

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 V

A MISCELLANY

20,000 Edition

"If any Men Buildeth upon this Foundation Gold, Silver Precious Stones,
Wood, Hay, Stubble, every Man's Work shall be Made Manifest: for
the Day shall Declare it, because it shall be Revealed by Fire; and
the Fire shall Try every Man's Work of what Sort it is. If any
Man's Work Abide which He hath Built thereupon, He
shall Receive a Reward. If any Man's Work shall be
Burned, He shall Suffer Loss; but He Himself shall
be Saved, yet so as by Fire (1 Cor. 3:12-15)."

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

To the King of Kings and Lord of Lords

IN THE INTEREST OF

HIS CONSECRATED SAINTS,

WAITING FOR THE ADOPTION,

— AND OF —

"ALL THAT IN EVERY PLACE CALL UPON THE LORD,"

"THE HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH,"

— AND OF —

THE GROANING CREATION, TRAVAILING AND WAITING FOR

THE MANIFESTATION OF THE SONS OF GOD,

THIS WORK IS DEDICATED.

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

COPYRIGHT 1938
BY PAUL S. L. JOHNSON

AUTHOR'S FOREWORD

IN THE third volume of the EPIPHANY STUDIES IN THE SCRIPTURES the Little Flock, on the one hand, and the Great Company and Youthful Worthies, on the other hand, in the separate and mutual relations of their offices as God's mouthpieces to the world, were studied, as they were set forth in the Elijah and Elisha types. In the fourth volume the Epiphany, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies from a variety of standpoints were studied. But these two volumes do not exhaust these subjects. The Little Flock, the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies during the Parousia and the Epiphany are set forth from still other more or less related standpoints. These appear in such a variety of subjects that they do not permit themselves easily to come under one clarifying title. Accordingly, they will be discussed in this volume under the title, A Miscellany, which all will at once recognize gives, as a title, no clear idea of the book's contents, except that the topics therein discussed are more or less not a coherent whole, since they are not the parts of one general subject. While this is true, the topics herein to be presented are more or less related, and are of no small importance as a part of the subject matter belonging to these STUDIES. So important and elaborate are they that they will take, as they deserve, a full volume of this work for their elucidation.

It will not have failed to strike the reader, so far as he has studied them, that the two series of books: STUDIES IN THE SCRIPTURES, and EPIPHANY STUDIES IN THE SCRIPTURES, are more or less related. And this is true from a variety of standpoints. Had the beloved author of the first anticipated the coming of the second series, he could, in harmony with the facts, have properly entitled his series, PAROUSIA STUDIES IN THE SCRIPTURES; for such they are. And with that title the relation of these two sets of STUDIES could easily be seen. Since in the Parousia it was due to complete the development of the Little Flock, as the special Parousia work, naturally the Truth teachings of that time centered in Christ and the Church. And since in the Epiphany it is due to develop the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies, naturally the Truth teachings of this time center in these two classes. The Parousia Truth is the more important of the two, since

the class for which it was given is by far the most important in God's Plan. It is at the same time the foundation of the Epiphany Truth; for the latter is built upon, elaborated out of, and in harmony with the former. Hence the latter bows in subjection to the former in all things of Truth due in the Parousia. And as things not due cannot be seen before they are due, so during the Parousia, specifically Epiphany truths could not be seen. Thus when the Parousia ended, 1914, all error was removed from the Parousia truths, *i.e.*, the truths needed for the development of the Little Flock. But by the same token not all error was by 1914 removed from matters pertinent to the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies. This will have taken place by 1954, each of these things being set forth respectively by the purification of the mother of a son in forty, and that of a mother of a daughter in eighty days (Lev. 12). Hence as the Epiphany advances the immaturities on the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies of the Parousia and of the past Epiphany times give way to clearer light, even as this same principle operated during the Parousia as to its immaturities. Thus "the path of the just is as a shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect [full] day" (Prov. 4:18).

Accordingly, no new Truth for the development of the Little Flock for the Kingdom has come since the Parousia's end; all of it that has since come is for the development of the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies. Does this mean that the Little Flock should not concern itself with the study of the Epiphany Truth, and thus be indifferent to the EPIPHANY STUDIES IN THE SCRIPTURES? If such were the case, how would it know what, why and how it should act out its missions toward the Great Company and Youthful Worthies? To fulfill these missions the Little Flock, of course, will have to study the Epiphany Truth. Hence the EPIPHANY STUDIES IN THE SCRIPTURES are primarily intended for the Little Flock, and secondarily for the Great Company and Youthful Worthies. And upon these their Divinely intended purposes, as we send each book of these STUDIES forth, we pray the Divine blessing, and request God's people everywhere to join us in such prayer.

Your Brother and Servant,
PAUL S. L. JOHNSON.

Philadelphia, Pa., U. S. A., Feb. 12, 1938.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES AMONG TRUTH PEOPLE.

SIGNIFICANT EVENTS AMONG GOD'S PEOPLE SINCE OUR PASTOR'S DEATH. SEPARATION OF ELIJAH AND ELISHA. AZAZEL'S GOAT. SIXTY LEVITE GROUPS. THE ADVANCING LIGHT. THE FIRSTFRUIT WAVE LOAVES. THE FLOOD YEAR. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 7

CHAPTER II.

CALLS—SIFTINGS—SLAUGHTER WEAPONS.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE ARTICLE, THE LAST RELATED ACTS OF ELIJAH AND ELISHA. GENERAL REMARKS ON MATT. 19:27—20:16. GENERAL REMARKS ON 1 COR. 10:1-14. GENERAL REMARKS ON EZEK. 9:1-11. THE FIRST CALL—SIFTING—SLAUGHTER WEAPON. THE SECOND CALL—SIFTING—SLAUGHTER WEAPON. THE THIRD CALL—SIFTING—SLAUGHTER WEAPON. FOURTH CALL—SIFTING—SLAUGHTER WEAPON. FIFTH CALL—SIFTING—SLAUGHTER WEAPON. SIXTH CALL—SIFTING—SLAUGHTER WEAPON. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 97

CHAPTER III.

THE TIME OF REAPING.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS. REAPING COMPLETED BEFORE "THAT SERVANT'S" DEATH. REAPING BEGAN IN 1874. OUR PASTOR DID NOT TEACH THE REAPING PERIOD TO BE FROM 1878 TO 1918. OUR PASTOR'S CHANGE OF THOUGHT ON THE REAPING'S END. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 143

CHAPTER IV.
GIDEON—TYPE AND ANTITYPE.

ANTITYPICAL ISRAEL'S OPPRESSION. JESUS' PREPARATION FOR THE WORK OF DELIVERANCE WHILE IN THE FLESH. SALIENT FEATURES OF JESUS' GOSPEL-AGE MINISTRY PREPARATORY TO OVERTHROWING THE MAIN ERRORISTS AND THEIR ERRORS. THE GOSPEL-AGE ELECTIVE AND REJECTIVE WORK. JESUS' FINAL ENCOURAGEMENT FOR THE CONFLICT. DIRECTIONS FOR AND PARTICIPATION IN ANTITYPICAL GIDEON'S FIRST BATTLE. THE LEVITES' PARTICIPATION IN THE WARFARE. THE YOUTHFUL WORTHIES' PARTICIPATION IN THE WARFARE. THEIR DISSATISFACTION AT BEING TOO LATE FOR THE HIGH CALLING. JESUS' TACTFUL ANSWER TO THEIR MURMURING AT HIM FOR NOT INVITING THEM TO THE HIGH CALLING. THE ORDER OF THE NARRATIVE. OUR LORD'S SEEKING SINEWS OF WAR FOR HIS ARMY. THE FINAL MARCH AND BATTLE. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 183

CHAPTER V.
THE SMALL AND LARGE EIGHT WONDERFUL DAYS.

JESUS' LAST EXPERIENCES TYPICAL OF THE CHURCH'S LAST EXPERIENCES. THE SMALL EIGHT WONDERFUL DAYS. A POSTSCRIPT WRITTEN IN MARCH, 1930. THE LARGE EIGHT WONDERFUL DAYS. FIFTEEN EARLIER EVENTS OF THE LARGE SIXTH WONDERFUL DAY FORECAST. LATER EVENTS OF THE LARGE SIXTH WONDERFUL DAY. PARTS OF MATT. 27:51-54 AN INTERPOLATION. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 263

CHAPTER VI.
OUR LORD'S PAROUSIA AND EPIPHANY MISSIONS.

JESUS' SECOND ADVENT SEVENFOLD MISSION TO HIS OWN. IN ONE HOUR. SOME THOUGHTS ON REVELATION 17. THE HOUR OF REV. 17:12. GOD'S POST-APOSTOLIC MOUTHPIECES WHILE FALLIBLE ALWAYS GIVE THE TRUTH AS DUE. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 395

CHAPTER VII.
TWO HOUSES BUILT AND TESTED

EXPLANATION OF MATT. 7:24-27. THE FOURFOLD BUILDING PROCESS: INSTRUCTION; JUSTIFICATION; SANCTIFICATION; DELIVERANCE. THE THREEFOLD TESTING PROCESS: DOWNPOUR OF TRUTH; A FLOOD OF ERROR; SPIRITUAL WARS. BEREAN QUESTIONS. 473

CHAPTER I.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES AMONG TRUTH PEOPLE.

SIGNIFICANT EVENTS AMONG GOD'S PEOPLE SINCE OUR PASTOR'S DEATH. SEPARATION OF ELIJAH AND ELISHA. AZAZEL'S GOAT. SIXTY LEVITE GROUPS. THE ADVANCING LIGHT. THE FIRSTFRUIT WAVE LOAVES. THE FLOOD YEAR. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

THE THEME of this chapter requires some explanation to make clear its meaning. Especially is this true of the words, "it all." By the words, "it all," we refer especially to the happenings among God's people since the death of our dear Pastor. What is the meaning of the peculiar events among God's people since our Pastor's death? This is the thought that we have condensed into the question taken as our subject. This question implies that there have been significant things happening among the Lord's people since our Pastor went beyond the veil. These things are to be considered as signs of the times that deserve our attention, understanding and responsiveness. To deny that these events are highly significant and altogether different from any other events among God's people would betray a woeful inability to discern the signs of the times. And to understand them will prove helpful from many standpoints, particularly from the standpoint of assisting us to take an intelligent and Divinely warranted stand toward these things and their resultant conditions.

(2) It is undeniable that very unusual things have taken place since our Pastor left us. While he was with us in the flesh there was peace among us. We were a united people. We loved the same table of Truth; we developed the same spirit of fellowship; we ministered to the same Truth, and that by the same

general methods. Those were joyous days of feasting, fellowship, growth and service. We all had the same bond of peace, the same spirit of oneness, the same hope of our high calling, the same work of service, the same Lord, the same faith, the same baptism and the same God as Father, all of which were the joy and rejoicing of our hearts. But in many of these respects changes have set in, and now we are no longer a united people; we do not in many ways believe the same things. Some of us have repudiated some of our former beliefs and have accepted discordant ones in their stead. Many of our former practices some have set aside, taking others in their place. Some among us have revolutionized against many of the teachings and arrangements that the Lord gave us through "that Servant." Leaders among us—some real and some would-be—have made divisions among us; and thus we see that many things have been occurring among us that must be significant.

(3) To some these things have a general significance as implying peculiar events; but they do not see any special Scriptural significance in them. But surely, beloved, events overshadowing many other events that we do recognize as being pointed out in the Bible must also be Biblically marked. We believe that these events are Scripturally indicated. Since some of these events are among the most important happenings among any one generation of God's people, it would be contrary to the Scriptural procedure and the Scriptural teaching for them not to be set forth in the Scriptures. Do we not recall the Lord's assurance that He would do nothing in His plan except such things as He would set forth in the Word (Amos 3:7)? This being the case we should expect to find some Biblical prophecies or types referring to these momentous events. If our hearts are hungry, humble, meek, honest and holy (consecrated), we will eventually be among those to whom the Scriptural meanings of these

events will be unfolded. We believe that among other things there are especially three Scriptural lines of thought that find their fulfillments in the remarkable events among God's people since "that Servant" left us. Let us see by the Lord's help what these three things are.

(4) The first of these great events, Scripturally marked, is the 1917 separation of the Lord's people into two general divisions: (1) adherents of the Society under its "present management" and (2) non-adherents of the Society under its "present management." This separation corresponds as antitype with type in the minutest details with the separation between Elijah and Elisha. Let us note this correspondence. We all recall that our Pastor pointed out that Elijah's and Elisha's coming to Jordan typed the crown retainers and the rest of the Lord's people in the Truth coming in 1914 to the peoples in Christendom judged down unto the wrath of the Time of Trouble. The smiting of Jordan by Elijah corresponds to the crown retainers from Oct., 1914, to Nov., 1916, chastising Christendom for its great sins that led up to and brought about the war; while Elisha's not smiting, but walking along with Elijah, types the consecrated who were not of the Little Flock either abstaining altogether or, shortly after beginning, ceasing from denouncing Christendom's sins, but sympathizing with antitypical Elijah in this work. The antitypes being unharmed is pictured in the two prophets crossing the river's bed dry shod. These events certainly occurred from the fall of 1914 to that of 1916. Elijah's and Elisha's walking and talking together after crossing Jordan until their separation, corresponds to the peaceable fellowship of all the consecrated in the Word, work and Spirit of the Lord until the separation set in. But just as the peaceable fellowship and communion of Elijah and Elisha was broken up by their separation, so the sweet fellowship in the Word, service and Spirit of

the Lord between the crown retainers and the other consecrated brethren, from the standpoint of mouthpieceship toward the world, ceased with the separation which set in among the Lord's people in the summer of 1917. Let us not forget that our dear Pastor in Jan. 1916, forecast that this separation was to be expected within a little more than a year, which now we see did actually take place within a year and a half (Z '16, 39, col. 2, par. 2).

(5) That this setting is correct the facts clearly prove. All must admit that there was peaceful fellowship in the Church, in general, following the first smiting of Jordan until the summer of 1917. All must admit that this peaceful fellowship was broken up in the summer of 1917, and that by the greatest division which has ever occurred among God's consecrated people. All must further admit that this separation divided God's people into two classes: (1) adherents of the Society under its present management and (2) non-adherents of the Society under its present management. Consequently the breaking up of the fellowship among God's people and the dividing of them into two classes after antitypical Jordan's first smiting must be the long expected and predicted separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha; for there could be no breach of harmony between them until after the first smiting; and the breach after that must have been their separation. To this conclusion all the preceding, accompanying and following events agree in the perfect harmony of an antitype with its type. Above we have shown the harmony in the events of type and antitype preceding the separation. Let us now look briefly at the accompanying and following events. First let us examine the accompanying events.

(6) Just as the two prophets walked on peacefully communing together until the fiery chariot and horses appeared and separated them, so did the Little Flock as God's mouthpiece to the world and the rest of the

consecrated walk and talk together in sweet communion until the antitypical chariot and horses drove between and separated them. In the symbols of the Bible, chariots represent organizations (Berean Comments on Ex. 14:9; Is. 31:1; etc.). *The* chariot of Israel would fittingly represent the most important organization among the Lord's people—the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, which has always been more important than the People's Pulpit Association and the International Bible Students' Association, as organizations. The fieriness of the chariot types the trials in which the Society, as consisting of the Board and its officers, was involved, on account of the Society's president usurping authority over the Board, especially as exemplified in his busybodying in our work as the Board's special representative in Britain and on account of his recalling us, the Board's special representative, without the authorization or knowledge of the Board, which usurpatory acts and other usurpatory acts of the Society's president moved the Board's majority to seek to abolish his powers as executive and manager as well as his usurped controllership. This course of the Board's majority occasioned the president usurpatorially to oust these four directors. This whole course of events was very trialsome to the Society as consisting of the Board and its officers, hence the antitypical fiery chariot. Horses in Biblical symbols type teachings, secular or religious. (See Berean Comments on Is. 31:1; Rev. 6:2; 19:14; etc.) The supposedly legal but actually illegal teachings that the Society's president claimed necessitated the ousting of the four directors (who sought to put an end to his unholy ambition and usurpation) and the appointment of four pseudo-directors, are represented by the horses; and their fieriness types their trialsomeness. The horsemen represent the so-called "present management"—the Society's president, his special representative and its secretary-treasurer.

These officials manipulated these illegal doctrines in such a way as to drag the sorely tried Board, as an organization, before the entire Church unto dividing the latter into two parts—those siding with the Board's majority and those siding with the "present management." It is undeniable that this combination of things—the illegal doctrines and the sorely tried Board—by the driving power of the present management was made to divide the Church by forcing the brethren to decide for or against the present management, and to end the peaceful union, co-operation and fellowship between the Little Flock and the rest of the consecrated in the Truth. Henceforth this division persisted, about 10,000 being on one side, and from about 30,000 to 40,000 being on the other side; and this undoubtedly antitypes the separation between Elijah and Elisha.

(7) If the separation of 1917, which followed the first smiting of Jordan and the sweet fellowship of the Lord's people after that smiting, is not the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha, how can there be a separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha with the Church so thoroughly divided as it is now? The only possible place to find a separation that antitypes that of Elijah and Elisha is where we put it. All the facts agree with this and do not agree with any other setting. It is the completeness of this agreement of type and antitype from the standpoint of the above setting, combined with the necessary conclusion flowing therefrom—that the partisan Society adherents are of the Great Company—that forced the Tower to give up our Pastor's view of the Elijah and Elisha type and to invent four others successively to evade this necessary conclusion. Also the P.B.I., repudiating this setting, and seeing that the present divided condition of the Church makes a future separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha impossible, have given up faith in the separation of Elijah and Elisha as being at all typical. Thus the

repudiations of these two groups is strongly confirmatory of the truthfulness of the above setting.

(8) When we look at the events connected with, but following, the separation among the Lord's people in 1917, we again find a complete conformity between them and the events connected with, but following Elijah's and Elisha's separation, which third form of conformity would be a conclusive proof of the correctness of our understanding of this type and antitype. Elisha's cry, "My father, my father," types the Society adherents' recognition of, surprise and sorrow at and discussion of, such prominent brethren, as the Elijah leaders and their companions were, as being separated from them and as being accused of attempting to wreck the Society! His cry, "The chariot of Israel," types the Society adherents' recognition of, surprise and sorrow at, discussion of and agitation for the Society as the supposed channel, as being involved in such trials and supposed danger. His cry "And the horsemen thereof," types the Society adherents' recognition of, surprise and sorrow at, discussion of, and agitation for the present management as being in the predicament in which the trouble indicated them to be. Certainly the Society adherents, antitypical Elisha, made this threefold cry in the antitype.

(9) It will be noted that before Elisha uttered this threefold cry, it is said of him, "he saw." In the Hebrew it is not said what he saw. The A.V. inserts the word "*it*" in italics, thereby indicating that this word has no corresponding word in the original. We believe the word, *him*, should be supplied, since the statement, *he saw*, is the record of the fact that Elisha saw—recognized—Elijah up to the time of their separation: the condition that Elijah told him he would have to fulfill in order to become his successor (2 Kings 2:10, 12). This types the fact that the Elisha class recognized the Elijah class as the Lord's mouthpiece to the world up to the time of the separation. And

the expression, "*He saw him no more*" (v. 12), records the fact that Elisha after the separation no longer recognized Elijah as he had previously done, typing the fact that antitypical Elisha no longer recognized the Elijah class as formerly. Certainly this has had its fulfillment. No more are the Faithful recognized by the Society adherents. Instead the "avoid them" policy has been enacted by the Society adherents against the faithful Elijah class.

(10) Elisha's rending his garments in twain types the violence unto double-mindedness (Jas. 1:8) committed by the Society adherents to their character graces by the wrongs that they committed in the separation; for they grossly violated truth and righteousness by their course at the separation. The falling of Elijah's mantle types the letting go of the power of being God's mouthpiece to the world on the part of the Faithful. This occurred through their representatives'—the five directors—letting the power of controlling the instrumentalities, agencies and finances, whereby the work was done, slip out of their hands at the insistence of usurpers. Elisha's picking it up types the Society adherents' taking up controllership of the work. Elisha's return to the Jordan represents the Society adherents' giving their attention to public work toward Christendom judged down to the wrath of the time of wrath. His standing at the Jordan types their preparation and readiness to work toward the peoples; and his smiting Jordan types the Society adherents' chastising—rebuking—Christendom for its sins, through Vol. VII, lectures, conversations and the Fall of Babylon tract. These acts were set into operation about the fall of 1917. Thus they followed the separation which took place in the summer of that year. Thus we have examined the events preceding, accompanying and following the separation, and they show a perfect correspondence between themselves and the type, even as we should expect to find as between type and antitype.

(11) It is easy for us—by a simple test—to see who antitypical Elisha is. As in the type Elisha had the mantle after the separation, so in the antitype that class must be antitypical Elisha who had the mantle after the separation. The mantle types the powers of mouthpieceship toward the world. These powers were the instrumentalities (the Truth literature), the agencies (the Bethel family, pilgrims, colporteurs, volunteers, etc.) and the finances, whereby it was possible to do the work. Who had and controlled these powers after the separation? Undoubtedly those who remained with the Society and who by their representatives—"the present management," the new board, etc.—carried on the work. Therefore they must be antitypical Elisha.

(12) We repeat it: The perfect correspondence between the type and our understanding of the antitype forced the Society's president (in order to evade the conclusion that he was leading the Great Company) to repudiate our Pastor's view of Elijah and Elisha; for our above-given understanding points out the actual fulfillment of the antitype along the lines that our Pastor forecast that it would occur. And it also forced the P.B.I. (in order to evade the conclusion that the Lord made use of us as the special representative of the antitypical Elijah class at the separation, and in giving the truth on the fulfillment of the Elijah and Elisha separation, as the Society's president was the special representative of the Elisha class at the separation and the one to give the error on the subject), to give up faith in the typical character of the separation of Elijah and Elisha. These two facts are eloquent with proof of the correctness of the setting of the antitypical fulfillment as given above. We have treated the last related acts of Elijah and Elisha in detail in Vol. III, Chapter II, to which we refer our readers for these details. Truly this understanding gives a Scriptural, reasonable and factual explanation of the separation between the Lord's people during 1917. Beloved

brethren, "can ye not discern the signs of the times" therein?

(13) A second set of remarkable events has been enacting since our dear Pastor went beyond the veil: (1) revolutions against the Lord's teachings and arrangements given through "that Servant" on the part of various leaders, supported partisanly therein by their adherents; and (2) a steadfast resistance to such revolutions on the part of those who have been faithful to such teachings and arrangements, which resistance culminated in the resisters' withdrawing of priestly fellowship from the revolutionists. It is undeniable: (1) that revolutionism has been committed against the Lord's teachings and arrangements given through "that Servant" on the part of certain leaders who have therein received partisan support by many of their followers; and (2) that the Faithful resisted them unto withdrawal of priestly fellowship. In Britain this revolutionism began through Bros. Shearn's and Crawford's seeking to subvert our Pastor's Tabernacle arrangements and set aside many of his Bethel arrangements. In such revolutionism they received partisan support from others. Supported by not a few, we resisted them steadfastly until their stubbornness in revolutionism forced us to withdraw priestly fellowship from them. In America the present management conspired to put into the hands of the Society's president all our Pastor's powers, despite his contrary arrangements in the charter and will. This conspiracy was resisted by the so-called "opposition." The conspirators retaliated by ousting the Board's majority, depriving us of opportunities of service, driving us and others from Bethel and most deceitfully misrepresenting the situation to the Church through *Harvest Siftings* and a convention, pilgrim and correspondence campaign the world over. A little later the Sturgeonites and Ritchieites enviously revolutionized against the evident prominent use the Lord was making of us in resisting the revolutionists

and in giving the truth on antitypical Elijah and Elisha.

(14) In 1918, by a series of acts like those of the "present management," occurring on the anniversaries of the latter's acts, the P.B.I. revolutionized against the Lord's arrangements on giving meat in due season and sought to foist a corporation on the Church to manage its work. These things were resisted by us and our supporters steadfastly until the withdrawal of priestly fellowship from the P.B.I. Board and their partisans was made necessary. Shortly afterwards the Standfast brethren began to revolutionize by endorsing the Society's revolutionism up to Passover, 1918, discouraging all further work apart from "comforting the Brethren," and fighting the Epiphany work. Olsonism with its false teachings on Revelation, etc., by its leaders, who were not appointed to the pilgrim office by the Lord through "that Servant," assuming the privilege of teaching the General Church, and by its attacks on the Epiphany work, reared its head in revolutionism, which was resisted by the Epiphany saints until the latter withdrew priestly fellowship from the former. Then the Hirshites revolted against certain arrangements for the training of prospective elders as set forth by our Pastor, against confining Church voting to the Spirit-begotten members of the Church, and against certain Epiphany arrangements in dealing with Levites. Here again the Faithful resisted until priestly fellowship was withdrawn from the former by the latter.

(15) In the two preceding paragraphs the beginnings of revolutionism in eight groups are set forth. But the revolutionists did not limit themselves to such revolutionism. They went very much further in the wrong. The Tower editors, especially their leader, the Society's president, began to set aside various of our Pastor's teachings to introduce opposing errors, *e.g.*, on Elijah and Elisha, tentative justification, Youthful Worthies, various parables, the jubilee, etc., etc., until

literally hundreds of errors have been introduced and hundreds of our Pastor's teachings and interpretations have been repudiated. They have so greatly changed his arrangements for conducting the work that one cannot recognize in what they are now doing the work as he arranged for it to be done. The P.B.I. have added to their initial revolutionism. They adopted a charter that in not a few ways is revolutionary of the sample charter for controlling corporations among Truth people. On doctrinal questions they have gone astray on large parts of Revelation and Daniel, and on the entire chronology they have adopted nominal church views as against our Pastor's, whom they deny to have been "that Servant"! Similarly, others of the above-mentioned revolutionists have added to their initial revolutionisms.

(16) In every instance we and our supporters have resisted these revolutionisms. The columns of *The Present Truth* contain many articles exposing these errors of doctrine and wrongs of practice. The Lord has enabled us in every case successfully to refute these errors of doctrine and to reprove these wrongs of practice. So steadfast have we been in defending the Truth and its arrangements and in refuting the errors and their arrangements that even our revolutionistic brethren have had to admit that we stand consistently for the teachings and arrangements that our dear Pastor gave. Our course in this respect has been misrepresented as a contentious and cantankerous one by the revolutionists, who at first attempted to answer our presentations. But our replies so completely crushed their answers that they have ceased attempting replies, alleging that they stand for peace and will have nothing to do with controversy, thereby pretending great meekness in contrast with what they allege to be our contentious spirit! When did our Lord, our Pastor and other faithful servants of the Truth keep silent when their presentations were attacked and errors were

introduced (Micah 5:5, 6)? Certainly they acted as we do in similar conditions, and not like the revolutionists.

(17) But what is the significance of such revolutionism and its steadfast resistance, both of which as prominent events have impressed the Lord's people? We understand such revolutionism to correspond to Azazel's goat seeking to extricate itself from the grasp of the high priest, and such resistance to correspond to the high priest dragging Azazel's goat from the door of the tabernacle to the gate of the court. We have treated of this subject in great detail in Vol. IV, Chapter III. Here we will limit ourselves to generalities. That the sin of the Great Company is revolutionism is evident from Ps. 107:10, 11, which we will quote and explain after first giving a summary of the Psalm: Vs. 1-9 treat of the Little Flock; 10-16 of the Great Company; 17-22 of Fleshly Israel during the Gospel Age and at its end; 23-32 of the world during and at the end of the great tribulation; 33-38 of the Millennial conditions and people; 39-42 of the good and evil in the Little Season; and 43 shows that whoever understands this Psalm will understand Jehovah's plan for the human family. According to this setting, vs. 10-16 treat of the Great Company. We now will quote and in brackets explain verses 10 and 11: "Such as sit in darkness [error into which the Lord permits the Great Company class to fall while they are in Azazel's hands] and in the shadow of death [danger of the Second Death, to which their willfulness nearly brings them], being bound in affliction [Satanic temptations, 1 Pet. 5:8, 9] and iron [strong bonds of selfishness, worldliness and sin]; because they REBELLED [revolutionized] against *the words* [teachings] of the Lord, and CONTEMNED [despised; considered as of small and negligible account] *the counsel* of the Most High." [God's Plan consists of a series of truths, facts and arrangements, whose setting aside in any particular is contempt against the whole

plan (Jas. 2:10). Certainly, therefore, setting aside the arrangements for doing the Lord's work, given through "that Servant," is contemning God's counsel, Plan.]

(18) This passage, as shown above, treats of the Great Company. It charges them with (1) revolutionism against the teachings of the Lord and (2) with contempt of His arrangements. The repudiation of various of the Lord's teachings and arrangements this passage proves to be the sin—especially the manifesting sin—of the Great Company. *Revolutionism* manifests them as such. *Only then*, according to this passage, do we know that a New Creature is of the Great Company, *when he revolutionizes* against the Lord's teachings and arrangements. We cannot be sure of their loss of their crowns by other sins than revolutionism, for we cannot judge what degree of other wrongs effects the forfeiture of one's crown; but when New Creatures revolutionize against the Lord's teachings and arrangements, we are by the Lord (through such revolutionism) informed that such revolutionists have lost their crowns and are thus in the Great Company. Ps. 107:10, 11 is the passage whereby God gives us this information. *We* do not judge them. *God*, by their conduct, judges them; and, as explained in this Scripture, *by their revolutionism*, He manifests them to the Faithful as Levites—Great Company members. Let us repeat it: We do not judge them when we, on account of their *manifested revolutionism*, DECLARE them to be Great Company members. We thereby merely announce God's judgment previously given by Him and now, through their revolutionism, as shown in this Scripture, manifested to us. Our Pastor taught that after the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha and before the Faithful would leave the earth, they would know who are of the Great Company, even as the following quotation (Z '16, 264, par. 1) proves: "It will be after the

smiting of Jordan—after the division of the people by the Message of the Truth and the mantle of Elijah's power—that the separation of the Church into two classes will take place. Thereafter, the Elijah class, the Little Flock class, will be CLEARLY MANIFESTED, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT from the Great Company class. The division, be it remembered, will be caused by the fiery chariot—some very severe, trying ordeal, which the Elect class will promptly accept and enter into; the Elisha class holding back from the persecution, but not drawing back to sin or to a repudiation of the Lord. It will be but a little *later on* that the whirlwind (probably anarchy) will bring about the 'change' of the Elijah class." Another quotation from him (1916 Convention Report, 198, Question 10) reads as follows: "The Great Company class will first be manifested when the Elijah class will be separated [from it] by the fiery chariot; and from that time and onward it would be proper to speak of some as being of the Little Flock and others of the Great Company ... After the Lord has manifested the distinction between the Elijah class, the Royal Priesthood class, and the Great Company class, the Elisha class, then thereafter those will be represented as being in the Court."

(19) Let us repeat it until the thought is thoroughly grasped: It is *their revolutionism against God's teachings and arrangements* that manifests the crown-losers as such to the faithful and enlightened Little Flock. The necessity of their knowing the crown-losers as such springs out of their ministry toward them; for apart from such knowledge how could they intelligently lead them in their humanity as Azazel's Goat from the Door of the Tabernacle to the Gate of the Court, deliver them to the fit man and still later on abandon them in Azazel's hands (Lev. 16:20-22)? How could they apart from such knowledge consider them as no longer in the Holy, but as antitypical

Levites in the Court, whom they with and under their Head consecrate to their Levitical work (Num. 8:13; comp. 8:5-26)? Aaron's sons would have been blind—a quality which would have disqualified them for priestly ministration, and thus for the service of consecrating the Levites (Lev. 21:16-24)—if they could not have seen the Levites as such, whom they together with Aaron were cleansing and consecrating to Levitical service. So in the antitype, during the cleansing and consecrating of the Great Company as antitypical Levites, not only the High Priest, Jesus, but the Under-priests cleanse and consecrate the Great Company as Levites, and therefore the Under-priests would be blind as to this service and thus disqualified for it, if they could not see who are of the Great Company. Let no one therefore, brethren, any longer say that we are indulging in forbidden judging when we declare the Lord's manifested judgment as to the Great Companyship of revolutionizing new creatures.

(20) Let us now briefly look at the picture of Azazel's goat (Lev. 16:20-22) and note the correspondence of type and antitype. That Azazel's [averter's and perverter's] goat was tied to the door of the tabernacle is implied by the Hebrew word translated "set" (Lev. 16:7), which means "to station," "to fix." No goat, seeing the other goat killed and the high priest entering and leaving the Holy at least twice, would have stood still during the time of such events—over an hour—unless tied. According to the Pyramid the last member of the Lord's Goat class was placed upon the altar Sept. 16, 1914. Immediately thereafter the World's High Priest, Jesus and the faithful Church, began to confess Christendom's sins in the hearing of the Great Company. This confession is another picture of the acts that constituted Elijah's smiting Jordan, antitypical Gideon's First Battle and the saints' binding the kings and princes, etc. (Ps. 149:5-9). Certain it is that from the public meeting at the Fort Worth

Convention (Sept. 20, 1914) onward until Nov. 1916, great emphasis was put upon declaring the sins of Christendom that led up to and caused the World War. The war itself became the occasion for such activity. This was done by our Pastor's sermons in the papers, by his and the pilgrims' lectures, by the colporteurs' specializing on Vol. IV, and by the volunteers' distributing pertinent tracts, such as, Distress of Nations, Social Conditions beyond Human Remedy, Why Financiers Tremble, Clergy Ordination Proven Fraudulent, The World On Fire, etc. And it was not the Great Company brethren who did this work in the Lord's Spirit unto a completion. They listened to it being done, as Azazel's goat heard Aaron confess the sins over it.

(21) As in the type, the next step was loosing Azazel's goat, untying it, so the antitypical Goat of Azazel was untied, given more liberty. This occurred by two things: (1) by the World's High Priest, Head and Body, permitting such errors to spread on our Pastor's powers as "that Servant" as emboldened various Great Company brethren to disregard his authority as "that Servant," and consequently to seek to set aside his arrangements for doing the work; and (2) by the Head of the World's High Priest removing "that Servant's" powerful hold on the controllership of the work through his death. These two things gave the restive revolutionistic antitypical Goat opportunities for revolutionism that they did not have before these two things set in. This burst for liberty, self-will, began in England, where the first-named unloosing act set in at least a year before our Pastor died, and resulted in efforts being put forth to get our Pastor to give up the exercise of his controllership in the London Tabernacle and Bethel. The Lord knowing fully, and our Pastor knowing measurably, what was going on, selected us to be the priest in the flesh who should especially represent them in handling, under our Head,

the revolutionists. Accordingly, after our Pastor's death the British section of Azazel's Goat made a dash for liberty. They found that the rope that was about them was in hands that jerked them off their feet! The Lord Jesus through us and our supporters firmly and victoriously resisted their revolutions, led the Goat to the Gate, and because of their stubbornness in due time withdrew priestly fellowship from these revolutionists, delivered the Goat to the fit man, unfavorable circumstances.

(22) On our return to America we found that "the present management" had so far gone into error on "that Servant's" powers in regulating the work by his arrangements, charter and will as to consider their provisions negligible—contemned the counsel of the Most High, *e.g.*, discontinuing the newspaper service, disarranging the pastoral and the Angelophone work, taking away controllership from the Board, securing for the Society's president all our Pastor's controllership of the work, etc., etc., as well as rejecting tentative justification in talks before the Bethel family, but not yet in the Tower articles, etc. On seeing these things, we set ourself against them and rallied five of the seven directors to the work of resisting such revolutionism and of attempting to secure the operation of our Pastor's arrangements and teachings in the work. This led Azazel's Goat in America, headed by the "present management," to give mighty jerks on the rope. Such jerks were: depriving us of service, ousting the four directors, driving us and others from Bethel, falsifying the conditions to the Bethel family, *publishing* a thoroughly dishonest Harvest Siftings, and campaigning by conventions, pilgrim visits, conversation and correspondence to win the Church to their support. The World's High Priest gave counter jerks, by Light After Darkness, Harvest Siftings Reviewed, Facts For Shareholders, etc. The arbitrariness of the "present management" and its partisan

supporters caused the World's High Priest to withdraw priestly fellowship from these—to deliver them to the fit man, and later to abandon them to Azazel.

(23) In principle these same things were done to the Sturgeonites, Ritchieites, P.B.I.'s, Olsonites, Standfasters and Hirshites on account of their revolutionisms. Our Lord's repeated attacks through The Present Truth on the errors of the Tower, of the P.B.I. Herald, of Olsonism's views, of Standfastism, of the Elijah Voice Society, etc., are only so many jerks that the World's High Priest has been giving to Azazel's Goat in connection with each form of its revolutionism. The Priesthood gave steadfast resistance. Beloved brethren, it is not contentiousness and cantankerousness on our part that prompts us to resist these revolutionisms. It is a genuine devotion to Truth and righteousness that animates us therein. Why? Because Satan through the revolutionists seeks to destroy the Truth and the Truth arrangements in order to ruin God's people and plan. Knowing this, his fell purpose, as an enlightened and faithful servant of the Truth and the Lord's people, and entrusted with such a work by the Lord, we have thrown ourself athwart the course of these revolutionists, determined by the Lord's grace to resist them unto the utmost—until they throw up their hands in surrender, as those of them who will retain the Holy Spirit surely will do in due time; for the Lord has given us a mouth and wisdom that none of our adversaries can gainsay or resist. They tried it; but have given up the attempt as useless. Why so? Because God's Truth is stronger than Azazel's errors. It is not by ability of our own that we have the Truth and the victory. It is solely the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes. Thus have we explained Scripturally the second set of events that have been occurring among the Lord's people since our Pastor's death. "Can ye not discern the signs of the times" in them?

(24) We now come to the third set of events among the Lord's people since our dear Pastor's death: the division of the Great Company into many groups. These divisions, we understand, correspond as antitype to the divisions of the Levites. Our Pastor told us that in the end of the Age, after the reaping was over, the Levites would be manifested in their various groups. This division we see going on before our eyes. In the type there were three general classes of Levites: the Kohathites, the Merarites and the Gershonites (Num. 3:17). It will be noted that the Kohathites had no wagons, or chariots (Num. 7:9); likewise the priests had none; while the Merarites had four (Num. 7:8) and the Gershonites had two (Num. 7:7). We have seen that wagons, or chariots, type organizations. The priests have not had, nor do they have, earthly organizations to do their work. But we notice that many of the revolutionists also will have nothing to do with organizations controlling their work. These unorganized revolutionists are the antitypical Kohathites.

(25) There are two groups of organized revolutionists: (1) those who sought to gain and succeeded in gaining control of our Pastor's corporations: corporations that were dummy, inactive corporations during his life, he controlling everything; and (2) those who sought, but failed to gain control of our Pastor's organizations and then proceeded to form several of their own. The former correspond to the Mahlite Merarites, the latter to the Gershonites. The Mushite Merarites in The Elijah Voice Society formed a Society. Thus we find among the revolutionistic New Creatures three general groups antityping the Kohathites, the Merarites and the Gershonites.

(26) But the three general groups of Levites were divided into eight subdivisions: two of which were Gershonites—Libnites and Shimites, four of which were Kohathites—Amramites, Izecharites, Hebronites

and Uzzielites, and two of which were Merarites—Mahlites and Mushites (Num. 3:17-20). Accordingly, we are to look for eight subdivisions among the three general groups of antitypical Levites; and these we certainly find. Above we showed that certain of the antitypical Levites—those who do not believe in organizations controlling their work—are the antitypes of the Kohathites. These antitypical Kohathites consist of four subdivisions, antitypical of the four divisions of the Kohathites. The Sturgeonites are the antitypical Uzzielites; the Ritchieites are the antitypical Hebronites; the Olsonites are the antitypical Izeharites and the Hirshites are the antitypical Amramites. None of these, as antitypical Kohathites, have organizations in control of their work. Above we have seen that the Mahlite Merarites type those who gained control of our Pastor's organizations, which were three antitypical wagons: (1) The Watch Tower Bible And Tract Society, (2) The People's Pulpit Association and (3) The International Bible Students' Association. The Society adherents gained control of these at the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha in 1917. The next year the Society adherents split into two parts: (1) those who endorsed the military compromises of the Society leaders after their arrest, by remaining with the Society, and (2) those who disapproved of these by withdrawing from the Society—the Standfasters. The latter then formed an organization as a committee which functioned for awhile, but finally disappeared to be followed by the Elijah Voice Society, a branch of the Standfasters. The Society adherents correspond antitypically to the Mahli Merarites and the Standfasters to the Mushi Merarites; and the four above-mentioned organizations correspond antitypically to the four wagons given to the Merarites. Above we showed that those revolutionists who believe in organizations controlling their work, but who failed to get control of our

Pastor's organizations, are the antitypical Gershonites. In England the Shearno-Crawford movement tried, but failed to get control of the I.B.S.A., and in America those who later first functioned as the Fort Pitt Committee and afterward as the P.B.I. sought, but failed to gain control of all three of our Pastor's organizations. These two groups then formed organizations of their own: (1) the former the Bible Students' Committee—the B.S.C. for short, and (2), the latter the Pastoral Bible Institute—the P.B.I. for short. The former correspond to the Libnite Gershonites and the latter to the Shimite Gershonites. Thus we find the main divisions and subdivisions of the revolutionists to correspond as antitype to the main typical divisions and subdivisions of the Levites. Thus we find just what we should expect, if the Levites are now being developed as a whole and in their main divisions and subdivisions. This is highly confirmatory of the correctness of our viewpoint of these events. "Can ye not discern the signs of the times" in these many things?

(27) But some may object to this setting of things, saying that while there are these three main divisions, there are more than these eight main subdivisions among the revolutionists. To this we assent, and add that according to the type we should expect more: for the three sons of Levi through their eight sons had many children, who in turn had other children until there were in the Levitical genealogies 60 heads of families recorded. These type 60 divisions into which the eight subdivisions will develop by the time the Levites are through with their divisions! The 60 pillars in the Court type the same thing. Allusions are also made to these 60 groups from two different standpoints in Cant. 3:7; 6:8. So we see in the subdivision of the three divisions and eight subdivisions the antitype working unto a sixty-fold division. This is not yet complete [written in 1925], but will in due time

be completed; and its progressing toward a completion should increase our faith in the correctness of the above setting [it is now complete]. "Can ye not discern the signs of the times" in these things?

(28) These three signs of the times are what we had for years been expecting to be enacted after the reaping was finished. We have elsewhere given 63 reasons proving that the reaping ended by Oct. 1914, and the gleaning in April 1916. Hence these things are now in order. Nor can they be explained Scripturally, reasonably and factually from any other standpoint, as is evident from the complete failures of all other explanations. These events, therefore, prove the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha, the leading of Azazel's Goat to the Gate and fit man by the World's High Priest, and the separation of the Levites into their divisions, subdivisions and sub-subdivisions to have been enacted. This is the Voice of these signs, and therewith agree all the Scriptures.

(29) If the above setting is correct, as the Bible, reason and facts prove, the work of the Editor of *The Present Truth* and of the *Studies In The Scriptures* and the author of *The Epiphany Studies In The Scriptures*, must have a totally different character from what it has been represented to be by those whom the Bible, reason and facts prove to be revolutionists. They have represented him to be an insane, ambitious, self-seeking, fraudulent and mischievous power-grasper. But if the above setting of things be true, these charges are gross misrepresentations, and his work and efforts among the Lord's people against the revolutionists since our Pastor's death are Divinely sanctioned, directed and supported, *i.e.*, our opposition to the revolutionism of the British managers, of the "present management," of the P.B.I., etc., was authorized by the Lord, directed by the Lord and supported by the Lord, who of His abounding grace, despite our weaknesses and mistakes, has been pleased

to use us in this work to encourage our fellow priests and to oppose the revolutionism of Azazel's Goat in Satan's attempts through it to subvert and pervert the Truth and the arrangements that the Lord has made for conducting the Truth work. And if this is true, the revolutionists whom we sought first with loving and private persuasion to draw back from their wrongs, and whom we opposed with increasing rigor, only as they increased their willfulness in persisting in their revolutionisms, are the ones who should be repudiated by God's people. The events and the Scriptures prove that they have been the ambitious, self-seeking, fraudulent and mischievous power graspers, who, caught red-handed by us in wrongdoing, used on us the fraudulent stop-thief cry of the pursued wrong-doer to divert attention from their evil deeds and teachings.

(30) They have accused us of bitterness; but we challenge the production of one bitter sentence from our writings. Our plainness and clearness of exposure required by Epiphany purposes they have misrepresented as bitterness. Some of them have accused us of betraying them to the officials, whereas we sought to shield them when questioned by one of their prosecutors. Some of them have charged us with being of the Judas class, whereas we have faithfully served the brethren at constant self-sacrifice and loss of our human rights. Some of them have publicly proclaimed that we were of the Second Death class, whereas our retention and service of the Truth prove the contrary. They have whispered many defamations of our personal character all of which are gross misrepresentations. Their perversion of various truths and the Truth arrangements and their introduction of errors and wrong arrangements prove that they have measurably fallen away from the Lord, while our retention and defense of the Truth and its arrangements, combined with being given the advancing light for the

support of the brethren and our self-denying service of the Lord and the Truth and the brethren, and that despite the persecutions heaped upon us, prove that the Lord has approved of our general course, while disapproving of their general course. Brethren, beloved in the Lord, examine our teachings, our service and our life, as they are in deed and in truth, and you, barring the inevitable weakness of our earthen vessel, will find them to be in harmony with those of God's loyal servants. Not many of you are in a position to examine our life apart from what you see in our writings; but you are in a position to examine our teachings. If you give them an honest, hungry, humble, meek and holy examination, you will find them in accord with, based upon, and flowing out of, those which God gave us through "that faithful and wise Servant." In view of this and the terrible errors and repudiations of Truth on the part of our opponents, "can ye not discern the signs of the times" as witnessing of our teachings and work that they are given and done in the Truth and Spirit of God, and that the revolutionisms against the Lord's teachings and arrangements on the part of our traducers originate in Azazel—Satan—and are done in his spirit?

(31) A fourth sign of the times is that the Truth advances along Epiphany lines; but at the same time, as against it, much error is presented as advancing light. In Z '26, 115-119, is an article on, "The Shining Light." It uses Prov. 4:18, 19 as the text of the article, which furnishes another illustration of how the pope of little Babylon, in the spirit and manner of the pope in great Babylon, applies to himself and his followers, the counterfeit faithful, the things that the Bible applies to the real faithful; and the things that the Bible applies to the unfaithful, the counterfeit faithful, like himself and his partisan followers, he applies to the real faithful. Therefore, to him the part of the passage that speaks of increasing light coming to the

just, means that he and his followers are getting the increasing light; while the part of the passage which speaks of the darkness as being the portion of the wicked and of their stumbling unawares, he applies to the Truth people who have left the Society. Especially do his readers understand him thereby to mean the Epiphany-enlightened brethren. While doubtless many of those who left the Society, like the partisan Society adherents themselves, are Levites, and therefore like themselves have stumbled unawares into various errors because of their measurable unfaithfulness, some who have left the Society have not gone into darkness, but have been getting the advancing Truth as due. The proof that they have so fared is that they retain all that our Pastor gave them and have received as advancing Truth such things only as are based upon, in harmony with, and developed out of what he taught. The advancing Truth must agree with the past Truth. It does not repudiate the formerly received Truth, but makes it clearer and brings out further details that project the same Truths into greater elaborations. But that which leaves part of the former foundations, tears down other parts of them and builds on other and contrary running foundations, cannot be a part of the former house. It must be a part of another house.

