and letter campaign, they charged him to cease his protests, lest embittered ones among them would cut him and his supporters off (v. 25). Thereafter they, ignoring J., went about their own affairs and J., seeing that

they were too strong to be overcome in their plundering, gave up his pursuit of them to recover the Fort Pitt Committee, its magazine and its pilgrims and returned to his sphere of work (v. 26). They took away the Fort Pitt Committee, its magazine and its pilgrims, together with I.F. Hoskins, and by surprise took the careless part of "the Opposition" in their idleness and slothfulness, and by their errors on a corporation controlling the priestly work and ecclesiasties refuted these, subjecting and undoing them as a party (v. 27).

These found no deliverer, for they were far removed from the little nominal church and did not seek help from the Epiphany movement, because they desired an extreme independence; for they claimed that their condition was one that made them a sphere of such large liberality as made them in the Epiphany fellowship with anyone claiming justification and consecration, no matter how much of the Truth he might reject. In this spirit the six and their supporters developed a religious government having a corporation, the P.B.I., with its directors and officers, to control the so-called general Church and its work, establishing a semi-monthly magazine, *The Herald Of Christ's Kingdom*, appointing its editors, publishing tracts and books and instituting a pilgrim service, with old, and its own newly appointed pilgrims on its staff. And in this religious government they lived, moved and had their being (v. 28). They made this religious government a ruler on all matters pertaining to their adherents, even as they were fathered by the idea of clericalism, though their religious government was first that of the Fort Pitt Committee (v. 29). Yea, verily, they set up the P.B.I. corporation and made I.F. Hoskins their main religious leader, though originally he was a stranger to their theories and practices; but in his various character transformations he acted in this capacity, until the P.B.I. officially took the stand of so-called liberalism, *i.e.*, letting errors on the covenants and sin-offerings prevail among them, and thus going into symbolic captivity. All the time that the true priests

continued in their isolated condition, these leaders preserved J.'s erroneous theory of a committee's managing the Church's general work, though they added the further evil of perverting the committee theory into the corporation theory (v. 31).

The second episode appended to the book of Judges is recorded in Judg. 19; 20; 21, whose small antitype will now be presented. Like the preceding episode its antitype deals with J., the Fort Pitt Committee, its rage at the Asbury Park Convention and the consequent controversies, resulting in the complete refutation of the reorganized committee and the P.B.I.'s pertinent course, especially as to the course of their four former Fort Pitt Committee members, who, as in Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed, will for short be called the group. In the antitypical first episode, as the parallel of the Sardis star-members, who in ignorance of the real situation mistakenly furthered the church-state, its officials, its publications and its mouthpieces, J. in ignorance of its real situation mistakenly furthered the Fort Pitt Committee, its officers, its magazine, The Bible Standard And Herald Of Christ's Kingdom, and its pilgrims, the Lord using the involved experiences to show J., first, that corporations and, later, that committees are not to control the general work of the Church, though they are to be used in the general work of the Merarites and Gershonites. Thus, while the first episode impartially rebukes his pertinent mistaken course, though he was the Epiphany messenger, it more severely exposes the evils of the group as such and the P.B.I. editors as such. But, apart from J.'s giving way under pressure, exerted by the falsely informed vast majority of the Asbury Park conventioners' pertinent insistence, to the breaking up of the Fort Pitt Committee, J.'s course as typed in the second episode is not reflected against; but that of certain members of the group, its editorial and other supporters, in breaking up that committee, is censured by being typed in the vilest act recorded in the Old Testament, the rape of the Levite's concubine. In the

resultant controversy J.'s course received the Lord's approval and that of the P.B.I. God's severe disapproval and condign punishment. In this episode the Levite represents J., the concubine the Fort Pitt Committee as a whole, her father the group, Gibeah the group's main partisans, especially at the Asbury Park Convention, the Israelites those who stood for right in this affair, the Benjamites those who supported the group's main partisans, and the rape of the concubine representing the defiling and disrupting of the Fort Pitt Committee at the Asbury Park Convention. With these few generalities we will now take up the particulars as typed in these three chapters.

The setting of this antitype is at a time when no one brother had full influence and power among the Lord's people. It was thus in the first half of 1918 that, from the Divine standpoint, J., as occupying an influential place among God's people, took the Fort Pitt Committee, gathered out from among Bible Students, as a symbolic half-wife (Judg. 19: 1). But this committee became unfaithful to J. after a few weeks, and left him in mind, adhering to the group for several months (v. 2). J. sought in a kindly way to win it back to the carrying out of the mission of publishing a magazine, for which it was appointed at the Fort Pitt Convention, in which effort J. was assisted by R.H. Hirsh and R.G. Jolly, F.H. McGee giving more or less support therein, and the authorizations to establish a magazine and a pilgrim service. Responding to his effort, the committee for awhile reconciled the group and J., to the joy of the group (v. 3), which kept him in its sphere of delaying matters for months, they spending much time in discussing together on various problems and delaying the work of carrying out their instructions to start publishing the magazine (v. 4). J. sought to move the group to go ahead on this subject, but it procrastinated, alleging that the matter of fixing on headquarters must first be decided, over which discussions stretching over months were held, and during which the group asked J. to wait in

good cheer, until from uncertainty certainty as to action could be reached (vs. 5, 6); but when J. protested against this procrastination the group urged him to wait, to which he reluctantly consented (v. 7). New York finally being decided upon as headquarters for the work, as against Philadelphia, where J. was offered a fine house to be used as headquarters, J. again brought up the matter of proceeding to the work of publishing the magazine, but, on the arrest of the Society leaders, fear seized hold on the group; and they insisted that it was dangerous under the conditions to go ahead. Long discussions made more time-consuming delays set in, lasting from early in May until after the middle of June (v. 8).

Finally, weary of such procrastinations, in the absence of the worst procrastinator, I.I. Margeson, J. proposed, June 22, 1918 a series of motions, including the election of R.H. Hirsh as managing editor, with a fixed salary, to devote all his time to his duties as such, and the decision to go ahead with preparing, printing and circulating the first issue of the magazine. Again, the procrastinators, especially I.I. Margeson, set into operation dilatory operations, including the latter's holding up unduly the MSS. of the first issue (v. 9). But J. strongly refused to consent to further procrastination, at which R.H. Hirsh went ahead, putting the first issue of the magazine through the press. The group later blamed J. for the procrastination; but this Scripture disproves their point and blames it therefore. By this time they were at the point where the question arose as to applying for second-class rates at the P. O. for the magazine. The committee and the views on the magazine and pilgrim service now ready for operation were in unison with J. (v. 10). As the time for publishing the magazine was approaching R.H. Hirsh and R.G. Jolly, particularly the former, suggested to J. that the authorization of second-class postal rates for the magazine be asked for as a continued privilege (v. 11). J., mindful that R.H. Hirsh was still under arrest with the

Society leaders, advised delay on this point, until he could be released from arrest, on which J. advised him to appear before the authorities at Washington, and, presenting proof that he was no longer on the Watch Tower editorial committee when the offending article appeared, to seek to secure the quashing of his indictment. Thereafter he could apply for the pertinent authorization; hence J. counseled to take the paper without authorization of second-class rates to the Fort Pitt Committee or to the Asbury Park Convention for issuing (vs. 12, 13). The *wrangling* in the last Fort Pitt Committee meeting, July 18, on forming a corporation prevented any other matters coming up; hence the circulation of The Bible Standard was postponed until the convention (v. 14). The whispering campaign conducted by I.F. Hoskins, I.I. Margeson, H.C. Rockwell and R.E. Streeter had so permeated the bulk of the conventioners that, apart from F.H. McGee, the group and their partisans gave J., his two supporters and the Fort Pitt Committee as such the cold shoulder, despite their prominence there (v. 15).

The only exception to this unkind treatment and aloofness among the group as a leader was F.H. McGee, who, in harmony with the committee's [unrescinded] decision of June 22, in a sympathetic and helpful way greeted and joined R.H. Hirsh, R.G. Jolly and J. in distributing The Bible Standard's first and only edition, after the conventioners' night session, July 26 (vs. 16, 17): on being informed by J. that the three were engaged in carrying out the Fort Pitt Convention's instructions to forward the magazine, but were not kindly regarded therefore (v. 18). J. assured him that their pertinent views were fully provided with sufficient power by that convention, as were also he and his helpers by the committee's involved resolution for the work on hand (v. 19). Thereupon F.H. McGee gave them a friendly response, agreed to vindicate their course, and urged them not to remain in unprotected publicity (v. 20). Thus he welcomed them and their purpose; and together they participated in the

work of distributing and commanding The Bible Standard, which they did with clean conduct the night of July 26, at the Asbury Park Convention (v. 21). At this authorized deed, in which the four had joyous fellowship, I.F. Hoskins, I.I. Margeson and H.C. Rockwell were beside themselves with rage, severely denouncing the four brothers, especially J., that night, as though they had done an unauthorized and evil thing, while their pertinent course was contrary to the instructions of the Fort Pitt Convention and motion of its committee. They demanded of F.H. McGee that he deliver up J. to their defiling him with what were slanderous misrepresentations (v. 22). He remonstrated with them against so gross a wrong, even offering to yield to them his power as a committee member and the whole committee for their defiling these, but required of them that they abstain from slandering J. (vs. 23, 24). Especially did F.H. McGee so remonstrate after H.C. Rockwell attacked J. without mentioning his name, though his meaning was clearly understood by the conventioners, in his sermon at the July 27 morning session. After this denunciation F.H. McGee expressed sympathy with J. thereon.

These efforts to defile J. with their false slanders were continued at an I.F. Hoskins' specially called meeting of elders and deacons, to which practically the whole convention came. So greatly aroused was this assembly, most of whose attendants had been made the objects of the group's whispering campaign against J. and the Fort Pitt Committee as made useless by J., that cries on all sides were raised to dissolve the committee as useless and effectless. Never before at a convention of Truth people was such misconduct manifested as was that manifested by I.F. Hoskins and his partisan supporters; for it was he who started at that meeting the denunciation of J. and the committee and by the worked-up partisanship of his supporters his denunciations were taken up, repeated and amplified. An incessant demand was made for the dissolution of the committee. It was objected that the Fort Pitt

Convention having appointed the committee, it alone could dissolve it. Thereupon the demand was made that the members of the Fort Pitt Committee present vote to dissolve it, and J. was the last one of them to consent thereto. Many a falsehood was told to justify the dissolution, *e.g.*, Dr. Robbins, of Hampton, Va., who was not at the Fort Pitt Convention meeting that appointed the committee, told the meeting that all remembered that the convention appointed the committee until the next convention, when it was to be replaced by another committee, no such thing having been even hinted at, let alone decided upon there. The poor committee was abused, defiled, slandered, until it was worn out and shortly ceased to be. To this day J. regrets that, though unwilling, he yielded to the pressure to surrender that committee to the symbolic rapists; for that is exactly what I.F. Hoskins, I.I. Margeson, H.C. Rockwell and their partisans on that occasion were. And God's view of their conduct can be seen from His typing it by the vilest episode narrated in the entire Old Testament (vs. 25, 26)!

When J., the next morning, at the service at which he was scheduled to speak, proceeded to fulfill his word uttered July 18, when after the committee's last meeting I.I. Margeson said that the committee trouble would be brought up at the convention, to the effect that if it would be brought up there, he would make a full exposure of the evils of the group, the poor committee lay dead, its last effort having been to make an entrance to a place of refuge (v. 27). By his exposures that morning he sought to arouse it to life and its prescribed service, but no response came; therefore J. took upon his theory of the situation the memory of the committee's history and with that departed to his sphere of service (v. 28).

Awaking early Monday morning, July 29, the last day of the convention, J.'s thoughts turned, undoubtedly by the Lord's working, to Judg. 19, and he saw in general outline the rape of the Fort Pitt Committee pictured in the rape of the Levite's concubine. This aroused his opposition to the

group and its supporters to a still higher degree; and, accordingly, he led the opposition to the group's program offered at the convention's business meeting that morning; and every one of its recommendations was voted down, and that almost unanimously. Leaving the convention, he determined to write up the only thing left of the Fort Pitt Committee, the memory of what it had been and experienced, *i.e.*, its history; and he did this in *Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed*, under twelve heads exposing the evils of the group, and sent this paper broadcast among the brethren (v. 29). Under each of these twelve heads many particulars of wrong-doings on the part of the group, 150 in all, placed in a deadly parallel over against 150 wrong-doings of Rutherfordism, were set forth; and wherever that paper went it produced a profound revulsion among wide-awake and non-partisan brethren who believed in standing for truth and righteousness against the gross wrongs of the group, particularly of I.F. Hoskins and I.I. Margeson. Such wide-awake and non-partisan brethren declared that the evil deeds, especially of these two, were the guiltiest ever heard of among the Lord's people since their coming out of the present evil world into the Truth and its Spirit.

They called on all to study these things, to come to a decision thereon, and then to express their minds thereon as to what should be done about it (v. 30). All of the wide-awake and non-partisan brethren assembled in spirit in the condition of watching and prayer (*Judg. 20: 1*). These were the bulk of God's people among "the Opposition," leaders and led, armed with Scripture, reason and facts, some of them gathering in the Mizpeh Convention at Philadelphia, Sept. 8-10 (v. 2), news of which and of the general assembling in spirit reached the P.B.I. partisans, and all asking for details on this subject (v. 3). In the convention's investigative meetings, in private conferences and by mail J. answered these requests, giving the general outlines of the group's and their partisans' attempt to cut J. off, their raping the Fort Pitt Committee unto dissolution, his preparing and circulating

Another Harvest Siftings Reviewed, in which, divided into twelve parts, the evils done in, as to and to that committee were set forth, charged the group, especially the two above-mentioned members of it and their partisan supporters, with committing wickedness and folly among the Lord's people, and asked all the wide-awake and non-partisan people of the Lord as such to discuss and to give pertinent counsel (v s. 4-7).

Such brethren everywhere determined not to let this matter go by default, but to follow it up unto a complete putting away of the evil done by the group and their partisans, especially at the Asbury Park Convention, arranging for some of the brethren out of the smaller and larger ecclesias and out of the general Church to give supplies of argument to the rest to use against the wrong-doers (vs. 8-10). And in this spirit they were united against the group and their partisans, particularly as to Asbury Park Convention matters (v. 11). These brethren sent out messages to all the P.B.I. supporters, asking for an accounting of the things done among them and to deliver up to discharge from office the group, the new P.B.I. Committee and its editorial committee and to set aside its partisan supporters. But these refused to comply (vs. 12, 13). On the contrary, they gathered themselves together to support their evil leaders, especially as to what was done at the Asbury Park Convention (v. 14). At the outstart of the conflict there were decidedly more among "the Opposition" against than for the P.B.I. leaders and partisans as to the Asbury Park doings, the ablest argument warriors among whom were, of course, their two new committees and their pilgrim and elder partisans (vs. 15-17). The wide-awake and non-partisan brethren sought counsel of the Lord, especially at the Mizpeh Convention, particularly as to who should lead in the attack; and the principles of the Word indicated the leaders as an investigative and curative committee, which should place itself at the disposal of any ecclesia that would invite them to investigate evil conditions in its midst and to suggest curative

counsel (v.18). To secure representatives from each side and from neutrals, one from each of these three groups was selected, with alternates, in case any of the three could or would not serve. The election of this committee was the start of the campaign against the course of the group and their partisans, including their effort to form a corporation (vs. 19, 20).

The P.B.I. responded, by its representative, F.H. McGee, declining to serve on the committee, by its influencing the neutrals, in both the first nominee and his alternate, to ignore the matter altogether, by a literary, pilgrim and correspondence campaign, grossly misrepresenting J.'s course, whitewashing the group's evils, terrorizing minorities in ecclesiastas who disapproved of the P.B.I., and grossly misrepresenting the purposes of the investigative and curative committee, as an inquisition, and by false teachings as to corporations in the Lord's work. This resulted in their winning away from the wide-awake and non-partisan group large numbers (v. 21). Noting the course of this struggle, though not yet having a magazine through which to wage the battle, J. renewed the matter of arousing the wide-awake and non-partisans to battle, and in this R.H. Hirsh and R.G. Jolly loyally joined, and thus aroused the pertinent brethren to encourage one another to renew the attack, and that along the same lines as before (v. 22), first in sorrowful prayer and then in asking counsel of the Lord's Word, which again encouraged them to renew the conflict (v. 23), which resulted, as in the former phase of the fight, in the P.B.I.'s winning over to their side some more, but not so many as in the former struggle. It was during this stage of the conflict that the P.B.I. held its Providence Convention, Nov. 8-10, 1918, and persuaded it to sanction its committee to organize the P.B.I. as a corporation, which was done (vs. 24, 25). The second repulse sent the wide-awake and non-partisan brethren to earnest self-examination, prayer, self-denial and sacrifice; and in this attitude they earnestly sought the Lord's will in connection with the Truth as due (v. 26), which our

Lord as the Giver of strong Truth utterances was giving; and the response was that victory would come, and that through a new publication, *The Present Truth*, in which the Biblical phases of the points at issue should be thoroughly set forth, and that a call should be issued for a convention at Philadelphia to seek a reconciliation on the matters of dispute, after both sides had presented their case. An inaccurate report coming from the Providence Convention, of whose inaccuracy J. did not learn until after the first issue of *The Present Truth* appeared, gave rise to the hope of a reconciliation and occasioned the decision to publish what proved to be the first issue of *The Present Truth* (vs. 27, 28).

The doctrinal parts of the first issue of *The Present Truth*, Dec. 9, 1918, with their implication for both sides, proved to "set liars in wait round about Gibeah" (v. 29). Accordingly, the third phase of the battle developed (v. 30). While in discussing matters connected with the conventions there seemed to be a leaving of the former position of J. and his supporters, through which a few of the latter were "wounded" on the positive and negative features of the conflict (v. 31), and the P.B.I. supporters thought that they would again win the victory, the seeming withdrawal was to draw them away from their position (v. 32), so that the doctrinal parts of the paper might destroy their entire position. Hence on the surface the main strategy of the fight seemed to be on the question of the P.B.I. leaders as crown-lost leaders in relation to attending the Hebron (*friendship*) Convention, Dec. 20-22, on which feature the bulk of the wide-awake and non-partisan brethren were fighting; but in reality the main and deciding feature of the conflict was in the presentation of the doctrinal features of the first number of that magazine (v. 33). This phase of the fight worked very sorely against the P.B.I. position before, at and after the Asbury Park Convention in relation to it (v. 34). And in the twofold phase of the battle on its doctrinal lines, the first carried on in No. 1 and the second in No. 2 of *The Present Truth*, an utter overthrow of the P.B.I. position was effected (v. 35).

The strategy unfolded in the first issue was, when too late, recognized by the P.B.I. as defeating them; for the side standing for truth and righteousness by seeming to flee from their position, in arranging for the kind of a convention that the Hebron Convention was announced to be, gave the doctrinal features the opportunity to effect their devastating work on antitypical Gibeah (vs. 36, 37). The understanding between the two parts of the antitypical attackers was that when the destructive effect of the doctrinal features of the battle would be noted (v. 38), the convention fighter section, which before had retreated and let the P.B.I. seem to be victorious in wounding some of their opponents (v. 39) would, when the P.B.I. saw the evidence of the destruction of their whole doctrinal standpoint (v. 40), turn in attack upon the P.B.I. The latter were nonplussed on the question of taking part as fighters; for they saw that whether they attended or not, they would be smitten (v. 41); hence they were nonplussed into inactivity.

Therefore they gave up the entire fight in a most ignominious rout, by ignoring the convention altogether, and by promising to write a letter to the Philadelphia Ecclesia, a letter full of hypocrisy, which was published with the reply of the Church in Present Truth, No. 3, In all their ecclesiastas defeat met them on their stand (v. 42). The supporters of truth and righteousness surrounded them on every side, chasing them from one position after another, easily crushing them and driving them away from their entire position (v. 43). Thus the doctrinal and convention phase of the fight won away from the P.B.I. position quite a number (v. 44). The rest fled for refuge to their human corporation, which Christ's merit allows Gershonite as well as Merarite Levites to have. But No. 2 attacked them here on two phases, as to their corrupting the organization of the Church and as to a corporation controlling priestly work, and in both phases convinced many of their supporters of the error of their way (v. 45). Thus, apart from the P.B.I. board and editors and grossly partisan supporters, the faith

of all their former sympathizers was shaken in them as to the group's and their partisans' course before, during and after the Asbury Park Convention (v. 46). But the P.B.I. board, editors and rank partisans fled for refuge for a while to the P.B.I. as a corporation, which after this defeat they formed (v. 47). After this the lovers of truth and righteousness turned on the P.B.I. individuals and refuted with Biblical, reasonable and factual points their defiled New Creatures and humanity and thus also refuted their ecclesiastas (v. 48). The subsequent battles waged in Nos. 3, 4, 5 are the ones typed in v. 48, and the result was certainly an overwhelming defeat of the P.B.I. everywhere, *i.e.*, in its board, editors, partisans, ecclesiastas and individuals.

Now the antitype turns back from the events typed in v. 48 to events setting in immediately after the Hebron Convention, Dec. 20-22. At the time of the Mizpeh Convention, Sept. 8-10, the wide-awake and non-partisan brethren had there and elsewhere vowed to withdraw priestly fellowship and encouragement from anyone who supported the P.B.I. partisanly (Judg. 21: 1); but when the overthrow of them through Nos. 1, 2 had occurred, pity and sorrow for them filled the brethren who now stood out separate from others as Epiphany-enlightened brethren, because of the resultant condition of the P.B.I. as destitute of real supporters apart from the antitypical 600 (the number 600, being a multiple of six, the number of evil and imperfection, and of ten, the number of natures lower than the Divine, characterizes the remnants of the P.B.I. as defiled Great Company members of especially bad qualities); and this distressed the Epiphany brethren, who poured out their distress thereover before the Lord (v. 3). Already in Dec., 1918, the Epiphany brethren were developed as one company of saints and sacrificed to the Lord in service (v. 4). In view of letting the P.B.I. attract needed supporters they asked as to who had not among them participated sympathetically in the anti-P.B.I. movement in the Mizpeh Convention, since

their decision at the time of that Convention, requiring such to be cut off from priestly fellowship, precluded their encouraging any of their own from supporting the P.B.I. (v. 5). In view of the resultant great depletion of real sympathetic P.B.I. adherents the Epiphany brethren somewhat altered their pertinent course (v. 6), inquiring what they should do to relieve the desperate P.B.I. situation in harmony with their solemn decision not to encourage their own to support or join the P.B.I. (v. 7).

Their inquiry as to who had not joined in the anti-P.B.I. movement at the time of the Mizpeh Convention received the answer that some in the Philadelphia and other Epiphany-minded ecclesias had not only not done so, but that under Levite-manifesting experiences had proved themselves to be partisans of the P.B.I., and as such had fought every effort of these ecclesias in their struggle with the P.B.I. (vs. 8, 9). Accordingly, the abler Epiphany brethren were by the rest encouraged to refute these and all their defiled supporters and cut them off from fellowship, which was done, especially in the Philadelphia, Jersey City and Newark ecclesias, besides in others (vs. 10, 11). Among these were some consecrated ones who had not defiled themselves; and these were in the accompanying controversies allowed to be led into joining the P.B.I. siftlings, without the Epiphany friends attempting to interfere; rather they announced that any of these who were disposed to go to the P.B.I. with the disfellowshipped ones, of whom were 8 or 10 in the Philadelphia Church, might follow their free will in the matter without hindrance from the Epiphany brethren, who peacefully announced this in *The Present Truth*, No. 2 to the P.B.I. This resulted, by P.B.I. partisanship, in several members of the Philadelphia Church, who while not before being partisanly for the P.B.I. took no part against them, so doing, the same occurring in a number of other churches, and all this because the Epiphany brethren out of pity for the diminished P.B.I. hoped that they would increase as a Levite group (vs. 12-15).

But these did not suffice to give the P.B.I. sufficient support; so the leading brethren wondered how further to relieve the situation (v. 16); for they recognized that the Lord desired this group of Levites to survive as a separate movement of the Truth people (v. 17), and yet they had to keep their solemn decision to cut these off from priestly fellowship (v. 18). They recalled that there was left the privilege to each of the Lord's people to choose their course in the Christian life according to their proper or improper understanding, and that this right was exercised regularly among the so-called independent brethren (v. 19). Therefore, again in No. 2, the Epiphany leaders encouraged the P.B.I. to seek among such increases to give them adequate support as various of such could be proselyted to the P.B.I. (v. 21), assuring the latter that they would pacify such independent brethren who should complain at such proselyting, on the ground that they had not given such to the P.B.I., and thus had not violated their solemn decision (v. 22). The P.B.I., accordingly, to recoup their depleted supporters, did this proselyting work and energetically set to work to repair the ruins of their former adhering ecclesias and occupied them (v. 23). This period was one in which each one gravitated toward his place, some in the Little Flock, some into various divisions of the Great Company and some Youthful Worthies to the Little Flock and others of them to their congenial groups among the Levites (v. 24). This was at a time when no one brother was recognized by all the brethren as leader; hence each did as he pleased (v. 25).

Thus we have finished our study of Judges and we find that in the large antitype the star-members, despite little slips here and there, did the things acceptable to God, as His eye, hand and mouth, and that in the small antitype the same is true of J., while, on the other hand, the foes of the star-members in both pictures are shown to have served Satan, not God, and to have been disapproved of, and rejected by God. These facts ought to enable all Truth people how properly to appraise the actors in the antitypes.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### JOB—TYPE AND ANTITYPE.

PROLOGUE. JOB'S TWELVE SPEECHES. ELIPHAZ'S THREE SPEECHES. BILDAD'S THREE SPEECHES. ZOPHAR'S TWO SPEECHES. ELIHU'S SPEECH. JEHOVAH'S THREE SPEECHES. EPILOGUE.

AS A RULE the books that type J.'s work do so from the standpoint of the small or smallest antitypes. To this rule there are several exceptions, one of which is the book of Esther, of which there is but one antitypical fulfillment. Another exception to this rule is the book of Job (*greatly injured, greatly hated* or *greatly persecuted*), which also has but one antitypical fulfillment. From the literary standpoint the book is mainly a dramatic poem, whose poetic parts are preceded by a prose prologue and followed by a prose epilogue, and is rightly considered, yea, even by skeptics, *e.g.*, Gibbon, the skeptical, but very able historian, as the supreme literary product in existence. There are especially seven persons who take part in this drama: God, Satan, Job, Eliphaz, Bildad, Zophar and Elihu. In the narrative, *i.e.*, prose portions of the book, others are referred to, like angels, the members of Job's families, his wife even making a short speech, his brothers, sisters and friends; but the above-mentioned seven are the main actors in the drama. In these poetic parts Job speaks more than the others, eleven times in all; Eliphaz and Bildad each make three speeches and Zophar makes two, Elihu one, though a lengthy, repetitious and apologetic one, and God two. In the prose parts God makes seven speeches, Satan four, and Job three. Thus in all 35 speeches are made in this book. Of the five human speakers only Job, a prophet (Jas. 5: 10, 11), speaks infallibly, as inspired in his utterances (Job 42: 7, 8). While the *record* of the speeches of the other four is inspired, the *contents* of their speeches are uninspired and, in not a few places, untruthful and erroneous. This is by God directly

affirmed of Job's three friends (42: 7, 8), and implied in the fact that God approved of Job's utterances, of many of which Elihu disapproved. All four repeatedly bring false accusations against Job, and are anxious, but unable to prove him a rebel and wrong-doer.

That Job, as well as the other prophets, is a type is evident from Jas. 5: 10, 11. The Greek word *hypodeigma*, here translated "example," usually means *types*, as is evident from four of its other five uses in the Greek New Testament (Heb. 4: 11; 8: 5; 9: 23; 2 Pet. 2: 6). In John 13: 15 it evidently has the senses of our English words, example and type. In Jas. 5: 10, 11 it has the sense of *types*, but collectively in the singular, for the prophets type, some certain ones, others all of God's people in their suffering wrongs and longsuffering. Heb. 12: 1, compared with Heb. 11: 32, proves that "the prophets" are typical. Hence when James in v. 11 cites Job as one of the prophets, as types, he implies that Job was a type. While our Pastor used Job as an illustration of unfallen, fallen and restored mankind, he did not use him as a type of such. That Job is a type of an officiating priest is evident from his offering to God the sacrifices of his three friends acceptably and praying acceptably to God for them (42: 8-10), which facts prove that he could not *type* the race and which facts also prove that no antitypes could be found for his three friends as reconciled to God by those about to get restitution.

We evidently have a propheticotypical allusion to Job in Ezek. 14: 12-20. In this section, to show the wickedness of the supporters of the symbolic earth, society, in the second evil world and the impossibility of their escaping one or more of the four great forms of evil—famine, pestilence, the sword (the World War and Revolution) and wild beasts (the anarchists—lawless, like wild beasts)—whereby it would be destroyed, God tells us that only Christ (Noah), Bro. Russell (Daniel) and another brother (Job), if they should be parts of this society, could be delivered therefrom, all its supporters being punished under one or more of the four

forms of wrath there mentioned. In contrast, God shows (vs. 21-23) that while the nominal church would be destroyed even more exemplarily than society, yet the Little Flock (sons) and the Great Company and Youthful Worthies (daughters) would gain deliverance therefrom. There is no doubt that the entire section (vs. 12-23) refers to the Parousia and Epiphany messages on the Time of Wrath and on what it will do to the symbolic heavens (the nominal church) and earth (society) and to their inhabitants. Hence Jesus is meant by Noah, the Parousia messenger by Daniel, as elsewhere shown, and J. by Job. It is certainly fitting that, as these three for the end of the Age are typed by Moses (Jesus) and Aaron (the two messengers, Ex. 19: 24), they should here be symbolized by Noah, Daniel and Job in the symbolic book of Ezekiel, just as they are variously represented in the symbolic book of Revelation. Again, as a proof of Job's typing J., it may be said that the facts as they will be set forth in this chapter as antitypes will be seen to correspond to the typical facts as set forth in the book of Job.

Most of the book of Job, *i.e.*, Job 3: 1-42: 6, except 32: 1-5, is written as poetry, but Job 1; 2; 32: 1-5; 42: 7-17 are written in prose. The prose parts of this book are narratives, first, of Job's state of prosperity, secondly, of his twofold form of affliction, one of which was the loss of his property, sons and most of his servants, and the other of which was his bodily affliction, and, thirdly, of the introduction to the speech of Elihu and, fourthly, of God's reproof of Job's three friends and his returning prosperity to Job in greater measure than was his former prosperity, God's and Satan's part in the second feature being set forth in connection therewith. In the antitype of the prose parts of the book there are set forth J.'s position, character and possessions as the Epiphany messenger officially functioning as such from Nov. 1, 1916 to Feb. 26, 1917 (1: 1-5), his loss of possessions, including seven of his special supporters, and his reaction thereto (1: 6-22), his being afflicted in his faults

and the reaction of his close supporters, himself and the three Levite groups to all his afflictions (2: 1-13), Jehovah's rebuke of, and charge to these Levite groups (42: 7-9) and, finally, Jehovah's increased favor to J. (42: 10-17). In the antitype of the poetic parts of the book there are set forth J.'s lamenting his ever having been given his office, before he came to see its real nature (3: 1-26); the Merarites' and Gershonites' faulting J. in connection with his defense of the Lord's arrangements, and J.'s replies to them (4-10); the Kohathites', the Merarites' and the Gershonites' faulting J. in connection with his teachings, and his replies to them (11-19); the Kohathites', Merarites' and Gershonites' faulting J. in connection with his refutations of their errors, and his replies to them (20-31) (it will be noted that these three antitypical features correspond to the first three attempts of the little antitypical Delilah and Philistines to capture the little antitypical Samson); the crown-losers' in the Epiphany movement, the good Levites', years-long unkind and largely untruthful and inappropriate criticisms of J., to which J. gave no formal answer, so far as this book is concerned, but his reaction thereto will come out in the next chapter, (32-37); and, finally, Jehovah's speeches and J.'s reaction thereto (38-42: 6). This, then, is the general setting of the antitypes.

In our explanation of the antitype of the poetic parts of Job we will not attempt an exposition of every word, phrase or even of every verse, for that would take much more space than the limits of a chapter could fairly demand. Rather, as a rule, longer or shorter summaries of their verses and occasionally of their paragraphs will be given, enough, we trust, to make the antitype clear; but in the prose parts of the book general details of the antitypes will be brought out. With these introductory remarks we will now begin the exposition of the antitypes. Job 1; 2 are properly called the drama's prologue; and Job 42: 7-17 may properly be called its epilogue. Let us remember a statement made above, that Job 1: 1-5 types J. officially functioning as the

Epiphany messenger from Nov. 1, 1916 to Feb. 26, 1917. Among those who were in places of power (*Uz, strength*) among God's people was J., who later became greatly injured, hated and persecuted (*Job, greatly injured, greatly hated or persecuted*). God here says of him that he was perfect in love and upright in justice, who in all things put God first and hated and avoided wrong of all kinds (*Job 1: 1*). Among God's people he had seven special supporters: J.F.R., H.J. Shearn, J. Hemery, Menta Sturgeon, A.I. Ritchie, I.F. Hoskins and R.H. Hirsh, and three special powers: those of a writer, speaker and executive (*v. 2*).

God put into his charge His people, who at that time were all regarded as of the Little Flock (7,000 sheep), the three corporations then existing: the W.T.B.&T.S., the P.P.A. and the I.B.S.A. (3,000 camels), their charters and their powers as to by-laws (500 yoke of oxen), the Truth literature (500 she asses) and very many Truth servants (a very great household), which resulted in his being the chief servant of God among His people (*v. 3*). Each one of his seven special helpers performed a special service among his other six brethren and each of them used in connection therewith J.'s powers as a writer, speaker and executive (*v. 4*). And as each one of these had performed his service J. promptly examined him and sought to purge him from pertinent faults, and in so doing performed for each one a service on which Jehovah manifested His acceptance; for J. feared that each one had by his acts spoken evil of the Lord's matters in his heart; hence he pursued this course with them continually as each one of them had finished his pertinent service; thus as to vs. 4, 5, J. began to fulfill this part of his service toward J.F.R. before sailing for Europe, Nov. 11, *i.e.*, on Nov. 3, when he cautioned him against seeking the place of the steward, and finished it in the case of R.H. Hirsh the night of July 11, 1920, at Jersey City. J., however, did not begin to know that he had any feature of such an office

as is typed in vs. 2, 3, until he had been functioning in this office slightly over three months; and even then, and for a long time afterward, he did not realize the true import and full scope of this office.

It was during these slightly more than three months that the scene of vs. 6-12 was enacted in antitype. We are not to understand, either in the type or antitype, that Satan entered God's presence in the sense of going to God's abode; for Satan has been forever cast out of that heaven, and has been ever since confined to the atmosphere about this earth as his present prison (Luke 10: 18; Eph. 2: 2; 2 Pet. 2: 4). Rather, the thought seems to be this, that as the good angels busied themselves in matters pertinent to God, so Satan presumed to busy himself in matters pertinent to God, which were at that time the matters especially connected with J.'s ministry in Britain (v. 6). Nor are we, in either type or antitype, to understand that there was vocal conversation between God and Satan, between whom there is no conversing whatever. Rather, God's attitude and works toward Job's and J.'s pertinent works suggested to Satan's mind the respective typical and antotypical thoughts embodied in God's words of vs. 7, 8, 12; and Satan's attitude and works toward Job and J. suggested to God the respective typical and antotypical thoughts embodied in Satan's words in vs. 7, 9-11. God's attitude and works toward J.'s British ministry, in view of Satan's seeking by the revolutionary British brethren to thwart it, was a demand upon Satan to tell Him from what activities he had come prior to his presuming to busy himself in the Lord's affairs. And Satan's manner indicated that he had come into busybodying in such matters from his general activities in human society (v. 7). Next Jehovah's attitude and works as to J.'s ministry suggested to Satan the thought that God was demanding of him as to whether he was giving special attention to J., whom God's attitude and works showed to be His chief servant on earth and the one among God's people most like God in character, reverently

serving God and avoiding evil (v. 8). Satan's attitude toward J. and his work questioned J.'s motives, charging that he was selfish in his service of God (v. 9), rendering it only because of God's giving him, his and his supporters special protection, prosperity and increase of possessions on all hands (v. 10). His attitude further told God that if God would by His power take from J. all that he had, J. would blaspheme God by teaching things derogatory to God in matters pertaining to Him (v. 11). Jehovah, knowing J.'s loyalty, to test and demonstrate it, by His attitude toward J.'s opposers in Britain and J.F.R.'s first disapproval of him while he was yet in Britain, gave Satan to understand that he could do anything that he wished with J.'s special possessions as to God's work, but refused him power to control entirely J.'s official powers. This ended the scene pictured in vs. 6-12 (v. 12).

Vs. 13-19 cover the period from Feb. 26, 1917, when J.F.R.'s "absolutely without authority" cable reached J. and when his cable recalling J. was sent from Los Angeles to London, to the night of July 11, 1920, when R.H. Hirsh at a meeting of the Jersey City Convention publicly denounced and renounced J. as an evildoer, in the presence of at least 50 brethren, including J. It was during this period that all seven of J.'s chief supporters were engaged in their pertinent selfish appropriations in relation to J.'s three powers as writer, speaker and executive, and that in the house of ambition which J.F.R., the principal one of the seven, had erected. Accordingly, all seven had unholy ambitions relating to J.'s three special powers (v. 13). The first feature of their power-grasping was in relation to J.'s Divinely-given powers as to the Society's charter, its by-law powers and its literature; for all seven of these main supporters of J. sinned from various standpoints against these: J.F.R. in seeking control over these and fighting everyone and everything opposing him therein, especially J.'s oppositions to his usurpations, A.I. Ritchie and I.F. Hoskins in voting him managerial and executive power as to these, R.H. Hirsh

and Menta Sturgeon in acquiescing with them therein, and H.J. Shearn and J. Hemery in their usurpations as to these in "the scheme" and otherwise. Thus in these and other ways, including J.F.R.'s ousting of the four directors and deceiving the shareholders on the resultant controversy on corporation control, these seven and their partisan supporters variously despoiled J. of his powers as to the three charters, their by-law possibilities and the Truth literature, and as antitypical Sabeans (*spoilers*) perverted all but a very few of J.'s pertinent supporters to their erroneous views. There remained only a handful of J.'s supporters who were not perverted on this phase of J.'s despoiling, and who announced it to him (vs. 14, 15).

Close on the heels of this announcement came another still more severe: that of the loss to J. of the bulk of the Truth people, including the bulk of the pilgrims and elders, which occurred through the disfellowshipment (fire from heaven, Rev. 13: 13) agitation, grossly advocated and practiced by the Societyites and more refinedly advocated and practiced by the other Levite groups. This agitation spread destructively among the Lord's people, even among their elders and pilgrims, until the bulk of them were lost to J., only a few of such remaining with him to announce this result to him (v. 16). Scarcely had this announcement come to J. when another small group came telling him that the antitypical Chaldeans (*encroachers*) in the three Levite groups—Merarites, Gershonites and Kohathites—in their pillaging controversies on the three corporations—W.T.B.&T.S., P.P.A. and I.B.S.A.—had despoiled J. of these, and by their respective errors had perverted from him to themselves severally his supporters as to these, except the few who announced this evil to him (v. 17). Finally, as this announcement was coming to an end, a still more painful one came to J., telling him of his being despoiled of his seven chief supporters, namely that his seven above-named special supporters, much loved by him as symbolic sons, while indulging their selfish ambitions in connection with

J.'s powers as writer, speaker and executive, in the house of J.F.R.'s ambitions, originating in the isolation of God's people, were, by revolutionism, as a symbolic whirlwind (Jer. 25: 32), lost to J., by the fall of that house, struck from every side by revolutionism. This news came from the few that still supported J. (vs. 18, 19).