(32) Therefore we say that the Epiphany teachings, standing squarely on the Parousia Truth and being built higher thereon, must be the advancing Truth; while what the Society's president is giving as advancing Truth, leaving as it does parts of the Parousia foundations and breaking other parts of them down to put contrary-running foundations in their place, must be deviating error, not advancing Truth. Hence the little pope of little Babylon and his partisan followers, like the great pope in great Babylon and his partisan followers, are stumbling unawares into increasing darkness as their portion (Prov. 4:19), while the Epiphany-enlightened brethren are walking in the

increasingly shining path of the just (Prov. 4:18). Nor does it make any difference how much the little pope of little Babylon, like his prototype, the great pope of great Babylon, struts, boasts and speaks swelling words in his claims of Divine mouthpieceship, the channel, he is none the less, yea in part for that very reason, the head of the little Antichrist; and the works that he is continually exhorting his followers to do as the sacrifices of the real sin-offering, are but works of the little abomination that maketh desolate—little Babylon's counterpart of the mass in great Babylon; while his so-called light is in little Babylon real darkness—the counterpart of the darkness of great Babylon in its Roman Catholic quarter. But, wholly given over to Satan, the little pope of little Babylon will continue, like his prototype, the great pope in great Babylon, to strut, to boast and to speak swelling words until the judgment of God forever strikes him down, as it will his prototype in great Babylon; for strong is the Lord God that judgeth him; for having bowed the knee to Baal—Satan—when he, Satan-like, grasped for power and began to lord it over God's heritage, using hundreds of Azazelian falsehoods to blacken the faithful and to deceive the unwary, he turned God into his Opponent, who is only letting him, the little pope, like the great pope, be raised higher and higher that his fall may be all the deeper; and when he lights he will be symbolic pulp, leaving, like the great pope, behind him the memory only of his atrocious sins against the Lord, the Truth and the brethren (Matt. 24:48, 49).

(33) In par. 14, in the article under review, the Society's president reiterates, for perhaps the hundredth time, a falsehood that he knows to be a falsehood, *i.e.*, that our Pastor for years taught that a person could be justified before consecration and *then later gave up this thought*. We will prove in Volume VI such a statement of our Pastor's view to be an error, and as presented by the Society's president to be a falsehood;

and now we charge the Society's president, who has repeatedly said that our Pastor gave up tentative justification before he died, with deliberately, and therefore wickedly, misrepresenting our Pastor's position on the subject, which he doubtless does the more easily to palm off a false doctrine. The item in the above mentioned paragraph is introduced to illustrate allegedly how the (supposed) advancing Truth clarifies previous obscurities. And what actually took place in our Pastor's experience as to his teaching on justification in its time relation to consecration was a case of an advancing truth clarifying obscurities; but note the fact that the truth of justification before consecration at no time was repudiated by our Pastor. We repeat it: Our Pastor never denied or repudiated his teaching that one was justified before his consecration; for up to within a few days before his death, in his last printed statement on the subject [The Foreword of Vol. VI], he still taught that one is justified before his consecration, because numerous Scriptures teach it, notably Rom. 3 and 4 and Gal. 2, and, as for years he had been doing, he called such justification up to the very end a tentative one. But in 1909 he began, by contrast, to call attention to a twofold distinction in justification, a thing that he did not with the distinctiveness of a striking contrast, with suitably differentiating terms, bring out before. He came to see distinctly that justification is exercised in two ways by God: (1) tentatively, which is its mode of operation before consecration, and (2) vitalizedly, which is its mode of operation after consecration. While he taught both of such justifications years before 1909, yet then for the first time he brought them out by differentiated terms in striking contrast with one another, and clearly showed when each of them operated. But the Society's president repudiates tentative justification, claiming that there is no justification at all operating before consecration, and belies our Pastor's view by claiming

that he, like the Society's president, gave up tentative justification, *i.e.*, the justification that operates before consecration. Our Pastor truly did advance with the advancing light on the subject, and therefore when the due time came he clarified the subject wherein it before had been obscure, by explaining and proving that tentative justification during the Gospel Age, and in keeping with its purposes, operates exclusively before consecration, and that after the priesthood's consecration vitalized justification operates exclusively. The error of the paragraph under review lies in the fact that it silently ignores the existence of tentative justification and denies the existence of justification in any sense for Gospel-Age purposes before consecration. The stubbornness, perversity and dishonesty of the Society's president on this subject is a strong proof that he either has not "developed character," or, after having done so, he corrupted it grossly. The latter we believe to be true of him.

(34) Par. 15 rightly inveighs against the error of those brethren who deny that the light has been advancing since Bro. Russell's death. Such dear, bewildered brethren are to be congratulated, however, for holding to the Parousia Truth. In this they do better than the Society's partisans, who repudiate much of it; but they would do still better, if they would accept the Truth that has in the Epiphany been given in harmony with, as based upon, and as a further development of, the Parousia Truth. Certainly we are not yet in the perfect day, for then error will no more raise its head; hence more light is to be expected for the path of the just (Prov. 4:18). But not everything that is offered as light should be accepted as such; since Satan as of yore is still putting darkness for light and light for darkness. By what criteria then may we judge as to what really is light and what really is darkness among the things offered to us as light? Since light agrees with light, and darkness and light disagree, *i.e.*, since

Truth agrees with Truth and Truth and error disagree, such things as are based upon, in harmony with, and flow out of the Parousia Truth must be the advancing light, and what contradicts it or sets it aside or does not flow out of it must be error. These criteria as to Truth and error are certainly true and safe. Hence what the Society's president has been presenting as light in contradiction and repudiation of the Parousia Truth must be error—it is Azazelian darkness set forth as light. But the Epiphany teachings, being in harmony with, based upon, and elaborated out of the Parousia Truth, must be the advancing light, which Satan is, by antitypical Jambres, whose chief leader is the Society's president, setting for darkness. Therefore, it is not true, as the paragraph under review claims, that those who accept the Society's "new views" are walking in the light, and that those who reject them are necessarily wicked, are walking in darkness and know not at what they stumble. The facts and the Scriptures prove that "that evil servant" is the great stumbler and walker in darkness, and knows not at what he stumbled. (Matt. 24:49); and he has occasioned the stumbling of more New Creatures and Youthful Worthies than any other man that ever lived. From this we can construe measurably how overwhelmingly great his guilt before God must be. Beloved brethren, especially you of the Society who had the Truth in Bro. Russell's days, we beseech you to distrust, as from Satan, every teaching that repudiates the teachings that our Lord gave through him whom He placed over the household and the storehouse (Matt. 24:45-47; Luke 12:42-44), the antitypical Eleazar at the end of the Gospel Age, who had as his charge the antitypical Tabernacle, furniture, vessels, oil, sweet incense and the daily meat offering (Num. 4:16). Therefore, in the interest of your own souls, distrust the contrary teachings of the Society's president,

"that evil servant" of Matt. 24:48-51, and the "foolish and unprofitable shepherd" of Zech. 11:15-17.

(35) Prov. 4:18 shows, among other things, that the light must be advancing, because we are not yet in the perfect day, and that, accordingly, there must have been new features of Truth coming due since our Pastor's death. But only such things should be regarded as the advancing Truth as agree with the Parousia Truth, which the Lord gave through the Parousia Servant, "that faithful and wise Servant," because Truth agrees with Truth, and does not contradict it. But there are brethren who neither believe the Lord's Word in Prov. 4:18, nor our Pastor's explanation of it (A 20-28)—that until the perfect day would come the Truth would increase. They claim that no more light has or can come after his death, since, they argue, the storehouse was in his charge. Undeniably we are not in the perfect day; for the empire of Satan is still here, and the operation of the two phases of the Kingdom is years in the future. These brethren think that they are standing by our Pastor's teachings in their contention; but they evidently are not; for he himself repeatedly taught that the light would continue to shine until the perfect day, which is sometime in the future. The fact that errorists use the principle of the advancing light to effect an entrance for their errors, as the supposed advancing light, does not justify the opponents of their errors in denying the truth that the light does advance unto the perfect day, any more than counterfeit money proves that there is no genuine money. We gave above the criteria by which we can know what is and what is not advancing light.

(36) Nor does the fact that our Pastor had charge of the entire storehouse prove that no advancing Truth would come after his death by another. Even while he was alive the Lord gave some new features of the Truth first to other brethren, whose duty in such cases

was, not first to present it to the brethren in general, but to him, and let him present it first either directly, *i.e.*, by himself, or indirectly, *i.e.*, by them, to the brethren in general. The cases of the Edgar Brothers on the chronology and on the Pyramid, of Bro. Barton on Is. 18 (Z '04, 230-232), and on the individual Satan's binding (Z '10, 315, 316), of Bro. Bundy on the parable of the lost piece of silver, etc., etc., are facts to the point. And this is true because the Lord Himself promised that every able and faithful servant of the Truth would by Him be favored with bringing something new out of the storehouse (Matt. 13:52). Such a giving of some new Truth by the Lord to other servants of the Church than our Pastor was certainly not in disharmony with the fact that our Pastor during his life had charge of the entire storehouse. And if it was not then, we may be certain that now, since our Pastor does not have any more the charge of the storehouse, for someone else to bring forth things new and old from the storehouse is not in contravention to the thought that the storehouse was formerly in our Pastor's charge. The very figure used by the Lord on this subject, when understood, proves this. This figure implies that there was a certain householder, having a steward who had charge of his storehouse, and that there were other servants co-operating with and under this steward in the ministering of the things in the storehouse to the household. The steward did not put the goods into the storehouse. They were placed there by his lord. Usually his lord told him the new things that he was to bring forth for the household, he not knowing what and where they were until his lord told him. Exceptionally, and without at all displacing him as steward, his lord would tell other faithful servants of the nature and location of some new things in the storehouse, and tell them to bring them out and show them to the steward, who would then arrange for them to be given to the household.

But when that householder's steward died, the householder was not thereby estopped from having his household fed with other new things, hitherto kept unused, in the storehouse, just because that steward formerly had charge of the storehouse. Nay, on the contrary, even though he should not have appointed another steward, he would yet use someone to bring forth such new things as he desired his family to eat. Just so has our Lord been doing before and since His special steward died, and thus ceased being His steward. This disproves the contention under consideration, supposedly based on the fact of our Pastor's having charge of the storehouse.

(37) The brethren who err on the meaning and implications of our Pastor's having charge of the storehouse do not understand the functions of his office. He was the Parousia messenger, appointed by the Lord over the storehouse and the household for Parousia purposes—giving the Parousia Truth and superintending the Parousia work. Thus he gave the Church the full Parousia Truth, and superintended the full gathering of the Church (hence he can have no successor), and thereby gave the foundation of the Epiphany Truth and work; for the Parousia Truth and work are the foundation of the Epiphany Truth and work. But, as our Pastor's work was not that of gathering the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies *as such*, the truths that he gave on these subjects were not full enough for the work of gathering these as such. Their gathering as such is an Epiphany work, for which special Epiphany truths also, not due to be seen in his day, are needed. Therefore "things new and old" are needed for the Epiphany work. The facts of the case prove that our Pastor did not understand these new Epiphany things, *e.g.*, the time of the deliverance of the Church, the length of the Time of Trouble, the time of Israel's deliverance, the duration of the dealing with the Great Company and the

Youthful Worthies, the time relation between the sprinkling of the Goat's blood and the dealing with the Great Company, etc., all of which and other things too are Epiphany matters. Hence he made mistakes on these subjects. This we say without the slightest disparagement of him; for though used more markedly than any other servant of God, except our Lord (for of these, except our Lord Himself, he is undoubtedly the greatest), he could not see things before due. Hence, whenever he attempted to explain things not yet due, he made mistakes on them, as the above-enumerated things, as well as other things, prove, *e.g.*, his premature explanation of the meaning of the pounds, of the parable of the penny, of the honor given to all saints, etc.

(38) All of us are familiar with the fact that our Pastor taught, up to about 1909, that everything in the Bible, which is given for the saints' understanding (1 Pet. 1:12; Rom. 15:4), would be understood by the Church before leaving the world, *i.e.*, by 1914, as he then supposed. Later, in view of the fact that he saw that there was not time enough by 1914 for about $\frac{3}{4}$ of the Bible that were not yet commented on to be made clear, he gave up the thought that all things in the Bible would be understood before all new creatures would leave the world (supposedly by 1914). Had he known the length of the Epiphany, he would not have given up that thought; for it is evidently a Biblical one; for the Bible expressly teaches that everything in it would be understood while the Church would yet be in the flesh (Rom. 15:4). What follows from this? That the Bible passages which he did not explain before his death—about 66 per cent of the Bible—will be explained during the Epiphany, and that correctly. Moreover, he himself said just before he died that it was to be expected that the true explanation of Ezekiel and Revelation, which he had expected to give, would be given by another brother

after his death. In the summer of 1916 he told the Bethel family that there were in the Revelation four things that he did not yet understand—the number of the beast (he evidently had by then concluded that the Adventist view, which he had once endorsed, *i.e.*, the numerical value of the letters on the pope's crown, was wrong), the 1600 furlongs of Rev. 14, Rev. 17:9-11, and above all the key of the book. At the Dallas Convention, Oct. 21, 1916, he told the brethren in answer to a question as to when he would write on Revelation that there were certain matters therein, especially its key, that he did not understand and that until he would understand them he would not think it due for him to write thereon. His not understanding these things, coupled with his statement, nine days later—the day before his death—that another was to be expected to give the true explanation of Revelation and Ezekiel implies that he held that the Truth would advance after his death. Moreover, when he expressed his doubts as to the time relationship of the deliverance of the Church and of the sprinkling of the Goat's blood on the one hand and the dealing with the Great Company on the other hand, he expressly stated that the brethren who would be living at their fulfillment would understand them more clearly than he did (Vol. IV, Chapter III). These facts prove that he expected increased light to come after he gave up his stewardship over the storehouse. Thus the Bible, the teachings of our Pastor, facts and reason, all prove that the light was to advance, even after our Pastor's death. Therefore those are in error who teach that, in view of his having had charge of the whole storehouse, no new light could first come through another, and that none should be expected after his death.

(39) We have written the foregoing on the occasion of a letter which one of our correspondents has written us. We will quote the letter a little later on. Our readers know that we stand whole-heartedly for that

great body of Truth that our Pastor gave us. The Present Truth and the Epiphany Studies in the Scriptures are the only publications among Truth people that do this. Our stand on this subject was stated in P '19, 103, pars. 1 and 2, and has faithfully been carried out to the best of our knowledge. We believe our candid readers will support us in this statement. We will quote these paragraphs

(40) "The Present Truth and Herald of Christ's Epiphany stands squarely and sincerely for the Parousia Truth, as basic for all further development of the Truth. Thus it heartily embraces the system of Truth which is presented in the writings of our beloved Pastor, as well as holds to its principles and spirit. Whenever he gives two or more harmonious views of a Scriptural passage or doctrine, we accept all; whenever, as in a few instances in the great system of Truth which he presented, these cannot be harmonized, we accept the latest expressions, unless they are manifestly not so harmonious with the Scriptures, Reason and Facts as earlier ones. In all cases of unfulfilled types and prophecies we hold to his thought as the one along whose lines we look for their fulfillments. And as he in many cases rejected a former interpretation of a type or prophecy after its fulfillment proved that he misunderstood it, *e.g.*, the deliverance of the Church, the restoration of Israel, the [complete] destruction of organized evil in the world and the establishment of the earthly phase of God's kingdom at certain times; so only after a type or prophecy is fulfilled differently from his understanding of it, would we attempt to set aside his interpretation in favor of what the fulfillment of the type or prophecy proves to be its proper interpretation. Thus it will be seen that we honor him as God's appointed channel for the Parousia Truth [and for giving the foundations of the Epiphany Truth]; but like him do not believe him to have been infallible, and therefore make only such

changes as in principle he made; *i.e.*, such as clear fulfillments force us to make. All sober and non-partisan brethren and friends of his will agree to the propriety of this course. It was his own method under such circumstances, and we follow it.

(41) "As to things new: The Present Truth and Herald of Christ's Epiphany, as it is given by God to understand, rejects whatever new views it discerns to be 'fanciful interpretations, wild speculations and frenzied delusions,' and will to the best of its ability keep all such things out of its columns, unless it is to state them for purposes of refutation. Further, it recognizes that, while many new things presented to the Church belong to the realm of fanciful interpretations, wild speculations and frenzied delusions, there are many new features of Truth pertaining mixedly to the Little Flock, Great Company and the Youthful Worthies, as well as to various worldly classes that are, have been and will be unfolding from literal and symbolic passages. As these become clear to us and due for the Church, The Present Truth will be pleased to announce and explain them, not dogmatically, but suggestively, with the supporting Scriptures, that each may be helped to judge for himself, and thus build for himself an independent faith structure. The Present Truth will endeavor to subject all its teachings to the Word, on the basis of the Parousia Truth, in harmony with the seven axioms of Biblical interpretation: Every Scriptural passage or doctrine must be interpreted harmoniously, (1) with Itself, (2) with all Scriptures, (3) with all Scriptural Doctrines, (4) with God's Character, (5) with the Ransom and Sin-offerings, (6) with Facts and (7) with the purposes of the Bible, and will reject everything contrary to any of these axioms."

(42) Above we referred to a letter which we promised to quote later. The writer of the letter has, among other letters, written us four in which he strenuously

insisted that we were teaching contrary to our Pastor, and therein were doing as badly as The Tower and P.B.I. Herald, without even specifying in the first three letters wherein he thinks we do so. To the first and second letters we replied, stating that we were unconscious of so doing, and asked him to give instances of such teachings. To our two letters we received no answers. After the Sept., 1926, Truth appeared, which, among other things, mildly pointed out as erroneous the claim of those who say that the light has not been advancing since our Pastor's death, he wrote us, blaming us severely for our understanding, and again, without particulars, accused us of teaching contrary to our Pastor's views. We did not answer the third letter, because of its harsh, condemnatory tone and its reiterating charges on which its writer withheld specifications twice before asked for by us. On Oct. 31 he mailed us what he calls a supplement to his third letter. This supplement we quote as his fourth accusing letter:

(43) "Dear Brother: Will you please read an article under heading, Mind the Same Things? The article is found in Watch Tower 1909, page 233. Especially we would be glad to have you note in this article pars. 1, 2 and 3, col. 1, page 234. Having done so, please read and note the last par., col. 2, page 234, on Dawn Studies, etc. If the Dawn Studies are but the Bible rearranged, and we believe this to be true, then I ask you whether you are doing injury to the cause prosecuted [advanced] by the Lord through His faithful servant. If there is anything that puts the successors of Pastor Russell, as they call themselves, to real test, it is this very article. If the Dawns are the Bible rearranged, as above, it surely needs no additions or subtractions, for the Bible is complete. Again, on pages 265-268, 1909 Tower, subject, The Will of the Lord be Done, note on page 266, bottom of col. 1, under sub-heading, Sons and Daughters

Shall Prophecy. Note especially col. 2, pars. 2 and 3. Having done so, ask yourself the question whether you differ in your teachings from our dear Pastor. Having done this, will you please read the letter which was published in the Sept. 1st Watch Tower [1926], then ask yourself the question whether or not these 'would-be' *up-to-date* teachers are doing more injury to the cause—Up-to-date—the path of the just is as a shining light, etc., etc. My dear brother, it is very easy to deceive yourself and others in your teachings, but you cannot deceive God. He is not mocked. No, He knows what is going on in the offices of these up-to-date teachers. If I were these men, I would never mention the name of that 'Great man of God,' for each time they do so they thus add more condemnation to that which they already have. It is no surprise at all to me that you do not seek to defend your stand, for you are wise enough to know that in doing so you will only do injury to your own propaganda. I am writing this supplement with no animosity in my heart against you as an individual at all. However, I promised the Lord more than 30 years ago that I would defend the Truth against any who would assail it, even if I had to stand alone. However I am glad to say that the Lord has many more who are standing loyal. May God help you to get your eyes open is our prayer. Yours in Him."

(44) We will leave it to the Lord to judge the letter's general condemnatory spirit against the one who defends our Pastor's teachings as no one else in the Truth does. We have covered the main points of the writer's misunderstandings above, but will add some other items. We read the articles that the letter requests us to do, and enjoyed them immensely. We are in heartiest sympathy with them, and have time and again re-echoed their principles in print and orally. We believe that the Six Volumes are "the Bible arranged topically" just as our Pastor meant. But we

do not believe that he by the expression, "the Bible arranged topically," meant what the writer of the above letter claims he meant by it, *i.e.*, that everything in the Bible is in those Six Volumes, and that hence there is no need of additional light beyond that given in the Six Volumes; for our Pastor, both by word and act, held otherwise. If he thought that all of the teachings of the Bible were given in the Six Volumes, why did he prepare to write a seventh? Why did he give us booklets like those on the Tabernacle, Spiritism, Hell, Bible and Evolution, and Our Lord's Return, explaining some matters not explained in the Dawns? Why did he give us sermons explaining many things not touched on in the Six Volumes? Why, after writing the last of the Six Volumes, did he for 13½ years give us the Towers, which contained many things new, not treated of in the Six Volumes? Why did he on dying say that the new things of Revelation and Ezekiel, that he had expected to write, are to be expected from another hand than his? Why did he hold, for a number of years after 1903, when the Sixth Volume was completed, that all things not yet understood in the Bible would be understood before the Church left the world? Why did he write new things in the scenario of the Photo-Drama of Creation if all the Bible's light was in the Six Volumes? Evidently these things prove that the brother does not understand what the expression, "the Dawn Studies" are "the Bible topically arranged," means. We understand it to mean that they explain systematically the main subjects of the Bible, but not everything in it, nor everything in it that the Lord means for us to know, for the Bible teaches that all the Bible will be understood before the Church passes from the earth (1 Pet. 1:12; Rom. 15:4); while the Six Volumes do not explain even 15% of the verses of the Bible, and while in his other writings our Pastor comments on

about 15% more. So much on the half-baked thought of the letter on this point.

(45) We now come to the only specification that the letter's writer has made on his solemnly grandiose charges that we "teach contrary to our Pastor," and that as badly as the Tower and the P.B.I. Herald; and it is indeed an illustration of the proverb, "Behold, mountains travail, and bear an insignificant mouse!" We quote the two paragraphs that the letter particularizes for us to read (Z '09, 266, col. 2, pars. 2, 3):

(46) "The two ages and their blessings are distinguished, therefore, by the expressions, 'In those days,' as signifying the Gospel Age, and 'After those days,' as signifying the Millennial Age. We are still in the Gospel Age, styled 'In those days.' And we still have the blessings promised in this Age, namely, the bestowment of the Holy Spirit upon God's servants and handmaidens regardless of age, sex or national distinction. This blessing began at Pentecost and will close with the anointing of the last member of the Body of Christ. Then will begin the other part of the blessed promise, namely, 'After those days I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh.' This blessing surely does not apply to the present time; and just as surely it will have fulfillment under the ministration of the Millennial Kingdom. Then will come the time when 'Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy,' shall teach. That will not be a teaching *in* the Church, nor *of* the Church, but a teaching of the world by the world, under the supervision of the glorified Christ and the perfected Ancient Worthies as the earthly representatives of the heavenly Kingdom.

(47) "Now notice the expression, 'Your old men shall dream dreams and your young men shall see visions.' We prefer a different translation, which, we believe, gives the intended thought, namely, 'Your young men will see the glorious visions (of restitution blessings, etc., in process of fulfillment) of which your

ancient men dreamed (the things respecting which they vaguely hoped and dimly understood and greatly longed for)."

(48) Evidently the writer thinks that par. 3 of Z '09, 266, col. 2, is the one to which we (supposedly) teach contrary. Our readers know that we apply the words, "Your old men shall dream dreams and your young men shall see visions," to the Millennial inspirational activities of the Ancient and Youthful Worthies. We are warranted in applying them to the Millennium, because in both of the above-quoted paragraphs our Pastor rightly applies Joel 2:28 to the Millennium. Our Pastor's explanation of the special words here referred to is very brief, so brief in fact that we are not sure just what he meant by it, for his explanation is quite susceptible of several meanings. He does not explain whom he understood by the young men, nor by the old men. Since he applies the passage to the Millennium, he may have meant that some restitution things that the aged at first would see dimly would later be seen clearly by the young people. Or he may have meant that what old people in this life longed for as coming in the Millennium, the young folks then would clearly see. Or, again, he may have meant that what Old Testament people saw dimly would be clearly seen by the young in the Millennium. Any of these three thoughts and all of them are true, so far as they are concerned in themselves; but the explanation he gives is too indefinite for us clearly to see his thought, hence is no proper basis for the charge brought against us. The reason our Pastor did not have the full light on this verse is that it is Epiphaniac. Has it ever struck our dear readers that while our Pastor said that those whom we call Youthful Worthies will be the Millennial associates of the Ancient Worthies as princes, he never once cited a Scripture to prove it. He simply drew the conclusion from the fact that there were more

consecrations than available crowns since the general call ceased in 1881, and from God's general methods of dealing in the way of rewards with similar characters. So far as we can recall, he treated of the Youthful Worthies in but three places in his writings—F 156, 157; Z '11, 181, pars. 5-10; Z '15, 269, col. 2, pars. 6, 7. Additionally he treated of them at Convention Question meetings (What P. R. Said, 151, 152, 154). In none of them does he cite a Scripture dealing with the Youthful Worthies as distinct from the Ancient Worthies. Why this from one who so strenuously insisted on Scripture as the source and rule of faith? The answer can only be that the subject being an Epiphaniac one, no Scripture on the subject was due to be understood before! But the Epiphany being the time for dealing with this class as such, Scriptures not previously understandable began to open up on the subject. Our Pastor's comment on the pertinent words of Joel 2:28 is as fine an illustration of the truth that it is impossible clearly to explain a passage before it is due as we could give. We are not at all blaming or disparaging him on this head; for no one can understand a passage before it is due; for even our Lord could not understand when the Judgment Day and Israel's having the Kingdom restored to them would come, until that truth was due; but whenever a passage was due our Pastor always, as "that Servant," interpreted it correctly.

(49) Please mark, dear brethren, we do not contradict our Pastor on this verse. We do not deny that any one of the above three understandings of his explanation will be factual, for doubtless those three things will have taken place by the time the Millennium will have advanced some time, though we do not think that any of them is the Divinely intended thought of the pertinent clause. Some one gave a *mistranslation* to our Pastor, which suggested the explanation that he gave. Not understanding the

proper translation and not being a Hebrew scholar, he accepted the mistranslation on the mistranslator's authority, since it gave an undoubtedly true thought. In our library we have twenty-four translations of the Old Testament, every one of which renders the pertinent words as the A.V. renders them. Then we have a Bible that gives variant renderings of 150 of the ablest Hebrew translators whenever their renderings differ from the English Bible, and none of them translate like the mistranslation that someone gave our Pastor. Only one of these 150 changes the words (but does not change the thought) thus: Your old men shall *have* dreams. We know that the translation under review is wrong because the tenses of the Hebrew words translated in the A.V. "shall see" and "shall dream", are the same in the Hebrew of this verse—they are both the future tense, not one future and the other past as the mistranslation under review gives them. Moreover, there are no words in the Hebrew corresponding to the words "of which" in the clause "*of which* your ancient men dreamed." Hence the suggested translation, which gives an indefinite though a true thought, is wrong. The A.V. is thoroughly correct here, and our explanation of it is strictly in harmony with it. That this language of Joel 2:28 on the old and young men was not due to be understood in our Pastor's day is positively proved by the fact that he could not interpret the proper translation, but while giving a true thought on a suggested mistranslation, he expressly preferred the mistranslation to the correct one. We ask, How could it be better proven that the passage was not due to our Pastor to interpret than by these facts? On the other hand, we are satisfied that no one could, before the passage was due, have given so good an interpretation as our Pastor did, whose interpretation, though not the Divinely intended one for these clauses, contained no doctrinal, reasonable or factual error. We are satisfied that if our Pastor

were giving the Epiphany Truth, he would explain the pertinent words as we do, seeing that they so clearly substantiate from the Bible his teachings on the Millennial activities of the Ancient and Youthful Worthies in their teaching office.

(50) We repeat it, we do not contradict, as not factual, the three meanings that our Pastor's explanation can carry, for we believe all three of them are true. We do not contradict his doctrine on the Ancient or Youthful Worthies. We simply give the explanation that the correct translation suggests as better than the one which a false translation suggested to our Pastor, who was made to believe it was the true translation. Therefore, in view of the indefiniteness of his explanation of the false part of the translation on which it was based, of the undueness of the light on the pertinent clause in his day, of the evident desire of the letter's writer to convict us of teaching contrary to our Pastor, of his classifying us with our Pastor's real repudiators, and of his seemingly having nothing else to advance to prove his claim against us, is it not appropriate that we should quote as descriptive of his acts the proverb, "Behold, mountains travail, and bear an insignificant mouse"? We should be congratulated, if this is all our enemies can advance as proof of their claim that we "teach contrary to our Pastor." Such self-styled defenders of the Truth harm it; for to be a real Truth defender requires poise and the ability properly and soberly to appraise matters—things that the letter's writer seems to lack, if we may judge from our correspondence with him. We pass by without further comment on his insinuations against our candor and fair dealing with our readers than that this article proves that we have no fear to write on the paragraph alleged as against us. Nor will we accept his suggestion, based on his mountain-travailing and mouse-bearing proclivities, that we never mention our Pastor's name. We will, praise God, keep right

on faithfully defending his teachings in all good confidence, honest purpose and transparent candor as hitherto, despite such accusatory letters written against one who has suffered and toiled much for the maintenance of "that Servant's" teachings and arrangements against real repudiators of them. Having above repelled our accuser's charge, and proven him guilty of repudiating our Pastor's view on the advancing light after his death, we are reminded of the proverb on glass-house dwellers throwing stones, and especially of Rom. 2:1, "thou that judgest another, etc."

(51) Our discussion raises another question: Does the statement of Prov. 4:18, on the light shining more and more unto the perfect day, mean, as the Apr., 1936, Dawn, page 17, par. 4, claims, not the unfolding of the advancing truths of the Bible as due going on until the perfect day, but the illumination of the Christian's pathway by an increased ability to apply the principles of the Lord's Word to the problems of his conduct in his daily life? To this we answer: We note that Dawn's answer is not in harmony with our Pastor's thought from the beginning to the end of his ministry, as can be seen, *e.g.*, from the explanation that he gives Prov. 4:18 in A 20-28, in which, among other things, while not ignoring the lesser truth that Dawn one-sidedly emphasizes as *the* truth on the subject, our Pastor emphasizes the greater truth, saying, "While it is true that the path of each individual believer is a shining one, yet the special application of this statement is to the just [justified] as a class" (A 20, par. 2). That our Pastor held to this greater truth as the special sense of Prov. 4:18 throughout life no one conversant with his teachings will in honesty deny, *e.g.*, Vols. I-VI use Prov. 4:18 as the motto passage of the series, on their title pages, in the sense of his explanation given in A 20-28; and he would have so used this passage on the title page of Vol. VII, had he written that volume, since, as the motto of the entire

series, he thus indicated that it gave the advancing Truth as due. We note, secondly, that Dawn gives as the truth its thought in contradictory contrast with the thought that increasing knowledge on God's plan accompanies God's people as a class unto the end of their path, even unto the perfect day. Hence Dawn's one-sided emphasis of an indirect application of the passage in contradictory contrast with its special application is a contradiction of our Pastor's thought, and is some of that deceptive alleged new light, against which Dawn inveighs (in others). Thus "the Lord taketh the wise in their own craftiness." But what do the pertinent facts prove? Three things: Firstly, and especially, our Pastor's explanation of the special application of the passage is certainly true, as *e.g.*, the history of the unfolding of God's plan in the Parousia and the Epiphany proves, yea, even from the beginning of the Reformation by individuals through Marsiglio in 1309 A.D.; secondly, that Dawn's one-sided and contradicting contrasted emphasis sets aside the main truth on the subject; and, thirdly, Dawn champions an error on the subject. Dawn came to this error in an effort to evade (1) the Society's gross error on the subject that their contradictions of our Pastor's true teachings are advancing light, and (2) the true advancing light—the Epiphany Truth—that is based upon, elaborated out of, and in harmony with our Pastor's view of the Lord's Word; this second evasion Dawn commits in an attempt to escape the conclusion that the Parousia and the Epiphany Truth teaches, that the Epiphany is devoted especially to the manifestation and cleansing of the Great Company (2 Tim. 4:1; Rev. 7:14), a combination of which Truth proves the Dawn to be an unclean Levitical movement, in which its active, participating crown-losers, as antitypical Lot, and its active, participating Youthful Worthies and faith-justified, as antitypical Lot's two daughters, are committing antitypical incest,

and producing symbolic bastards, antitypical Moabites and Ammonites, who will Millennially find themselves among the restitution class (Gen. 19:30-38; Deut. 23:2-6). Dawn's strictures (in the same article as contains the above-refuted error) against us (without naming us) as "seeing himself in the Scriptures" the Lord Himself will shortly answer in a way that will unanswerably show it, in making such strictures and teaching various errors, to be a mouthpiece of Azazel.

(52) During the year 1916 at the Bethel table we asked our dear Pastor whether the forty days from Jesus' resurrection to His ascension typed the Parousia Period (1874-1914), and whether the ten days from His ascension to Pentecost typed the following ten years as the time that must intervene from the end of the reaping until the Spirit would begin to be poured out upon all flesh (1914-1924). His answer was that he hoped to give his thought on those forty days and their following ten days in the Tower sometime, and therefore would defer his answer until that time. His manner in giving this answer, as well as the answer itself, gave the impression that he held these periods to be typical. But he never gave his thought on them to us through the Tower, his death doubtless preventing it. Since the manifestation of the Levites has been going on, we have frequently thought of the typical significance of these two periods. From the fact that so frequently in the Scriptures periods of forty days are used typically of the reaping period (1874-1914) we feel satisfied that the forty days of our Lord's resurrection history type the forty years of the Harvest, particularly from the standpoint of the period in which our returned Lord gave instructions to the Church respecting the Kingdom—the Parousia Truth (Acts 1:3). But if we were now to ask our dear Pastor as to the typical significance of Jesus' Pentecostal work of presenting the Church to God ten days after His ascension, we would not

connect the antitype's end in 1924 with the outpouring of the Spirit upon all flesh; for there remains only three years [this was written in 1921] until the fall of 1924, and the prophetic program to be enacted between now and the beginning of the Spirit's outpouring upon all flesh is of too gigantic proportions to be enacted within three years. Rather, if now asking him what should be expected from the fall of 1923 to that of 1924 as the antitype of Jesus' Pentecostal presentation of the Church to God, we would inquire whether it would not mark chronologically the beginning of the offering of the Levites to Jehovah by our Lord, and *by contrast* the presentation of the Priests to God separate and distinct from the Levites (Num. 8:11, 13, 21). We will now proceed to explain our reasons for such thoughts.

(53) The types of the firstfruits connected with Passover and Pentecost are recorded in Lev. 23:9-14, 15-21. As our Pastor explained, the first ripe sheaf represents our Lord as a New Creature, and its presentation before Jehovah on Nisan 16 represents our Lord's resurrection on the third day, as the Firstfruits of them that slept (1 Cor. 15:4, 20; Z '98, 68). The expression *firstfruits* seems always to refer to the New Creature, and never to the humanity of the Lord's people (Rom. 8:23; 11:16; 16:5; 1 Cor. 15:20, 23; 16:15; Jas. 1:18; Rev. 14:4). Therefore the high priest presenting and waving the first ripe sheaf before the Lord on Nisan 16 types our Lord presenting Himself to Jehovah as a New Creature at His resurrection, and from then on continually as such serving Jehovah. The presentation of the two firstfruit loaves baked with leaven (Lev. 23:17), and their waving before the Lord, cannot represent something done beyond the veil, else leaven would not have been put into the loaves. It must, therefore, represent something done with New Creatures this side of the veil; for, while in the flesh, our New Creatures are

associated with the corruption (leaven) that is in our flesh, and are by it more or less hampered in their activities.

(54) Our dear Pastor has shown that these loaves baked out of the firstfruits flour type the Little Flock and the Great Company (Z '98, 68)—expressions that are equivalent to the expression, the Church of the Firstborn (Heb. 12:23). Accordingly not as human beings, but as New Creatures, are these two classes typed by these two loaves made from the flour of the firstfruits. It would seem that the presentation of the loaf that typed the Little Flock has the same typical significance as the presentation of Aaron's sons to the Lord—their consecration to the priesthood (Lev. 8:13, 24-27, 30-36). Furthermore in that picture, in a tentative sense, the presentation of all new creatures is typed, though in the finished picture only those who retain the antitypical Priesthood are included. Hence in a tentative sense the presentation of those who later become of the Great Company, and who are typed by that loaf which types the Great Company as new creatures, is also typed in Lev. 8:13, 24-27, 30-36; but they, of course, are not there typed in the finished picture. On the contrary, in the finished picture their presentation *as Great Company members, as such*, is typed by the presentation of the Levites in Num. 8:11-21. Hence in the finished picture the presentation of the second loaf, *i.e.*, the one that types the Great Company, types the presentation of the cleansed Great Company as such—a *thing that is yet future* [to 1921]. Such a presentation of them by our Lord to Jehovah will be their consecration to their Levitical service as such. The antitype of the waving of the loaf, in the finished picture, could not take place until the Great Company as such were active—not in Azazel's service, but—in the Lord's service. That this event is future is manifest from the fact that their purification, their shaving themselves, and their washing their garments,

which precede their offer to God, is not finished (Num. 8:21, 7-11).

(55) As we have seen that our Lord's initial Pentecostal presentation of the entire Church antitypes the presentation of the two loaves by the typical high priest on Pentecost (Lev. 23:16-21); and as we have seen that our Lord's teaching His disciples of the Kingdom during the forty days' of His resurrection experience types our returned Lord teaching His new creatures in the flesh the Parousia Truth, so it would seem that our Lord's delay of ten days after his ascension before presenting the Church to God types how during the ten years from 1914 to 1924 our Lord delays to present the Church in its two parts *as such, separate and distinct*, to the Father. Then as Jesus presented the whole Church of the Firstborn to God at Pentecost, so it would seem that He thereby types how during the end of the antitypical ten days, *i.e.*, between Oct., 1923, and 1924, He will at the consecration of the Levites present the Little Flock as such and the Great Company as such to God for their future distinct services, the presentation of the Little Flock and Great Company being in the finished picture the antitype of the presentation of the loaves typing the Little Flock and Great Company. This would seem to imply that by the fall of 1924 the Truth Levites and the Priests will begin to be individually manifest as separate and distinct; and that by the complete presentation of the antitypical Truth Levites as such to the Father for their Levitical service all other New Creatures in the Truth would be openly acknowledged by Jesus before God and His New Creatures as His Under-priests. Hence somewhat before the fall of 1924 we may expect [in 1921] a work to begin that will lead to each New Creature recognizing himself and all other New Creatures as antitypical Priests or antitypical Levites, as the case may be, in view of being publicly demonstrated

as such before God and the Church by Christ, our Lord. This is typed by Moses' setting the Levites before Aaron and his sons—the priests and Levites, of course, recognizing one another as such (Num. 8:13). In the meantime the Lord gives the Epiphany-enlightened saints, who are only a part of the Priesthood, in their conscious dealing with Azazel's Goat to recognize the more markedly revolutionistic and sectarian Levites as such (Lev. 16:21). The work of the World's High Priest in dealing with Azazel's antitypical Goat does not cover so wide a sphere of activity as that covered by Num. 8:7-21. His work of leading Azazel's Goat to the Gate and to the fit man, as described in Lev. 16:21, is covered by the work of sprinkling the water of separation upon the Levites, and of giving them the razor with which they are to shave themselves—sever themselves from their claims to, and their exercise of, *powers* that do not belong to them (Num. 8:7) While Lev. 16:20-22 does not include nearly so wide a range of the things pertaining to the Great Company as Num. 8:7-21, yet there seems to be no reference to the confession of sins and the fit man and Azazel experiences set forth in the latter passage. The chief difference in these passages is this: the former passage treats of the humanity, the latter of the new creatures of the Great Company.

(56) It is our expectation that the presentation of the Epiphany Levites as a class will have begun by [written 1922] the fall of 1924. It is very certain that this will not include every individual Great Company member in the flesh: for many of them, *e.g.*, the last ones to come into the Truth who are now in the nominal church, will not be so presented until after most of the Little Flock leave the earth; for the true Church will still be in the flesh after 1924. Nor is it reasonable to expect that every Truth Levite will be by that time presented to the Lord for true Levitical work. It is more in harmony with the time types

that have so far been fulfilled on certain predicted dates to expect that by Oct., 1924, the *beginning* of their presentation will have set in—that of a class in certain of its members rather than of every individual of that class. Thus in fulfillment of a part of the time type (Lev. 23:11, 15-17) of the firstfruit loaves at Pentecost only a part of the Little Flock, as representatives of the whole, was then presented to the Lord, the rest of them being presented at their consecration throughout the Gospel Age. Thus, too, the ends of the 1290 and 1335 days did not mark the completion but only the beginning of the revelation of certain pertinent truths. Again, as seen in the 2520 years' parallel, the tenth day of the fifth month (Aug. 1, 1914)—2520 years after the burning of the temple (Jer. 52:12)—did not mark the completion, but the beginning of the destruction of Christendom. It seems to be a general Scriptural rule that when many individuals of a class are involved and when time types or prophecies are due to be fulfilled in them, the prophetic time marks the beginning, and not the completion, of the predicted event. It is for this reason that it seems to us more reasonable to expect that by Oct., 1924, the beginning of the presentation of certain cleansed Levites will be witnessed rather than the beginning and completion of the presentation of all of them, as it is also unreasonable to expect all of them at the same time to come into the right heart attitude. We should therefore rather expect to see, then, not all, but some of them, as representatives of the whole class, presented to the Lord for His service, even as we see that this was done at Pentecost in the parallel case of the Little Flock, covered in the first feature of the same type (Lev. 23:15-17). However, as this is a prophecy whose fulfillment is yet future, we cannot be certain about its details until the fulfillment comes. Then we will know more about it than we do now.

(57) Do we look for a thorough and clear separation

of the Priests and Levites by this fall (written Aug., 1924)? The question arises in view of our forecast (P '21, 151, 152) for the fiftieth year since 1874, based on the presentation of the two antitypical wave loaves at Pentecost (Lev. 23:15-21; Acts 2:1-4). The antitypical fifty days—fifty years—are from Oct. 1874, to Oct. 1924. The fiftieth day began Oct. 1923, and ends Oct. 1924. We have, therefore, been for nearly eleven months in this antitypical day. Has the forecast been fulfilling? We answer, Yes. For about the last ten months we have been observing certain acts which show that the Lord is manifesting good Levites as such. Our readers will recall how we have shown that the Levite movements have been working out on time, *e.g.*, on the anniversary of a Levite leader of one group committing revolutionary acts, a Levite leader of another group did a similar thing (P '20, 98-100). Beginning with Nov. 11, 1923, we have been observing a series of similar revolutionisms against Epiphany arrangements on the same dates. The good non-Epiphany Levites, of course, do not revolutionize against Parousia teachings and arrangements; for that is characteristic of bad Levites. Nor is it reasonable to expect the Epiphany-enlightened section of them to revolutionize against Epiphany truths; rather as we understand the matter, their revolutionism is and will be against Epiphany arrangements. From this standpoint we see evidences showing that certain priests and good Levites are mutually becoming active, and are thus becoming manifest as such. Their acts are just seven years to the day later than similar acts began to be enacted, when a certain priest and leaders in the Gershonite and Merarite groups began their separate acts. We do not expect this work to be *complete* by Oct. 1924. Perhaps the following year—Oct. 1924, to Oct. 1925—will witness similar revolutionisms among the good Levites who are now mingling with the Levitical groups under

bad Levite leadership. Probably very few will recognize the work going on until the Lord will make clearer manifestations through the Small Jesus after the end of the small *eighth* wonderful day—toward the end of 1925 and afterward. All the cases that have already come under our notice have been marked with a recognition of the wrongdoing and a humbling of themselves on the part of the wrong-doers. This would be in line with their cleansing themselves; and as they have been doing this they have doubtless been presented to Jehovah by Jesus, their High Priest, as parts of the Great Company, in antitype of what our Lord did at Pentecost with that class. This fact would imply that the faithful priests are undergoing the antitype of the presentation of the Little Flock at Pentecost. [Good Levites' coming into manifestation since the foregoing was written becomes more and more pronounced—year after year since Oct. 1924.]

(58) It will be recalled that in 1906 Jesse Hemery wrote a letter to our Pastor on the antitype of the Flood year, and that this letter was published in Z '06, 111. It was Jesse Hemery's thought that the Flood year typed one year, *i.e.*, the year from Oct., 1914, to Oct., 1915, as the year in which the Time of Trouble would begin, progress and end. While it is true that the Great Tribulation began in 1914, facts, of course, prove that it has not by any means yet ended. Accordingly, the Flood year could not type the year period suggested by Jesse Hemery. The Scriptures, as our Pastor interpreted them, evidently give us two distinct sets of types connected with Noah's Flood experiences: (1) The days before the Flood (Matt. 24:37-39; Luke 17:26, 27) typing the period preceding the tribulation in its various stages; and (2) the days of the Flood, typing the period in which certain ones are delivered from the destruction which involves others (1 Pet. 3:20, 21). In Vol. IV our Pastor in great detail traced the antitype of the days before the Flood, and we will

treat of them no further in this article, desiring to give some details on what seems to us to be the antitype of the Flood year.

(59) It will be remembered that our dear Pastor explained the Ark as typing "Christ and the power in Him which will replenish and reorganize Society" (A 318). Christ and that replenishing and reorganizing power are summarized in the Abrahamic Covenant, which we all know was made in April, 2045 B.C., *i.e.*, 2044¾ years before Jan. 1, 1 A.D. Therefore it would be in harmony with our Pastor's definition of the Ark's antitype to define its antitype as the Abrahamic Covenant, the embodiment of God's counsel; whose central feature is the Seed of Abraham, The Christ, and whose glorious work of replenishing and reorganizing power is to bless all the nations of the earth (Gal. 3:8, 16, 29). The relation between these two sets of thoughts is that of container to the things contained, and as such give the two sets of antitypes, that on the Ark typing the Covenant being the one explained in this chapter. Thus both sets of antitypes are harmonious. It will also be noticed that there were four human pairs who went into the Ark, as well as at least one pair of every clean and unclean kind of animals. We know that there are four elective classes who in this life obtain a good report through faith in the Abrahamic Covenant: (1) The Christ, (2) the Ancient Worthies, (3) the Great Company, and (4) the Youthful Worthies. Noah undoubtedly types our Lord, who is the Heir of the righteousness which comes to us by faith (Heb. 11:7). These classes we understand to be typed in their respective order by Noah and his wife, Shem and his wife, Japheth and his wife and Ham and his wife, the males apart from Noah representing all the leaders of their respective classes and the females the rest of these classes. We understand the animals in the Ark to represent the non-elect who will ultimately be saved. We understand

the clean animals to represent the Jews, as typically clean, who will be saved, and the Tentatively Justified, as tentatively clean, who will be saved. The unclean animals we understand represent those of the present unclean world who will be saved; while those who perished in the Flood we understand to represent from one viewpoint those who have perished under the Adamic curse, and from another standpoint, the movements and systems of Satan's Empire and the Second Death class. Just as in the type the clean and the unclean animals occupied altogether different positions in the Ark from those of Noah and his family, so in the antitype the Jews and the Tentatively Justified on the one hand, and the prospectively saved of the rest of mankind on the other hand, are quite differently related to the Abrahamic Covenant from antitypical Noah and his family. These animals were placed in the Ark to type that anticipatorily their antitypes would be included in the Abrahamic Covenant. As the Ark in the type was the means of rescue from the Flood, so God's eternal purpose—the Abrahamic Covenant—is the means of safety from destruction. These general remarks will prepare us better to see the antitype of the Flood year.

(60) Apart from those Ancient Worthies who lived before the Covenant, but who were by God anticipatorily considered as in that Covenant, the first ones actually to enter the antitypical Ark—the Covenant—were Abraham and Sarah. Hence the antitypical Ark was first entered by the Ancient Worthies as a class in the persons of Abraham and Sarah in 2045 B.C. The last of all the classes to enter the antitypical Ark consists of the Youthful Worthies. They as a class first entered the antitypical Ark in 1881, when the General Call ceased, and as a result the surplus consecrators became a class different from any other class. Thus between April, 2045 B.C., and Oct., 1881 A.D., the four elective classes actually and the rest

anticipatorily entered the Covenant; and consequently this period is, we believe, the antitypical Flood year, on the principle that types in their time features give us the beginnings of the antitypes. This will become all the more apparent if we consider the Flood year as a leap lunar year plus ten days (Gen. 7:11; 8:14), *i.e.*, an ordinary year of 365 days, which was its actual duration. Ordinary lunar years consist of 354 calendar days, leap lunar years of 355. The lunar year of the Flood was a leap year. Hence we should consider in the antitype that the time from April, 2045 B.C., to Oct. 1881 A.D. was a symbolic year consisting of 365 symbolic days. It was just about 3925.50 years from the Covenant until Oct. 1881. This time, then, would be the antitypical Flood year. A day of such a year would be $1/365$ of 3925.50 years, which is 10.7547945 years. From the standpoint of such a year containing such days we give below a table indicating the exact periods and the years B.C. and A.D. marked typically by the various Flood days mentioned in Gen. 7 and 8, beginning the calculation with the date of the Covenant with Abraham, April, 2045 B.C.

	DAYS	YEARS	DATE
Gen. 7:12	40	430.19178080+	July 1615, B.C.
Gen. 8:4	107	1150.76301364+	April 464, B.C.
Gen. 8:3	3	32.26438356+	July 432, B.C.
Gen. 8:5	70	752.83561640+	May 322, A.D.
Gen. 8:6	40	430.19178080+	July 752, A.D.
Gen. 8:10	7	75.28356164+	Oct. 827, A.D.
Gen. 8:12	7	75.28356164+	Feb. 903, A.D.
Gen. 8:13	35	376.41780820+	July 1279, A.D.
Gen. 8:14	<u>56</u>	<u>602.26849312+</u>	Oct. 1881, A.D.
	365	3925.49999980+	

(61) In this table we have given the exact time from the end of each stage of the Flood year to the

end of the next stage mentioned in days and years as type and antitype, as well as the date B.C. and A.D. when each antitypical stage ended. In each case we are to remember that the date given marks the *end* of the pertinent antitypical day. Each antitypical day began 10.7547945+ years before its end. Hence the antitypical events are to be found within a period beginning 10.7547945 years before the above dates. The total of the years as added—3925.49999980+ — is decimally very slightly shorter than the 3925.50 given above. This almost infinitesimal difference is due to the fact that we stopped with our dividing operation, in finding the length of a symbolic day in the antitypical Flood year, after we reached the eighth decimal, knowing that a difference of only a few seconds would result—a period that is so very short that it could make no difference in our calculations. As in the type the end of each day-period specifically mentioned brought some relief from preceding disadvantages, and was the promise of further relief, so in the antitype the end of each antitypical day, typically indicated, brought a relief from preceding disadvantages suffered by those in the antitypical Ark, and was a promise of further relief. Having made these general remarks we now proceed to give some details.

(62) The first Flood period—the downpour of rain—lasted forty days; and on the theory that a day typed 10.7547945 years of the symbolic year of 3925.50 years, these forty days would represent 430.19178080+ years. With April, 2045 B.C. as the starting point, 430.19178080 years later would bring us to July, 1615 B.C., as the end of the fortieth antitypical day. This antitypical day began 10.7547945 years before. What striking event occurred between Oct. 1626 B.C., and July, 1615 B.C.? We answer, the Law Covenant was made with Israel, beginning exactly 430 years from the Abrahamic Covenant, hence in April, 1615 B.C. During these 430.19178080 years all outside of the

Covenant—the antitypical Ark—were suffering from lack of its shelter; and only those in it were protected from the deluge of the curse pouring down its woes. By entering into the Law Covenant the faithful in Israel received added blessings—otherwise not theirs—though none of them could gain life by the Law. As symbolized by the pertinent ascending passage of the Pyramid they by entering the Law Covenant were lifted up in many ways above those who were not so favored. Thus during the symbolized time—the antitypical fortieth day—relief from past disadvantages and promise of future relief were given those in the antitypical Ark. All of us are sufficiently familiar with the history of the first forty symbolic days of the antitypical Flood year to recognize both the woes of those who were without, and the blessings of those who were within, the antitypical Ark, and to recognize the relief that came toward the end of those forty days to Israel delivered from Egyptian bondage, and the blessings that their Law Covenant brought them.

(63) Five actual lunar months, if they begin as the Flood did, from a date in the second lunar month (Gen. 7:11), consist of exactly 147 days, not 150 days, as the P.B.I. Editors and Directors claim. Hence these five months of the Flood ended 107 days after the forty days' downpour of rain ended. Each one representing 10.7547945+ years, 107 typical days symbolize 1150.76301364+ years, which number of years from July, 1615 B.C. would bring us to April, 464 B.C., the end of the 107th antitypical day. This antitypical day, therefore, began 10.7547945+ years before, *i.e.*, July, 475 B.C. In the type it will be noticed that the Ark rested on the mountains of Ararat at the end of the fifth month (Gen. 8:4). What event occurring within the years 475 to 464 B.C. would antitype the Ark resting on Ararat's mountains? We answer that in 468 B.C. the Persian empire through the

commission that its King, Artaxerxes, gave Ezra (Ez. 7:1-28) furnished very especial support to God's real people and their hopes—the Covenant—and provided for their help especially along religious lines according to the Word of God. While previously this empire favored Israel with respect to their return and the building of their temple, it made no such generous provision for their religious needs as was done in connection with Ezra's commission. Here the antitypical Ark, the Abrahamic Covenant, rested—was borne up—supported—by the kingdom (mountain) that consisted of many kingdoms (mountain peaks). In this connection we might remark that if we should accept the P.B.I. chronology for Ezra's commission, 457 B.C., our date, April 464 B.C., would be seven years too early for Ezra's commission; and if we accepted their theory of the first five Flood months as being 150 days, Ezra's commission would be skipped altogether. Nor could we fix any other event of outstanding importance within the proper period as an antitype of the Ark's resting on the mountains of Ararat. This type is, like the Pyramid, another corroboration of the Scripturalness of our chronology.

(64) In the type the next day-period mentioned—the beginning of the water's subsiding—ended 150 days from the beginning of the Flood (Gen. 8:3), or three days after the Ark rested on Ararat. These three days represent 32.26438356+ years, and ended July, 432 B.C. Accordingly, the last of these antitypical days began Oct., 443 B.C. What occurred during the period between Oct., 443 B.C., and July, 432 B.C.? In Israel Nehemiah in Oct., 443 B.C., finished the first twelve years of his reformatory and defensive work for Israel; and leaving on a brief visit for Persia he shortly afterward returned, and completed his reformatory activity on behalf of Israel (Neh. 13:6-31). This reformation very ably freed Israel from many evils formerly in their midst, and so firmly established

them in their peculiar covenant relations—both in the Abrahamic and Mosaic Covenants—as largely secured them against the demoralizing effect of heathen fellowship and dealings. For centuries from that time onward Israel enjoyed peace and security as a result of the recession of the curse of heathenism from their midst, and remained very largely free from the contaminations of heathendom. Yea, this curse began to abate for them.

(65) The next period in the type (Gen. 8:5) lasted seventy days and on its last day the tops of the mountains were seen. The antitypical seventy days lasted 752.83561640+ years, ending in May, 322 A.D., as its last symbolic day began Aug., 311 A.D. What events occurred between Aug., 311 A.D., and May, 322 A.D., corresponding to the appearance of the mountains from under the Flood? We answer that during those years, *e.g.*, in 313 A.D., the last of Pagan Rome's persecutions ended, after continuing ten years (Rev. 2:10); Constantine made his various edicts of religious toleration, which gave both true and counterfeit Christians religious freedom; and both the true and the false Christianity used their freedom to do what each considered best. During this time, 318 A.D., Arius began his very fruitful work for Truth. Thus religious freedom was for the first time in history proclaimed by earth's mightiest kingdoms, both in the eastern and in the western parts of the Roman Empire, which at that time consisted of two equally authoritative kingdoms, united in one Empire (the mountains of Gen. 8:5). Certainly for the Empire to grant religious freedom to the Christians was a marked stage in the subsidence of the curse, so far as it concerns the Abrahamic Covenant and all therein, howsoever related thereto.

(66) The next period in the type came to an end forty days after its preceding period, and on its last day a raven and a dove were sent forth, the dove, but not the raven, returning in the evening to Noah (Gen. 8:6-9).

These forty days type 430.19178080+ years and bring us to July, 752 A.D., its last symbolic day beginning Oct., 741 A.D. What events occurred during this period corresponding to the sending forth of the raven and the dove? We have already a number of times seen (Vol. III, Chapter II) that a raven is used to represent sectarianism. On the other hand, the dove is used to represent the Holy Spirit, especially of Truth and Love (Matt. 3:16). We understand the raven of these verses to represent Papal sectarianism, especially as it was carried on in Germany and France by Boniface as the representative of Pope Zacharias, who reigned A.D. 741-752, the exact period of the antitypical fortieth day of Gen. 8:6. While previously to 741 Boniface sought to convert German heathen, it was especially after the death of Charles Martel, 741 A.D., that Boniface, instead of seeking to convert the heathen, sought to subject all converted Germany and France to the Pope, and wrought unweariedly to this end for over ten years, and succeeded in Romanizing these countries, driving out all who would not submit to Rome's organization, doctrines and practices. If ever a sectarian lived, it was surely Boniface, whom Romanists call the Apostle of the Germans. Certainly this sectarian's activity brought none of his followers and works to the Abrahamic Covenant (the raven returned not to the Ark). But he did fight to the end, by means fair and foul, every one who would not submit to the Romanizing of their Irish, British, French or German forms of Christianity. His work, especially in France and Germany from A.D. 741-752, more than anything else made these countries bow down at the feet of the pretended successor of St. Peter.

(67) But what corresponded to the dove that was sent out at the same time as the raven was sent out by Noah? We answer that there was an anti-Romanizing movement, led by a Frank named Adalbert, by a

Scotchman named Clement, and by an Irishman named Virgilius, during this antitypical fortieth day. They opposed the worship of angels, saints and relics, pilgrimages and auricular confession, insisted on the priesthood of all the consecrated, and the worship of God in spirit and in truth, as against Rome's formalism. They also rejected the Romish canon law, the obligatoriness of the decrees of the synods, and of the teaching of the Roman Church Fathers, as well as the celibacy of the priesthood. They insisted on the Scriptural teaching of a hope for the dead heathen, and of the selection of a "Little Flock" as the Lord's Bride. These teachings these three men and their followers set forth with clearness and love, and their activity was evidently of the Holy Spirit; and hence it would properly be symbolized by the dove. Boniface secured their condemnation and imprisonment by the civil power, and their ecclesiastical condemnation at a synod at Soissons, France. Soon they recovered their liberty. Then Boniface persecuted them before Pope Zacharias, and secured their condemnation, unheard, at a Lateran Council, A.D. 745. For several years they were persecuted and before 752 they were entirely suppressed and their movement ceased (the dove found no rest for the sole of her foot). Yea, antitypical Noah stretched forth His power and drew back this movement as being premature for the conditions then prevailing.

(68) Seven days later, in the type, Noah sent forth the same dove, and in the evening it returned with an olive leaf in its mouth plucked from an olive tree. These seven days represent 75.28356164+ years, which ended Oct., 827 A.D., the seventh symbolic day beginning Jan., 816 A.D. What movement that was pervaded by the spirit of Truth and Love was active A.D. 816-827? We reply, the anti-Papal Absolutism and anti-Idolism movement led by Claudius of Turin, the principal man of the Thyratira Church, "the first

Protestant Reformer," and, his special helper, Agobard of Lyons. We have already explained the main features of this movement (Vol. III, Chapter I), and refer our dear readers to it for a fresh study. This movement gave more promise than the former, that of 741 to 752, and gave out more Truth, which was by far more widely spread and assimilated. The fuller Truth and greater prosperity of this movement above the former one are represented by the plucked-off olive leaf in the mouth—Holy Spirit utterances—of the dove. This gave our Lord—antitypical Noah—assurance that the waters of the curse were more and more subsiding for the Lord's purposes. Noah's receiving it again into the Ark types the fact that since conditions were not yet fully ripe to let a Holy Spirit movement take its free course in the world, it had again to be withdrawn from work amid the evils of the curse.

(69) Seven days later Noah sent forth a third time the dove, which did not return again to him (Gen. 8:12). These seven days represent 75.28356164+ years, which ended Feb., 903 A.D., the seventh antitypical day beginning May, 892 A.D. What events (A.D. 892-903) correspond to the third sending forth of the dove and its not returning? We reply that during this period Alfred the Great, King of England, was especially active in the interests of Christianity, Law, Order and Education in his realm. Alfred was one of the noblest of rulers, and one of the best men that has ever lived. To his people he was a genuine David, planted in a Christian soil; and it was especially through the educational and religious work that he set into operation in England that the antitype of the dove's being sent forth the third time was realized. He personally and through others translated valuable books from Latin into English, that his people might have the best of literature then obtainable. He founded schools and colleges for the people; he strove to instill the true principles of Christianity in his people; and

among other things translated the Psalms into English, and was the first one during the Dark Ages to render a considerable portion of God's Word into the living language of a European nation. In his noble life and in the movement along religious and educational lines that he brought into being we see the dove spirit, the Holy Spirit of Truth and Love. And the movement so started continued more or less to the present—the dove returned not again to the Ark.

(70) The next date mentioned in the type is the first day of the first month, in the 601st year of Noah (Gen. 8:13). This date came 35 days after the preceding date, and these 35 days type 376.41780820+ years. The antitypical 35 days ended July, 1279 A.D., the thirty-fifth day beginning Oct., 1268, A.D. What corresponding events occurred A.D. 1268-1279? During this time the zeal for anti-Saracen Crusades died out, and Louis IX of France, 1269 A.D. obtained for the French Church many valuable privileges wrung from the Papacy, insuring the French more liberty than the Catholic Church of any other country had. Crusades were encouraged among Christian rulers by the popes to wrest the Holy Land from its Mohammedan rulers. The popes promised full indulgence to the Crusaders who would deliver the holy sepulcher from the infidel Mohammedans. Pope Urban II at the Council of Clermont, France, 1095 A.D., roused France to the first Crusade, and thereby started a movement that soon spread over all Christendom, lasting nearly two hundred years, and dragging down to death millions of men who under the banner of the Cross went forth with carnal weapons to battle supposedly for the Lord with the Saracens. In all, seven Crusades were organized and led against the infidels. The last of these was organized and led by Louis IX of France in 1270. Half of his army, including himself, was that year carried away with pestilence, which ended what proved to be the last anti-Saracen Crusade.

All subsequent efforts of the popes to arouse such Crusades ended in failure. The kings and people had had enough of them; and Acre, the last Christian stronghold in Palestine, was taken by the Saracens in 1291 A.D. Surely the Crusades were a curse, and their ceasing—the waters of the curse drying up—was a blessing to mankind, a distinct relief from some of the rigors of the Adamic curse.

(71) The Crusades ended just 25 years before God, by Philip the Fair, of France, in A.D. 1295, began a great and long series of acts stretching over centuries, whereby He gradually by civil rulers, religious and political reformers and worldly educators and scientists dried up the features of the curse centering in the Papacy, and working against the Covenant and God's people; and by the time Oct., 1881, was reached this drying up process was so complete that mouthpieceship had been (1878) wholly taken away from the Nominal Church, both in Catholic and Protestant sects. This is the period typed by the 56 remaining days of the Flood year. This period of 56 days typed 602.26849312 years, which ended Oct., 1881. The last day of these antitypical 56 days began Jan., 1871. During this antitypical day our Lord returned, raised the sleeping Saints, cast off Babylon, ended the General Call, and began to develop the Youthful Worthies, who were from God's viewpoint anticipatorily in the antitypical Ark with all its other classes from the beginning of the antitypical Flood year. The going forth from the Ark types the entrance of the various classes into the conditions where they will no more need the Abrahamic Covenant, *i.e.*, the eternal conditions of blessedness—beyond the period of imperfection—secured by God's rainbow promise that there will be no more curse, and given when the sacrifices offered to God will be eternally pleasing, in the new heavens and in the new earth (Gen. 8:15-22). Praise be to God for light on the Flood year!

(72) The foregoing raises some questions that we will state and answer:

Question: Why do we say above that the first five Flood months were 147 days and not 150 days?

Answer: The months of the Flood year, like all literal Bible months, were, of course, lunar months. A lunar month averages 29.53059 days; hence the lunar calendar is adjusted to take care of the actual time of each lunation as follows: The odd-numbered months, with occasional exceptions to make up the fraction over 29½ days, and to harmonize the added thirteenth month, are months of 30 days, while the even-numbered months are months of 29 days. The Flood began on the seventeenth day of the second month of the lunar year, hence in an even month. Its first five months ended on the seventeenth day of the seventh month. In addition to covering the end of the second month, these five months covered two other even months, *i.e.*, the fourth and sixth months. Hence these five months consisted of three months containing 29 days each, and of two months containing 30 days each, and therefore lasted 147 days. This fact, as well as others, corroborated by the event—Ezra's commission—on the last one of these 147 days in the antitypical Flood year, proves that the P.B.I. Editors and nominal-church writers in general are wrong in their claim that God, apart from designating the prophetic months in the Old Testament, counted the months as containing 30 days and the years as containing 360 days.

(73) The second question follows: Question: Is it not self-contradictory to teach that the antitypical Flood year began 2045 B.C., and that persons, typical of classes which began to exist thousands of years later, entered the Ark before the Flood began, while these antitypical classes entered the antitypical Ark long after the antitypical Flood year began?

Answer: We are to remember that the antitype of

the days before the Flood year (Luke 17:20, 27) consists of conditions in the world before and especially during the Parousia; while the Flood year represents the time during which the elect classes by consecration entered into covenant relations with God (1 Pet. 3:20 [last clause], 21). Entering the Ark was a part of the former picture. As God in the cases of Abel, Enoch, Noah, etc., anticipatorily gave them the benefits of the Abrahamic Covenant, *i.e.*, treated them as being in that Covenant centuries before it was made, so He anticipatorily considered classes to be in the antitypical Ark—the Abrahamic Covenant—centuries before these classes came into being, on the principle that God "calleth those things that are not as though they were," in view of His plan respecting them (Rom. 4:17). Again, as our Pastor held and as a number of types prove, this type is one that sets forth the Youthful Worthies as a part of the Ancient Worthies; hence they are included in them as entering the Ark before the Flood began. This will harmonize the apparent discrepancy. The reason that no typical reference is made to our Lord's death in the Flood picture is because it would have had to be typed by something done inside the Ark, while the various Flood stages refer to happenings outside the Ark.

(74) Our third pertinent question is: Since Alfred the Great's reform work is pointed out in the antitypical Flood year, should we consider him as one of the Little Flock reformers?

Answer: We rather think he was, because his movement was typed by the dove—a symbol of the Holy Spirit. The other two reform movements—that of Adalbert, Clement and Virgilius (741-752) and that of Cladius of Turin (816-827)—typed by the first and second doves sent forth, were Little Flock movements. And this fact, combined with the fact that a dove represents each of the three reform movements, favors our answer. Moreover, Alfred's character was

certainly that of a Little Flock member. He is probably the noblest and best king that ever sat on a throne. By having the Holy Spirit he was in a position to better even David as a king. There will in all likelihood be representatives of every calling and condition of humanity in the Little Flock, in order sympathetically to assist others of the same calling and condition in life; and we know of no other king who has been so Christlike as was Alfred—one of the very few earthly monarchs who has really deserved the title, the Great.

(75) Our last question is: Why were some lesser reform movements typed in the Flood year, while many greater ones were not?

Answer: Several answers will clarify the question: (1) One of the methods that the Lord used in revealing His purposes in the Bible, is to give "here a little, there a little." In no one passage or place in the Bible do we find everything stated pertinent to any of the more important features of Biblical revelation. It is for this reason that all the reform movements typed in the Scriptures are not represented in the Flood year type, or in any other one type. Hence only certain of them should be expected to be represented in the Flood picture. (2) It seems that this type rather represents the subsidence of the secular features of the curse on the race as such; hence the amelioration of secular evils of the curse, rather than the amelioration of religious evils of the curse, is most prominently emphasized in the Flood year type. This will account for the fact that the more important Little Flock movements are not emphasized in this type, since they were occupied with coping with the religious evils of the curse upon man.

(1) What does our theme require? Of what words in it is this especially true? What is meant by the words, "it all," in the theme? What does our subject mean? What does our theme imply? What does our text mean in connection with our theme? What is implied in denying

special significance in the implied events? How does our understanding of these events advantage us?

(2) What kind of events has happened among us since our Pastor's death? What were our condition and privileges while he lived? What has since set in? What two evil activities have set in since then?

(3) What kind of a significance do some attach to these events? What do they not see in them? Why should we expect to find Scriptural significance in them? How unique are some of these events? Why must they be Scripturally marked? Quote and explain a proof text on this point. What heart condition is necessary to receive the Biblical explanation of them? At least how many lines of Biblical thought are evidenced in these events?

(4) What is the first of these? Into how many and into what divisions were the Lord's people separated in 1917? To what does this separation correspond? How does it do so? What is typed by Elijah's and Elisha's coming to Jordan? By Elijah's smiting Jordan? By Elisha's not smiting? By his walking along with Elijah across the river's bed? By their crossing dry shod? When did the antitypes occur? What is typed by Elijah's and Elisha's walking and talking beyond Jordan? What is typed by their ceasing from these two acts? When did the antitypical separation set in? Who forecast its time quite accurately? When and where?

(5) What proves the correctness of this setting? What four things do facts force all to admit? Of what must these events be the antitypes? Why? What things agree with this view?

(6) What events accompanied the separation—type and antitype? What do chariots symbolize Biblically? What is *the* chariot of antitypical Israel? Why it rather than two other organizations? What does the fieriness represent? What does the fiery chariot represent? What events made the antitypical chariot fiery? What do horses symbolize Biblically? What do the horses under consideration type? What made the antitypes fiery? Whom do the horsemen type? How did they drive the antitypical chariot and horses? Among whom did they drive these? What resulted there from? Explain the division—type and antitype. What were the approximate numbers on both

sides? Of what is this division undoubtedly the antitype?

(7) Why must this division be this antitype? What do all the connected facts imply? How have these facts affected the Tower editors? The P.B.I. editors? What conclusion do their courses corroborate?

(8) What third line of events corroborate the same thought? What is typed by the cry, "My Father, my Father"? "The chariot of Israel"? "The horsemen thereof"? Were there antitypes of these three cries?

(9) What is the proper word to insert after the words, "He saw," in verse 10? Why? What is the force of the word *saw* in verses 10 and 12? Why is it stated in verse 10, "He saw him"? What is meant—type and antitype—by the expression of verse 12, "He saw him no more"? State some of the facts of the antitype.

(10) What is typed by Elisha's rending his garments in twain? By Elijah's mantle falling? Elisha's picking it up? His return to the Jordan? His standing at Jordan His smiting Jordan? By what instrumentalities was this done? When did the three last mentioned acts set in? What did they follow? What kind of events associated with Elijah's and Elisha's separation have we hitherto examined? What do they manifest? What does this prove?

(11) How can we prove who antitypical Elisha is? What is the proof? Why is it conclusive? What does the mantle type? What are the three chief powers typed by the mantle? Who controlled these powers after the separation? What does this prove?

(12) What did the perfect correspondence between the type and the antitype force the Tower editors to do? Why? What did it force the P.B.I. editors to do? Why? How did the Society's president act at the separation and in attempting to explain it Scripturally? What conclusion is favored by these logically forced repudiations? Where are these matters, here summarized, set forth in detail? What kind of an explanation does our view give of the 1917 separation?

(13) What is the second set of remarkable events among the Lord's people since "that Servant's" death? What is the certainty of these events? What are some, of the details in both sets of events in Britain? In

America? How do, both sets of events appear in both countries? What were two smaller sets of events after the chief one first described?

(14) Who did some prominent revolutionizing in 1918? What are some of the correspondencies of their acts with those of the 1917 revolutionists? In what particulars did they revolutionize? With what did this revolutionism meet? Who gave it? To what extent? Who followed the P.B.I. in revolutionism? In what especially did they revolutionize? What revolutionistic movement followed the Standfast movement? In what especially did it revolutionize? What was the last of these general revolutionistic movements? In what did its revolutionism consist? To what did it lead the Faithful?

(15) What is set forth in the two preceding paragraphs? What else did the revolutionists do? What did the Tower editors, especially their leader, do as to our Pastor's teachings? What are some of the particulars on this head? What has the Society's president done with many of our Pastor's arrangements? With what results? What have the P.B.I. done beyond their initial revolutionism? In what particulars? What have other revolutionists above mentioned further done?

(16) What occurred in every case of revolutionism? Through what journal was this especially done? What is the source of its refutations? What have the revolutionists been forced to admit? What two things have they done to the resisters? With what success? Whose examples justify the course of the resisters?

(17) What do such revolutionism and its resistance mean? Where is this matter treated of in greater detail? How can we prove that the Great Company's sin and means of manifestation is revolutionism? Give a summary of Ps. 107. What is meant by darkness in Ps. 107:10? By the shadow of death? By affliction? By iron? By the expression, the words of the Lord, in verse 11? By the counsel of the Most High? Of what does God's Plan consist? How does rebellion against any of its arrangements mean rebellion against the whole Plan of God?

(18) Of whom does Ps. 107:10, 11 treat? With what two things does it charge them? According to it, what is

their manifesting sin? When only can we know that a new creature is of the Great Company? Why can we not be sure of this in connection with other sins? By what does the Lord manifest to the Priesthood the forfeiture of a crown? What passage proves this? Who only judges them unto Great Companyship? What is the Priests' function as to their Great Companyship? Who taught that while in the flesh the Priests would recognize the Great Company as such? Where did he teach it? In what words in the two quotations did he teach it?

(19) What thought must be repeated here? Why must the Priests now be able to recognize the crown-losers as such in their humanity? What three of their ministerial acts toward their humanity require this? What ministerial act toward their new creatures requires this? In what blemished condition would the Priests now be, if they could not discern the Great Company as such? Show this—type and antitype. From what should these considerations restrain us?

(20) What type forecasts the above facts as to the revolutionisms of the Great Company and the Priests' resistance thereof? What does *Azazel* mean? What proves that Azazel's Goat was tied to the door of the tabernacle? When did the last begetting of the Spirit occur? What was thereafter immediately done by the World's High Priest? In what other ways is this work set forth in the Bible? What was greatly emphasized from Sept. 18, 1914, onward? By what means was it done? Who did and who did not do this? What did those new creatures do who did not declare Christendom's sins?

(21) What in the type and the antitype followed the confession of the sins over Azazel's goat? By whom was it done? In what two ways was it done? What new thing did these two things furnish the antitypical Goat? Where did it begin? When did the first loosening act begin in England? With what did the spurt for liberty begin in England? Who was by the Lord and our Pastor selected to handle the British revolutionistic brethren? What did they do after our Pastor's death? What interfered with their dash for liberty? Who successfully resisted their revolutionism and withdrew priestly fellowship from them? What are the types of these two acts?

(22) What error among the brethren was being practiced in America while the English trouble was on? In what ways was it manifesting itself? What did the brother who led the English brethren against the revolutionists do toward the American revolutionists? What effect did this have on the present management and their partisan supporters? In what ways did this effect express itself? What did the World's High Priest do to counter this effect? Through what means? What else did the arbitrariness of the present management prompt the Priesthood to do?

(23) Through what periodical did the World's High Priest continue to resist the revolutionists? What groups and their mouthpieces were such revolutionists? How often was this resistance given? Of what characteristics did this resistance not partake? Of what did it partake? Why? Why is this resistance invincible? How has this been manifested? Who is not and who is the source of this victorious resistance?

(24) What is the third set of remarkable events among the Lord's people since our Pastor's death? To what do these events correspond-type and antitype? Who forecast the manifestation of the Levites in their various groups after the reaping? What is happening before our eyes with this forecast? How many general classes of Levites were there? What were they called? Who among the sons of Levi had no chariots for their work? Who among them had them? How many did each of these groups have? What do wagons or chariots type? Who are the antitypical Levites who have no organizations to control their work?

(25) How many groups of organized antitypical Levites are there? What is the difference between them? To whom do each of them correspond? To what do the three classes of revolutionists correspond?

(26) Into how many subdivisions were these three Levite groups separated? How many subdivisions were there among the Gershonites? The Merarites? The Kohathites? What should this lead us to look for among the three antitypical Levite groups? What do we find in this respect? How many subdivisions have the antitypical Kohathites? What are these, and how do they correspond

to the four Kohathite subdivisions? What do they not have and use? Whom do the Merarites type? What organizations did our Pastor form? Who got control of these at the 1917 separation? How did the Society divide in 1918? What did the Standfasters form? To what did it give place? Of whom are the Society adherents and the Standfasters the respective antitypes? To what do their four organizations correspond? Who are the antitypical Gershonites? What did their British branch seek, but fail to gain? Their American branch? What did these two groups then proceed to do? What are these two organizations? To what does each of these groups correspond antitypically? What has our investigation on this line brought to light?

(27) What objection is offered to this setting of things? How is it to be answered? How many heads of families did the Levites ultimately develop? What do these heads of families type? What, in the Tabernacle, pictures the same thing? What do we see progressing along this line? Is it yet complete? How should this affect our faith in this setting of things?

(28) What had we for years been doing as to the three signs discussed in this article? When did the reaping end? The gleaning? How many reasons have been given in proof? How only can they be explained Scripturally, reasonably and factually? What is in line with this thought? What do they therefore prove? What is the voice of these events? What agrees with this?

(29) What follows as to the character of the Editor's work since our Pastor's death? How have the revolutionists represented him? What does the above setting do to these representations of him? What has the Lord done to his work? What uses has the Lord made of him? What does this setting of things prove should be done to the revolutionists? Describe the progress of the Editor's treatment of them. What are they proven to be? What tactics have they been using on the Editor?

(30) How have they misrepresented his plainness of speech? How has his conduct when being questioned by their prosecutor been misrepresented by them? How has his defense of the brethren against their revolutionism been misrepresented by them? How have they misrepresented

his standing before Justice? What disproves this charge? What have they done as to his character? What does their revolutionism prove of them? What do his retention of the Truth and its arrangements and his giving of the meat in due season prove of him and of them? How should his course be treated? What will best help the bewildered ones to recognize his place and work in the Lord? What qualities are necessary for such a recognition? What do the signs of the times say as to him and his opponents?

(31) Of what does the article of Z '26, 115-119 give an illustration? To what perversions did the illustrated course lead? Whom especially do the sympathizers with the view set forth in the article understand to be meant disapprovingly by it? What standing, similar to that of many Societyites, do some who left the Society have? What similar experience do both have? Why? How, on the contrary, have others fared? What proves this answer to be true? How does advancing Truth stand related to past Truth? What must be the character of the alleged Truth which antagonizes the past Truth?

(32) What proof have we that the Epiphany teachings are true? That J.F.R.'s are erroneous? What two conclusions follow from these two facts? Despite what is J.F.R. the head of the little Antichrist? What is the real character of the sacrifices of his followers? Of his alleged advancing light? What parallel will he continue to fulfill? What guarantees his overthrow? Why will God overthrow him? Why is he now being allowed to attain higher and higher elevation? What will result as he lights from the fall?

(33) What to him known falsehood does he reiterate? Where will this be proven? With what is he charged? Why does he in this matter misrepresent our Pastor? How is this item introduced by him? In our Pastor's case of what is his progress in teaching justification by faith an illustration? What statement is repeated in the text? What proves this? Why did he so teach? What did he begin to do in 1909 on this subject? While teaching both tentative and vitalized justification before 1909, how did he thereafter teach them as not before? What does J.F.R. do with tentative justification? By what

claim? How does he belie our Pastor therein? How did the latter clarify the pertinent Truth? Wherein does the article under review teach falsely? What is to be said of J.F.R. in this connection?

(34) Against what does paragraph 15 of the reviewed article rightly inveigh? For what are those inveighed against to be congratulated? Than whom do they do better? By what would they do still better? What day have we not yet reached? Why not? What results from this? What should not be done with everything offered us as light? Why not? By what criteria may we judge as to what is advancing light and what is darkness? Why are these proper criteria? What do they prove J.F.R.'s alleged advancing light to be? As to the Epiphany teachings? How does Azazel set it forth? Through whom? What flows from these things as to the pertinent claims of the article under review? What do the pertinent facts and Scriptures prove as to J.F.R.? What has he occasioned? What may be construed there from? To what appeal should these things lead? Why should this appeal be heeded? In what interests should its contrasted appeal be heeded? Why?

(35) What does Prov. 4:18 show? Why is this true? What only should be accepted as the advancing light? Why? How do some stand on Prov. 4:18 and our Pastor's explanation of it? What is that explanation? What is the theory of such brethren as to the matter of the advancing light? What proves that we are not yet in the perfect day? What proves that such brethren are not in harmony with our Pastor's pertinent thought? What fact does not disprove that the light still advances? What comparison illustrates this? What was given above?

(36) What does the fact that our Pastor had charge of the storehouse not prove? What fact occurring while he was yet alive would not be against the view that is here opposed? What was, and what was not the duty of such finders of new features of Truth? What are some facts proving that not all new features of Truth became clear to him first? How does Matt. 13:52 prove such facts as of Divine origin? In disharmony with what fact do these facts not stand? If not then, how about now, since he no more has charge of the storehouse? How

does the pertinent figure prove this? What are the pertinent facts implied in this figure? How do the facts of this figure apply to the case at hand? What do these considerations prove as to the point under review?

(37) What should be said as to the pertinent errorists' view of our Pastor's office functions? As what did he function? As such how did he function? What flows from this as to his having a successor? While acting as the Parousia messenger what did he also give? Why is this? What work as such did our Pastor not have? What results from this as to his pertinent teachings? To what period does the gathering of the Great Company and Youthful Worthies belong? For this work what kind of truths also are needed? What follows from this? What do the facts of the case prove? What are some of these facts? What kind of matters are these things? What did he make when dealing on these undue things? In what are these remarks not made? Despite what could he not see things not yet due? What resulted from this fact when he attempted to explain undue things? What are some illustrations on this point?

(38) Based upon 1 Pet. 1:12; Rom. 15:4, what view did our Pastor hold up to 1909 as to the understanding of the Bible by 1914? What, after 1909, induced him to change his mind on this thought? What knowledge, not had by him, would have prevented this change of view? Why? What follows from this? What did he say while dying, as to the true explanation of Revelation and Ezekiel? What four things in the book of Revelation did he tell the Bethel family were not understood by him? What pertinent thing did he tell the convention at Dallas, Oct. 21, 1916? What is implied in the two above-mentioned facts? How is the same thing implied in his saying that what was uncertain to him as to the time relation of sprinkling the Goat's blood and dealing with Azazel's Goat would be clearly understood by those who would witness the latter? What do all these facts imply? What four general things, accordingly, prove that the light would advance after our Pastor's death? What results there from as to the view under examination?

(39) What occasioned the foregoing discussion? What do the readers understand? What are the only publications

that do this? Where is this stand set forth? What has been done with it? Who will support this statement?

(40) What is this stand? What does it, accordingly, embrace? As to two or more different, but harmonious interpretations of his on the same point? As to such as are not harmonizable? With what exception? As to unfulfilled types and prophecies? When only would we set aside an interpretation of his on such types and prophecies? In this whose example do we follow? What are some cases to the point? What two things does this stand prove of the author? Hence, what kind of changes alone in principle will he make as to our Pastor's teachings? Who will agree to this stand? Why?

(41) What is the author's stand as to unsound new things? While recognizing that many unsound things are presented, what does he nevertheless recognize? To whom do these new things pertain? From what kinds of passages do these come? What will the writer do with such things? Why? To what things will such new things be subjected? What are these axioms? What will be done with things contradicting these?

(42) To what was reference made above? How many, among others, has the writer oppositionally written to the author? What specifications were omitted in the first three? What pertinent reply was made to the first two? How were these replies treated? What in the Sept. 1926, Present Truth induced the brother to write a third oppositional letter? What accusations did the third letter contain? How was the third treated? Why? What did the brother mail Oct. 31, 1926? What is here done with this fourth letter?

(43) What is a summary of the argument of the letter quoted as paragraph (43), as to all new light ceasing at our Pastor's death? What is the general tone and object of the letter?

(44) What will be left to the Lord in this letter? What was done with the articles referred to in the letter for reading? What are the author's attitude and activities toward their principles? What is his belief as to the Dawns' being the Bible arranged topically? What does the letter claim as to the meaning of that expression? Why? What is the first disproving fact against its claim?

The second? The third? The fourth? The fifth? The sixth? The seventh? What do these seven reasons prove? What does the expression mean? Why is this true? How do the cited passages prove this view? What eighth fact proves that the Six Volumes do not give all the light of the Bible? What other fact proves that our Pastor did not give all its light?

(45) How many counts does the letter allege as a proof that the author "teaches contrary to our Pastor"? Even to what degree? What proverb is illustrated by this alleged count? What two paragraphs are said to contain this count?

(46) How does the first of these two paragraphs read?

(47) How does the second read?

(48) Which of the two quoted paragraphs does the letter's writer think the author contradicts? How does the author apply the words, "Your old men shall dream dreams; and your young men shall see visions"? What warrants the application of the passage to the Millennium? What in truth may be said of our Pastor's explanation of these words? Why? What does he not explain as to the young men and the old men? His application of the passage to the Millennium may favor what interpretation? What second thought may he have meant? What third thought may he have meant? What may be said of any or all of these three thoughts? Why is his explanation no proper basis for the letter's charge? Why did our Pastor not have the full light on the subject? Though teaching that the Youthful Worthies would be the Ancient Worthies' Millennial associates, what did he never offer in proof of his thought? How did he come to the thought? Where only has he treated of the Youthful Worthies thus? What is not cited in these five passages? Why this absence of proof from Bible passages? What has occurred in the Epiphany as to such passages? Of what is our Pastor's comment on the pertinent words a fine illustration? How is our pertinent course not to be understood? Why was it not to his disparagement? What weightier examples prove this? What was the character of our Pastor's interpretations of things due?

(49) What is to be marked? How is this answer proven true? What was given our Pastor as the basis of

his explanation of the pertinent clauses of Joel 2:28? What did he do with the mistranslation? Why? How do Bible translations treat this matter? How many of them were by the author consulted on this verse? How many of them change the wording, but not the thought? What three things prove the translation under study to be wrong? What conclusion follows this? What is positive proof that this passage was not due to be understood in our Pastor's day? On the other hand, what may be said in his defense? Of what may we be sure as to this passage, if he were living now in the Epiphany? Why is this to be believed?

(50) What should be here repeated? Why? What else do we not contradict? What is the actual condition as between the Pastor and the author on this matter? What six things warrant the quotation of the proverb on mountains travailing and bearing an insignificant mouse? What should the author receive, if this little thing is all that can be charged against him in defense of the solemnly grandiose accusation of the letter under review? Why do self-styled defenders, like the letter's writer, harm the Truth? What will be passed by without further than a brief comment? What is it? What in the letter will not be accepted? What will the author's course continue to be? How? Why? Despite what? With the refutation of the letter and with the proof that its writer repudiates our Pastor's thought on the advancing light, what two things naturally come to mind?

(51) What question is raised on the nature of the advancing light by *The Dawn*? What answer does it give? In disharmony with what is its answer? How long did our Pastor hold his pertinent thought? Where is it elaborated? What is the lesser truth on the advancing light? The greater truth thereon? Which is the one specially emphasized in Prov. 4:18? What did he do with it? How long? What fact corroborates this answer? What would have lent more corroboration thereon, had he lived to write it? Why is this so? How does *Dawn* give its thought as the truth in relation to the larger truth? What two conclusions result therefrom? What Scripture is fulfilled in this state of things? How many things do the pertinent facts prove? What is the first

and especial one of these? What facts prove this? The second? The third? To evade what two things did Dawn come to champion this error? Why does it attempt to evade the second of these two things? What does a combination of the Parousia and Epiphany Truth prove of Dawn on this point, in the first place? In the second place? How do the cited passages prove the second thought? What will the Lord do shortly with Dawn's strictures against the writer for "seeing himself in the Scriptures"?

(52) What question did the author ask our Pastor at Bethel in 1916? What was his answer? What impression did his manner of answering give? What did he fail to give thereon? What has been done on this matter since the Levitical manifestations began? What conclusion should be drawn as to the involved 40 days from the frequent typical use of 40-day periods as typing the Parousia? If asking the question now, with what would the author not connect the following 10 days? Why not? If asking the question on the 10 days in 1921, how would the author have framed it?

(53) Where is the type of the firstfruits connected with the Passover and Pentecost recorded? What is typed by the first ripe sheaf and its presentation before Jehovah on Nisan 16? How do the cited passages prove this? To what does the expression *firstfruits* always refer? And never to what? How do the cited passages prove this? What is typed by the high priest's presenting and waving the first ripe sheaf before the Lord, Nisan 16? To what condition can the presentation and waving of the two wave loaves not refer? Why not? To what condition do they refer? Why so?

(54) How did our Pastor explain the antitype of the two loaves? How does the citation prove this? To what are the terms, Little Flock and Great Company, equivalent? How does the cited passage prove this? How do these two loaves type these two classes? What is the parallel type of the presentation of the loaf typing the Little Flock? How do the cited passages show this? What two things are brought out in the presentation of Aaron's sons in the consecration service? How is the Great Company involved in that picture? How not? On

the contrary, in the finished picture where and in what is the Great Company's presentation as such typed? What is typed by the second loaf in the finished picture? To what time did it belong in 1921? What will such a presentation of them be? Until when must the activity of the second loaf's antitypical waving wait? In whose service, negatively and positively? What proved that their waving was future to 1921?

(55) Of what is our Lord's initial presentation of the entire Church the antitype? What is typed by our Lord's 40 days' pre-ascension teaching of the disciples on the Kingdom? By His delay of 10 days after the ascension before presenting the Church to God? By His presenting the Church on Pentecost to God? Of what will the presentation of the Great Company be the finished picture? What does this seem to imply? What seems to be implied by the complete presentation of the Truth Levites? What should [in 1921], therefore, be expected to set in before the fall of 1924? In view of what? By what is this typed? How does the cited passage prove this? What does Jesus give the Epiphany-enlightened priests to recognize in the meantime? How do the works with Azazel's Goat and with the Levites compare and contrast with one another as to sphere of activity? As to leading the Goat to the Gate and the fit man and the first three pre-consecration works on the Levites? As to Lev. 16:20-22 and Num. 8:7-21 in general? What things in the former are not mentioned in the latter? What is the chief difference between the two passages?

(56) In 1922 by when was the presentation of the Epiphany Levites expected to have begun? Whom was it not expected to include? Why not? What was not to occur until after 1924? What also was not then expected to have occurred by that time? What was then more harmonious with the manner of the fulfillment of other time types? How is this manner of fulfillment indicated as to the time feature of Lev. 23:11, 15-17? As to the ends of the 1290 and 1335 days? As to the 2520 years' parallel? What seems to be the pertinent Scriptural rule when many individuals of a class are involved? What would this imply as to the date Oct. 1924, and the Great Company wave loaf? What other thing corroborates

this? What was in 1922, accordingly, to have been expected? When would certainty come?

(57) What did the questioner seem to have in mind? What were the antitypical 50 days? What was the period of the antitypical 50th day? How long had we been in the antitypical 50th day when the question was answered? How long had the forecast been fulfilling when the answer was given? What peculiarity has been working in the various Levite movements as to their time relation to one another? How does the citation prove this? With what date did a series of annual parallels in Levitical movements set in on the presentation of good Levites? Against what do good non-Epiphany Levites not revolutionize? Of whom is that kind of revolutionism characteristic? What should not be expected of good Epiphany Levites? Against what may they be expected to revolutionize? What has since sometime during the antitypical 50th day been occurring among good Levites? How long to the day after similar acts characterized the bad leaders of Levite groups. What in this connection was not expected by Oct. 1924? What was suggested as a probability for the period, Oct. 1924, to Oct. 1925? What was suggested as a probability as to pertinent manifestations after the end of the small eighth wonderful day? What has marked the cases already manifested? With what would that be in line? As they would do this, what would Jesus be expected to do? What would this imply as to the Little Flock? In antitype of what?

(58) What did Jesse Hemery do in 1906 that was that year published in the Tower? What was his thought on the flood year? What do facts indicate as to his view? What do they prove as to his view? How many antitypes do the Scriptures give on Noah's flood experiences? What is the first of these? The second of these? Where did our Pastor give details on the first of these? What will be here done with the second of these?