Vs. 20-22 set forth the effect upon J. of these calamities that bereaved him as the Epiphany messenger of all his stewardship possessions and their appurtenances, except his powers as a Truth writer, speaker and executive, though greatly limiting his use of these three powers, nothing being said as to Job's three daughters' perishing in the wrecking of the house (vs. 18, 19). Nobody, except the Lord and J., knows what grief fell to his lot over the situation, especially over his bereavement of the symbolic sheep and sons. He has at various times experienced four major griefs; but this one overshadowed the other three by far. In fact, certain phases of it moved him to violence to his office and to shear himself of parts of his powers, even unto almost giving them up; but while in its deepest depths he submitted to God's providence (v. 20), declaring by his acts during these years that as a pilgrim developed under and by Bro. Russell's arrangements he had none of the possessions that he lost between 1917 and 1920, and that he would return to his pilgrim state with none of them; for he recognized that God had given and then taken away those possessions; and by word and acts he reflected credit upon God's character (v. 22). In his pertinent course J. did not violate proper principles, nor did he by erroneous teachings attribute an unwise course to God.

Another form of afflictive matters as to the Lord came into enactment, beginning about the middle of, and ending after the previous set of experiences were had. The first form treated above was connected mainly with service, the second mainly with character expressions. The good angels partook helpfully in providential ways in such matters of the Lord; and Satan presumed to exert activities in this sphere,

of course with fell purpose (2: 1). God's pertinent course—acts, not words—suggested to Satan's mind a demand as to what he had been doing; and Satan's pertinent course—acts, not words—suggested the answer that he was active in matters of human society (v. 2). God's pertinent course—acts, not words—asked Satan if he had not been studying J., and, as a result, if he had not been finding him to be as God had held and declared of him in Job 1: 8, despite the fact that God had given him up to Satan to afflict him with the harrowing experiences typed in Job 1: 13-19 (v. 3). Satan, by act, not by word, suggested that J. had not yet been afflicted enough unto bringing him to an abandonment of his faithfulness and to an impugning of God by erroneous teachings, that J. had piously submitted to the loss of his stewardship possessions and exercise of most of his powers merely to preserve himself (skin for skin), since self-preservation is the first law of nature (v. 4); and that if God would afflict him as to his teachings (bone) and character (flesh), by permitting others to make subtle attacks on them and revolutionisms against the Parousia teachings and arrangements, he would turn against and publicly blaspheme God by erroneous teaching (v. 5). By act, not by word, God gave Satan permission to war against J. with the subtlest errors and attacks on his faults; but by His providential acts supporting J., He circumscribed Satan within such limits as would not permit him to take away J.'s office as the Epiphany messenger, even though he was deprived of his office goods and limited in the use of its powers (v. 6).

Under such providential checks and limitations Satan busied himself in stirring up the Levite leaders to introduce many revolutionisms on matters of Truth teachings and arrangements and many official misdeeds, Satan having therein the specific purpose of working on J. to afflict him by playing on his lacks, and arousing his weaknesses and faults into activity. And there was not a weakness or fault or lack in him that Satan did not work

on and bring to the surface in word, manner and act, particularly in connection with his defense of the Truth and its arrangements against Levite revolutionisms. The hypocritical, the self-seeking, the power-grasping, the dishonest, the reputation-assassinating, the error-teaching and the arrangement-perverting course of the Levite leaders in the three Levite groups greatly horrified and later severely angered J., as he saw their evil course and the evil effects of their course upon the Truth and brethren; for at first he sought by loving and long-drawn-out remonstrances and persuasions to draw away these misleaders from their evil works and designs. Their wilfulness frustrating J.'s pertinent efforts, indignant at their stubbornness in wrong teaching and practice, and at the evil effects of these upon the brethren, J. ceased to exercise his accustomed mildness, and in word and act failed to be as longsuffering, forbearing and gracious in his proper opposition to them, and at times allowed too much anger and severity to mark his manner, speech and writing against them.

Moreover, he at times went too far in his efforts to vindicate himself and his office against the misleaders' false accusations along personal and official lines. These things made him at times too severe in manner and speech, while doing and teaching the things that God willed him to do and teach. These faults were surface, not heart faults, even as Job's boils were surface blemishes (v. 7). It will be noted that God approved of J.'s ministry and teachings against his three group antagonists—approving of his ministry against them by calling him His servant, and of his teachings against them by saying that he spoke aright of the Lord's matters, whereas they taught and practiced error thereon (42: 7, 8). J. sought to overcome these faults, lacks and weaknesses by using parts, hence not enough, of the Truth teachings against them, as he dwelt on the memory of his misfortunes (v. 8). The successive groups whose cause he espoused urged him to teach certain errors, e.g., the Society as the channel,

corporations having the right to control the priests' general work, a future first smiting of Jordan, etc., etc. At the same time these urged him to cease claiming and exercising his Divinely-given office, as they claimed it to be the cause of his troubles, all the while demanding of him, some by word and act, and some by act alone, why he should not give up what was actually his loyalty and his office powers (v. 9). By his attitude and speech he gave them to understand that he considered their affirmations to be of a piece in folly with those of the Romanist Church. And he demanded of them, if they dared to deny the proposition, that if we have received toward experiences from the Lord, we should be willing to receive from Him untoward ones. By so doing J. kept himself from teaching and practicing error (v. 10).

The first attitude of the three Levite groups toward J. in his calamities is described in vs. 11-13. It was one of brief sympathy, ere long to change into one of increasing opposition, false accusations, condemnations and disfellowshipment. Their sympathy was aroused at their hearing of his calamities, each group occupying a different point of view, but each one being moved with a mutual understanding with one another to sympathize with, and to comfort him: the Merarites (Eliphaz, *a mighty one in purity*, the Temanite, *right-hand one*, names indicative of the Merarites' self-estimate as a group), the Gershonites (Bildad, *contentious one*, the Shuhite, *depressed one*, in allusion to their actual condition as those who are strifeful and degraded in rank; for the Gershonites, as Levi's firstborn, should have been the chief group of the Levites, but were degraded to the lowest class of them) and the Kohathites (Zophar, *chirper*, the Naamathite, *a pleasant one*, in allusion to their temporarily chirping more or less agreeably to J. as against the others; v. 11). They stood aloof from J.'s viewpoint as they gave attention to his condition, not recognizing him, so altered was he from his former self, which caused them grief, violated their office

powers and characters and publicly exhibited signs of mourning. They put themselves in thought into his place, and were made speechless by the sight of him for a full period; for they saw that J. was in the depths of grief. So far we have studied the antitype of the prologue to the drama. Hereafter our comments will be much briefer, as short summaries of the contents usually of the separate verses and sometimes of paragraphs.

Crushed by his calamities, J. denouncingly wished that he had never been given the office of leading “the Opposition” to what proved to be the bad Levite leaders, their ledlings and their movements. This was especially, but not exclusively, the case as to the Merarites and Gershonites. He felt sorry that the arrangements had developed him unto his being sent to Britain; and by his acts of intense grief he spoke against that whole period of his development for what proved to be the work of the Epiphany messenger, though at the time of such renouncing grief he did not really understand exactly what his office was; yet as much as he understood of it he wished had never come into existence, or to have ended as it came into existence as such (Job 3: 1-19). During the earlier spasms of his grief J. wondered over the question as to why he should have come into such troubles, knowing that he had acted out right principles in the various experiences that brought him such loss (vs. 20-26).

In our study of the separate antitypical features of the book we are to remember that in the antitype, not the full end of acts and speeches comes before other acts and speeches set in; rather, while the successive beginnings follow one another in the time order given in the book, the ending of one antitypical feature does not set in before the next one’s beginning sets in. We can illustrate this by the workings of the seven volumes of the Studies as pictured by the plaguing of the seven vials: Vol. I did not cease to plague, and then after such cessation Vol. II start to plague, but the plaguing by Vol. I continued after that of Vol. II and each other’s plaguing set in and ends only as all the others

end their plaguing. So while the controversy over the Lord's arrangements was the first to begin, it continued throughout the other two controversial features: that over the truths that J. announced and that over the errors that the three Levite groups announced; as also the controversy over such truths continued after that over such errors began. It is necessary to keep this thought in mind, else confusion will prevail as to the antitypical facts. Another thought should be kept in mind: the details of these three controversial lines of thought are not the special things that are discussed typically in Job. Rather, the main features of the speeches are the Levitical faultfindings against J. for his stand on the Lord's arrangements and teachings and the others' errors and J.'s defending himself against such faultfindings, which in practically all cases were untrue and proceeded from the others' selfish ambitions and desires to slander and condemn J. Hence the points typically discussed in Job are mainly personalities arising in connection with the threefold controversial lines of thought above given. But the discussions on these personal attacks and personal defenses are connected with the threefold lines of controversy: the Lord's arrangements, the Lord's truths and the Levite errors. Let us repeat the necessity of keeping these two thoughts in mind in order to a clear understanding of the progress of the antitypical controversy and points of issue between J. and the three Levite groups. We will, when coming to Elihu's repetitious, long-winded and faultfinding speech, make some general remarks thereon which, we trust, will prove helpful to its proper appreciation.

In time the controversy on the Lord's arrangements was the first to begin, which was begun by the Merarites' faulting J.'s stand on the Lord's arrangements as given through Bro. Russell in his ordering of things in the London and Brooklyn Bethels and Tabernacles, by the way that the Lord through him had adjusted them before he died and by his charter and will, which came into operation after his death. It was J.'s insistence on such arrangements' being

observed, his setting aside those who would not observe them at the London Bethel, and his securing their non-election at the London Tabernacle that started the Merarites, first and primarily in J.F.R., and second and secondarily in his supporters, to embark on a course of criticizing and slandering J. The burden of their claims was this J. had done wrong in his stand as to the Society matters at London and Brooklyn; therefore God was punishing him; but if he would repent and right his (alleged) wrongs, God would again restore him to a prosperous condition. With this epitome of the antitype of Eliphaz's first speech, let us look at a few details. They began their faultfinding course, which they called, "Commune with thee," with the question as to whether it would grieve J., yet say they cannot be silent (4: 2). Then they faulted him as having sought to help others to bear up under trouble and allegedly fainting under it himself (vs. 3-5). Sarcastically they threw into his teeth his alleged confidence in his piety and integrity (v. 6), and preached him a sermon to the effect that, not the righteous, but the wicked are afflicted by God (vs. 7-9), and illustrated this by the course of the ravenous lion (vs. 10, 11). Then they stated that they had gotten a special truth under terrifying conditions (vs. 12-16), to the effect that God's justice is so much greater than man's that God distrusts His servants and charges His angels with folly (both of which statements are untrue). This was said with the false implication that J. was claiming to be more pure than God, and they alleged in proof of their position that all were as easy to crush as a moth (vs. 17-19), that all were soon undone, perished unnoticed, with their achievements plucked up and dead like fools, and that this applied to J. (vs. 20, 21).

Then they asserted that none of the consecrated would give him any heed ("Avoid them"; 5: 1). They falsely charged J. with wrath and envy, which they claimed destroyed him as a New Creature (v. 2). They claimed that they saw him, the foolish one, as making some progress,

but as the channel they suddenly spoke evil of him and his position in Harvest Siftings (v. 3), with the result that supporters of his came into danger, they were publicly overcome without anyone to save them (v. 4), all the fruitage of their labor was devoured by greedy ones, who took it amid trying conditions, and temple robbers devoured their possessions (v. 5). They assured J. that his troubles were not accidental, implying that he was being punished by God (v. 6) in a manner different from that of the Adamic curse (v. 7). Then they advised him to submit to God as allegedly working through the channel (v. 8), whose marvelous and numerous dealings they (falsely) alleged were prospering the channel (v. 9), that God who sent prosperity (v. 10) for the exaltation of the lowly and sad in safety (v. 11), who foiled the (alleged) schemers (allegedly) conspiring to destroy the Society (v. 12), and checkmated the plans of the (alleged) shrewd ones and power-graspers (v. 13). They said of J. and his supporters that they went into error, while they, the channelites, were enjoying the alleged advancing light of Vol. VII (v. 14). They claimed that God had rescued their allegedly humble from the Opposition's theory on Society arrangements and from their power (v. 15), resulting in their humble having hope and the opponents being silenced (v. 16).

Then they made effort, mainly by letters, to bring J. to repentance of his alleged evil-doings, as a happy end of the Lord's correcting and chastising him (v. 17), assuring him that his afflictions were upon him to bring him to amendment (v. 18), and that the Lord would be merciful to, and deliver him out of all his troubles, healing him from their effects (v. 19), delivering him from his supposed lack of Truth, which they thought they had in unmixed purity in Vol. VII, from the controversy in which he was engaged (v. 20), from the verbal lashings that fell to his lot in Harvest Siftings and in many letters and from the danger of the Second Death (v. 21), claiming that he then could disdain the Second Death, the lack of Truth and the civil

powers on the military question (v. 22), even suggesting that if he made the channel his refuge, it would make him secure with the great ones of earth and the civil powers as a conscientious objector (which events soon disproved for them, v. 23), alleging that he could then be sure of his position and be in it without sin (v. 24), promising him much fruitage among the brethren (v. 25), and that he would end his ministry with much wisdom and fruitfulness as due (v. 26). Then they told him that this was the true outcome of their studies on the subject, and asked him to take part of it as for his good (v. 27). As the brethren recall the Merarites' claims and teachings from 1917 to 1920, during the controversies involving the Lord's pertinent arrangements, they will recognize that their pertinent criticisms of, and exhortations to J. are very accurately described in Eliphaz's first speech..

J.'s reply to the Merarites' criticisms and exhortations connected with the controversy on the Lord's arrangements are typed in Job 6; 7, which, with God's help, we will now very briefly connect with the type as its antitype. J. felt that his grief and troubles should be properly appraised (6: 2); for they were very great and weighty. His great love for the Truth, its service and the brethren in view of the prevailing confusion made these silence and crush him (v. 3); since he recognized that all the steps of a child of God are ordered by Him, he knew that these griefs and troubles the Lord was pleased to bring upon him as symbolic arrows whose poison was eating him up; and terrors such as only God can make one feel were battling with him (v. 4). J. showed that if his circumstances were favorable, he would not speak or do the inappropriate things of his grief (v. 5). He asked whether his sense of appreciation should be exercised on unappreciable things (v. 6). He declared that the troubles that he had abhorred he had in sorrow now to accept (v. 7). He longed that God would answer his ardently desired petition (v. 8). Even at the cost of being crushed by God (A. R. V.), he longed for God to remove

His power from him and cut him off from his griefs and troubles (v. 9). Yet this would be his comfort, even in hardening pain, that he had not denied the Truth of God (v. 10). He feared that his strength would not hold out, and questioned whether the outcome should nerve him to continue energetic efforts in his work (v. 11); for he felt that he had the strength of neither a great nor firm one (v. 12). He despaired that he had in himself the strength and wisdom to help him out of his condition (v. 13, A. R. V.). He lamented that while *friends* should kindly support friends about to give up their fight of faith, even when they were about to give up their reverence of God (v. 14), yet his *brethren* had dealt deceitfully and disappointingly with him, even as dried-up streams disappoint travelers in the desert, who as a result turn away from the dried channel into the desert wastes and perish; for such is the experience of some members of the Arabian tribes whose hopes were disappointed on coming to such dried-up streams (vs. 15-20).

So far as helping J. was concerned, the Merarites might just as well have been non-existent; for they saw his troubles and feared to relieve him (v. 21). J. had asked nothing of them in the way of money, gifts, deliverance or ransom from his oppressors (vs. 22, 23). Accusing him of error, they were asked by him for enlightenment, he assuring them of the power of truth; but he told them that their reasoning hitherto had effected no refutation (vs. 24, 25). Further, he asked them whether they reckoned mere words to be refutation, and the speeches of a despairing one to be mere wind (v. 26). Then he charged them with overwhelming brethren bereaved of their teachers and with framing a legal pit, *i.e.*, J.F.R.'s *illegal* legal points, with which to entrap a friend such as J. had been to them (v. 27). He asked that they investigate his course, both in Britain and in America, and do so thoroughly, demanding of them whether they regarded him to be a liar (v. 28). He pleaded with them to reverse their course, and not let it become a wicked course,

and asked them to vindicate him as having done righteously in his course in Britain and America. This was done by his petition for a review of his British work by the Board and in his publication of *Harvest Siftings Reviewed* (v. 29). He asked whether his teachings and defense contained sin and error, and whether his appreciation of the Truth and its Spirit could not discern matters of truth and right (v. 30).

In Job 7 J. is represented as preferring to cease having his office to his suffering under such circumscribed conditions of its administration. He recognized that a servant of God had an appointed time to serve on earth, and recognized that his days were, like those of a natural servant, defined and limited (7: 1). As a wearied servant who earnestly longs for the shadows of night that end his toil, and as a paid servant who longs for his wages (v. 2), so J. had long periods of sorrow and nights in which he was weary (v. 3); for he suffered much from insomnia, induced by weariness, sorrow and testful conditions, during the period from 1917 to 1920, while normally he should have slept the night through (v. 4). He bewailed the fact that his powers were decayed with faults and covered with sad memories, that surface matters with him were in a poor condition (v. 5). Swiftly and hopelessly did his time pass (v. 6). This made him plead with God to be mindful of his transitoriness, declaring that happy days would no more be his because of the desolations in the Church (v. 7). He believed that he would lose entirely his office from the sight of the brethren, and that God was marking him for death officially (v. 8), fearing that as the cloud that disappears never again reappears, and just as Second Deathers after going into the second hell never return to their position and life, so he would lose his office, and as such an officer never exist again (vs. 9, 10).

These thoughts made J. break his silence, speaking in the depth of his sad heart and uttering his plaint in the grief of his being (v. 11). He wondered as to whether he was like the

rebellious race or like an evil spirit, that God had to set a guard over him (v. 12). He looked to the Truth for comfort and ease from his distress (v. 13), but was frightened and terrified by certain teachings and pictures that God had unfolded to him, revealing further calamities as being in store for him (v. 14). Under such conditions he preferred the strangling and end of such an official course rather than its possession (v. 15). He loathed its frustrated activities and desired not to continue in them for long; hence he pleaded for freedom from their cares, since they seemed to lead to no practical results (v. 16). As an example of man he wondered how God should magnify him, or give him attention (v. 17), or fellowship with him early in his Christian life and try him continually (v. 18). He wondered when God would cease trying him, and leave him undisturbed long enough to appropriate some of Truth (v. 19). He recognized that he had in many ways come short of God's glorious character likeness, and inquired as to what he could do for God, who was closely observing him, asking why God had marked him out for special tribulations, even unto his becoming a burden to the Lord (v. 20). Seeing trouble continually increasing, and fearing that he rested under God's disapproval, he asked why God did not forgive his sin and take away his error, since he thought that as a special servant of God his ministry would be only a memory, and when God should seek him He would not find him to be His special servant (v. 21).

Job 8 types the Gershonites' making false charges, assumptions and sophistries against J. because of his misfortunes experienced in connection with the controversy on arrangements of doing the Lord's work, particularly on presenting new typical, symbolic and prophetical thoughts unsanctioned by them, and on corporations controlling the priests' work. They faulted him, alleging that he spoke too much and long on the Lord's arrangements, and engaged in too mighty a controversy (v. 2), falsely implying that J. was charging Almighty God with perverting right (v. 3), also

impliedly charging that J. had lost his special helpers because of his, as well as their sins (v. 4). They said that if by prayer and effort he had sought to win God over to his side, and had been proved to have a proper disposition, God would surely deliver him from his troubles, make him prosperous and, despite the small results of his new start, he would in the end greatly prosper (vs. 5-7). They told him to gain knowledge from the experiences of the past, *e.g.*, the Parousia, when so much error arose through typing, alleging that the present efforts were those of small and short experience (vs. 8-10). They further hinted that as unprofitable rushes and flags required proper nourishment, though with these they are but transitory, so J. in his opposition to corporations' controlling God's priestly work was forgetting God, and as a wicked teacher would cease to be a teacher, even like those transitory rushes and flags, his hopes, confidence and trust coming to ruin like a spider's web (vs. 11-14), that he would rely upon his position, which, despite his holding fast thereto, would come to naught (v. 15), that his apparent prosperity and security appear so to him alone (vs. 16, 17), and that his loss of his place would make it disown him (v. 18). In irony and ridicule they told him that such would be the reward of his course, and that from among the Lord's people others would arise and take his place (v. 19). Still disparaging him, as though he were wicked, they declared that God would not cast off a faithful servant, as he was evidently cast off; nor would God uphold evil-doers, even as he was not, they alleged, upheld (v. 20). But they hinted that if he would reform he would yet become a preacher of the good tidings and its various doctrines (v. 21), and that his enemies would be silenced and refuted (v. 22).

J. answered, as typed in Job 9 and 10, the jeers, sarcasms, false charges, assumptions and the condemning claims of the Gershonites connected with their controversy on the arrangements for doing God's work. He admitted that

in principle some of their sayings were true, but that they did not apply to him as they charged; for he knew that none could justify himself before God (9: 2), reasoning that if God should choose to debate with man he could not answer one thing of the thousand that God could bring against him (v. 3); for God is wise and powerful; consequently none who would presume to take a stand against God would achieve anything (v. 4). His creative works in earth, sea and the heavens with their wondrous stars and constellations manifest His great, wonderful and numberless powers (vs. 5-10). He admitted that many things in God's works are not clear to him (v. 11); for God cannot be hindered or be taken into accounting for what He does (v. 12). He recognized that if God is displeased, proud servants of His are subdued under Him (v. 13). Hence there was less reason that J. should enter into a controversy with God (v. 14); for even if J. were righteous, he held that it would be wrong for him to debate against God; rather it would be seemly for him to plead for God's mercy and help as his judge (v. 15). He further asked, If God had answered his prayer, would he not believe that God had hearkened to his petition (v. 16), despite the fact that God was breaking his power by Levitical revolutions, and was increasing the blows that he endured (v. 17), despite the fact that God did not allow J. to exercise freely his powers and filled him with sorrow (v. 18)? Yea, God is strong, but men would give J. no chance in judgment to defend his course (v. 19).

All his alleged attempts to prove himself sinless would by his own teachings be refuted; and any alleged claim of his to perfection would prove him a pervert (v. 20). Yea, even if he claimed perfection he would thereby prove his ignorance; on the contrary, in humility he would count himself as of no consequence (v. 21). J. contended that God abases from one's position the pious and the wicked (v. 22). If by discipline God cuts one of His faithful off from exercising his office powers, He would count the resultant

trial of such as not a serious thing (v. 23). Truly, society now is controlled by the evil, whose judges are by God counted ignorant. If this be not so, where would God's sovereignty be in activity? And what kind of a Ruler would He be (v. 24)? J. recognized the fleeting character of his exercise of his office (vs. 25, 26). He greatly desired freedom from his suffering and comfort therefrom (v. 27). Though fearing his sufferings, which were for righteousness, he knew that he was not by God regarded as sinless (v. 28). If he were an evil-doer, would he labor without results in the world where Satan rewards evildoers with external prosperity (v. 29)? Despite his efforts to cleanse himself of evil and to do his service properly (v. 30), God brought adversity upon him that made his powers forsakers of him as abhorrent (v. 31). His reverence for God, as so much above man, made him refuse to attempt to argue with God in judgment (v. 32). Nor would he claim an umpire to decide a question, if it were in issue between God and him (v. 33). But J. greatly desired to be delivered from the Lord's disciplining and making him afraid (v. 34). If God should do this, fearless he would tell God his case; but it was not so (v. 35).

But J. was worn out in his office activities unto weariness, and would freely speak of his burdens, because of the soul's grief (10: 1). He would plead that God do not condemn his work, but would manifest to him the reason for God's seeming opposition to him (v. 2). It was good in God's eyes to lay heavy burdens upon him, that He should abase him and consider J. as a work of His hand as little, and should allow the plans of the bad Levites to seem to prosper (v. 3). He declared emphatically that God's knowledge and understanding were not those of fallible man (v. 4), nor is God's eternity like man's short span of life (v. 5), that God should investigate J.'s imperfection, despite the fact that God knew him to be not wicked, and that none could deliver out of God's power (vs. 6, 7). He recognized that while God

had fitted him for his office balancedly, yet he was cutting him off from exercising many of its features (v. 8). He pleaded with God to recall that despite his imperfections he was given his office by God, and pleaded with Him not to make it non-existent (v. 9). He said that God had emptied him of easier services and had sorely altered in quick succession his untoward experiences (v. 10). He recognized that God had lovingly given him all his qualifications for his office, as well as blessed him in his New Creature (vs. 11, 12), all the while hiding in His heart from J. His purpose that he should have such harrowing experiences in fulfilling the functions of his office (v. 13), and yet holding J. responsible for anything that he would do amiss (v. 14). If J. should sin in his office, he would have woe; yet if righteous therein, he would be ignominiously put to shame and experience trouble (v. 15). If he should feel exalted, God's power would hunt him out, showing Himself wondrously therein (v. 16). God was providentially allowing another set (the Gershonites) to witness against J., and thereby was increasing what seemed to be His displeasure against him (v. 17). His distress, not words, asked God why, He had ever developed him for his office, instead of letting him be passed by as never having had it (vs. 18, 19). He pleaded that as his days were few, God might cease from afflicting him, and might give him even a little comfort before he cease to exercise the remnants of his office functions, and thus be non-existent so far as his office was concerned (vs. 20-22).

Next, the Kohathites cast many bitter and false accusations of a personal kind against J., in connection with their attacks, and that on the truths that he was teaching. Like the Merarites' and Gershonites' accusations, theirs were not so much against his teachings, but were connected with their attacks on his teachings (11: 1). They falsely denounced him as using much speech, which must be refuted and he be condemned (v. 2). They falsely charged him with boasting that should not be allowed to silence its hearers, and with mocking for

which others should make him ashamed (v. 3). They railed on his claim that his doctrine (which they attacked) was true and that he was unconscious of unfaithfulness in his ministry (v. 4). They even prayed that God would condemn his teachings (v. 5), and reveal to him His true secrets from the greatness of His knowledge, and claimed that God was punishing J. less than he deserved (v. 6). They then expatiated on God's being so great in knowledge as to be ununderstandable by J. (vs. 7-9). They falsely accused J.'s case as having already been passed upon by God's condemnatory and unhinderable judgment (v. 10), and as coming upon him as a false servant whose iniquity was seen by God intuitively (v. 11). Falsely they accused J. of vanity, voidness of understanding and unruliness (v. 12). Then they counseled him to amend his heart, pray for forgiveness (v. 13), set aside his iniquity and put unrighteousness away from his office (v. 14), promising him that then he could present spotless knowledge, steadfastness and courage (v. 15). Then, they said, he would forget his misery as a thing of the past (v. 16); and his office powers would be transparently bright, its darkness being a thing of the past and its clarity like the Millennial morning (v. 17). They also promised that then he would be safe with hope, urging him to assist the investigations into his case that thus he might find safe rest (v. 18), that he would be in safety and rest, and that many would seek his assistance (v. 19). But they implied that, if he did not follow their advice, he would go into darkness, with no hope of escape and with the expectation of ceasing to exercise his office (v. 20).

The false accusations and implications of the Kohathites connected with their attacks on J.'s Epiphany teachings received an answer from him (12: 1) that began with sarcasm, to the effect that the Levites were the depositaries of the Truth, which would cease with them (v. 2); but, dropping the sarcasm, he assured them that he understood the Truth, at least not one whit less than they, remarking that

all Truth people knew the principles lying at the foundations of their exhortations, insofar as they were true (v. 3). Then J. said that he, who had faithfully served God as a just and pious man, had become for it a laughing-stock (v. 4), assuring them that they who were at ease despised him in his misfortunes, and were upon the lookout for him to make some mistake (v. 5), and that now evil-doers prosper, that tempters of God are now safe, and that now God seemed to prosper them (v. 6). This lesson as to the prosperity of the wicked animate and inanimate nature teaches (vs. 7, 8); for it is common knowledge that God's power is connected with this condition for mankind (vs. 9, 10). Each bodily organ performs its function (v. 11). Their claim that with age and experience is wisdom, is in most cases untrue; for God, who has wisdom, power, counsel and understanding, frequently brings their wisdom and understanding to naught, and shuts up some in their folly, without escape (vs. 12-14), even as He controls waters into dryness and makes them become devastating floods (v. 15); for He has wisdom and power that prevail over the deceived and the deceiver, making wise counselors ashamed and judges foolish (vs. 16, 17). He frees from bonds that kings use on their prisoners, and makes these kings serve His purposes (v. 18). He puts priests to shame and conquers great warriors (v. 19). He dries up the eloquence of trusted orators, and turns into folly the knowledge of leaders (v. 20). He makes great leaders contemptible, and loosens the armor of the strong (v. 21). He exposes to light deep errors, and reveals what is the death state (v. 22). By Him nations rise and fall; He makes them great, and then delivers them into subjection to greater ones (v. 23). The great human leaders He bereaves of knowledge, and leads them into the tracklessness of error (v. 24), where they grope in darkness, staggering like the others drunk with error (v. 25).

J. declared that he perceived and understood all this (13: 1); for he knew what they did and not less (v. 2). His hope was to speak and reason over matters with God (v. 3),

and he accused them of inventing errors and of being pseudo-dagnosticians in his case (v. 4). He wished that they would preserve silence, as the wise thing for them (v. 5), and give proper attention to his arguments and the pleas of his teachings (v. 6). He charged them with being unrighteous and deceitful speakers for God (v. 7), with partiality in things of God and with so contending for things of God (v. 8). He demanded whether good would result from God's investigating them, whether they would attempt to deceive Him as one deceives his fellows (v. 9). Certainly He will rebuke them for their secretly practicing partiality (v. 10). Rather, His greatness should frighten them into awe of Him (v. 11); for their best teachings are untrue sayings; and their defenses of their teachings are unsubstantial (v. 12). Again J. asked them to be silent, and to leave him undisturbed to speak, regardless of consequences (v. 13). In suffering and danger he would proceed (v. 14); yea, even if devotion to the Truth bring death to him, he would still trust in God and remain, despite all suffering, true to His ways (v. 15). That the evil Levite leaders should undertake matters pertaining to God would inure to his salvation (v. 16).

Again he asked diligent attention to his misrepresented teachings (v. 17). He claimed that he set forth his teachings in a proper way, and would be justified by them (v. 18), despite any of his opponents, whose teachings, if refutative of his, would make him be silent and yield up his office (v. 19). If God would refrain from two things, he would not seek to hide himself from matters pertaining to God (v. 20), *i.e.*, refrain from keeping His hand heavy upon him and refrain from frightening him (v. 21). These two things refrained from, God might call for anything from him, and he would respond favorably; or if he might ask something of God, God might then answer him (v. 22). He recognized that his sins were many, and desired to recognize his wrongs (v. 23). It seemed to him that God was by withholding His

favor from him treating him as an enemy (v. 24). Surely God would not harass or pursue with hostile intent him who was as weak and worthless as a dried leaf and stubble (v. 25). He said this because God seemed to arrange bitter experiences for him and to remember his past sins (v. 26), seemed to make it hard for him to walk in the ways of the Truth and its Spirit (v. 27), and seemed to have cast him off as a rotten, corrupt thing, even as a moth-eaten garment (v. 28).

In Job 14 J.'s teachings in antitypical Gideon's Second Battle on the death state and the punishment of sin are set forth. They showed the shortness of human life and the evils of the dying process (v. 1); despite the beauties of early life the race under the curse is cut down and passes away as a transient shadow (v. 2). Was not God viewing and treating man as under the curse (v. 3)? J. recognized that, coming from fallen parents, no one could be perfect (v. 4), which results in all being under the condemnation of death. This confines them to the period of the dying process, which in none of Adam's fallen race can reach a full 1,000 years (v. 5). This made J. long for God's ameliorating the condition of the curse from man's relief, even as a laborer may rest from the day's toil (v. 6). If given favorable conditions a felled tree, despite its devastated condition, if supplied with proper moisture, may have hope of its own inherent powers to spring up again (vs. 7-9); but no such inherent powers of a re-kindling of life is in a dead human (v. 10). Even as waters of some lakes fail and of some rivers waste and dry up, so man lies down in death and arises not nor awakes from the sleep of death, by his own inherent power, as long as the universe lasts (vs. 11, 12). But fallen men have been given a hope for another life, apart from any so-called inherent powers, even through the ransom, for they longed to be freed from their miseries and they longed for rest, death, and a part in the resuscitation when God would remember them (v. 13). J. denied that man was alive when dead (the word "*again*"

is an interpolation, v. 14). The race would wait in the death state until the resuscitation time would come, when it would answer God's mighty call, "Come forth"; and then God's favor would return to the race (v. 15). But now the race is being described as to its conduct; and its sins are recorded in its character. God's justice securely keeps the record of man's sins and iniquities (vs. 16, 17). As destructions are wrought by natural forces, so the race under the curse is destroyed by it (vs. 18, 19). God's just sentence through imperfect conditions on earth works out the death sentence of man, and sends him into the changes wrought by the dying and death processes v. 20). Regardless of prosperity or adversity in his children a dead parent is unconscious of their state (v. 21). Alive, he suffers the dying process (v. 22).

The next class to criticize J.'s Truth teachings was the Merarites, who began to fault him first for his presenting his views on the last related acts of Elijah and Elisha; but, as in all other cases in this book, not their attempts to refute these are typed, but their criticizing him on personal matters in connection with their pertinent controversy is set forth (15: 1). They denied him to be wise, claiming that he was answering with error and was filled with endless strife (v. 2). They declared a wise man should not argue with useless words or unedifying speeches (v. 3). They accused him of expelling from his heart reverence and from his mouth proper speech in matters pertaining to God (v. 4), and of having utterances coming from iniquity, and of choosing to use a crafty speech (v. 5). They claimed that his teaching, not they, proved him an errorist, his doctrines witnessing against him (v. 6), reminding him to remember that his elders were abler than he, who was but young (v. 7). They sneered at him as one who was alleged to claim to have learned God's secrets and to arrogate to himself exclusive knowledge (v. 8). They challenged him to state what he knew and understood that they did not know and understand (v. 9), claiming by act in setting that Servant

aside that with them were such as were wiser than even his symbolic father, Bro. Russell (v. 10). They sneeringly demanded of him to tell whether the regular comforts of God's people were not enough for him, or whether God had imparted special secrets to him (v. 11). They accused him of ambition that covetously sought others' positions (v. 12), even making him turn against God and speak evil words (v. 13). They charged him with acting as though he did not have the Adamic uncleanness and unrighteousness of all born of woman (v. 14). To condemn him as unworthy, they falsely charged God with distrusting His saints and as regarding the heavens as unclean (v. 15); how much more so was he, whom they falsely accused of being corrupt and imbibing iniquity (v. 16).

Usurping the place of being his teachers, they demanded to be heard, claiming to tell him what they knew (v. 17). They falsely alleged that the wisdom of wise and prosperous generations was on their side against J. in the argument (vs. 18, 19), that only to the wicked does God by decree let continual sufferings and oppressions come (v. 20), that fright is brought to him and in prosperity he comes to ruin (v. 21), that despair of deliverance and expectation of a violent death of his office powers are his portion (v. 22), that he fruitlessly and aimlessly seeks here and there for spiritual food, knowing that dark days are ahead of him (v. 23), and that suffering and keen sorrows affright him and overcome him, as a victorious king prepared for war (v. 24). All of this is in retribution for his (alleged) opposition to God; for he allegedly acted in pride against the Omnipotent (v. 25). His course is one of stubbornness backed by his fighting equipment (v. 26). Though his knowledge and his work give him a kind of prosperity (v. 27), though he uses his acquisition of ecclesiastical offices that his wickedness has gained and in turn ruined for him (v. 28), yet real riches he does not have, nor will his kind of riches continue, nor be widely distributed as a useful part of Truth society (v. 29). No deliverance from his

mistakes will be his; destruction will overtake the objects of his love; and by the sentence of God he will depart his official life (v. 30). Therefore he should not trust in his vain errors, whereby he merely deceives himself, since empty error will be his reward (v. 31). Thus his ruin will be fulfilled before it seems due, and his works will not prosper (v. 32). He will even lose before due time the fruits of his labor, even as the vine loses its unripe grapes, and as the olive tree loses its flowers (v. 33); for the associates of the impious shall be unproductive, and destruction shall overtake the products of their corruption (v. 34); for they produce harm and wickedness; and they in love of error prepare it to entrap others (v. 35). These Merarites falsely applied all these general ways of God's dealing with the wicked against J., as though he were guilty of the conduct that brings such experiences from God upon the wicked. When one looks back at the way the Merarites reacted to, and spoke against J. for his Truth presentations, he will recognize that Job 15 gives a very accurate description of their pertinent reactions and sayings; for of the three groups of Levites the Merarites were the cruelest in denouncing J. for his Truth teachings.

Their false and cruel acts and sayings against J. for his Truth teachings drew forth from him those replies that are typed in Job 16 and 17, which we will now consider (16: 1). He stated that he had heard such false accusations before, *i.e.*, from the 1908-1911 sifters; and they proved that all the three groups of Levites were unhappy consolers (v. 2). He asked whether their empty words would end, and what was provoking the Merarites to answer him (v. 3). J. said that, if he were so minded, he could return reviling for their reviling, and that if they were in his condition, he could add accusation to accusation against them and treat them with disapproval (v. 4); but instead of so doing he would encourage them by his words; and the comfort of his teachings would lighten their grief (v. 5). But he found no

lightening of his grief by his teaching them, though that was the thing to expect from them as a result of his labor for them; nor did his silence bring him any relief from them (v. 6). J.'s attitude declared that zeal for God's cause had exhausted him, and had caused him to lose the great company of his supporters (v. 7), that it had shriveled him up, which was accepted by his enemies as a witness against him, and his apparent unproductivity as proof of God's forsaking him (v. 8).

His whole attitude said that apparently as from God's wrath his enemies had torn him in his work to pieces, hated him, expressed extreme wrath against, and looked sharply to injure him (v. 9), had spoken against him with reproaches, condemned his teaching and assembled against him (v. 10). It said that God had delivered him into the power of the impious and wicked (v. 11), and that while he was in peace, by these enemies God had wrecked him, yea, had violently seized upon him and hurled him into ruin, and had made him His mark to be shot at by his enemies (v. 12), who with sharp sayings surrounded him, dividing his powers without leniency and rejecting his grief (v. 13). Break after break came to him; by his enemies as mighty ones God attacked him (v. 14). As a result, mourning fell to J.'s lot; and his strength was lost (v. 15). His teachings mingled with sorrow and his insight into things was of one about to die (v. 16), despite his faithful work and unselfish prayers (v. 17). In Truth Society circles he desired that the wrongs done him be exposed by his protests (v. 18), because God on high witnessed and vouched in his favor (v. 19). Amid the mockings of those whom he considered friends he poured out mourning prayers to God (v. 20), entreating Him to stand for His faithfulness to Him and his fellows (v. 21), since his course soon would lead him to the end of his office powers, to which he would not return (v. 22).

Job 17 continues to type J.'s answers to the Merarites' false charges. He felt that his power and life as God's mouthpiece were about ended (17: 1), since mockers at his

side ridiculed him, and caused him to think of their provoking course (v. 2). He asked that God guarantee his faithfulness, wondering who else would do it (v. 3), even though God closed the Merarites' minds from understanding, for which reason God would not honor them in office (v. 4). J. then warned that the Merarite leaders, having for the booty of controllership of the Society denounced J. and others of their friends, would witness their adherents going blind in the eyes of understanding (v. 5). Yet J.'s work for the Lord made him a byword to most Truth people, who insultingly cast their errors on his truths (v. 6). His sorrows dimmed his studying of the Truth; and his faculties of mind and heart were weakened (v. 7). His experiences will yet arouse the astonished righteous and the innocent to oppose J.'s impious opponents (v. 8). Despite J.'s experiences, the righteous will continue in the narrow way; and upright Truth servants will continually develop strength (v. 9). But as for his opponents, he by his attitude invited them to attack him further; and he assured them that he would find none among them wise enough to refute him (v. 10). He lamented that his times of full powers' exercise were past, his purposes were wrecked and his office possessions so much loved by him were ended (v. 11). He charged his Merarite enemies with putting light for darkness and darkness for light (v. 12). He denied that his office had ceased, that his teachings as to faith's rest had become error (v. 13), that he had given himself up to Adamic sinful depravity as to a father and its erroneousness as to a mother or sister (v. 14); yet he declared that his hope of being a blessing through his office was lost to him and from the sight of others, who considered it forever lost, with him resting in the dust of defeat (v. 16). So he finished his answer to the Merarite personal attacks on him in fighting his Truth teachings.