(59) What, according to our Pastor, did the Ark type? In what is this antitype summarized? When was this covenant made? How long before Jan. 1 A.D.? What would be in harmony with our Pastor's definition? Why so? What is the relation between these two lines of thought? How are these two sets of antitypes to be

harmonized? How many human pairs went into the Ark? At least how many pairs of clean and unclean animals? How many and what are the elect classes? What are typed by the four human pairs? What are typed by the animals that entered the Ark? What do the clean animals represent? What do the unclean animals type? What are the lines of thought typed by those who perished in the flood? What is typed by the clean and unclean animals' occupying different parts of the Ark from the four human pairs? Why were these sets of animals put into the Ark typically? How does the Ark type the Abrahamic Covenant in their missions? What will these general remarks help us to do?

(60) Who were the first to enter the antitypical Ark? How is this related to the pre-Abrahamic Covenant Ancient Worthies? When was the antitypical Ark first entered by the Ancient Worthies? In the persons of whom? What class of the elect was the last to enter the antitypical Ark? When? As a result of what? Between what times did the elect classes actually enter the Ark? How and when did the rest enter it? What, accordingly, is the antitypical Flood year? On what principle? How will this become all the more apparent? What is the difference between an ordinary and a leap lunar year? Which of these two kinds of years was the Flood lunar year? How should we, therefore, consider the actual Flood year, type and antitype? How long was the antitypical Flood year? How long would a day of such a year be? On the basis of this, how long are the periods marked typically by the chronological periods of the typical Flood year?

(61) What is indicated by the dates of the two sets of Flood years in the tables given at the end of the preceding paragraph? What must be remembered as to the dates given in the table? How long before its end did each antitypical day begin? Accordingly, when are the antitypical events of the antitypical days to be expected to have occurred? Why is the total of these years not exactly 3925.50 years? What is typed by the fact that the end of each mentioned day brought some relief and gave promise of greater relief? What will now be taken up?

(62) How long did the first period of the Flood last?

What did it bring? How long did the antitypical 40 days last? With April, 2045 B.C., as the starting point, when did these antitypical 40 days end? When did the 40th begin? What notable event occurred during the last of these antitypical 40 days? During the antitypical 40 days what happened to all outside of the Ark? To those inside the Ark? What did the faithful in Israel receive by entering the Law Covenant? Despite what? How is this symbolized in the Pyramid? Accordingly, what happened during the 40th symbolic day? With what are we familiar?

(63) How many days did the first five lunar months of the typical Flood year last? How long after the 40th day did they last? How many years did these 107 days type? To what date from July, 1615 onward did these years lead? When did the 107th antitypical day begin? Whereon at the end of the fifth month did the Ark rest? What antitypical event occurred between 475 and 464 B.C.? How had the Persian Empire previously favored Israel? How did that compare with its helps to Israel through Ezra? What was then done to the Covenant? What three remarks do these facts suggest as to the P.B.I.'s chronology, which puts Ezra's commission in 457? What, accordingly, like the Pyramid, does the Flood year do for the true chronology?

(64) What happened on the 150th day of the Flood year? What do the involved 3 days type? When did the antitypical 3 days end? What occurred at the beginning of the 3rd antitypical day? Shortly thereafter? What followed Nehemiah's return to Jerusalem from Babylon? What did Nehemiah's work accomplish for Israel? How long did the effects of this reformation last? In antitype of what was this?

(65) How long did the next period of the Flood year last? What appeared at its end? How long did the antitypical 70 years last? When did they end? When did its 70th day begin? What events occurred between Aug., 311 A.D. and May, 322 A.D., typed by the top of the mountains appearing above the flood waters? What is the antitype of the mountains appearing? How were these events beneficial to the Abrahamic Covenant and those in it?

(66) How long until the next Flood year period ended? What were sent out of the Ark on the 40th day? How long did the antitypical 40 days last? To what date do they bring us? When did the antitypical 40th day begin? What does a raven type? How is this Scripturally shown? What does a dove type? How is this Scripturally shown? In whom was the antitype of the sending forth and the remaining away of the raven fulfilled? As what? When? What had Boniface previous to 741 been doing? After what event did he begin a sectarianizing work? As such a worker how may Boniface be described? What do Romanists call him? What was the twofold effect of his strenuous labors?

(67) What is the antitype of the dove sent out at the same time as the raven? What did the anti-Romanizing movement do? When? Who were its three leaders? What Romanist doctrines and practices did they oppose? What positive truths did they set forth? How did they set forth these teachings? How is this symbolized? What twofold condemnation did Boniface secure against them? After their liberation what did he then do against them? What were the results of his further persecution of them? How are their untoward experiences typed? What was thereupon done? How is this typed? Why did the involved movement not prosper?

(68) What occurred 7 days later in the type? What do these 7 days type? When did they end? When did the antitypical 7th day begin? What Spirit-pervaded movement was active from 816 to 827? Who were its two main leaders? Where has this movement been explained? What should be done with that explanation? How does this movement compare with the one of 741-752? How is its greater prosperity typed? What assurance did this movement give our Lord? How is this typed? What is typed by Noah's receiving the dove a second time into the Ark?

(69) What did Noah do a third time 7 days later? What did the dove no more do? How many years do these 7 days represent? When did the antitypical 7 years and the 7th begin? What events correspond to the third sending of this dove and its not returning? What

is said in the text of the character and works of Alfred the Great? Of what is the dove's course the type? What is the antitype of the dove's not returning?

(70) How long later did the next mentioned typical event occur? How many years are typed by these 35 days? When did the antitypical 35 days end? When did its 35th begin? What two special events occurred during the period of 1268 to 1279? What is a short description of the crusades? How many of them were there? Who led the last? How did they end as a whole? What effects followed popes' subsequent efforts to arouse others? What was their result? The result of their ceasing? How is this typed?

(71) When relatively to Philip the Fair's anti-papal activities did the last crusade end? Who through him began a centuries-long opposition to the papacy? Through whom? What did He thereby accomplish? As the antitype of what? What had already been thereby accomplished by 1881? By what days of the Flood year is this period typed? How many years are typed by these 56 days? When did they antitypically end? When did the 56th antitypically begin? What great events occurred during their last antitypical day? How had the Youthful Worthies been in the Ark during the antitypical Flood year? What is typed by the going forth from the Ark? Under what conditions? What should we render to God for light on the Flood year?

(72) What is a question raised by the foregoing study on the Flood year? What kind of months were those of the Flood year? How long is a lunar month actually? By the lunar calendar? Which lunar (calendar) months are of 30 days? Which of 29 days? When did the Flood begin? When did its first five months end? In what even months were these five months? In how many even and odd numbered months were they? How did they come to amount to 147 days? What does this fact, among others, corroborated by the time of Ezra's commission, do with the P.B.I's and the nominal-church writers' contention?

(73) What is the second question arising from the preceding discussion on the Flood year? What do the conditions before the Flood type? The Flood year? Of what was entering the Ark a type? What benefit in this

connection did God give Abel, Enoch and Noah? By contrast how did He treat classes who came into existence long after the Covenant was made? On what Bible principle? On what other principle may the Youthful Worthies be said anticipatorially to have entered the Ark in 2045 B.C.? What does this do with our question? Why is no typical reference made to our Lord's death in the Flood year picture?

(74) What is the third pertinent question? What is the answer to this question? What is the first reason for this? What similar movements suggest this answer? What symbol of all three movements suggests this answer? What bearing on the answer has Alfred's character? What other reason suggests this answer in Alfred's favor? How was his character, compared with that of other kings?

(75) What is our last pertinent question? What is the first reason given in answer to this question? What is the second reason given in the answer thereto?

A gentle dove
'Scaped from the casement of the Ark, and spread
Her lonely pinions o'er that boundless wave.
All, all was desolation. ...
Nor found her weary foot a place of rest. ...
With drooping wing the peaceful Ark she sought.
The righteous man that wandering dove received,
And to her mate restored, who, with sad moans,
Had wondered at her absence. ...

Then the waters dried,
And the green branches waved, and the sweet buds
Came up in loveliness, and the meek dove
Went forth to build her nest, while a thousand birds
Awoke their songs of praise, and the tired Ark
Upon the breezy breast of Ararat
Reposed; and Noah with glad spirit, reared
An altar to his God.

CHAPTER II.

CALLS—SIFTINGS—SLAUGHTER WEAPONS.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE ARTICLE, THE LAST RELATED ACTS OF ELIJAH AND ELISHA. GENERAL REMARKS ON MATT. 19:27—20:16. GENERAL REMARKS ON 1 COR. 10:1-14. GENERAL REMARKS ON EZEK. 9:1-11. THE FIRST CALL—SIFTING—SLAUGHTER WEAPON. THE SECOND CALL—SIFTING—SLAUGHTER WEAPON. THE THIRD CALL—SIFTING—SLAUGHTER WEAPON. FOURTH CALL—SIFTING—SLAUGHTER WEAPON. FIFTH CALL—SIFTING—SLAUGHTER WEAPON. SIXTH CALL—SIFTING—SLAUGHTER WEAPON. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

IN VOL. III, CHAPTER II, it was our privilege to set before the dear brethren the "Last Related Acts of Elijah and Elisha," from the standpoint of type and antitype. This article first appeared in The Present Truth No. 1, December 9, 1918. There appeared in the January 15, 1919, "Labor Tribune," and later in the "St. Paul Enterprise," an article by J.F. Rutherford, endorsed by his six associates in bonds, repudiating our Pastor's interpretation of this subject, accepted by us and set forth in our above-mentioned article, also repudiating his and his associates' view of the subject as published in Z. 1918, beginning page 51. Apparently our presentation in No. 1 came into his hands, and was recognized by him as refuting his views given in Z. 1918, page 51, etc.—views that were given to answer our understanding of the subject; for it is worthy of note that his new view did not appear until six weeks after the publication of our reply to the article in Z. 1918, page 51, etc.

(2) In Present Truth No. 6 (Vol. III, Chap. II), we answered his first and second new views. Some have wondered why we spoke of the dear brothers as in bonds in a paper that was not circulated until several months after their release. We reply that we wrote the article in question late in January, and had it printed in February, 1919, with the article on the

"Last Related Acts of Elijah and Elisha." The reprint was made, in part, because No. 1 of *The Present Truth* was a small edition, and had been restricted for circulation as nearly as possible among Truth people who are not adherents of the Society. We knew from certain Scriptures that our dear brethren would be released, and rejoiced greatly when we heard of it; as we were greatly grieved when we learned of their being put into bonds. So in January we decided not to publish the number before May, and so dated it. When May came, we again decided to postpone circulating the paper, believing that the interests of the brethren before the courts would be better subserved by silence on our part. (In this and in every way we knew how, we and others, falsely accused of betraying them, protected them against their prosecutors. We even went so far as to send word through M.L. Herr to J.F. Rutherford advising him, from what we had learned, along what lines the prosecution was working, that he might thus be forearmed. And yet, how thoroughly he has succeeded in misleading thousands of dear, unsuspecting sheep into the belief that we and others betrayed him and his associates and belong to the Judas class!) Then came his illness. All these things, as well as certain Epiphany Scriptures, kept back the circulation of the involved issue.

(3) In his article in *Z.* 1918, page 51, by the connection in which the following language occurs, he gave the impression that we were repudiating, and that he was holding to, our Pastor's view of the last related acts of Elijah and Elisha: "Where a brother gives an interpretation of a Scripture which differs from that given by our Pastor, and the latter's interpretation seems reasonable and in harmony with the plan of God, then we believe it a safe rule to follow his interpretation, for the reason that he is the servant of the Church, so constituted by the Lord for the Laodicean period; and therefore we should expect the

Lord to teach us through him. Where there arises a doubt in the mind as to which interpretation is correct, then it is always safer to resolve that doubt in favor of our Pastor's interpretation. We believe such to be in harmony with the Lord's will." We say Amen to this; and in view of his often published repudiations of our Pastor's view of this subject, and his substituting several different views, we suggest that the Lord's words, "Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee," apply to him. Hence we advise all the dear brethren to cling to that view of this subject that is in harmony with "that Servant's" view, and that the fulfilled facts prove to be true; and to repudiate the unsteadwardly, unbiblical, unreasonable and unhistorical views set forth by J.F. Rutherford and his associates, each one being contrary to his preceding view and his own principles, so ably and truly stated in the above quotation of his own language.

(4) In the texts Matt. 19:27—20:16; 1 Cor. 10:1-14; Ezek. 9:1-11 is given a prophetic history of the Gospel-Harvest, both in its gatherings and siftings; and we desire to study in this chapter this prophetically outlined history for our enlightenment, encouragement and exhortation. The Lord bless us with meek hearts that we may be profited thereby (Ps. 25:7-9).

(5) All of us recall the interpretation that our dear Pastor gave in Vol. III to the Parable of the Penny, *i.e.*, that the day of the Parable was the Gospel Age; that its first call period was the Harvest of the Jewish Age; that its last call period was from 1881 to the end of the Gospel Harvest; that its other calls were in periods between these two calls, and that the evening and the giving of the Penny were connected with Kingdom honors beyond the veil. But this view raised the difficulty before his mind that the murmuring must occur in Heaven—an impossible thing. This made his mind open to another interpretation that puts the murmuring this side of the veil, in the end of the Harvest.

This necessitated a change of view as to the day of the Parable; for if the day were the Gospel Age, this would make many called before 1881 live many centuries, in some cases over 1800 years, to receive their Penny. Hence he concluded that the day of the Parable was the Harvest period—1874-1914—and held this view from 1910 until his death. In Z. 1914, p. 171, col. 1, pars. 1-5, he sets forth briefly his general change of view from that of Vol. III; but does not give details, as these would have been too strong meat for the Sunday School teachers, for whom the Sunday School lessons were specially prepared, and for whom they were at that time separately published.

(6) When we study the Parable and its context we recognize this later setting of things to be true. The Parable was given to prove how there would be a difference manifested among the Lord's people connected with the giving of the hundredfold—the Penny of the Parable; for we are expressly told that the hundredfold is our reward in this life. (Compare Matt. 19:29 with Mark 10:29, 30.) Matt. 19:16-30 tells us the story of the rich young ruler and of the ensuing conversation. The disciples, knowing that earthly riches were a sign of God's favor under the Law, could not understand Jesus' remarks on the special difficulties experienced by the rich in gaining the Kingdom. After Jesus explained this, Peter asked what the twelve would receive for their sacrifices. Then, having answered him, Jesus added what His other followers would get, promising them a hundredfold in this world and eternal life in the world to come. Then in v. 30 He points out that there would be *a difference between certain ones whom He calls first ones and last ones in their receiving the hundredfold in this world, and life eternal in the world to come*; whence He proceeds to illustrate these two things by the Parable of the Penny, introducing it by the word "for," which proves that the Parable is given to prove the statements of

Matt. 19:29, 30 as to the difference in distribution of the hundredfold and the eternal life. A second argument also proves this: for after He finishes the Parable He draws the conclusion as a proven one: "So the first shall be last, and the last first," the very remark that He set out to prove, as Matt. 19:30; 20:1 show. The break in the chapter causes many to overlook the fact that the word "for," introducing the Parable, proves the Parable is given to explain Matt. 19:29, 30.

(7) The expression, "The first shall be last and the last shall be first," is in the Bible used to designate not individuals but classes. Apart from Matt. 19:30; 20:16 and Mark 10:31, it occurs nowhere else in the Scriptures, except in Luke 13:28-30, where the Little Flock and the Ancient Worthies are undoubtedly contrasted. Here, therefore, it refers to two classes, *i.e.*, those called last, the Little Flock, would be the first in rank among the two ruling classes in the Kingdom, and those called first, the Ancient Worthies, would be last in rank among the two classes. Therefore our understanding of the language used in Matt. 19:30; 20:16; Mark 10:31, in harmony with the class use of this expression in Luke 13:30, is the following: Those reached as the last group by the Harvest call would (as a rule) be among the first in rank (the Little Flock) of the two spiritual classes; and those reached as the first group by the Harvest call (and this group embraces, as a rule those called before the eleventh hour) will be among the last in rank (the Great Company) of the two spiritual classes. In other words, this Parable is given by the Lord to show that, connected with the giving of a certain feature of the hundredfold, symbolized by the Penny, *i.e.*, *that feature which the fulfillment proves to be the twofold smiting of Jordan*, an experience would occur that would manifest a separation of some of the Lord's people from the Little Flock into the Great Company;

and that those so separated would get their Penny after the others. All of us agree that the hundredfold represents the Lord's blessings to us as New Creatures in this life, such as special knowledge of the deep things, special fellowship, special opportunities of service, etc., embryo Kingdom honors. The Parable is intended to show that there would be a difference in the giving of a certain feature of the hundredfold, *i.e.*, opportunities of service—to the two consecrated classes, and that their separation would occur in connection with the Great Company receiving their hundredfold, their penny, *i.e.*, opportunity of smiting Jordan the second time. These general remarks will assist us to recognize the scope and purpose of the Parable.

(8) The day of this Parable we understand to be the Harvest period, 1874-1914. It is, therefore, a symbolic day of 40 years. A working day among the Jews was a period of 12 hours (John 11:9; 9:4). Hence, a symbolic working day of 40 years would have twelve symbolic hours, and each of them would be 1/12 of 40 years, *i.e.*, 3 years and 4 months. Accordingly, the 12 hours of the Parable would begin as follows: (1) October, 1874; (2) February, 1878; (3) June, 1881; (4) October, 1884; (5) February, 1888; (6) June, 1891; (7) October, 1894; (8) February, 1898; (9) June, 1901; (10) October, 1904; (11) February, 1908; (12) June, 1911, and the day would end and the evening begin October, 1914. In his Penny Tract, C.J. Woodworth altered the setting of the day from what our dear Pastor held from 1910 onward, making it begin October, 1881. He also altered the hours, making them three years in length. Hence, his day was one of 36 years, and, therefore, ended October, 1917. But this brought him into manifold difficulty: (1) it ignored the first call period of the Harvest—"early in the morning"; (2) it assumed a symbolic day of 36 years, a thing nowhere mentioned in the Scriptures, while a 40-year day is mentioned there (Ps. 95:7-11, etc.); (3)

it implied that his Penny (Vol. VII), which was given out July 17, 1917, was *distributed before his evening came*, which began October, 1917; (4) *it implied that all got their Penny at the same distribution, and not at two different distributions, as in the Parable*. His interpretation, in so far as it differs from "that Servant's," involves, also, other inconsistencies and incongruities, some of which we will note as we proceed with this chapter.

(9) The Parable brings to our attention five calls, each one particularized (vs. 1-7), and one sifting (vs. 8-16). As we are here giving only general considerations on our texts, we leave their particulars for discussion further on in this chapter.

(10) This passage expressly teaches that it applies to the Harvests of the Jewish and Gospel Ages. This is proven in v. 11, which is correctly translated in the Diaglott as follows: "But these things occurred to them typically; and were written for our admonition *on whom the ends of the Ages* have come." It will be noticed that the words "ends" and "Ages" are both here translated as plurals, and this is correct. Jesus says that the Harvest is the end of the Age (Matt. 13:39). Hence, in this verse at least two Harvests and two Ages are meant, *i.e.*, the Harvest of the Jewish Age and the Harvest of the Gospel Age; and only these two Harvests are meant; because in these two Harvests only, as Harvests, is the Church specially tried and in special need of admonition, encouragement, etc., amid her trials. Hence, this passage is easy to place chronologically. Its time in the Gospel Harvest is the same as the day of the Parable of the Penny; but it treats some of the happenings of this day from a different standpoint from that of the Parable. This Scripture does not particularize five calls as the Parable does. Instead it gives a general description of the calling work of the Harvest. It calls attention to the fact that the events of vs. 1-5 are typical of events

connected with "us." This is seen from v. 6 (compared with v. 11), when the word *typoi* is properly translated *types* instead of "examples." V. 1 shows typically our experience during the Harvest as we are led by the Word (under the cloud) amid the race in Adamic Death (the sea) after leaving symbolic Egypt. V. 2 shows typically our consecration into Christ amid such conditions. These two verses have also an application to the faithful in the end of the Millennium. Vs. 3 and 4 show, typically, our spiritual food and drink. In these verses the call features of the Harvest are shown as one work, without particularizing five periods in which they were enacted, as in the Parable. V. 5 introduces, typically, a general statement of the sifting work of the Harvests; and vs. 6-10 set forth, typically and antotypically, the trying experiences of these five siftings, admonishing, warning, encouraging and exhorting, as the case may require. This section of Scripture does not describe the sixth sifting, which takes place after the Harvest, *i.e.*, after October, 1914; for it expressly *describes those only which occur during the ends of the Ages* (v. 11), *and not after the ends of the Ages*. Hence, this Scripture does not refer at all to the sifting of Matt. 20:8-16. So far our study has shown us five calls and five siftings during, and one sifting after the Harvest.

(11) In Ezek. 9 we have a picture that is closely related to our other two texts, and that describes the same general period and thing. This passage helps to cement the other two together; and the three combined give us a splendid illustration of the principle, "here a little and there a little," as one along the lines of which the Bible is written, and as one requiring us to compare Scripture with Scripture. A study of this Scripture will reveal to us the calling work of the Harvest given in a summary, somewhat like that of 1 Cor. 10:1-4, under the symbol of the work of the man with the writer's inkhorn, and not distributedly as in the five

calls of the Parable; while the five siftings of 1 Cor. 10:5-14, and the sixth sifting, that of Matt. 20:8-16, are given under the symbols of the six men with slaughter weapons, slaying in the temple, in the courts and in the city.

(12) In his book Ezekiel throughout represents the Lord's people (and not "that Servant" alone, as Vol. VII teaches) at the time of the fulfillment of the events symbolized, just as John does in the Revelation. But two instances will suffice to prove this: (1) Ezekiel lying on one side 390 days (Ezek. 4:5, 9) symbolizes the Church doing certain things 390 years, a thing that could not be true of our Pastor alone; (2) the man with the measuring reed (Ezek. 40:3, 4, etc.) represents "that Servant," while Ezekiel in this transaction represents the Church being instructed by him. How often did he exhort us with thoughts like those in verse 4! In 1908 he told us that the six men with slaughter weapons represent six classes of evil-doers; therefore they do not represent, as Vol. VII affirms, the antitypical Elijah; for he is no evil-doer. Nor do they represent six European kingdoms, as Vol. VII also affirms; for these will not kill all of those without the mark, since this would imply the literal death of all except Truth people in Christendom; and since these powers will have perished before some without the mark will be killed; and since they have killed some having the mark. Moreover, Vol. VII makes one class kill literally, the other symbolically—a perversion. Our understanding of these six men is that they represent the six sifting classes—from 1878 until the last sifting is over. This interpretation will, under examination, prove to be in harmony with the Scriptures, Reason and Facts. Their slaughter weapons represent the six sifting errors and practices that the *sifters have used and are yet using*. Their coming from the North gate represents that they were, from the Divine standpoint, Great Company

members even before they would begin their sifting work; and their standing beside the brazen altar indicates that their work has some relation (oppositional) to the antitypical sacrifices.

(13) Who is represented by the man with the writer's inkhorn? Vol. VII and most of the brethren understand that he represents "that Servant." We are satisfied that he is greatly involved in the symbol; that he was the earthly leader of the class symbolized by the inkhorn man; but, among others, for three reasons we do not think that he alone is symbolized by the inkhorn man: (1) If the six slaughter-weapon men represent six classes, it is highly probable that the inkhorn man represents a class; (2) "that Servant" alone did not put the ink on the foreheads of all that sighed and cried in the city, nor did he put all of it on some foreheads; *e.g.*, some who could not read got the Truth from others, and not from him. This is also true of some of the blind. So, too, many were too prejudiced to read until orally they had been taught much of the Truth by others than "that Servant"; while others who did read his writings did not understand many things in them without the help of other brethren. Thus the facts prove that he did not, by the written, printed or spoken word, put the ink on all that sighed and cried in the city. Hence he alone does not seem to be symbolized by the inkhorn man. Although he furnished us with the horn, the Truth literature, and put the ink, the Truth, into it, and put it upon incomparably more foreheads than any one else, yet he did not put it on all foreheads, nor all of it on some foreheads, where it was put. In this we all co-operated with him; hence, the symbol includes others than himself. Doubtless the writer referred to in the expression, "a *writer's* inkhorn," is "that Servant," for he furnished us with the inkhorn, *i.e.*, he wrote for us the Truth literature, and put into it the ink, the Truth. (3) The seal of God (Rev. 7:2, 3)

represents the same thing as the ink. The angel here is a multitudinous one—"until we have sealed the servants of God on their foreheads." This angel represents God's people in their capacity of ministering the Truth to their brethren who did not yet have it (C 303); therefore, for the end of the Age, this angel represents the reapers, and not Jesus alone, as Vol. VII teaches; and for the end of the Age symbolizes the same thing as the man with the writer's inkhorn, who, therefore, represents all of God's people in the reaping time in their capacity of teaching their brethren the Truth.

(14) It will be noticed that the inkhorn man is not represented as going forth five times, as is the case of the Householder in the five calls (Matt. 20:1-7); rather his work is given in summary, and not in detail. Comparing our three texts we note that they dovetail into one another; and each supplies what is lacking in the others to make a complete picture, which we get only from a comparison of all three texts. Ezekiel and Paul distribute the siftings, but not the calls; Matthew distributes the calls, but not the siftings; Matthew supplies the sifting that Paul omits; Matthew supplies the distributed calls that Ezekiel and Paul do not distribute; Paul supplies the siftings that Matthew omits, while Ezekiel gives all of them. In our study of these three texts we will dovetail them into one another, and all of us, we trust, will find a wonderful harmony subsisting between them. They give us a wonderful prophetic history of the Harvest period in its gatherings and siftings. We now proceed to give particulars.

(15) It will be noticed that, unlike the other four calls of the Parable, the first is not limited to one hour. Its time is referred to as "early in the morning" (Matt. 20:1), while each of the other calls is connected with its particular hour, "third hour," "sixth hour," etc. There is a reason for this variation of expression: the

general call ceased in 1881; hence the general call was going on throughout the first and second hours of the Parable, *i.e.*, October, 1874, to February, 1878, and February, 1878, to June, 1881. It was because the early morning call, *i.e.*, the first call of the Parable, as a part of the general call, extended over the first two symbolic hours of the Parable that the Lord altered the time expression for it from that which He uses of the other calls. This significant point is wholly lost by starting the day with October, 1881.

(16) Turning to the history of the Harvest, we find that there was a call that went out from October, 1874, to June, 1881, which brought many people into the Truth, gathering them in quite a number of cases into classes. In proof of this we refer to Z. 1916, pp. 171-173. The work was extended and fruitful. Our dear Pastor assured us in 1914 that it was in September or October, 1874, that he first recognized that the Lord's Second Advent would be invisible; and he began at once to teach it to others. This was undoubtedly the first special Harvest Truth given to the Elijah class in the antitypical *second* cake of bread and cruise of water at His second waking; and with this event we begin to date the 40 symbolic days' journey to symbolic Horeb, the general reaping period (1 Kings 19:7, 8); for the object of our Lord's return for the Restitution of all things had been recognized for years before 1874; *e.g.*, by Brother Storrs, editor of the *Bible Examiner*, from whom our dear Pastor learned in part to understand it before 1872 (Z. 1916, p. 170, col. 2, par. 6). The latter's learning to understand the first distinctive Harvest Truth about October, 1874, marks that date as the one with which the Harvest began. Shortly afterward he published his booklet on the "Object and Manner of Our Lord's Return," which seems to be the first distinctive Harvest publication. According to Z. 1916, p. 170, pars. 1-4, this was before 1876. In 1877 Mr. Barbour published, under

our Pastor's patronage and direction, a booklet entitled "The Three Worlds," which, with the latter's "Object and Manner of Our Lord's Return," was widely and fruitfully distributed. Furthermore, from shortly after October, 1876, to January, 1879, "The Herald of the Morning," a monthly, edited by Bros. Barbour, Russell and Paton, was circulated, giving the Harvest Message. These three, particularly the last two, did much Pilgrim work, traveling over a wide territory, covering most of the States East, and not a few West, of the Mississippi. July, 1879, The Tower appeared, giving the Harvest message. Before 1881 Mr. Paton published the Truth edition of his book, "Day Dawn," which, after 1881, he corrupted with error. Besides these three most prominent harvesters, there were a number of other able harvesters during its first call, "early in the morning." Thus we see that throughout the first two hours of the Parable, *i.e.*, from Oct., 1874, to June, 1881, many harvesters swayed the sickle of Truth, reaped many stalks of wheat and gathered them into sheaves, classes, *e.g.*, in Allegheny, Pa., Rochester, Dansville, N.Y., Almont, Mich., etc., every feature of this work being plainly manifest as early as the year 1876, and some features of it were performed before 1876. Thus the fulfilled facts with reference to the call, "early in the morning," agree with the thought that the day of the Parable began in the Fall of 1874, and that there was a call of two symbolic hours, *i.e.*, 6 years and 8 months, before the call that occurred from June, 1881, to Oct., 1884, *i.e.*, the call of the Parable's third hour, which, minus four months, the "Penny Tract" makes the first hour.

(17) Before discussing the siftings and slaughter weapons we desire to ask our readers to study the article entitled, "These Things Were Types," in Z. 1913, p. 198. A few remarks on this article will, we believe, prove helpful. It was our privilege in the Spring of 1910 to write out an extended discussion of 1 Cor. 10:1-14,

and hand it to our Pastor. After studying it, within a week he made a brief abstract of certain features of our communication and handed it to us, asking us to go over it to see whether it fairly represented those features of our thought. This abstract, with several brief additions that we made to supply certain important omissions, is word for word the article which, over three years later, he published under the title, "These Things Were Types," in *Z.* 1913, p. 198. As the article shows, he omitted many of our details. Doubtless one reason why he held the article back so long was because certain of our conclusions applied to the future, and he wanted to wait and see whether the future would reveal the fulfillments. In several particulars the fulfillments came; but in one of them the fulfillment failed to materialize, *i.e.*, we expected the antitypical plague of Num. 16:46-50 to affect also the Truth people, which did not occur. It seems that after he was well assured that our general view of 1 Cor. 10:1-14 was correct (for he was at first doubtful as to several particulars), he published the article without changes, apart from several of our additions, from his abstract, which we returned to him early in June, 1910. The Lord gave us this understanding, we believe, as a reward for our faithful service of the Truth in the 1908-1910 sifting (a service so earnestly engaged in and so long continued that it resulted in brain fag, which "Harvest Siftings," whose writer did not speak from personal observation, very uncharitably and untruthfully called insanity. Our Pastor's course with this article, in publishing it in "The Tower," showed that he had a totally different opinion of our mental condition! Had he thought us insane, would he have restarted us in the pilgrim work 3½ months—by the way, a very short time to recover from brain fag—after the supposed insanity began?)

(18) While five of the siftings, as well as the five calls, can be traced in the Harvest of the Jewish Age,

we limit our study in this article to the Harvest of the Gospel Age. As we study these calls, siftings and slaughter weapons, we will see that chronologically there is a sifting and a slaughter-weapon activity during each one of the call periods, a thing that is not true of the chronological setting of things that C.J. Woodworth gives to the Parable, except in his first call period, which covers the third hour call, minus 4 months, as our dear Pastor viewed it. A study of the situation enables us to see that there should be such a sifting during each one of the call periods; for in the call, "early in the morning," there had to be a sifting at its middle, the Spring of 1878, when the fullness of the Gentiles came in (B 210-218), in order to shake out those whose crowns fell to those coming in as the fullness of the Gentiles. Hence we find a sifting during the first call beginning in 1878. So, too, from 1881 onward, the four large calls following could not have occurred, unless there were four large castings off, manifested by their four subsequent siftings; for we know that no one would have been called after the Fall of 1881, unless some of the previously called ones had lost their crowns, the predestinated number being full October, 1881. This is another point that corroborates the call periods chronologically as "that Servant" viewed them, and that contradicts the call periods as C.J. Woodworth gave them in his "Penny Parable Tract." If we had no other argument than this, his setting of the chronology of the Parable's fulfillment would be proven untrue. His view does not permit what the facts of the five calls, coming as they did during the Gospel Harvest, require, *i.e.*, accompanying siftings proving that many crowns were lost and that large callings were required to fill the large number of places lost by those whose crowns lapsed. Accordingly, we find a large sifting and slaughter-weapon activity accompanying each of the five calls, and that beginning in each case a little after its corresponding

call began, as was written: "Go ye *after* him" (Ezek. 9:5).

(19) "Now these things were types of us ['upon whom the ends of the Ages have come,' v. 11] to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted" (1 Cor. 10:6). In these words St. Paul points out, type and antitype, the first sifting in "the ends of the Ages." The typical transaction is in Num. 11:4-35. Shortly after leaving Egypt the people received Manna as their food by Divine provision (Ex. 16:1-36). About a year later, shortly after leaving Mt. Sinai, the people began to weary of the Manna and to pine after the foods that they had had in Egypt. Their ungrateful murmuring displeased Jehovah and Moses. Nevertheless the Lord gave them according to their desire, sending them flesh in the form of quails from across the east arm of the Red Sea, called the Gulf of Akabah; but with the flesh He sent a plague (induced by their gluttony), which wrought much havoc and death among them. Their strong desire for Egyptian food, accompanied by their murmuring, St. Paul describes in the words, "as they also lusted," and warns those living in "the ends of the Ages" not to "lust after evil things, as [in the type] they also lusted." Hence we recognize by St. Paul's Divinely inspired explanation that the story of Num. 11:4-35 is typical, and that its antitype is found in "the ends of the Ages." St. Paul's mentioning this story as the first of the five types of the five Harvest siftings proves that it types the first Harvest sifting.

(20) For the historical details of this sifting we refer our readers to Z. 1916, pp. 172, 173. We will here show how it was typed in Num. 11 and symbolized in Ezek. 9. Manna is used in the Bible as a type of food for heart and mind, the Truth (1 Cor. 10:3, 4), and as Christ is the Truth (John 14:6) it types Him, especially as the Ransom (John 6:31-58). Just as the Israelites wearied of the literal Manna and

longed for Egypt's fleshpots, so antitypical Israelites, first in the Spring of 1878, began to weary of the Truth, especially with respect to the Ransom, and longed for teachings in harmony with the present evil world. Among Truth people, Mr. Barbour was the first to weary of, and to renounce the Ransom, which he did in the Spring of 1878, thus becoming the leader of the class who cast off the Wedding Garment "when the King came in" (Matt. 22:11-13). Not a few Truth people followed his unholy course. The faithful teachers in harmony with the Lord's will shortly afterwards began to defend the Truth against Mr. Barbour's fundamental error, and completely refuted him (binding him hand and foot); while by his struggling to defend his errors he was logically driven to discard one truth after another, until he was in outer darkness, in full error, seeing darkness for light, eating the unclean foods of the symbolic world, with as many as he could mislead among the Truth people.

(21) Nor did Ransom-denying limit itself to the Truth people. It shortly became frequent among the clergy and among many of their followers to deny the vicarious death of our Lord and to set Him forth merely as our Example, not as our Redeemer; and thus the symbolic plague infected vast numbers among the tentatively justified. Even beyond these it reached those who had no real faith in the Savior at all, though called Christians, *i.e.*, those "in the Camp," working in them the denial of the Ransom as they imbibed the doctrines of Evolution, Spiritism and Christian Science, all of which logically or expressly deny the Ransom. These began after the Summer of 1878 to spread greatly. Verily they despised the antitypical Manna, the Ransom, and partook of the antitypical quail, no-ransomism's theories belonging to the present evil world! "He gave them their request; but sent leanness into their soul" (Ps. 106:15).

(22) The same general lines of thought are given

in Ezek. 9 in the symbol of the first man with the slaughter weapon. Having above given general explanations of this picture, we will here take up details. First we note in harmony with what we have just seen, that it was appropriate that the first slaughter-weapon man should take his place at the altar, since his slaying work was related to a service connected oppositionally to the Sin-offerings. In harmony with the charge, "Go ye after him," we find that the harvesters wrought several years, *i.e.*, from the Fall of 1874 to the Spring of 1878, before the first sifting class began their work. The first sifters certainly smote with their slaughter weapon, which we understand to be no-ransomism. They spared no one, being eager to infect, and thus slay, every one with their no-ransom error. The knowledge of the Truth prevented their slaying those who received "the mark." And true enough, they began with the ancient men in the sanctuary, *i.e.*, they began to spread their no-ransomism among the consecrated Truth people, singling out first among these the leaders and the elders. Thus the no-ransomers defiled the house, the consecrated Truth people, with error (1 Cor. 3:17); and the defiled parts were slain as new creatures, died as new creatures—*i.e.*, ceased to be God's people (Heb. 6:4-6; 10:26-29).

(23) Next after defiling the house, these no-ransomers, with their slaughter weapon of no-ransomism, filled the courts with the slain. In the courts were the tentatively justified—and the plural, courts, seems to be used to indicate that the tentatively justified would be in the various denominations. We are not to understand the symbol of this or any other slaughter-weapon man to mean that the same persons did the slaughtering in the sanctuary as did it in the courts, or as did it in the city; rather that they were the same class of persons, *i.e.*, no-ransomers; *e.g.*, the no-ransomers among the Truth people did not slay especially in the

court. This was done especially by the clericalistic no-ransomers. Even as we have seen in Vol. III with reference to the wise and foolish virgins going forth since 1829, while they are now of the same classes as then, they are not now the same persons as then. So in the Sanctuary, as no-ransomers, Mr. Barbour and his associates were of the first slaughter-weapon man; yet not they, but some of the clergy and their associates as no-ransomers, were the first slaughter-weapon man slaying in the courts, *i.e.*, destroying those of the tentatively justified *as such* who imbibed their no-ransomism; and the first slaughter-weapon man, the no-ransomers, who slew in the city, which was related to the Temple, as the camp in the wilderness was to the Tabernacle, were not Mr. Barbour and his associates, nor especially the ransom-denying clergy, but the Evolutionists, the Spiritualists, the Christian Scientists, etc. Their slaying in the city symbolized their infecting with no-ransomism those who were called Christians, but who were not even tentatively justified, destroying them as nominal Christians. Accordingly, as the plague, typed in Num. 11:33, 34, has slain among the consecrated, the tentatively justified and the worldlings we recognize it to be the same as the first slaughter weapon, *i.e.*, no-ransomism, since the latter did the same work as was typed by the plague of Num. 11:3, 34, *i.e.*, slaying in the temple, in the court, and in the city. It should be here noted that the threefold sphere of activity, both in the types of Moses and the prophecy of Ezekiel, appears in all six of the siftings, and in all six of the slaughter-weapon men's activities, *i.e.*, the sifting, the slaughtering, affected the unworthy ones among the consecrated, the tentatively justified and the merely professing Christians. How remarkably our three texts dovetail into one another in every way!

(24) We are told that the householder agreed with the laborers for a Penny a day (Matt. 20:2). It is

certain, whether we view the early morning call as from 1874 to 1881, as our Pastor did, or as 1881 to 1884, as C.J. Woodworth does, that at neither of those times was Volume VII offered as the Penny to those who would labor throughout the day, as during that period nothing was said of seven volumes, it being thought about 1884 that three or four would suffice. But it is certain that a hundredfold in this life has been offered throughout the whole Gospel Age to the Lord's servants, and this was done, therefore, from October, 1874, to June, 1881, as well as throughout the rest of the Harvest. Hence C.J. Woodworth's Penny was not promised those called "early in the morning"; but the hundredfold, as the Penny, was.

(25) According to our Pastor's understanding of the chronology of this Parable the third hour was from June, 1881, to October, 1884. C.J. Woodworth's view fixed the third hour from October, 1887, to October, 1890. During the latter's third hour there were neither large numbers called into the Truth nor did a sifting then occur, two considerations that are fatal to his theory; while his explaining the second call as the first, and his making each hour three years, force him entirely to ignore the first call of the Harvest and to claim parabolic calls when there were no such calls made. Only in the call periods were large numbers called; only a few individuals being called at other times. If we look at the events from June, 1881, to October, 1884, we do find a widely extended call made during that time. The Lord arranged for this second call by giving our dear Pastor the light on the Tabernacle in 1879, at which time He gave him as "that Servant" charge of the storehouse, while previously he had been exercising the executive function of that office "over the household." The details respecting this call and its attendant sifting are found in Z. 1916, p. 173, col. 1, par. 6, to end of page 175. In this call some of the previously employed agencies for the calling

work were used, *i.e.*, "The Tower," the booklet, "The Object and Manner of Our Lord's Return," and the Pilgrim service. To these as parts of the sickle the Lord added two booklets, one of 161 pages, entitled "Food for Thinking Christians," and the other a somewhat smaller one, entitled "Tabernacle Shadows." Of the former 1,400,000 copies were distributed by mail and during three successive Sundays at Church doors by district messenger boys. Those who became interested thereby were on inquiry sent "Tabernacle Shadows," and later were sent "The Tower" regularly. By the use of these various agencies, particularly by "Food for Thinking Christians," several thousand persons came into the Truth. Thus the man with the writer's inkhorn went forth "into the city," and certainly with the Truth comforted those who sighed and cried because of the errors of doctrine and the wrongs of practice prevailing in "the city"—Christendom.

(26) "Neither be ye [who are living in 'the ends of the Ages'] idolators, as [typically] were some of them; as it is written, 'The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play'" (1 Cor. 10:7). In this language St. Paul gives us an allusion to the type of the second sifting. This type relates to the making and worshiping of the golden calf, etc. (Ex. 32:1-35). The golden calf was an idol; and an antitypical idol is anything, apart from God, to which one devotes himself in supreme service. Antitypical idols are therefore of various kinds; but the chief one here meant is a creed idol. A creed idol is the product of one or more minds, and is always a false religious belief. Noting that in the third hour call, *i.e.*, June, 1881, to October, 1884, very many people came into the Truth after the general call ceased, we conclude that there must have been many who then lost their crowns and consequent opportunities of service, these being apportioned to the newly called. Hence we are to look for a sifting at that time. And true enough,

we find one which was manifested by various ones thinking out wrong religious beliefs, and devoting their powers to propagate them. These wrong beliefs were *infidelistic* in character and, in part, correspond to the golden calf, their inventors correspond to Aaron, and their dupes to the idolators of Ex. 32. Among the Truth people Messrs. Paton, Adams, Jones, etc., during the Parable's third hour made this idol, and their followers from among the Truth people in considerable numbers worshiped it. Their views were an infidelistic repudiation of the plan of God and the substitution of a theory of self-atonement without a Ransomer. Scarcely a doctrine of the plan but they perverted, and led many to serve their golden calf.

(27) In the nominal church, where the tentatively justified as a rule were, there arose infidelistic men repudiating the inspiration of the Bible, as well as others of its doctrines (the sinless birth of Jesus, His resurrection, miracles, etc.) and advanced instead the products of their own intellects, the theory and findings of Higher Criticism. Their chief leaders were Mr. Wellhausen, of Germany, and Mr. Kuenen, of Holland, who with their colaborers from 1882 onward circulated widely their infidelistic views and many were they that became antitypically plagued, spiritually fevered into an unsound mind on religion (Ex. 32:35) by worshiping this form of the golden calf.

(28) Unjustified ones throughout Christendom were inveigled into worshiping the golden calf of grosser infidelism in the form of Rationalism, Deism, Pantheism, Materialism, Agnosticism and Atheism, propounded during the third hour by Messrs. Ingersoll, Huxley, Helmholtz, Bradlaugh, etc. The sons of Levi (Mal. 3:3) who rallied at Moses' call to slay the idolators represent the Lord's people in and out of the Truth (in the type the Tabernacle and the priesthood were not yet in existence) who have with the sword of the Truth refuted (slain) the servants of infidelism

among the Truth people, among the Church systems, and among worldlings outside of these systems. The plague (Ex. 32:35) of the second sifting was *Infidelism*, which crazed many minds on religious and other theories.

(29) Infidelism was also the second slaughter weapon. The infidelistic persons spreading infidelism are represented by the second man with the slaughter weapon doing his slaying work. True to Ezek. 9 infidelistic persons, *i.e.*, men like Messrs. Paton, Adams, Jones, etc., began in the third hour to advocate their infidelism among the Truth people, killing as new creatures those of them who imbibed their infidelistic theories, *i.e.*, they slew in the Temple, defiling the house. They began this work shortly after "Food for Thinking Christians" was sent forth, *i.e.*, they went *after* the inkhorn man. Soon afterwards in 1882 the higher critics became busy with their slaughter weapon in the courts, *i.e.*, among the tentatively justified in the Church systems, influencing many of them to repudiate the inspiration of the Scriptures, etc., and serve Higher Criticism, thus killing them as tentatively justified persons. Very shortly after this grosser infidels, led by such as are above named, began an intensified activity, reaching people of the world outside of the Church systems; and, infecting them with their grosser forms of infidelism, killed them as professed Christians; because they influenced them to give up all profession of Christianity. Thus in the second sifting we see how Infidelism as a slaughter weapon slew in three spheres: (1) some in the temple, (2) some in the courts, and (3) some in the city, even such as were not in right heart condition, just as prophesied in Ezek. 9. Hence we note how our three texts dovetail into one another in this call, sifting and slaughter weapon.

(30) The third call was in the sixth hour (Matt. 20:5). It was, therefore, three hours after the second

call. Three hours of three years and four months each equal 10 years; hence the sixth hour was from June, 1891, to October, 1894. Specially large numbers did not come into the Truth from October, 1896, to October, 1899, C.J. Woodworth's sixth hour. Nor was there a general sifting at that time, though there was some trouble locally at Allegheny beginning before October, 1896, while the large call and sifting of the period from June, 1891, to October, 1894, are entirely ignored by his view. Here again the fulfilled facts prove "that Servant's" view to be correct.

(31) Certainly there was a very extended call in the real sixth hour of the Parable. The Lord continued to use "The Tower," the "Pilgrims," "Tabernacle Shadows" and certain Tracts during this call; but gave the call especially through the *Colporteurs*, who, greatly increasing in numbers beyond former years and working with much success, had in the first three volumes a splendid sickle. And the Lord greatly blessed their efforts. Of course, there had been some Colporteur work before this hour; but now it became greatly extended. Many people were brought into the Truth during those years, a fact that demonstrates that many lost their crowns, making the sixth hour call necessary. There are yet many people of the sixth hour living.

(32) The third sifting is described historically and thoroughly by our Pastor in 90 pages of a booklet, entitled "A Conspiracy Exposed," now out of print, wherein he in great detail exposed the offenses and refuted the charges of the sifters who published and worked against him before he exposed them. This sifting, beginning about the Passover of 1892, worked rather secretly among certain leaders and some of their followers for two years before it became worldwide among Truth people at the Passover of 1894. Its main leaders among the Truth people were Messrs. Von Zech, Bryan, Roger and Adamson. They sought

to corrupt the Truth methods by *combining* with them Babylonian methods, advocating a discontinuance of the Colporteur work and seeking to substitute for it *paid* and *titled* preachers, who should take up collections, who should do much begging, and who should offer to loan the volumes to those showing interest in their preaching, but otherwise keeping the volumes out of sight. Failing to induce our Pastor to combine the Harvest with Babylonian methods, they by falsehoods sought to ruin his reputation; but in the end forsook the Truth movement.

(33) Before describing the workings of this sifting among the tentatively justified and the mere professors we desire to introduce St. Paul's language treating of this sifting, type and antitype. "Neither let us [in 'the ends of the Ages'] commit [antitypical] fornication, as [typically] some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand" (1 Cor. 10:8, compared with Num. 25:1-18). *Baal Peor* means Lord of the penis; and alludes antitypically to Satan's ruling in symbolic fornication—an illicit union. Its proponents' wrong theory and practice may be called *Combinationism*. Just as fornication is an illicit union of persons who should be separate; so it is used to type illicit combinationism. The sixth hour sifters among Truth people were antitypical fornicators; because they illicitly combined Truth and Babylonian methods. Seeking to induce others thereto for their own personal gain and honor, they from another standpoint are fittingly typed by Balaam (2 Pet. 2:15, 16; Rev. 2:14). Their being publicly proven and exposed as such wrong-doers antitypes Num. 25:4, 5.

(34) During the sixth hour Combinationism also wrought havoc among the tentatively justified, who are usually found in the nominal church. In this the clergy led, seeking in each denomination to unite its various sects, and seeking interdenominationally to combine the various denominations in the Federation

of Churches, and Protestantism with Catholicism. Through the World's Congress of Religions at the Chicago World's Fair in 1893, they sought to unite Christianity with all other religions. This was an illicit combining of things that should have been kept separate, symbolic fornication. Zimri [sung] represents the combinationistic clergy. Cozbi [lies] (Num. 25:6-18) types the new, false world religion concocted by the Congress of Religions, teaching the Fatherhood of God for all men, the brotherhood of all men; the equality of all religions; and the acceptableness of all religious service to God, provided it is honestly given. The clergy were illicitly united with this World-religion in a most public manner at that time and occasion, antityping Zimri's public and illicit union with Cozbi. Phinehas [brazen mouth], the oldest son of the then high priest, Eleazar, as the chief under-priest types "that Servant," the chief under-priest in the time of the antitype. The javelin which he thrust through Zimri and Cozbi types the article in Z. 1893, pp. 323-349, entitled "Echoes from the World's Great Parliament of Religions," afterward with elaborations published in Vol. IV, chap. 6. By that article our Pastor thrust the combinationistic clergy and the new World-religion through, completely refuting them. But its errors infected very many of the justified.

(35) Of deep interest to us antitypically is Num. 25:10-13. While our dear Pastor was, in 1879, made "that Servant," in the teaching function of that office, at the time the Tabernacle became clear to him, neither he nor anyone else this side the veil learned of it until 1894, when the Lord made it clear in antitype of Num. 25:10-13. This doctrine was first set forth by "that Servant" to the Church at large in Z. 1896, p. 47. As in the type Phinehas was recognized as the chief under-priest, and was singled out as a specially honored and used priest among all under-priests before the people, because of his loyalty, so in antitype, after "that

Servant" hurled the antitypical javelin through antitypical Zimri and Cozbi, it was made known from the Lord among the Truth people that he was "that faithful and wise Servant." Here a type represents an individual.

(36) Combinationism was active among mere professed Christians who had no real relation to Christ. Combinations in Capital and Labor were greatly increased at that time. France and Russia then formed the Dual Entente, which later, with Britain's accession, became the Triple Entente. The Triple Alliance was renewed in the sixth hour. Lodges, clubs and associations also greatly increased at that time. Thus the facts show that Combinationism wrought during the sixth hour among the Truth people, among the justified, and outside among mere professors.

(37) The same line of thought is given in the symbol of the third man with the slaughter weapon (Ezek. 9). The third man himself types the combinationists; and his slaughter weapon, Combinationism. His beginning his slaughter work in 1892 proves that he went forth *after* the inkhorn man started the third call. His slaying (1) in the house, (2) in the courts, and (3) in the city, represents (1) his defiling with combinationism certain new creatures unto death, (2) certain justified ones unto the loss of their tentative justification, and (3) certain mere professors unto the loss of all claim to Christianity. Thus again our understanding of the calls, siftings and slaughter weapons dovetails the facts of the Harvest's gatherings and siftings into one another so as to prove true our view of our texts.

(38) The fourth call occurred in the ninth hour, three symbolic hours, and therefore ten literal years after the sixth hour. This would fix the ninth hour from June, 1901, to October, 1904. C.J. Woodworth's ninth hour, October, 1905, to October, 1908, had no special call or sifting in it, except what, beginning in

its last few months, was due—as will be shown in connection with the fifth call and sifting—to the fact that these few months were the beginning of the eleventh hour call and sifting, from February, 1908, to June, 1911. This chronological condition of affairs is a conclusive proof that he has misinterpreted the chronology of the Parable, which refutes his view.

(39) In the fourth call, *i.e.*, that of the ninth hour, the Lord continued to use previously existing agencies, *i.e.*, The Tower, many old Tracts, the Pilgrims and Colporteurs, but gave the call more especially through the Volunteers, who of course had previously done some work, though by no means on so large a scale. In 1901 they began a wide distribution of the "Hell Tower." The next year, "Our Lord's Return" and "The Parousia, Epiphaneia and Apokalypsis Towers" were widely distributed. This distribution occurred mainly at Church doors. The debate with Dr. Eaton, both as spoken and printed, was a part of this call, as well as the volunteer work resulting therefrom. Many people by these agencies were reached and brought into the Classes. In many places Classes doubled their numbers. Thus we find a well-defined call bringing many new laborers into the vineyard in the ninth hour—from June, 1901, to October, 1904.

(40) Accompanying this call was, as was to be expected, a large sifting, set forth in type and antitype in St. Paul's language: "Neither let us [in 'the ends of the Ages'] tempt Christ, as some of them [in the type] tempted and were destroyed of serpents" (1 Cor. 10:9; Num. 21:4-6). Because the Edomites refused them permission, as a short cut to Palestine, to pass through Edom, the Israelites had to make a circuit of Edom; and the journey being a dreary one many tempted Moses, Christ's type, by blaming him for their lot and making it hard for him. In punishment fiery serpents bit them. Edom types Christendom, and the Lord's people tried to get to antitypical

Canaan by a short cut over Christendom's highways, coveting full freedom from persecution. The nominal people of God refused this. Hence the way of self-denial around Christendom had to be traveled. Therefore an effort was made to introduce an easing of this road by earthly reforms. Hence some Truth people, led by the wife of "that Servant," advocated certain reforms like woman's rights, prohibition, the wife's right to be in effect the head of the home, this latter theory being brought to a climax in practice by a certain divorce action brought at the Passover of 1903, after the wife greatly tampered with her husband for some time to the disturbance of his work, which proved to be a tempting, a tampering with Christ, whose special representative the former was. Not a few of the sisters resented the teaching of their keeping silence in the Churches in doctrinal meetings and of covering their heads. Some brothers, with more gallantry than sobermindedness, aided and abetted these measures of reformism. But their efforts failing, their consequent bitterness evidenced their being bitten by sin, and as new creatures many of them died.

(41) Reformism was advocated in the Churches. "Civic righteousness," "Christian citizenship," "the social uplift," "slumming," "prohibition," "suffrage," etc., were advocated widely; and reform efforts frequently failing, bitterness as a fiery serpent bit many of the justified.

(42) Outside of the Churches Reformism found many advocates, whose contentions were: "Politics must be purified; business must be made honest; the trusts must be restrained; the home must be elevated; against vice we must make crusades." The Reformers labored long and hard, but their antagonists fought, and thus embittered them. The "muckrakers" also became embittered. Mr. Lawson's "Frenzied Finance" and Miss Tarbell's Standard Oil exposures and reform measures show something of the Reformers' bitterness.

But many who were mere professors, following the movement of reform in these respects, were with their leaders, because of ill success, embittered, bitten by fiery serpents, losing all Christianity.

(43) Reformism is pictured in the fourth slaughter weapon, as the Reformers are pictured in the man with the fourth slaughter weapon. True to the picture, the inkhorn man started the work of the fourth call before the fourth slaughter weapon began to slay. It slew (1) in the temple those of the new creatures who imbibed and enacted its principles; it slew (2) in the court those justified ones who accepted and practiced Reformism; it slew (3) in the city mere professors of Christianity who gave themselves up to its spirit. The bitterness that these three classes felt at the hardness of the way that the faithful took in self-denial, as they steadfastly kept away from Christendom's Reformism, manifested itself in opposition to them, and proves that they were bitten by the serpent of sin. Thus, as we study the fourth call, sifting and slaughter weapon, we see another remarkable example of their harmony and interrelation, which proves our view.

(44) The eleventh hour call occurred two symbolic hours after the ninth hour, *i.e.*, six years and eight months later. This would be from February, 1908, to June, 1911. C.J. Woodworth gives his eleventh hour as October, 1911, to October, 1914, and says its call was especially through the "Photo-Drama." During this period there was no sifting; hence no calling of large numbers to fill vacant crowns. Moreover, the Photo-Drama was not well under way until about May, 1914, though exhibited in a few cities previously from January onward. Hence at most his call would have been only a few months, very unlike the preceding Harvest calls; but if we look at the real eleventh hour, we find the largest call and sifting of the Reaping time taking place therein. This is another fact that proves that our dear Pastor's view of the Parable's

Chronology is correct as against that of C.J. Woodworth.

(45) In this call the Lord continued to use previously existing agencies, *i.e.*, The Tower, the Pilgrims, the Colporteurs and the Volunteers, with the attendant literature; and especially gave the call through the newspaper and extension work, both of which were very greatly enlarged. By February, 1908, there were probably not over 20 newspapers publishing the sermons. Within two years over 2,000 were publishing them at one time, the total number publishing in this hour being about 4,000. The debate at Cincinnati, February, 1908, began to open up the call through the newspapers, a number of which were won for the sermons through printing the debates. Early in 1909 our Pastor expressed the opinion that probably 5,000 persons had recently lost their crowns, and that this meant that the call, which was then going on, would bring at least that number into the Truth. Certain it is that during no hour of the Harvest did so many people come into the Truth as in the eleventh hour, especially from 1909 to 1911. The repeated exhortations during that hour to enter the service correspond to the exhortation of vs. 6 and 7.

(46) And surely during that time we had the greatest of all Harvest Siftings! It began in the late Spring of 1908 on the Vow, and in February, 1909, proceeded along the lines of the Ransom, Sin-offering, Mediator and Covenants controversy. Almost all the Truth people remember how Messrs. Hennings, McPhail, Williamson, etc., gave themselves up to contradicting almost everything that "that Servant" brought forth from the storehouse at that time: "Neither murmur ye [in 'the ends of the Ages'] as [typically] some of them also murmured and were destroyed of the destroyer" (1 Cor. 10:10). In these words whereby St. Paul refers to the fifth Harvest sifting is an allusion to Num. 15:37—16:50. We understand that

Num. 15:37-41 types the giving of the Vow to assist us to remember our consecration obligations. As Moses' commanding the wearing of the fringes was the occasion of the typical rebellion (Num. 16:1-3), so the Lord's giving the Vow was the occasion of the antitypical rebellion. We understand Korah to represent the sifters among the Truth people; Dathan, the Beast; Abiram, his Image; On, the Dragon, especially in his judicial and in his periodical mouthpieces; and the 250 Levites (Num. 26:10), the crown-losers (from God's standpoint) in the various (perhaps 250) divisions of the nominal church. Each day in the typical transaction seems to represent one year. The offering of incense by the 250 on the second day corresponds to the attacks on our understanding of the Ransom, Sin-offerings, Mediator and Covenants, beginning in February, 1909. The censers represent the Scripture passages that were used by the controversialists. Moses sending for Dathan and Abiram seems to type the Lord speaking through the Creed-Smashing Sermons and Tracts to the Beast and his Image, whose destruction is typed in the earthquake scene. The destruction of the 250 Levites represents the death of the new creatures in the antitype. Eleazar, the then most prominent under-priest, types "that Servant," who took the same passages (censers) of the contradictionists and interpreted ("beat") them in such a way as to defend the Truth on the Ransom, Sin-offerings, etc. ("a covering," a defense, of the altar). How our hearts were at that time refreshed by these blessed broadplates! The scene on the third day seems to type events from February, 1910, to February, 1911. The Scriptures and the truths on Zionism, the Kingdom, the death state and the penalty of sin seem to correspond to the censer and fire with which the High Priest in His Body members rushed among the people and delivered the deliverable from the plague of murmuring *contradictionism*, which by the co-operation of

the antitypical Korah and his antitypical 250 Levites was infecting the masses of the Nominal Christian Church.

(47) True to the picture, the fifth slaughter-weapon man, after the inkhorn man began the fifth call, started to slay and that in the temple, first contradicting the Vow, and then the Truth, especially on the Ransom uses, the Sin-offerings, Mediator and Covenants, and misrepresenting the Sin-offerings' doctrine as contradicting the Ransom. The fifth slaughter weapon is murmursome *contradictionism*. In the Nominal Church the antitypical 250 Levites began a widespread attack on the Truth in 1909; and in 1910 worldly editors and thoroughly secular people, aided by certain lawyers, judges and juries, waged a campaign of slander, especially against "that Servant," involving the whole Truth people. Thus the fifth slaughter weapon was widely used; and thus we see it to have slain first in the temple, second in its courts, third in the city, as the prophecy shows.

(48) The sifters who engaged in murmursome contradictionism among the Truth people are the antitypical Korah, whose death represents the second death of his antitypes—those leaders who, renouncing their share in the Sin-offering and misrepresenting knowingly the Truth on this subject as teaching for the Church a share in producing the ransom-price, "counted the blood of the [sacrificial (Ps. 50:5)] covenant wherewith they were sanctified [not justified] an unholy thing," a thing not belonging to the Altar (Heb. 10:29). From this we are not to understand that all who went wrong on this subject are doomed to the second death; rather those who were deceived by the sifters into believing that the Truth teachings on the Church's share in the Sin-offering were to the effect that the Church partook in the work of producing the ransom-merit, and who hence, out of loyalty to the Ransom as alone laid down by our Lord,

renounced the doctrine that the Church shares in the Sin-offering, are not to be understood as being under the second death sentence. This is expressly shown in the type (Num. 26:11; 1 Chro. 9:19). However, their being deceived, amid circumstances in which the Truth could have been learned, proves that they were not living up to their privileges; and this, together with their aiding and abetting sifters, made them antitypical Levites, sons of Korah, who as antitypical transitional Kohathite Levites will wash their robes eventually, and, in the meantime, will keep themselves free from the various Societies, Corporations, among Truth people. While we may not hope nor pray for their deceivers, we are glad that there is hope for these (1 John 5:16, 17). The Lord open their eyes and lead them to repentance and thus to life.

(49) The fact that 1 Cor. 10:1-14 and Num. 15:37—16:50 prove that the fifth sifting was from February, 1908, to June, 1911, and the fact that the former passage mentions nothing about the sixth sifting, prove that the sixth sifting would not take place until after the reaping period was over, not until after "the end of the Age" (Matt. 13:39), which was the day of the Parable, and ended October, 1914. These two facts are decisive against C.J. Woodworth's view of the day of the Parable, and corroborate our Pastor's view of it as the true one.

(50) Matt. 20:8-16, as well as Ezek. 9:5-10, however, refer to the sixth sifting. Let us first examine Matt. 20:8-16. Since the day ended October, 1914, the evening then began. And true enough the Lord by His Providences so arranged matters that "that Servant," as "the Steward" of the Parable, first gave special opportunities perseveringly *to smite Jordan* to the Faithful only. These as a rule were those who came into the Truth from February, 1908, onward. For details on this point we refer our readers to Vol. III, Chapter II. It is remarkable how the bulk of the

Truth people who came into the Truth during the calls prior to the fifth call, and who evinced their lack of zeal under test, either through financial cramping of the work or through disgruntlement at their not leaving the earth before October, 1914, were found so lacking in zeal as not to persevere to the end in the first smiting of Jordan, *i.e.*, from the Fall of 1914 to that of 1916—and *thus failed to receive the Penny in its first distribution*. With very few exceptions, those who were called in the eleventh hour were very zealous in receiving their Penny, the special hundredfold for the end of the Age, it taking the form of special privileges of service, the honor of executing the judgment written (Ps. 149:5-9). Thus seen the Penny is the execution of judgment, confessing the sins over Azazel's Goat, partaking in antitypical Gideon's First Battle, and the first smiting of Jordan—the varied pictures of the Faithful's hundredfold at the end of the Age. They got this before the others, the measurably Faithful, "received" their Penny, their opportunity of smiting Jordan, which is that of the Elisha Class, and constitutes the second smiting, as seen in the Parable and the Elijah and Elisha type.

(51) It will be noted that the Faithful in the fulfillment did not murmur at their hundredfold; but the measurably Faithful did murmur. As parabolic and typical conversations are usually fulfilled in pantomime, *i.e.*, in acts, and not in words, so do we find it here. The hundredfold offered those who received their Penny last was the same thing as the others received, *i.e.*, the privilege of smiting Jordan, its second smiting, which occurred from the Fall of 1917 to the Spring of 1918; and "that Servant," as "the Steward" of the Parable, gave them this privilege by a series of things: (1) by arranging for what proved to be the second smiting of Jordan, which gave them special opportunities of service; (2) by rearranging the workers (especially at Bethel, from which it happened

that the measurably Faithful took over the controllership of the work), which was done partly by his changing the positions of various workers just before he died, and partly by the changes that provisions of his will made after he died, which likewise gave them and their ardent and partisan supporters special opportunities of service in the second smiting of Jordan; (3) by instituting the Pastoral work and the V.D.Ms. he gave special opportunities of service in smiting Jordan the second time to those who availed themselves of these arrangements. In these and other ways "that Servant" gave the Penny also to the second class among the Truth people.

(52) V. 10 proves that the second class were possessed with *unholy ambition*. They wanted "*more*," and wanted the "*more*" before they received their hundredfold, which proves that they had cultivated a wrong spirit. How did these murmur? We answer, by their *acts*. The fact that the three British Managers grasped for more powers than "that Servant" arranged to be given them was murmuring against the Goodman of the house, and against the faithful servants whom they sought to set aside. The fact that "the present management" in the Society grasped for more power than "that Servant" arranged for them to have was murmuring against the Goodman of the house and His faithful ones, whom they sought to set aside. The fact that certain ones partisanly supported these in their course, which invariably brought them rewards, was murmuring against the Goodman of the house and His faithful servants, whom they sought to set aside. Thus all who grasped for power and their partisan supporters were the murmurers against the Goodman of the house and His faithful servants, *and their acts in these respects* were their murmurings; and prove conclusively that they wanted "more" than the Faithful got.

(53) These acts constituted *revolutionism* in unholy

ambition against the Lord's arrangements for special opportunities of service connected with smiting Jordan, as given through "that Servant," "the Steward" of the Parable. In personal conversation with us several times he referred to himself as "the Steward" of the Parable. He did this also to Menta Sturgeon just before he died. C.J. Woodworth has offered us another Steward; and to give this thought even a measure of plausibility he has had to twist the Parable as very few Scriptures have ever been twisted; but the historical facts that are so beautifully harmonious, as given above, completely refute his view of things, and prove "that Servant's" view to be correct. Since C.J. Woodworth's day did not end until October, 1917, *his* Steward gave *his* Penny, Vol. VII, before *his* evening came, a contradiction of the Parable.

(54) V. 13 proves that Vol. VII (against which so-called Penny not one word was said in Bethel dining room July 17, 1917, C.J. Woodworth to the contrary notwithstanding) is not the Penny of the Parable; for it was not promised in the first hour of either view of the Parable, for *seven* volumes were not promised until long afterward. But the hundredfold was promised in the real first hour. C.J. Woodworth's order in which the Penny was given is not that of the Parable. His definition of those who received the Penny first, *i.e.*, the foreign brethren, the majority of whom were called before the eleventh hour, contradicts the Parable, which teaches that those (as a rule), called in the eleventh hour, no matter where they lived, first "received" it; moreover, none of the foreign brethren "received" it so soon as the American brethren. Z. 1917, p. 372, col. 2, par. 1, proves that it was sent to *all* Tower subscribers at *one* distribution; hence it was not given to the Truth people in two distinct distributions, corresponding to the Spirit-begotten classes, as the Parable requires of the distribution of the real Penny. What a mechanical,

confused and unhistorical interpretation C.J. Woodworth has given us! Yet how true to the facts and principles involved the interpretation given above is! V. 12 shows that the murmurers did not want the others to be "*equal*" to them. Hence they wanted *superiority*, more power and lordship. Therefore they grasped for power and became lords over God's heritage, revolutionizing against the Lord's arrangements for the hundredfold given through the real Steward of the Parable! The real murmurers are thus clearly the Society leaders and their partisan supporters.

(55) Vs. 13-15 show that the Lord would direct an especially severe rebuke to a class that he addresses as "friend." This class we believe to be the leaders in Revolutionism. V. 14 shows that this "friend" was given his Penny, the second smiting of Jordan, "the Big Drive," from the Fall of 1917 to the Spring of 1918, and was left to go his "*own way*," a way which, therefore, was one of selfishness with its concomitants of error and disaster. Certainly, *so far* their "way" has been one of much error and disaster; for they have made a fearful wreck of things in the Society. What of injury have those not done to the Society who *falsely accused some of their brethren of conspiring to wreck it!!* The last clause of this verse should be rendered, "I will *to* give to this last *one* [a class therefore, even as the 'friend' is a class] even as unto thee."

(56) V. 15 proves that the Lord did the right thing; but that the class represented by the one addressed as "friend" desired and did wrong. Despite the Lord's goodness in giving them a hundredfold, their eye, perception, saw therein opportunities of evil-doing, grasping for power and lording it over God's heritage. The Lord gave them the rebukes of vs. 13-15 through certain protests and the "opposition" publications of the year 1917. V. 16 expresses the thought, to demonstrate

which Jesus gave the Parable, *i.e.*, that at the end of the Age, in connection with giving the hundredfold, as a rule late comers in the work would attain joint-heirship with Christ in the Kingdom, while as a rule those called before them would be placed in the Great Company. How clearly these events prove the fulfillment of this Parable!

(57) The sixth slaughter weapon is *Revolutionism* (Ps. 107:10, 11); and the Revolutionists are represented by the sixth slaughter-weapon man. Whoever among the consecrated revolts against the Lord's Truth and arrangements given through "that Servant" is represented in the sixth slaughter-weapon man; and whoever among the consecrated imbibes his errors and supports him in his practices is represented by those slain in the temple. Revolutionism has assumed several forms among Truth people: setting aside Truth by error and setting aside right arrangements by wrong ones. Both practices are against the Lord's protective ways given through "that Servant." One of the worst forms of the latter is Clericalism, which has manifested itself in two forms, general and local. General Clericalism has gotten control of the organizations among the Lord's people, and has more or less dominated over the general Church, while local clericalism manifests itself in local elders grasping for power and lording it over the ecclesias. One of our dear Pastor's last warnings was against clericalists, given in the article on "The Hour of Temptation" (Z. 1916, p. 327). Little did we think that the three British Managers and the Society leaders would be the leaders in Clericalism! The leaders of the Pastoral Bible Institute are likewise Revolutionists, by displacing certain truths through opposing errors and by having adopted a charter that deviates from our Pastor's violently. In vain do the P. B. I. leaders point out in justification of themselves that the People's Pulpit Association's charter is different from that of the Society. We answer them on this point

exactly as they answered J.F. Rutherford on the same point: *The charter of the Association is not the charter for a controlling corporation among the Truth people, while that of the Society is.* On this point their condemnation of J.F. Rutherford is their own: "Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee," says the Lord.

(58) Text-bookism, another form of revolutionizing against God's arrangements, is of two forms, gross and mild. In the first of these forms it starts with disowning of our Pastor as "that Servant," progresses to a repudiation of the Truth literature, ends with a denial of the Truth itself, and in the end results in the second death. In the second of these forms it sets aside the "Studies" as text-books, using the Bible as such, and doubtless results in one's being remanded to the Great Company. Revolutionism against the Lord's arrangements given through "that Servant" is a sign that the Lord in this, the Epiphany period, gives us, enabling us to recognize those who are *manifested* as having lost the High Calling (Ps. 107:10, 11). Revolutionism will continue among the Truth people, until all are tested and manifested by their stand toward it pro or con.

(59) Revolutionism, as the sixth slaughter weapon, is active in the nominal churches, *i.e.*, in the courts, among the justified. Through the Federation of Churches and the agitated League of Churches, the Clergy are leading a revolution against certain good things in the systems, *i.e.*, are grasping for power and lording it over the Nominal people of God; and those who are succumbing to their theories are being slain by their slaughter weapon. These in their tentative justification are being slain right and left.

(60) Then Revolutionism is active outside the courts, *i.e.*, in the city, leading up to the symbolic earthquake of Revelation 16:18-21. It was this great earthquake of the future, in the third sphere of activity, "in the city," that enabled us, from a study of the character of the sifting movements in the Truth,

to conclude that Revolutionism is the sixth slaughter weapon. As early as February 24, 1917, in a cablegram sent from England, we warned J.F. Rutherford that the sixth sifting of Ezek. 9 was on in England. The sixth sifting, like all the others, began among the consecrated, then proceeded to the justified and will culminate among the mere professors, who are strangers to real faith in the Lord, even as their Savior. Thus we find in all six siftings the statement to be true: "that judgment must *begin* at the house of God" (1 Pet. 4:17; Ezek. 9:6).

(61) The sixth sifting, however, has a peculiarity that none of the others had. Whereas all the others made a marked separation between those who retained and those who lost the Holy Spirit, the present sifting is mainly marked by the separation of the Priests and the Levites, both retaining the Holy Spirit. And this is exactly what we should expect for the Epiphany time (Mal. 3:2, 3; Matt. 7:24-27; 1 Cor. 3:12-15; 4:5; 2 Tim. 4:1); nor do we think the present sifting will be over for several years, and of course it will be somewhat later before the Great Company will recognize itself as such.

(62) How marvelous is the harmony of our texts! Dovetailed together, how remarkably do they disclose Jehovah's foreknowledge of our wonderful times! And how these texts admonish us to watch, to pray, to keep ourselves in the love of God, and in the waiting for the mercy of Christ unto eternal life, to be humble as to self, trustful as to the Lord, and to be free from all idols of selfishness, worldliness, error and sin! How have we been heeding these admonitions in the past? How are we heeding them now? Are we *Revolutionists* or their partisan supporters, or are we their *Opposers*—Which? Let us examine ourselves as to our stand with respect to the sixth sifting, which is yet testing us! "Who will be able to stand when He appeareth [when He makes all His people manifest, *i.e.*, in the Epiphany, Mal. 3:2]?"

Who? "He that hath a pure heart and clean hands," and none else. "Wherefore, my dearly beloved, flee from idolatry" (1 Cor. 10:14)! For other particulars on the Penny Parable, please see P '29, 106.

(1) What is the probable reason for the publication of the "New View"? Why is this the probable reason?

(2) Give a brief history of the writing, printing and publishing of the article entitled "Brother Rutherford's New View."

(3) Give, according to Z. 1918, p. 51, a good rule for us to follow in our teaching.

(4) Of what do the texts Matt. 19:27-20:16; 1 Cor. 10:1-14; Ezek. 9:1-11 treat? Why and how should we study them?

(5) Give our Pastor's earlier and later views of the Parable of the Penny, and the reasons for his change of view.

(6) What additional argument and its corroborative Scriptures prove the later view to be correct?

(7) How do the Scriptures use the term "the first" and "the last"? What is the Penny? And what is implied in its being given to "the first" and to "the last"?

(8) Give and prove the true duration and time of the day and the hours of the Parable. State and refute an erroneous view.

(9) What two lines of thought does the Parable give?

(10) State and prove to what periods 1 Cor. 10:1-4 apply and give a general explanation of the three divisions of this Scripture.

(11) Briefly give the contents of Ezek. 9:1-11 and show their relation to those of Matt. 20:1-16 and 1 Cor. 10:1-14.

(12) Give the true and erroneous views of those symbolized by Ezekiel and the slaughter-weapon men. Prove the true, disprove the erroneous views.

(13) Give the true and erroneous views of the inkhorn man. Disprove the erroneous, and prove the true view by three arguments.

(14) By comparison and contrast give the relation between the contents of the three texts.

(15) Why is the time of the first call expressed differently from the times of the other calls?

(16) From Scriptures, instrumentalities, results, agents and facts, corroborated by Z. 1916, pp. 170-173, prove that the first call was from October, 1874, to June, 1881.

(17) Give a history of the article "These Things Were Types."—Z. 1913, p. 198.

(18) Why were siftings necessary, first during the first call, and second during the other calls? What bearing does this have on C.J. Woodworth's day and hours? What was the chronological relation of each call to its accompanying sifting?—Ezek. 5:9.

(19) State the events of Num. 11:4-36; and prove their typical character.

(20) Give the antitypes of the main feature of this history and show their fulfillment among Truth people "early in the morning."

(21) Show their antitypes in the antitypical courts and in the antitypical camp.

(22) Explain, symbol and reality, the first slaughter weapon, its wielder and his activities in the temple.

(23) Explain, symbol and reality, the first slaughter weapon, its wielder and his activities in the courts and in the city; and show the distinctions in the personnel of the slayer in the Sanctuary, courts and city.

(24) State a fact that proves that not Vol. VII, but that the hundredfold is the Penny.

(25) Give the facts, agents, instrumentalities and results that disprove the "Penny Tract's" view, and those that prove our Pastor's view of the third hour call.

(26) State the facts of Ex. 30:1-31; prove their typical character; and show their antitypes among Truth people during the third hour.

(27) Show the antitypes of these in the nominal church.

(28) Show the antitypes of these in the world; and explain, type and antitype, the slaying of the idolators by the Sons of Levi (Mal. 3:3) and the plague.

(29) Explain, symbol and reality, the second slaughter weapon, its wielder and his activities in the sanctuary, courts and city.

(30) Disprove the false chronology of the sixth hour call.

(31) Give the true chronology, and the agents, instrumentalities and results of the sixth hour call.

(32) Give the historical facts of the sixth hour sifting among the Truth people.

(33) State the facts of Num. 25:1-18; prove their typical character, and antitypes among Truth people.

(34) Show the antitypes of these among the nominal people of God. Explain, type and antitype, the account of Zimri, Cozbi and Phinehas.

(35) Explain the antitype of Phinehas in our Pastor *as "that Servant."*

(36) Show the activity of combinationism in the world.

(37) Explain, symbol and reality, the third slaughter weapon, its wielder and his activities in the sanctuary, courts and city.

(38) Disprove the false chronology of the ninth hour, and state its true chronology.

(39) Give the facts, agents, instrumentalities and results of the ninth hour call.

(40) State the history of Num. 21:4-6; prove its typical character; and show its antitype among the Truth people in the ninth hour.

(41) Show its antitype among the nominal people of God in the ninth hour.

(42) Show its antitype in the world.

(43) Describe, symbol and reality, the fourth slaughter weapon, its wielder and his activities in the Sanctuary, courts and city.

(44) Disprove the false chronology of the eleventh hour, and state its true chronology.

(45) Give the facts, agents, instrumentalities and results of the eleventh hour call.

(46) State the history of Num. 15:37—16:50; prove its typical character; show the antitypes of its persons, events, days and things.

(47) Describe, symbol and reality, the fifth slaughter weapon, its wielder and his activities in the sanctuary, courts and city.

(48) Define the antitypes of Korah and his sons and show their present and future conditions.

(49) What two facts prove that the sixth sifting would occur after the Reaping, and what do these facts do with the true and false chronology of the Parable?

(50) Describe the Penny and those who first received it; and how and when the real Steward first gave it. Why did some not, and why did others get the Penny first?

(51) How are parabolic and typical conversations usually fulfilled? How was the Penny in both distributions the same thing? How and when did the real Steward give the Penny the second time?

(52) What quality (Matt. 20:10) prompted the murmuring? How did power-graspers, etc., murmur?

(53) What did these murmuring acts constitute? Who is the real, and who the counterfeit Steward? Why? How does the time of the counterfeit Steward's giving the counterfeit Penny contradict the chronology of the counterfeit day?

(54) Show the disharmony of facts with C.J. Woodworth's view on the Penny, the order of its distribution and its recipients. How may we characterize the two views of the Parable? And what does Matt. 20:12 prove against the murmurers?

(55) Who are represented by the "friend"? When did he receive his Penny? By whom and by what means was he rebuked? What kind of a course did he then take?

(56) What are the thoughts given in Matt. 20:15, 16?

(57) Explain the sixth slaughter weapon, its two parts, its wielder and his activities in the form of Clericalism among Truth people? By whom and where was a warning given against the Clericalists? Who are the chief Clericalists? How does one of these groups in vain defend itself against the charge of Revolutionism?

(58) Explain the two forms of text-bookism in their operation and results. What does and will Revolutionism among the consecrated manifest?

(59) Explain, symbol and reality, the sixth slaughter weapon, its wielder and his activity in the courts.

(60) Explain the same features in the city. How was the "city" activity a clue to the sixth slaughter weapon? By what date had the sixth sifting been recognized? Among whom did all siftings begin, progress and end?

(61) What especially differentiates the sixth from all others? Why is this so? How long may this sifting last? When will the Great Company recognize itself?

(62) What lessons should we learn from this study?

There is a mystery in human hearts,
 And though we be encircled by a host
 Of those who love us well, and are beloved,
 To every one of us, from time to time,
 There comes a sense of utter loneliness.
 Our dearest friend is "stranger" to our joy,
 And cannot realize our bitterness.
 "There is not one who really understands,
 Not one to enter into *all* I feel";
 Such is the cry of each of us in turn.
 We wander in a "solitary way,"
 No matter what or where our lot may be.

And would you know the reason why this is?
 It is because the Lord desires our love.
 In every heart He wishes to be *first*.
 He, therefore, keeps the secret-key Himself,
 To open *all* its chambers, and to bless
 With perfect sympathy and holy peace
 Each solitary soul that comes to *Him*.
 So when we feel this loneliness, it is
 The voice of Jesus saying, "Come to Me";
 And every time we are "not understood,"
 It is a call to us to come *again*;
 For Christ alone can *satisfy* the soul,
 And those who walk with Him from day to day
 Can never have "a solitary way."

And when beneath some heavy cross you faint,
 And say, "I cannot bear this load alone,"
 You say the truth. Christ made it purposely
 So heavy that you must return to Him.
 The bitter grief, which "no one understands,"
 Conveys a secret message from the King,
 Entreating you to come to Him *again*.
 The Man of Sorrows understands it well.
 In *all* points tempted, He can feel with you.
 You cannot come too often, or too near.
 The Son of God is infinite in grace;
 His presence satisfies the longing soul;
 And those who walk with Him from day to day
 Can never have "a solitary way."

CHAPTER III.

THE TIME OF REAPING.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS. REAPING COMPLETED BEFORE "THAT SERVANT'S" DEATH. REAPING BEGAN IN 1874. OUR PASTOR DID NOT TEACH THE REAPING PERIOD TO BE FROM 1878 TO 1918. OUR PASTOR'S CHANGE OF THOUGHT ON THE REAPING'S END. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORD Harvest, as it occurs in the Truth literature, is used in two senses, *i.e.*, in a wide and in a narrow sense. In the wide sense it includes all the work done with the symbolic grains of wheat from their seeking, until they are safe in the Kingdom. In this sense of the word, as in the natural, so in the spiritual harvest, in Palestine as well as here, there are seven distinct processes: (1) reaping, separating the Lord's people from their place of growth, the nominal church; (2) sheaving, gathering them into classes; (3) drying, developing them in knowledge, grace and service; (4) threshing, testing them with view to strengthening of character; (5) winnowing, separating them from outsiders; (6) sifting, separating them from Second Death and Great Company members; (7) garnering, taking them into the Kingdom. In the narrow sense of the word there is but one Harvest process, *i.e.*, reaping. In the title of this chapter we use the word "reaping," and not the word "Harvest," so as to prevent any from thinking that we are discussing the time of all seven processes of the Harvest, our object being to discuss the time of reaping only.

(2) As we study the word reaping we note that it, too, is used in a wide and in a narrow sense. In the wide sense of the word it includes the gleaning as well as what we usually call the reaping work, while in the narrow sense it excludes the gleaning work. In this chapter we will use the word reaping sometimes to include, and sometimes to exclude, the gleaning work.

The connection will show whether we use the word in the narrow or in the wide sense of the term.

(3) The completion of the reaping work in the wide sense of that term and the completion of the sealing of the Elect in their foreheads are one and the same thing. Hence in this chapter these expressions will be used synonymously.

(4) The Scriptures speak of the sealing of the Elect from two standpoints—one of these has respect to the heart (2 Cor. 1:22; Eph. 1:13; 4:30), the other has respect to the head (Rev. 7:3-8; 14:1). In both cases the sealing is an evidence of God's approval of the sealed one. The sealing in the heart is the impressing of the Spirit of at-one-ment with the Lord which delights in, and is sympathetic with, all His ways, whether these are expressed in His Spirit, Word or Providence. The sealing in the forehead is the bestowment of enough of Truth as due to enable one from knowledge of it to escape the errors of God's nominal people of both Israels (Is. 8:14), leaving them or the world during reaping time.

(5) It is not the purpose of this chapter to discuss the sealing with the Holy Spirit in the hearts of God's saints; for just when this kind of sealing of the Elect will be completed we do not know. Rather our purpose in this chapter is to discuss the time of completing the sealing of the Elect in their foreheads. On this subject the light, not visible in our dear Pastor's day, has now come. This does not, of course, mean that we think ourself more talented mentally than he, or more highly regarded by the Lord than he; for he stood head and shoulders above us in both of these respects; rather it is our thought that it was not due in his day to know this feature of Truth; but that now it is due to be known. Had his feature of Truth been made clear to, and by him, it would have made impossible the tests whereby the Lord has been pleased to separate the Little Flock from the Great Company, as He

has been doing for several years. Hence God hid the light on this subject from him, so that it could not be fully understood nor explained until such time as its knowledge would not interfere with, but advance His purposes.

(6) In this chapter we desire to submit for the consideration of the Lord's Truth-hungry people a large number of Biblical reasons proving:

(I) That the reaping of the Little Flock, i.e., the sealing in their foreheads, but not the other features of the Harvest, was completed before our Pastor's death.

(II) That the reaping began in 1874; and

(III) That our Pastor never taught that the reaping began in 1878 and would end in 1918.

I. The reaping ended before our Pastor's death. In proof we submit a number of reasons:

(7) Our second text gives us our first argument, for according to it, it is evident that, as there would come a time in the experience of the Church, when her last member will have been Spirit-begotten and sealed in the forehead, so also thereafter no one else would be begotten of the Spirit during the rest of the Gospel Age. Further, it is also evident that this last Spirit-begotten and forehead-sealed member of the Church would have to remain in the world for several years, at least, in order to develop, strengthen, balance and crystallize a character like Christ's, as well as overcome sin, error, selfishness and worldliness; and that therefore there would be a number of years intervening between sealing (reaping) the last member of The Christ and his going beyond the veil; as it is self-evident that, like the rest of the New Creation, this last-found member of The Christ could fall from grace; but that he, being the last one of the faithful ones, will not fall, even as the others of the 144,000 could have fallen, but have by faithfulness been preserved from falling. Therefore the Church in the flesh must come to a time when for several years she

could do no more reaping of Little Flock members, all of the faithful saints having been reaped—a time which would be a night wherein no man can work—as a reaper.

(8) The kind of work referred to in our text evidently is *reaping work*; for that is the kind of work that Jesus and the Apostles ("we must work") were doing in Israel when Jesus uttered the exhortation expressed in our text (John 4:34-38; 3:29, 30; Matt. 9:35—10:5; Luke 9:1-6; Mark 3:13-15). Therefore, the work referred to in this text is reaping work. The text could not refer to all features of the Harvest work, which in addition to and after the reaping included sheaving, drying, threshing, winnowing, sifting and garnering; for it is unthinkable that a time would come, while the Church is in the flesh, when the fellow members, mingling with one another, could do nothing for one another after the reaping was over, but before the other six Harvest features were finished. Our dear Pastor showed us that after the reaping was over we would yet have the work of helping one another make our calling and election sure, among other ways, *e.g.*, by garnering, giving final preparatory help to those who shortly must pass beyond the veil, which, of course, in some of the last members of The Christ, would have to be some years after the completion of the reaping.

(9) Our second text, which is translated according to the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS., treats of a night coming when no one can work, *i.e.*, do (not every part of the Harvest work, but) no more reaping work. This night is spoken of in many other Scriptures (Is. 21:11, 12; Joel 2:2; Amos 5:20, etc.). We are all in agreement that this night refers to the great Time of Trouble (Dan. 12:1; Matt. 24:21, 22; 1 Thes. 5:1-5), which consists of three marked stages—war, revolution and anarchy (1 Kings 19:11, 12)—with famine and pestilence interspersed (Ezek. 14:21).

This night began in each country as it was involved in the World War, the first part of the great tribulation, which began when the first countries entered the war in August, 1914. Accordingly, we recognize that the night began in 1914. But this symbolic night, just like the natural night, did not set in everywhere at the same instant of time, rather it reached each country only as it became involved in the war. While every government did not declare war, every one of the nations was involved therein; because every one of them was afflicted by the war. Now every nation is in the night, and has been since the war afflicted, and thus involved all nations, even those that did not declare war. Therefore the reaping is complete the world over; the Elects' forehead sealing is finished.

(10) Closely connected with our text in thought is Rev. 7:1-3, which we offer as a second proof that the forehead sealing of the Elect is complete. As these verses have, we think, been greatly misinterpreted in Vol. VII, we will introduce and expound them briefly: "And after [seeing] these things [in Chap. 6] I [the Little Flock] saw [with both physical and mental eyes] four angels [the messengers of wrath, C 165, *i.e.*, (1) rulers, (2) aristocrats, (3) proprietary business men and proprietary farmers and (4) laborers, who bring about the trouble, and thus pour out the sufferings, the wrath of the Time of Trouble; the Harvest workers are not the messengers of wrath, as Vol. VII claims, but are messengers of peace, announcing and working for real peace, Is. 52:7; Eph. 6:15] standing [each group stationed in the section of society to which it belongs] on the four corners of the earth [the symbolic earth, society (the symbolic heavens are not here included), is divided into four sections, each one corresponding to one of the four messengers of wrath: (1) government, (2) aristocracy, (3) bourgeoisie, (4) labor] holding [these

groups, prompted more or less by their selfishness, which worked in different forms in the various groups, followed a course that restrained the fallen angels from bringing the great tribulation sooner than the due time] the four winds of the [fallen angels, who seem to be divided into four classes (Rom. 8:38; Eph. 6:12), and who are ruling over the symbolic] earth [society] [so] that the wind [the World War, 1 Kings 19:11; see its Berean comments, also on Rev. 7:2. This "wind" is *not* the "whirlwind," which will only then come when the fallen angels are more fully loosed than they were when causing the war, and as such meet in great conflicts among themselves and produce among mankind the symbolic whirlwind, revolution and anarchy (Jer. 25:29-33, especially v. 32; 2 Kings 2:1, 11, etc.). The wind, as this text implies, must precede the whirlwind, which occurs as a result of the hostile meeting of the fallen angels, after "the wind," 1 Kings 19:11, 12] should not blow [bring tribulation] on the earth [society], nor on the sea [the restless, rebellious, lawless masses], nor on any tree [great one: the Lord's people are counted great ones by Him; and the leaders among the four sections of society are also by their partisans].

"And I saw [mentally and physically] another angel [God's people in their capacity of ministering the Truth to their brethren not yet in the Truth (C 303; Rev. 7:3—'until we have sealed'—Ezek. 9:2-5, 11), and not Jesus alone, as Vol. VII teaches] ascending from the east [Jesus and the Church (The Christ) are the Sun, Light, of the world, John 9:5; Matt. 5:14] and having the seal [the Truth as due], of the Living God [given in the Scriptures], and he cried with a loud voice to [as the Salt of the earth, the Light of the world, and the City set upon a hill (Matt. 5:13-16), the faithful have with a great message, reprov'd the world for sin, righteousness and judgment to come (John 16:8-11), this work having had a

wholesome effect upon the world and having inculcated such principles as, measurably imbibed, have measurably restrained the selfishness of mankind from giving way to the full will of the fallen angels and thus arrested these unholy beings, who if unchecked by] the four angels [the four groups of mankind, as above, would long ago have brought the ruin of the Time of Trouble upon the race] to whom it was given to hurt the earth and the sea [evidently from this clause it can be seen that these four angels do not, as Vol. VII teachers, represent the Little Flock, whose work in the flesh is not to injure organized society, nor the lawless, rebellious people, nor themselves, nor the earth's great ones, the symbolic trees of v. 3. The four classes of people, as shown in the explanation of v. 1, represented by these four angels, are indeed the messengers of wrath, *i.e.*, are the ones who bring the great tribulation, wrath, upon the people organized in the present order of affairs];

"Saying [by teaching throughout the Gospel Age proper principles respecting sin, righteousness and judgment to come], Hurt not [do not give away to such unholy influences as will prompt you to injure] the earth [society], neither the sea [the rebellious, restless and anarchistic masses], nor the trees [both God's children and the great ones of society], until we [the Church in its capacity of giving the Truth to the brethren not yet having it] have sealed [sufficiently enlightened] the servants of God [the truly consecrated ones, who are faithful to the little Truth that they have] in their foreheads [intellectually, to such a degree as will enable them to escape from bondage amid the nominal Israels]."

(11) According to this passage, especially its third verse, the great tribulation, which began with the symbolic wind (the World War), could not come anywhere until first all of the Elect there, already sealed, would have left Babylon. We do not understand this

verse to teach that before this symbolic wind would begin to blow at all every one of the saints everywhere would be sealed: rather we would understand it to mean that as the war gradually spread from one country to another, so the sealing would be gradually finished in one country after another, being completed in each country before it became involved in the war. Thus all of the Elect in Britain, Russia, France, Germany, Austria, Servia and Montenegro had received a sufficiency of Present Truth to enable them to leave Babylon before August 1, 1914; while there were at that time, *e.g.*, in America some of them yet in Babylon who did not have enough of Present Truth to enable them to "come out of her." These, however, were reached and given enough of Present Truth to enable them to "come out of her" before May, 1916, when America almost declared, and henceforth steadily progressed toward, war with Germany, and thus became involved in the World War. The same principle applies to the Elect in the other countries. The only language nation of Europe that did not declare war explicitly is Scandinavia, including the governments of Norway, Sweden and Denmark, which, however, dividedly, gave marked support to, and suffered marked loss from, each side, and thus may be considered to have been involved in the war. The war being over everywhere, evidently the Elect were already everywhere sealed before the last nation became involved in the war, which was effected by the intensified submarine campaign of 1917. Hence "the Big Drive," beginning after this, yea, even after America declared war, could not have been a part of the reaping or sealing work.