Thereupon followed personal attacks on J. by the Gershonites; in connection with their controverting his Truth teachings (18: 1). They appealed to the Merarites and

Kohathites, asking how much more time they would take in studying answers to J., at the same time asking them to join them in studying carefully the pertinent matters before speaking, since it was unwise for them to be accounted by one another as unreasonable beasts and as defiled in one anothers' esteem (v. 3). Then turning frercely on J., the Gershonites demanded why their social circles should be rent by, and their alleged Truth teachings be cast aside for, him, whom they accused as doing violence to his graces in his anger (v. 4). Speaking of him, they charged that as an ungodly one the Truth that he once had had turned into error, that his teachings no more enlightened (v. 5), that the teaching of his office would always be error, that the Bible would cease to give him Truth (v. 6), that the steps of hitherto strong Christian life would become too difficult for him to take, and that his plan would be overturned (v. 7); for they said that his own conduct led him into a labyrinthine net, gin, snare, noose and trap (vs. 8-10). They charged that terror would seize him on all sides and closely pursue him (v. 11), that his strength of mind and heart would be famished, that misfortune would leap upon him from all quarters (v. 12), that all his powers would be consumed, that a most public end would put them out of offrcial existence (v. 13), that he would be totally thrust out of his position, in which he trusted, that he would be forced to face its extinction as the chief terror of his heart (v. 14), that a stranger (the Gershonites) would take over his position, that destruction would end it as his (v. 15), that like a tree he would wither, root and branch, the foundation and superstructure of his position alike coming to naught (v. 16), that his memory and reputation would be forgotten in public Truth circles (v. 17), that he would be driven from one truth after another into one error after another and be disfellowshipped from among (what was actually) the Levite order of affairs (v. 18), that he would lose his supporters, who in turn would lose theirs from among God's people,

nor would any remain even in his temporary position as a Parousia pilgrim (v. 19), and that he would be an example to astonish all coming after him, as those of his kind were to those who preceded him (v. 20). So Gershonites said he would be as unjust and ignorant of God (v. 21).

These unjust and false charges made against J. by the Gershonites J. answered (19: 1). He expressed his weariness at having been so long vexed and torn to pieces by the false personal criticisms of the three Levite groups (v. 2). With the full ability of natures lower than the Divine they reproached him, and that without shame at their hard dealings with him (v. 3). Granted that J. erred, yet it was his, not their error (v. 4). He told them that though they exalted themselves against him and charged against him reproaches, they should recognize that it was for God's cause that he had been abased, and that God was pleased to bring him into circumscribing trials (vs. 5, 6). Wronged, he cried out without obtaining deliverance; appealing for assistance, no righting of his cause was wrought (v. 7); for devotion to God's cause brought him into impassable conditions; and he had no knowledge as to a way of escape (v. 8). His faithfulness to his office for God resulted in his loss of the previous honor in which he was held by Truth people; and his exercise of the full office powers of the Divinely-authorized mouthpiece was taken away from him (v. 9). Such faithfulness had wrecked and ruined him in his office on all sides; and his office hopes were like an uprooted tree (v. 10). His experiences were like those of them against whom God had expressed wrath, and as those of one whom God had counted as among His enemies (v. 11). Like an army those who in a sense were His warriors have gathered against and surrounded his position (v. 12).

His devotion to God had severed his brethren far from him; and less knowing ones became estranged from him (v. 13). Youthful Worthies forsook him; and close friends forgot him (v. 14). Foreign helpers, strong and weak, regarded him as a stranger and alien (v. 15); and close

helpers responded not to his call for service, despite his entreaties (v. 16). To closest associates his voice was that of a stranger, and those whom his and their covenant developed heeded not his plea (v. 17). Even new ones in the Truth despised him, and spoke against him whenever he entered into any activity (v. 18). All his most intimate friends abhorred him; and those whom he deeply loved turned against him (v. 19). He was greatly reduced in his office powers and barely escaped the loss of all of them (v. 20). He cried out for the sympathy of his friends, because God's power lay heavy upon him (v. 21). He desired to know the reason of their persecuting him, as though they were God, and for their not being satisfied at their having consumed his privileges and prerogatives (v. 22). He longed to have his thoughts committed to writing in some strong, enduring and inerasable form (vs. 23, 24). Despite all this, he knew that his Vindicator lived and would in the latter part of the Epiphany arise among Truth circles and, despite the exteriors and interiors of his prerogatives and privileges being destroyed, then apart from such prerogatives and privileges he would discern God in the purposes that He had in afflicting him (vs. 25, 26), and recognize Him as on his side, and discern it, and not get this from an outsider, despite his present misfortunes that were so disheartening (v. 27). As to their decision sharply to persecute him as entirely to fault for his afflictions, he cautioned them to stand in fear of the Word, which as a symbolic sword would punish them in wrath, teaching them that there was a Divine judgment coming (vs. 28, 29).

A second and final time the Kohathites attacked J., and that in connection with his Truth refutation of their errors; for be it remembered that they did not rebel against the Lord's arrangements, as the corporational Levites did; yet their replies consisted of personal criticisms only (20: 1). They stated that it was by reason of their being in a hurry that their thoughts gave answer for them (v. 2). They heard

J.'s answers (that refuted their errors), and their disposition moved them to answer (v. 3). Accusing him of wickedness, they asked him whether he did not know, as a matter of ancient standing, yea, from the beginning, that his wicked triumph in the controversy was of short life, and that his joy was of brief duration (vs. 4, 5). Even if his abilities were heaven-high and his intellect reached the clouds (v. 6), he would perish forever, like the errors that he excreted, so that they who recognized his intellectual powers would ask for his whereabouts (v. 7). They prophesied of him that he would be as unsubstantial and lost as a forgotten dream, even as a night vision (v. 8). His beholders would see neither him nor his position any more (v. 9). His supporters would become the lowliest of beggars; and he would be made to yield up his alleged usurped riches of powers (v. 10). Though his various powers had the vigor of youth, they would moulder away as a body in the grave (v. 11).

Though he delight with appreciation in wickedness (v. 12), tenderly nursing and preserving it, keeping it as a sweet morsel in his mouth (v. 13), it would yet become nauseating and an aspen poison within him (v. 14). They claimed that though he appropriated to himself rich powers as God's mouthpiece, he would repudiate them; for God would cause him to disgorge them (v. 15). They charged that he would accept the worst of errors; and even the less evil of them would ruin him (v. 16); he would not view the streams of Truth, flowing with joyous hopes and love (v. 17). What he toiled for he would have to restore, and not take for himself, nor would he rejoice in his acquisitions (v. 18). They charged him with grinding down and leaving the humbler brethren unhelped, and of robbing others of their office, but claimed that he would not exercise it (v. 19). Not being a man of peace, he would retain nothing to his delight (v. 20). His devouring others' patrimony would ruin his prosperity (v. 21); though having full sufficiency, he would suffer want; and all whom he made miserable

would pounce upon him (v. 22). While he would be appropriating his ill-gotten gains, God would cover him with wrath as by a heavy rain (v. 23). In controversy a strong argument would put him to flight; a strong intellect would pierce him through (v. 24); and he would be compelled to extract it and its sharp point from himself with much sorrow and fear (v. 25). Complete error would become the storehouse of his treasured teachings and a destruction not man-directed would overwhelm him and consume all his office powers (v. 26). The Divinely-appointed teachers would expose his evils, and Truth circles would oppose him (v. 27). All his acquisitions would pass away; and his attainments would perish in the time when Divine wrath would overtake him (v. 28). These evils the Kohathites claimed would fall to J.'s lot from God as his Divinely-appointed heritage (v. 29).

To these false charges and predictions made by the Kohathites as their answers to J.'s refutation of their errors J. gave answer (21: 1). He asked their diligent attention, and let them get whatever of comforts they could therefrom (v. 2), saying that after they would permit him to speak they could continue mocking him (v. 3). He disclaimed his complaint as being a merely human one, and asked why he should not be impatient under the circumstances (v. 4). He asked them to give heed to him, be surprised and then keep silence (v. 5). His remembrance of his past troubled and horrified him, as he considered the past's contrast with the present (v. 6). He wondered why the wicked Levites lived on so long and increased into great power (v. 7). Their disciples and their disciples' disciples were made secure in their sight (v. 8). Their fields of service were made secure from fear; and God did not punish them (v. 9). Their organizations and arrangements brought them increase and prosperity in great abundance, and that to the joy of their supporters (vs. 10, 11). They issued their message by tracts, Bibles and preaching (v. 12). They prospered to the end of their course, when they ceased from their office works (v. 13). By their

evil acts they told God to leave them, that they did not desire His Truth (v. 14). By act they disclaimed God and His real service, seeing no profit in prayer (v. 15). Then J. declared of them that their prosperity was not by their, but by Azazel's, power, and that their view of things, which he was refuting, was far from being in harmony with his (v. 16). Very often, he declared, the Bible becomes dark to the unfaithful Kohathites; and their punishments overtake them; for God in displeasure pours out on them their sorrows (v. 17). They would be blown away in controversy as stubble before the wind and as chaff by the storm (v. 18).

Then he took up their argument that God prepares sin for His children, lets the wicked recompense it unto himself for his information (v. 19), lets his own eyes experience his destruction, and lets him receive the Almighty's wrath (v. 20), since he cares not what shall come to his own organization after his giving it up (v. 21). To this line of thought J. answered, Will these Kohathites undertake to foist their erroneous views as proffered knowledge on God, who judges the exalted (v. 22)? Some of the wicked Kohathites end their office work in full enjoyment of their powers, being at ease and comfort (v. 23), prospering in their undertakings and in good health (v. 24), others, in much sorrow, never having enjoyed themselves in their office work (v. 25); but after yielding these up they are alike in their symbolic death state covered with corruption (v. 26). Then J. plainly told them that he knew their theories and devices whereby they planned to wrong him (v. 27); for he charged that they held that his leadership supporters were non-existent, and that his position as a wicked one was likewise non-existent (v. 28). He demanded of them whether they had not asked and learned the witness of the narrow-way travelers (v. 29), to the effect that wrong-doers were kept for the time of trouble, that they might be brought into the trouble (v. 30). He asked to be told as to who would declare to the wicked Kohathite to his face his course, and who is the

Recompenser of his evils (v. 31). Yet he must give up his office works; and men must guard the memory of his deeds (v. 32). His symbolic grave would be acceptable to him; all others would come to the same fate as his, as innumerable predecessors did before him (v. 33). J. then told them that their so-called comforting speeches were fruitless and erroneous (v. 34).

Then the Merarites undertook to answer J. with erroneous personalities as replies to his attacks on their errors (22: 1). To minimize J.'s services of God, they asked whether he could benefit God, alleging that at best he could merely profit himself (v. 2). They demanded whether God got any pleasure out of J.'s righteousness or profit out of J.'s vindicating his ways as pious (v. 3). They demanded to know whether it was for his reverence for God that God allegedly reproved and entered into judgment with him (v. 4). Then they emphatically charged him with great wickedness and endless iniquity (v. 5), accusing him of exactions against his brethren and of despoiling unto nakedness their graces (v. 6), that he had not given the Truth to the weary brethren to imbibe, and had withheld the bread of life from the Truth-hungry (v. 7). On the other hand, they declared that their leader was the controller of society among the Merarites and in honor functioned there (v. 8). They charged him with not giving to the needy who had no supporter and with destroying the executives of those who had no providers (v. 9). For this reason, they declared, J. was entangled with many snares and was troubled with fear that he expected (v. 10), with error that blinded him and with many sorrows that covered him (v. 11). Then they demanded of him whether God was not yet Sovereign, even presiding above the high stars (v. 12). Falsely they charged him with questioning God's knowledge and His ability to judge deeply hidden things (v. 13), that he held that there were things that God did not know, since he was so far away (v. 14). Then they demanded of him if he would still continue in the old Adamic ways, as if he had been doing so,

after the manner of wicked sifters (v. 15), who had an untimely end of their ministry, and whose position was unsubstantial (v. 16), who by act bade God depart from them, questioning His ability to do ought for or with them (v. 17), despite God's blessing them; for their plans were far from the self-praising Merarites (v. 18).

They claimed that their supporters as righteous ones beheld this and rejoiced thereover, and that the guileless among them laughed such to scorn (v. 19), declaring that their opponents were cut off, and their remnants destroyed (v. 20). Then, falsely assuming that J. was an evil-doer who needed repentance, they preached him a sermon, exhorting him as one allegedly ignorant of God to become acquainted with Him, by submitting to the channel; and thus he would gain prosperity and good (v. 21), to receive His Word from his alleged teaching channel, and to take such teachings to heart (v. 22), promising him that if he should thus (allegedly) return to God, he would be built up in mind and heart, if he would put aside evil from his office work (by doing what the Society demanded of him, v. 23), and counseling him to put aside his treasures of advancing Truth and those Parousia truths that the channel was rejecting (v. 24). Then, they assured him, the Lord by the channel would become his treasure; and real Truth would become his (v. 25). So doing, they claimed, he would make God his joy and would be glad Godward (v. 26); then the throne of grace would (allegedly) again open to him with favorable answers and he be privileged to carry out his consecration vows in the Merarites' ministry (v. 27); his decisions would then be fulfilled; and Truth would illuminate all his ways (v. 28). When enemies would cast him down, he could be sure of being raised up again and of God's delivering the humble, which, they claimed, J. had not been (v. 29); for they said, with the implication that J. was blamable, that even he would be delivered, and that it would surely occur, if he would cleanse his services by carrying out the channel's direction (v. 30).

Such false charges, implications and assumptions J. refutatively answered (23: 1). He charged that even then his statement of his trouble was by his opponents termed rebellious, despite the fact that his blow was heavier than his description of it (v. 2). Then he expressed his great desire to find God, and that, ready to hear his cause as he would lay it before Him (v. 3). If so, he would make an orderly presentation of his cause to Him and use many proofs thereon (v. 4), and would understand God's answers to his queries for information, which he craved to get from God on his condition (v. 5). Not that they be given in the greatness of His power, but in His father-love, by which He would listen to J. (v. 6); for J. knew that with God the upright might reason; and thus he would gain lasting deliverance, coming from God's loving decision (v. 7). But God for wise reasons was delaying to give J. a favorable hearing on his case; and thus J. could not find Him as a Hearer of it, though seeking in all directions for Him to hear him (vs. 8, 9). Yet J. in faith recognized that God was aware of his course in this trial, which, faithfully endured, would result in his dross being removed from his gold (v. 10); and before and during his trial J. knew that he trod faithfully in God's ways, keeping thereto and not turning aside (v. 11), not forsaking God's precepts and treasuring His Word more than his necessary natural food (v. 12). He recognized that God kept immovably to His plans, so that none could turn Him aside therefrom, that so He might bring to pass His appointments (v. 13). He felt confident that God would bring to pass His purposes as to J., in the multitude of His works (v. 14). These thoughts had their terrifying effect on J.'s humanity; for as he thought thereon he feared God (v. 15), since God by J.'s afflictions had discouraged him at times, and then God frightened him (v. 16), because of the great uncertainties, before which he was not cut off from his office powers, and because God did not hide from his knowledge the uncertainty surrounding him (v. 17).

J. then raised the question, Why does God not reveal the

times and seasons that fall to the lot of those who know Him, so that they might better understand (24: 1)? He recognized that there were unclean Levites who were removing the Lord's truths and arrangements, and with violence were robbing the true shepherds of their flocks and feeding them error, (v. 2). They took away the Volumes from those who were bereaved of Bro. Russell as their symbolic father, and took away the teacher from those who were Bro. Russell's symbolic wife, now a widow, as a pledge of following the mis-teachers (v. 3). They turned the needy brethren out of the way of truth and righteousness; and the humble in Merarite society must hide themselves away from their former brethren to gain security (v. 4). Even natural men under the curse go about their business seeking, in obscure places even, the wherewithal to feed their dependents (v. 5). They prepare their provisions in the world, and even get a little from the evil ones of the race (v. 6). They endure privations and uncertainties to gain a livelihood (v. 7). They face untoward climatic conditions and seek to ameliorate the hardships of the curse (v. 8). Yet there are oppressors who rob the symbolic orphans of Bro. Russell of the milk of the Word coming out of the Covenant, and put the humble under obligations to be subject to them, making them destitute of the graces by teaching against character development and making them win others without feeding them on the Word (vs. 9, 10). The Merarite leaders exact heavy labor from their underlings, and let them thirst for the Spirit and Word, unsatisfied (v. 11). From their well populated religious government the groans of some of God's children come; and the very being of some of these wounded ones cries out, yet God suffers the folly of these leaders to go on (v. 12).

These leaders are among those who revolutionize against the Lord's Truth and arrangements, not recognizing their ways, and not continuing in their practice (v. 13). Early they arise, especially their chief, murdering new creatures, to bereave even the poor and needy as to grace and knowledge; and secretly they steal from the brethren their

varied possessions (v. 14). Under cover of, and trusting in error and deceit, they, especially their chief, practice combinationism, expecting to deceive others by their shady disguises (v. 15). They practice dark tricks privately and publicly, and disown above-board conduct (v. 16), because the dawning Truth is thick error to all of them; and they know how to utilize the terrors of deep error (*e.g.*, on the channel, and on the second death coming to their opponents and those who take no part in their drives) to enslave the Lord's people (v. 17). They are quick to make troubles for those who oppose their evils, but the curse of God is upon them; they will not go the proper ways of the Great Company groups (v. 18). As drought and heat cause the snow waters to evaporate, so oblivion from their office will overtake those who have so greatly sinned therein (v. 19). The Covenant promises that developed them will no more extend to them; and destruction will appetitively feast on their office powers; they will no more be in fond recollection, for their wrongs will be hewn down as a tree (v. 20). They devour those who will not yield them fruitage; and to the brethren that are bereaved of their supporter they do no good (v. 21). Yet God preserves J., whom He made strong, and exalts him in his almost despair of official life (v. 22). He gives the faithful security and rest; and He observes with favor and care their ways (v. 23). Despite this exaltation their stay here is transient; and often they are abased; apparently like the rest of men they die, being cut down like the best of those ripe for the Kingdom (v. 24). J. then challenged them to deny his statement of things, prove him an errorist and make his speech worthless (v. 25).

No sooner had J. finished refuting the Merarites the third time, and that on their replies to his attacks on their errors, than the Gershonites for a third time attacked him, and that by attempting to answer a third time, mainly by personal criticisms, his attacks on their errors (25: 1). However they did not have much to say on that phase of the controversy, alleging that they did not wish to enter controversies. They

stressed God's power, domain and the reverence due Him, as securing His peace and prosperity for those allegedly on His side (v. 2), as well as stressed His innumerable hosts and the subjects of His universal Empire (v. 3). Hence they concluded that J., a human like others, could not be regarded by God as righteous in his ministry (v. 4). His power extends to the Old Testament, which He causes to become dim; hence J.'s interpretations of it, they alleged, did not clarify it; and even the teachers in the Church, they alleged, were not pure in their teachings (v. 5); how much less so is J., the most groveling of all of them (v. 6).

The Gershonites' railings on J. drew forth his final refutation of Levites and his final defense of himself against their false charges (26: 1). He began this refutation and defense by extolling God for helping him, the powerless one, and saving the work of him, the strengthless one (v. 2), for enlightening him with good counsel in his lack of wisdom, and in supplying him with true knowledge (v. 3), emphatically declaring that God made known to him His teachings, and was the Source of J.'s disposition (v. 4). Troubles bring to loss of office powers those who once had these (v. 5). Even in such oblivion and destruction God sees them (v. 6). His wisdom and power put the spiritual powers in space, and made society exist upon no power of its own (v. 7). He compounds trouble out of many troubles; and they do not undo it (v. 8). He hides the acts and designs of His authority and makes it obscure (v. 9). He circumscribes trouble within the boundary of Truth and error (v. 10). The strong ones of the powers of spiritual control among God's people trembled with astonishment at God's rebuke of their errors of teaching and wrongs of practice, as these rebukes went forth, especially in The Present Truth (v. 11). By His power He divided the revolutionists into their 60 groups as Levites; and by the true understanding of His Word at J.'s hand He smote their proud leaders (v. 12). God's power had given the powers of spiritual control among God's people whatever good appearance they have; yea, His power had

even formed Lucifer before he became the deceitful Azazel (v. 13). These are but some forms of His acts; yea, how little of what He is; but none can fathom His strong fight (v. 14).

J. continued his replies, and now to all three groups of Levites (27: 1). He recognized that in ultimate analysis it was God who had stripped him of his office rights, and had engulfed him in trouble, since God orders the steps of His servants (v. 2). He was determined that as long as he had life and breath his teachings would not be unrighteous nor erroneous (vs. 3, 4). He refused to justify the Levites in their revolutionism; nor would he even until death give up his loyalty to his Divinely-given office (v. 5). He was determined to maintain his right course as a servant of God, on which he was determined to have a good conscience throughout his tenure of his Divinely-given office (v. 6). He was content that his enemies, who were such because of his official acts, have the lot of the wicked, and that his pertinent opponents have that of the unrighteous (v. 7). What real gain have the Levitical power-graspers, though they secure the power for which they grasped, when God deprives them of their official life (v. 8)? God will pay no attention to their cries in their trouble (v. 9). Certainly they will not delight in and call upon God continually, since He will give them no heed (v. 10). Then J. declared that without concealment he would teach them concerning the agent of Almighty God (v. 11). They once saw the Truth. Why did they then turn to error (v. 12)? The following is the portion and the heritage that God allots to that wicked servant, J.F.R. (v. 13): Though his converts be much increased, controversy will cut them off from him; nor will they find satisfying spiritual food with him (v. 14). Those who remain with him will be either Second Deathers or reprobate Youthful Worthies, reprobate justified ones or those never justified and as such not rightly disposed; and those bereaved of him will not mourn him (v. 15). Though he should have riches in great abundance, and prepare

almost unlimited authority (v. 16), despite his works a just one will possess this authority and guileless ones shall get his riches (v. 17). Substantially he constructs his organization (v. 18); he will cease to function while rich, but he will not dwell among God's people; and in full knowledge he will come to the end of his office powers (v. 19). Terrors like flood waters will overtake him; and stormy troubles will glide upon him in secret (v. 20). A controversy coming from the sun-rising of Truth will undo him; and he will give up, it driving him out of his position (v. 21); for God hurls the Truth at him unsparingly, unto his utter refutation, despite his efforts to escape its power (v. 22). People will triumph in his defeat, and express their utmost abhorrence of him (v. 23).

J. expressed his confidence in the Bible as the God-given source of the Truth (28: 1), and that power comes from a true society, and justified ones from the Lord Jesus (v. 2). God puts an end to error, and investigates unto perfection by the Truth and its Spirit the teachings of error and threats of death (v. 3). Troubles break out in courses long forgotten; but they cease and leave God's people (v. 4). While the society of God's people brings forth the bread of life, underneath it quakes by destructive siftings (v. 5). Its teachings are eternal and of Divine origin (v. 6). The way of Truth no ravening false teacher knows; neither has Azazel's eye been able to discover it (v. 7). Mighty civil powers have not gone its way; nor has the papacy passed over it (v. 8). God seizes, through J., His hand, the hard Levitical teachings and overturns the Levitical kingdoms of error from their foundations (v. 9). He makes a channel, in which the Truth flows, pass through strong Levite erroneous teachings, and causes J. to see every precious truth as due (v. 10). He limits the streams of Levitical error so that, dried up, they do not even trickle among their former accepters, while He brings in the Epiphany to light the hidden things of darkness and makes manifest the counsels of hearts (v. 11).

J. then asks, In whose possession will the Truth properly

understood be found (v. 12)? Mere humans do not know its value, nor can it be found among them (v. 13). The abyss of error as Azazel's workshop by its nature declares that it does not have it; the rebellious Levites by their acts and words declare that they do not have it (v. 14). Earthly treasure more valuable and less valuable cannot purchase it (v. 15). Even the Parousia Truth is not its full value, neither are its virtues nor its praises (v. 16). No symbolic metals, nor their costly jewels or fabrications equal it in value, nor can be exchanged for it (v. 17). Nor should any human graces, as varied and precious as they may be, be mentioned in the same breath (v. 18). The best that the unjustified have is unequal to it; nor even the most refined human effort as to the Divine can be valued with it (v. 19). In view of these things, J. again asks whence the wisdom of understanding comes (v. 20), seeing that neither the ordinary man nor his natural teachers have it; death and destruction know only of rumors of it (vs. 21, 22). Then he replies that God only is its Source and Originator (v. 23), whose omniscient eye takes in everything in earth and heaven (v. 24), who balances the wind and measures the waters (v. 25), and who arranges for rain, lightning and thunder (v. 26). At creation He made and declared the wisdom of understanding, prepared for it and analyzed it (v. 27), and told man that to revere God is wisdom and to depart from evil is understanding, a message especially appropriate for His priests and Levites (v. 28).

As chapter 27, so chapter 29 informs us that Job's speeches were parables, *i.e.*, pictorial of future speeches, hence were with the rest of his book typical (29: 1). J. longed for the blessed condition of his Parousia experiences, when God closely shielded him (v. 2), when the Bible in that Truth clarified his views, and enabled him to pass unscathed amid error (v. 3), when he was in much fruitfulness; and God's favor smiled upon his position (v. 4), when clear evidences prevailed that God was forwarding him; and the leading brethren as his symbolic children were in sweet

communion with him (v. 5), when holy love attended his course; and when the Truth anointed him richly (v. 6), when he went publicly among the Truth people, and took his official place in the way of Truth; when the less developed brethren showed him respect, and the leading brethren deference (v. 8); when the very leaders preserved silence; and the most illustrious refrained from expressing their thoughts (vs. 9, 10); for when they listened to J. they praised and approved him (v. 11), because he helped the humbler brethren out of their spiritual distresses, as well as the orphaned and helpless among them (v. 12). Those in great danger of losing out blessed him for his encouragements; and those ecclesias that lost beloved elders were comforted by him with the joys of the Truth (v. 13). He developed a just and holy character while preaching to others (v. 14). He became an enlightener of spiritually blind ones and a sustainer of those who limped in the narrow way (v. 15). He was a life support to the needy brethren and diligently investigated the needs of uninformed brethren and supplied them (v. 16). He overthrew the utterances of sifters, and delivered captured brethren from their maw (v. 17). He verily thought that he would end his official days in his pilgrim position after a very long-drawn-out ministry (v. 18); for he had every indication of fruitfulness in the Spirit, Word and providence for this ministry (v. 19). His character was ripe and his power of propelling controversial Truth was renewed in strength after his break-down in brain fag in 1910 (v. 20). Respectful heed was given to his utterances; and in deferential silence his counsel was received (v. 21). After he gave his thought on a subject, they disputed not his word; and like the refreshing dew his speech fell upon them (v. 22). They waited for him in thirst for Truth, as the thirsty land for rain, and longed much for his words, like the parched land for the latter rain (v. 23). With friendliest look he encouraged the discouraged; and they did not reject his favor (v. 24). He directed the choice of their way

as their leader; and in controversy was as their king, even as a comforter of the comfortless (v. 25).

But in the Epiphany a great contrast set in; for now his juniors mock him, even those whose present support he would not even place with the sectarians among the Lord's flock (30: 1), whose best abilities yielded J. no profit, and whose good sense was lost (v. 2). They were lean through lack of spiritual food, and sought spiritual nourishment from non-nutritious elements in the errors of waste and desolation (v. 3). They fed upon waste food and on spiritually unnourishing first principles (v. 4). They were cast out of teaching places, and were cried out against like a thief (v. 5); they dwelt in error-arousing conditions and trusted in lodges and financial strongholds of society (v. 6). Like the ass, they browsed on unsubstantial teachings and tormenting tenets (v. 7). They had the spirit of the foolish and degraded, and were by the sharp truths scourged out of the society of the brethren (v. 8). But during the Epiphany J. became the theme of their taunting talks, a by-word among them (v. 9). They abhorred him, and avoided him, and refrained not from defiling his truths with their errors (v. 10); for since God loosed His scourge and afflicted J. by severe trials, they cast off his influence over them in his very presence (v. 11). The rabble of the Truth people rose against his chief power and rejected his conduct and maneuvered to overthrow him (v. 12). Even the helpless distorted his course, and advanced his trouble (v. 13). They attacked him as an army making its way through a wide breach; and amid a great ruin they hurled themselves upon him (v. 14). As a result great fear came upon him; they pursued his reputation as in symbolic war; and as a result his prosperity passed away like a cloud (v. 15).

During the Epiphany his very being seemed to have turned upon him; for days of affliction seized him (v. 16). In times of uncertainty his various powers pierced him with grief, gnawing him restlessly (v. 17). God's testing power has disfigured his graces and authority, and limited him like a close-fitting garment (v. 18). He has made J. appear

as covered with sin, error and ruin (v. 19). His cries to God seem unheeded; and in his prayers God seems to avert His eyes (v. 20). God seems to have become cruel to, and a Persecutor of him (v. 21). His providence brings him into controversies wherein God makes him continue, and dissolves his strength therein (v. 22). He recognized that these things would bring his office to an end, even to what all ultimately must come (v. 23). Yet when one falls, does he not stretch out his hand to ease the fall, or does he not in trouble call for help (v. 24)? Did not J. sympathize with the afflicted and grieve with the needy of God's people (v. 25)? Expecting good, he experienced evil; and expecting clarity, uncertainty came (v. 26). His heart was troubled without rest; and times of distress came to him (v. 27). He mourned without the Lord, his Sun, and among the whole brotherhood called for help (v. 28). He was considered bitter as the demons and blind like the owls (v. 29). His exterior was forbidding; and his powers were singed (v. 30). The Bible and his preaching gave by him a sad sound to Levites (v. 31).

He had solemnly bound himself never to defile a consecrated person. How then should he desire to defile one (31: 1)? He earnestly longed to know what portion and inheritance on high God had meted out to him (v. 2). In the Epiphany God apportions to the unrighteous and errorists calamity and disaster (v. 3); but He sees and describes J.'s life and conduct (v. 4). If J. had lived erroneously and acted hypocritically (v. 5), (but let God try him justly in Christ's merit and recognize his devotion to Him, v. 6), if his conduct had deviated from the narrow way, and his character had followed selfish motives, and accumulated sins had cleaved to his ministry (v. 7), then he was willing that others should reap what he had sown, and that the product of his work be uprooted (v. 8). If he had been enticed by any of the nominal churches in either great or small Babylon, and had sought to seduce a great or small Babylonian church from its leader (v. 9), then he was willing that as a punishment his

office help another, and that others might take it for their own uses (v. 10); for so to have treated another's symbolic wife were an abominable wickedness, a sin to be punished by the leaders (v. 11). It would be a destruction upon, and rooting up of J.'s fruits (v. 12).

He further avowed that if he had wronged the rights of his stronger or weaker helpers, when they disagreed with him (v. 13), how could he answer God when He would arise to reckon with him thereover (v. 14), since the same God is the Maker of him, as well as of his strong and weak helpers, and, therefore, would deal justly in their dispute (v. 15). He further said that if he had refused to satisfy the spiritual needs of the poor and caused the bereaved to weep unto their blinding to the Truth (v. 16), if he had for himself alone satisfied hunger for the bread of life, and not allowed spiritual orphans to feed at his table (v. 17), rather, he was a father to these symbolic orphans from his early ministry, and was a guide in the way of life to symbolic widows from his outstart in the Truth (v. 18), if he had seen any lose out from lack of the graces or the needy as needing them, if such had not been covered by him unto their praising him for help in their service, and if such had not found comfort from the graces that he helped them to put on (v. 20), if he had used his power against symbolic orphans, because he saw that his help was used publicly (v. 21), then J. was willing to lose his office power, and be cut off from its exercise (v. 22), which, if it occurred, would be one of the greatest calamities that God could send him; for then God's greatness would make him powerless (v. 23).

He further declared that if he had fixed his hope on earthly wealth, and had put his confidence in the choicest riches (v. 24), that if he had rejoiced in his spiritual riches as having been gained by his own power (v. 25), that if his prosperity by day or night had secretly enticed his heart from the way of truth, righteousness and holiness and he had shown love for power (vs. 26, 27), then he would be guilty of a sin to be punished by the leaders, since thereby he

would have denied the Supreme Being (v. 28). Moreover, he declared that if he had rejoiced in seeing those that hated him come to ruin and exalted himself when they came to evil (v. 29), (he declared that he had not allowed his mouth to transgress by praying that their life be taken by a curse, v. 30), if his co-laborers had not said, Who can find one whom he has not satisfied with food? (v. 31), that the sojourner was not given by him hospitality, and that he did not give lodging to the traveler (v. 32), if like Adam he had concealed his sin by keeping it in his secret heart (v. 33), because of the fear of the many or of the contempt of relatives, and hence kept silent thereover, and did not come into the open thereover (v. 34), (breaking out with a cry, he hoped to have some one hear him), then he was ready to sign a condemnatory sentence, to let God give him a condemnatory answer, and plead guilty to his adversary's indictment (v. 35). He pledged to bear the punishment and to accept it as a mark of authorization (v. 36). He would describe accurately his conduct and would approach him as though he were a prince (v. 37). Finally, J. declared that if his field of service would charge him with neglect, and its branches be in sadness, because he failed to work therein (v. 38), if he had appropriated to himself anything without yielding a just return, or caused others to come to loss through unfaithfulness in his service (v. 39), then he was willing that great evils, instead of Little Flock fruitfulness, and damaging growths, instead of Great Company fruitfulness, should spring up in his field of labor. And with this J. concluded his refutation of the false charges of the three Levite groups and his defense of himself (v. 40).

His replies completely refuted and silenced them, because he defended victoriously his propositions that his ministry was by him righteously administered (32: 1). Thereat and thereafter the Good Levites, the crown-losers who were in and remained in the Epiphany movement, who were confessors of God (Elihu), blessed by God (Barachel), despised (Buzite) by the Levites in other groups because of

their support of J., and high (Ram) in knowledge and character attainments, became angry at J. for defending himself (v. 2), as they were also angry at the unclean Merarites, Gershonites and Kohathites, because they could not answer J.'s defenses and refutations, and yet condemned him (v. 3). They had deferred to these because of the latters' larger experience and thus did not say anything against them and J. while the debate went on between them and him (v. 4). And when the Epiphany crown-losers saw that the three bad Levite groups could not answer J., they became angry at them and him (v. 5). Hence they began their speeches against J. by apologizing for their inferiority to the three groups as their superiors, as the reason for withholding their opinion in the matters at dispute (v. 6), believing that age and experience entitled them by superior wisdom first to express their opinion (v. 7). But humans are endowed with mentality, and the power of God gives them understanding (v. 8), since not always are the great wise, nor do all the aged understand justice (v. 9); hence they requested attention to their opinion, which they would now show (v. 10).

Let them recognize that they had waited for their words and listened to their reasoning, while they studied over what they should say (v. 11). They repeated that they had listened and found none of them able to overcome J. in the debate or to answer him (v. 12). They cautioned them not to say that they had learned the wisdom of concluding that God and not man could overcome J. (v. 13). They recognized that J. had not been debating against them, nor would they answer him with the speeches of the three Levite groups (v. 14.) Turning to J. they say of the three Levite groups that they are dumbfounded and speechless (v. 15). But they think that they should not refrain from answering J., because the Levite groups speak no more and stand still in silence (v. 16). They would answer and show their opinion (v. 17), for they claim to be full of teachings and their disposition forces them to speak (v. 18). They are ready to explode unless they find a vent, like wine and new

wineskins ready to burst (v. 19). The sense of finding relief from pent-up feelings makes them speak, opening their lips and answering (v. 20). They ask that they be not permitted to show partiality, nor give encomiums and titles to anyone (v. 21), for they claimed not to know how to indulge in such, since otherwise God would set them aside (v. 22). They began, continued and completed their speech with multiplied apologies, and not a few misrepresentations and objections, which betray approbateness and a bad conscience for speaking against J.

To shed some light on the good Levites' disputation against J., which, among other places, occurred in the Philadelphia Ecclesia, the following will suffice: Quite frequently they charged J. with being impractical; frequently motions of his were not seconded or were opposed as too strict, *e.g.*, a certain brother flaunted the ecclesia with a threat to resign his office, if his conduct of it was not acceptable. J., seeing the wrong spirit, proposed that his resignation be accepted; and before a second could be made R.G. Jolly arose and made speech to the contrary, which resulted in the motion not even being seconded; but the Lord in this simple episode, which occurred Nov. 11, 1923, in the tenth year after Oct., 1914, thus started the work in antityping the presentation of the two antitypical wave loaves in the finished picture, J., the leader of the priests, being the first one of the Little Flock wave-loaf and R.G. Jolly, the leader of the good Levites, being the first one of the Great Company wave-loaf in the finished picture, then starting to be enacted. Another incident illustrative of antitypical Elihu's unfair and unkind criticisms of J. occurred in connection with J.'s advocating the ecclesia's giving financial help to an aged Youthful Worthy widow who was both sick and penniless. Certain ones not pleased with her carried on a whispering campaign against her and against J. for advocating her being helped by the ecclesia, resulting in such feeling being aroused as almost made a division in the ecclesia; and R.G. Jolly again was J.'s main

opponent before the church on the subject. Actually the sister by a combination of starving and cancer died; and the hospital blamed the ecclesia to J.'s face therefore. The final matter that made J. withdraw priestly fellowship from R.G. Jolly and the two auxiliary pilgrims who supported him occurred after an hour and a half debate between the three and J. in an elders' meeting, they favoring a revolutionary method of conducting elections. The three later under R.G. Jolly's motion strove to have passed his pertinent resolution in a business meeting of the ecclesia. These are a few among a number of incidents at Philadelphia (others were enacted elsewhere) in which the good Levites severely criticized J. Many of this class individually gave J. more or less digs and cuts. This sheds some light on antitypical Elihu.

To return to our exposition, the good Levites now turn on J., criticize and pick him to pieces, demanding his attention (33: 1). Repetitiously they tell of their taking part in the discussion, claiming that they were speaking in righteousness and sincerity (vs. 2, 3). They repeat from 32: 8 that they were God's workmanship (v. 4). Then they challenge J. to stand forth and answer them, if he can (v. 5). Believing that they who were crown-losers were crown-retainers, they boast that they have the same relation to God as he, as New Creatures (v. 6). They profess that they did not seek to intimidate nor oppress him with too heavy opposition (v. 7). They charge that he had spoken in their hearing, and that they had listened to his claim of cleanliness, freedom from transgressing, innocence and freedom from error, but failed to note that he claimed merely to be free from the official evils of which the Levite groups accused him (vs. 8, 9). They charged that he blamed God as picking fault with him, counting him as His enemy (v. 10), hemming in his conduct and too critically noting his goings, but suppressed the fact that J. had said that all this seemed to be so (v. 11). Therefore they asked his attention to their answer in proof that his ministry was not righteous, since God is

greater than man, a reason not applicable to the charge just made (v. 12). They demanded an answer to their (false) charge that he had been contending against God, who is not bound to account to anyone as to His affairs (v. 13). They aver that God spoke in the Old Testament, yea, again in the New Testament, man disregarding His words (v. 14). He did it by deeper revelations through the prophets, who understood not, as men resting on the Truth that they had (v. 15). Thereafter in the New Testament He gave the Church the opening of their ears of faith to understand the sealed instructions (v. 16), in order to draw them away from selfish plans and deliver them from pride (v. 17), and thus deliver the New Creatures from the Second Death and from the refutations of error (v. 18). He punished His nominal church with afflictions, while it reclined on its creed beds, letting it have long-drawn-out controversies as to its powers (v. 19), until it loathed His Truth, yea, even its simpler kind (v. 20). As a result, its prerogatives and privileges since 1878 were consumed into invisibility; and its powers were seen to be unprotected (v. 21), yea, its being is drawing on to destruction and its vitality to annihilation (v. 22).