(12) The Bible teaches that all of the saints, the entire 144,000, would be given the honor of executing (spiritual) vengeance upon the nations, and (spiritual) punishment upon the people, of binding the kings and princes, and executing upon them the judgment written

(Ps. 149:5-9). This was done from the Fall of 1914 to that of 1916, as we have already shown in Vol. III, Chapter II, to which we refer our readers for a fuller discussion of this point. Consequently, all of the Elect must have been sealed in the forehead before the Fall of 1916 in order to have taken part in this work; hence the reaping was then over.

(13) The Bible teaches that the antitypical Elijah's last work toward Nominal Spiritual Israel, before he lost the mantle of power to be God's mouthpiece to Nominal Spiritual Israel, was the smiting and dividing of Jordan (2 Kings 2:8). But to be a part of the antitypical Elijah at all, one would have to take part in his last work as God's mouthpiece to Nominal Spiritual Israel (for Elijah represents God's Elect in that capacity); because all the saints were to share in that work (Ps. 149:5-9). This smiting work was finished in the Fall of 1916, as we have shown in Vol. III, Chapter II. Therefore, before the Fall of 1916 all of the Elect were sealed in their foreheads, the reaping was complete.

(14) The Bible teaches that the last general work of the World's High Priest, before leaving this world in His last members, would be: (1) to confess the willful sins of Christendom over the antitypical Goat of Azazel, (2) to lead it to the Gate of the Court, and (3) to send it away to Azazel by the hand of the fit man (Lev. 16:20, 21). (1) The confession of these willful sins over Azazel's Goat (Satan uses the Great Company for his purposes, while the Lord uses the Little Flock for His purposes) was completed by the Fall of 1916. (See Vol. III, Chapter II, and Vol. IV, Chapter III.) Therefore, all the Elect were previously sealed, since the last of the Elect must share in the last general work of the World's High Priest done through His members in the flesh. (2) The leading of Azazel's Goat to the Gate began November 25, 1916, and that in Britain. (3) The sending away of Azazel's Goat had

a small beginning in January, 1917, in Britain, where the clericalistic conduct of certain brethren was exposed by the Lord through the writer and others; but its large beginning was connected with the exposures of the clericalistic conduct of certain British and American brethren in the Spring, Summer and Fall of 1917. For a few particulars on Lev. 16:20-22, which we expounded in detail in Vol. IV, Chapter III, we refer to Vol. III, Chapter II. The work of sending away Azazel's Goat having begun early in January, 1917, before that time all of the Elect must have been reaped, sealed in their forehead; since the last one of the Elect must share in the last general work of the World's High Priest, before He in His last members leave the earth.

(15) The separation of Elijah and Elisha (2 Kings 2:11-14) proves that before that time all of the Elect had been sealed in the forehead; because the Church would have to be complete and fulfill its missions toward Nominal Spiritual Israel before the separation of the Little Flock from the Great Company could take place. In Vol. III, Chapter II, we have proven that this separation has already taken place, beginning June 27, 1917. Therefore, for some considerable time before June 27, 1917, the entire Little Flock was reaped, sealed in the forehead.

(16) The Penny of Matt. 19:17—20:16 means the special opportunities of service implied in smiting Jordan, which was done twice, a fact implied in this Parable. Hence the Penny was given in two parts, implying two smittings of Jordan—(1) generally speaking, those called in the eleventh hour (February, 1908, to June, 1911) received theirs first. Exceptionally, others than these received their Penny with them, but being comparatively few in number, are ignored in the Parable as receiving the Penny at the same time, the Parable dealing with generalities only. (2) Generally speaking, those called before the eleventh hour (the

exceptions being few in numbers are also here ignored), received theirs later. That Servant, from the Fall of 1914 to that of 1916, gave the first class special opportunities of service in connection with the first smiting of Jordan (Matt. 20:8, 9). In the late Summer and early Fall of 1916 "that Servant," by rearranging the workers at the Tabernacle and Bethel and in the field, by introducing some new features of service and by his will made operative through his death, gave the second class special opportunities of service in the second smiting of Jordan (Matt. 20:10-16), which was done from the Fall of 1917 to the Spring of 1918. Since the Penny was given to all of those called in the end of the Age, who after the eleventh hour were comparatively few in number, and are therefore not specially mentioned in the Parable, it dealing with generalities only, it follows that all of the Elect were not only reaped, sealed, but were smiting Jordan before Oct. 24, 1916, when its first smiting began to end with our Pastor's last public lecture. The preceding chapter gives a detailed exposition of the Parable of the Penny.

(17) "That Servant" was made Steward of all the Lord's goods for the whole of the reaping time following his appointment, and ruler over the whole household, according to Matt. 24:45-47 and Luke 12:42-44. Therefore, he must have set forth on the table all the meat for the reaping time, and controlled the entire work for the whole household during the reaping time following his appointment. Consequently, before his death every one of the Elect was working in harmony with his teachings and under his direction of the work. Hence, before his death, October 31, 1916, all of the Elect had been reaped, sealed in the forehead, and were engaged in serving others under that Servant's general direction.

(18) The man with the writer's inkhorn (Ezek. 9:2-5, 11) began at least to report the completion of his

work about the time of Brother Russell's death. All of us are agreed that "that Servant" is at least included in the symbol of the man with the writer's inkhorn. Some think that he alone is symbolized by the man with the writer's inkhorn; others that he was the earthly leader of those who have sealed the Lord's people in the end of the Age. If we should hold the thought that "that Servant" alone was symbolized by the "man clothed with linen with the writer's inkhorn on his side," as the Society brethren do [did], we would all the more forcibly have to conclude that the forehead-sealing of the Elect was completed before Brother Russell's death, October 31, 1916.

(19) We are among those who hold to the opinion that the man with the writer's inkhorn represents, not an individual, but a class. Three reasons make us of this opinion: (1) It is quite evident that six classes of evil-doers in the end of the Age are represented by the six men with slaughter weapons (see the preceding chapter). So "that Servant" held. Therefore the seventh man, the one with the writer's inkhorn, by parity of reasoning would seem to represent a class of well-doers, *i.e.*, those who during the reaping time of the end of the Gospel Age gave the Truth to their brethren distressed by the evils of doctrine and practice in Christendom. (2) It is quite apparent that "that Servant" did not reach every such individual and teach him the Truth; not even every one of these was reached by his literature; for not a few who were blind and unable to read blind script, and others who could not read at all were taught the Truth by word of mouth; while some who could read did not without oral instructions understand enough to "come out of her." Thus the facts show that he alone, neither by voice, nor by pen put the ink, the Truth, on all, and did not put a sufficiency of it on not a few to enable them to come out of Babylon. It is true that he furnished us with the horn (the Truth

literature); put the ink (Truth) into it; put the horn of ink on our side (furnished it for our work) and put the ink on incomparably more foreheads than any one else did; but he did not do this work alone; consequently is not the only one symbolized by the man with the writer's inkhorn. (3) The parallel passage of Rev. 7:2, 3, in so far as it applies to the end of the Age, proves that the angel with the seal of God, the ink of Ezek. 9, is a multitudinous one—"until *we* have sealed the servants of God on their foreheads"—*i.e.*, put the ink "mark upon the foreheads of them that sigh and cry in the city"! This angel represents (C 303, par. 1) for the end of the Age the reapers; therefore the inkhorn man, corresponding to him, does the same. These three reasons seem to prove that "that Servant" alone is not symbolized by the man with the writer's inkhorn by his side; but that he and all others who faithfully co-operated with him in serving their brethren in Babylon or in the world with the Truth for their deliverance are symbolized by the inkhorn man. However, he was not only the most efficient of those who thus served, but he also seems to be the first one of them to have recognized the completion of the sealing, and to have reported it to the Lord. This he seemed to do the day before he died in the toga scene in the Pullman car. We recall how Menta Sturgeon tried in three ways to prove to him that he was not going to die: by reminding him that he had not (1) written Vol. VII, (2) smitten Jordan, (3) given the Penny. He had answers for the first and second objections, but none for the third. He knew that he was the Steward (Matt. 20:8), yet when questioned in the face of death could not harmonize this with his apparently not having given the Penny, which hitherto he had expected to do shortly. Our conviction of his mental process, which he did not express in words, is this: Knowing that he was the Steward, and therefore that he, who had but a few

hours more to live, must have given the Penny, he concluded that the reaping work was finished; and thus he reported the completion of the sealing of God's Elect, October 30, 1916, just one day before his death, while solemnly standing arrayed in the toga in the Pullman car. And this act was his last service for God as "that Servant." The only thing he did after that was to die! O glorious death, following such a faithful life! God bless his memory! Each one of us individually, as we come to recognize the completion of the sealing of the Elect, as parts of the man with the writer's inkhorn, may also now report "the matter saying, 'I have done as thou hast commanded me.'" Thus this Scripture proves that all the Elect had been sealed in the forehead before his death.

(20) According to the Berean Comment on Rev. 16:17, it is the Great Company that cries out: "It is done." This is the first marked message after the contents of the Seventh Vial were poured out. The first marked message that the Society leaders and their ardent supporters gave, and that was true with respect to the Little Flock, after their declaring widely the truthful and smiting features of Vol. VII, was that all the Elect were under the call. While not agreeing with their date for this event, we do agree that they were right in announcing the fact that entrance into the Spirit-begotten condition under the terms of the high calling was a thing of the past. It is noteworthy that in harmony with this verse the Great Company, not the Little Flock, first announced the completion of the Elect Church. In Vol. III, Chapter II, we gave some details on this verse that need not be repeated here. Suffice it here to say that there the proof is given that the message, "It is done," is the message of the Great Company, as such; and that, therefore, before they gave this message, they, as such, must have existed for some little time; and hence were separate and distinct from the Little Flock; and that,

consequently, they must have had the antitypical mantle in their possession some time before the announcement. But since this mantle must have been in the possession of the Little Flock, until its last member was sealed in the forehead, in order to have given that last member a part in the last use that the antitypical Elijah made of that mantle, *i.e.*, smiting Jordan, the last member of "the Church which is His Body" was sealed in the forehead and was functioning in the powers of that mantle, before it left the hands of the Little Flock and came into the possession of the Great Company. The Great Company made the announcement, "It is done," at the Passover Convention at Brooklyn, March 26, 1918. Therefore some considerable time before March 26, 1918, the entire Little Flock was sealed in the forehead.

(21) Rev. 19:1, 2 is another argument to the point. A comparison of Rev. 19:1, 6 and 7:9 proves that Rev. 19:1-9 treats of the Great Company; for the Greek words translated "much people" in Rev. 19:1 are the same words as those that are translated "a great multitude" in Rev. 7:9; 19:6. We have already given some details on Rev. 19:1, 2 in Vol. III, Chapter II, to which we refer the dear brethren for these details. The passage under consideration proves in the following way that the Elect have all experienced their forehead-sealing. The message of these verses (Rev. 19:1, 2) is the one by which the second smiting of Jordan was done, a thing which had to be preceded by the antitypical Elisha's receiving the mantle, and which, therefore, could take place only after the antitypical Elijah had already lost the mantle. Before antitypical Elijah could have lost this mantle, he had to make his last use of it; and nobody could be a part of the antitypical Elijah, unless he shared in some of the work of Elijah, who was to act as God's mouthpiece to Nominal Spiritual Israel. Hence the last one of the Elijah class

must have shared in the last use of the mantle. We have already seen (Vol. III, Chapter II) that Elisha smote Jordan, *i.e.*, delivered the message of Rev. 19:1, 2, from the Fall of 1917 to the Spring of 1918. Therefore some time before the Fall of 1917 the antitypical Elijah lost his mantle. Consequently, before that event all of the Elect had not only smitten Jordan, but also, previous to its completion, must have been sealed in their foreheads, *i.e.*, the reaping must have been finished.

(22) The story of Gideon and his 300 (Judg. 6-8) is another proof of the fact that before the Fall of 1916 all of the Elect were sealed in their forehead. We all recall how our dear Pastor expounded the antitype of this story: Gideon's call to arms representing our Lord's call throughout the Gospel Age for people to enlist in holy war against Sin, Error, Selfishness and Worldliness; the responding 32,000 representing all who entered tentative justification; the 22,000 giving up the warfare representing those who feared to go further than the battles for righteousness experienced in the state of tentative justification, *i.e.*, those who, counting the cost, fear to consecrate and enter into the harder part of the warfare; the remaining 10,000 representing all who consecrate; the 9,700 who stooped to drink representing those not full of loving zeal and obedience in their relations to the Lord's Word, *i.e.*, the Great Company rejected from the High Calling throughout the Gospel Age, the rejection of whose last member from the High Calling occurred some little time before the Fall of 1916, also before September 16, 1914; the 300 representing the Very Elect in those of their numbers who lived after God had remanded the last unsuccessful probationary member of The Christ to the Great Company.

(23) In the "Photo-Drama of Creation" (Scenario, p. 38, published late in 1913) our beloved Pastor says: "The triumph of Gideon's little army over a host

typified the FINAL victory of Christ and His followers over the hosts of Sin"—a victory therefore that was future to the publication of the "Photo-Drama of Creation." The 300 gained their victory in two battles (Judg. 7:19-22; 8:10-12, 18-21). These type the two conflicts of the final victory of the Little Flock. The first of these battles corresponds to the first smiting of Jordan, in which, according to this type, none of the Great Company was privileged to participate unto a completion, and in which all of the last members of The Christ took part unto a completion. This antitypical battle, therefore, was from the Fall of 1914 to that of 1916. The antitypical second battle represents the present public conflict against Eternal Torment (*Zebah, sacrifice, i.e., Moloch sacrifice, torment*) and the Consciousness of the Dead (*Zalmunna, shade, ghost*), wherein the Little Flock participates unto a completion. This is one of the passages that we had in mind, when we announced in the first number of *The Present Truth* that the Little Flock would yet give another public and widespread witness for the Truth. As touching the point under discussion, the completion of the reaping, in harmony with the above given facts, so far as fulfilled, we recognize the statement of the "Photo-Drama" Scenario, p. 38, as giving us the clue to explain the two battles of the 300 as typing the two parts of the final conflict of the Very Elect. Therefore, of course, they must be participated in by the last called member of "the Church which is His Body." Hence the last of the Elect must have been sealed before the close of the antitype of the first of these battles, the Fall of 1916. The interval between these two antitypical battles was filled in by at least a part of the antitype of the battle, with the host that retreated under *Oreb and Zeeb* (Judg. 7:23—8:3). This latter antitypical battle began with the Second Smiting of Jordan in the Fall of 1917 (Rev. 19:1, 2); but is not yet complete [written Feb. 1919].

It includes the Great Company's work described in Rev. 19:3.

(24) Num. 7:1-9 contains a further argument proving that the forehead-sealing of the Elect is completed. V. 1 proves that the wagons of vs. 3, 7, 8 were given the typical Levites after the typical Tabernacle was completed, anointed and sanctified with all its furniture and vessels. The completion of the Tabernacle, its anointing and sanctification, type the completion of the true Church, its anointing with the Truth, forehead-sealing, and its Spirit, and its separation from Babylon or the world. This separation, as already proven, occurred before the Fall of 1916, and began thereafter to be externally manifested. The day of v. 1 is the Epiphany period. During this day the antitypical Merarite and Gershonite Levites get their antitypical chariots, organizations. These have come into the former's possession already; two others apparently are now in the hands of the latter brethren; and these facts prove that the Elect were sealed in their foreheads before the three, organizations, *i.e.*, the W.T.B.&T.S., the P.P.A., the I.B.S.A.—came into the possession of the antitypical Mahli Merarites, and before two others came into the hands of the antitypical Gershonites. Some time later we will have something further of deep interest to give to the dear ones on the rest of Num. 7.

(25) Ezek. 44:1, 2 contains a proof on our subject. The gate here seen to be closed represents vitalized justification, which was an experience of those only who were about to be begotten of the Spirit. The eternal closing of this gate represents the end of Spirit-begetting for the purposes of the High Calling. Shortly after Ezekiel (who throughout his book represents not that Servant, as Vol. VII teaches, but what John in Revelation represents, *i.e.*, the Church at the time of the fulfillment of the symbolized events) is brought to this gate the last time by the man with

the measuring rod, he is shown matters pertaining to the Levites connected with their wrongs and their separation from the Priests (Ezek. 44:4-14). Accordingly, after Spirit-begetting ceased and the Church was given her last view of vitalized justification by "that Servant," in the foreword of Vol. VI, pp. iii, iv, the next things of Truth expounded to her were and are matters pertaining to the Great Company. We are now hearing the message of Ezek. 44:4-14! This proves that the forehead-sealing of the Elect was completed before the foreword of Vol. VI was written—October 1, 1916, and finally approved October 16, 1916.

(26) Matt. 24:36; 25:13 contain a time proof which shows that before May 3, 1916, all of the Elect were sealed in the forehead. The Day referred to in these verses is the Millennial Day—beginning September 12, 1874, the first day of the seventh lunar month of that year, and ending in 2874. The hour of these verses is the first 1/24 of that Day; for while no one could foretell its date, yet some living after it came would foreknow the dates of the other 23 hours. Hence the first hour of the day of these texts is the only one of the 24 of which it could be truthfully said that its beginning could not be known beforehand. Therefore, we conclude that the hour of these texts is the first hour of the 1,000-year day. An hour of a 1,000-year Day would be 1/24 of 1,000 years, *i.e.*, 41 years and 8 months. Forty-one years and 8 months (of lunar time) from September 12, 1874, would bring us to the date May 3, 1916, as follows: The 41 years ended September 8, 1915. There were 13 lunar months in the lunar year beginning March 16, 1915. These ended seven full lunar months after September 8, 1915, *i.e.*, April 4, 1916; hence the eight months following the 41 years ended May 3, 1916. *The hour of these texts was the reaping and gleaning period of the Gospel Age* (Rev. 14:15, "the hour to reap is

come," Rev. Ver., Diag., etc.), and for this reason is marked out among the hours of the 1,000-year Day, the reaping ending September 16, 1914, and the gleaning before May 3, 1916. Consequently, there was no more reaping or gleaning after May 3, 1916. Before that date, therefore, all of the Little Flock were reaped or gleaned—sealed in the forehead.

(27) Genesis 15:7-21 gives us a time proof that indicates April 18, 1916, *i.e.*, Nisan 15, the first day of the Passover feast—as the date when the last member of The Christ was sealed in the forehead. According to the Berean Comment on v. 9 the days of the years that the animals and birds sacrificed by Abraham lived totaled 3,960, and represent that many years. The Covenant was made with Abraham Nisan 15, 2045, B.C., exactly 430 years to the day before the Exodus (Ex. 12:41), which occurred Nisan 15, 1615 B.C. This was 2044 years and 8½ months before January 1, A.D. 1. The difference between 3,960 years and 2,044 years and 8½ months is 1,915 years and 3½ months, which from January 1, A.D. 1, would end (lunar time) April 18, 1916, not 1915, as C.J. Woodworth in the Berean Comment changed the thought which the brother who sent in the suggestion stated in his letter, published in Z. 1907, p. 79, col. 2, pars. 2, 3; for from January, 1; 2045 B.C., to January, 1, A.D. 1, would be 2,045 years; thence to January, 1, 1916, would be 1,915 full years. Nisan 15, 2045, B.C., was 3½ months later than January 1, 2045. Hence the full 3,960 years—from Nisan, 15, 2045 B.C.—would be Nisan 15, 1916.

(28) The brother in whose letter this matter was explained suggests that the total number of days in the years of the sacrifices that Abraham offered was given by the Lord as an assurance of the length of time in years that Abraham must wait to inherit the land of promise. He therefore suggested that we were to expect the return of the Ancient Worthies at the end

of 3,960 years. That feature of the suggestion failed to materialize. Therefore it was a mistake, which, however, is easy of explanation in the following way:

(29) If we look carefully at the words of the question in Genesis 15:8, we will notice that they do not state that the time of his inheriting the land was inquired for by Abraham; but his query was concerning *the thing* whereby he might know that he would inherit it, an inheritance which Abraham knew would not be his before his death. What does Jehovah give as a basis for the assurance that Abraham and all like him would inherit the land? Our answer is, the sacrifice of Jesus and the Church, who as the chief Seed of Abraham are to give the inheritance of the land to the heirs of the earthly promise (Heb. 9:14, 15). Therefore, when the last member of The Christ would be found and placed upon the altar of sacrifice, and prove that sacrifice as genuinely offered by leaving symbolic Egypt in the symbolic fourth generation—*i.e.*, (1) Patriarchal Age, (2) Jewish Age, (3) Gospel Age, (4) Millennial Age, in which we have been since 1874, as indicated in vs. 13-16—then the basis of the assurance would be complete; for the Seed would be produced that would give the heirs the land. Accordingly, this passage proves that on Passover Day, *i.e.*, April 18, 1916—the last member of The Christ demonstrated that his humanity was being sacrificed by his leaving symbolic Egypt, *i.e.*, by his having enough of Truth (sealed in the forehead) to sever himself from this present evil world as it is represented in the nominal church.

(30) Volume VII suggests that we must begin this period of 3,960 years ten years later than the Covenant, because the account of the sacrifice is given a few verses before the statement is made (Gen. 16:3) that ten years after the Covenant Abraham took Hagar as his wife. Our answer is that we cannot prove the event of Genesis 16:3 and that of Genesis 15:7-21 to

be of the same date; and that therefore we cannot begin to count the time from an event whose date is not known. Doubtless the time of giving the Covenant is the proper one with which to begin to date the 3,960 years, as suggested in the letter in the 1907 Tower.

(31) A little further thought will make this manifest; for it will be noticed that three animals and two birds were used for sacrifices by Abraham (Gen. 15:9). They seem to represent the five classes that would be more or less separated to the Lord from the time of the Covenant—2045 B.C.—until the last one of the Little Flock would be sealed in the forehead. The heifer (T 105-112) seems to represent the Ancient Worthies and Youthful Worthies (these two classes are sometimes coupled together as one class in some types, *e.g.*, Elisha, etc.); the she goat, the Great Company; the ram, The Christ; the turtle dove, those of fleshly Israel who have measurably held to the promises and to Moses; and the pigeon, those of the tentatively justified who have remained loyal to the Ransom and to Righteousness. The cleaving of the animals seems to represent the entire consecration and death ("a good report through faith") of the classes typed by them; and the birds left undivided seem to suggest the incomplete consecration (not "a good report through faith") of fleshly Israel and the tentatively justified. The sign given to Abraham in the transaction, while concentrated in the sacrifice of the entire Christ—the highest class of sufferers for righteousness—included all of the classes of Abraham's Seed that have suffered more or less because of their faith in some or in all of the promises made to Abraham. Thus the Seed of Abraham—especially the complete Christ, suffering for righteousness—is that whereby God gives the assurance that Abraham will inherit the land. And the time feature in this our sixteenth argument proves that the forehead-sealing of the Elect, the reaping, was finished at the Passover

of 1916. Therefore and henceforth it is certain that Abraham will receive the land.

(32) On the basis of the foregoing 16 reasons we conclude that we have a firm foundation for our faith that the reaping is done, that the Elect have already been sealed in the forehead. That none of the Little Flock during Brother Russell's days could see this is neither to his nor to their disparagement, God wisely hiding this fact from him and them in order to test his people more thoroughly, and to effect more easily their separation into their various classes. Such concealment of this fact was also made by the Lord in order to make it possible, in harmony with His will, for the Great Company, as such—therefore after their separation from the Little Flock—to be the first ones among His people to announce the completion of Spirit-begetting for high calling purposes (Rev. 16:17). It is also in thorough harmony with, and a natural sequence of, the thought that the saints' forehead-sealing was completed April 18, 1916, that shortly following that time both in America and Britain, trouble broke out among the leaders of the three groups of the antitypical Levites (antitypical Kohathites, Merarites and Gershonites) on account of their antagonistic ambitions, effecting against the opposing ambitions of these groups the steadfast opposition of the Little Flock—first in its leaders, then in the others, as their eyes were opened to see the conditions.

(33) II. Having seen that the reaping, including the gleaning, was finished in the Spring of 1916 we now proceed to prove that the reaping began October, 1874, as our dear Pastor taught to the end of his life; for while in Z. 1916, pp. 263-265, he taught that the reaping was not yet over and might last three years, he nevertheless taught in that article (p. 264, col. 1, last par.) that the reaping began in 1874.

(34) The first argument that we offer on this subject is Daniel's 1,335 days (Dan. 12:12), which, as

we know, ended in October, 1874. From that time onward the sickle of Truth, according to this passage, blessed with most heart-cheering enlightenment the faithful, as it reaped them. Previous to that time our dear Pastor had learned to understand the Ransom, Restitution and the Object of our Lord's Return. In September of that year he learned to understand the Manner of our Lord's Return, and with these doctrines and others as a sickle he began immediately an active campaign on these subjects, among other ways circulating these thoughts in the first Harvest publication, "The Object and Manner of our Lord's Return" (Z. 1916, p. 171, col. 1, pars. 1-3). Hence Daniel's 1,335 days and their fulfilled facts prove that the reaping began in October, 1874.

(35) Elijah's second awakening and second meal (1 Kings 19:5-8) likewise prove that the reaping began in 1874. The first awakening and meal of the antitypical Elijah began in 1829; his second falling asleep began just after the disappointment of 1844; and his second awakening and meal began in 1874 (Matt. 25:1-6). The first part of the second meal in part consisted of the truths mentioned in the preceding paragraph. The 40 days of journeying represent the 40 years of reaping (Z. 1908, top of page 223), which ended 1914, and were followed by a gleaning period of 19 months. The facts mentioned in the preceding paragraph prove the date 1874 as the beginning of the reaping work, from the standpoint of antitypical Elijah's second awakening and meal.

(36) The 40 days of spying out the land (Num. 13:1-25) seem to give the same thought. These 40 days of spying the land represent, among other things, the 40 years (1874-1914) during which Little Flock leaders were especially searching out their prospective inheritance as revealed in the Parousia-disclosed truths. As pointed out above, this started with the reaping in 1874.

(37) The Day of the Parable of the Penny teaches the same thought. This we set forth with much elaboration in the preceding chapter, and refer our readers to it for details.

(38) The account of the Crowned Reaper and of His work (Rev. 14:14-16) proves that the reaping began in 1874. The golden crown as a symbol represents *Divine Authority* as King (Z. 1911, p. 120, col. 1, par. 3). Jesus received this authority before His Second Advent (Ps. 45:3, 4). The sharp sickle is the Parousia Truth. The reason why the "One like unto a Son of man" is asked to reap is: "Because the *hour* [the first 41 $\frac{2}{3}$ years of the 1,000 years] to reap is come." In God's Harvests reaping time implies the doing of the reaping work. This hour, beginning with the 1,000-year Day, set in October, 1874; hence the reaping then began; *because God is punctual*. When His time to do a thing comes He does it, and does *not procrastinate* (Hab. 2:3). This answers J. F. R.'s claim that the Harvest time, but not the Harvest work began in 1874. The cry of the angel—"Thrust in thy sickle and reap"—represents the prayers of the Lord's people for Him to send forth and prosper what proved to be Parousia truths, and this began before the first presentations of these truths. The thrusting in of the sickle began, as shown above, in the Fall of 1874; hence the reaping began in that year. A caution should be here given: let us not confound the *possession* of the crown, Divine authority as a King, with the *exercise* of such kingly authority. Jesus possessed this authority before His Second Advent (Ps. 45:3, 4) and while in possession of this authority, began in 1874 to reap, three and one-half years before He began to exercise such kingly authority, in casting off Babylon and in awakening the sleeping saints April, 1878 (Is. 52:7).

(39) The Parallel Harvests are another proof that the reaping began in 1874. The arguments are unanswerable that our dear Pastor gives us in the "Studies"

and in the "Towers," and that Brothers John and Morton Edgar give us in the "Pyramid Passages"—that the Harvest Parallels refer to grace as well as to wrath, to the real Israels as well as to the nominal Israels. Hence, if we can prove that the reaping of the Jewish Harvest began 29 A.D. and progressed for over 3½ years before Pentecost of 33 A.D., it would follow that the reaping of the Gospel Harvest began in 1874 and progressed for some years before Pentecost, 1878.

(40) Jesus as the first grain of wheat was reaped in the Fall of 29 A.D. In order to overcome the force of this argument J. F. R. at Bethel in 1917 and later in a "Tower" article denied that Jesus was a grain of wheat, claiming that a grain of wheat must be a fallen member of our race. Jesus disagrees with this claim and definition on this point; because He called Himself a grain of wheat (John 12:24). A ripe grain of wheat is a character fitted for the Harvest Truth in the reaping time. Such Jesus was; and Jehovah reaped Him October, 29 A.D.

(41) The 12 and the 70 were reaped some considerable time before they were sent forth as messengers of the Gospel to reap others (Matt. 4:18-22; 9:9; John 1:35-51; Matt. 9:37—10:7; Luke 10:1-9).

(42) Many other Israelites were reaped during our Lord's ministry, of whom over 500 remained steadfast, despite the sore sifting incidental to His last earthly experiences (Luke 6:13; 1 Cor. 15:6).

(43) Express passages show in so many words that Jesus and His disciples did a reaping work (Matt. 9:35—10:7; Luke 9:1-6; 10:1-9; Mark 3:13-19).

(44) John the Baptist, using the figure of the Bridegroom, Bride and the Friend of the Bridegroom, and showing that he was seeking and winning some for Jesus' Bride, did a work which under another figure is called a reaping work (John 3:29, 30).

(45) Jesus' statement in John 4:34-38, uttered

about seven months after His baptism, expressly says that not only were they in the Harvest time, but that the disciples had already done some reaping: "I *have* sent you to *reap* that whereon ye bestowed no labor; other men have labored, and ye *are* [*have*] entered into their labors." This passage also refutes J. F. R's. view that while 29 A.D. began the Harvest time, Harvest work, reaping, did not begin until Pentecost, 33 A.D.

(46) Before Pentecost, when *garnering*, the last Harvest process, began, the six preceding Harvest processes, whose first one is reaping, had been in operation. Passages previously quoted prove that reaping work, the first of the seven Harvest processes, was done from the beginning of our Lord's ministry; and Luke 22:31 shows that Peter was sifted; while the final accounts of our Lord's career imply that all of the Apostles and many others were sifted before Pentecost. Sifting is the sixth Harvest process; hence the intervening processes were in operation before our Lord's betrayal. The fact that the last Harvest process, garnering, began to operate at Pentecost (Z. 1916, p. 264, col. 2, par. 2), proves that the other Harvest processes operated before Pentecost, and that the first of these, reaping, must have begun a considerable time before Pentecost, even, as we have proved, in 29 A.D.

(47) Hence, as proven by the seven arguments just given, reaping having been in operation for over 3½ years before Pentecost, 33. A.D., it follows from the Parallel Harvest that reaping was in operation from October, 1874, to April, 1878.

(48) Facts abundantly prove that reaping was going on from October, 1874, to April, 1878. The reaping process implies two things: (1) that the sickle of Harvest Truth be wielded: (2) that it cut down the stalks of grain, *i.e.*, separate them from their places of growth. (1) During the time in question the following Harvest truths were proclaimed in conversations, lectures

and Bible studies: "The Mortality of the Soul"; "Death, not Eternal Torment, as the Penalty of Sin"; "The Ransom"; "Restitution"; "The Time, Manner and Object of our Lord's Return"; "The Election of the Church"; "The Millennial Reign of Christ"; "Future Probation"; "The Permanence of the Earth," etc., etc. In addition to the oral proclamation of these truths during those years, the following publications at that time carried these same truths to many by the printed page: The booklets, "The Object and Manner of our Lord's Return," by our Pastor; and "The Three Worlds," by Brother Barbour; and the Monthly periodical, "The Herald of the Morning," edited by Bros. Barbour, Russell and Paton. (2) As a result of this propaganda hundreds of brethren were won by these truths and severed themselves from Babylon. Thus grains of wheat were separated from the stalks on which they grew by the sickle of Truth, *i.e.*, reaping was in operation from 1874 onward.

(49) Again the fact that there were a number of classes of Truth people formed during those years proves that the second process of the Harvest work was in operation, *i.e.*, sheaving. There was a class at Allegheny, Pa.; another at Rochester, N.Y., a third at Almont, Mich.; a fourth at Dansville, N.Y.; elsewhere there were smaller groups of brethren.

(50) Furthermore, the fact that, as the sixth Harvest process, the first sifting of the Gospel Harvest began at the Passover, 1878, paralleling the sifting connected with our Lord's death, proves that before the Pentecost of 1878 six of the Harvest processes had been in operation, and that, therefore, the Gospel Harvest began some considerable time before 1878. Thus the facts prove that the reaping began in 1874.

(51) On the point that the reaping began in 1874 other than the above seven arguments could be given, *e.g.*, the floor-line measurement of the Grand Gallery in the Great Pyramid, terminating with 1914,

proves that the 40 years' Harvest work began in 1874; but we believe that a sufficient number has been given to prove our second test. Considering this proposition proven, we now proceed to our third proposition.

(52) III. Our Pastor never taught that the reaping began in April, 1878, and would end in April, 1918. It is claimed by J. F. R. and his supporters and by Carl Olson and his supporters that our Pastor taught that the reaping began April, 1878, and ended April, 1918. This we deny. The article on which they base their claim (*Z.* 1916, pp. 263-265) does not state these thoughts, which it has been so gratuitously assumed to do. We suggest to our dear brethren that they read and reread and, if necessary, again reread it, and see for themselves that it does not so teach. The most careful study of the article fails to reveal, as taught therein, these dates as the beginning and the ending of the reaping work. Will these brethren kindly tell us where the article gives these as the dates of the reaping?

(53) Not only does that article not teach April, 1878, and April, 1918, as the dates for the beginning and ending of the reaping, but nothing in it implies these dates as such beginning and ending. There are two statements in the article from which J. F. R. and others have inferred the dates, but quite erroneously. One of these statements is to the effect (p. 264, col. 2, pars. 2, 6) that the end of the wrath on Israel was April, 73, and that the parallel of this date was April, 1918. This statement is true, but does not refer at all to the reaping; rather it refers to the burning of the chaff; and of course completing the burning of the chaff in Fleshly Israel cannot be paralleled with completing the reaping of the wheat in Spiritual Israel. People who blunder into such an inference are not safe guides. They surely will lead others into the ditch! The second statement from which the inference was drawn that April, 1878, and

April, 1918, respectively witnessed the beginning and ending of the reaping, is that made on there being no garner until Pentecost, 33 A.D. (p. 264, col. 2, par. 1). The reasoning that produced this inference is the following: Since there was no garner until Pentecost, 33 A.D., there was therefore no reaping until then! hence there was no reaping until Pentecost, 1878, the parallel time in the Gospel Harvest; and since the Gospel reaping lasts 40 years, the reaping must have ended in 1918! What poor reasoning! In it the *reaping* process is confounded with the *garnering* process, whereas in both nature and grace reaping is the first and garnering is the seventh and last process of the Harvest. The proper inference to draw from the fact that the garnering began Pentecost of 33 is this: that the other six Harvest processes, whose first is reaping, began before Pentecost of 33, and that reaping, the first of these processes, must have begun considerably before Pentecost of 33. This is in harmony with October, 29, as the proper date, even as we proved above. Thus the very point on which they mainly base their contention completely disproves their view!

(54) The above-mentioned "Tower" article by our Pastor denies the fixing of 1918, or any other date, as the time for the end of reaping the Gospel Harvest. This denial is clearly stated (p. 263, last par.) as follows: "We are not fixing the time, for we know of no time feature applicable before us—even as Elijah and Elisha were not sent to any definite place after reaching Jordan." Had J. F. R., C. J. Woodworth and C. Olson maintained the holy reserve of our dear Pastor, they would not have been guilty of misleading many brethren on this point and on others. Menta Sturgeon in print tells us that just after our Pastor's death he vowed to be as faithful to him in his death as he was in his life. He knows and has repeatedly said that after the article, "The Harvest is not Ended," appeared our Pastor in response to repeated

questions at conventions positively asserted that he fixed no date for the end of the reaping, a thing that we and many others also heard our Pastor say at several conventions that late Summer and early Fall. In view of these facts we desire to ask Menta Sturgeon how can he harmonize with his vow his endorsement of C. Olson's book, which sets aside our Pastor's teaching, not only on this subject, but also on multitudes of others? [Written in October, 1919.]

(55) In fixing this date, 1918, the Society leaders caused much disappointment to thousands of the brethren; and their and others' fixing wrong dates, we are satisfied, will produce further disappointments.

(56) Statements in "Pastor Russell's Sermons" (pp. 287, par. 1, and 289, par. 3) are cited by not a few as a proof that our dear Pastor taught that the reaping began in 1878 and ended in 1918. We reply that in the book of sermons printed late in 1917 by the Society these dates will be found on the pages cited above; but not in the sermon as our dear Pastor published it. The sermon in question was first published in 1908, and correctly gave the dates 1874 and 1914 as the beginning and end of the Harvest. *Our Pastor never changed those dates* in that sermon. They were changed *after his death, seemingly to palm off as his certain time features that he never taught, thereby misleading many, even as was done by the interpolated verse, 1 John 5:7.* The one responsible for this change has much to answer for. Such a course cannot but arouse distrust that other misleading changes have been made, or may yet be made, in his writings. In the Lord's name we serve these Levites notice to refrain from further presumption and fraud in tampering with the priestly writings of "that Servant." They are not qualified for the work of correcting them, and do it at their peril (Lev. 10:1, 2)!

(57) It is not our claim that our dear Pastor did not give up the date 1914 as the end of the reaping work;

for the article above referred to proves that he did so do, though neither in that article nor in any other, nor by word of mouth, would he fix another date for the end of the reaping work. The question arises, how did he come to think that he had been in error on the subject? The article itself shows (p. 263, col. 2, par. 4) that there seemed to him to be too many people won for the Truth from October, 1914, onward, to be the product of a gleaning work. It is certain that goodly numbers of people came into the Truth during that time; but may this not be accounted for in harmony with the thought of a gleaning work going on at that time? We think it may. Of course, none of us know definitely how many are required to constitute the gleanings of the Gospel Harvest, though the number would hardly be considerable, by no means so many as our dear Pastor saw coming into the Truth at that time. Hence his doubts; and if all that came into the Truth at that time were members of the Little Flock, we would have to draw the conclusion that he drew, *i.e.*, that it must have been as a result of a reaping and not of a gleaning work. But there is good Biblical evidence for believing that at that time large numbers of the Great Company were leaving the nominal church and coming into the Truth. Lot leaving Sodom *before* the destruction of the city began *types how a section of the Great Company* would leave the nominal church and come into the Truth, *before* the destruction of Christendom in its successive parts would begin. The destruction of Christendom *began with the war*; hence *before* the war began to involve a country, a section of the Great Company in that country would leave the nominal church, and come into the Truth. Thus, for instance, for some time before America became involved in the war, a very considerable number of the Great Company left the nominal church here and came into the Truth. These large numbers made our Pastor doubt that they were the products of a

gleaning work. But if we keep in mind the fact that the antitypical Lot is no part of the Little Flock gleanings, we will have no difficulty in harmonizing the facts of those times with the facts clearly proven by our Pastor—that the 40 years' reaping began in 1874 and ended in 1914, and that the rest of the Little Flock members coming into the Truth thereafter were the gleanings of the Gospel Harvest.

(58) In the Lord's Providence, at Bethel in 1917 we were by several brethren (at present Society adherents) who were witnesses and in part actors in the events, apprised of how our dear Pastor came to make some of the changes suggested in Z. 1916, pp. 263-265. We herewith submit the facts. He had for some time been troubled by the fact that more people were coming into the Truth than a gleaning work alone would warrant. While in this state of mind he wrote an article on the subject, for publication in "The Tower," but before it was sent to the printer, a brother, who now stands with the Society, asked our Pastor during a meal in Bethel dining room the question: "Does not the fact that the reaping was done by the *Crowned* Reaper (Rev. 14:14-16) prove that the reaping began after our Lord began to exercise kingly authority in 1878?" The brother in his question confounded the *possession* of Divine Authority as a King with the *exercise* of such kingly Authority. Our Lord had such authority before His Return in 1874 (Ps. 45:3, 4), though the first exercise of it occurred in 1878. This brother further urged that his thought was corroborated by the time of the awakening of the sleeping saints (Rev. 14:13), which is described just before the reaping is described. But he overlooked the fact that the visions in Revelation do not always follow one another chronologically. While our Pastor did not endorse the brother's thought, it increased his doubts as to the reaping ending in 1914; and going to his study after the meal he dictated several paragraphs which he

had inserted into the aforementioned article. These paragraphs added several changes to those already in the article. This was late in the summer of 1916. Our Pastor was a dying man and with his many burdens could not give the subject his former strength and clearness of thought. Hence he published an article that contradicted his unanswerable arguments given in the "Studies" and "The Towers." Scriptures, Reason and Facts prove his former presentations to be correct. Hence we accept them rather than this later one. Surely, under the circumstances no lover of his will hold it against him, if, while dying and burdened by superhuman tasks, he gave us a less logical explanation than when in his full vigor! Yea, the very act itself shows his great humility, and increases our love for him! We thank God for every remembrance of him, and daily pray our Father to bless his memory! O that the brethren would prize his teachings more!

(59) Why did the Lord permit our Pastor to suggest that he had erred in teaching that 1914 was the end of the reaping? Subsequent events suggest a satisfactory answer: The next great event before the Lord's people was to be the separation of the Little Flock from the Great Company. This implied one of the sorest trials in the experience of the Little Flock, and the operation of the strongest delusion ever let loose among God's people; for, in view of their retaining the Holy Spirit, to bewilder many of the Little Flock and to delude the Great Company, required a frenzy of delusion by far more subtle than any of the frenzies of delusion by which the Second Death class, with its loss of the Holy Spirit, had been deceived and separated from the Church previously; and we know that the 1918 date for the end of the Harvest (yea, *they even claimed it as the date when the last member of the Body would leave the earth*), a date given for neither event by our Pastor, was a part of the strong delusion, and as such contributed to bewilder not a

few of the Faithful, and thoroughly to deceive the bulk of the Great Company. The Lord knew that the Society leaders, as teachers of "perverse things," would twist the article, "The Harvest is Not Ended," into teaching what it does not teach, and thus use it to blind their credulous followers into "The Big Drive," which proved to be Jordan's second smiting. Knowing that it would serve His purposes with respect to both classes of His people, the Lord permitted our dear Pastor, while slowly dying, to write that he had been in error as to the date of the reaping's end; and the Society leaders, twisting the change into another meaning worked this and others of their "perverse things" overtime unto the deception of many. "He hath done all things well" (Mark 7:37).

"O the depths of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable [to those lacking meekness] are His judgments, and His ways past finding out! ... For of Him, and through Him and to Him are all things, to Whom be glory forever! Amen" (Rom. 11:33, 36).

(60) We desire to assure all of the brethren, whether adherents or non-adherents of the Society, that they have our heart's sincere love. The motive prompting our exposures of their errors is love for the Lord, the Truth and the Brethren. It is this love that prompts us to send The Present Truth to as many of the dear ones as we can locate. We would gladly send them to the others, but lack their addresses. We are assured that not a few have been helped. We sympathize with any who may have been displeased. Our faith is that in due time these will also recognize and appreciate our efforts on their behalf. And in the meantime we pray for all of the Lord's dear people the richest blessings that they are capable of receiving. The Lord grant these for Jesus' sake!

(1) In how many, and in what senses is the word

Harvest used? What acts are implied in the wide, and what act is implied in the narrow sense of the word?

(2) In how many and in what senses is the word reaping used? What acts are implied in the wide, and what act is implied in the narrow sense of the word?

(3) What two terms relating to the final features of the Little Flock's work selfward are synonymous?

(4) How many sealings are there? How do they differ?

(5) What is not, and what is the purpose of this study? When was the time of the forehead sealing not, and when was it due to be understood? Why was it not made known to "that Servant"? Why was it not, and why was it made clear to another?

(6) Under what three heads is the Time of Reaping presented in this chapter?

(7) What three things are implied with respect to the last Spirit-begotten and forehead-sealed saint? After the last member of The Christ is reaped what kind of work cannot, and what kind can for some years be done?

(8) To what kind of work does John 9:4 refer? And to what kind can it not refer? Why not? Explain Scriptures that prove these thoughts.

(9) What is meant by the "night" of John 9:4? When and with what did it start? How did it envelop each country? What conclusions are to be drawn from its presence everywhere?

(10) Explain each symbolic term in Rev. 7:1-3.

(11) What had to precede the symbolic wind of Rev. 7:1? What does this not, and what does it mean? Give illustrations explaining this. What language nation did not declaratively enter the World War? How was it involved? What two conclusions follow from these considerations?

(12) How does Ps. 149:5-9 prove that the reaping was completed before the Fall of 1916?

(13) How does the first smiting of Jordan prove that the forehead sealing was finished before the Fall of 1916?

(14) How does the High Priest's twofold dealing with Azazel's Goat prove this?

(15) How does the separation of Elijah and Elisha prove this?

(16) How does the twofold distribution of the Penny prove this?

(17) How does our Pastor's mission prove this?

(18) What is a wide-spread view as to the meaning of the inkhorn man?

(19) Give three reasons for understanding him to represent a class. How and when did "that Servant" as the leader in the inkhorn man begin to report the sealing of the Elect? What does this prove as to the time of such sealing?

(20) How does Rev. 16:17 prove that the forehead sealing of the Elect was completed before Passover, 1918?

(21) How does Rev. 19:1, 2 prove that the forehead sealing of the Elect was completed some time before the Fall of 1917?

(22) Explain, type and antitype, Gideon's work with the Israelites up to the first battle.

(23) Explain, type and antitype, Gideon's two battles. How do these prove the completion of the forehead sealing before the Fall of 1916? Explain, type and antitype, the battle occurring between Gideon's two battles.

(24) How does Num. 7:1-9, type and antitype, prove the completion of the reaping before the Fall of 1916?

(25) How does Ezek. 44:1, 2, symbol and reality, prove the completion of the reaping before the Fall of 1916?

(26) Describe the day and the hour of Matt. 24:36; 25:13. Why are these things true? How long was each hour of the day? When did the first hour begin and end? Why? Why was this hour the reaping and gleaning period? Before what date, accordingly, must the forehead-sealing have been complete?

(27) What date for the completion of the forehead sealing is indicated in Gen. 15:7-21? Explain in detail how this passage gives us the date April 18, 1916, for the completion of the gleaning work.

(28) What mistaken suggestion was made as to what would occur April 18, 1916?

(29) What was not, and what was the query of Abraham? What pantomime answer did Jehovah give? What typical answer did He give? What truth do we derive from the answers?

(30) What suggestion does Vol. VII make as the date

for the beginning of the 3,960 years? What unprovable assumption does it make for so beginning the years?