If the nominal church had had and accepted a true messenger, even Bro. Russell, who was one incomparably better as an interpreter of God's Word than any of its messengers, to teach it the Truth (v. 23), then God would have been gracious to it and delivered it from destruction, on the basis of the ransom (v. 24). Its prerogatives and privileges would have been refreshed, even as in its primitive condition (v. 25). It would have found God favorable to its prayers and would have rejoiced to behold His favor toward it; and thus God would have restored to it its works of righteousness in still using it as His mouthpiece (v. 26). It would then proclaim publicly that it had done wrong in teaching and arrangement, from which it had obtained no advantage (v. 27), and would proclaim that God had delivered it from losing its office as mouthpiece, and had given it to see the Truth (v. 28). God did these things to

the nominal church in pre-Reformation times and in Reformation times, yea, also early in the Parousia (v. 29), to draw it back from extinction as His mouthpiece, and thus to give it the Truth (v. 30). Then thrice the Epiphany crown-losers told J. to give heed to their speech (v. 31), asking twice for an answer, if he had any, since they desired to defend him against the three Levite groups (v. 32). It might here be remarked that the Epiphany crown-losers also made such statements as make vs. 18-30 applicable to the three Levite groups, as well as to the nominal church, and that because they constitute little Babylon. Then, twice commanding him to be silent, they presumed to ask God's mouthpiece to be silent, and to let them become his teacher (v. 33).

Then these crown-losers proceeded to read more lectures to J., who in silence let them go on, knowing all the while what they did not know—that they were crown-losers and that he was the Divine mouthpiece, though many of them believed the second thing (34: 1). Again they demand attention from those whom they call wise and knowing men, *i.e.*, the three Levite groups and J. (v. 2), since attention is necessary for spiritual food, even as the palate is for natural food (v. 3). They exhort that the right be chosen and the good be known (v. 4). This they say because J. alleged that he was righteous (in his office work) but that God had taken away his privileges (v. 5), and that notwithstanding his proper work he was reckoned a falsifier, and the wounds given his office powers were fatal, notwithstanding his faithfulness (v. 6). These claims of J., whose import they perverted, aroused them to revile J. as being worse than others in appropriating scoffing as one would drink water (v. 7), as going by such claims in company with errorists and wicked teachers like the Levite leaders (v. 8). They give as a reason for these misrepresentations the misrepresentation that J. had claimed that it is of no advantage for one to delight himself in God (v. 9). Again they demand attention of the three Levite groups and J., declaring that it is far from God to do wrong and commit iniquity (v. 10). They alleged

that God rewards each according to his works and ways (v. 11); for God would not do wrong nor pervert justice (v. 12), since no one has arranged His course and superintended Him as to ordering the universe (v. 13); for if He should shut up His affection unto Himself, and retreat within Himself from supervising His creatures (v. 14), all would die and return to the earth (v. 15). Again in arrogance they demand J.'s attention to their saying, if he has knowledge (v. 16). They denied that one who hated justice should rule; and should he, therefore, condemn God, the righteous and mighty One (v. 17)? Him that condemns J.F.R. as vile and Levite leaders as wicked (v. 18)? Him that shows no partiality to leaders, nor favors those rich in gifts more than those poor therein, since they all are alike His creatures (v. 19); for all are short-lived, and suddenly people pass away; and the mighty are shaken to ruin (v. 20)?

They declared that God knows all man's ways and doings (v. 21), resulting in nothing, even the deepest darkness and gloom, hiding evil-doers and false teachers (v. 22), seeing that He did not need to make a fresh study of man in order to bring him before Him in judgment (v. 23); but by inscrutable ways He brings the mighty to ruin and puts others into their positions (v. 24); therefore He takes note of their doings and secretly overthrows them and undoes them (v. 25). He smites the Levite leaders as wicked men publicly (v. 26), because they apostatized from Him and disregarded His teachings and arrangements (v. 27), whereby they distressed the humble unto crying to Him, and He responded to the afflicteds' cries (v. 28); for when He gives peace, who then can cause fear; but when He shows disfavor, who can discern His ways, regardless of whether a nation or an individual is concerned (v. 29)? This results, they falsely alleged, in no impious one ruling among God's people, and in their not being ensnared (v. 30). They then inquired whether any had confessed to God that they had borne punishment unto lasting reformation (v. 31), and requested Him to teach them what they did not

know, promising that if they sinned, they would do so no more (v. 32). In such cases should God's recompenses be as J. wished, he who, they alleged, had refused to submit thereto, since J. must choose his way and not they; hence he should speak only what he knew (v. 33). They alleged that all intelligent and wise men listening (v. 34) to them would agree that J. spoke in ignorance and unwisely (v. 35). Then they wished that J. had been tried unto a full conclusion, because they alleged that he had spoken like the wicked Levites (v. 36), alleging that he had added rebellion to his alleged evil official acts, acting triumphantly over the Levites and the Epiphany crown-losers (not yet manifested as such), and allegedly increasingly spoke against God (v. 37).

They went on in denouncing J. as they spoke to one another and before him and the three groups of Levites (35: 1). They falsely accused him, asking him if he thought it was right that he claimed to be more just than God (v. 2), again falsely alleging that he claimed that doing right would not be more profitable or advantageous to him than if he did wrong (v. 3). Assuming that this false charge was true, they promised to answer J. and the three Levite groups (v. 4). His contemplation of the powers of Levitical spiritual control, then allegedly higher than he (v. 5), should teach him that by sin he could effect nothing against God, not even if he had greatly increased his transgressions (v. 6). Conceding that he had faithfully fulfilled his office work, what, they ask, could he benefit God or what thereby had God ever received from him (v. 7), though they conceded that his sin could injure man, and that his righteousness could benefit a human (v. 8). Mankind because of the curse cry out, even because the mighty Satan oppresses them they cry for help (v. 9); but none of them inquire for God, who gives the song of Moses and the Lamb during the night of the curse (v. 10), and teaches His people more than He does the civil and ecclesiastical powers of great and small Babylon (v. 11). Amid these powers the people cry out for help, which none

of those give them, because of the pride of such evil ones (v. 12). Certainly God will not regard nor heed an insubstantial petition (v. 13). How much less would He listen to J., who, they falsely allege, could not understand God, but that his cause was before Him; and he was waiting in vain on God's answer (v. 14). But because He has not in anger punished J., nor paid much attention to his (alleged) arrogance, they alleged that J. opened his mouth to say vain things and ignorantly multiplied words (vs. 15, 16).

The loquacious, repetitious and false-accusing Epiphany crown-losers proceeded to pour out their partly wise and partly foolish effusions (36: 1). Apologetically they asked, knowing that they were presumptuous in attempting to read God's mouthpiece their lectures and largely false criticisms, to be endured somewhat, and would then teach J. in (alleged) defense of God (v. 2), declaring that they would draw their knowledge from far-off Bible teachings, and thus ascribe justice to God (v. 3). They solemnly aver that their views were not false, since, they alleged, the all-knowing Jehovah was on their side as against J. (God's mouthpiece! v. 4). They declared that God is powerful and without arrogance, especially mighty in strength of intellect (v. 5). He was not preserving J., the alleged wicked one, in his office, but vindicates the (unjustly) afflicted (v. 6). He ceases not to watch over the star-members, including J., but appointed them and him as the executives to long-reigning kings, God and Jesus, and exalted them and him (v. 7); but when as such the Philadelphia star-members and J. were restrained and punished (v. 8), He makes them and him aware of their and his evil works wherein they and he allegedly acted arrogantly (v. 9). But God caused them and him to learn the proprieties of their abused offices and charged that they reform (v. 10). But upon obedience to, and service of God, they will by Him be prospered and happy their life long (v. 11); but, if disobedient, they are refuted by their enemies' arguments, and in ignorance lose their office (v. 12); but the false and wicked teachers in great

and little Babylon arouse God's wrath, and fail properly to call for help when God restrains them (v. 13). They are soon cut off from their office; and their powers cease as they are put among the antitypical lepers (v. 14). But God frees the penitent amid their chastisement, and gives them an understanding of their condition, while oppressed by sectarians (v. 15). Hence, these good Levites alleged, God all along desired to persuade J. into forsaking his (alleged) evil course and out of his affliction into a free and unrestrained position and to a rich spiritual table (v. 16).

Sharply they charge him with being filled with sentences coming upon the clergy of great and little Babylon, and becoming the subject of condemning truth and righteousness (v. 17), charging him not to be filled with wrath over his chastisements, nor to let the largeness of the equivalent price that in punishment he must suffer for his (alleged) wrongs enrage him (v. 18), alleging that his cry and the power of his strength will not deliver him from his distress (v. 19), nor should he desire privacy, as people do when they are forced to give up their position (v. 20). They admonished him to be on his guard not to plan wrong, which, they alleged, he chose to avoid trouble (v. 21). Then they imply by contrast that J. is a wrong-doer, because God has been dealing sublimely with him as an incomparable Teacher (v. 22), whom none can direct or charge with unrighteousness (v. 23). Thereupon they admonished J. to magnify God's work, of which people have preached (v. 24), work which all see and consider in awe (v. 25), since He is great and people do not appreciate Him, and His duration is beyond man's comprehension (v. 26). He put the Truth into the Bible and caused it to become clear as due (v. 27); abundantly through the ministry of the powers of spiritual control He gives it to man (v. 28). They deny that any can understand the spread of trouble as God's controversy respecting His Church (v. 29); for He spreads the Truth and hides it from the depths of the rebellious (v. 30), since by the Truth He judges His people, as well as feeds them abundantly (v. 31). He hides His works from the

unworthy by the Truth, and charges that it accomplish His design on the good and evil (v. 32). Its proclamation manifests His exalted way to His people (v. 33).

They said that this fact made their hearts fear and be greatly moved (37: 1). They called upon J. to attend God's Word, even his own teachings (v. 2). God causes it to be spread among the powers of spiritual control in both Babylons unto the illumination of their several societies (v. 3), sending after it controversies commensurate with His greatness; nor does He restrain them with His proclamation going forth (v. 4). Great indeed are His controversies; and He does great things incomprehensible to His people (v. 5). He commands cold and warm truths, even in great abundance to be poured out upon society (v. 6). He reveals in this day of manifestation the work of all, that all His creatures may recognize it (v. 7); even this makes the governments seek shelter and hide from exposure (v. 8). From religious and secular exposures He causes the great tribulation to come (v. 9). By His power hardened Truth is formed, and it distresses the entirety of the rebellious race (v. 10); yea, He makes heavy the clouds of trouble, and spreads them abroad by His Truth (v. 11). Such Truth by His direction circulates everywhere, to effect His will among men (v. 12). He sends the Truth either to stripe or show mercy to His own, or to correct society (v. 13).

Again these crown-losers demand J.'s silent attention and meditation on their view of God's works (v. 14), asking him whether he understood the charge God laid on His Truth-bearers and His causing the Truth to shine out of troubles (v. 15), whether he understood how God balanced afflictions to His purposes in the works which flow out of His perfect knowledge (v. 16), how God developed his graces into good condition, while society among the Lord's people was at peace (during the Parousia), through easier controversy (v. 17), and whether he was with God to develop the powers of spiritual control in little Babylon, which are powerful to reflect the things of God (v. 18). If so, then he should teach

these Epiphany crown-losers and the three Levite groups how they should speak to God, for they acknowledged that by reason of their ignorance and effort they could not do it aright (v. 19); or does He need to be told that the former desires to speak, or should these desire to be swallowed up by silence (v. 20)? Yet the three Levite groups do not see the Truth as due, but controversy will clarify it (v. 21). But from the seat of the Divine glory the Truth comes in splendor, since God is encompassed by awesome majesty (v. 22). Then these Epiphany crown-losers summarize their thought on God, declaring that God is inscrutable, excelling all in power, wisdom, full justice and love (v. 23), which qualities draw out man's reverence for Him who does not appreciate the proud (v. 24). Thus ends the loquacious, unkind speech of the Epiphany crown-losers against J.

Amid and out of the revolutionisms of the good and bad Levites God speaks to J. (38: 1). First of all, through J.'s writings God charges that both the three bad Levite groups and the good Levites, the crown-losers in the Epiphany movement, darken the Truth by their teachings without proper knowledge (v. 2). We are not to understand that God spoke to J. audibly, but through His Word and works. And as in chapters 26-28 J.'s speeches typed there were made through his articles on God in *The Herald Of The Epiphany*, Nos. 33-69, so in God's speeches to Job, God spoke to J. through his articles on God's Creative Works, in Nos. 70-105, *i.e.*, as J. contemplated God's creative works he was in connection with all of them impressed by their majesty with the sense of God's greatness and perfection and of his own littleness and imperfection. It was thus that God, by these works impressing upon him these two great lines of thought, spoke in the antitype the things that He spoke to Job in the type.

This general remark will clear up everything in the antitype of Job 38: 3-41: 34. J.'s reactions to these thoughts that God impressed upon his mind by his contemplation of God's creative works are the antitypes of

those that Job experienced and expressed in Job 40: 3-5; 42: 1-6. These explanations will make it unnecessary to expound antitypically every verse in God's speeches; rather a summary of its sections will suffice to clarify their antitypes. We are now ready to proceed with these summaries. The providence of God in connection with J.'s discussion with Mr. Darrow aroused J. to undertake a very difficult service, *i.e.*, taking up the subjects of God and creation for lengthy discussions; and as such they were tasks for one well developed, and would more than tax his ability fully to expound (v. 3). In vs. 4-38 God typed how He by the pertinent products of inanimate creation, first in the earth (vs. 4-30) and then in the heavens (vs. 31-38), impressed upon J.'s mind God's majesty and perfection, and his own littleness and imperfection, by making those products of inanimate creation press upon J.'s mind questions like those that God asked Job: Thus He raised these questions as to the earth in its foundation (v. 4), its measures (v. 5), its law of gravitation and its main law of force (v. 6) and its dimensions (v. 18), operative when the angels in triumphant joy declared God's works (v. 7), as to the sea (vs. 8, 11, 16), as to earth's canopies (vs. 9, 10), as to light and darkness (vs. 12-15, 19-21, 24), as to death (v. 17), as to frost, snow, hail, dew, ice and rain (vs. 22, 23, 26-29) and as to streams, floods, lightning, thunder and springs (vs. 25, 30). J.'s efforts to get at the rock-bottom of the physical questions underlying these things resulted in his being baffled. The same was the result of his contemplation of the inanimate things of the heavens and the questions that arose in his mind for explanations on details connected with them (vs. 31-38). Thus this was true as he contemplated the constellations (vs. 31, 32), and the stars and their courses beyond the constellations (v. 33), with the clouds and lightning (vs. 34, 35, 37, 38), with the laws that underlie them (v. 36). Baffling!

Then the Lord in the articles on God's creative works treating of the animate creation in natures lower than man

raised certain questions in J.'s mind, whose solutions likewise baffled him. This occurred in his descriptions of lions (vs. 39, 40), of ravens (v. 41), of wild goats and antelopes (39: 1-4), of the wild asses (vs. 5-8), of the rhinoceros (vs. 9-12), of peacocks and ostriches (vs. 13-18), of the horse (vs. 19-25), of the hawk (v. 26), of the eagle (vs. 27-30). After bringing home to J. these questions, whose solutions baffled him, God proceeded to remind J. (40: 1) that no one who contended with God could teach Him anything, and any attempting to reprove God would be held responsible (v. 2) Overwhelmed with the sense of God's greatness and perfection and his own littleness and imperfection, J. often in his prayers, cried out (v. 3), confessed his littleness, acknowledging that if he should dispute with God he could not answer Him, and considered silence the proper thing for himself in God's presence (v. 4). He admitted that he had spoken on creative matters, but could not solve various questions that his contemplating the inanimate products of creation aroused in his mind. Yea, he admitted to have spoken again, this time on the animate products of creation lower than man, and was unable to solve the pertinent questions that God's works raised in his mind; but he decided to go no further in such efforts, since they baffled him (v. 5). Thereupon God amid and out of the Levitical revolutionisms proceeded to make J. more humble, assuring him (v. 6) that He was proposing to him a full-sized man's task in the work of giving solutions to the questions that God proposed to put to him (v. 7). God then by the condition of the Levitical revolutions asked if J., too, would set aside God's Truth, condemn God in order to justify himself (v. 8), and if he had power equal to God's or could controvert as God can (v. 9). Then God told him, if he were to do his utmost in the way of greatness and excellency and with honor and majesty (v. 10), of pouring out expressions of anger and attending to abase the proud (v. 11), and abasing him and treading down the wicked in their standing (v. 12), relegating them into obscurity (v. 13), then God

assured him that He would acknowledge that J. could by his own chief power declare himself (v. 14). Unable by such means to do the things of vs. 11-13, he was by God again shown his insignificance.

After this conviction was deepened in J., God, returning to the questions raised by Him in J.'s mind on animate things lower than man, suggested to his mind the hippopotamus as an herbivorous creation of God, even as J. was a creation of God (v. 15), a mighty and large beast (vs. 16-18). It is the first of God's surviving beasts, yet God can overcome it (v. 19). Like other beasts he can feed on the mountains, but unlike many others he can lie in the water under shade trees and amid its reeds and fens (vs. 20-22), slowly gulping down immense amounts of water, not even fearing a Jordan (v. 23). None can take or snare it, when it is on guard (v. 24). Thus God showed J. his weakness in the presence of this beast, about which were many questions that J. could not solve; and this fact served further to make J. feel God's greatness and perfection and his own littleness and imperfection, both very important lessons for J. to learn in his office.

Next God impressed the same lesson upon J. by various things that J. could not solve about the crocodile, showing him that he could not draw it with a hook, tie down its tongue with a cord, put a hook into its nose or bore through its jaw (41: 1, 2), nor prove it to plead with, or speak gentle words to him (v. 3), nor by agreement make it his lasting servant (v. 4), nor play with it as with a bird, or make it subject to his weaker helpers (v. 5). Can even bands make a feast of it and parcel it off among buyers (v. 6)? Nor could J. with barbed wires or fish spears overpower it (v. 7). If he should lay hands upon it, he would do no more than realize that it was in a fight (v. 8). Such an one would hope for rescue in vain, since even his appearance is discouraging (v. 9). No animal is so fierce as to dare anger it, let alone stand in conflict with it (v. 10). Yet God asserted that none had ever put Him under obligation, since everything is His (v. 11). God then

proceeded to a description of the crocodile's body in its various parts as an evidence of its supremacy among beasts and reptiles: limbs, strength, frame (v. 12), skin, jaws, teeth (vs. 13, 14), scales (vs. 15-17), nose, eyes, mouth (vs. 18, 19), nostrils (v. 20), breath, bill (v. 21), neck, with its terror-arousing appearance (v. 22), scales (v. 23), heart (v. 24), legs in rising (v. 25), against which neither sword, spear, dart nor pointed shaft can prevail (v. 26), which disposes iron and brass as straw and rotten wood (v. 27). Neither arrows, slingstones, clubs nor javelins affect it (vs. 28, 29); nor do sharp stones hurt his belly, as it claws the mire (v. 30).

Its moving in the water makes the latter boil, and stirs it into foam, like perfume shaken up (v. 31), leaving behind it a foaming grey wake (v. 32). Fearless, like it is not its equal on earth (v. 33). All the heights of power he experiences, and is chief among proud creatures (v. 34). In his contemplation of the crocodile as a work of God J. again recognized God's declaring His greatness and perfection and J.'s littleness and imperfection, and, therefore, in deep humility acknowledged (42: 1) God's ability to do anything that He pleased, and that none of His plans can be checkmated (v. 2). Humbly he acknowledged that, like the Levites on religious matters, he had been unable to explain and clarify many things in inanimate and animate creation lower than man (v. 3). He besought God to give a hearing to his speech and to let him ask God, and pleaded with God to explain matters to him (v. 4), confessing that he had heard matters as to God externally, but now perceived them internally. This made him think little of himself and in deep humility correct his standpoint on creative matters (v. 6); for we are to remember, as stated in the introduction to the study of Job 38-41, the things there dealt with are connected with his writing the treatise on God's Creative Works, in *The Herald Of The Epiphany*. None of these matters pertain to the Truth, on which God expressly states that J. taught aright, which neither the good nor bad Levites in the pertinent controversy did (vs. 7, 8). V. 6 ends the poetic part of Job.

Next comes the drama's epilogue. After Jehovah had in the articles on Creation, which ended in the last issue of the 1937 Herald Of The Epiphany, spoken to J. by the various things of inanimate and animate creation lower than man, God, early in 1938, aroused J. to prepare to write this treatise on The Epiphany messenger, which he began to write in the late Summer of 1938, after some preliminary study in the first half of that year. Since this treatise is a proper exposition of very much Scripture, it is as such God's voice speaking in displeasure at, and disapproval of the Merarites, and for this controversy, their less important allies, the Gershonites and the Kohathites, telling them that His wrath is kindled against them for their erroneous teachings as to Him in controversy with J., who had taught aright as to the Lord's Truth (v. 7). Then threateningly, and that through this treatise, God will demand of them that, with reliance upon Christ's merit for their acceptableness, they should turn to J. and have him in the incense coming from his service administer acceptably to God as a sacrificial priest the executive matters of their Levitical service; otherwise God would deal with them as their evil deeds and teachings required from justice, again reminding them that in the pertinent controversies they had advocated error in contradiction to J.'s true teachings (v. 8). This charge the Merarites, the Gershonites and the Kohathites will fulfill; and Jehovah will accept on their behalf J.'s sacrificial service ascending in prayer incense to God by Jesus' merit (v. 9). It will be while J. will be administering as a priest executively in matters of the Levites' service (Num. 4: 28, 33; 7: 8) that God will reverse J.'s condition into a better one than he had before the troubles typed in Job 1; 2 set in, giving him twice as much as he had before (v. 10).

Then will rally to him the Little Flock (brethren) and Great Company (sisters), the Youthful Worthies as friends of former years, and of course those of more recent times, and will partake of the Epiphany Truth at his hand in his exercise of the functions of his office as the Epiphany messenger,

sympathizing with him in his afflictions, and comforting him as to all the trouble that his loyalty to God, the Truth and the brethren brought upon him, due to his sharing in the Sin-offering sufferings, all giving him their support in their confidence that he is God's choice to administer the Epiphany Truth and work toward all God's people in the flesh (v. 11). Thus the Lord will give J. more powers, prerogatives and privileges than he had before in the number of the brethren, in the number of organizations, in the number of charters or constitutions and by-laws and in the amount of Truth literature (v. 12). He will have seven; very likely members of the Little Flock, as special helpers in lieu of the seven whom he lost, as typed in Job 1: 18, 19 (where it will be noted that nothing is said of the loss of his powers as writer, speaker and executive (three daughters), though the facts prove that these three powers were in their exercise greatly limited during J.'s affliction time). These three powers will in the fulness of their exercise be restored to J. (v. 13). The first of these is J.'s Holy Spirit power as a writer (correspondent, editor and author, Jemima, *dove*); the second of these is his interpretative and persuasive power as a speaker (lecturer, preacher, conversationalist—Keziah, *cassia*) and the third is his practical power as an executive for both priests and Levites (Kerenhappuch, *horn of beauty*, v. 14). In these three powers there will be no one in Truth circles whom God will consider J.'s equal in themselves and in the Holy Spirit; and J. will use these in his dealings with his seven special helpers (v. 15). And after the setting in of J.'s restoration to the exercise of his full office powers, he will exercise his office toward the priests and Levites [ $140 = 7$  (Little Flock as Divine)  $\times 10$  (Great Company and Youthful Worthies as of natures lower than the Divine)  $\times 2$  (combined in their work)]. He will have the privilege of presiding in his ministry over his seven special helpers, and over the three groups of Levites, who will consist of Great Company brethren and Youthful Worthies (v. 16), serving until he finishes his course (v. 17).

## CHAPTER IX.

### JOSEPH—TYPE AND SMALLEST ANTITYPE.

INTRODUCTORY CONSIDERATION. JOSEPH'S HUMILIATIONS. JOSEPH'S PRE-FAMINE EXALTATION. JOSEPH'S FAMINE DEALINGS WITH HIS BROTHERS AND FATHER JOSEPH'S FINAL DEALINGS WITH HIS FATHER, INCLUDING THE FATHER'S FAREWELL TO HIS SONS. THE FINAL SCENES.

AS INTRODUCTORY to the study of this chapter's subject a brief consideration of Gen. 33: 17-35: 29 will be helpful. Elsewhere it has been shown that Gen. 31 treats of the separation of the Lord's real people from His nominal people from 1846 to 1916; vs. 1-16 type the acts that produced the separation; vs. 17-21 type the separation itself; vs. 22-24 type the reaction of the nominal people of God thereto and God's warning them as to their pertinent course; vs. 25-32 type the debate of the leaders of God's two peoples thereover; vs. 33-35 type the nominal people of God searching the teachings and arrangements of God's real people in an effort to find their creed idols with the latter; vs. 36-42 type the leaders of God's real people rebuking the leaders of God's nominal people for the latters' Gospel-Age oppression of the former; vs. 43-54 type the agreement between the two sets of leaders to keep each one to his peculiar sphere of activity in their separation; and v. 55 types the final act of separation in more or less good will. In Chapter II a brief exposition of Gen. 32: 1-33: 16 is given; and with these brief remarks we are ready to take up a brief study of Gen. 33: 17-35: 29 as an introduction to the proper subject-matter of this chapter, remarking that in this section is typed a brief summary of certain main Parousia and Epiphany matters.

The formation and chief work of the Zion's Watch Tower Tract Society in 1881 to 1884, before it was incorporated (Dec. 13, 1884), are given in v. 17; for in those years the five leading brethren occupied themselves in a temporary form (*Succoth, tents*) of expediting the work for the Lord's Truth people toward the brethren in

the nominal church. But in 1884 the leading brethren in peace (mistranslated in the A.V. as a proper noun, Shalem; see the A.R.V.) entered into the discussion of incorporating the Zion's Watch Tower Tract Society (*Shechem, shoulder, accord*, v. 18; in 1896 there were added to the name, after the word Tower, the words "Bible and"), in the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit, after leaving the sphere of the nominal church's creeds and their spirit, and with all the Truth people they took their position in relation to the discussion of such incorporation. The leading brethren paid the price of sacrificing some of their human all for the advantages to be gained from incorporating (the children of Hamor [*ass*, here representing the charter, which fathered the board of directors]); for unincorporated they feared certain dangers to the work in case of Bro. Russell's death. In connection with this corporation, which during Bro. Russell's life was only a name behind which he hid himself, the Church as God's altar was gathered together and was called, the mighty one of God's people (v. 20). Thus is briefly treated the Society as a corporation during the Parousia. Its real vitalizing occurred at the time of Bro. Russell's death, *i.e.*, in the Epiphany, even as he had all along purposed; for then the Society as shareholders, directors and officers stepped upon the stage of activity, and developed into a sectarian movement, partly a Truth movement and partly a nominal-church movement and took its stand as such among both (*Dinah, judgment*, 34: 1). The directors, developed by the charter, the Society's rulers in the spheres of the Truth people's relations to these two movements, defiled the Society as shareholders, directors and officers: (1) by giving the shareholders the liberty of passing J.F.R.'s resolutions, intended to be by-laws; (2) by converting those resolutions into Society by-laws, and (3) by acquiescing three months in J.F.R.'s usurpation over the Society (v. 2).

These directors, especially their majority, thereafter greatly longed to be the head of the Society in its share-

holders and officers and in its business and affairs, seeking to win them thereto (v. 3). They enlisted the charter's provisions as favoring their pertinent desires and as gaining them for themselves (v. 4). The Little Flock leaders in J. had learned that the directors had done these three defiling acts to the Society as share holders, directors and officers, before the prospective Great Company groups, busy with their shepherdizing the Lord's people, were aware of it; and for a while these Little Flock leaders in J. kept silence thereover (v. 5). The charter in the persons of the board's majority and their supporters sought J.'s consent to the former's suit (v. 6). From the resultant discussion the prospective Great Company groups learned of the pertinent evils of the directors, and were from various standpoints grieved and greatly enraged thereover, since this was a great wrong and folly done among God's people (v. 7). The charter in its supporters sought to bring to the directors the headship of the Society in its officers and shareholders (v. 8), as it proposed other cooperative connections (v. 9), whereby it was thought their mutual interests would be prospered (v. 10). To the pleas of the charter in its supporters, the board's majority, which representatively as such was the board, added their pleas, promising to render any service required to gain headship in the Society (vs. 11, 12). This came to a head in the directors' meeting of June 20, 1917, when the resolution was presented to rescind the by-laws that J.F.R. was using to usurp controllership over the Society and its business and affairs, as well as over the board. Deceitfully in J.F.R., W.E.V. and A.H.M., because of the pertinent evils done antitypical Dinah (v. 13), put off the directors as requiring something illegal and dishonorable for them on corporational matters, since the shareholders had voted these as valid by-laws (v. 14), but agreed to reciprocate in matters of mutual relations, if, like them, they would submit to pertinent corporational law (vs. 15, 16), threatening that if they would not agree thereto, they would take all society

matters out of their power (v. 17), and promising that they would furnish legal proof that the shareholders' resolutions were binding on the board.

The four directors and the charter in its supporters, satisfied with this line of thought (v. 18), agreed to abide by the law on the subject, if J.F.R., etc., could furnish legal proof on their claim, because they honorably desired to be conformable to the law, and thus get their rights in harmony therewith in the Society (v. 19). The directors and the charter in its supporters conferred with their like-minded brethren (v. 20), assuring them of the peaceable character of J.F.R., etc., and proposing mutual cooperation on all sides (v. 21), on condition that they agree to abide by the pertinent corporational law, like the others (v. 22), alleging that they would greatly profit from this course (v. 23). To this all the prominent ones consented, signifying and enacting their willingness to submit legally in the matter (v. 24). But when these were distressed by their agreed submission to the alleged pertinent law, treacherously the prospective Mahlite and Mushite Levites, July 17, 1917, presented an opinion of a lawyer who later in effect acknowledged that it was a bought and untrue opinion, to the effect that the four directors were not legal directors, alleging that the law required directors to be annually elected, an opinion that, if true, would have voided the directorship of the other three and voided the standing of the three officers of the board (vs. 25-27); and these Mahlite and Mushite Levites used that opinion as though it were a judge's decision, and thus illegally for that opinion ousted the four directors, cutting them and their supporters off from the Society, practically made the charter nonexistent and took the Society in its directors, officers and shareholders out of the possession of the genuine directors and went their way, making plunder of every pertinent person and thing (vs. 28, 29). Later it was learned that the law's requirement affected only directors of corporations to be formed *after* its enactment, and did not apply to corporations formed *before* its enactment,

if their charters required their directors to hold office longer than a year. In other words, the law was not retroactive. The Little Flock leaders in J. protested against the course of these Mahlite and Mushite Levites as grieving them and making them unpopular to outsiders, especially in the civil powers, and of endangering them, few in number, to the many outsiders, unto cutting off from place and privilege (v. 30). These excused their deed on the basis that the directors had defiled the Society (v. 31).

God having in 33: 18–34: 31 typed the Society, the first phase exclusively Parousiac, the second Parousiac and Epiphaniac, in its main features in its two phases, the antitype of chapter 35 goes back to the Church as such apart from corporational matters and treats of it, first in certain Parousia features, then in certain Epiphany features. God charged the Little Flock leaders, especially their chief, Bro. Russell, to occupy themselves with Church matters, erecting the true Church as God's Altar in conformity with the model erected in the Jewish Harvest, when the Apostles and their supporters, fleeing from Fleshly Israel, were favored with the Lord's revealing to them His plan (35: 1). Thereupon Bro. Russell and his special helpers, five successive brethren, as previously pointed out, exhorted all Truth people to put away the idols of error, sin, selfishness and worldliness in all their various forms and to purify their graces from pertinent faults (v. 2), and in this condition to betake themselves to the sphere of the Church as to Biblical Truth and its Spirit, and there erect the true Church as the Altar of that God who revealed Himself in His plan to the Apostles and their special helpers amid their distress and the course that they took (v. 3). This exhortation led to the reformation suggested; and all yielded up their symbolic idols and their speculations to Bro. Russell and his five successive special helpers; and these buried them in oblivion in connection with the ministry of Bro. Russell and his successive special helpers, near Society conditions (v. 4). They made the mental journey to primitive Church

conditions, the nominal people of God, by God's providence, fearing them and not opposing them successfully (v. 5). Thus Bro. Russell, his five successive special helpers and all the rest of the Truth people passed over the misdevelopments of the Interim and reached Apostolic conditions in the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit (v. 6). In that condition Bro. Russell and his five successive special helpers erected the Church as God's Altar and called the condition, the mighty one of the house of God, since it was in that condition that God revealed Himself to the Apostles and their special helpers when they fled from persecuting Fleshly Israel (v. 7). It was in this condition that servants (*Deborah, bee*) of the elective truths pertinent to Fleshly and Spiritual Israel finished their course, and were kept in loving remembrance in connection with Bro. Russell and his five successive special helpers near the true Church's conditions, the Lord's people sorrowing over their loss of these (*Allon, oak; bachuth, of weeping*).

During the Parousia God by the Truth manifested Himself to Bro. Russell and his special helpers, as He had done before to the Apostles and their special helpers (v. 9). Whereas during the Jewish Harvest God made the Apostles and their special helpers in particular the supplanters (*Jacob, supplanter*) of the Jewish clergy, during the Parousia God made Bro. Russell and his special helpers the warriors, or princes, of God against the nominal-church clergy (v. 10). During the Parousia God in His power gave them much fruitfulness, even unto their developing the holy nation, the Little Flock, and those who later would be developed into the Great Company groups, yea, even developing such as would become Millennial kings (v. 11). The sphere of Truth and its Spirit that God in His attribute of power gave to God in His attribute of love (Abraham) and to Jesus Christ in His attribute of love (Isaac), God in the Parousia pledged Bro. Russell and that special helper of his who would remain faithful and to all whom they would

develop unto faithfulness (v. 12). This ended that phase of the Divine revelation of Truth to Bro. Russell and his special helpers (v. 13). In view of this revelation Bro. Russell and his special helpers set forth the Parousia Truth, presenting it in its simpler phases (drink offering) and in its harder phases (oil) in understandable ways. And this condition was called the Church by Bro. Russell and his special helpers. Thus briefly in vs. 1-15 we are given a typical description of the development of the Parousia Truth.

Epiphany conditions are described in vs. 16-29. During post-Parousia times the elective truths that developed the two spiritual classes of the Gospel Age—the Little Flock and the Great Company—reached the completion of their work, which is typed by Rachel's death, she typing these two sets of Gospel-Age elective truths and their appliers. The production of the Great Company as a class is an Epiphany work; for by the time the Epiphany ends in its lapping, 1956, all Great Company members will have been brought into the Truth; this completion of that class and their later development in grace, knowledge, service and trial will be some little time (how long we do not know) before the earthly phase of the Kingdom is established. The secondary elective truths and the servants who apply them to the Great Company have very hard labor in bringing this class forth (v. 16). Amid this hard labor J. tells the personal part of these Gospel-Age promises to take comfort amid their hard labor from the thought that they are developing another elect class, the Great Company (v. 17). (In v. 18 the word rendered *soul* should have been given as *life*.) In the death throes of the Great Company promises in their appliers they consider and will consider this class as one that gave them overmuch pain (Ben-oni, *son of my pain*), but J. counts them the class of his chief favor (Benjamin, *son of the right hand*, v. 18). These promises and their appliers, beginning in their second phase, Oct., 1954, to come to an end, will cease entirely to operate some time after 1956, when they shall have fully prepared

the Great Company unto fitness for their spirit existence and work but before the earthly phase of the Kingdom that will feed all with the bread of life is reached (Ephrath, *fruitful*; Bethlehem, *house of bread*), and will be held in respectful memory from Oct., 1954 onward (v. 19). In his exposition of Revelation J. will erect a literary memorial to the Gospel-Age's two elective sets of Truths and their applicers to their respective classes, a literary memorial that will be preserved into the Ages to come (v. 20). It is to be remembered that in the personal parts of antitypical Rachel the applicers of the promises of the Parousia Little Flock movement and of the Epiphany Great Company movement have been finishing their course, some during the Parousia, some during the Epiphany, and some (Great Company applicers of pertinent truths) after 1956 up to the end of this class's stay on earth. Hence the antitypical memorial could be erected before the last of them leaves the earth.

Another phase of the Epiphany is brought out in vs. 21, 22. J. led the Lord's peoples to the Epiphany elective Truth as the strength of God's flock (*Edar, flock*) and even beyond it to truths relating to Israel and the world. This began in the way of a foregleam, June 27, 1914, when J. pointed out to Bro. Russell that the evening of the penny parable would come Oct., 1914, and that during it the Great Company would murmur and be separated from the Little Flock; and it began as an actual Epiphany work the night of Nov. 9 (God's time, the 10th), 1916, when he told the executive committee, on the basis of Ps. 91: 5, 6, and Ezek. 9: 2, 5-10 (the sixth slaughter man), that a world-wide, the sixth, harvest sifting was about to break out, beginning in Europe, and that this would continue in ever-increasing measure (v. 21). It was during this time that the Gershonite Levites (Reuben, *behold a son*) defiled certain of the Lord's truths and arrangements, particularly those that are nearest the Little Flock truths and arrangements. Among such truths are those on the Sin-offering, the chronology,

Daniel and Revelation; and among such arrangements are those on headquarters, corporations and charters. This was a great grief to J. (v. 22). Vs. 23-26 treat of the Epiphany Levite groups and of J. They will be merely enumerated here and details on them will come in the exposition of Gen. 49. Reuben types the Gershonites, the first class of the Epiphany Levites to be manifested; the Merarites are not typed by a single son, but their two groups, Mahlites and Mushites, are respectively typed by Simeon and Levi; the Kohathites are typed by Judah; the Libnite Gershonites are typed by Issachar, and the Shimite Gershonites by Zebulon. These are the groups developed by the less refined Epiphany truths and their appliers (Leah, v. 23). J. is typed by Joseph, and the good crown-losing Levites are typed by Benjamin. These are developed by the higher Epiphany truths and their appliers (Rachel, v. 24). The Sturgeonites are typed by Dan, and the Hirshites by Naphtali. These were developed by truths and their appliers more nearly related to those typed by Rachel (Bilhah, v. 25). The Ritchieites are typed by Gad, and the Olsonites by Asher. These were developed by truths and their appliers (Zilpah) better than those typed by Leah, but not so good as those typed by Bilhah (v. 26).

A final Epiphany feature is typed in vs. 27-29. In their mutual relations Jacob and Esau have double applications: for Esau types (1) Fleshly Israel rejected from the spiritual election (Rom. 9: 10-13) and (2) the Great Company rejected from the chief spiritual election (Heb. 12: 16, 17); and Jacob types (1) Spiritual Israel accepted into the spiritual election (Rom. 9: 10-13) and (2) the star-members and their special helpers. From the standpoint of the first set of types blind Isaac types God in His impartiality as to which class the Lord would make the Gospel-Age elect, though giving Fleshly Israel the first chance thereat; and Rebekah types the spiritual promises and their appliers as favoring Spiritual Israel. From this viewpoint first we will interpret vs. 27-29: Spiritual Israel in both elect classes

in the Epiphany in mind journey to the strong (Mamre, *strength*) friendship (Hebron, *friendship*) of God in His elective impartiality (v. 27); and they come there, in the Little Flock before, and in the Great Company shortly after the last one of the Great Company class in 1956 gets the Truth, and find that God has come to an end of His Gospel-Age spiritual elective work after He has exercised it throughout the Gospel Age and in its three Miniatures; and they will hold Him in loving appreciation therefore; while later, Fleshly Israel, after their conversion, which will come after 1956, will come to see their real place in God's earthly election, and will hold Him in loving appreciation (vs. 28, 29) As to the second set of antitypes: Bro. Russell made and J. will make a mental journey in the strong friendship of God in His elective impartiality (v. 27), and will find that God will come to an end of His elective work as to the Little Flock in J., its last member to leave the earth; after he has fully seen God's elective work as to the star-members, he will revere God heartily therefore (vs. 28, 29).