(31) With what date should these years begin? Why? What classes are represented by the five sacrifices? What is represented by cleaving the animals and not cleaving the birds? What is the general and the special sign that God gave for the inheritance of the land? And what does the time feature prove?

(32) What conclusion should we draw from the 16 reasons given above? What is no argument against this conclusion? What further two facts corroborate this conclusion?

(33) When did the reaping begin? How long did "that Servant" teach this?

(34) What argument does Daniel give on this point? What facts are in harmony with Daniel's prophecy?

(35) Explain, type and antitype, 1 Kings 19:5-8. Show how it proves 1874 as the beginning of the reaping.

(36) How does the spying out of the land prove this?

(37) How does the Penny Parable's Day prove this?

(38) How does Rev. 14:14-16, symbol and reality, prove the same thing? What caution is to be observed respecting the symbol of the crown? Why?

(39) What do the Parallel Dispensations prove as to the date 1874? To what things and periods do they refer?

(40) Who was the first grain of wheat? Why? What follows from this fact as to the beginning of the Jewish Harvest?

(41) What does the call of the 12 and of the 70 prove as to the time of the beginning of the Jewish Harvest? Note and explain the pertinent Scriptures in their details.

(42) Scripturally and factually point out the reaping work prior to our Lord's death.

(43) Read and explain four Scriptures that point out a reaping work between Oct., 29 and April, 33 A.D.

(44) How does John 3:29, 30 prove the same thought?

(45) How does John 4:34-38 prove the same thing?

(46) How do the operation of six Harvest processes before Pentecost prove the same thing?

(47) What follows from the above considerations?

(48) What two detailed sets of facts prove that the reaping began 1874?

(49) What facts prove that sheaving was in operation several years before 1878?

(50) When did the first sifting of the Gospel Harvest begin? What does this prove as to the time of reaping?

(51) What other corroborative argument may be given for the reaping?

(52) What unfounded claim is made for 1878? Why is this an unfounded claim?

(53) What is not implied in Z. 1916, pp. 263-265? From what two statements have the two false dates been inferred? How are the inferences to be refuted? What are the proper inferences to be drawn from the fact that there was no garner until Pentecost, 33?

(54) How does Z. 1916, p. 263, last paragraph, disprove the claim that it teaches 1918 to be the end of the reaping? How have those who have perverted this article acted toward "that Servant"?

(55) What has resulted from fixing the date 1918? What will result from fixing other wrong dates?

(56) What glaring interpolation was made to make our Pastor appear to teach what is a false period for the reaping? What are the character and results of such an act?

(57) Who gave up the date 1914 as the end of the reaping? Why? How may we harmonize the facts that perplexed him with his proven dates as to the reaping?

(58) What are the facts connected with our Pastor's change of mind as to the reaping ending in 1914? What was his physical condition at that time? Which view of his is the correct one? How should we feel toward him in view of all the circumstances?

(59) Why did the Lord permit him to give up the right date? How and why did this change contribute to the Lord's purpose? How should we feel toward the Lord for His part in this matter?

(60) What motive has prompted the discussion of Society conditions and teaching? For what may we hope and pray for all concerned?

Reaping all day were the virgins fair,
Patiently toiling in faith and pray'r,
Seeking the wheat from the dawn till night,
Jewels to shine in the morning light.
O! rich will the harvest be,
O! rich will the harvest be.

Reaping all day, though their foes were nigh,
Saving the wheat that it should not die,
Gath'ring the jewels bright and fair,
Sorting them out with tender care.
O! grand will the harvest be,
O! grand will the harvest be.

Reaping from seed that was sown in tears,
Gath'ring the fruit of laborious years,
Looking in hope for the harvest home,
Reapers and sowers together come.
O! sweet will the meeting be,
O! sweet will the meeting be.

Reaped from the garden, or reaped from the rock,
Reaped from the wayside, the wheat from the stalk.
Gathered from wealth or from poverty,
Grand and blest will the harvest be,
When Sowers and Reapers together come,
When Sowers and Reapers together come.

CHAPTER IV.

GIDEON—TYPE AND ANTITYPE.

ANTITYPICAL ISRAEL'S OPPRESSION. JESUS' PREPARATION FOR THE WORK OF DELIVERANCE WHILE IN THE FLESH. SALIENT FEATURES OF JESUS' GOSPEL-AGE MINISTRY PREPARATORY TO OVERTHROWING THE MAIN ERRORISTS AND THEIR ERRORS. THE GOSPEL-AGE ELECTIVE AND REJECTIVE WORK. JESUS' FINAL ENCOURAGEMENT FOR THE CONFLICT. DIRECTIONS FOR AND PARTICIPATION IN ANTITYPICAL GIDEON'S FIRST BATTLE. THE LEVITES' PARTICIPATION IN THE WARFARE. THE YOUTHFUL WORTHIES' PARTICIPATION IN THE WARFARE. THEIR DISSATISFACTION AT BEING TOO LATE FOR THE HIGH CALLING. JESUS' TACTFUL ANSWER TO THEIR MURMURING AT HIM FOR NOT INVITING THEM TO THE HIGH CALLING. THE ORDER OF THE NARRATIVE. OUR LORD'S SEEKING SINEWS OF WAR FOR HIS ARMY. THE FINAL MARCH AND BATTLE. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

THE Present Truth has frequently referred to antitypical Gideon's first and second battles. The reason for such frequent references in that magazine to these battles is that both of them belong to the Epiphany. Just now we refer very frequently to the second of these battles, because it is now being waged. The brethren, we are sure, will appreciate this battle more, and take a more zealous and fruitful part in it, if Gideon, type and antitype, is more clearly understood by them. For this reason we take pleasure in presenting this subject here to the Church. We have frequently planned to do it ere this, but have until now been hindered therefrom. Until last Spring [written in December, 1920] we had frequently studied Judg. 6, but had as frequently failed to grasp its antitypical teachings. When last Spring we concluded that antitypical Gideon's second battle was approaching, believing that the clear understanding of the entire antitype, so far as fulfilled, would help all Gideonites in the second battle, we went to the Lord in special prayer, asking for the understanding of those parts not yet clear to us, especially Judg. 6, and promising Him

that we would gladly give the interpretation to the Church, if He would graciously favor us with it for the brethren. Within a half-hour after offering that prayer almost everything in that chapter was antitypically clear to us; and we take much pleasure in setting forth herewith what we believe to be the antitype of Judg. 6:1—8:12. It has refreshed those who have heard it given orally. May the dear Lord be pleased to bless to our hearts and heads the study of this remarkable piece of history as we give it to all through the printed page.

(2) That Gideon is a typical character is evident from the fact that St. Paul enumerates him (Heb. 11:32) among the heroes of faith, and states (Heb. 12:1) that we are encompassed, surrounded as a type surrounds its antitype, by these heroes of faith as by a cloud of witnesses—shadowy or typical witnesses. That Gideon's battles with the Midianites are types is directly stated (Is. 9:4; 10:26; Ps. 83:9, 11, 12). Since Gideon was the leader of typical Israel, he quite likely types Jesus, the Leader of antitypical Israel. God's people of the Jewish and Gospel Ages are the antitypes of Israel, in Judg. 6, 7, 8. Midian means strife, and the Midianites represent errorists who have striven with God's people, and have oppressed them with erroneous doctrines and practices. We already have seen that Gideon's first battle types the defeat of those who taught the errors of the Divine right of kings, aristocrats and clergy, by the Lord's faithful people, from the Fall of 1914 to that of 1916, otherwise pictured by the first smiting of Jordan, the confessing of the sins over Azazel's Goat and the binding of the kings and nobles in executing the judgment written. Therefore 1914 is the end of the oppression of the antitypical Israelites by the doctrines of Divine right. We know that God's Israel began in 607 B.C. to be oppressed by those that have taught these doctrines, and, actuated by such beliefs, subjected God's

people to themselves. Hence we understand the seven years (Judg. 6:1) of Midian's oppression to represent the seven symbolic years—2520 literal years—of the Times of the Gentiles. Israel's captivity, 607-537 B.C., was the beginning of these times of antitypical Midian's oppression, especially by the doctrines of the Divine right. As Fleshly Israel's sins brought this oppression upon them, so Spiritual Israel's sins brought the same oppression upon them. In this oppression (Judg. 6:2) the errorists injured both of God's Israels by putting their false teachings into practice; and this oppression caused God's people to resort for safety to secret methods and dealings (dens and caves), *e.g.*, dwelling in the catacombs, meeting in secret, working more or less under cover; and to fortifying themselves by arguments (strongholds) against the errorists. V. 3 shows that every time the true people of God would produce some fruit in their fields of labor the errorists would take it away from them—a thing that was true of the experiences of Fleshly and Spiritual Israel. Their chief oppressors were the errorists (Midianites), who were seconded by the wicked (Amalekites, *lowlanders*, those who inhabit the lowlands of sinful degradation) and the selfish and worldly (the children of the east). These certainly fought (v. 4) against the Lord's people until they overcame them, not ceasing their strife until they had subdued them into captivity in their sects (Gaza, a city of the Philistines, sectarianism). They robbed the Lord's people of their truths (substance), taking away the doctrine of the Sin-offerings and Ransom (sheep, margin, kid, and ox, *i.e.*, bullock) and perverting every other doctrine (ass), as we see this illustrated in the course of the Papacy. V. 5 shows how this was accomplished. The oppressors came up against them with all their followers and equipment (cattle and tents) in great multitudes, individually and organizationally (they and their camels), being intent on

destroying antitypical Israel's teachings and fruits. V. 6 brings us to the opening of the Christian Era, at which time all men (Israelites indeed) were in expectation, longing and praying amid their oppression for the coming of Messiah to deliver them from the yoke of Rome. The same thing was in spirit fulfilled among Christians incidental to the oppressions of Pagan and Papal Rome. According to v. 7, when these cries for release began, the Lord began to prepare deliverance for His people.

(3) In vs. 8-10 we understand the type to picture forth the ministry of John the Baptist, begun when all men were in expectation of the Messiah; for just as the prophet there reminded Israel of God's Covenant benefits to them, despite which they sinned against the Lord and His Covenant, so the preaching of John the Baptist was a preaching of God's goodness to Israel, of His Covenant with them, of their violations of this Covenant, and of the necessity of repentance and faith in order to obtain from the Messiah their deliverance (Matt. 3:1-12).

(4) Vs. 11-24 typically refer to our Lord's preparation for, and execution of His ministry while in the flesh. In this section the angel that instructed Gideon as to his mission types the Word of God that made clear to our Lord Jesus His mission. The conversation between Gideon and the angel types our Lord's inquiries put to the Lord's Word in His studies of it, and its solution of His questions. Trees in the symbols of the Scriptures represent great ones, especially the Lord's people (Is. 61:3); and an oak tree would represent an especially mighty one among the Lord's people. We understand John the Baptist, the mightiest of the prophets, to be represented by the oak tree of vs. 11, 19. Ophrah (*fawn*) seems to represent the Kingdom of God, both in its typical and its embryo aspects. Joash (*God-given*) seems to type Israelites indeed. Gideon (*destroyer*) types our Lord Jesus, not

from every aspect, but as the Destroyer of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness. Hence the thought of v. 11 seems to be that, connected with the ministry of John the Baptist (under the oak), God's Word (the angel) in the typical kingdom of God (Ophrah), which belonged to the Israelites indeed (Joash), began to become clear to Jesus, while He in support of the ministry of John the Baptist was engaged in encouraging Israelites indeed (threshing wheat) respecting the Kingdom, as a means of protection against their oppressors (to hide it from the Midianites). The first thing that the Word of God made clear to Him, and that before His consecration, was that He was the One especially favored by God (the Lord is with thee), and that He was the chosen One, the mighty One among the people, upon whom the Lord had laid help for the people (thou mighty man of valor). The way in which the Lord's Word made this clear to Jesus was in all probability as follows: As He considered what He had heard from others, especially from His mother Mary, respecting the angel's announcement of His begetting, birth and future ministry, Bible passages pertaining to these matters came to His mind and corroborated His thoughts, making Him realize that He was the One of whom these Scriptures treated.

(5) No sooner was this thought corroborated to Him by the Scriptures than He began (v. 13) to inquire as to why God had permitted evil (why, then, is all this befallen us?)—a question that every person asks who is given to serious reflection on the Lord's Providences. Still a further matter was pressing upon His mind for solution—the deliverance of God's people from the Empire of Satan, symbolized by Israel's deliverance from Egypt, a thing promised in the Word of God, but not yet realized; for God's people were then oppressed by errorists, etc. (Midianites, etc.). V. 14 types how Jehovah intimated to Jesus through

His Word (the angel) that this deliverance was to be wrought by Him, through His doing two things: (1) that in the strength of His perfect character He should go forth on the ministry entrusted to Him, first in dying for the world, and second in leading God's people in holy warfare (go in this thy might), and (2) in His utterly routing the forces of error, sin, selfishness and worldliness (and thou shalt save Israel, etc.). The expression, "Have I not sent Thee?" implies that the Lord through His Word gave Him the evidence that He was Shiloh, the Sent of God (Gen. 49:10).

(6) V. 15 is a touching description of our Lord's deep humility, which He especially felt, when it became clear to Him that He was the Divinely chosen Deliverer of God's people. He felt (1) His lack of means to accomplish the work (Wherewith shall I save Israel?); (2) the lowliness of His ancestral position (Behold, my family is poor in Manasseh! *i.e.*, I have not come from David's royal descendants, from Solomon, etc., but from obscure descendants of David, through Nathan); and (3) the ill-repute of His supposed illegitimate birth (and I am the least, etc.).

(7) V. 16 shows how Jehovah comforted Him (through the Word, for which probably Is. 49:6-9 was the special section used) with the assurance that the Lord would give Him all the help and strength necessary to carry out His mission in delivering God's people. And by these promises our dear Lord, as Gideon's antitype (v. 17), was enabled to decide to consecrate Himself to Jehovah for the carrying out of the mission that Jehovah had in the Word outlined for Him to perform, His only concern being that the Lord by His Word would give Him the Holy Spirit, as the final proof of and sufficient equipment for, His ministry (v. 17). For this reason He asked (v. 18) for the Lord's presence with Him in His consecration (Depart not hence, etc.). And the Lord by His Word (the

angel) assured Him that He would be with Him, and not leave Him (I will tarry, etc.).

(8) Vs. 19, 20 type the events immediately connected with our Lord's consecration of Himself to Jehovah to do the Latter's will in the mission offered Him. The expression, "Gideon went in," types our Lord searching His heart and mind as He counted the cost, as a part of a sober, well-considered consecration. The kid typed His humanity; the unleavened cakes typed the fact that His humanity was sinless; the ephah of flour shows that His sinlessness consisted of full and actual perfection. The distinction between the flesh in the basket and the broth in the pot seems to be the same as between that which was burned on the altar and the incense that was offered in the Holy: our Lord's sacrifice as it appeared, on the one hand, to those in the Court condition, and on the other hand to Jehovah and to the New Creatures in the Holy. Gideon's bringing these out and presenting them to the angel types our Lord's consecration. His doing this under the oak types that our Lord's consecration to do Jehovah's will, as stated in the Word, would occur in connection with the ministry of John the Baptist (the oak). In Scriptural symbolisms a rock often represents a truth, especially a fundamental truth. The particular truth typed by the rock of v. 20 seems to be the truth that Peter announced (Matt. 16:15-18). This was the rock truth that supported our Lord's sacrifice; and God's Word bade (the angel of God said unto Him, Take, etc.) Him base His sacrifice on the truth that He was the Messiah, who would save the world from the Adamic sentence by the sacrifice of Himself (Is. 53:1-12). Thus before His baptism He was given to understand by the Word that by His baptism He was symbolically to fulfill all righteousness (Matt. 3:15), (1) which was actually done by His satisfying the demands of the Law for the life of the world, through His death, pictured by His being put under the water;

and (2) by satisfying the demand of the Law for the obedience of all under it, through His complying with all its requirements, walking in newness of life, symbolized by His rising out of the water. His delight at the time of His consecration to do the Lord's will in sacrificing Himself, *based upon His faith in His Messiahship*, is thus typed by Gideon's offering the sacrifice on the rock, as the angel charged.

(9) Vs. 21-23 briefly represent our Lord's sacrificial career, culminating in the Gethsemane and Calvary scenes. In the symbols of the Bible a staff represents an office, or work. Thus the shepherd's staff represents the shepherd's office, or work. The angel's staff would therefore represent the office, or work of the Word of God, one of whose works is to beget of the Spirit (Jas. 1:18; 1 Pet. 1:23). Touching the sacrifice with the end of the staff seems to represent the Spirit-begetting. The fire coming out of the rock represents the power of God in the truth that He was the Messiah, which enabled His New Creature to consume His humanity in sacrifice. Thus briefly His three and a half years' sacrifice of Himself is pictured forth. The angel departing from Gideon (v. 21) types how for the brief hour in Gethsemane the teachings of the Word that He would be faithful unto death vanished from Jesus' eyes of understanding. In Gethsemane's dark hour for a while He feared that He had not done perfectly; and He also feared that He might not be able on the morrow to do perfectly, and therefore feared that He could not be saved (by resurrection) from death (Heb. 5:7). Thus for a brief time He lost sight of the Lord's Word that foretold His faithfulness unto death. Perhaps our Lord's uncertainty on the cross (Matt. 27:46) is also included, with the Gethsemane scene, in this feature of the type under consideration. Gideon's perceiving (v. 22) that he had seen an angel types our Lord's deep sense of responsibility (felt in Gethsemane) involved in His

Messianic Mission, and the dangers involved in clearly perceiving such knowledge (seen an angel face to face). Gideon's fear of death types our Lord's fear of the Second Death for supposed or prospectively feared failure to be faithful—the fear that so greatly oppressed Him in Gethsemane. But as the Lord (v. 23) comforted Gideon with the benediction of peace and the assurance that He would not die, so the Father comforted Jesus with the benediction of peace and the assurance that He had been and would continue to be faithful, and therefore would not suffer the Second Death (Heb. 5:7; Luke 22:43). This strengthened the Lord unto the completion of His sacrifice; and as Gideon (v. 24), through the Lord's comfort, was enabled to erect an altar of peace from Jehovah for Israel (Jehovah-shalom), so Jesus, completing His sacrifice, was enabled to erect an Altar—even His Ransom-sacrifice—which speaks peace from God to antitypical Israel. This Altar is found even now in the embryo Kingdom of God (Ophrah), among those whom the Father helps (Abiezrites).

(10) Thus we find, as above-stated, in vs. 11-24, a brief typical history of our Lord's experiences beginning just before His consecration and ending just before Pentecost. In the remainder of this chapter we find brief typical pictures, of salient features of His Gospel Age activities with His followers against errorists, *as preparations for the overthrow of the main errorists and their errors*. This will appear from a study of the rest of the chapter, type and antitype.

(11) One of the salient features of our Lord's Gospel-Age activities is His association of the Church with Himself in His service and in His activities for Truth and against error and errorists. This is shown typically in vs. 25-27. We understand that the second bullock of Gideon's father (v. 25), offered as a burnt offering, types Jesus' ministry manifesting God's acceptance of Jesus' sacrifice for the

humanity and New Creatures of the Church, whose sacrifice by our Lord follows our Lord's erection of the Ransom-sacrifice as an Altar speaking peace from Jehovah. The fact of its being seven years old types His perfection before God, affecting, among other things, the reckoned perfection of the Church's humanity. Baal's altar was the Clergy class in Fleshly Israel, where the scribes, Pharisees and priests sacrificed to Satan by grasping for power and lording it over Fleshly Israel in Jesus' day. The fact that Joash had this altar proves that He did not type Jehovah as Jesus' Father, as some might infer from the fact that he was the father of Gideon, the type of Jesus; for Jehovah did not erect and keep an altar for Baal, Satan. As Gideon's father he types Israelites indeed, of whom Jesus was one, even as Aaron in Lev. 16 types the whole Priesthood; and for the ends of the Ages Eleazar, one of Aaron's sons, types the Twelve and our Pastor. But from the fact of Aaron's fatherhood of Eleazar we are not to infer that the whole Priesthood or any part of it is the father of any priest; rather sonship here implies membership in the class typed by the father. Thus in this particular this fact is a parallel of how the antitypical Joash is not Jehovah, the Father of our Lord Jesus, but is a class, Israelites indeed, of which Jesus was a member. The antitypical Joash of the Jewish Harvest, before becoming spiritual Israelites, certainly supported those who sat in Moses' seat, despite their clericalism, and thus had an altar of Baal. The charge to throw down (v. 25) Baal's altar represents God's charge to Jesus to abrogate the office of the Jewish clergy as no longer a Divinely pleasing institution, and to overthrow their clericalistic claims. The grove that was by the altar seems to represent the partisan supporters of the system of clericalism. To cut it down seems to type the casting off of such persons from God's favor (Rom. 11:16-22).

(12) The altar (v. 26) that Gideon was commissioned to build types Jesus and the Church which under the Headship of Jesus is the Body of The Messiah—the mystery hidden from ages and generations. It is as such built upon the same Rock—the truth respecting The Messiah, *i.e.*, that The Messiah is Jesus, the Head, and the Church, His Body—even as in the type Gideon was commissioned to build his second altar upon the same rock upon which he had offered his first sacrifice. The expression, in the ordered place, is in the margin given, in an orderly manner, *i.e.*, both the typical and antitypical altar would have to be built according to the Lord's arrangements as typed in the Law, which for the antitype would imply its actual and reckoned perfection through Jesus' merit, and its acceptance by Jehovah for sacrificial uses. On this Altar the humanity of the Church was to be sacrificed by the Gospel-Age ministry of Jesus' burnt offering (the second bullock was to be offered). The wood of the grove seems to represent the Old Testament truths, once in the possession of the supporters of Jewish clericalism, by which truths the humanity of the Church, energized sacrificially by them, would be consumed by Jesus' offering up His burnt offering. This offering of the Jesus manifests God's acceptance of Jesus' sacrifice (burnt offering).

(13) The number ten (ten men) is the number for completion for any nature lower than the Divine, of which seven is the number of completion. The ten men, therefore, seem to represent the totality of human (possibly also angelic) helpers that the Lord used to carry forward His work of manifesting God's acceptance of His sacrifice for the help of the Church and of overthrowing the Jewish clericalists. By means of these our Lord accomplished the prescribed work (v. 27). By His people He set aside the Jewish clericalists and their system as obligatory upon Spiritual Israel (cut down the altar of Baal). By them He

refuted their clericalistic claims and cut down the supporters of that system (cut down the grove). Gideon's doing this by night types the secret way in which the Lord has throughout the Age wrought with His people: "The world knoweth us not, even as it knew Him not." Needless suffering is spared the Lord's people by a proper hiding from the world what is exclusively the business of The Christ.

(14) Vs. 28-32 type the effects of the Lord's manifesting God's acceptance of Jesus' sacrifice for the Church. The men of the city (v. 28) type the leaders, great ones, in Judaism. Shortly after Pentecost (early in the morning) these perceived that their authority and power in things Divine were questioned and refuted by faithful Christians, as shown in the manner in which they looked upon the preaching and office of the Apostles. They recognized increasingly that the principles of the Truth repudiated their system and them, as any longer the representatives of God (behold, the altar of Baal was cast down and the grove was cut down, etc.). They recognized a sacrifice was being offered that was different from theirs, and on an altogether different Altar—an Altar that permitted no grasping for power, lording it over God's heritage, or any other selfish thing.

(15) They gave diligent search (v. 29) for the instigator of these acts and traced them to Jesus. They demanded of the Israelites indeed (Joash, v. 30)—now become faithful Christians—that they by repudiating Jesus join in the work of extirpating His name and principles (bring out thy son that he may die) because of the effect of His teaching on the Jewish systems, leaders and supporters. But the spiritual Israelites (v. 31) reasoned against supporting a clericalistic system, and warned that such deeds as the Jewish clericalists desired against Jesus were a defense of Satan himself. They announced that all who would take up such a course would be broken off as branches from the

olive tree (Rom. 11:17-24) during the Jewish Harvest (let him be put to death while it is yet morning). They further said: Let Satan and those who like him attempt to be lords over God's heritage defend their right to such authority, if they can. Hence the Christians of that time and onward have challenged Satan's power as a pleader or striver against our Lord, and have looked upon Jesus (Jerubbaal) as One who perpetually is a Challenger to Satan along this line (Let Baal plead against Him, v. 32).

(16) The remainder of the chapter (vs. 33-40) gives very brief sketches of the chief scenes in our Lord's activities against errorists during the rest of the Gospel Age. In v. 33 are typed the rise and association (were gathered together) of Gospel-Age errorists and sinners and selfish and worldly persons as oppressors of God's people; their progress toward (went), and their militant methods (pitched) for, the union of church and state (Jezreel). It will be recalled (Vol. III, Chapter I) that Jezreel, the mutual dwelling-place of Ahab and Jezebel, types a union of church and state. As we are aware, the mystery of iniquity, already working in St. Paul's time (2 Thes. 2:7), developed rapidly into more and more of error, sin, selfishness and worldliness and all who had their spirit were drawn (were gathered together) more and more into a fellowship of error, sin, selfishness and worldliness, developing (went) through clericalism into the Antichrist system uniting church and state (Jezreel), for which they strove (pitched), as a Divine institution, and which in the days of Constantine the Great came into existence. This mystery of iniquity boldly taught the Divine right of kings, clergy and aristocracy as the main principle of the union of church and state. Thus v. 33 gives a brief history of the falling away in the beginning of this Age. As Gideon (v. 34) was energized by the Lord (the Spirit of the Lord came, etc.) to raise up Israelites against their

oppressors, so our Lord sent forth a message (blew a trumpet) through Arianism and related movements calling upon the faithful to oppose the apostates, the oppressors of Spiritual Israel. And these faithful ones, helped by God (Abi-ezer), in the various anti-Catholic movements from the fourth to nearly the ninth century gathered together against the clericalistic errorists, even as the Abi-ezrites in the type responded to Gideon's trumpet call.

(17) In v. 35 we have a brief history typical of the reformatory movements from the ninth to the end of the fifteenth century. This brief sketch is elaborated typically in the experiences of Elijah in 1 Kings 17:1—18:33, of which we have (Vol. III, Chapter I) given the antitype. As in the type (Judg. 6:35), after the Abi-ezrites, four groups (Manasseh, Asher, Zebulun and Naphtali) were called to battle, so in the antitype we find four distinct reform efforts, following the Arian and related movements. The first of these, corresponding to Manasseh gathering to Gideon, had as its chief messengers Claudius of Turin, Agobard of Lyons, and Ratrammus of Corbie, the chief antitypes of Gideon's messengers sent to Manasseh, and lasted with much fruitfulness against papal Idolism and Absolutism, especially in Northern Italy, in France and in Germany, throughout the ninth century. It will be recalled that three efforts were made before another successful reform movement could be made permanent, the first effort being begun in 1045 A.D. by Berengar of Tours and Guido of Milan, the second by Peter Abelard and Arnold of Brescia, and the third, the successful one, in 1173, by Peter Waldo, 128 years intervening between the beginning of the first and the third efforts. We understand that this movement, consisting of these three efforts at establishing a permanent reform movement, is represented by the calling of Asher; and the above-mentioned second set of brothers are the main antitypes of Gideon's messengers sent

to Asher. The third anti-papal and anti-idol reform movement was begun by Marsilius, 1309 A.D., continued by Wyclif, and brought to a climax by Huss, 1415 A.D. This reform movement, we understand, is typed by the call of Zebulun; while the three brothers just mentioned are the leading antitypes of the messengers sent by Gideon to Zebulun. The next reform movement was a doctrinal one, in which the two main leaders were John Wessel and Jerome Savonarola. This movement laid down the four chief principles of the Protestant Reformation: (1) the Bible, the sole source and rule of faith and practice; (2) the Headship of Jesus in all things over the Church; (3) Justification by faith alone; and (4) the Priesthood of the faithful. We understand this movement to be typed by Gideon's call of Naphtali, and the two brothers last mentioned to be the main antitypes of Gideon's messengers sent to Naphtali. In all of these movements a favorable response was made to our Lord's call through His messengers (and they came up, etc.).

(18) In vs. 36-40 we have a very brief history typical of our Lord's experiences connected with the Reformation by sects and with the Harvest movement. As in the type Gideon was given the two signs as pledges of the success of His mission, so in the antitype, the antitypes of the two signs were given to our Lord as a pledge of His success in delivering God's people from their oppressors. We understand the fleece of wool to type the Reformatory Churches—Lutheran, Presbyterian, Baptist, Episcopal, etc. Wool is used to represent Justification by Faith (Is. 1:18), which was both the condition and the teaching of the true members of these churches; hence they could be fittingly typed by the fleece of wool. The earth represents those outside of these churches. The dew represents the Truth as due. The wool alone being full of dew represents that during the period of the Reformation by sects the Truth as due would be found only in these

sects, saturating them—it would not be found outside of them (on the earth beside). How, then, was the fact that the Truth as due was found in these sects alone and not outside of them a proof that God would use our Lord to deliver His people from their oppressors? We answer: (1) that the reformatory truths were sufficient to consume (2 Thes. 2:8) the Papal power in very many ways, especially governmentally, and thus gave our Lord a sure proof that He would prevail against the oppressors of Spiritual Israel. Moreover, (2) the fact that the Truth given through the Reformation divided Christendom into many sects and nationalities made the overthrow of errorists much easier than if Christendom had remained largely one, nationally and ecclesiastically. The bowl *full of water* that Gideon wrung out of the fleece represents the sum total of Truth that the Reformation by sects contained; and this Truth was available for the movement following the Reformation by sects: The cleansed Sanctuary had this bowl full of Truth for its purposes, as those that pointed to the Harvest movement just ahead. The wringing out of the dew thus represents our Lord gathering together in the cleansed Sanctuary all of the truths of the Reformatory sects. The bowl itself seems to represent the literary productions into which the Lord put the Truth.

(19) Vs. 39 and 40 type the Harvest movement and Truth as another and final proof to Jesus that He would successfully deliver God's people from their oppressors. As the Reformation gave truths destructive of many Papal teachings and of much of Papal power, as well as divided Christendom nationally and ecclesiastically, and thus weakened the oppressors of God's people; so the Harvest movement furnished a people for the Lord's purposes free from all sectarian claims, and gave all the truths necessary completely to confute the errors of their oppressors. Hence it became another and final evidence of victory for our Lord over

all oppressors of God's people. While during the Reformation by sects the truths as due came through and were found in the Reformatory sects alone (the dew on the fleece alone), during the Harvest all of the sects were spewed out of God's mouth (Rev. 3:16), and thus no new truth was found in them (for it was dry upon the fleece only); but during the Harvest the Truth was found outside of the churches among the Harvest people (the dew was upon all the ground); and much secular truth was, as Millennial foregleams, found among worldlings, but not in the churches. Thus the Reformation and the Harvest truths, the divided churches and nations and a united people outside of the churches, became from God to our Lord the sure pledges of victory over the oppressors.

(20) Thus we bring to a close a brief study of Judg. 6, in which we find a most remarkable typical history of the salient features of the Times of the Gentiles, especially from the standpoint of the oppression of both Israels, and God's preparation of our Lord for the deliverance of them from their oppressors.

(21) Above we set forth the antitypical fulfillment of Judg. 6, and found it to be a brief typical history of God's people of both Israels, more particularly during the Times of The Gentiles, as well as a typical history of our Lord's preparation for the work of delivering God's people from the oppressions of error, sin, selfishness and worldliness. We desire to continue the presentation of Gideon—Type and Antitype. As we trust the subject so far treated has proven a blessing to the Epiphany-enlightened saints, so we pray that the Lord may be pleased to bless to them the further discussion of the subject. The antitypes of Judg. 6 closed with the Reformation by sects and the Harvest Movement as proofs given to our Lord that Jehovah would by Him deliver His people from their oppressors; and the curtain of Judg. 7 is raised on a

scene in which the two opposing forces are represented as encamped against one another. Then the chapter depicts the selective and rejective work of the Lord connected with the participants on His side of the conflict. This is followed by a picture of the final encouragement given the Leader of God's people for the impending conflict. The directions for the first battle then are given, followed by the conflict that the Leader personally directed; and the chapter closes with a subordinate battle in which the Leader did not participate, but in which he called certain ones not previously invited to the warfare to participate.

(22) In v. 1 the hosts marshalled against one another are described. The scene was in the easternmost part of the plain of Esdraelon (*seed of God*), known also as the Valley of Megiddo (*destruction*), the great battleground of Palestine (Josh. 12:21; 17:11; Judg. 1:27; 5:19; 2 Kings 9:27; 23:29; Zech. 12:11). This valley ended in passes north and south of the Hill of Moreh (*instruction*), now called the Little Hermon. It was south of this hill, "in the valley," where the Midianites were encamped; while it was a little south of them on the north slopes of Mt. Gilboa at the well Harod (*terror*) that the host of Gideon encamped. In this verse the names applied to Israel's leader point out in type the fact that our Lord acts as the Opponent of Satan (Jerubbaal), and as the Destroyer (Gideon) of his works. The well of Harod (*terror*) types the arguments on the penalty of Sin which according to the Truth is a terror, and which according to Satan's eternal torment theory is certainly a magnified terror. It is on this point, from the beginning of the Harvest onward, yea, even from the time of the cleansed Sanctuary onward, that God's true mouthpieces have contended (encamped) against the errorists. That the antitypical battle would have to do with teaching is suggested by the word Moreh (*instruction*); and that the opponents of God's people are here spoken of as

Midianites (*contenders*) suggests that the battle was mainly against error.

(23) That the privilege of sharing in the typical and antitypical battles was to be obtained along elective lines is taught in vs. 2-8. It is decidedly necessary that the lesson, "Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit," be taught to, and impressed upon the Lord's people. The glory of delivering the Lord's people from error, sin, selfishness and worldliness should not be claimed by the warriors of the Lord ("lest Israel vaunt themselves," etc.); for the battle is the Lord's. And, among other ways, God has impressed this lesson by limiting the privilege of engaging in the battle to a very small number, compared with the number of their adversaries, and by rejecting from His army a large number, compared with the number that He retained in His army. Thus there could be no doubt that the victory was of the Lord. His glory the Lord will not give another. And certainly the few who took part in antitypical Gideon's first battle, and the few who are now taking part in His second battle, have no possibly reasonable claim to the victory as gained by their own might ("mine own hand hath saved me"). There were 32,000 men in Gideon's army, which was not quite a fourth of the number of their enemies. But frequently in war victory has been won by a force proportionally that much smaller than their enemies. Hence the number had to be reduced to prevent Israel's boasting. We understand these 32,000 men to represent all who have entered the initial warfare waged by our Gideon, *i.e.*, all who have enlisted on the side of Truth and Righteousness. Hence the 32,000 would represent all of the tentatively justified and all of the consecrated.

(24) The proclamation of v. 3 ("Whoso is fearful and afraid," etc.) types the call to consecration, in connection with which the exhortation to count the cost is given, and in connection with which those who lack a consecrating faith (the fearful and afraid lack such a

faith) are invited to stand aside, and not go forward and make a consecration. These were to be separated from the others as soon as possible ("Let them depart early," etc.); for their presence interfered more or less with the consecrated. This proclamation was more especially made early in the Harvest period, and certainly from that time onward comparatively few of the tentatively justified mingled among the Harvest people. While the antitypical proclamation is not just the same as that which called upon the Lord's people to leave Babylon, yet their leaving Babylon served to separate the tentatively justified from them; and leaving Babylon is, in the antitype, one of the things whose cost is to be counted. The fact that 22,000 left and 10,000 remained is not to be taken as giving us an exact proportion of those who are merely tentatively justified and those who are consecrated; for the proportion of the former to the latter is much larger than these figures indicate. Rather it is to show that the majority who begin the battle for Truth and Righteousness give it up, because fearful and afraid, *i.e.*, they have no consecrating faith, hence do not progress to the sharper conflicts beginning with consecration.

(25) But the privilege of sharing in the great victory cannot be given even to all the consecrated; for Jehovah decided that this privilege should be given to the Very Elect alone. Therefore the scene of the separating of the 10,000 into two companies (vs. 4-8) is used to type how God took away the crowns from the measurably unfaithful; and thus He made them become of that class whom since antitypical Gideon's first battle He has been manifesting as Great Company members; and thus as being such as from His standpoint were no longer of the Very Elect, though He did not for several years manifest these persons as such to us. It would not surprise us, if there were from 500,000 to 1,000,000 New Creatures in the world during the Harvest. These were typed by the 10,000. As in

the type the separation was made by the manner in which these drank of the water, so in the antitype the separation that God made in His decision (then not yet manifested to us) was based upon the way the new creatures acted toward the Truth. As Jehovah, but not Gideon, in the type decided what the test should be, so He, not Jesus, in the antitype decided what the test should be. He decided that it should be the attitude of each individual toward the Truth ("Bring them down to the water and I will try them for thee there"). That our Lord Jesus was the Agent through whom the trial was applied is indicated both by the fact that Jehovah commanded Gideon to bring the people to the water, and by the fact that the latter did bring them there. That Jehovah decided the whole issue is manifest from His statement to Gideon: "of whom I shall say unto thee," etc. (v. 4).

(26) Jesus therefore applied the Divinely ordained test (v. 5: "So he [Gideon] brought down," etc.). In the type we are told that the division should be based on whether the drinkers would stand, and lap water with the tongue as a dog laps it, or whether they would bow down upon their knees to drink water. Whoever would do the former should be put into one company, and whoever would do the latter should be put into another company. Therefore their attitude in, and manner of drinking the water would decide whether or not they should be participants in the victory. What is typed by these things? Let us examine first what is typed by those who, while standing, lapped with their tongues. It will be noted (1) that they stood upright as they drank; (2) that they raised the water to their mouths by their hands; (3) that they used their tongues in appropriating it; (4) that they had to look up as they did this; (5) that they like a dog had to lap vigorously to get enough; (6) that the lapping caused the tongue to work in and out frequently; and (7) that such lapping was more conducive to satisfying thirst

and to nourishing the body than the large amounts gulped down by the other method. Each of these thoughts suggests things that in the antitype enabled one to be fit to be of the Very Elect. (1) The upright position types how the Very Elect have maintained the true dignity and nobility of sons of God, refusing to bow down in human servility to the earthly dispensers of the Truth, as though they were its originators, as the other class has done. They persisted in dealing with the Word in a way that built for them an independent faith structure, which did not need to lean upon any one except the Lord as indispensable to their standing. (2) The raising of the water to the mouth by the hand types that the faithful would exert their activity with zeal to gain the Truth. They worked for it; they labored for the meat that perisheth not. Their appreciation of the Truth was so great that they were willing to work diligently to obtain it. The Truth is not for the easy-going Christian, but for those who labor for it. (3) The tongue is the agent by which the sense of taste is exercised, and by which salivation is produced; and it would in this connection type that as natural food is better prepared for digestion by salivation, so the Truth by spiritual salivation is better prepared for digestion by the antitypical three hundred thoroughly studying it; and that the Truth was very tasteful, greatly appreciated, by the antitypical three hundred. (4) Looking up as the drinking was done types recognition of God as the Source of the Truth, trust in His provision of it, and gratitude to Him as its Giver. (5) Lapping vigorously, like a dog, symbolizes great energy put forth in gaining the Truth. Herein it was preeminently necessary to do with one's might what one found to do. The more thirsty a dog is the more vigorously he laps; and in this particular the figure suggests the energy and vigor with which the Very Elect partook of the Truth. (6) Inasmuch as lapping implies a frequent application of the tongue to

the thing lapped, the type suggests that appreciation of the Truth must be continual and that there be a continuous preparation of the Truth for digestion. (7) And inasmuch as the lapping was more conducive to satisfying the thirst and for nourishing the body than was gulping fluids down by the other method mentioned in the type, this action would type that the faithful would more thoroughly satisfy their thirst with Truth and would better nourish the graces of their hearts than the measurably unfaithful would do. And these seven things done with the Truth enabled the faithful to become the Very Elect, as the neglect of these seven things prevented others of the Spirit-begotten from becoming of the Very Elect. Thus we see how in the type God by the three hundred figured forth that the faithful would so use the Word of Truth as by it to guarantee the making of their calling and election sure.

(27) On the other hand, bowing down upon one's knees implies a number of things: (1) that one assumes a servile posture; (2) that one is leisurely in his drinking; (3) that one is lazy in his drinking; (4) that one scarcely tastes or salivates the water that he drinks; (5) that one looks downward instead of upward while he drinks; and (6) that the water is gulped down in large quantities unprepared for digestion. These six thoughts are typical of such actions toward the Truth as disqualify a New Creature for membership in the Little Flock: (1) Bowing down to drink types how some New Creatures made themselves servile to those who taught them the Truth. They accepted it upon their teachers' word without making the Truth their own by such a study of it as was convincing of its Scripturalness, reasonableness and factualness. They therefore leaned upon and trusted human leaders, and thus gave them such an honor as made themselves servile. For instance, how many accepted our Pastor's teachings, not from a thorough

and convincing study of them, but merely because he was "that Servant"! Neglecting his repeated exhortation to accept nothing that he wrote or taught, unless they "proved" it true, they simply swallowed what he said, just because he said it. These failed to maintain the true dignity and nobility of sons of God. On the contrary, they became servile to a man. And when he died, not having learned to lean upon the Lord alone to serve them through His mouthpieces as He would, they had to have another human support, a crutch, to lean upon. Hence how readily they fell into the trap of Satan, that the Society was the Channel for the Priests' meat and work! Of course, an independent faith structure could not be so built; and, of course, those lacking it could not be in the Little Flock; for they lack the necessary stability and poise of character.

(2) Bowing down on the knees to drink likewise types leisureliness. Such Christians as this action types were not diligent and vigilant, always abounding in the work of the Lord. They would be intermittent in their use of the Truth. They claimed in effect to have so much time as would permit them to work with the Truth only at intervals, resting between times. Steadfast zeal and energy were accordingly lacking in these and, of course, they could not make their calling and election sure. (3) Bowing down on one's knees to drink types another thought, laziness, a near relative of the preceding thought. Not only has leisureliness caused New Creatures to lose their crowns, but also laziness has produced the same effect. Those who would not exert themselves with the Truth, those who would not by faithful use of the Truth produce weariness in, but not of the Lord's cause, and those who would not endure hardness as good soldiers of Christ failed to retain their crowns. The crown is not for the easy-going, the lazy Christian. Hence those who bowed down type such also as have by laziness been severed from the antitypical three hundred. (4) As

those that bowed down to drink were in such a position as scarcely permitted them to taste or salivate the water, so their antitypes are those who had very little appreciation, taste, for the Truth, and who did not by proper study prepare the Truth for digestion. To them the Truth was not "sweeter than honey and the honey comb." They could not say in reality, "O how love I thy Law!" "More than my necessary meat!" More than once they showed almost nausea at the Truth, and more than once they were faint from spiritual indigestion. Such as were in this attitude of course lost their crowns. They were set aside in another company than that of the antitypical three hundred.

(5) Looking downward while drinking types that God is not appreciated as the Source of the Truth; that He is not trusted to provide it as due; and that He is not thanked and loved heartily as its Giver. On the contrary, it implies that some earthly one is appreciated as its source, trusted as its provider and thanked as its giver. Surely such a use of the Truth would be subversive of making one's calling and election sure. (6) Gulping down the water in large quantities unprepared for digestion types the action of those who swallowed the Truth instead of thoroughly "proving" it to be Scriptural, reasonable and factual: This has resulted in spiritual indigestion and dyspepsia, with the resultant disagreeableness of disposition that makes one unloving and unlovely. Surely those who misused the Truth in these six particulars forfeited their crowns, and thus lost Little Flockship. Thus just as in the type (vs. 5, 6) there were two classes formed, because they drank differently, so in the antitype there have been two classes formed, because they have acted differently toward the Word of Truth, the Little Flock being typed by those who drank while standing upright, the Great Company being typed by those who drank while lying prone. We are, of course, to understand that the picture here applies somewhat

more particularly, though not exclusively, to the Truth people during the Harvest, otherwise shadowed forth by typical Elijah and Elisha. We are not to understand that the numbers 300 and 9700 are in the exact proportion of the number of the Little Flock and of the Great Company, nor even of the Truth sections of these two classes. Rather the difference is to indicate that a large majority of the consecrated people are of the Great Company. The test in antitype was complete so far as the Great Company was concerned by the Fall of 1914, when the last crown was lost.

(28) V. 7 types a statement made by Jehovah to Jesus which proves that They by the Fall of 1914 knew who had lost and who would retain their crowns. So God and Christ knew by that time who would remain in the Little Flock and who did not; but They did not for several years begin to manifest this to us. Jehovah thus pointed out to our Lord the Little Flock members through whom under our Gideon He, Jehovah, would win the great victory. Probably this in the Fall of 1914 was done anticipatorially in the case of those whose forehead sealing was not complete until a little later; for the Lord, having indicated both in the Pyramid and in the Bible when the last crown would be finally assigned, knew when that last crown was assigned, and hence knew that all then having crowns would retain them, though it is also probable that only as each individual of the antitypical three hundred did his upright drinking was he pointed out by Jehovah to Jesus as one of that class. On the other hand, those who in the antitype did the prone drinking did it before the last one was begotten of the Spirit, and hence were then set aside for the Great Company by Jehovah's decision. It must have been a very happy time both to Jehovah and to Jesus when the last one of the antitypical three hundred had stood the test faithfully, and when Jehovah could say antitypically, "By the three hundred men that lapped will I save you,

and deliver the Midianites into Thy hand," even though He had to say antitypically of the Great Company, "Let all the other people go every man unto his own place."

(29) V. 8 types how the faithful would possess themselves of the Truth by making it their own ("the people took victuals in their hands"), and how they armed themselves with it as an implement of war ("and their trumpets"). Our Lord sent the others away ("and he sent all the rest of Israel," etc.). Jesus did this by making the circumstances connected with the work from the Fall of 1914 to that of 1916 of such a kind as overtaxed the zeal of the Great Company, so that they gradually under the strain gave up the work, and thus were not in the finished picture of the first battle of antitypical Gideon. He kept the antitypical Three Hundred as the King's own with Himself ("and retained those three hundred"). V. 8 compared with v. 1 seems to prove that Gideon's host was on the north slope of Mt. Gilboa, while the Midianites were still farther north, below them in the valley of Jezreel; and hence the scene of the battle was just north of Mt. Gilboa and considerably south of Mt. Tabor, the retreating host fleeing southeastward in two groups toward two different parts of the Jordan. Gideon's position on Mt. Gilboa (*fountain*, Bible) shows that antitypical Gideon would with His own be on the Mount of Truth, while the others would be in error, especially in those errors connected with the union of church and state (Jezreel), *i.e.*, the errors of the Divine right of kings, clergy and aristocrats.