Since Gen. 36 treats of Fleshly Israel in details not germane to this chapter on Joseph, Type and Smallest Antitype, we will leave its exposition for some future time and occasion. Having ended the exposition of the sections that are introductory to the study of the smallest Joseph, we are now prepared to take up the matters that are germane to the subject of this chapter. From Gen. 37 to the end of the book, with certain exceptions immediately to be noted, a new set of antitypes are typed. We have seen that up to Jacob's flight from his home he types Spiritual Israel, while Esau types Fleshly Israel. Then from the outstart of Jacob's flight up to Gen. 35: 29 Jacob types the star-members and their special helpers, *i.e.*, the special leaders of God's people from Pentecost until the end of the Epiphany. We have further seen that ten of Jacob's sons, from the standpoint of the Gospel-Age picture, as a whole type the ten denominations of Christendom, Joseph (*increase*), the Parousia Little Flock and its movement, and

Benjamin, the Epiphany Great Company and its movement. And because Gen. 34: 1-31 and 35: 16-29 refer to the Epiphany, in the exposition of Gen. 34 and 35: 23-26 Epiphany antitypes were given. And beginning with Gen. 37, the Epiphany setting is the antitype of the rest of the book in its smallest application. Having given the Epiphany antitypes of Jacob's sons in expounding Gen. 34 and 35: 23-26, the only additional remark necessary as introductory to the study of the rest of Genesis is that everywhere from Gen. 37 onward Jacob represents the Little Flock, except at his death he also, for parallel dispensation purposes, types our Lord as founding the Church on the twelve Apostles, and his sons, accordingly, type the twelve Apostles. We will here, by the Lord's grace, give briefly the Epiphany picture from Gen. 37 to the end of the book, remarking that additionally Joseph typed (1) Jesus, (2) the 49 star-members and (3) J., in certain features, as the Epiphany messenger from the standpoint (1) of his humiliations and (2) of his exaltations. From here on (3) will be the viewpoint.

The Little Flock during the Epiphany continued to live in the sphere of God's Truth and Spirit (37: 1). The rest of Genesis is a history of the events of this period as related to it, the Little Flock, the Levite groups and J., whose ministry (1) from June, 1911 to June 27, 1914 and (2) from June 27, 1914 until Oct. 31, 1916 was a special preparation for his work as the Epiphany messenger, and from Oct. 31, 1916 to Oct. 31, 1956 is a fulfillment of his work as the Epiphany messenger, a work that is specifically that of a Little Flock brother (one of the Divine class, symbolized by the 7 in the 17) toward the Great Company and Youthful Worthies (two classes of natures lower than the Divine nature, hence symbolized by the 10 in the 17). During the periods (June, 1911 to June 27, 1914 and June 27, 1914 to Oct. 31, 1916) preparatory for his ministry as that messenger, J. was busily engaged in serving God's Flock, and that in special association with crown-losers, who, unorganized at that

time, were all anticipatorily counted by God as Kohathites in their four subdivisions; and seeing the mischief that certain of their leaders were doing the brethren, *e.g.*, E. W. Brenneisen, at Bethel, and G. B. Raymond, in pilgrim work, as shown in Chapter V, J. brought these matters to the attention of the Little Flock, representatively in Bro. Russell, not in the spirit of tale-bearing, but in the spirit that would protect the Flock from their evil influence (v. 2).

The Church in Bro. Russell favored J. during the second of those preparatory periods above all the other prominent brethren, because of his having been developed by the Little Flock in Bro. Russell in his ripest wisdom, for which reason during that period the Little Flock in Bro. Russell promoted J. to the most responsible work of the pilgrim service, *e.g.*, during this period (1) he caused him increasingly to attend more conventions and increasingly to take more prominent and frequent parts on their programs, including quite a number of chairmanships, than any other pilgrim, and selected him as the only extra-Bethel pilgrim to deliver one of the lectures in the series of lectures given in the N. Y. Temple the summer of 1916; (2) he arranged in May 1916 for J. to be appointed to serve especially in the larger ecclesiastas, and had his routes arranged to this end; (3) he arranged pilgrim trips for him that were especially intended to reconcile contending parties in divided ecclesiastas, perhaps the most difficult form of the pilgrim work; (4) he arranged for J. to have more public meetings than any other pilgrim; (5) he arranged for J. to have regular follow-up colportresses to devote all their time to visit those who left inquiry cards at his public meetings; (6) he appointed him to introduce the Pastoral work at conventions and in the larger ecclesiastas; and (7) he appointed him to do the work in Britain that, quite probably unknown to Bro. Russell, actually was to be the first part of his ministry as the Epiphany messenger, *i.e.*, that part of the work that he as God's hand has been doing with Azazel's Goat (v. 3).

Such promotion of J. by the Little Flock in Bro. Russell as the pilgrim to do the most responsible work of all the pilgrims, as an evidence of his being the most favored of them by the Little Flock in Bro. Russell, stirred up, sad to say, the envy and ill-will of the other leading pilgrims, especially those at Bethel; and they showed this in their speaking of him in an unfriendly way (v. 4), *e.g.*, J.F.R., on learning that J. was appointed to take the European trip, told J. at Oakland, Md., Oct. 30, 1916, that he wished that he himself were the one who was to take it. At the time J. did not think that J.F.R. envied him, but in view of v. 4 and of the fulfillments of vs. 5-11, 18-24, which typed events in 1917, as will shortly be shown, he now believes that before Bro. Russell's death J.F.R. envied him (v. 4). During Feb., 1917, J. first began to see from the Bible that he was appointed to be what proved to be the Epiphany messenger, the proofs of which are found in the preceding chapters, though on account of the leading brethren, including himself, believing that Bro. Russell, having died without giving the penny, was to have a successor, *i.e.*, the steward of the penny parable, J. temporarily believed that his office was that of the steward of that parable, which thing J. told, first a number of British brethren, first of all J. Hemery, who had already concluded that himself was antitypical Mordecai, and who showed the envy of ill-will when J. proved that he could not be such, since he bowed down to H.J.S., antitypical Haman; then to pacify J.F.R., who after Nov. 3 assumed himself to be the steward of the penny parable, J. cabled it to him in a wire of which J.F.R. later made dishonest use at the first of "two hearings before the Board" and later before the Bethel family and still later in Harvest Siftings. J.F.R. repeatedly showed by expression and act the envy of ill-will thereover, especially in the second of the "two hearings before the Board," when J. proved from 2 Sam. 23: 8-23 and 1 Chro. 11: 10-25 that J.F.R. was the seventh, and that J. was the second ranking Truth warrior of the Parousia. This same

envy of ill-will infected the leaders of the various Levite groups (v. 5). J. told his pertinent thought, to the effect that what proved to be the Levite brethren would be subject to him in his executive office (vs. 6, 7). This they greatly and increasingly resented, especially throughout the period from Feb. to Dec., 1917, *i.e.*, while Levites were being manifested as such under the bad Levite leadership of H.J.S., J. H., J.F.R., M. Sturgeon, etc.

But there was another phase than that of executorship in J.'s office powers as the Epiphany messenger, *i.e.*, that of special mouthpieceship for the Lord; and the disclosure of this phase to the Levite leaders, as well as to the Little Flock, by J. is brought out in vs. 9-11; for J. saw from certain Scriptures, indicated above, that, not only executorship as to the priestly work was committed to him, but also mouthpieceship for the Lord Jesus, which put into his *teaching* care not only the Truth (the moon), but also the Little Flock (the sun) and the Levites of the Great Company and Youthful Worthies (the eleven stars, v. 9). This J. told to the priestly and Levitical brethren, the Little Flock brethren rebuking him therefore, as they saw the implications of J.'s claim to having charge of the Truth (v. 10). But the Little Flock neither rejected the thought nor envied J. thereover, but made it a matter of study, while this thought increased Levitical envy and ill-will against him (v. 11). These two disclosures by J. occurred increasingly on both phases from Feb. to Dec., 1917, and thereafter on mouthpieceship alone into March, 1918. Vs. 12-17 treat of antitypes from Oct. 7, 1916 to June 20, 1917. On Oct. 7, 1916, the Little Flock in Bro. Russell, and Nov. 2-10, 1916, in the Board by the Executive Committee, among other things, announced to J. that he was to go to Europe as pilgrim and investigator, the Board through that committee giving him power of attorney in all the business and affairs of the Society wherever he was sent outside of America. J. expressed willingness to undertake the mission and left on Nov. 11, 1916, in a condition of friendship to all, and

sought to find the brethren in one accord (Shechem, *accord*, vs. 13, 14). But J. wandered in a more or less mistaken view of his office functions, which he mistakenly understood to mean those of the steward of the penny parable, and did not find the brethren in one accord (Shechem, *accord*). While in this mistaken condition J. was asked by M. Sturgeon what he sought; and he told it. Then the former told him how Bro. Russell had given the penny, and thus was the parable's steward, and then showed him the real condition of things at Bethel and the general shepherdizing of God's flock, *i.e.*, that the brethren were divided into two groups, those standing for Bro. Russell's arrangements and those standing for J.F.R.'s arrangements as to Truth work in feeding the flock (Dothan, *two wells*). Accordingly, J. mentally went to and met the brethren so divided at Brooklyn, even as in London he found a like condition, not noted in the type (vs. 15-17).

J.F.R. having announced at the Bethel table before J.'s return from Britain that the latter was (allegedly) insane, for a time the Bethel brethren held aloof from him, both physically and mentally, a great contrast from the conditions that prevailed when he left Bethel on Nov. 11, 1916, for Britain. Nevertheless, for the most part this aloofness increasingly passed away, when the brethren saw that J.F.R.'s above-mentioned announcement was untrue; still the leading brethren, first "the present management," then later others at Bethel and, finally, even the four directors conspired against J., "the present management" counseling to cut him off, both from fellowship and service, entirely (v. 18), as one who (allegedly) imagined that he was the Divinely-authorized executive and mouthpiece (v. 19). Not only did "the present management" advise such cutting off, but additionally published untrue slanders against him, agreeing to charge that a demon possessed him; and thereafter they would see what would come of his claims (v. 20); but I.F. Hoskins, June 20-22, 1917, and his supporters (Reuben), hearing of

this plan, fought it so thoroughly, in so far as the cutting off was concerned, that it was in that part entirely given up, he and the other three directors agreeing to the slandering of J.'s British mission and work, as advocated by J.F.R., assisted especially by W.E.V. and more or less passively by A. N. Pierson, who up to July 10, 1917, had not heard J.'s defense, and who after hearing it took his view of his British mission and work. I.F. Hoskins' purpose was to gain time and then deliver J. from J.F.R.'s and W.E.V.'s fell purposes into the safe-keeping of the Little Flock (vs. 21, 22). But laying hold of J., they, from June 20 to June 27, 1917, stripped him of his credential-sanctioned authority, as well as his special pilgrim powers, with which he was invested as *bona fide* authority and powers (v. 23). Then they made him the object of a world-wide slander campaign, beginning at Bethel, proceeding through J.F.R.'s whispering falsehoods to his prospective pseudo-directors, a letter campaign and Harvest Siftings, Nos. 1 and 2, and coming to a head in the numerous conventions held in 1917, the straw-vote campaign and the voting shareholders' meeting, Jan. 6, 1918. In this slandered condition J. found no comfort and refreshment (v. 24).

Considering that they had finished J. forever as an influence among Truth people, the Levite leaders and their supporters appropriated to themselves what they could lay hands on, the Merarite leaders and their supporters appropriating to themselves the Society powers, and the "Opposition" leaders and their supporters, whose cause was distinct from J.'s, but whose cause they declined to espouse, though saying some things in his favor, even as their paper, Light After Darkness, distinctly avows, appropriating to themselves various powers as various of them severally were able to get these from the "Opposition"; but they noticed that there were genuine sympathizers (Ishmaelites, *whom God hears*) of J. coming from a strong position of truth and righteousness on their way to Epiphany matters and conditions (Egypt, *fortress*), where they would engage

in symbolic trade with graces and comfort amid sufferings (v. 25). A.I. Ritchie, R.H. Hirsh and M. Sturgeon, cherishing a kindred feeling for J., and not desiring him to be cut off entirely, reasoned that what proved to be the Kohathites and certain Gershonites would gain no profit from his being cut off entirely and from their hiding the deed (v. 26); hence they suggested that they dispose of J. to his real sympathizers; and thus they would be guiltless of his entire cutting off, since he was of a kindred spirit with them. This suggestion appealed to the Kohathites and certain Gershonites (v. 27). In the meantime the Merarites as erroneous strife-breeders (Midianites, *strifeful ones*), as bargain-makers, passed by and beyond them, as done in a fellowship way with J. forever, though later they shared by their course at the Society officers' election in selling J. to those of the "Opposition" who were the main supporters of the Fort Pitt Committee. Thereafter the Kohathites and certain Gershonites vindicated J. from the untruthful slanderous condition in which he had been put and disposed of him to his sympathizers for the price of their gaining the powers of Kohathite and Gershonite Levites. And J.'s sympathizers brought him into Epiphany conditions and matters in humiliation (v. 28).

Intent on fully delivering J. from his situation and on bringing him safely to the protection of the Little Flock, the section of the Gershonites who were not partakers in the symbolic sale of J. and who were led by I.F. Hoskins, returned to the task of vindicating J. from the malicious slanders in which he was involved; but finding him removed from that condition, and fearing the worst, they did violence to their graces in their disappointment (v. 29). Going to the others, they told these that J. was undoubtedly entirely cut off, and demanded to know on what mental journey they should betake themselves for search of him (v. 30). Now faced by the problem as to how to account to the Little Flock for J.'s disappearance from among what were Levites, certain of them decided to tell them the

story that J. had as a New Creature been destroyed by a demon which gained possession of him, and as such had ruined his New Creature unto the Second Death; and to lend plausibility to the story they claimed that J. in his alleged demoniac insanity had broken up irretrievably the British Church, his guiltiness having therein, according to their charge, stained his executive and pilgrim powers (v. 31). Then his powers allegedly so stained they presented to the Little Flock, claiming that their investigations resulted in the findings that they presented in their various slanders against J. and asked the Little Flock whether they could recognize them as J.'s. The poor, guileless Little Flock, accustomed to getting only truth from the Society publications and its various mouthpieces, recognizing J.'s powers and, accepting the falsehoods told them by the prospective Levite leaders and groups, heart-brokenly believed that an evil angel had destroyed J.'s New Creature (v. 33). Doing violence to their graces and putting on the disgraces of inordinate grief, disappointment and despair, they mourned him many years as a Second Deather (v. 34). Despite the efforts of the Great Company and Youthful Worthy brethren to comfort them, they refused to accept their comforting assurances, moaning that unto the end of their life they would mourn for J. (v. 35). Some of J.'s sympathizers, turning strifeful at the Fort Pitt Convention, Jan., 7, 1918, by the formation of the Fort Pitt Committee, of which they made him a member, sold him to that committee's main supporters as the Lord's specially chosen officer over those who guarded His interests, even as the Societyites by their strifeful course in their 1918 election shared therein (v. 36).

In Gen. 38 various pictures are given typing the genesis and development of the four groups of the Kohathites, who are typed by Judah, the subject of Gen. 38. During this period, *i.e.*, Oct., 1916-March, 1918, the Kohathite Levites in withdrawing gradually from the other Levites came to J. (*Hirah, nobility*), as the latter dwelt in the rest of faith (38: 1),

and there took up with the view (daughter . . . Shuah, *wealth*) that the Lord's priestly work (these Kohathites, of course, believed themselves to be priests) should not be controlled by corporations or committees; and they in M. Sturgeon developed out of this truth the Uzzielite Kohathite movement (*Er, watcher*), which, in its observing of prevalent Truth people's conditions, took an oppositional stand toward the Fort Pitt Committee, especially toward J. (v. 3). Again, from this same doctrine the Kohathites in A.I. Ritchie developed the Hebronite movement (*Onan, strong*), which with a friendly exterior worked underhandedly against the Fort Pitt Committee, especially against J. (v. 4). A third time the Kohathites out of this doctrine developed a movement, the Olsonite movement (*Shelah, petition, request*); at that time the Kohathites were in a deceptive condition; for Olsonism was a bundle of deceptions (*Chezib, deceptive*, v. 5). The Kohathites took for the Uzzielite movement the teaching (*Tamar, palm*) that the general elders of the Church were free and independent of the authority of any other general elder, a teaching that is true, except when there is a star-member officiating (v. 6). But the Uzzielite movement did evil in a variety of ways, *e.g.*, in Brooklyn without class authorization it formed a class out of members of the Brooklyn "Opposition" ecclesia, and under M. Sturgeon's lead studied with many erroneous conclusions Revelation. It under M. Sturgeon's envious opposition to J. fought J.'s view of the last related acts of Elijah and Elisha; and when the ecclesia disapproved of the existence of the unauthorized class and of its study of Revelation, under M. Sturgeon's manipulation Hattie O. Henderson published as venomous an attack on J. as Harvest Siftings, and passed it out in the ecclesia as "a love letter." Wherever M. Sturgeon would do pilgrim work he would sometimes covertly, sometimes overtly attack J. One of these attacks, favored by his movement, he made to J.'s face in a sermon preached in the Brooklyn "Opposition" ecclesia. These and other things led to the disruption and

extinction of the Uzzielite movement as such under M. Sturgeon's leadership (v. 7).

This movement being dead, the Kohathites in A.I. Ritchie urged the Hebronite movement to use the same doctrine of the independence of the general elders from one another to resuscitate a movement unto the Uzzielite movement (v. 8). But the Hebronite movement in A.I. Ritchie, knowing that such a movement would not be its own, went through the motions of forming it, but deliberately wasted its pertinent energies; and for this God destroyed the Hebronite movement, though individual members of it still continue (vs. 9, 10). Thereupon the Kohathites in C. Olson told the same doctrine in its adherents to wait in solitariness until the Olsonite movement would be properly developed; and it would then unite itself with it. However the Kohathites in C. Olson did not mean this honestly, because it feared that by such ill-omened union the Olsonite movement would pass out of existence. Hence without being united with any other movement this doctrine in its adherents remained in its originators' abode (v. 11). In time the teaching that the work of the priests is independent from subjection to corporations and committees sickened and became inactive, and thus passed away; and the Kohathites in R.H. Hirsh gave up mourning its death as an inactive thing. They in R.H. Hirsh, in late 1919, who was in association with J., sought to gain fruitage from brethren in their service (v. 12).

The teaching of the independence of general elders in its supporters learned that the Kohathites in R.H. Hirsh were seeking such fruitage in their portion of service (v. 13). This teaching in its supporters disguised itself, at the entrance to matters of both the Little Flock and the Kohathites, and did this because in its adherents it saw that it was being purposely withheld from union with the Olsonites (v. 14). The Kohathites in R.H. Hirsh failed to see its real import in its relation to J.'s ministry, thinking it was a teaching that might be used for their selfish purposes (v. 15). Deceived

as to his real relation to this teaching, he proposed to it in its adherents an illicit union and cooperation; but it in its adherents desired a price for their cooperation (v. 16). The Kohathites in R.H. Hirsh agreed to give it authority to appoint pilgrims independently of J. to visit such churches whose appointments they in R.H. Hirsh were making, and were in him requested to give a pledge to fulfill the promise; and when in him it was asked what pledge was required, they were asked to give the pledge of the emblems of their authority in him as an executive, a worker and a feeder of the Lord's flock. This was done and the abuse of the doctrine of the independence of general elders from one another when a star-member was functioning set in; and this resulted in the beginning of two embryonic movements (v. 18). Thereafter the disguise was set aside; and the teaching in its adherents acted in its natural way (v. 19). Details on the misuse that the Kohathites in R.H. Hirsh made of this teaching against J. as an officiating star-member and J.'s reaction thereto are given in P '20, 145-148; and a summary of them is given in the section of Chapter VII on Jephthah. But when the Kohathites in R.H. Hirsh offered through J. this teaching in its adherents, the pledged powers on pilgrim service, it in them could not be found, because of its double-dealings in this matter, and none abiding in the two classes, Little Flock and Kohathites, knew of such a camouflaged teaching (vs. 20, 21). J. reported to the Kohathites that there was no such depraved teaching found there by him, nor was it recognized by any belonging to the two classes of brethren involved (v. 22). The Kohathites in R.H. Hirsh were resigned to suffer the loss of their pledged powers rather than be put to shame before the brethren, though he had sought to keep his word to the camouflaged teaching that could not be found (v. 23).

Some time later J. told the Kohathites in R.H. Hirsh that the teaching of the independence of the general elders from one another had gone wrong and was producing a

sifting in embryo. Yea, in The Present Truth, on the basis of vs. 24-30, several months beforehand J. forecast that the sifting would develop into two divisions. When the Kohathites in R.H. Hirsh learned the results of some one's illicit union and cooperation with this teaching, he advocated its destruction (v. 24). But this teaching in its adherents revealed by the powers given in pledge to it in them that the Kohathites in R.H. Hirsh were responsible for the embryo sifting (v. 25); they in him acknowledged his pertinent misuse of this teaching and its results, as due to a prior wrong in him in withholding from it a union between it and the Olsonite movement; and they in R.H. Hirsh repudiated the teaching. He certainly deeply lamented his evil, and his pleas for reinstatement into J.'s favor as a Little Flock member would have been by J. given a favorable response unto receiving him back into priestly fellowship, had not J. known that his conduct was typed in vs. 12-26. But with the antitype as a clear fulfillment of these verses before J.'s mind, he knew that R.H. Hirsh was a manifested Levite. His case was a clear illustration of the Great Company as antitypical Esau vainly seeking, even with tears, to change God's mind into receiving them back into the Little Flock. J. was by R.H. Hirsh's partisans severely denounced for not receiving him again into priestly fellowship, after even with tears he pleaded for it; but this Scripture restrained J. therefrom; and now hereby it is made known why he did and could not accept his repentance and pleas for reinstatement to priestly fellowship.

But as this misused teaching of the freedom of the general elders from subjection to one another had by R.H. Hirsh produced the Amramite sifting, the siftlings were found to be in two movements: the Hirshite and the Kittingerite movements (v. 27). The Hirshite movement was the first to show its activity and J. identified it by pointing it out as such by his exposure of it (v. 28). But these very exposures caused R.H. Hirsh to draw himself and his partisans back as an active sifting movement; for he,

conscience-stricken, forsook his siftling supporters and worked against them and the Kittingerite embryo sifting movement, supporting J.'s opposition to them. Thereupon the Kittingerite movement came into full activity alone for a while, and made a great division (*Pharez, breach*) in the Philadelphia Epiphany class, making the adherents of the pertinent misused doctrine cry out in its adherents' questioning, Why did it make a division for itself (v. 29)? But a little later, in June and July, 1920, R.H. Hirsh created in the Jersey City Ecclesia the Hirshite movement, identified as such months before by J. and seeming to be a daybreak for the Amramite Kohathites (*Zarah, shining forth* v. 30).

We now return to the Joseph type (Gen. 39). The Fort Pitt Convention as J.'s sympathizers delivered J. for their profit to that part of the "Opposition" that rallied to the Fort Pitt Committee, later calling itself the P.B.I. Committee. This part of the "Opposition" was the composite leader of those who guarded the Lord's interests (v. 1). But God's favor was with J.; and He prospered J.'s undertakings for the "Opposition," particularly in the affairs connected with steadyng the ecclesias against J.F.R.'s Feb. 15, 1918 Tower article, by which he sought to prove that the Societyites were antitypical Elijah, and that the "Opposition" were antitypical Elisha. The Lord also prospered him in winning over new ecclesias from the Society, *e.g.*, the Society sympathizers were in a large majority in the Providence class; and when a division threatened, J. was, at the request of "Opposition" sympathizers in that ecclesia, in the hope of reducing that large majority, by the Committee sent there in pilgrim work; the result of his three discourses delivered there was that many Societyite sympathizers in that ecclesia were won over to the "Opposition," who thereby became the majority in that ecclesia at the vote on the division (v. 2). His successes made the "Opposition" recognize that God favored him (v. 3), which won him increasingly their favor, so that, *e.g.*, at his advocacy the

Committee's muzzling resolution forbidding new thoughts on types, symbols and prophecy unsanctioned by it to be given by any of its members, a resolution especially aimed at J., was rescinded and from then on J. had a freer hand as teacher and pilgrim (v. 4). This resulted in increased blessing from God on the "Opposition" (v. 5); and no important step was thereafter taken apart from J.'s cooperation or suggestion, even unto the passing of his motions to go ahead immediately to publish The Bible Standard, to establish headquarters at Brooklyn and to salary I.F. Hoskins as secretary and R.H. Hirsh as managing editor, so that they might devote all their time to the work, all the while J.'s Biblical knowledge and Christian character making him desirable to the "Opposition" (v. 6).

Thereafter the four Committee members, and thus its majority, I.F. Hoskins, F.H. McGee, I. I. Margeson and J. D. Wright, supported by H.C. Rockwell, R.E. Streeter, etc., desired an illicit union and cooperation with J. to incorporate the P.B.I., which was disloyalty to the "Opposition" (v. 7). J. refused so to do, alleging that that would make him disloyal to the "Opposition's" entrustment of its interests with him, since it entrusted to him its every interest, except the Committee itself; hence J. protested that the desired course would be a sin against God Himself, which he refused to commit (vs. 8, 9). But the corporation advocates in the Committee repeatedly sought, but in vain, to seduce J. from his loyalty to consent to the illicit union with them in corrupting the organization of the Church by foisting upon it a corporation to superintend its general work (v. 10). They even in the privacy of the Committee, July 18, 1918, sought with more or less verbal violence to bring him into this evil; but to escape he allowed himself to be divested of some of his graces, by a too violent opposition to their course (vs. 11, 12). And his faults of too violent opposition they seized upon falsely to accuse J., a foreigner to their plans, of attempting to frustrate, impede, ruin and defile the Committee. This they did from July 18 to July 27, by a

whispering campaign to secure enough supporters before the Asbury Park Convention, to insure the overthrow of J. at that convention (vs. 13-15). They studied ways of undermining J. when the convention would assemble (v. 16).

Accordingly, prepared for it, at that convention, beginning with H.C. Rockwell's denouncing J. in his sermon the morning of July 27, proceeding with I.F. Hoskins' calling that afternoon the elders and deacons together in a meeting, attended by almost everyone at the convention, and falsely denouncing J., with R.H. Hirsh and R.G. Jolly, with attempting to rape the Committee by frustrating, impeding, ruining and defiling it, and ending with the convention's discussing the matter unfavorably to J., they carried out their plan (v. 17), protesting all the time that the group by outcries against J.'s alleged attempt defended itself, and offering as evidence against J. his too violent opposition to its actually evil course (v. 18). Practically the whole convention, believing such misrepresentations, became very angry (v. 19), disrupted the Fort Pitt Committee and by boycotting methods put J. under such restraints as limited his ministry to a comparatively few supporters, the (unmanifested) Epiphany-enlightened crown-losers, who, like himself, were put under restraints put upon such as had offended against the Lord, in which restraint he remained for years (v. 20). But even under such restraint Jehovah was with J., giving him favor with the Lord Jesus; who is in charge of this condition of restraint, and who promoted J. to have and fulfill executive charge of such Epiphany-enlightened (but unmanifested) crown-losers (vs. 21, 22). The Lord Jesus trusted J. with the entire and exclusive supervision of such crown-losers, for Jehovah favored and prospered J.'s work (v. 23).

The support that the unmanifested Epiphany-enlightened crown-losers gave J. as the Lord's mouthpiece (cup) made them the Lord's butler (cup-bearer); and the mixture of teachings, true and false, that the manifested Levitical Societyites prepared as symbolic bakery made

them in a sense Jehovah's baker. Both of these groups offended the Lord, the former by failing sufficiently and properly to support J., and the latter by teaching false doctrine and operating wrong arrangements, both among themselves and the public, e.g., millions . . . after 1925, (40: 1). This displeased the Lord against the former as the chief supporters of J. and against the latter as the chief makers of symbolic corrupt bakery (v. 2). God put them under arrest through the office of those of the "Opposition" who were loyal, and then restrained them just as J. was restrained (v. 3). The loyal "Opposition" left them with J. to deal with them; and by The Present Truth and otherwise he served them; and they were in such restraint from 1920 to the early part of 1925 (v. 4). Each of these restrained classes at the same period held a theory of future things (v. 5). J. recognized that both of them were troubled (v. 6), the reason for which he asked them (v. 7). They then told him that they had certain theories that were not at all clear to them, and that no one seemed able to interpret them clearly; but J. replied that God was the real Interpreter and, therefore, asked them to declare to him their symbolic dreams (v. 8). Thereupon the restrained unmanifested Epiphany-enlightened crown-losers told J. that they believed that they would yet again give proper support to J. as the Lord's mouthpiece (vs. 9-11). J. gave the explanation in the Sept., 1922, Truth, by making clear The Small Eight Wonderful Days article, according to which in the third year (corresponding to the small eighth wonderful day), beginning July, 1924, and ending July, 1925, the Epiphany-enlightened crown-losers would be delivered from their restraint and restored to the privilege of properly supporting J. as the Lord's symbolic cup, mouthpiece (vs. 12, 13). J. requested of these to work for his release from restraint when their freedom therefrom would set in (v. 14), telling them that he was unjustly taken from the sphere of the general people of

God, and without guilt on his part was put under the restraint that he was enduring (v. 15).

The Societyites had been told by J.F.R. that the Gospel of the Kingdom was that millions then living would not die after the period from Oct., 1924 to Oct., 1925. Very many at first accepted this thought heartily, later first a few, then later more, and still later a very large number of them, yea, the bulk of the Societyites, doubting the millions proposition, began to fear that evil ones would make capital of this thought when Oct., 1924 to Oct., 1925 would come. These made known their pertinent thoughts to J., when they learned what, on the basis of The Small Eight Wonderful Days picture, J. had told the Epiphany crown-losers (vs. 16, 17). J. told them, on the basis of the proof given by Jesus' resurrection as to the evil-doings of the Jewish priesthood and their supporters, set forth in that same article, that between July, 1924 and July, 1925 the Societyites, in leaders and ledlings, by the Epiphany-enlightened saints' coming again into activity as the Lord's mouthpiece to the Levites between July, 1924 and July, 1925, would be publicly proven to be evil teachers and doers, whose substance would be devoured by evil ones (vs. 18, 19). And sure enough, on the small antitype of the day of Jesus' birth of the Spirit—the small eighth wonderful day, July, 1924-July, 1925—the Lord Jesus gave a pertinent feast of Truth in The Present Truth to His people of all groups; and in connection therewith He freed the two above-mentioned groups (v. 20), restoring the former to their place of supporting J. as the Lord's mouthpiece (cup), which support they gave him *as such* (not *as a restrained one*, in which capacity J. in a certain sense still remained, v. 21).

From Jan., 1923 to Jan., 1925 the Epiphany-enlightened saints circulated among the Societyites no *new* refutations of their errors coming out during that time, though some of such refutations were published and circulated exclusively among the Epiphany brethren, which corresponds to Jesus' silence from mouthpieceship toward

Israel from the time of His condemnation by the full Sanhedrin, just two days before His resurrection. But corresponding with Jesus' resurrection, which powerfully refuted the stand of the Jewish leaders and ledlings, the Epiphany-enlightened saints in the Jan. and May, 1925, Truths presented among the Societyites the first time for two years powerful refutations of the Societyite errors coming out since Jan., 1923, and thereby publicly proved them to be wrong-doers in teaching and practice, even as J. had forecast in the article on The Small Eight Wonderful Days (v. 22). But despite the deliverance of the unmanifested Epiphany-enlightened crown-losers, these did not remember, but rather forgot to intercede for J. While during 1920-1925 the P.B.I. did much wrong in theory (on Revelation, the chronology, Daniel, etc.) and practice, and though in the Jan. and May, 1925, Truths, some of these were refuted, yet they are not included in the antitypical chief baker; for, not they, but the Society, were the antitypical *chief* baker; and it was the chief baker, not subordinate bakers, who was imprisoned, as, not the brethren in general, but the unmanifested Epiphany-enlightened crown-losers are the antitypical chief butler.

One would naturally think that the antitype of Gen. 41 would progress in the same chronological succession, as do the types of several preceding chapters, but, as we have seen in many other cases, it does not so do, but goes back to the time before the smallest Joseph type began in its first aspect, *i.e.*, before June, 1914, even at an earlier date than that of the preludes to his humiliations, as was shown above on Gen. 37: 2. Not only the facts of the fulfillment prove this, but the facts in the case of Jesus as the first antitype of Joseph also prove it; for our Pastor showed us on the Jesus' antitype of Joseph that His interpreting Pharaoh's dream and raising and storing up the grain (providing and depositing the right to life and liferights) represent a work that He did before His resurrection, *i.e.*, during His entire 3½ years' ministry,

while His humiliations began slightly later in His ministry, though typed by Joseph's earlier experiences. A parallel thing is likewise the antitype of Joseph from the standpoint of his representing the 49 star-members from Pentecost until the end of the Epiphany; for in this antitype these two experiences are given in this peculiar way. Hence the smallest Joseph in his immediate preparations for interpreting the antitypical Pharaoh's dream underwent those direct preparations from June, 1911 until June 27, 1914. The first installment of his interpretation was given when J., on the basis of Matt. 20: 8, told Bro. Russell (June 27, 1914) that a night would follow the Parousia day, beginning Oct., 1914, which night is as long as the Parousia day. Omitting some minor details given between June, 1914 and Oct., 1916, the next important installment of his interpreting that dream occurred the night of Nov. 9, 1916, when J. expounded to the Executive Committee "the pestilence that walketh in darkness," of Ps. 91: 6, and the sixth slaughter-weapon man, of Ezek. 9, as referring to the coming world-wide sifting, a sifting that has proven to be the long-drawn-out Epiphany sifting. Thereafter more and more thoughts were expressed by J. belonging to the smallest explanation. Thus the interpretation for the smallest Joseph represents the explanation of very much Epiphany Truth, as an explanation of God's Epiphany plan, the smallest antitype of Pharaoh's double dream.

As in the case of our Lord and the 49 star-members the Patriarchal and Jewish Ages had to pass before they could enter into their respective antitypical second sets of their Joseph experiences, so the Gospel Harvest in two of its phases, (1) the four calls preceding the 11th-hour call and (2) the period of the 11th-hour call, Feb., 1908 to June, 1911, had to pass before J. entered into his second phase of the smallest Joseph. These two periods having passed, God's thoughts turned practically on the Epiphany classes, to the outworking of the Epiphany plans and purposes, which for different classes would enact a small Gospel Age and a

small Millennial Age; and His pertinent thoughts thereon are set forth in the Bible in various ways, among others, those set forth in the preceding chapters of this book (41: 1-7). But these plans and purposes require a qualified expounder. The Lord gave various ones the opportunity to give the exposition, and set before them the involved conditions, which exposition none of them were able to furnish (v. 8). In J.'s being favored increasingly by God from April 20, 1909, with the ever-expanding interpretation of the penny parable of Matt. 20: 1-16, from May, 1910, with the ever-expanding interpretation of the calls and the five harvest siftings as set forth in 1 Cor. 10: 1-14, and from about 1911 with the ever-expanding interpretation of the six siftings of Ezek. 9, he was used by the Lord to give an interpretation that in principle was like that pertaining to the rejected antitypical baker and to the re-accepted antitypical butler, because it pertained to certain persons, at least, who were involved in both classes; for J. from 1909, 1910 and 1911 on pointed out that certain siftlings were utter reprobates, and others were of the Great Company.

The antitypical baker contained many in the former class and the antitypical butler many in the latter class, and recognized themselves as such; hence in this type the antitypical butler could recognize that certain thoughts that J. was privileged by the Lord to bring out on Matt. 20: 1-16, 1 Cor. 10: 1-14 and Ezek. 9 were in principle identical with those that he was by the Lord privileged in The Small Eight Wonderful Days article to bring out as to certain ones of the two classes typed by the chief butler and chief baker. It is because of the class relation involved in these thoughts that the chief butler could be used in vs. 9-13 to type that class referring to J.'s interpreting Matt. 20: 1-16, 1 Cor. 10: 1-14 and Ezek. 9 as though it were the same as that typed in 40: 9-13. Hence the viewpoint of vs. 9-13 goes back to such crown-losers who some time after 1909 looked upon J. as one qualified to interpret what God by the developing conditions was

indicating as about to come to pass. Hence brethren of this class were reminded of the fact that by the Lord, especially in the 1908-1911 sifting, they were with the utter reprobates put into restraint and that the theories of the two classes during that sifting were by J. interpreted to mean that one would be restored to his former office of supporting Bro. Russell, at that time God's cup, mouthpiece, and the other would be proved completely to be reprobate, both of which things were fulfilled by June, 1911 (vs. 9-13).

God by our Lord quickly and increasingly brought J. out of such restraints as his previous pilgrim powers imposed upon him; and during about three years, 1911-1914, he underwent a series of experiences ridding him of faults and developing him in ability, as the first part of his preparation for the work of becoming the Epiphany messenger, by which office he would become by Divine grace under Christ both the interpreter of Epiphany truths and the executive of Epiphany works; and June 27, 1914, J. showed Bro. Russell from the night of Matt. 20: 8 that with Oct., 1914 a *night* would set in, which by contrast with the Parousia *day* is shown to be one of 40 years, the Epiphany. At that time J. began to interpret the antitypical dream (v. 14).

The Lord, after this small beginning, by His Word and the providential facts, began increasingly to set the Epiphany conditions before him, among other ways, by their miniature Gospel-Age aspects, when abundant opportunities would be obtainable to win powers for future needs, and in their miniature Millennial-Age aspects, when the only way to gain the supply of those needs was to get it from the one who had gained those powers—the Epiphany Truth and its arrangements, which include assigning to their office works the pertinent brethren—for distribution to those in need of them (vs. 15-23). The doubling of the dream types that the Lord's pertinent thoughts were given in two ways: (1) in the Scriptures and (2) in the providential facts as shown in the miniature Gospel and Millennial Ages; and the presentation of these things to J. is as long-

drawn-out a thing practically as J.'s interpretation of them is long-drawn-out, *i.e.*, as due to be revealed in much of the Epiphany; even as the others throughout these times previously to J.'s various stages of interpretation in all cases were unable to interpret them clearly in their various stages of unfolding (v. 24).

J. began to interpret it as stated above, in its first stage, the afternoon of June 27, 1914, to Bro. Russell, as a proof that the Church would be here after Oct., 1914, to which he added some minor details from June, 1914 to Oct., 1916 as its further development, and, in its second stage, the night of Nov. 9, 1916, to the Executive Committee, perplexed over the tidings of the conspiracy of the eleven London Tabernacle elders, and has continued ever since to add to, and will complete it when much of the Epiphany ends, when every pertinent detail of God's Word and work will have been fully expounded. He declared that there was a unity in both forms, the Biblical and the factual, of the stated conditions, and that they came from God (v. 25). He explained that the propitious features were the Divine completeness of the miniature Gospel Age (v. 26) and that the unpropitious features were the Divine completeness of the miniature Millennial Age (v. 27) and that these two different sets of features represent what God was about to do and was showing to Christ as His representative (for Pharaoh in these miniatures types Christ as God's ruling Agent, v. 28). J.'s interpretation implied that there would come the miniature Gospel Age, in which an opportunity would prevail to obtain abundant powers (v. 29) needed for the work of the miniature Millennium, which would use up all those powers and would provide no others (vs. 30, 31). The certainty of the coming of these things, each successively, was made all the firmer by the previous Scriptural and factual unfoldings of each successively (v. 32).

J.'s attitude and acts suggested to our Lord that He select a qualified brother to place over the Epiphany conditions (v. 33) and that the selectee arrange for assistants

to help him and to store up the gained powers for the brethren during the little Gospel Age, in various positions, against the needs that would follow in the little Millennium, lest Epiphany classes fail (vs. 34-36). This tableau suggestion was acceptable to Jesus and to all in harmony with Him, and was carried out in its toward part during the first smiting of Jordan, Sept. 21, 1914-Nov. 3, 1916, in which, of the then Little Flock main leaders, only Bro. Russell and J. smote perseveringly and in the Lord's Spirit; and J.'s part in that smiting gained for him from the Lord the powers of conferring Epiphany office powers—the Epiphany Truth and its arrangements, which include assigning to their office work the pertinent brethren—on Little Flock, Great Company and Youthful Worthy brethren in the Epiphany work (vs. 37-39). This gave him executive charge of the priests who cooperated with him in dealing with the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies, which powers he was and is to exercise under the supremacy of Jesus (v. 40). By the pertinent Scriptures and fulfilled facts Jesus revealed to J. his charge of the Epiphany teachings and arrangements (v. 41).

Jesus gave J. the authorization of his being His special representative (signet ring), clothed him with the pertinent authority, adorned him with the needed Divine qualities (v. 42), and caused him to have the direction not of the priests as such, since the priesthood is God's and Jesus' chief organization, but of the Levites, both of the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies, who constitute God's and Jesus' secondary organization, and caused to be proclaimed that as such all cooperators should work under his direction. In this way Jesus set J. over all Epiphany matters (v. 43); and Jesus made known to J., especially through the pertinent Scriptures, that by His authority, as that of God's Special Representative, the conduct and ministry of all in Epiphany matters were to be subject to J.'s management (v. 44). Jesus made J. in his office work the savior of the

Levitical world and the revealer of Divine secrets [the words *Zaphnath-paaneah*, if Egyptian words, mean *savior of the world* (Gen. 45: 5; 50: 20), if Hebrew words, *revealer of (Divine) secrets*; in both senses they define J.'s Epiphany office work, the former as executive, the latter as teacher]; and He made God's Biblical wisdom, interpreted by Jesus to J., his special helper (*Asenath, she is of Minerva*, the goddess of wisdom; *Potipherah, he who belongs to the sun*; *On, sun*). Thereafter J. supervised Epiphany matters (v. 45). Thus we see that J. was provisionally appointed Epiphany messenger in 1914, but did not enter into his work as such until he, as such, had gained possession, Nov., 1, 1916, of the blessings he was to distribute.

At the time of J.'s appointment as the Epiphany messenger he was mature for such priestly work and as such, as Jesus' special representative, has been supervising all Epiphany matters (v. 46). During the time of smiting Jordan, confessing the sins over Azazel's Goat, fighting antitypical Gideon's First Battle and executing the judgment written, unconsciously J. availed himself of the abundant opportunities for him to gain the powers that would sustain the priests and Levites in their Epiphany office powers (v. 47). These powers were stored up during that time, Sept. 21, 1914-Nov. 3, 1916, for each prospective Levite group and the priests connected with each one of these groups, and that as proper and appropriate for each of them (v. 48). Indeed, these powers were so abundant that as time went on J. ceased to describe them (v. 49). And during that period two classes, the Youthful Worthies and the Great Company, the former as a class, the latter not as a class, but as individuals, began to become Epiphaniacally active, originated in part by certain thoughts that J. announced in connection with God's Biblical wisdom made clear by Jesus to him; for J. cooperated fully with Bro. Russell in his teaching on what was actually the second smiting of Jordan and the enlistment of the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies as antitypical Elisha for that

smiting [EC 87 (30) – 91 (35), v. 50]. J. made such Youthful Worthies (Manasseh, *causing to forget*) a means of forgetting his troubles and the bad Levites' plaguing him (v. 51); and he made such Great Company members doubly fruitful (Ephraim, *doubly fruitful*) in his troubles in the Epiphany conditions (v. 52).

After this period (Sept., 21, 1914-Nov., 3, 1916, at which latter date J. at New Haven, Conn., delivered what proved to be his last smiting, etc., talk, and thus brought to an end the period of gaining the powers typed in the smallest Joseph picture by the grain) the time came when no further opportunities set in for gaining new antitypical grain anywhere; but these powers could be dispensed by J. as things already fully in Epiphany conditions (vs. 53, 54). But during the period following the smiting time, when no new powers could be gained for Epiphany matters, and when the desire for such powers was felt by those living more or less in harmony with Epiphany conditions, such came for them to Jesus, who led them to J.'s ministry to obtain them, indicating to them that they must submit therein to the arrangements that J. would make thereon (v. 55). Everywhere the symbolic famine prevailed; but J. opened up opportunities to get these powers and gave them to those more or less sympathetic with Epiphany conditions, teaching and practices, whose need of them was great (v. 56). And to J. those more or less not in harmony with Epiphany conditions, e.g., those interested by J.'s public work in Britain, America, etc., were led for pertinent powers to J., by the Lord's providence (v. 57).

Little Flock brethren, first in Britain, later in America, increasingly saw that powers for God's Epiphany service prevailed in the Epiphany movement, and, accordingly, successively and increasingly reasoned with the Levite groups over their not seeking powers for their work from what proved to be Epiphany conditions (42: 1), assuring them that they understood that such prevailed therein, and urged them to go and secure them from those conditions, that all

might continue to function well in their work (v. 2). Accordingly, successively each of the ten main Levite groups, beginning in the Fall of 1916 with the antitypical Libnite Reubenites, the Shearnites, in their London Tabernacle correspondence, etc., and ending with the Hirshites in Dec., 1918, started their first attempts to get such powers from what proved to be J. (v. 3); but the Little Flock, fearing that they might suffer evil, did not send the Epiphany-sympathetic crown-losers on this first errand with the ten; for all ten came revolutionarily, in which action the Epiphany-sympathetic crown-losers did not participate (v. 4). These ten groups, with scattered individuals not belonging to them, left Parousia conditions, where the pertinent powers could not be gotten to obtain them in what, unconsciously to them, proved to be Epiphany conditions (v. 5). At that time J. was the supervisor of Epiphany matters; and powers for Epiphany conditions were in his hands for dispensing; and the ten Levite groups as given in the exposition of Gen. 35: 22, 23, 25, 26, each in its time from Nov., 1916 to Dec., 1918, began humbly to appear before J. as a Levite group starting out on its rampage for what proved to be Levite power, whose dispensing was by God committed to J.'s supervision (v. 6). J. recognized them in their power-grasping attempts and acted, not as they were wont to see him in the amiability of his pilgrim days, but roughly and resistingly, demanding what their sphere of teaching and spirit was, and got from them the answer: The sphere of the Parousia Truth and Spirit (for all Levite groups at their first rampages' start professed loyalty to the Parousia Messenger's teachings and arrangements, though in the smallest Joseph picture the revolutionism of the Levite groups is not the thing *specially* typed), and by their acts let it be known that they desired what was really Levite power, offering therefore due service (v. 7).

J. saw through these groups' purposes, but they were unable to recognize him in his office (v. 8). J. recalled his view of his powers as to them, and by his acts and words

accused them of fell motives as to Epiphany conditions (v. 9). This they denied by word, claiming that they were seeking powers for which they would give an adequate price (v. 10). They claimed to be the supporters of the Little Flock, to be faithful as such and meekly denied that they had fell purposes against Epiphany conditions (v. 11). Because of their revolutionisms, shown elsewhere, but not in this type, J. denied their claim, reiterating his charge of their having fell designs on Epiphany conditions (v. 12). They then again affirmed by word and act their filial relationship to the Little Flock, which they declared to be in harmony with the Parousia teachings and arrangements, and their relationship to the unmanifested good crown-losers, and asserted by their acts that one of their brethren was dead as to office work (v. 13). J.'s acts told them very solemnly that his charge would stand until they disproved it by bringing what proved to be the good crown-losers into Epiphany conditions, all the rest remaining there as prisoners, while one of them went for, and brought the good crown-losers into Epiphany conditions, which thing not done, they would be proven to have fell designs upon Epiphany conditions (vs. 15, 16). Then by resisting their revolutionisms J. put them for a proper season into restraint (v. 17).

After the proper season of restraint had come to a full end, J., by the act of giving them a respite from resisting them, showed leniency and a way of survival for them, because of his reverence for God (v. 18). His pertinent acts, while keeping the Societyites under the restraint of his opposition, were those connected with his allowing the others to go free, with such powers as he allowed, to do their work of bringing by their revolutionisms the good crown-losers into Epiphany conditions, by which they would be able to prove their innocence of having fell purposes against Epiphany conditions. This, he asserted by act, would result in their not being cut off from their office work, to which by act they agreed (vs. 19, 20). But their

bad consciences over the wrongs that they had done J. made them think that their difficulties came as a punishment therefore (v. 21). Particularly did the P.B.I., through I.F. Hoskins, thrust this guilt upon them as committed deliberately by them against their earnest expostulations, and as now calling for Divine retribution (v. 22). J. dealing with them through publications and distant acts, and not personally to their faces, they did not realize that he understood their self-accusations (v. 23). In secret he felt deeply for them; but before them he acted sternly; and by his continued assaults, by word, letter and printed page, on the Societyites for their revolutionisms he restrained them before the rest of them (v. 24). J. charged that they be conceded Levite powers in their equipment, but declined to accept their service, which he gave to them to have in their equipment and gave them certain teachings that were pertinent to their Levite work, and that would be helpful for their work (v. 25).

Accordingly, putting these matters upon their teachings, they went on their way (v. 26). The Sturgeonites, in Jan., 1918, when Menta Sturgeon went off in his Levitical rampage, in their efforts to sustain their teachings, looked through their equipment and found there that their service was rejected by J., and declared this, which spread consternation among them as another evidence of Divine punishment (vs. 27, 28). Later they came to the Little Flock and narrated to them their experiences amid Epiphany conditions, declaring what J. by word and act had said to them (vs. 29-34). But as they took out of their equipment its contents, they found there the evidence that J. had rejected their services as an exchange for powers that he had yielded to them, which gave them and the Little Flock consternation (v. 35). The Little Flock bewailed their acts, saying that J. in his office work had been lost to them, likewise the Societyites, and now they were planning to bereave them of the good crown-losers, all of which things, they declared, worked against them (v. 36). About this time, the Spring of

1918, the Gershonites, in the Fort Pitt Committee about to go off on the P.B.I. rampage, pledged the safety of the good crown-losers, by the activities of the B.S.C. (Libnites) and the P.B.I. (Shimites, v. 37). But the Little Flock, especially in J., conscious that their moves presaged a sifting, opposed all of their preliminary moves, as pointing in the direction of a Levitical rampage, and as involving what were actually the good crown-losers in a sifting, bewailing the fact that J. in his ministry had been lost to them, and that now, if what actually were good crown-losers were lost to them, they would in old age sorrowfully pass into oblivion as to their earthly office. This held off their rampage awhile (v. 38).

But the need for more power made itself much felt among the new creatures (43: 1); and when those powers that were gotten in the first set of Levite rampages were consumed the Little Flock counseled that they get some more from the Epiphany conditions. This was in the late Spring and early Summer of 1918, before the Asbury Park Convention (v. 2). But the Kohathites, acting through A.I. Ritchie, by act, not word, told Little Flock brethren that according to what proved to be J.'s attitude this could not be, unless what were the good crown-losers would go off in an independent movement (v. 4), and refused to go for such powers, unless such crown-losers go along, as they would otherwise not get any favor from what proved to be J. (v. 5). The Little Flock then blamed them for implying that there was another group among them (v. 6). They replied that J.'s attitude as to themselves the Little Flock, and the good crown-losers, was such as forced them to tell the state of affairs, whose (seemingly) unfavorable use by J. they could not foresee (v. 7). The Kohathites in A.I. Ritchie pleaded for accordant action, in order to preserve their standing, and made themselves surety for the safe return of the good crown-losers, by giving the assurance that they would not allow them to be swallowed up by a corporational Levite group, for which the P.B.I. were

then agitating, and against which the Kohathites stood. They further gave assurance that if they kept not their word, they would be willing to bear the blame continually (vs. 8, 9), alleging that if procrastination had not set in, they would by then have already gotten back with added powers (v. 10). The Little Flock, including J., persisted in opposing this course, until during the Asbury Park Convention under pressure they gave in, urging the others to stress the fruits of the Spirit in their teachings and to seek to appease J. with the presentation of unctuous words, the hope of Kingdom joys, various graces, patience in sufferings and other adornments of character (v. 11) and to offer renewed service, additional to that which before was rejected, since its return may have been accidental (v. 12).

They yielded up to the symbolic trip in their care the good crown-losers (v. 13), with the prayer that the Lord might grant them mercy before J., unto releasing the Societyites, as well as the good crown-losers. Then, with indescribable pathos, the Little Flock expressed resignation to the worst, if it should come (v. 14). Thereupon the Levite groups successively went off on their second rampage for power, the P.B.I.'s and the B.S.C. as antitypical Reuben starting it respectively at the Asbury Park Convention and at a London Convention, and the other groups, each other group in turn, coming afterward, it taking several years before the last group set off on this rampage. The Standfests, as representatives of the Merarites, followed on their heels and the Olsonites immediately after them started on their first rampage. Thus in the second phase of Levite siftings the Levites stood before J. as executive (v. 15). It will not have escaped the reader that above it was stated that the Hirshites as the last of the ten groups (Amramites, or Naphtalites) started in R.H. Hirsh on their first rampage in Dec., 1918, which was after three of the four groups mentioned in several preceding sentences started out on their second rampage. How is this to be harmonized? By

remembering that types involving various antitypical acts do not find their antitypes usually to have finished before another set of antitypes sets in, *e.g.*, we saw that before antitypical Elijah had finished smiting Jordan he and antitypical Elisha were antitypically crossing it and were also walking and talking on the other side. Such a thing could not occur in the type, but repeatedly does so in the antitype, as were the cases of the Olsonites and Hirshites going on their first rampage, as the antitype of Asher and Naphtali going to Egypt the first time, after antitypical Reuben in antitypical Zebulun and Issachar and antitypical Merari in antitypical Levi began their second rampage.

This second phase of seeking for added powers set in at the Asbury Park Convention in public blast, just after the Fort Pitt Convention was raped, by the P.B.I. group's securing the election of the new committee, Saturday night, July 27, when J. recognized as present the good Levites (Benjamin). The next morning J., in his office as dispenser (Joseph) of Levite powers, charged himself as the resister (steward) of Levite usurpations with the task of preparing an exposure of the wrongs of "the group" in the Fort Pitt Committee, which exposure he made as his Sunday morning convention talk before the entire convention, except the new committee, which during that session held a meeting in which it organized, appointed an editorial committee and decided to publish a semimonthly to take the place of The Bible Standard; the second and third things they did without the convention's authorization. That night the symbolic feast was continued in I.F. Hoskins' and J.'s debate, in fact was continued for years in J.'s first refutations of the errors of the ten groups, as one after another went on its second rampage, and in his giving them the opposite truth to appropriate; and this occurred in J.'s office as Epiphany messenger (vs. 16, 17). These ten groups, each in turn, feared their being brought into touch with J.'s office; each thought an occasion was being sought against them because

of the rejected service of their first Levite rampage, in order to enslave them and their teachings under J. (v. 18). These fears moved them to seek to justify themselves before J. as their refuter, before coming in touch with J. in his office as dispenser of Levite powers (v. 19).

They told that after their quest for powers they had found their proffered service rejected among their equipment as they came to act out their official functions, and that they were anew offering it (vs. 20, 21), that they now brought other service for added powers, and did not know who had put their former service as rejected among their equipment (v. 22). J. as refuter sought to allay their fears, on the ground that the God of the Great Company and the Little Flock had done this, not desiring it for Himself, and gave it to them for what it was worth, as a part of their equipment, and assured them that he had had in his control their rejected service. J. likewise at this time, from about July, 1918 to July, 1919, freed the Societyites from the restraints of refutations to join the rest in the second Levitical rampage, which for the Societyites began (1) through the Aug., 15, 1919 Tower article, *Blessed Are The Fearless*, Part II, and (2) by the re-energizing of them for public work at their first Cedar Point Convention, in Sept., 1919 (v. 23). J. as refuter of Levite errors then brought the ten Levite groups under the auspices of J.'s office as dispenser of Levite powers and gave them cleansing truths with which to wash away their evil conduct, e.g., the exposures of the wrongs in the Fort Pitt Committee group, the Society wrongs, etc., and supplemented their true teachings with needed additions (v. 24), they making ready their present, on learning that they were to be given certain truths by him (v. 25).

When J. entered into his sphere of dispensing Levite power, they offered him in their publications the antitypical presents mentioned above, and did it with considerable deference to him (v. 26). J. was solicitous to learn of their welfare, especially that of the Little Flock, as ripe in wisdom and experience, asking whether they were

functioning in their office work (v. 27). With great deference, as their publications show, they set forth the thought that the Little Flock fared well and were faithfully functioning in their office (v. 28). Then J. asked whether the good crown-losers, now functioning as Epiphany-enlightened believers, nourished with him by both the Parousia and Epiphany truths, and mentioned by them formerly as not with them, but as with the Little Flock, were a group of God's people, as he took note of them. These Parousia and Epiphany nourished ones J. wished by word and act God's grace, and that in a most loving manner (my son, v. 29). During all this time J.'s heart bled for the fellowship of the Little Flock and of these Epiphany-enlightened crown-losers, and for the sad condition of the other Levites, but he hid his emotions from the Levites, in the secret of his own heart and mind, emotions felt also whenever he severely reproved their evils (v. 30). He hid from their view every indication of such feelings, as an interference with the object that he had in view, and had the Truth set before all (v. 31). The Lord gave him exclusively certain feasts of the Truth, some of which are now being given in this book to all the brethren, and certain things in The Present Truth for the Levites themselves, and certain things in The Herald Of The Epiphany for certain interested outsiders, and that because certain things intended for the Levites were abhorrent to such interested outsiders (v. 32). These feasts for the Levites were specific controversial truths pertinent to each specific group, so set forth as to reach each group chronologically as it was coming into existence as on its second rampage, the antitypical Reubenites first, and so on until it came to the last, the antitypical Benjamites, which struck all of them as remarkable; for J. sent to each group only those volunteer Truths exclusively pertinent to that group (v. 33) connected with its own part in the fivefold Epiphany siftings, which correspond with the five Parousia siftings; but to antitypical Benjamin, who got

all The Present Truths, he gave all of the truths pertinent to all five Epiphany siftings; and what was simple and agreeable to each group each one appropriated to itself and rejoiced with J., the type here ignoring the things disagreeable to the Levites in those truths, which will appear in the sack search (v. 34).

J. as dispenser of Levite powers charged himself as the refuter of Levite error to put among the equipment of each group the added powers due each group, and to put therein the services that they gave for such powers, but not desired by him, among their equipment (44: 1); but he charged himself as refuter of Levite errors that he, himself, as God's mouthpiece should be placed among the good crown-losers' powers and services in their equipment. Hence J. has from practically the outstart of the second Levite rampages, *i.e.*, from the Summer of 1918, been a part of the equipment of the good Levites, who constitute the bulk of the brethren in the Epiphany movement; for while the Epiphany movement has been a priestly movement primarily, since J. and some other crown-retaining priests are in it, and since J. directs it in the work of leading Azazel's Goat to the gate, and subordinately because the crown-losers therein have as a whole not yet been manifested as Levites, yet from the standpoint of the finished picture, as God views it, as consisting, in the bulk of its adherents, of crown-losers, it is in large part also a Levite movement, engaged in priestly work until the pertinent Levites are manifested as such (v. 2).

After arrangements were made each Levite group started out on its career to do according to its own plans (v. 3); but shortly afterward, before they had proceeded far on their way, J. as the dispenser of Levite powers to them charged himself as the refuter of their errors to pursue, and, on coming up to them, charge them with returning J. evil for his good to them (v. 4), even with making off with J. as God's mouthpiece (cup) in their equipment, upbraiding them with evil-doing by having so done (v. 5). J. as refuter,

overtaking them, accused them accordingly (v. 6). Denying the charge, they asked why he so blamed them, since it was far from their thought to do such a thing (v. 7). They appealed, as a proof of their guiltlessness of the charge, to the fact that they offered again the rejected service, asking in view of this how could they have taken J., the Lord's mouthpiece, as a part of their equipment (v. 8). They offered to cut off from fellowship any one of them guilty of taking J. as a part of their equipment, and offered themselves as slaves of J. (v. 9). J. as refuter agreed to accept this offer in a revised form, to let the innocent ones go free and keep the guilty one as a bondman (v. 10).

Thereupon they laid hold on their equipment and by their various publications and drives ten groups among them (v. 11) exposed the fact that they had so many errors that God's mouthpiece certainly could not be a part of their equipment; for as Joseph's steward closely examined their equipment and found not Joseph's cup there, so J. in his many articles examining, reviewing, etc., the teachings and arrangements of the first ten of the eleven Levite groups found so much of revolutionism in teaching and arrangement therein that it was impossible that he as the Lord's mouthpiece could be among their equipment. The search began with the Gershonites (Reuben) in *The Present Truth*, Nos. 3-5, proceeded with the Societyites (Simeon) in Nos. 10-12 and from then on proceeded to all the other eight groups, these examinations and reviews going on for many years, and finally it reached the Epiphany crown-losers, in December, 1937, starting with the effort of R.G. Jolly, a pilgrim, and E.F. Hochbaum and S.B. Calhoon, two auxiliary pilgrims, contrary to a previous resolution of the ecclesia abrogating a revolutionary method of negative voting on elders and deacons, to put through a business meeting of the Philadelphia Ecclesia a motion that was a revolutionism against proper methods of voting against candidates for elders and deacons. This led to J.'s exposing them as attempting to gain control of J., the Lord's mouthpiece. Not

a few in the ecclesia sympathized with them; and had not J. been present and vigorously opposed their resolution, so Azazelianly constructed, as, if possible, to have deceived the very Elect, it would doubtless have passed.

The fear of being declared Levites kept not a few others back from voting for that resolution. From what J. observed at that and other times and from what he knew from the Samson, Job and Joseph types and the medium Miniature, J. told the ecclesia that many of its new creatures were Levites; and it was this reason, after the three brothers recognized, and asked for forgiveness of, their wrong, that J. recommended the three to be invited to serve the ecclesia, not as elders, but as guest leaders. It is, therefore, among the equipment of antitypical Benjamin that the Lord's mouthpiece has been ever since mid-summer of 1918, and this is proven by the fact that antitypical Benjamin has all along since then had the Epiphany Truth, which it has gotten by accepting J. as its general teacher as the Epiphany messenger (v. 12).

J. did not announce to the brethren outside of Philadelphia that the three above-mentioned brothers were manifested Levites; rather when asked by extra-Philadelphia brethren who had heard of it, from gossips of course, he evaded the question, neither denying nor affirming it, because he desired to shield especially R.G. Jolly until the time would come to announce the entire group of Epiphany crown-losers as Levites. However, in the various Levite groups it became noised about; and these did violence to their graces by their various denunciations against J. therefore; but now they are being brought, through this book, before J. as the dispenser of Levite powers for his general manifestation of himself to them and their self-recognition in their standing before God and him (v. 13).

From v. 14 onward we have to deal with things future, and hence on them can merely give our *surmise* of the nature and course of the antitypical events, and naturally can deal only in generalities, which we ask the reader kindly

to bear in mind. The Kohathites, more prominently, as the less guilty of the Levites, and the rest of them less prominently, will henceforth deal with J. as the dispenser of Levite powers. They will find him occupied with matters of his office, and will humble themselves before him (v. 14). J.'s attitude and words will upbraid them as attempters to take advantage of him, one who as the Epiphany messenger has supernatural knowledge as to the Lord's affairs gotten from the Epiphany prophecies and types (v. 15). The Kohathites will recognize their undone and helpless situation as an evidence that God has brought to light Levitical evils, especially against J., and will resign themselves and antitypical Benjamin to subjection to J. (v. 16). J.'s attitude will deny accepting the subjection to himself of any except antitypical Benjamin, with whom the antitypical cup was found, and for the rest he will reject their service, bidding them to return to the Little Flock (v. 17). Very humbly the Kohathites will approach J. repetitiously, entreating him to grant them a hearing in all longsuffering, since he is the Lord's special representative (v. 18). Then they will declare (vs. 19-29) what is a recapitulation of Gen. 42: 13-16 and 43: 2-9, 13, 14, which, therefore, will not be explained again here. Having said these things, the Kohathites will declare that if they return to the Little Flock without antitypical Benjamin, since the former are so wrapped up in the latter (v. 30), on becoming aware of the latter's absence, the former in his old age would receive a fatal blow, for which the other Levites would be responsible (v. 31), and the Kohathites, who became surety for antitypical Benjamin, would be forever responsible therefore to the Little Flock (v. 32). To prevent such a situation from setting in, the Kohathites will plead that they be reduced to bondage instead of antitypical Benjamin, and thus the latter be permitted to return with the other Levites to the Little Flock (v. 33), asking J. how they, unaccompanied by antitypical Benjamin, could bear facing the Little Flock's passing away officially (v. 34).

The sincerity, humility and pathos of this speech will prove too much for the pent-up emotions of J.; who for years had been expecting, longing and praying for this very thing and for the Levites to show a right spirit, such as antitypical Judah, the Kohathites, will show on this occasion, and whose acts will enforce privacy between him and the eleven Levite groups, by driving others away, probably through the suppression of our public work by antitypical Herod and through limiting to the former the circulation of this book in the form of a Jubilee issue of The Present Truth at the 25th anniversary of his entering into the work of the Epiphany messenger. In such distribution of this book J. will make himself in his office function as dispenser of Levite powers known to his Levite brethren, whom, in spite of their wrongs against him, he has all along continued to love, despite their revolutionisms, which at times made him treat them roughly (45: 1).

J.'s pent-up emotions, a mingling of grief for their fall and joy at their recovery, will express themselves in ways that will attract the attention of interested outsiders, as well as that of Jesus' household (v. 2); for as they will read this book J. will thereby be revealing to them two things: (1) his brotherly relations and feelings to them, and (2) the Divine Word vindicating his office, in which capacity they had not recognized him hitherto, even the Epiphany crown-losers, among whose equipment he has been since 1918, not realizing in a fair measure what the Word had to say on J. as to that office, and he will most solicitously in this book be inquiring for the welfare of the Little Flock, love for whom, next to that for God and Jesus, has been the main motive prompting him in its writing. At first the eleven groups will be speechless, being worried at his presence among them in the book (v. 3). In the last chapter they will find him lovingly entreating them to draw near to him in spirit and cooperation, to which they will respond; and they in this book will hear again, by a re-study of it, J.'s revealing himself to them as the brother whom they for personal

advantage delivered up to Epiphany tribulations and conditions (v. 4); but he will encourage them, again by the book's last chapter, not to be over-grieved, nor to be over-angry with themselves, for their delivering him up to Epiphany tribulations, since God had overruled, and would yet overrule it unto the delivering of many—the Little Flock, the Great Company, the Youthful Worthies, the loyal tentatively justified and the loyal Jews (v. 5).

He assured them that there had already been two periods in which powers of service had failed all except as they got them from the Lord through J., and that there were yet five more periods in which such conditions would prevail (v. 6), and that God had sent J. into the Epiphany conditions ahead of them to preserve for the eleven groups such as they might serve, *e.g.*, their Great Company brethren in Babylon, new Youthful Worthies for the Epiphany Court and the loyal tentatively justified and loyal Jews for the Epiphany Camp, and by a great deliverance under Christ to preserve the Little Flock and the Truth Levites (v. 7). Encouragingly J. in that chapter will assure them that in ultimate analysis it was not they, but God that had arranged for J. to enter Epiphany tribulations and conditions, and had appointed him to act as a father (life-preserver) to others for Jesus (so the Hebrew; God evidently did not appoint J. to be Jesus' father), as well as provider for all His house, and to be the executive for the Epiphany (v. 8).

Therefore J. charged them to hasten back to the Little Flock and to inform them that J. as a member of the Little Flock declares that God had appointed him as the Epiphany messenger over all Epiphany matters, and invites them in all haste to come to him into the Epiphany conditions (v. 9), and that they would function in the richest sphere of the Epiphany conditions, together with all the other consecrated and justified ones, even with all their possessions and privileges (v. 10). And in that sphere J. would feed with the Epiphany Truth the Little Flock throughout the five yet remaining different forms of activity; these five forms of

activity yet future would quite likely be such as concern: (1) the Little Flock, (2) the Great Company, (3) the Youthful Worthies, (4) the loyal tentatively justified and (5) the loyal Jews, for all of whom the pertinent powers could be gotten under Christ from J. as their dispenser; for if the Little Flock should not come to J. in the Epiphany conditions, they, their household and all their privileges would come to utter poverty (v. 11). Then J. will call to the attention of the eleven groups, the ten first, and the one afterward, that now from the Bible they could see J. as the Epiphany messenger assuring them of these things (v. 12). Again, he will charge them with telling the Little Flock his honorable office in Epiphany conditions, as well as all that they will have seen, and with hastening to bring the Little Flock to those conditions (v. 13). J. and the Epiphany-enlightened crown-losers will then express their special and mutual love and mixture of grief and joy over the situation (v. 14). He will then express his love and grief mingled with joy as to the other ten groups, and after that they will fellowship with him (v. 15).

Our Lord Jesus will note this revelation and reconciliation and will, as well as the glorified Church, be well pleased thereover (v. 16). Jesus will charge J. to have the eleven groups load their teachings with true Levite powers—Truth teachings and arrangements and the privilege to administer these according to their pertinent offices—and to go to those functioning in Parousia conditions (v. 17) and to come to J. with them into the Epiphany conditions, and to assure them that he would give them good things in such conditions, and that they would enjoy the best therein (v. 18). Jesus will command J. to provide such organizations as will be in harmony with Epiphany conditions for the Great Company, whereby they would be able to bring their adherents and the Little Flock into the Epiphany conditions (v. 19), and to charge them not to regard whatever they would have to give up in order to come into harmony with Epiphany conditions; for some of their possessions, *e.g.*, the

P.B.I. charter, which the Lord will set aside (Judg. 8: 17), will have to be given up as revolutionisms, all of which will be more than compensated for by greater advantages gotten in Epiphany conditions (v. 20). The eleven groups, accordingly, will do as charged, J. giving them the necessary organizations according to Jesus' charge, as well as teachings and powers for the way (v. 21)

He will also give to each of the ten changed groups a new authorization and its pertinent qualities; and to antitypical Benjamin the fullness of Truth for Great Company and Youthful Worthy matters and five sets of authorizations, with their pertinent qualities (v. 22). For the Little Flock J. will send along ten of Bro. Russell's publications, which J. has had reprinted for this purpose, *i.e.*, the six Studies, Tabernacle Shadows, Manna, Hymnal and Life-Death-Hereafter, all laden with Epiphany written notes; and the ten volumes of Epiphany Studies, of which this book is the tenth, all laden with powers—the Epiphany Truth and its arrangements—for the Little Flock, to help it come into harmony with Epiphany matters (v. 23). Thus J. will send the eleven groups on a happier mission than they formerly had, cautioning them to maintain peaceable relations with one another during their mission (v. 24). Coming out of Epiphany conditions they will reach Parousia conditions and the Little Flock (v. 25), to whom they will declare that J. is an active New Creature, not a Second Deather, and is the Divinely-appointed teacher and executive in Epiphany matters. This news will overwhelm the Little Flock, who, at first, will believe it "too good to be true" (v. 26). Thereupon they will tell the Little Flock all that J. had charged them to tell them, and when the latter will have seen the organizations, etc., that J. will have sent to bring them, their spirit will revive (v. 27), and they will say: Evidence enough! We will go and see him ere we leave our earthly office (v. 28).

The Little Flock with all their belongings will undertake the journey of faith from Parousia to Epiphany conditions, and on the way will refresh themselves with the Sarah

Covenant truths; and in connection therewith will serve Jehovah, the God and Father of the Lord Jesus (46: 1). In connection with these truths the Lord through J.'s publications will make Himself manifest to them as to the final Little Flock, these giving a ready response (v. 2). Through the Epiphany truths Jehovah will be manifesting Himself to them as the God of Christ, bidding them not to fear to come into harmony with Epiphany conditions, assuring them that He would multiply them into a great nation (v. 3), promising to be with them amid Epiphany conditions, and to bring them up in due time to Millennial conditions, and that J. would serve them, even until they would leave the earth (v. 4). Next leaving off temporarily the study of the Oath-bound promises, they will continue their mental journey to Epiphany conditions, assisted by the eleven Levite groups, who will bring along their proper views and those brethren developed by them and the organizations that Jesus shall have sent to expedite their journey (v. 5); for they will take their adherents and their Parousia-obtained possessions and come to Epiphany conditions, the Little Flock and with them the Great Company, with all their adherents and groups, even all those developed by the Little Flock and Great Company (vs. 6, 7). As shown when treating of Ezra 2; 10 and Neh. 7, in Chapter IV, we are not yet thoroughly certain as to several of the 60 Levite groups; hence it would not yet be due for us, and accordingly we will not attempt here, but hope later on, to give a full explanation of the 70 groups—56 plus the 10 national groups of Epiphany crown-losers, Jacob, Joseph and the latter's two sons and the 4 groups, "Rutherfordites," "Robisono-Concordant Versionists," "Kuehno-Sadlachites" and the Great Company as a whole (as the Levites as a whole are counted in among the 60 groups in the Tabernacle picture), not being counted in among the 56 Levite groups coming to Epiphany conditions. Also in the type the two females, Dinah (v. 15) and Serah (v. 17), are not counted among the 56 + 10 who went down to Egypt with Jacob, nor

are any of the wives of Jacob's sons, who type not groups, but their teachings (vs. 8-27).

Because the Kohathites are more sympathetic with J. than the other Levites, the Little Flock will send them forward as leaders of the rest on the way to J., to search out the way before them to the most fruitful sphere of Epiphany conditions, to which they also will come (*Goshen, fertile*, v. 28). J. will prepare his organization, such Great Company and Youthful Worthy brethren, particularly the latter, who will remain with him in Epiphany conditions while the Levites will have gone to bring the Little Flock, etc., to J. and will meet the Little Flock in the most fruitful sphere of Epiphany conditions. There J. will present himself to his beloved Little Flock brethren, as that member of them who shall have been long and sadly separated from them. Their meeting will be a long-drawn-out affectionate one, mingled with grief over the evils of their long separation and joy over present and future fellowship (v. 29). The Little Flock, then granted their one longed-for hope as to new-creature fellowship on this earth, of seeing J. a healthy Little Flock New Creature, and not a Second Deather, as the guileless Little Flock was deceived into believing by the designing Levite leaders, will then be willing to leave their work in the flesh (v. 30). J. then will promise his people to report to Jesus their safe coming to J. in Epiphany from Parousia conditions (v. 31); for the Lord's people have tended the consecrated and justified as God's flocks and herds, all of which and their other proper possessions they will bring with them (v. 32). J. will tell them to answer Jesus' providential questions as to their occupation (v. 33), to the effect that they are feeders of God's flocks and herds hitherto, just like the Little Flock, Jesus and God before them, requesting that they might dwell in fruitful Epiphany conditions separately from the usual Epiphanyites, who will have had them in abhorrence (v. 34).

Thereupon J. will report to Jesus that the Little Flock, the Great Company and their adherents and all their possessions will have arrived from Parousia into the most fertile

Epiphany conditions (47: 1). Then J. will sever out the five most active groups and will present them before the Lord Jesus: the good Societyites, Dawnites, the B.S.C.ites, Kohathites and Epiphanyites (v. 2). Providentially the Lord Jesus will inquire as to their occupation; and they will answer as J. shall have instructed them to answer (v. 3). They will state that they will have come to tarry awhile in Epiphany conditions, since Parousia conditions are no more fruitful to pasture their symbolic flocks and herds, and will request that they might be active in the fruitful Epiphany sphere (v. 4). Anent the arrival of J.'s people the Lord Jesus will charge J. (v. 5) to select from the Epiphany conditions their best sphere for their purposes, even antitypical Goshen (*fertile*), and will charge him to select their able ones to tend and prosper the justified ones and Jews (v. 6).

J. will present before the Lord Jesus the Little Flock in pertinent activities, and the Little Flock by its services will reflect credit on the Lord Jesus (v. 7). To His providential inquiries as to the Truth and character attainments of the Little Flock (v. 8), the answer will be that they will have had (70+60=130) Little Flock (70) experiences throughout the Age, amid many evil (60) circumstances, but were inferior in experiences as to Truth and character to the Lord Jesus and the Heavenly Father in Their time of activities as to the unfolding of God's plan (v. 9). With reflection of credit upon the Lord Jesus by the Little Flock the audience will come to an end (v. 10). According to the Lord Jesus' charge J. will apportion to the various groups of God's people their spheres of activity in the choicest fields of Epiphany matters, even in the sunlight of Jesus' favor as God's Son (Rameses, *son of the Sun*, v. 11). J. will feed with the Truth the Little Flock, the Great Company, the Youthful Worthies, the justified and Jews, apportioning the Truth according to their standing and needs (v. 12).

There will continue to be a lack of gaining new powers by personal effort in Epiphany conditions; and Parousia conditions will become very weak because of such lack

(v. 13). Then J. will require pertinent service in the reformation, repentance, that precedes justification for pertinent features of such powers in Epiphany and Parousia matters, and will give the Lord Jesus the resultant benefit (v. 14). Thereafter, at the entreaty of the people for more powers at J.'s disposal, to enable them to survive for justification purposes, he will demand and they will yield therefore the necessary things of faith and righteousness to obtain justification powers (vs. 15-17). Still later, needing more powers, to survive in higher justification features, they will finally offer to give their all in consecration, if J. will mete out to them the pertinent powers, they feeling that this is the only way to maintain their justification life, which there was no reason for them to give up, and which they will willingly give up to the Lord Jesus, if they will be able to retain their justification and experience the surviving powers of consecration (vs. 18, 19). Thereupon J. will accept their consecration gifts, all they are and have, for the Lord Jesus' possession (v. 20), placing the consecrators into the pertinent Truth groups from everywhere amid Epiphany conditions (v. 21). Naturally, the glorified Church will be exempt from J.'s supervision, and will get their powers directly from the Lord Jesus (v. 22). J. will teach the consecrators that, they being now the possession of the Lord Jesus, He will give them out of their human all whatever they need to meet their first mortgage for themselves and their dependents; but whatever will be beyond their duty to use for their and their dependents' needs they must devote to the Lord Jesus in service (vs. 23, 24). In gratitude for their repentance, justification and consecration blessings, which they will acknowledge as having come to them from the Lord through J.'s ministry on their behalf, they will entreat his further favor, and acknowledge that they are Jesus' servants in consecration (v. 25). Accordingly, J. will make such thoughts a fixed Epiphany teaching unto the end of the Age, that one's personal human rights should be yielded in consecration to the Lord Jesus, the exception

being the glorified Church, whose sphere of being is not human (v. 26).

The Little Flock and the Great Company will function in the most fruitful sphere of Epiphany conditions, and will increase in grace, knowledge, service and in the number of those that they shall win for the Lord (v. 27). The Little Flock will pass through experiences as the Little Flock of the Divine nature in embryo (the 7 in the 17 years) in relation to the Levites of the Great Company and Youthful Worthies, as natures lower than the Divine (the 10 in the 17 years);  $147=7\times7\times3$ = Divine (7) embryos fully (3) fit for the Divine nature (7) (v. 28). As the time for their leaving the world in their last members, except J., approaches, they will call J. to themselves and ask him as the Divinely-appointed historian of the Church in his prospective work on Revelation solemnly to promise them, as they will have his special favor, to deal kindly and truly with them after they are called to glory, not to make special memorials of their Epiphany conditions (v. 29), but especially to memorialize them in pre-Epiphany experiences and matters, and to set up the memorials of them in their relations to the memorials of God and Christ, J. promising to do it (v. 30).

The Little Flock will ask him to give them solemn assurance to this end, which he will do. Thereafter the Little Flock, at the chief points of the Truth as faith's rest, will express special reverence for, and subjection to J. whose continuance, according to Rev. 19: 10, J. will refuse to permit, though such reverence was implied in the vision of Gen. 37: 9-11. Thereafter the report will be made to J. that the Little Flock will have been decreasing in numbers and strength. At this J. will give special attention to Little Flock matters, associating with himself therein the Youthful Worthies and the Great Company (48: 1). J.'s and the Youthful Worthies' and Great Company's taking up Little Flock matters will be reported to the Little Flock. Accordingly, they will strengthen themselves as they will be resting upon the bed of Truth (v. 2). The Little Flock will refer to the promise that God gave them during the Jewish

Harvest, when God blessed them (v. 3), and promised to increase them unto many classes and give them the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit as their eternal inheritance (v. 4). According to that promise the Little Flock will claim as their own those Youthful Worthies and those Great Company brethren whom J. developed amid Epiphany conditions, before the Little Flock came into them, just as the Gershonites and Merarites will be theirs (v. 5). They will promise J. that after him would be named any class that he would later on develop, but they desired these to inherit among the Little Flock's descendants (v. 6). Then, with fondest memories, they will recall how the spiritual elective promises of the Gospel Age end with the development of the Great Company and began to come to an end in the late Parousia times, after the Little Flock had fully left the nominal church, and are memorialized in a fulfilled condition just before the fruitful Kingdom of Truth (v. 7).

The Little Flock will then fix their attention on J.'s developed Youthful Worthies and Great Company, inquiring as to who they are (v. 8). J. will answer them, My winlings developed in the Epiphany conditions by God. Whereupon the Little Flock will ask that they be brought to them, that they may minister a blessing to them (v. 9). Their wisdom will make them impartial; and J. will lead these to the Little Flock, who will show them affection by their ministries of Truth and providence (v. 10). They will express their pleasure at the thought that, whereas they had despaired of seeing J. alive as a New Creature, they were now blessed by God in seeing the two classes that under God J. had developed (v. 11). Then J. will remove them temporarily from the Little Flock's services; and the latter will again show J. undue reverence and subserviency, which in his part therein, not shown here, but shown in Rev. 22: 8, 9, J. will dissanction, as the other 48 star-members respectively dissanctioned it in their respective days (v. 12). Then J., favoring the Youthful Worthies more than the Great Company as to their receiving the Little Flock's services,

will bring them near for them to serve the two classes (v. 13); but the Little Flock will designedly give its chief service to the Great Company and its secondary service to the Youthful Worthies, despite the fact that the latter *as a class* came to ripeness earlier into existence than the former *as a class* (v. 14). The Little Flock will then confer a blessing in service on J., but additionally will by service draw down upon these two classes a blessing from Jehovah, praying that the God before whom God (in His attribute of love) and Christ ministered, who gave the Little Flock throughout their course the seasonal meat, and the Christ, who as God's messenger delivered them from all evil, might bless these two classes, also praying that their character and that of God and Christ might be developed in them and increase them greatly in the Epiphany and in the Millennial society (v. 16).

But when J. will see that the Little Flock will be conferring the chief favor upon the Great Company, it will displease him; and he will attempt to direct the Little Flock's chief favor upon the Youthful Worthies (v. 17), telling the Little Flock that the latter were the first as a class to be developed ripely, and that they should, therefore, show them the chief favor in services of blessing (v. 18). But the Little Flock will refuse J.'s request, saying emphatically that they know it, and that the Youthful Worthies will become a great elect class in the Millennium and afterward, yet the Great Company will be their superiors in numbers and position (v. 19). During that time the Little Flock will pronounce blessing, declaring prophetically that by these two classes the Little Flock will bless unto character likeness of the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies. Thus will the Little Flock put the Great Company ahead of the Youthful Worthies (v. 20). But the Little Flock will have some things to say to J.: (1) that the Lord will bring him and the Great Company out of Epiphany conditions into the Millennial sphere of the Truth and its Spirit for Spirit-born ones, even into the same mode of existence as God's and Christ's, though not necessarily of the same nature; and

(2) that J. would be in the glorified Little Flock, proven by God's inspiring the Little Flock to declare that for Him they had in their teachings reserved an inheritance above that of the Great Company, *i.e.*, one in the Divine nature, the very one that the Little Flock had acquired by its victorious fight, through the Word's sword-thrusts and bow-shots, over sin in its various forms (v. 22).

We now come to a chapter that is of great interest and that in its details was never seen until the Epiphany, though formerly glimpses of parts of it were seen. It has been having (1) its first fulfillment upon Fleshly Israel, which fulfillment will be completed in the Millennial Israel, with Jesus as its antitypical Joseph; (2) its second fulfillment on the crown-losers in the twelve denominations of the nominal church, which fulfillment will come to a completion at the end of the Epiphany, in which setting the 49 star-members are the antitypical Joseph, J. acting therein as the last one of them, and as their visible representative on earth at the time; and (3) its third antitype among the Epiphany Truth people, with J. as its Joseph. Before the Epiphany here and there glimmerings of light were seen on the first fulfillment, but only during the Epiphany has the light come upon the second and third antitypes, as well as further light on the first one. In harmony with the subject of this chapter, we will limit our study to the third antitype. We have already in our study of Gen. 35: 22-26 stated what each of the sons of Jacob typed in the third application. Now for the details as given in Gen. 49: The Little Flock before going beyond the vail will teach the antitypes of Gen. 49: 2-27, as it assembles the eleven groups of the Great Company and J. to hear its repetition of the pertinent teachings of J., as a summary of their Epiphany experiences (49: 1). They will ask the eleven groups of the Great Company and J. to gather themselves to hear and heed the Little Flock's words (v. 2). The main characteristics of each is illustrated by some object in nature, which in each case will be italicized. The Gershonite Levites (the B.S.C. [of Britain], P.B.I., Dawn

and Berean Bible Institute [of Australia], the antitypical Reubenites) were the first Great Company group, in the Shearno-Crawford movement, to be manifested during the Epiphany, as the firstborn of the Levites, the beginning of those whose strength and might came from the Little Flock; to them as such chief honor and power belonged by birthright (v. 3).

But their instability, like that of *water*, forfeited for them the birthright, preeminence of honor and power, because in the Shearno-Crawford movement they defiled God's Truth arrangements, and in the P.B.I. they defiled God's Truth teachings, *e.g.*, on corporations as controlling the priests' work, on the chronology with its many implications, on the Sin-offerings, Covenants and Mediator, on Revelation, Daniel, etc. (v. 4). The Merarites, instead of being set forth by one son, are presented in their two main divisions, Mahli and Mushi, as two *brothers*, given over to unrighteous acts. Their fighting theories were "the present management," *i.e.*, J.F.R. as controller in the Society, the four directors' illegally holding office, not having been annually elected, the legality of their ousting, the four (pseudo) directors' appointment being required by law, the theory of the Society, *i.e.*, J.F.R., as the channel, Harvest Siftings' theory of the British affair, the theory underlying the holding of the 1917 conventions and the straw vote, the theory that proxies sent for the annual election of the P.P.A.'s officers could be used for expelling I.F. Hoskins and R.H. Hirsh seven months later, without the knowledge and consent of the proxy senders—all of these erroneous theories were in gross violence used to set aside the Lord's arrangements for the Society in a series of unrighteous acts (typed in Gen. 34) hard to equal by anything that has ever happened among Truth people (v. 5). The Little Flock, thinking thereon, exhorts itself very emphatically not to share with them as a council, and not to let their characters be united with such an assembly, since in their anger they cut off J. from the brethren, and in their willfulness they hamstrung the W.T.B.&T.S.'s

and the P.P.A.'s charters (see margin, v. 6). God's curse rests upon their fierce anger at J. and upon their cruel wrath against the four Society and two P.P.A. directors. Hence God decided to scatter them among other groups, which facts prove has been so (v. 7).

The Kohathites, because strong through largely holding to the Parousia Truth, being likened to a *lion's whelp*, have been praised by other groups. They have been victorious in their controversies with the other Levites (but not with J.); and they thus subjected these in controversy (v. 8). They arose from the act of spoiling their enemies; they made themselves ready to spring upon opponents of the Parousia Truth and arrangements. They were strong, like a lion, and an old lion, and all Levites stood in fear of arousing them (v. 9). The right to act executively and an executive did not leave the Kohathites until the Epiphany messenger, who was among the Kohathites until the Amramites went on their rampage, would come, and unto him the Little Flock, Great Company, Youthful Worthies, loyal justified and loyal Jews will rally (v. 10). He will cause his arrangements and teachings to adhere closely to the Old and New Testaments. He will justify his graces and authority by clear Truth teachings (v. 11). His insight will be filled with clear Truth teachings; and his faith appropriations will be pure with nourishing Truth (v. 12). The Libnite section of the Gershonites, the B.S.C., are a symbolic *haven of ships* seeking as a symbolic harbor to invite symbolic traffic, in which all sorts of compromises, dickering and bargains are made in spiritual wares for personal power and advantage, which will tend toward nominal-churchism in matters of arrangement, e.g., a presbyterian order of church government, which they tried to introduce in the London Tabernacle and other churches (v. 13). The Shimite Gershonites, the P.B.I., at first like a *strong ass*, were a strong teaching class, but became overburdened by a twofold task: to shield itself against J.'s attacks on its revolutionisms, and to defend itself against the Society's opposition (v. 14); but they wearied of these

labors, determining that to rest from them by avoiding all controversy in The Herald's columns was good, and that pleasant was the sphere of nominal-church prophetic teachings; hence they undertook the labor of commenting on Revelation and Daniel under the lead of nominal-church writers as more or less against Bro. Russell's views, and as a result became a servant assigned by Azazel to tribute tasks (v. 15).

The Sturgeonites (Dan) as Uzzielites set out in an independent movement of God's people (v. 16), but in the envy and ill-will of a *serpent* in subtle secrecy they proved to be a symbolic *adder*, biting at J.'s teachings and influence, so as to make J. fall backward in the esteem of the Fort Pitt Committee and many of its supporters as an incumbrance (v. 17). Under this experience J. as a representative of the Little Flock was put into a state of heart and mind longing for the Lord to send him deliverance (v. 18). The Ritchieites as Hebronites were overcome as a *troop* by a marauding band and remained non-existent as a movement for a long time; but later they will assert themselves and overcome their opponents (v. 19). The Olsonites, whose prophetic, typical and chronological errors are here ignored, as a symbolic *baker* offered rich spiritual food, dainties on Kingdom matters (v. 20). The Hirshites as Amramites would go as rapidly as a *freed hind*, when loosed from J.'s supervision, and would teach goodly truths (v. 21). J. in fertility as to Truth, grace and service is like a *fruitful bough*. He is nourished to such fruitfulness by being planted at the fountain of Truth, the Bible; his activities are not confined to the Little Flock, but extend beyond its limits to the Great Company, the Youthful Worthies, the loyal justified and the loyal Jews (v. 22). The Levite leaders have sorely grieved him, shot their sharp sayings at him and hatefully persecuted him (v. 23); but his controversial equipment continued strong; and his mental abilities of Truth-service remained powerful, even by the ministry of our Lord Jesus, from which conditions he becomes the shepherd of God's sheep, the strong one of God's people,

even by the Little Flock's God, who helps him, the Almighty, who blesses him with the good things of Truth respecting spiritual matters and earthly matters, even the good things of Truth from the Old and New Testaments, and with the good things as to new ones developed through J. by the Covenant promises (v. 25); for the blessings pronounced by the Little Flock on J. will, on account of (so the Hebrew; *al* is not here to be rendered *above*) the blessed things promised by God and Christ, prevail unto the farthest limits of the present two-phased Kingdom of God—these shall rest upon J., even upon him who as a Little Flock member was in Nazarite consecration separate from the Great Company (v. 26). The Epiphany crown-losers, as antitypical Benjamin, are like a *wolf* that ravens, arising early in the Epiphany, *i.e.*, in 1918, to gain additions from the Levite groups, they will late in the Epiphany divide the gains into the ten good Levite groups (v. 27).

Thus are set forth the eleven Levite groups and J., according to the Little Flock; and the above are the blessed teachings that the Little Flock will issue as to the eleven Levite groups and J., as to each according as the Lord's Word forecasts, and as the Little Flock will announce. They will charge these, in view of their soon leaving the flesh for the Kingdom, to associate their memory with those of God and Christ in the secret condition of God's two salviations' plan (Machpelah, *double*), established in strength (Mamre, *firmness*), which God works out for Himself, His Christ and His covenants, from the fearful (Hittite, *fear*) great ones (Ephron, *gazelle-like*) of earth, by the heavy sacrifices that He made in working out the Gospel-Age features of His plan (vs. 29-32). From the standpoint of the smallest Joseph antitype, the declaration of the antitypes of Gen. 49: 1-32 is the last Little Flock message, apart from what J. will give, before they go beyond the veil; thereafter, early in anarchy, by more or less violence, they will leave the earth for the glories of the Kingdom (v. 33). First of all, J., in the grief of parting from the rest of the Little Flock, whose fellowship will greatly gladden him in the second

phase of his Epiphany ministry, will demonstrate his sorrow and love for them (50: 1).

Then J. will take from Church and secular histories and biographies, especially of the star-members, etc., the facts that are symbolized in Revelation, for his contemplated exposition of the book of Revelation, as an embalming of the Little Flock's memory (v. 2); for this embalming of the Little Flock's memory will take up their main experiences of the entire Gospel Age (40 days), as given by such historians, biographers, etc. The Youthful Worthies and the loyal justified and loyal Jews will, in the sense of missing, grieve for the Little Flock during the entire reign of Christ (70 days, Is. 23: 15; v. 3). J. will ask the brethren, if they favor him and his contemplated exposition of Revelation, to pray the Lord Jesus for grace to permit him to show the Little Flock the respect of setting forth their experiences as an exposition of that book, and of declaring their change of nature, etc., asking them to assure the Lord Jesus (v. 4) that the Little Flock required a solemn promise from him, in view of their expected leaving the flesh, that he would pay them that respect as to their pre-Epiphany conditions, and, therefore, to ask for him that the Lord Jesus sanction his so doing (v. 5). The Lord Jesus will graciously grant these prayers (v. 6). Accordingly, J. will prepare that exposition, with the sympathetic cooperation of the Levitical servants of Jesus in their writings and of the Truth leaders and secular leaders in their writings (v. 7). Antitypical Ephraim and Manasseh, the Great Company and Youthful Worthies, and their associates will also sympathetically cooperate with J. in producing that book; only the weak and the justified and Jews will not cooperate, but will remain in their sphere fruitful (v. 8).

There will accompany him in this task the Levite organizations and their executives, even very many (v. 9). They will enter a threshing experience of severity (*Atad, buckthorn*), this side of the race under the curse, *i.e.*, before the Millennium (*Jordan, descender, judged down*), where a great lamentation will set in, the Great Company

mourning over its loss of the Little Flock's fellowship and over its loss of Little Flockship, evidenced by the Little Flock, except J., having left the earth, J. sorrowing at the loss of fellowship with the Little Flock, the others because of their parting from the Little Flock, which mourning will be brought unto a completion (v. 10). Outsiders, even, will note and comment on their lamentations, calling it the mourning (*Abel-mizraim, mourning of the Egyptians*) of the Epiphanyites this side of the race under the curse (v. 11). J. and the eleven Levite groups by the pertinent exposition of Revelation will honor the memory of the Little Flock, in harmony with J.'s promise (vs. 12, 13). Thereafter J. and all the rest will attend to the remaining Epiphany matters (v. 14).

Thereupon the eleven Levite groups will begin to fear that J. will deal with them in requital of the wrongs that they did him (v. 15), and, therefore, will send him word to the effect that before the Little Flock was about to leave the earth they charged (v. 16) that the eleven Levite groups should ask J. to forgive the sins of his brethren in doing him wrong. Accordingly, they, therefore, will ask him to forgive them as servants of the God of the Little Flock. This will sadden J. when he hears it; for he will feel compassion for his fearful brethren, who even by then will not have learned that taking revenge is not a feature of his character (v. 17). Humbling themselves before him, they will declare that they are subject to him in his office (v. 18). He will dispel their fears, assuring them that vengeance belongs to God, whose pertinent prerogative does not belong to J. (v. 19). Sympathetically, and not upbraidingly, he will assure them that, despite their evil intentions toward him, God all along intended and effected good thereby, even working up to that time to save their lives, the official life of the Little Flock, and the life standing of the Youthful Worthies and the loyal justified and loyal Jews (v. 20). Hence he will dispel their fears, promising to develop them and those to whom they minister, thus comforting and speaking heartily to them.

(v. 21). J. will continue in the Epiphany conditions unto their end, as also will the Great Company (v. 22). He will serve the Great Company, in its Truth and nominal-church members, and the Youthful Worthies, in their Truth and nominal-church members (v. 23).

As J. will be about to experience his change to the Divine nature, he will inform the brethren thereof, assuring them that in due time they will get their deliverance from Epiphany into Kingdom conditions, according to the Oath-bound Covenant in its relations to God, Jesus and the Church (v. 24). He will require of them a solemn promise (1) to exercise faith in God's sure deliverance of them, and (2) to take with them the memory of his experiences, gains and works, because they will serve as a key to the understanding of the one or more Scriptural applications not given by him when he will have expounded one or more of them, the one or more that he will have expounded making the rest of them easy to unlock. Among such gains J. will require them to take over into the Millennium his library, which he in part collected so that to the Millennial world there will be shown the main priestly, especially star-member, and the main Levitical writings, as a witness to the Gospel-Age priestly and Levite works in their various kinds (v. 25). The things typed in vs. 24, 25 will likely be set forth in J.'s last will and testament, which will perhaps be written between Oct., 1954 and Nov., 1956. Then J. will pass beyond the vail to meet his awaiting and welcoming Lord and Little Flock brethren. The memory of his deeds, etc., will be preserved in suitable writings in Epiphany conditions; and in the deliverance of the rest of God's people they will be cherished, especially because of their antitypical relation to certain not hitherto expounded applications of typical and prophetical Scriptures, which applications they will serve to clarify; for while in the flesh J. will be unable to expound them in all of such applications, though he will, if Bro. Russell did not expound them, explain at least one of them pertinent to every typical and prophetical Scripture (Rom. 15: 4). Praise the Lord!

## CHAPTER X.

### CONCLUDING THOUGHTS.

GENERAL REMARKS ON OTHER PERTINENT TYPES. PROPER VIEW OF PAST EVIL DEEDS. EXHORTATIONS FOR THE FUTURE. THE GLORIOUS OUTLOOK.

IT HAD BEEN the intention to devote this chapter to a study of J.'s work as the small antitype of the good Solomon, who in the large good antitype represents the Millennial Christ, Head and Body. In our study of certain passages in Ezra and Nehemiah it was pointed out that Solomon's servants, there referred to, represent J.'s special helpers in Britain and America. These are Biblical proofs that J. is the small antitype of Solomon, whose peaceful reign, characterized by constructive works, great knowledge and riches, types the constructive features, ample knowledge and grace and service characteristic of J.'s forty years of Epiphany work. It might here be added that it had also been the intention of devoting a chapter—Chapter XI—to a study of J. as the smallest antitype of Joshua, whose conquest, division and subsequent peaceful rule in Canaan type J.'s successful Truth battles, his setting under God the various Truth peoples in their Epiphany spheres of service and his subsequent peaceful exercise of executive and teaching acts among them. But two reasons prompted a change of mind on the subject: (1) there are too many things in the antitypes of both of these characters not yet fulfilled, which would necessarily make a study of them, not only incomplete, but unclear, since the events, unlike the unfulfilled features of the Ezra, Mordecai, Job and Joseph types, are of a character whose fulfillments must largely take place before they can be clearly seen, and (2) the study of their fulfilled parts would add perhaps 150 pages to an already somewhat too large book.

This second reason also is responsible for our omitting the discussion of very many other types and prophecies of J. as their small or smallest antitype or fulfillment, as

the case may be; for in the three miniature Gospel Ages, every type or prophecy that had its antitype or fulfilment in the 49 star-members, which, of course, include the twelve Apostles and Bro. Russell, have these three small antitypes or fulfillments in J. This will help us to see how very wide is the significance of the statement in Esth. 10: 2, 3, to the effect that there are Epiphany applications of the uses that Jesus made of His main servants in the Church while she has been in the flesh, even as are typed in the Bible histories and forecast in the Bible prophecies descriptions of the events of the Church in the flesh during Jesus' glorified ministry toward her. This fact also shows that in the three Miniatures there is a threefold fulfilment of the book of Revelation on small scales, in which J. fulfils the pertinent prophecies fulfilled by the seven stars during the large Gospel Age. But these things, or at least some of them, must be left for future study. It was this thought of the many types and prophecies about J.'s work as about to be set before the brethren that he had in mind when, referring to Levitical sneers at him as "seeing himself in the Scriptures," he remarked that shortly the Lord would put them to shame for such sneers. They should remember that Jesus, St. Paul and Bro. Russell saw themselves in the Scriptures. And certainly, in the Epiphany, before whose end everything in the Bible will be seen, at least in one of its applications, it should be expected that it will be seen, since God has indicated in the Bible everything, even to the minutest detail, that He would do in the outworking of His plan (Amos 3: 7), that not only all prominent servants of God, but His less prominent servants, and the more and less prominent opponents of His plan, will also be seen in the Bible. The multiplicity of such references, therefore, will make us, instead of deferring our concluding thoughts for consideration in a Chapter XII, or a later one, briefly discuss them in this chapter.

First among these concluding thoughts we desire to inquire of the Truth groups as to the welfare of the Little

Flock among them. Since the divisions set in among the Lord's people in 1917 the Little Flock have not been in a group alone by themselves. They have been scattered among all groups—some of them in the Epiphany movement, some of them in the Society, some of them in the B.S.C., some of them in the Dawn, *etc., etc.* In all of them they have mourned the supposed Second Death of J. Now we desire to ask how they are faring. Are they being loved, respected and dealt with as of the Little Flock? Are they being given activities to perform compatibly with their being priests? How are their activities in resisting the errors of teaching and practice, so widespread among the Truth people, being treated? Are they being assisted, encouraged and comforted amid these, or are they being therefore despised, resisted and persecuted? Are they being built up in grace, knowledge and service? In a word, how are Little Flock members in the various groups faring and being treated? Please let us know on these two matters; for, first of all, our concern is for these beloved brethren, dear to our heart.

Secondly, we desire that all of the Lord's people draw near to us in heart and mind. You will find us the same loving, zealous, humble and self-denying brother whom you knew and loved in Bro. Russell's day. If at times we have had to exercise severity with those of your leaders who, in their selfishness to gain a following, perverted the Lord's Truth and arrangements, please remember that this severity flowed from loyalty to the Lord, the Truth and the brethren, and was intended to protect the Lord's people from the exploitation that we knew was being exercised against their interests in the interests of misleaders of God's children. And wherein we were too severe or not sufficiently wise in our efforts to defend the Lord's Truth and people, the very unusual circumstances, the to us known evil intentions of the misleaders, the partisanship of the misled ones and our fleshly imperfections combined to work on these faults in us; and we are sure that the robe of Christ's righteousness

covers these weaknesses in us. But in it all we sought the welfare of all the Lord's people according to our best judgment and power. Hence as a lover of God's people, one and all, we heartily desire that all of you draw near in heart and mind to us, assuring you of a warm and reciprocal response. And this we offer, despite the fact that the bulk of God's people, deceived, we are sure, by designing misleaders, surrendered us into special tribulations amid Epiphany conditions. Surely, if we, the wronged one, can and do stand ready to forgive, all the others, deceived and exploited as they were into cooperating to inflict the wrong, should welcome the opportunity of being undeceived, unexploited and forgiven for a full reconciliation. Therefore, please draw near in mind and heart to us.

Thirdly, do not grieve nor accuse yourselves overmuch for the wrongs of the past. Please remember this, first of all, that the Father stands more than ready to forgive them; the Elder Brother stands more than ready to impute of His merits for their forgiveness; and we are more than willing to forgive them; for we are persuaded that the bulk of the Lord's people were not wilful therein, but were deceived in this matter. Moreover, God has overruled it all for good; for He has manipulated this whole situation for the good of His people of the Little Flock, Great Company and Youthful Worthies. Some of His people, the crown-losers, are in danger of losing their lives; and God has raised us up for their deliverance, having put us into a position in which, by the Lord's Word and Spirit, the Lord's providences, through our ministry, will work deliverance for them. Again, there remains much work in the Epiphany to be done for the Lord's cause; and the Lord, through all of His people cooperating in its doing, will obtain the saving of their official lives; for the Lord has so arranged matters as to such work that the pertinent teachings, arrangements and apportionment of that work have been put into our charge exclusively, under the Lord Jesus' headship; hence the involved official powers to share in

that work cannot be had apart from our supervision. And it was to prepare us for the proper exercise of these office powers for the saving of the Great Company's lives and for the saving of the official lives of all God's people, that the Lord arranged for us to undergo the untoward experiences of the last 25 years. Hence despite whatever part the Lord's deceived children had in bringing us into the Epiphany tribulations, yet after all God was the primary cause of it; without His gracious will it never could have occurred; for He has, as it were, arranged for us by these experiences to get the training to fit us, for and under our Lord Jesus, to be a life preserver of His people; hence He has put us in charge of Jesus' household, made us the executive of His Epiphany work and the expounder of His Epiphany Truth—in the interests of His people. Hence grieve not nor accuse yourselves over much.

Fourth, let each of you in all zeal and alacrity assure the Little Flock that we are not a Second Deather, as they have been deceived by the envious, power-grasping and lording misleaders and deceivers of God's people into believing, but that our New Creature is alive and energetic, and has all along been loyal to God, the Truth and the brethren. Tell them that we have charged you to tell the Little Flock brethren in your groups that the Lord has made us His teacher and executive in Epiphany conditions and matters, and that we most earnestly and lovingly desire that they draw near to us with their hearts and minds in Epiphany conditions and matters, assuring them that we will arrange for them the most fruitful spheres of service, and that not only for them, but for the Great Company now in the Truth and those to be won later, as well as for the Youthful Worthies, the loyal justified and the loyal Jews, we will as the Lord's dispenser of Epiphany truths, arrangements and spheres of service minister these things, not only to the Little Flock, but also to the rest of the Lord's people, during the remaining Epiphany time, when in its fivefold forms of service none of these things can be gotten apart from our

ministry; for spiritual poverty in grace, knowledge and service must set in for unresponsive ones.

Fifth, you now see, both the non-Epiphany-affiliated groups and the Epiphany-affiliated group, that the same brother that you once knew and recognized, that you later rejected, and that you now recognize as the Lord's appointed dispenser, under the Lord Jesus, of the Epiphany Truth, arrangements and spheres of service, is the one expressly telling you these things; and as you recognize them, after careful and prayerful study, to be true, be sure that you declare to the Little Flock the official powers, prerogatives and privileges that we have as to Epiphany conditions and matters, and all else that you have Scripturally seen in this book, and that, proving these things to them as Truth, you assist them with all speed to come into harmony with the Epiphany.

Sixth, there are certain large-scale works to be done, as called for in the Epiphany. In addition to those implied in the preceding points, which apply to the Lord's Truth people, there will be a large work: (1) whereby our non-Truth Great Company and Youthful Worthy Brethren, and new ones not yet consecrated, are to be won for the Truth, some of whom will be won before Babylon is destroyed and others of them afterward. This will occur mainly in connection with a public work (Rev. 19: 5-8) of witnessing to the Kingdom and to the completion of the Church for the saving of their lives unto the completion of the Epiphany Court, (2) whereby the Epiphany Camp, which will consist of the loyal justified and the converted loyal Jews, by the Kingdom witness will be constructed, and (3) whereby the public by the Kingdom witness will be better prepared to enter into the Millennial Camp. For these works the methods and literature introduced by our Pastor will be mainly used. Whereas the public work by the various groups has been unfruitful, it will become very fruitful.

Seventh, and not the least, the work on personal carrying out of consecration in self- and world-denial, watchfulness

and prayer, study, spread and practice of the Truth and faithful endurance of the incidental experiences, remains to be completed in each one.

To all of these matters we invite the brethren's most earnest and prayerful attention and responsiveness; for the issues at stake are practical, important and incalculable. Brethren, let us give all diligence to these matters, which, if done, will make the future of each one of us as bright as the promises of God that apply to each one of us. Well will we do, if we lay aside all prejudices, all preconceived opinions and all personal preferences, wholly emptying ourselves of self and the world and wholly filling ourselves with the Word, Spirit and work of our God. How glorious is the prospect before us in the rest of the Epiphany, in the Kingdom and in the Ages of Glory after the Kingdom! Let each one of us arise to the height of his privileges! Then the Lord's favor will go with us.

God moves in a mysterious way,  
His wonders to perform;  
He plants his footsteps in the sea,  
And rides upon the storm.  
Deep in unfathomable mines  
Of never-failing skill,  
He treasures up his bright designs,  
And works his sovereign will.  
Ye fearful saints, fresh courage take;  
The clouds ye so much dread  
Are big with mercy and shall break  
In blessings on your head.  
Judge not the Lord by feeble sense,  
But trust him for his grace;  
Behind a frowning providence  
He hides a smiling face.  
His purposes will ripen fast,  
Unfolding every hour;  
The bud may have a bitter taste,  
But sweet will be the flower.  
Blind unbelief is sure to err,  
And scan his work in vain;  
God is his own interpreter,  
And he will make it plain.

THE END.

## INTRODUCTION TYPES

THE BIBLE contains seven distinct lines of thought; and everything in it belongs to one or another of these seven lines of thought. They are the following: doctrines, precepts, promises, exhortations, prophecies, histories and types. It is of the last named of these seven groups of thought that this article treats—types. Our English word *type* is derived from the Greek word *typos* (singular), *typoi* (plural). This word occurs 15 times in the Greek New Testament; and if a poorly attested reading of 1 Cor. 10: 11 should be accepted, it would occur 16 times there; but the word *typikos*, an adverb, derived from the noun *typos* and translated *typically*, is supported by Biblical numerics and the best MSS., e.g., by the three oldest and best of our MSS: the Vatican, Sinaitic and Alexandrine; hence it is doubtless the proper reading in 1 Cor. 10: 11. A careful study of the 15 New Testament occurrences of the word *typos* results in the conclusion that it is used there in four distinct senses, under which we will group all 15 of its occurrences: (1) *print*, used twice in John 20: 25 (it is from this sense of the word that we derive our use of the word *type* in the sense of the mechanical form or forms from which printing is done); (2) *example* (Phil. 3: 17; 1 Thes. 1: 17; 2 Thes. 3: 9; 1 Tim. 4: 12; Tit. 2: 7; 1 Pet. 5: 3); (3) *pattern* (Acts 7: 43, 44; 23: 25; Rom. 6: 17; Heb. 8: 5); and (4) *type* in the sense in which we ordinarily use the word, i.e., to mean one of the seven lines of Biblical thought as given above (Rom. 5: 14; 1 Cor. 10: 6, and verse 11, if the reading *typoi* be here accepted instead of *typikos*, which, if accepted as the proper reading here, would derive its meaning from the fourth sense of the word *typos*). This word's fourth sense is the subject of this introduction.

In this fourth sense of the word *types* are Old Testament institutions, persons, principles, things and events and New Testament persons, things and events shadowing forth

future things. A few examples will serve to clarify this definition. Under Old Testament institutions circumcision may be cited as typing the real baptism, and its annual passover supper as typing the Lord's Supper. Under Old Testament persons may be cited Sarah as typing the Divine features of the Oath-bound Covenant and Hagar as typing the Law Covenant; while Isaac (Sarah's son) and Ishmael (Hagar's son) may be cited as typing the Christ and Fleshly Israel. Under Old Testament principles the ten commandments may be cited as typing the Millennial law of duty-love to God and man. Under this head come the legal features of the Law Covenant. Under Old Testament things the city of Jerusalem may be cited as typing, sometimes the Church militant, sometimes the Church triumphant, sometimes the Ancient Worthies, sometimes Christendom and sometimes the nominal church; and Jordan may be cited as typing, sometimes the curse, sometimes the race under the curse and sometimes the peoples of Christendom. Under Old Testament events the giving of the Law Covenant may be cited as typing the giving of the New Covenant, and Abraham's dismissing Hagar and Ishmael at Sarah's insistence as typing God's casting off the Law Covenant and Fleshly Israel from His special favor, because the sufferings of the High Calling servants, as the personal parts of the Sarah Covenant, at the hands of the Law's servants, as the personal parts of the Hagar Covenant, and at the hands of the Law's children, appealed to Him to deliver His Little Flock from Fleshly Israel's persecutions.

Under New Testament persons Jesus may be cited as a type of the Parousia and Epiphany Little Flock; and the twelve Apostles (in the parallel Harvests) may be cited as typing Bro. Russell. Under New Testament things Jerusalem may be cited as a type of the Millennial religious government ("is [represents] the city of the Great King"), and of the nominal people of God ("it is impossible for a prophet to perish out of [apart from] Jerusalem"), Jesus' and the Apostles' miracles as typing various future things

## *Introduction—Types.*

and acts, especially in the Millennium; and Jordan may be cited as typing the sacrificial death. As New Testament events Jesus' betrayal by Judas may be cited as typing the Parousia and Epiphany Little Flock's betrayal by the Second Deathers; and the Jewish clergy's condemning Jesus to death can be cited as typing the clergy of Christendom as condemning the Little Flock to a cutting off of their rights as God's mouthpiece. Thus these few examples explain our definition, and passages like Rom. 5: 14; 1 Cor. 10: 6, 11; Gal. 4: 24; Col. 2: 16, 17; Heb. 9: 9, 23, 24; 10: 1 and numerous others prove our definition to be true, the first three cited passages expressly using the word *type* and the others using synonymous terms, while the Greek of Heb. 9: 24 uses the word *antitypes* (translated *figures*), and of 1 Pet. 3: 21 uses the word *antitype* (translated, *like figure*) in the sense in which we ordinarily use the word *type*. The following expressions: "figure," literally, parable (Heb. 9: 9), "mystery" (Eph. 5: 32), "according to the order of Melchizedek" (Heb. 6: 20; 7: 11, 17), "made like" (Heb. 7: 3), "similitude" (v. 15) and "signs" (John 2: 11; Mark 16: 17; Heb. 2: 4) are used as synonymous with the word *type*, as is also the case with the words "before whom" in Rom. 4: 17.

There is much diversity of opinion among Bible students as to what is included under the word *type*. Some deny that there are types at all in the Bible. Others claim that only those things that are expressly (according to their circumscribed view of the word "expressly") spoken of as types are to be considered to be such. These reduce types to a very small compass. Others arbitrarily take some things as typical, and as arbitrarily deny other things as being typical. Still others claim that everything in the Pentateuch and in the histories of the Old Testament and New Testament is typical; and still others claim that every history and biography in the Bible is typical. Amid such diversity how can we arrive at Biblical truth as to what is typical? We answer, Bible statements, Bible facts and

and Bible principles will enable the humble, meek, hungry, honest, reverential, loyal and holy child of God to reach clearness on what is Biblical truth on this subject as it becomes due. During the Epiphany the Truth on this subject becomes fully due; and therefore the humble, meek, hungry, honest, reverential, loyal and holy child of God may in the Epiphany expect to reach certainty as to the Truth on what in the Bible is typical. Accordingly, we present the following as aids to such children of God. We cannot hope that misdeveloped children of God—unclean Levites—as long as they remain unclean, will reach (see) such truth; but we have the confidence that when they will have begun a real cleansing of themselves, the Lord will on this point also bless them. According to our Pastor's expressed thought and constant practice there are at least seven ways by which the typical character of a Biblical statement may be recognized; and we will here set forth these seven ways, with three others not due to be seen in his day.

(1) Whenever the Bible expressly states that anything is typical we may be sure that it is so. Thus we know that Sarah, Hagar, Isaac and Ishmael are types; for St. Paul directly asserts this to be the case of them (Gal. 4: 21-31). Thus the many events of 1 Cor. 10: 1-10 are types, because St. Paul directly says so of them in vs. 6, 11. The making of the Law Covenant is directly stated by St. Paul to be typical, in Heb. 9: 14-23, especially in v. 23. The tabernacle and the high-priestly service directly connected therewith is expressly called typical by the Apostle in Heb. 9: 9, 24. Adam and Eve in their state of innocence are expressly called types, by a synonym of the word *type*, by the Apostle in Eph. 5: 31, 32; hence we know that they are types. For the same reason we know from Rom. 5: 14 that sinless Adam types Jesus. By the expression, “a cloud of witnesses” (Heb. 12: 1), *i.e.*, by metonymy, shadowy witnesses, since a cloud reflects a shadow when the sun sinks back of it, all the heroes of faith in their acts referred to in

### *Introduction—Types.*

Heb. 11 are types. Other occurrences of such express mention of types could be cited, especially in the epistle to the Hebrews; but the above are sufficient to demonstrate this first principle.

(2) A second way in which the Bible indicates a type is that of comparing things of one dispensation with things of another dispensation. This is a thing done very frequently in the Prophets, especially in Isaiah. Thus in Is. 28: 21 Israel's overthrow of the Philistines (2 Sam. 5: 20; 1 Chro. 14: 11) is shown to type God's Parousia people's overthrowing no-ransomists, and Joshua's and Israel's defeat of the five kings and the Amorites at Gibeon (Josh. 10: 10) is shown to type our Lord's and His people's defeating fully the five sifting errors and classes of the two Harvests (1 Cor. 10: 5-14). Thus in Is. 9: 4; 10: 26 the overthrow of the Midianites by Gideon is compared to that of the gross errorists of the nominal church in the Harvest, which proves the history of Gideon to be typical. These few examples from the Old Testament prove this point. The New Testament contains such comparisons, which proves the typical character of the Old Testament matters referred to, *e.g.*, the comparison between Isaac and the Christ class and Ishmael and Fleshly Israel (Gal. 4: 28-31); the days of Noah before and during the flood and the people of his days, and the days of the Son of Man before and during the great tribulation and the worldly at these times (Matt. 24: 37-39; Luke 17: 26, 27). The same is seen as to Lot and Sodom and the Great Company and the nominal church (Luke 17: 28-30). Jesus by comparison shows that He was typed by the brazen serpent in the wilderness (John 3: 14, 15). Especially in Isaiah, Jeremiah and the Psalms do we find many of these comparisons, and, of course, they prove that a type and an antitype exist in the things compared.

(3) At times a type is shown to exist by contrasting a type and an antitype, and in some cases by contrasting a type with a thing not its antitype, but containing the same principle as the type's antitype does. Notable cases on the

first point are found in the contrast between Heb. 12: 18-21 and vs. 22-29, in 9: 1-10 and 11-14 and in 25. A notable case on the second point is found in Heb. 10: 28, 29. The antitype of the Law of Moses is, of course, the New Covenant, which does not operate until the next Age, when wilful sinners against its law will perish without mercy at the mouth of two or three witnesses. Yet the same principle operates in connection with the covenant of sacrifice, as Heb. 10: 28, 29 proves. Totally wilful sinners against it will die the sorcer death than that inflicted by the Mosaic Covenant, *i.e.*, will die the second death. But the contrast suggests the thought of the typical character of the death penalties of the Mosaic Law. Is 1: 9 and Rom. 5: 15-19 from a slightly different point of view are other illustrations of this principle. This proves this point to be Biblical.

(4) One of the most frequent references to types is found in *prophetic* allusions made to *historical* persons, places and events *which happened long in the past*, and yet are prophecies of future things. This is a frequent phenomenon in the Psalms and Isaiah, *e.g.*, Ps. 83: 6-11 (note also the comparisons in vs. 9-11). Ps. 72, addressed to Solomon in his reign as a type of Christ in His Millennial reign, is also an example to the point. Is. 10: 5-34 contains prophetic allusions to many historical events, persons, nations, cities, etc., and yet all these are prophecies of future things in the second fulfillments, which proves that all those events, persons, places, cities, etc., are typical; for, as we know, these prophecies have a double fulfillment: (1) upon the literal things involved and (2) upon their antitypes in the Gospel Age. This principle our Pastor used very often. All of the Prophets abound with the use of this principle, prophesying literal things of Old Testament fulfillments, which God used as types of antitypical fulfillments of the Gospel Age, *e.g.*, Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Moab, Ammon, Philistia, Arabia, Syria, etc., and their pertinences in this connection. Rev. 2: 20-23; 17: 5; 21: 2 illustrate this point, all of which proves it.

(5) Another way that the Bible uses to point out types is explaining Old Testament matters as allusions, without direct statements that they are types, along doctrinal, ethical and hortatory lines, as the following will prove: Without directly calling circumcision and the lamb of Egypt types, St. Paul's allusion to the former in Col. 2: 11, 12 proves it to type the real baptism, and his allusion to the latter in 1 Cor. 5: 7, 8 proves the latter to type Jesus as our Paschal Lamb and the Israelites' eating the passover in Egypt to type the Gospel Church's appropriating justification and consecration blessings, and also shows how we are to purge out all evil by its reference to Israelites' casting out the leaven from their dwellings. Other cases to the point are Heb. 6: 18 (referring to the cities of refuge, typing Christ our Refuge and hope for life in Him); Jas. 5: 10, 11; Ezek. 14: 14-20 (prophets as types of various Gospel-Age worthies); John 1: 51 (Jacob's ladder typing Christ), etc. The prophetic writings of the Old Testament and the Apostolic writings, as well as Jesus' sayings, of the New Testament swarm with such allusions, pointing out types.

(6) The Scriptures imply that whoever acts in connection with a clearly expressed type and whatever is connected with a clearly expressed type are likewise typical. As an illustration of this rule let us cite Elijah, who is a clearly expressed type of the Christ as God's mouthpiece to the public (Matt. 11: 14 [literally, "is—*represents*—Elias, that was—literally, *is*—to come"]); Luke 1: 17; Matt. 3: 3; Mal. 4: 5, 6). Accordingly, Ahab, and his sons, Obadiah, Jezebel, Elisha, Jehu, Hazael, the priests of Baal and Ashtaroth, hence Baal and Ashtaroth, the widow of Zarephath and her son, *etc.*, are typical. Accordingly, Elisha being a type, all persons, places, events, *etc.*, coming into his life are typical. This principle, applied to Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Hagar, Ishmael, Jacob, Joseph, Pharaoh, Moses, Aaron, his sons, Joshua, the judges, Israel's kings, prophets, priests, Ezra, Nehemiah, Zerubbabel, John the Baptist, Jesus and the Apostles, shows us that practically

every historical person and event of the Old and New Testaments are typical. This, a very far-reaching principle on typology, is thus Biblical.

(7) There is a factual proof as to what in the Bible is typical—a method that our Pastor frequently applied, and expressly at the Bible House table stated that he used in many cases, *i.e.*, wherever Biblical persons, teachings, events, etc., have exact correspondencies with persons, teachings, events, etc., of, or related to, the Christian Church, even if none of the preceding six principles apply thereto, these Biblical persons, teachings, events, etc., are to be considered types of such persons, teachings, events, etc. The Bible teaches this in Amos 3: 7, which teaches that there is nothing connected with the unfolding of God's plan, even in the minutest detail, but God pointed it out by His prophets; and since this was not in all cases done by the prophets' writing what we call the fifth line of Biblical thought—prophecies, at least the rest of these cases must have been indicated in the writings of the prophets, like Samuel, etc., who gave their prophecies exclusively as types. Our Pastor testifies to this way of proving the existence of types in B 204, *e.g.*, no express Biblical statement says in so many words that the characters and events connected with the espousal and marriage of Isaac and Rebekah type those connected with the espousal and marriage of Jesus and the Church, yet our Pastor so applied them in detail. Why? Because the pertinent characters and events correspond. This principle, in the light of facts and Amos 3: 7, proves that what God's people of the Gospel Age, in leaders and led, did and accomplished and what was done to them in the outworking of God's plan is typed in the Bible. It was for this reason that Bro. Russell believed that he was the antitype of Daniel, as he showed by the pictures, Pastor Russell in the Critics' Den, and the handwriting on the wall, *etc.* It was also for this reason that he believed, as J. Hemery, A.H. MacMillan and the writer know, that he was the small antitype of David in the historical books, but not in

### *Introduction—Types.*

the Psalms. It is for this reason we know that the book of Esther as well as many other Bible books are typical.

(8) Whenever the Bible refers to a set of books as typical or to a set of historical books as *prophetic*, we are to understand everything in those books to be typical. The entire Law, which term Biblically includes the entire Pentateuch (Gal. 4: 21, 22), for God Himself calls it the Law in the name that He gave in the Hebrew Bible to the five books of Moses, is expressly called typical by St. Paul in Heb. 10: 1. Accordingly, St. Paul's argument here (Gal. 4: 21, 22) proves that Genesis, as well as the other four books of Moses, belongs to the Law; hence, according to Heb. 10: 1, everything in the first five books of the Old Testament is typical. It is for this reason that our Pastor referred to many stories as typical in Genesis to which no *express* statement, comparison, allusion, etc., of the Bible refer as typical, since these details are all included in a general statement like Heb. 10: 1, compared with Gal. 4: 21, 22, as it was for this same reason that he referred to many details of the other four books of Moses, as typical, even if the separate details are not otherwise proven to be types; for if these five books are called types, of course all their details are such. Thus the entire Pentateuch is typical in its details. Furthermore God in the Hebrew, as Luke also witnesses (Luke 24: 27), calls the second division of the Old Testament, the Prophets. He further divides the second part of the Old Testament, the Prophets, in the Hebrew into two parts: (1) the "Earlier Prophets" and (2) the "Later Prophets." The latter consists of the following books: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel and the twelve minor Prophets, while the former consists of the following seven books: Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 and 2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings. The English reader who does not understand Hebrew can verify the threefold division of the Hebrew Old Testament from Leeser's translation. Luke 24: 27 indicates the third division of the Hebrew Old Testament, not by the translation of its title *Kitubim*, Writings, but by its

first book, Psalms. Now please note the fact that the first part of the second division of the Hebrew Old Testament, the "Earlier Prophets," consists of the seven *historical* books, those mentioned above: Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 and 2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings. How does God come to call these books *Prophets*, which on their surface seem to be purely historical? We reply, It is because they consist wholly of histories shadowing forth future things, *i.e.*, types, and thus are prophetic. This means that everything in them is typical. The inspired Peter (Acts 3: 24) tells us that Samuel, the first of the Prophets, hence the author of Joshua, Judges, Ruth and a part of 1 Samuel (1 Chro. 29: 29) prophesied of the Millennium. But he did this in the types of the above-mentioned books, and in no other way, as a part of the Divine revelation, for only therein is found his part of that revelation ministered. And because 1 and 2 Chro., apart from the genealogies of 1 Chro., cover some of the ground of 1 Sam. and practically all the ground of 2 Sam. and 1 and 2 Kings in so far as they treat of the united kingdom and, after the division, of the kingdom of Judah, 1 and 2 Chro., which belong to the third division of the Hebrew Old Testament, the *Kitubim*, Writings, are also typical. The 2520 years' parallel proves the same thing of all contained in 1 and 2 Kings and in 2 Chro., apart from their parts treating of Solomon, who in other ways, given above, is proven to be typical. The parallel dispensations also prove that Ezra and Nehemiah are typical. Above we have shown that the historical parts of Daniel, which in the Hebrew is placed, not among the Prophets, but among the *Kitubim*, Writings, are typical. Above we also proved that the books of Job and Esther are typical. Thus all Old Testament historical books are typical.

(9) Every historical person, thing and event in the Bible must be revelatory, hence typical, because the Bible in entirety, and not simply in part, is a Divine revelation. Higher critics tell us that the Bible is not a Divine revelation, that at best it contains a Divine revelation, which they

### *Introduction—Types.*

usually limit to a certain few religious and ethical teachings. To these they ascribe an inspiration such as, they claim, all great religious leaders, like Buddha, Confucius, Zoroaster, etc., have enjoyed. But the truly instructed child of God believes that the Bible is in its entirety a Divine revelation, and is Divinely inspired in the full sense of the word. If the Bible in its entirety is a Divine revelation, then all its histories must be revelatory, which cannot be the case, if its histories are not typical. Some things and some stories would be out of place in the Bible, if they were not typical of future things, *e.g.*, most of the genealogies in 1 Chro., *i.e.*, of the non-sacred tribes, which type Christendom's sects and denominations, the stories in Judges 17–21, *i.e.*, of Micah and the Levite and his concubine, David's eldest son, Ammon, raping his sister Tamar (2 Sam. 13: 1-20), *etc.*, *etc.* To say that they are revelatory in the sense that they all teach us good lessons is not sufficient to entitle them to a place in a Divine revelation, since some events of church history teach us better lessons than some Biblical events (they do this because they are the antitypes of certain Biblical types), and since to be a part of a Divine revelation, they must reveal things that we cannot learn from any other than a Biblical source; and this is true of its histories, only if they are types. The whole Bible, not simply parts of it, is a Divine revelation. This proposition being true, the histories of the Bible are a part of the Divine revelation and all of them reveal Divine truths, which implies, among other things, that they are typical, which proves this point.

(10) A tenth way of finding out what is typical in the Bible is the fact that if anything is typical of a Gospel-Age person, event, movement, etc., it is thereby proven to be typical of corresponding things in the three Gospel-Age Miniatures, *i.e.*, the small, medium and large Miniatures: for during the Epiphany the Gospel Age is duplicated on a small scale in three Miniatures. The Bible proves this of the large Miniature; and fulfilled facts prove it of the small and medium Miniatures; for the bad Levites under bad

leadership have been manifested as such in the small Miniature; the good Levites under good leadership in the medium Miniature; and the nominal-church Levites are being manifested in the large Miniature. The Scriptural proof for the large Miniature is the following: The history of the spying out of the Land, the spies' report, the murmuring of the people at this report and their being therefore compelled to wander forty years in the wilderness type (1) the Jewish Harvest spying out of the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit, the report of the antitypical spies thereon, the murmuring of Jewish brethren at the report and the consequent Gospel-Age wandering of God's people in the symbolic wilderness; and (2) the Parousia spying out of the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit, the report of the antitypical spies thereon, the Parousia people of God murmuring thereat, and the consequent wandering in the symbolic wilderness during the Epiphany, which is thus proven to be a small scale duplication of the Gospel Age. Hence whatever types find their antitypes in the Gospel Age also find threefold antitypes during the Epiphany.

Having seen what the typical element in the Bible is, we will now turn to another phase of our subject, *i.e.*, the Bible's types in some cases pointing out individuals in the antitype. At times we hear brethren say that no individual, except Jesus, is typed in the Bible. Those who so speak do not agree with the Scriptures nor with our Pastor's interpretation of certain Scriptures. In some cases we fear that the wish is father to this thought, because certain individuals are pointed out in Biblical types to their disparagement; and these are the ones who started the outcry against individual antitypes' being pointed out in the Bible. Others seemingly join in their outcry, because they do not like to think of some of their fellows being so indicated. These accept the thought that individuals are pointed out in Bible prophecies, as distinct from Bible types. We can see no consistency in the attitude which believes that the Bible

### *Introduction—Types.*

prophecies point out individuals, and which denies that Bible types point out individuals. Let them show logical consistency in these two attitudes, if they can. We very much doubt their ability so to do. But in case any Truth people deny that Bible prophecy points out individuals apart from Jesus, they thereby show their disagreement with God, Jesus and our Pastor; for God Himself hundreds of years in advance pointed out, and even named Josiah and Cyrus (1 Kings 13: 2; Is. 44: 28; 45: 1-5). Or will such Truth person to maintain his position join the higher-critic infidels in saying that the pertinent passages were written after Josiah's and Cyrus' times? Jesus tells us that the Scriptures hundreds of years beforehand pointed out Judas as the betrayer of our Lord (John 13: 18, 21-30; Ps. 41: 9; Zech. 11: 12, 13).

Dan. 11 points out many individuals in its remarkable prophecy, as the following list will show: Cambyses, Smerdis, Darius Hystaspes and Xerxes (v. 2), Alexander the Great (v. 4), his four successors: Cassander, Seleucus, Ptolemy and Lysimachus (v. 4; 8: 8), Ptolemy Philadelphos (v. 5), Antiochus Theos, Bernice and Ptolemy Philadelphia (v. 6), Ptolemy Energetes and Seleucus Callinicus (v. 7), the latter's sons and Antiochus Magnus (v. 10), the latter and Ptolemy Philopater (v. 11), Antiochus Epiphanes (v. 12), Scopas (v. 15), Mark Anthony, and Cleopatra (vs. 17-19), Augustus (v. 20), Tiberius (vs. 21-24), Aurelian and Zenobia (vs. 25, 26, 28) and Napoleon (vs. 29, 30, 3645). Moreover, other individuals are by Bible prophecy pointed out: John the Baptist is referred to in Is. 40: 35; Mal. 3: 1, compared with Matt. 3: 3; 11: 10. In Zech. 11: 8 Messrs. Barbour, Paton and Henninges are foretold; and in vs. 15-17 J.F.R. is forecast. Bro. Russell is pointed out in Is. 21: 6-10; Ezek. 40: 1-47: 12; Hab. 2: 1-3; Matt. 20: 8; 24: 45-47; Luke 12: 42-46; and J.F.R. is again foretold in Matt. 24: 48-51. Another brother is pointed out in Rev. 19: 9; and the eight principal men of the seven groups of star-members are pointed out in Mic. 5: 5, which also under the words, "seven

shepherds," points out the 49 star-members who constitute the seven angels of the seven churches. The Parousia and Epiphany Messengers are foretold in Deut. 32: 30. Accordingly, these passages prove that the Bible in prophecies forecasts other individuals than our Lord. And if it thus forecasts by prophecy certain individuals, why should it not also forecast certain individuals by type?

We will now proceed to prove that the Bible does type individuals other than the Lord, and that our Pastor so believed and taught. The twelve Apostles are typed by the twelve wells at Elim and the seventy subordinate general teachers of the Church in the two Harvests and in the Interim between them are typed by its seventy palm trees (Ex. 15: 27). These three sets of seventy subordinate general teachers of the Church are also typed by the seventy elders of Israel (Num. 11: 24), while Eldad and Medad type Paul and Apollos in the Jewish Harvest, John and John Wessel in the Interim and the two Messengers in the end of the Age. Among others, the twelve Apostles are typed by Jacob's twelve sons at the time of his death (Gen. 49: 1, 2), even as, among others, our Lord is there typed by Jacob. The twelve Apostles, and especially St. Paul (T 110), are typed by Eleazar (Num. 3: 32; 4: 16; 16: 35-39; 19: 4). The parallel Harvests prove that Eleazar in these passages also types our Pastor. St. Paul with the epistle to the Hebrews and our Pastor with the Nov., 1893, Tower article on the Congress of Religions, reproduced and enlarged in D 157-268, are typed by Phinehas with his spear (Num. 25: 6-15). Phurah (Judg. 7: 10, 11) in accompanying Gideon on a scouting trip to the Midianitish camp types our Pastor accompanying Jesus on a scouting trip to the camp of the Gospel Harvest's errorists. Indeed, whole books and parts of others type our Pastor and his work. Thus under the type of David and his works he and his works are typed in the second half of 1 Sam. and in the whole of 2 Sam. Jeremiah and Daniel type him in their books, as do the Apostles in the Acts of the Apostles. Additionally he and

### *Introduction—Types.*

his works are typed in Gen., Ex., Lev., Num., Josh., Judg., Ruth and Lam.

The nine chief Parousia pilgrims are typed in the following order in 2 Sam. 23: 8-23: Bros. Russell, Johnson, Barton, (J.) Edgar, Hemery, (M.) Edgar, Rutherford, Sturgeon and MacMillan; and, barring the three just mentioned British pilgrims, the 34 pilgrims whose pictures appear in a picture of pilgrims on the last page of the Jan., 1910, People's Pulpit are antitypes of 34 mighty men of David mentioned in 2 Sam. 23: 8-39; and the names of the 34 (once more the three British pilgrims are omitted) are mentioned in the B. S. M. of 1911, No. 13, page 2, col. 3, par. 8 (enclosed), who are the antitypes of 34 of David's mightiest men mentioned in 2 Sam. 23: 8-39. These examples are sufficient to prove that Bible types at times point out individuals. In the Epiphany, and just because it is the Epiphany, many more individuals are pointed out in Bible types than at any other period of God's plan. The leaders of the Levite groups and some of their helpers are typed individually, and that, for the purpose of identifying them, their main supporters and their groups, of which there are 60 in all, according to the Bible's mentioning 60 posts about the tabernacle, the 60 heads of the Levite groups in the pertinent genealogies of Ex., Num. and 1 Chro., the 60 queens of Solomon (Cant. 6: 8) and his 60 mighty men (Cant. 3: 7); for to veil the Epiphany purposes, agents and events until due time, God put these in the Bible, mainly in the form of types.

The true exposition of types is among the most difficult works of true interpreters of the Word. Therefore God, apart from Jesus, who is His Mouthpiece to them, ordinarily has limited the interpretation of types to the star-members, of these more particularly to those living in the Ephesian phase of the Church, *i.e.*, to the Apostles, and to those living in the Laodicean phase of the Church, *i.e.*, the Parousia and Epiphany Messengers. The Apostolic writings, with their direct statements, comparisons,

contrasts, allusions, etc., prove this statement to be true of them; and God's statement in Ex. 19: 21-25, particularly v. 24, proves this with reference to these two Messengers, who are typed by Aaron, Moses there typing our Lord; for St. Paul's reference to Ex. 19: 11-20 in Heb. 12: 18-21 and his calling attention to the antitype in vs. 22-29 prove that Ex. 19: 11-25 applies to the Parousia and Epiphany. Hence Ex. 19: 21-25 shows that the Parousia's and Epiphany's antitypical Israelites and their priests (Christ's and the two Messengers' direct Bible study not being speculation) are not to speculate, which is mainly done with types. Hence this Scripture proves that, generally speaking, Jesus as God's Mouthpiece, and thus the exclusive Interpreter of the Word, would use in the end of this Age the Parousia and Epiphany Messengers as antitypical Aaron, generally speaking, to interpret to the brethren the Word as due, especially on new doctrines, prophecies and types. And any attempt of others to unravel these three things as new matters would be the prohibited gazing—speculation—of Ex. 19: 21-25, and would meet with a cutting off from their standing, if not stopped. Had this matter been heeded, the Lord's people in the Parousia, and especially in the Epiphany, would have been spared much confusion and many a fall from their class standing before the Lord. We said above, and that designedly, that, generally speaking, typical truth in its first reception is limited to the star-members. Yet others than these, *i.e.*, other scribes instructed in the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 13: 52), have from time to time been privileged to bring forth something new from the storehouse, the Bible; but this never occurred by their violating the injunction not to speculate—"gaze not"—*i.e.*, by their studying out types, *etc.*; but whenever they were favored with something new, they, as it were, stumbled upon it without study, God suddenly illuminating their minds thereon, and thus they got something new on types, parables, prophecies and other dark sayings, without engaging in forbidden speculation; for all the brethren, except the star-members, are forbidden direct

### *Introduction—Types.*

Biblical study on new doctrines, types and prophecy, which is “gazing” for them. We have given details on this matter in the article entitled, Moses, Aaron and Miriam (Num. 12), in P. '36, 172, 192; '37, 5, to which we refer our readers as given in El, Chap. II.

This brings us to a brief discussion of the abuse of typing. Of the seven forms of Biblical thought, the doctrinal, prophetical and typical forms have doubtless been the most misused for the inculcation of error. Of these three the doctrinal and typical forms of Bible thought have been the most misused. Of these two the Bible's doctrinal thoughts have been the most abused, and the Bible's typical thoughts have been a close second. But we are sure that during the Parousia and Epiphany, particularly during the latter, among Truth people typing has been the most abused of all seven lines of Bible thought. Satan, knowing that by typing he could introduce error perhaps more effectively than by other means, has made this his favorite way of spreading error among the nominal and real people of God. The effective agent whom most of all he used to introduce typing to darken the Bible was the exceedingly able theologian, Origen, who died a martyr's death in 254 A.D.; and from him mainly the apostacy took over this thing, to the invention and spread of much error during the Dark Ages. We will cite but one illustration on this head: Boniface VIII, during his controversy with Philip the Fair, of France, in the most infamous of his infamous bulls, *Unam Sanctam*, set forth the doctrine that the two swords that the Apostles had among them at the Last Supper typed the powers of the two Divine institutions: church and state; and by the sun and moon referred to in the description of their shining in Gen. 1 he claimed these two institutions to be typed, and the subjection of the state to the church to be typed by the sun, in ruling by day, as being a greater light than the moon, in ruling by night, alleging that the spiritual sword was to be used exclusively by the church, *i.e.*, the hierarchy headed by the pope, and that the temporal sword was to be used by the state for, and

under the orders of, the church; and by such reasoning he drew the conclusion that it was altogether necessary for salvation that every human being be subject to the pope, this monstrous doctrine being thus deduced from these two alleged antitypes. Very much of papal error has been built upon typing as foolish as the above.

And what shall we say of typing by the Toms, Dicks and Harries among the Truth people during the Parousia and Epiphany? Nonsense upon nonsense has been produced by their typing during these times. What our Pastor had to suffer in the way of loss of time in wading through brethren's speculations, and how his longsuffering and forbearance were sorely tried by these speculations only the Lord and he knew! We could tell many a story of our experiences on these two points, if we wished to waste time and printer's ink thereon. We have had to put several notices in *The Present Truth* reiterating the thought that we were not a doctrinal clearing house for the examination of speculations, especially in the form of types, in order to discourage speculators from sending us, especially their typical hallucinations, to the wasting of our time and the trying of our longsuffering and forbearance! Bro. Russell repeatedly warned against the mischievous practice of speculation, especially in form of types! And, like him, time and again by voice and pen, we have issued the same warning, cautioning the speculators that they were jeopardizing their standing before the Lord by this practice so emphatically disapproved of, and warned against by God in Ex. 19: 21-25. And how necessary such warnings are we can see from the follies and hallucinations of a J.F.R., a T.B. Clemons, a T. Chapman, etc. And again we raise our voice as a pertinent mouthpiece of the Lord thereon, exhorting the brethren everywhere, as imperiling their class standing before the Lord, to refrain from speculating, especially in its worst present form—typing.

But one may say that Bro. Russell and we have been inconsistent in warning the brethren against speculating, especially in the form of typing, and yet engaging in typing

### *Introduction—Types.*

ourselves, despite these warnings. To this we reply: (1) by the proverbs, “If two do the same thing, it is not always the same”; and “Circumstances alter cases”; and (2) the Lord condemns typing in all non-star-members; and He approves of it, as due, in star-members, especially in the two star-members whose ministry was to be exercised in the end of the Age: one during the Parousia, the other during the Epiphany; for undoubtedly, as proven above, the scenes of Ex. 19: 11-25 are Parousiac and Epiphaniac. Hence, as in Ex. 19: 24 by Moses Jesus is typed and by Aaron the two above-indicated Messengers are typed, they are approved as doing what vs. 21-25 disapprove of all the rest of God’s people, be they antitypical priests, Levites or Israelites. Bro. Russell’s practice of typing, while disapproving of, and warning against typing in others, proves that he knew that it was the Lord’s will for him to do it as due, but that it was against His will for others so to do; and our practice of typing, while disapproving of, and warning against it in others, proves that we believe that it is the Lord’s will for us to do it as due, but that it is against His will for others so to do. And if we do it on a more extensive scale than our Pastor, it is for two reasons: (1) that more extensive types are now, in the *Epiphany*, due to be given to the Lord’s people than were in the Parousia due to be given them; and (2) because, while during the Parousia, as the day (Ps. 91: 5, 6), the New Testament, as the symbolic sun, was due to do the main shining, now, in the Epiphany, as the night (Ps. 91: 5, 6), the Old Testament, as the symbolic moon, is due to do the main shining; because what was left uninterpreted by our Pastor is to be interpreted before the Church leaves the world (Rom. 15: 4); and because the bulk of the Old Testament types were not interpreted by him and must, therefore, be interpreted in the Epiphany. And as the faithful of the Parousia did not stumble over the symbolic sun’s shining, so neither will the faithful of the Epiphany stumble over the symbolic moon’s shining (Ps. 121: 6), even if much of it is typical in character. Hence we say to one and all, Leave off typing as highly

unsafe, and be content with studying the typing of the two Divinely-authorized Messengers at the end of the Age, whose writings will give all the typical and other interpretations needed by the brethren.

This introduction was originally occasioned by a brother's sending us for our opinion a tract entitled, *Types—Their Relation to Sound Doctrine*, apparently published by the Dawn, since it advertises the Dawn, since its title is the same as an article in the Feb., 1940, Dawn, and since it is almost word for word a reproduction of that article, though adding to, and omitting from, that article a few things. We agree with many things in the article, and with many we do not agree! We agree that no doctrine of the Plan should be based solely upon a type; but we affirm that doctrines clearly taught in the Bible are illustrated by types and in some less important details are supplemented by types, even as our Pastor's treatment, *e.g.*, of various of the sacrifices subsequent to the atonement day, proves he held. The main point stressed by the article is that only such Biblical events, persons, etc., are to be considered types as are expressly referred to as types. Its writer almost eschews the word *types*, and seeks to supplant it by the word *models*. His whole discussion indicates that he explains his thesis to mean partly what we explained as the first of our ten ways of knowing when a passage is typical. Against this too narrow view we present the nine other ways and part of a tenth way of so doing pointed out above. He expressly denies, without offering the slightest Bible proof therefore against our view, that all Biblical histories are typical. Above we refuted his view, from the Bible. The impression that his article and tract leaves on the reader is that the types of the Bible are a rather unimportant part of it, instead of being one of its seven main lines of thought. Hence his article and tract seek to reduce the typology of the Bible to the minimum that would result, if of the ten ways of arriving at the typical in the Bible only part of the first is to be used. Hence he rejects much that is typical as unsound. We think that our

### *Introduction—Types.*

discussion above overthrows his general point of view, and will therefore review some of his details only. His sophistries on the meanings of the word *types* are refuted by what we said above on the subject. His comments on Rom. 5: 14, as being claimed by some to teach that everything in the Old Testament is typical, are sophistical and set up a man of straw; for we have never heard anyone say that this passage is the basis of teaching that everything in the Old Testament is typical. We have never used that passage to prove anything more on Old Testament typology than that Adam in his state of innocence types Jesus, which is the case. The foolish conclusions that the writer draws from his pertinent straw man we will pass by as unworthy of a reply. His pertinent sophistries and his general attitude on types belittle the typical element in the Bible.

This last remark applies to his claims on 1 Cor. 10: 6, 11. Here the clear statement is made that the actors in experiences of good and in those of evil in 1 Cor. 10: 1-10 are types of us, *i.e.*, professed Christians, who consist of antitypical priests, Levites and campers, in the ends of the Ages, *i.e.*, in the Jewish Harvest, the end of the Jewish Age, and in the Gospel Harvest, the end of the Gospel Age. Their being written for our (antitypical priests, Levites and Israelites) admonition, does not in the slightest, as the article falsely implies, which contends for their being warning models, not types, undo their typical character. The sophistry that the article contains, as an effort to belittle the typical teachings of this passage, to the effect that it is used by some to prove that everything in the Old Testament is typical (a claim which before reading the article under review we never heard, and doubt that it was ever made by a responsible teacher among God's people), does not affect the fact that the passage expressly states that all of the good experiences of vs. 1-5 and the evil ones of vs. 7-10 are typical, as well as hortatory. The dust that is raised on Heb. 11, as allegedly only admonitory, cannot undo the fact that Heb. 12: 1, as shown above, proves that the events and persons mentioned

in Heb. 11 are typical. Nor can the dust that it raises on Heb. 9: 26 alter the fact that the *consummation* (in the A. V. mistranslated *end*) of the Ages (of Heb. 9: 26) means the entire Gospel Age, not the Jewish Harvest only; for the connection shows that the high priest here is the World's High Priest, Head and Body, and that the Ages here are the three Ages of the Second World—the Patriarchal and Jewish and Gospel Ages, the Gospel Age summing up (consummation) the Second World. Of course, 1 Cor. 10: 11 refers to both Harvests; and Heb. 3 proves that the events and persons of 1 Cor. 10: 1-11, though not so set forth in 1 Cor. 10: 11, like some others during the wilderness wandering of Israel, refer to the entire Gospel Age. The mud splashed about as to Gal. 4: 21-31, to the effect that some are alleged to draw from it the conclusion that every Old Testament story is typical (a thing we never heard before reading the article under review), cannot obviate the fact that it proves God to be typed by Abraham, the Divine features of the Oathbound Covenant by Sarah, the Law Covenant by Hagar, the Christ by Isaac and Fleshly Israel by Ishmael, and their pertinent experiences.

After belittling types the writer shows his woeful ignorance of them under the heading, “Difficulties in the ‘Interpretation’ of Details” of types. Under such alleged “difficulties in ‘interpretation’ of details,” by the examples that he gives, he creates the difficulties by assuming that an Old Testament character can have only one typical significance; and after setting up this strawman, he attempts to kick it over by citing accounts that are inconsistent with his alleged sole typical use of the pertinent person, thus ignoring the fact that typical characters often represent different antitypes, e.g., Esau at times types Fleshly Israel (Rom. 9: 10-13, 22-24), at others, the Great Company (Heb. 12: 16, 17). Thus he cites Abraham, under the assumption that his only typical meaning is God, and then asks, What would Abraham’s father, two brothers and Lot type? We answer that Abraham is used in various typical ways: in his journey to Haran he types certain ones (those of them who

### *Introduction—Types.*

would gain tentative justification, consecrate and win out as the Little Flock) progressing toward tentative justification; in his stay at Haran he types their stay in tentative justification before progressing toward consecration; in his journey to Canaan, their progressing toward consecration and Spirit-begettal; in his entering Canaan, their experiencing consecration, vitalized justification and Spirit-begetting; for then only did the promises become theirs. In his relations to Sarah and Isaac, Hagar and Ishmael and Keturah and her six children, he types God as the symbolic husband of the three great Covenants and as the Father of the children of these three Covenants. From the standpoint of the former sets of viewpoints, Abraham's father at Haran represents the whole class of the tentatively justified, and his two brothers represent the two classes of the tentatively justified who never consecrate, *i.e.*, (1) the measurably faithful and (2) the unfaithful of these, the former continuing to believe in Christ and to practice righteousness, who Millennially, as our Pastor taught, will be rewarded, like the believing Jews; and the latter, turning back to sin, will Millennially be treated like the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles. Lot types those who eventually will be of the Great Company; for he took all the steps that Abraham took, including entering Canaan, where, however, he left Abraham (the Little Flock) and cleaved to Sodom (the nominal church). Clearly, in being blessed by Melchizedek, the type of Jesus, Abraham does not type God, but the Little Flock, since the blesser is superior to the blessed (Heb. 7: 6, 7).

The writer of the article, in his belittling types, attempts again to kick his straw-man over by asking, What does Abraham type in leaving Canaan for Egypt, to escape a grievous famine? The following will answer his objection. In Abraham's pertinent acts he represents God's procedure in the outworking of His plan from conditions of the Truth and its Spirit (Canaan) marking the early Church to the conditions of worldliness marking the nominal church of the Dark Ages, because later in the

primitive Church the Truth began to darken. Again, the writer, in belittling types, asks, What could be typed by "his [Abraham's] spineless compromise of Sarah with Pharaoh and Abimelech and their rebuke of Abraham after God's instruction?" We reply: God in His attribute of love acted in such a way toward the Sarah Covenant *in its personal parts, its servants*, by permitting their persecution, etc., in the Dark Ages as gave Satan (Pharaoh) and the hierarchy (Abimelech) the thought that He did not own them as His symbolic wife (Is. 54), and allowed Satan and the hierarchy to get them into their power to use them for their purposes. God in His power by His Word later made known to Satan and the hierarchy His relation to antitypical Sarah in its personal parts, its servants; and, of course, Satan and the hierarchy blamed God for their intentions toward antitypical Sarah, and by their evil practices excluded God from their spheres of activity. Again the writer, in belittling types in details, asks, "What would be taught by his [Abraham's] . . . Sarah's or Isaac's death?" We answer, God's ceasing at its fulfillment from further work on His Plan, the Oath-bound Covenant's ceasing to operate after its fulfillment and the Christ class' ceasing from further work on the Plan after it is completed, as, *e.g.*, the high priest's death giving the refugees liberty to go home from the city of refuge types, not Christ's death after this Age and the Millennium, but His ceasing from further pertinent atonement work after the pertinent atonement is complete—see comments on Num. 35: 25. If the writer of the article had studied Bro. Russell's writings on several of the above-cited points, or if after studying them thereon he had not rejected his pertinent teachings, he would not have asked his pertinent questions as difficulties unless, which we trust is not the case, he deliberately capitalized on some not knowing our Pastor's pertinent thoughts, to deceive them with his sophistries.

He uses, in his belittling types, the same sophistry, *i.e.*, the assumption that a typical character is limited to but one antitypical significance, to rule out from being types those

*Introduction—Types.*

parts of Moses', Aaron's, David's and Solomon's lives wherein they do not type Jesus. He ought to know that our Pastor taught that Moses types: (1) Jesus, *e.g.*, in his experiences in Egypt, in the journey to Sinai, Palestine, etc.; (2) the Christ, *e.g.*, in mediating the Covenant; (3) the Law, *e.g.*, at the consecration of the priesthood (Lev. 8-10; T 41, 3); and (4) the Parousia Second Deathers, the Ransom and Church-Sin-offering deniers (smiting the rock twice). To his types-belittling question, "What about his [Moses'] unavailing prayers to enter the promised land?" we reply: He was sentenced to exclusion from the promised land because of smiting the rock, and his pertinent prayers were, therefore, denied, typing that the Ransom-and-Church-Sin-offering-denying new creatures are Second Deathers; and that no amount of prayers of theirs will avail for their inheriting the sphere of the Truth and its Spirit beyond the veil. As for his limiting Aaron to but one typical meaning—Jesus—we reply: He types: (1) the Church this side the veil during the Parousia and Epiphany as Christ's mouthpiece to Satan and his servants (Aaron acting as Moses' mouthpiece in Egypt); (2) the Ancient Worthies (at the Red Sea); (3) the infidelistic sifters (in the golden calf affair); (4) Jesus as High Priest (at the consecration of the priesthood and at numerous other times); (5) Jesus and the Church as the World's High Priest (in the atonement-day service, Lev. 16, and in many other places); (6) the Epiphany Second Deathers as Ransom and Church-Sin-offering deniers (at the smiting of the rock twice and at his exclusion from Canaan); and (7) the two Messengers (Ex. 19: 24).

As for his limiting David to but one typical meaning, we reply: In the Psalms David types: (1) Jesus; (2) the Church; and (3) Jesus and the Church as Head and Body; and in the histories he types: (1) the Church during the Gospel Age; (2) Bro. Russell. Our Pastor's writings show the first four of these typical meanings; and he held the fifth, but never wrote on it; but at least J. Hemery, A.H. MacMillan and ourself, from personal conversation with

him, know that he believed the fifth. As to his denying the typical character of David's domestic experiences, we would say David's sin connected with Bath-sheba and Uriah types, for Bro. Russell, his defiling the Sarah Covenant by drawing temporarily into the Gospel Age the New Covenant, and exposing the defenders of the Sarah Covenant against this view temporarily to refutative teachings; and, for the Church, its defiling certain truths with Babylonian errors during the Interim and exposing their defenders to refutative teachings. This point refutes the reviewed writer on his limiting David to but one typical meaning. Finally, as to his limiting Solomon to but one typical meaning, we reply; (1) In the large picture Solomon in his good acts types the Millennial Christ in the good acts of their reign, and (2) in his evil acts he types the papacy before the Reformation; for the division of the kingdom from Solomon's son is blamed upon his wicked deeds, and certainly papacy's pre-Reformation evils caused the division in the Church, as the 2520 years' parallels show. This sufficiently refutes his pertinent sophistry on these points. As to what he says on only the senses of those Biblical names having typical significance which Jehovah is expressly said to have given for symbolic meanings, we would reply: God is not expressly said to have given the pertinent character names to Abram, Sarai, Moses, Aaron, Miriam, Joshua, and most of the judges, kings and prophets of Israel, and yet their name meanings suggest their antitypes. Hence his pertinent claim is untrue. Furthermore, since all Biblical characters, as being parts of God's revelation, are typical and the meanings of their names, so far as the antitypes are due to be understood, imply something as to their antitypes, we are warranted in concluding that God providentially intervened to their receiving the names indicative of their antitypes.

Citing for proof of his statement 1 Cor. 10: 11 and Rom. 15: 4, he says: "*Twice* [italics ours] the Word of God says that 'the things written aforetime' were written for our admonition", and he uses the assumption to belittle types

### *Introduction—Types.*

and puts admonitions in their place, as required by his “models.” In the first place, only one of these passages uses types as admonitions, *i.e.*, 1 Cor. 10: 11, and that without belittling nor ruling them out as types, as the writer does by making them models instead of types. Secondly, he does not quote aright the pertinent statements of these passages; and his use of the garbled words tends towards the inculcation of his belittling types. The pertinent part of 1 Cor. 10: 11 reads in the A. V. as follows: “*They* [the typical events] *were written*,” which words are followed by the words: “for our admonition”; and the pertinent part of Rom. 15: 4 reads: “Whatsoever [not ‘the,’ as he quotes] things were [he omits the word *were*] written aforetime”; but instead of Rom. 15: 4 saying that they were written for our admonition, it says, for our *learning*; and this implies that all types as due, as well as other parts of the Word, should be studied by the Lord’s people. The passage says nothing about admonishing; but it does say that whatsoever things were written aforetime, *i.e.*, in the Old Testament, were intended for our learning, that through the patience and comfort that the Scriptures inculcate we might have hope. And, certainly, to the faithful, among other things, the types of the Church do impart hope and exhort to good, while the types of evil admonish against evil. Rom. 15: 4 proves that eventually some of the “us” class will understand everything written in the Bible. Again the writer has failed by his pertinent allegations on 1 Cor. 10: 11 and Rom. 15: 4 to rule types out, or at least to accomplish their belittlement into “models” (the evils of vs. 6-10 certainly are not *models*), to which he reduces practically all types.

Only once in his Dawn article does he refer as alleged excessive typing to one of the types that we use, and that Bro. Russell’s view of the tabernacle for the end of the Age implies; but his tract omits the point altogether. He refers garblingly to our teaching that the 60 posts about the tabernacle for the Epiphany type 60 divisions among the Epiphany Levites, his pertinent expression being “divisions

among the Lord's people"; for he does not use the expression "the Epiphany Levites." Bro. Russell gives us Scripturally three sets of tabernacle antitypes: (1) that given in Tabernacle Shadows and covering the Gospel-Age picture, in which he shows that the faith-justified condition is typed by the court, and that the 60 posts about the tabernacle type the faith-justified as Gospel-Age Levites; (2) that given in the Towers, especially from 1907 onward, and covering the picture in the extreme end of the Age, *i.e.*, the Epiphany, in which he shows that the new-creaturely condition of the Great Company at that time would be represented by the court, which implies that its posts represent its new creatures as Levites; and (3) that given in Studies, Vol. VI, and its picture covering the Ages to come, including the Millennium, in which the condition of the Ancient Worthies, the Great Company, etc., is represented by the court, which implies that they as Levites are represented by its posts; for above in this introduction we gave four Bible proofs on there being 60 groups of Levites. Certainly, as Bro. Russell puts it, the tabernacle picture covers the entire Gospel Age, to which the article impliedly limits it. But its writer overlooks the fact that, also as Bro. Russell puts it, it covers the extreme end of the Age, the transitional period, the Epiphany, between the Gospel and Millennial Ages, as well as the Millennial Age, etc. Above we are not to be understood as saying that Bro. Russell expressly, stated that for the end of the Age and for the Millennium the 60 posts represent the Great Company and the Ancient Worthies, Great Company, etc., respectively; for we do not recall such an expression, though he may have used it as fitting his general setting of pertinent matters; but we do say that his threefold view of the tabernacle, combined with his view of the Levites of the three periods, taking into consideration that he applies the 60 posts to the Gospel-Age Levites, *implies* what we teach as to the 60 posts for the Epiphany and the Millennium. God bless these thoughts to all!