(30) Vs. 9-15 types how Jehovah without being requested so to do encouraged our Lord before the battle began. Jehovah is (vs. 9-11) represented as charging our Lord to make certain observations of the conditions of the antitypical Midianitish host, assuring Him that He had so arranged its conditions as to make its defeat certain ("for I have delivered it into thine

hand"). Surely by the signs of the times, as the handwriting on the wall, Jehovah indicated the overthrow of the hosts of error. Phurah (*bough*) seems to type our dear Pastor, as a branch in the true Olive Tree. The scene here is somewhat similar to that of Jehovah's commissioning Moses to go to Egypt, whose fear to undertake the mission was overcome by the promise of the Lord's presence and Aaron's mouthpieceship, Moses here typing Christ beyond the veil and Aaron The Christ class this side of the veil, just before the Second Advent, the invisibility of Christ beyond the veil making a visible mouthpiece to Satan's Empire usable. So in investigating antitypical Midian our Lord needed one, our Pastor, who would with Him examine all things there, and set them before the antitypical Three Hundred. Jehovah assured our Lord that He would hear things in antitypical Midian's camp that would encourage Him to press on to victory ("afterwards shall thy hands be strengthened," v. 11). As Gideon and Phurah alone went down to the camp, so our Lord and our dear Pastor made many a discovery relative to antitypical Midian, and saw and heard things in their camp that no one else of the faithful saw or heard. The outermost part of the armed host, of course, was nearest in position to the three hundred. Those there encamped type those who in antitypical Midian were nearer the Truth people in faith than the other errorists; for as we know there are various shades and hues of error in antitypical Midian.

(31) V. 12 gives a description of the oppressors of God's people, typing how during the Harvest the errorists ("Midianites"), sinners ("Amalekites"), and selfish and worldly people ("children of the East") would be very numerous ("like grasshoppers for multitude"), and numerously organized ("and their camels were without number," etc.). Certainly when we think of the hundreds of millions who support church, state,

capital and labor in Christendom and of their vast, varied and multitudinous organizations, we can recognize the antitypes of this verse very readily, as here truly described.

(32) In vs. 13 and 14 a record is given of a dream that a Midianite in the outermost part of the camp told a comrade of his, and of the latter's interpretation of this dream. We suggest the following as the antitype: Those Midianites who were nearest in position to the Israelites type those in Christendom who are in faith and practice nearest the Truth people. During the Harvest these were undoubtedly those Foolish Virgins who were Pre-Millennialists; for there were many consecrated people (Foolish Virgins) who never came into the Harvest Truth, who believed that Jesus will come before the Millennium, will overthrow political, ecclesiastical, aristocratic and laboring Christendom, will establish Himself with His Bride in royalty over the earth, and will bless the then living, but will give no opportunity for the dead world to have Millennial blessings. They likewise believe in eternal torment and the consciousness of the dead. Certain ones of this particular class we understand to be typed by the Midianite who dreamed and told his dream to his fellow. These, studying some of the grosser errors of doctrine and practice in Christendom, and the increasing falling away from Truth and Christian life prevailing in Christendom, as well as other signs of the times, especially the exposures of evils, the outbreak of the war being the last of these, threatening ruin to Christendom, have seen thereby what antitypes the dream of the Midianite. His telling the dream antitypes how in perplexity as to the significance of these events these Foolish Virgins told the teaching class of the Foolish Virgins what they saw of the ominous signs of the times. The Midianite who interpreted the dream to its narrator types those Foolish Virgins who were teachers among them. These latter, like their

type, explained the signs of the times, especially those that exposed the evils, and that culminated in the war, as harbingers of Messiah's overthrow of error and errorists at His Second Advent. Barley bread is used, because the signs of the times, especially the exposures of the evils of Christendom, are certain ominous truths and their outworkings; and thus presaged what the Lord actually used in the first battle of antitypical Gideon—the sharp, exposing truths that disproved the doctrines of the divine right of kings, of clergy, of aristocrats and of laborers. In the literature of the Foolish Virgin group of Pre-Millennialists we find these explanations given as to the significance of the signs of the times.

(33) If in the time of war the thought can be made to prevail in an army that it will be defeated, the acceptance of that thought by it is half of its defeat; and if the opposing army learns that such is the belief of their enemy, they are thereby made doubly hopeful of victory. And in harmony with this principle Gideon and his three hundred were as encouraged at the prospect of victory as some of the Midianites were discouraged at the prospect of defeat; for the hope of victory mightily strengthens, and the expectation of defeat greatly weakens. Therefore we read that Gideon was strengthened; and he certainly imparted his strength to his three hundred ("Arise! for the Lord hath delivered into *your* hand the host of Midian!" v. 15). Antitypically our Lord was greatly encouraged when He saw how some who fought on the side of the errorists recognized that the overthrow of the doctrines of, and of the believers in the Divine right was implied in the signs of the times, especially as these culminated in the World War. And all we who were privileged to be in the first battle of antitypical Gideon recall how before it was fought we were encouraged when the Lord brought to our attention in the Views from the Watch Tower evidences, from the

statements of some in Babylon, that her overthrow was not far distant. Thereby He bade us arise, for the Lord had delivered into our power the host of antitypical Midian.

(34) In vs. 16-18 the preparations for the battle are described. Nowhere in war history were so great courage and faith manifested as were manifested by Gideon's three hundred, preparing for, and engaging in, the first battle. The nearest approach to it in secular history was when Leonidas, the Spartan king, first with 5000 Greeks, then later with 300 Spartans, defended the narrow pass of Thermopylae against the hordes of invading Persians; but the pass was so narrow that the 300 could advantageously defend it from a frontal attack; while Gideon's three hundred, insufficiently armed as no other warriors ever were, if we consider them from the standpoint of human armor, advanced against 135,000 men in an open plain. The sublime heroism of these three hundred is indescribable and incomparable. Probably in this event the faith of Ancient Worthies reached its climax. The arrangement of Gideon's soldiers, their equipment and their instructions were all ordered in a way to picture forth the wonderful antitype that their sublime faith enabled them to type, but were of a kind to give God, not them, the glory of the victory. Let us briefly look at the details. The division of the three hundred into three companies corresponds to the division of their antitypes into three companies: (1) the Volunteers, (2) the Pilgrims, and (3) the Colporteurs. The trumpets correspond to the message that their antitypes were to announce. Putting the trumpets into their hands types that the message would be in the power of each one of the antitypical three hundred: each one actually made it his own, had it in full control. The pitchers type the humanity of the faithful. Their being empty types the fact that the faithful were free from selfishness and worldliness. The lamps, or

torches, type the Truth and the Holy Spirit of Truth that filled the faculties of heart and mind of the faithful. As the brave Gideon could set himself forth as an example of heroic achievement for his soldiers to imitate, so our Gideon could do the same for His warriors ("Look at me, and do likewise").

(35) By the events of the times and the multiplied agencies, especially the sermons in the newspapers, that our Lord used shortly after the outbreak of the war to attack the doctrines of Divine right He gave a charge to His own to imitate Him in attacking these doctrines. And previously He had instructed His own that, as the providences of God would indicate the lines of attack that should be made, they should press the attack to the utmost along those lines. As in the type Gideon was to blow with the trumpet first, and then the hundred that were with him, so in the antitype. Seemingly the Volunteers, who in the Volunteer literature used certain reprinted sermons, correspond to the hundred that were with Gideon; for by the tracts that they distributed they announced the public meetings where the Pilgrims were to give the message. The Colporteurs, quickly following the example of the other two groups, specialized on Vol. IV, The Battle of Armageddon, when the Tower shortly after the war's outbreak suggested such specialization. In the type the three hundred were to shout, as they gave the blast on their trumpets, the slogan: "The sword of Jehovah and of Gideon!" In the antitype the proclamation was "the Word of God and the Testimony of Jesus." If we were to analyze the antitypical trumpet blast, we believe that we should define the Sword of the Lord as those Biblical principles of Truth and Righteousness that condemned the doctrines of the Divine right of kings, clergy, aristocrats and laborers, and that proved their supporters as defending errors. The doctrines of Divine right we have already defined and disproved (Vol. III, Chapter II). By pointing

out as violations of the Divine Word the many sins and errors of the kings, clergy, aristocrats and laborers we disproved the doctrines of Divine right. This part of our proclamation seems to have been typed by the cry, "The sword of the Lord!" Having pointed out these gross wrongs and errors, we then proclaimed the overthrow of Satan's empire by our Lord through the Great Tribulation—the war, as weakening it, and the revolution and anarchy as utterly destroying it. Then we announced the establishment of the Kingdom upon the ruins of Satan's empire. This double proclamation—the overthrow of Satan's empire and the establishment of Christ's Kingdom upon its ruins—seems to be typed by that part of the trumpet blast that consisted of the words, "and the sword of Gideon!" Surely before we entered the first battle of antitypical Gideon we were instructed to give the above-mentioned proclamations.

(36) Among other things v. 19 indicates the time when the first attack began: It was at the beginning of the middle, or the third watch, *i.e.*, from midnight to 3 A.M. It was therefore at midnight when the attack was begun ("they had but newly set the watch"). This was on the same night when Gideon and Phurah had alone come to the outskirts of the camp (vs. 9-15). We have seen that the investigation was antitypically conducted throughout the Harvest (1874-1914). Hence the antitypical midnight was about October, 1914, when we know the antitypical battle of Gideon began (Z '15, p. 11, col. 2, par. 4). How very opportune that at the end of Gentile Times the chief doctrines that oppressed God's people throughout those "Times" should all receive their death blow! Certainly in Christendom the outbreak of the war (Aug. 1, 1914) necessitated an altogether different set of guards to be placed for the defense of Christendom's course leading up to, and taken in the World War, as against new attacks that were likely to

be made upon it. And, true enough, the World War furnished the antitypical Three Hundred the best providential opportunity imaginable to attack the doctrines of the Divine right, inasmuch as the World War was a direct effect of these doctrines. Nor was the Lord slow to make the attack. Shortly after the World War broke out, through all sorts of channels of publicity, especially through our Pastor's published sermons, He began to launch the attack first against both the Kaiser and the Czar, both of whom were vociferous in claiming the Divine right. The B.S.M., "The Battle of Armageddon," was on hand for quick distribution by the Volunteers, among other ways, as advertisements for the public meetings. Thus following our Lord the hundred with antitypical Gideon began to sound their trumpets. This B.S.M. was followed by others attacking the principles of the Divine right, as the titles of those that were circulated from the Fall of 1914 to that of 1916 show: "The Distress of Nations Preceding Armageddon," "Why Financiers Tremble," "Clergy Ordination Proved Fraudulent," "Social Conditions Beyond Human Remedy." "The World on Fire," etc.

(37) The next group to enter the antitypical battle were the Pilgrims, the antitypes of the second hundred of Gideon's men. Our dear Pastor was the first of these to begin this part of the fight, *i.e.*, September 20, 1914, at Fort Worth, Tex. First he used as his subject, "The Battle of Armageddon," then, "After the War—What?" and then, "The World on Fire." It will be remembered that he continued along these lines until within the last week of his life, giving his last public discourse in this battle at San Antonio, Tex., Oct. 24, 1916. It was our privilege to begin our part in this battle Oct. 8, 1914, at Graham, N.C., where we began giving our lecture on The Overthrow of Satan's Empire. We had previously about fifty public lectures, which we had usually rotated in our public

meetings; but beginning with Oct. 8, 1914, we departed from the method of rotation of these fifty lectures, and during the next two years almost everywhere that we lectured in public we used the above subject the first time we visited a place, then on a second or third visit we used almost without exception the subjects, "The War in Prophecy," or "After the War—What?" In all three of these lectures the doctrine of the Divine right was attacked, the overthrow of Satan's empire was announced, and the establishment of Christ's Kingdom was proclaimed. Our last lecture along these lines was on "After the War—What?" at New Haven, Conn., Nov. 3, 1916. A few of the other Pilgrims more or less preached on these lines. Those who did not give lectures on these lines or who ceased giving them before the end of the fight or who did not give them in the right spirit were not of the antitypical three hundred.

(38) The Colporteurs, the antitypes of the third hundred of Gideon's men, seemingly were the last to enter the antitypical battle in response to our Pastor's suggestion to specialize on Vol. IV, The Battle of Armageddon, which better than any other weapon of that battle attacked the doctrines of the Divine right, announced the overthrow of Satan's empire, and proclaimed the coming Kingdom of Messiah. Those Colporteurs who specialized on Vol. I or Vols. I, II and III did not take part in this antitypical battle. Those who did not take part in the fight unto the end with Vol. IV, at least as a part of their equipment, were also not antitypical Gideonites, who consisted of those only who with a true heart continued faithfully fighting unto the end, blowing the antitypical trumpet: "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon!" Thus we see that all three of the antitypical companies blew their trumpets ("and the three companies blew the trumpets," v. 20).

(39) Moreover, they broke the antitypical pitchers,

which we saw above were their humanity. The breaking of the pitcher's in the type represents consuming the humanity in the service. Certainly the tests of zeal and devotion during the two years of antitypical Gideon's first battle were so exacting that not a few of the faithful died as a result of their sacrifices; and those of the faithful who lived after that period were in their human strength and health almost entirely used up. "They brake their pitchers." Holding the lamps in the left and the trumpets in the right hand seems likewise typical. The lamps representing the Truth and the spirit of understanding of the Truth pertaining to the true Church, and the trumpets representing the truths that were refutative of the Divine right of kings, etc., and of Satan's empire and defensive of God's Kingdom, to hold the lamps in the left hand seems to type the fact that not chief emphasis and use were made of the deeper truths in this battle; while holding "the trumpets in their right hands to blow withal" seems to type the fact that the more secular truths were mainly emphasized. This seems to be confirmed by the statement that through their trumpets they cried, "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon" (v. 20).

(40) The statement in v. 21 is quite significant: "They [the three hundred] stood every man in his place round about the camp." Over and over again have we emphasized the fact that only those who continued in the antitypical battle to the end and that in the Lord's spirit had part in the finished picture. Here this fact is typed: They *stood*. They remained stationed in their place, nothing by any means being able to allure them from their work. Were they weary? Yet they stood every man in his place. Were their means exhausted? Yet they stood every man in his place. Were others who sympathized with them weary, and did these give up? Yet they stood every man in his place. Did their auditors want to hear

something else? Yet they stood every man in his place. Yea, they stood to the end with their lamps in their left hands and their trumpets in their right hands, and thereby proved themselves to be antitypical Gideonites, and are thus represented in the finished picture in antitypical Gideon's first battle.

(41) "And the host ran and cried and fled" (v. 21). This shows that the Divine rightists were utterly confounded. Fear seized upon them, causing them to seek to escape the unanswerable arguments that came from the facts and principles presented by the faithful, while the World War lent an inescapable corroboration of the teachings of the faithful. The errorists cried out all sorts of excuses, but these were of no avail for justifying their claims, and finally in utmost confusion they fled from the field of argument, unable to stand before the flood-light of publicity against their claims cast athwart the World War as a screen.

(42) "And the three hundred blew the trumpets" (v. 22). Three times this is stated in the type, as we see from the account in vs. 19, 20 and 22. This was done to emphasize the fact that the three hundred kept on blowing their trumpets as loudly as possible, until the end of the battle; and types the fact that the faithful used all energy in continuing the onslaught against the doctrines of the Divine right in announcing the overthrow of Satan's empire and in proclaiming the coming Kingdom of God. "And the Lord set every man's sword against his fellow, even throughout the whole host" (v. 22). Certainly the World War divided Christendom so far as the doctrine of the Divine right is concerned; and they decimated one another in their contentions on autocracy and democracy, on capital and labor, on church and state, on the responsibility for the World War, and on their mutually condemnatory accusations. Out of this strife accompanying the World War has resulted a state of mind that has everywhere unsettled belief in the doctrines of the

Divine right. God's part in this was to cause the Truth to shine on these various subjects, resulting in much discussion of them, which produced a great overthrow of faith on all hands in the doctrines of the Divine right. Who now believes in the doctrine of the Divine right of kings? A negligible minority. Who now believes in the doctrine of the Divine right of the clergy? A small and decreasing minority. Who now believes in the doctrine of the Divine right of the aristocracy? Almost nobody. Who now believes in the Divine right of labor? A rapidly decreasing number. The World War, caused by the practices that were introduced by these doctrines, was accompanied by such factual contradictions and verbal exposures and discussions of these principles and their results as have led to an almost universal repudiation of these errors. As a result of these accompaniments of the war Christendom has on all sides retreated from the principles that are the basis of the union of church and state, *i.e.*, the doctrines of Divine right (the Midianites retreating from the valley of Jezreel).

(43) The E. and A.R.V. and almost all other versions of the Bible translate the last sentence of v. 22 substantially as follows: "And the host fled (1) *as far* as Beth-shittah [*house of acacia*] toward Zererah [*cooling*], (2) *as far* as the border of Abel-meholah [*meadow of the dance*] by Tabbath [*famous*]. Thus it will be seen that the Midianites fled away from the first battle with Gideon in two groups, headed in two different directions. This types what the division of the Jordan by Elijah's smiting types; for the first battle of Gideon, and Elijah's smiting Jordan, type the same general event in the antitype; and the result of Gideon's first battle, the division of his enemies into two retreating bodies, and the result of Elijah's smiting Jordan, the division of the receding waters into two parts, type Christendom's division into the two classes: (1) the Conservatives and (2) the

Radicals, a division that began as a result of the exposures made from the Fall of 1914 to that of 1916 against the effects of the doctrines of the Divine right. To become a Conservative is a "cooling" (Zererah) process; and a house of acacia (Beth-shittah) suggests strength, permanence. Hence we think that those who fled to Beth-shittah toward Zererah type the Conservatives, those who want to conserve, make permanent, the present conditions, cooling off toward all hotheaded radicalism. Dancing (Meholah) in Bible symbolism suggests putting into practice certain doctrines and theories, *i.e.*, acting in harmony with them. And certain famous (Tabbath) theories have been put into practice by the Radicals, *e.g.*, Communism in Bolshevik Russia, modified Socialism in Germany, etc., as a result of the attacks on those who have held the doctrines of the Divine right. Hence we understand those who retreated toward Abel-meholah by Tabbath to type the Radicals.

(44) Just as in our study of Judg. 6 we found there recorded a most remarkable typical history of the Times of The Gentiles and the Lord's preparation of the Deliverer of God's people from their oppressors, so in Judg. 7:1-22 we find a remarkable typical history of the selection and preparation of the antitypical Three Hundred for, and their victorious participation in, antitypical Gideon's first battle. Surely, beloved brethren, the fulfillment of the antitype so far discussed is very clear, and should give us zest for reading the fulfillment of the rest of the antitype so far fulfilled, and for engaging in antitypical Gideon's second battle. What a glorious privilege is ours! Let us use it to God's glory, and to the saving of many erring brethren's lives (Jas. 5:20).

(45) Hitherto we have traced according to Judg. 6 the typical and antitypical oppression of God's people at the hands of the typical and antitypical Midianites, and the preparation of the typical and antitypical

Gideon as their Deliverers from their oppressors. We then subsequently set forth—type and antitype—the opposing hosts, the selective and rejective work among God's people relating to the first battle, the final encouragement of the Leaders of God's hosts, the plan for, and the description and result of, the first battle. This was done in our study of Judg. 7:1-22. We trust that the study has thus far proven a rich blessing to all of us.

(46) We now proceed to finish the study of the rest of the story, as far as antityped, and will begin it with Judg. 7:23. V. 22 describes the Midianites' rout and division into two retreating bodies headed toward two different destinations. V. 23 brings upon the scene of the warfare three groups of warriors—the 9700 who were rejected from participation in Gideon's first battle. It will be noted that these 9700 were men from only three tribes, Naphtali, Asher and Manasseh. We have already seen that the 9700 type the Great Company, and we believe that the three groups of whom the 9700 consisted type the three groups of whom the Great Company consists. These three groups from the standpoint of the Levitical picture are the antitypical Merarites, Kohathites and Gershonites. In other words, v. 23 types how in three bodies the Great Company has entered into the warfare against the antitypical Midianites. And the facts of the antitype prove that this has already taken place—in each case seemingly the three groups, or at least two of them, though taking part in the warfare after the first battle was over, have labored under the delusion that they were engaged in the first smiting of Jordan. The first Great Company group to engage in this antitypical warfare was the partisan Society adherents, consisting especially of those who yet adhere to the Society, and of those who have since the second smiting of Jordan left the Society and become the Standfasts. These, as we have already learned, are

the two groups of the antitypical Merarites: the Mahlites and the Mushites (Chapter I). These we understand to antitype the men of Naphtali, the first mentioned of the three typical groups, because they were the first of the Great Company groups *as such* to battle against antitypical Midian. Their part of the warfare assuredly covered the period of the Big Drive from the Fall of 1917 to the Spring of 1918; and it may also include the public battling work of the Society adherents since the Summer of 1920 (Rev. 19:3).

(47) The second Great Company group to enter the antitypical warfare consisted of the Olsonite branch of the Great Company, or, to use the Levitical names, the Izeharite branch of the Kohathites (Chapter I). Like the former group they think that they are smiting Jordan the first time, using tracts, books, lectures, etc., to do their work. Many of the Sturgeonites—Uzzielites—and a few of the Ritchieites—Hebronites—have joined in this movement. Thus the second group of the Great Company in these representatives of it have entered the warfare against the antitypical Midianites. These we understand to be the antitypes of the men of Asher referred to in v. 23. For a long time we failed to see how the P.B.I. and the B.S.C. (British Bible Students Committee), the third group of the Great Company—the Gershonites from the standpoint of the Levitical picture (Chapter I)—were taking part in the warfare against antitypical Midian. This was in part because of their doing it in a half-hearted and in a half-concealed way, and seemingly making no public claim to smiting Jordan. But later we came to see how they have done it. There are thoughts in their "Revelation of Jesus Christ" series, in the special issue of their Hell Herald for June 1 and 15, 1919 (especially in that section which treats of the Parousia and Epiphaneia, pages 167-170), and in their tract, *The Inauguration of God's Kingdom Preceded*

by Distress of Nations (especially pages 2-6), that attack antitypical Midian. Hence those of them who distribute these, and those of them who have lectured and spoken according to these thoughts have, as the antitypes of the men of Manasseh, "pursued after Midian."

(48) It is noteworthy that while Gideon invited the 300 to enter the first battle with him (Judg. 7:15), and invited the men of Ephraim to pursue after the Midianites (Judg. 7:24), he did not invite the men of Naphtali, Asher and Manasseh to do either of these things; nor did he lead, nor was he with them in their part of the battle. These things type the facts that our Lord did not invite the three groups of the Levites to take part in the warfare against antitypical Midian; that it was not the Truth on the subject that impelled them to enter this antitypical warfare; but that they did it under a measure of error and unholy ambition; and that the Lord does not recognize as commendatory their part in this warfare, doubtless because they did so while in an uncleansed condition, and while evilly treating His Priesthood. However, the three groups in the type are introduced into the picture to show how in the antitype the three groups of the Great Company would take part in the warfare against antitypical Midian. The fulfilled facts prove the antitype of v. 23 to have taken place.

(49) Judg. 7:24—8:3 introduces an episode that has also been antityped—an episode that is full of antitypical instruction to us. These verses refer to the part that the men of Ephraim took—not in the first and second battles of Gideon, but—in a separate fight to which they were invited, but in which they were not led directly by Gideon, though he charged them as to what they were to do. Seeing the rout of the Midianites, Gideon desired to intercept and destroy them before they crossed the Jordan; therefore he "sent messengers throughout all the hill country of Ephraim,

saying, Come down against Midian and take before them the waters, as far as Beth-barah, *even the Jordan*" (A.R.V.). This all the men of Ephraim joined in doing (v. 24). According to the translation just quoted, which we consider to be correct, the waters that were taken were the waters of Jordan from a point considerably north of Beth-barah to Beth-barah (house of the passage). By this movement a considerable part of the retreating host was intercepted, and in the ensuing battle it was not only defeated and dispersed, but the two princes of Midian, Oreb (*raven*) and Zeeb (*wolf*) were captured and killed. The men of Ephraim brought the heads of these two princes to Gideon beyond, *i.e.*, east of, the Jordan, *i.e.*, after he and his three hundred had crossed over it in their pursuit of the Midianites fleeing from the west to the east of Jordan (Judg. 8:4). The men of Ephraim there very severely upbraided (v. 1) Gideon for not calling them out to the war in time for them to engage in the first battle. But this tactful answer to the effect that their gleanings were larger than his vintage pacified them.

(50) Let us now look at the antitype of this section. First let us see whom the men of Ephraim type. It will help us to understand this, if we keep in mind that the first battle of Gideon types the same thing as the first smiting of Jordan, the World's High Priest confessing the sins over Azazel's Goat, and the saints executing the judgment written (Ps. 149:5-9). These works were completely and properly engaged in by the Very Elect only. Hence to have been called to the antitypical warfare in time to take part in them implies that one was called to the High Calling; "for this honor have all His saints"; and to have been called to the antitypical warfare, but not in time to have taken part in it implies that one was not called to the High Calling, but to something else. The men of Ephraim, therefore, type certain ones called to take part in the

warfare against antitypical Midian *after* the full number of the Very Elect had been won, and had been given that to do which was an exclusive privilege of the Very Elect, *i.e.*, unto a completion and in the Lord's spirit to smite Jordan the first time, to execute the judgment written, to confess the sins over Azazel's Goat, and to engage in antitypical Gideon's first battle. Whom, then, do they type? We answer: Very evidently the Youthful Worthies. How did antitypical Gideon call them? We answer: (1) by continuing the invitation to consecrate after the Fall of 1914; (2) by emphasizing after the Fall of 1914, *e.g.*, in Z '15, 269, pars. 6, 7, the fact that there would be a class who, called too late for the High Calling, would be privileged to share in reward and honor with the Ancient Worthies, *i.e.*, that there would be a Youthful Worthies class; (3) by arousing them to battle against error; (4) by the teaching during 1916 that the Lord's people would smite Jordan twice; and (5) by encouraging repeatedly during 1916 the Lord's people along the lines of the privilege of smiting Jordan. These five things as well as others were a call to the Youthful Worthies to take part in the warfare against antitypical Midian, to take the waters of antitypical Jordan. As in the type the men of Ephraim were to take the Jordan waters as far as Beth-barah (*house of the passage*), so in the antitype the Youthful Worthies, who, as we have seen, being a part of antitypical Elisha (Vol. III, Chapter II), were to smite the peoples, Jordan, on subjects on which the smiting had been especially done by the Lord's house (Beth) who had had a passage (barah) across Jordan, *i.e.*, they were to smite especially what the members of the Elijah class, those who had crossed Jordan, had previously smitten. In other words, they were to smite Jordan the second time.

(51) Judg. 7:25 is also meaningful in the antitype. The two princes of Midian represent two prince—not

king—errors. Oreb (*raven*) we understand to represent Sectarianism, Divisionism; and Zeeb (*wolf*) we understand to represent Clericalism. We have already in the Elijah type (Vol. III, Chapter I) pointed out how the ravens that fed Elijah typed the sectarian theologians and systems who in their sectarian activity gave some nourishment to the faithful Elijah class from 539 A.D. to 799 A.D. We, therefore, understand Prince Oreb to represent Sectarianism. The capturing of antitypical Oreb we understand to mean the over-powering of Sectarianism, Divisionism, by argument. The killing of antitypical Oreb we understand to mean the complete refutation of Sectarianism, Divisionism. The rock of Oreb seems to represent the strong feature in the doctrine of Sectarianism, which is that the various denominations of Christendom are the branches of Christ, the Vine (John 15:1-8). On this parable, as a rock, they built their doctrines on the Divisions of the Nominal Church. But the Youthful Worthies from the Fall of 1917 onward demonstrated that the sects are parts of the Vine of the Earth (Rev: 14:18), while the branches of Christ, the true Vine, are the faithful individuals who are in Christ. Thus they utterly refuted Sectarianism by the Scripture (rock) that is supposed by the errorists to prove it.

(52) Zeeb (*wolf*) very fittingly types Clericalism, because the Scriptures so frequently refer to the clergy as being wolfish instead of being real shepherds (Ezek. 34). Against Clericalism, from the Fall of 1917 onward, the Youthful Worthies have also striven in argument. They overpowered Clericalism's claims, thus capturing antitypical Zeeb; and at antitypical Zeeb's winepress, the World War, etc. (Rev. 14:19, 21), they utterly refuted Clericalism by proving that the clergy were more responsible for the war, and were encouraging it more than any other class. Looking over the literature that the Youthful Worthies in association with the various groups of the Levites used in their

part of the warfare against antitypical Midian—"The Finished Mystery," "The Fall of Babylon," etc., used by "the channel"; "The Treatise on Revelation," and The Bible Truth Witness on "Babylon is Fallen, is Fallen," etc., used by the Olsonites (whose glorification occurs by April 1, 1921?); and "The Revelation of Jesus Christ" and "The Inauguration of God's Kingdom Preceded by Distress of Nations," etc., used by the P.B.I. and B.S.C.—we recognize that preeminently the two errors—prince errors—Sectarianism and Clericalism, antitypical Oreb and Zeeb, were singled out, captured and smitten unto death. Thus the fulfilled facts prove that the Youthful Worthies have captured and slain antitypical Oreb and Zeeb. The men of Ephraim bringing the heads of Oreb and Zeeb to Gideon beyond Jordan type the fact that the Youthful Worthies, some considerable time after the Fall of 1916, when antitypical Gideon's first battle was finished, have made a report of their fight against antitypical Oreb and Zeeb to our Lord.

(53) It will be noted that in the type the honor of capturing and executing Oreb and Zeeb is given to the men of Ephraim alone—the men of Naphtali, Asher and Manasseh are not given the credit of having a part therein. We believe that the Lord purposely arranged the type in this way to impress upon us a very important thought in the antitype. We know it to be a fact that the Youthful Worthies not only have fought against Sectarianism and Clericalism in association with the three groups of the Great Company, and that the latter have furnished the literature by which these prince errors were taken and executed, but also that these three Great Company groups have dominated the work, and have taken for themselves the most important parts in this work. Why, then, does the type not only fail to point this out, but even omit all mention of the types of the three Great Company groups as having anything to do with the capture and slaying

of antitypical Oreb and Zeeb? We answer this question as follows: The Lord counts as overcomers of false doctrines and practices only those who first in their own characters overcome the disposition underlying such doctrines and practices. That this is correct we can see from the fact that only the 144,000 are counted victors over the Beast and his Image (Rev. 15:2; 20:4), though, as we know, the Truth section of the Great Company opposed the Beast and his Image, but because they are not more than overcomers of certain characteristics of the Beast and his Image, God does not count them overcomers of these, however much they verbally preach and zealously work against them (Rev. 19:1-3). Hence it is because the three Truth groups of the Great Company have practiced Sectarianism and Clericalism as among the main forms that their Revolutionism, manifesting their Leviteship, have assumed, their battling against Nominal Church Sectarianism and Clericalism is not accounted by God as overcoming these prince errors. Hence the type very properly contains no representation of their activity against Sectarianism and Clericalism. On the other hand, from the type we infer that the Youthful Worthies overcome in their own characters the spirit of Sectarianism and Clericalism, and are thus privileged to have their verbal battling against the prince errors of antitypical Midian accounted as their capturing and executing them. This consideration should arouse the Great Company to cleanse themselves of these evil qualities, that their work against Nominal Church errors may receive the Lord's approval as that of victors.

(54) Judg. 8:1 typically sets forth how the Youthful Worthies as a class would resent and murmur against their not being favored with the High Calling ("Why hast thou served us thus, that thou calledst us not"). As we have from Rev. 16, 17 (see Berean Comments) already pointed out (Vol. III, Chapter II), it

was the Great Company that made the first announcement of the fact that all the Very Elect had been sealed in their foreheads, which they claimed was completed by the Passover of 1918, a date which we have proven to be two years too late (Chapter III). It was in April or May, 1918, that we first learned that by the Passover of 1916 all the Very Elect had been sealed in their foreheads. Having learned this, we began to present it to the Church. Our colaborers also joined us in presenting it to the brethren. The article on The Last Related Acts Of Elijah and Elisha, appearing first in No. 1 of The Present Truth, also carried this announcement. From the very outstart our presenting this thought aroused much resentment among the Youthful Worthies, and among some of their Levitical sympathizers in our Philadelphia Church and elsewhere. This was one of the matters that in 1918 aroused some of the Gershonite Levites to a manifestation of themselves in the Philadelphia Church and elsewhere, and prompted several Youthful Worthies to leave that Church with the Gershonite Levites late in 1918. After the appearance of The Present Truth, especially Nos. 1, 6 and 12, this same resentment increasingly manifested itself the world over. In varying forms these dear brethren showed their great disappointment at coming too late for the High Calling. Their sorrow and disappointment have been great, and we are sure that the entire Priesthood has deeply sympathized with them; for theirs has been a terrible disappointment, which, however, affecting them with more or less resentment, has occasioned them as a class to contend strongly with the Lord ("they did chide with him sharply") at their not being called in time to have had the privilege accorded to the Very Elect exclusively, *i.e.*, unto a completion and in the proper spirit to engage in antitypical Gideon's first battle, to smite Jordan the first time, to confess the sins over Azazel's Goat, to execute the

judgment written. In not a few cases we have received letters from some of these dear brethren blaming us, as if it were our fault that they came in too late for the High Calling, and as if our announcing the Truth on the subject caused them the loss of this special privilege. Seemingly such dear ones forget that our setting forth the Truth on this subject did not cut off further access to the High Calling; for the opportunity of the Spirit-begetting had ceased nearly four years before we learned of it; and the sealing of the Elect had ended about two years before we learned of it. In complaining against us on this account they are, as the type shows, really murmuring against the Lord, the antitypical Gideon, as do all of those Youthful Worthies who, without blaming us, resent their not having been favored with the High Calling.

(55) But in reality no wrong was done them by the Lord; for He does not owe any one the High Calling. At most it is a matter of grace and love on His part, not of debt or of justice, to have offered the High Calling to any one (Rom. 9:20, 21). Hence those that have received this favor should not boast of it, as of its being theirs by right; nor should those who have not been favored with it resent its withholding, as though they are being denied their rights. This is a matter for the Lord alone to decide, and the fully consecrated heart will accept His will in the matter as for the best interests of all concerned. All must admit that some time in the Lord's Plan the time for gaining the last member of Christ would have to set in, and this having set in would necessitate the withholding of the invitation to the High Calling from all others. Scripture, Reason and Facts prove that that time has already set in with the indicated results. It will help the Youthful Worthies to remember that the Lord could in justice have passed them by until Restitution times, and then simply offer them what He will offer the world; but that in grace He has favored them now

with privileges that He is withholding from the world, and will later favor them with princship in all the earth and still later with a spiritual nature! Surely this is ground for gratitude on their part! But on the part of the Priesthood, let there be no boasting nor vaunting of themselves above the Youthful Worthies (Rom. 11:18). On the contrary, let these extend their heart's sympathy toward them. Let these imitate toward them the course of their Head toward them as typed in vs. 2 and 3. Our Lord has not upbraided the Youthful Worthies, though they have striven mightily against Him. We are sure that He sympathizes with them, and has in the antitype commended their part of the work, even above His Own.

(56) It will be noticed how tactfully Gideon answered the men of Ephraim, praising their work above his own, as though their gleaning—the killing of Oreb and Zeeb—was more than his vintage, the first battle (v. 2). How could our Lord in the antitype have found something in the Youthful Worthies' victory that was larger than His in the first battle? We answer that this could be truthfully said; for the work in which the bulk of the Youthful Worthies took and are taking part with the Levites has been on a larger scale than was that of our Lord and the antitypical Three Hundred. As we look back to the work that the faithful Volunteers, Pilgrims (with these all those who by word of mouth faithfully testified against the Divine right are to be counted) and Colporteurs did in the first battle of antitypical Gideon, from the Fall of 1914 to that of 1916, we readily recognize that the battling work of the rest of the Lord's people since the Fall of 1917 has been on a larger scale than was that of the first battle, and has been engaged in by many more brethren than were engaged in the first battle. Undoubtedly in bulk they have done much more battling than the antitypical Three Hundred did in the two years of their battle. These facts would justify

our Lord's referring to His work with the Three Hundred as smaller than that of the Youthful Worthies.

(57) Remembering that our Lord is antitypically speaking in vs. 2 and 3 as the Mouthpiece of the antitypical Three Hundred, we see how very true was the remark that by these Three Hundred He had not made such captures and slaughters as the Youthful Worthies had in the case of Sectarianism and Clericalism, in antitypical gleaning; for let us not forget that as in the type it was not the Three Hundred who in the first battle did the slaughtering, but it was the Midianites, unable in the darkness to distinguish one another from foes, who did the slaughtering (Judg. 7:22), so in the antitype it was the antitypical Midianites who by their deeds and debates associated with the war slaughtered one another in their erroneous views, especially with respect to the doctrines of the Divine right, the antitypical Three Hundred doing nothing but breaking their pitchers, holding up the light and blowing on their trumpets. To Jehovah's direct interposition was the victory due in the typical and antitypical first battle (Judg. 7:22, "The Lord set every man's sword against his fellow, etc."). Hence up to the time of the second antitypical battle our Lord could truthfully say that larger were the results of the personal endeavors of the Youthful Worthies, among which was their victory over Sectarianism and Clericalism, their antitypical gleaning, than were the results of the personal endeavors of the Lord Jesus through the antitypical Three Hundred in their antitypical vintage ("What was I able to do in comparison of you?"). Our Lord gave this answer antitypically through His people's declarations when contrasting the comparatively small work done from 1914 to 1916 with the large work done from 1917 onward. Perhaps in part this thought was antitypically expressed in the sentence preceding the

subhead, "How Wise is our God," in Vol. III, Chapter II.

(58) It is well stated in Holy Writ (Prov. 15:1): "A soft [mild, kind] answer turneth away wrath." Surely this proved to be true in the case of Gideon speaking to the angry Ephraimites ("Then was their anger abated toward him," etc.). And in many cases have we noticed this antitypically in the case of our Lord speaking through His Priests to Youthful Worthies. We would therefore suggest to the Lord's people that they become the Lord's mouthpieces in giving such an answer to the Youthful Worthies, when the latter resent their not being given the privilege of the High Calling. Let them praise the work of the Youthful Worthies, especially against Sectarianism and Clericalism, above their own work in the first battle.

(59) The question may arise, how did those Youthful Worthies who refused to participate with the various Levitical branches in their public work because of its revolutionism, but who rather remained with, and assisted the Priests against the revolutionism of the Levites share in capturing and killing antitypical Oreb and Zeeb? We answer: They did capture and slay antitypical Oreb, Sectarianism, and Zeeb, Clericalism, as these were manifested in the practices of the various Levitical groups. With the Priests they steadfastly opposed the sectarian and clericalistic spirit among the Truth people; and therefore we believe the Lord praises them and rewards them above their fellow Youthful Worthies who entered the warfare against antitypical Midian in association and co-operation with the Levites. This, then, is our word of comfort to them: You have been privileged above your other Youthful Worthies brethren in the warfare against antitypical Midian.

(60) Glancing back at the study of Gideon—Type and Antitype, so far given, we find in the events

given so far as antityped a very clear fulfillment of the typical Gideon story. As hitherto presented everything is harmonious, everything is clear, everything is Scriptural, everything is reasonable, everything is factual. Here are no vagaries, no whittlings, no twistings, no stretchings, no modifyings, no suppressings, no dodgings necessary. The presentation is, we believe, self-demonstrative as true. Contrast it with the vagaries that the Society friends give and that Bro. Olson gives on Gideon—type and antitype, and at once we see the overwhelming power of the Epiphany Truth and the self-evident weakness of the Levitical error!

(61) We now proceed to study the next section of the Gideon story (Judg. 8:4-9), which likewise has had its antitypical fulfillment. Comparing Judg. 7:25 [last clause]—8:3 and Judg. 8:4 we have a splendid illustration of what we have repeatedly noted in these columns as being done in Biblical, as well as in other histories, *i.e.*, events are not always given in their chronological order, but rather connected events are frequently treated unto a completion, even if this makes parts of their record precede the record of an event that occurred before these parts; in other words the logical frequently displaces the chronological order. V. 4 of Judg. 8 tells of Gideon and his three hundred crossing from the west to the east side of the Jordan, while the events described in the last clause of Judg. 7:25 and in Judg. 8:1-3 occurred on the east side of the Jordan. Hence the event described in v. 4 occurred before the events narrated in the last clause of Judg. 7:25 and in Judg. 8:1-3. We would explain the phenomenon as follows: the sacred historian first described to a completion Gideon's first battle (Judg. 7:9-22); then he described to a completion that battle in which Gideon did not take a personal part (Judg. 7:23-25); then he described its aftermath (Judg. 7:25 [last clause]—8:3); then in Judg. 8:4, going back to the end of Gideon's first battle, the sacred historian

describes the pursuit of the Midianites retreating from the first battle by Gideon and his three hundred, who followed them from the Valley of Esdraelon to the Jordan, then across the Jordan eastward. So viewed the event of Judg. 8:4 preceded the events stated in the last clause of Judg. 7:25 and in Judg. 8:1-3.

(62) There is a special reason for inserting the statement of v. 4: It is to show that in the antitype the preparation for and the fighting of the Second Battle of antitypical Gideon would take place after the Lord's faithful people, viewed from the standpoint of the Elijah picture, would have crossed Jordan. Yea, the episodes given in vs. 5-9 prove that the preparations for, and the fighting of antitypical Gideon's second battle would occur not only after the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha (Succoth) but after another group of organized Levites (Penuel) would be separate and distinct from the faithful. Yea, the opening clause of v. 11 shows that as the antitypical Gideon was marching to the second battle, he passed by and beyond the last group of those Levites who do not believe in organizations controlling their work ("them that dwelt in tents"—not in cities). Thus this second battle was not to be entered into until the faithful were separated from all three groups of the Levites under *bad leadership*. The antitype has surely realized this: It was only after the separation of the Amramites, the last subdivision of the third group of antitypical Levites, from the Priests began, that the second battle was begun. Therefore vs. 4-11 prove that the Lord's faithful Three Hundred would have a public work to do long after the first and second smitings of Jordan would have taken place, and after the Priests would have been separated from all eight Levitical groups, as these are led by bad leaders. This helps us to determine the chronology of the second antitypical battle. And, true enough, the Laymen's Home Missionary Movement launched its first attack

against antitypical Zebah and Zalmunna, July 18, 1920, which was after the two groups of the Amramites as the last section of the antitypical Levites under bad Levite leadership had broken with the Epiphany-enlightened saints. Hence we understand the warfare of the Laymen's Home Missionary Movement against Eternal Torment and the Consciousness of the Dead more particularly to be antitypical Gideon's second battle with the antitypical Midianites.

(63) True enough (v. 4), the dear ones who participate in this conflict are antitypically faint, *i.e.*, they are weak in numbers and in resources: but the Lord God Almighty is with them by His Vicegerent, our beloved Gideon, the Lord Jesus, who is invested with all authority in heaven and in earth (Matt. 28:20), and with whom but one is a majority and an invincible host! And with an unwavering faith in and an implicit obedience to Him, though faint, they are yet pursuing! And with Him they will yet capture antitypical Zebah and Zalmunna, as they have struck them a blow, before which they are even now in ignominious flight with their terrified host.

(64) As we understand matters, the events of vs. 5-9 began to be antityped May 17, 1920, when the writer visited the Brooklyn Bethel and the P.B.I. headquarters, going there from Easton, Pa., where the two days before he made a pilgrim visit. Succoth (*tabernacles*), a city, in harmony with Scriptural symbolisms, types a religious government. We understand that Succoth types the Society as a religious government and its men—princes, v. 6—represent the Society leaders. We knew that the Amram shaking, which was well developed *in its leaders* by the end of the Winter of 1920, would precede our anticipated public work. We knew also that after the Amram sifting the next work for the Priesthood toward Azazel's Goat would be toward its Nominal Church section. We became convinced as we saw the

Amram sifting advancing that it was fast becoming time for us to prepare for the attack on Eternal Torment and the Consciousness of the Dead, which two doctrines we had for several years told the brethren were typed by Zebah and Zalmunna. We knew further that to accomplish this work we would need a book for the Colporteurs and tracts for the Volunteers. As we considered the matter, we concluded that to get a suitable book, the Hell and Spiritism booklets, and at least one suitable tract our expenses would reach at least \$5,000, apart from the advertising preparations for the public lecture work. We thought that we could not reasonably expect to have so large a sum of money on hand by mid-summer, when we thought the work would probably begin. We feared that our associate Priests were too weak in numbers and resources ("faint") to meet these and other expenses. What should we do? Of course, we went to the Lord about this matter. We then recalled that the Lord had given the Society brethren, the Merarites, the custodianship of the Truth literature, which they were to use especially in the interests of the Priests. The thought, therefore, came to us that, if we could get the Society brethren to publish for us a book consisting of the most appropriate of our Pastor's writings, and to print for us the Hell and Spiritism booklets and some suitable tracts of his, and to furnish the book and booklets to us at Colporteur rates and the tracts at slightly above cost, we would be spared the initial expense of publishing the book, booklets and tracts, and thus would be able to finance the work toward Azazel's Goat in the Nominal Church.

(65) We, therefore, decided to go to Bethel and lay our plan before the representatives of the Society. Some may think it strange that we should have ventured to go to Bethel after our expulsion therefrom in 1917, and our subsequent treatment at the hands of "the present management." Beloved brethren, we

allowed none of those things to prevent our going to Bethel; for we felt it a privilege to go there as the hand and mouth of the Lord, to present His request on behalf of His Three Hundred, "faint yet pursuing." Our reception by a number of the brethren in the storeroom was, except in the case of a certain sister, quite cordial, especially so by Bro. Wise, the Society's Vice-President, and by Bro. Martin, the Manager, whom we asked to see when we arrived. As briefly and as winsomely as we could we laid our request before these two brothers, emphasizing the small numbers and meager resources of our supporters and telling these two brothers that our intention was to use the literature in public work against Eternal Torment and the Consciousness of the Dead (v. 5). We assured them that it would greatly strengthen the Epiphany-enlightened saints, if our request were granted. We likewise assured these brethren that we did not want our name to appear on the book, booklets and tracts as their publisher, but instead we would be pleased to have the Society's name appear as their publisher, which would give them the opportunity of following up inquiries made by the recipients of the literature. Thus we assured them that we desired in no wise to trespass upon their work toward the public.

(66) After we presented the case Bro. Martin spoke to the following effect: It is now as it was in our Pastor's days; as then nothing involving expenditures of funds could be done unless authorized by him, so now such matters could be authorized by Bro. Rutherford alone; the latter had not yet returned from his Sunday pilgrim trip, but was expected to arrive shortly after noon; and if we would return about 4 P.M., we could get an answer. Accordingly we left Bethel, and on our return at 4 P.M. were told that Bro. Rutherford had not yet returned, and were asked to call again, at 7.30 P.M., when doubtless we would receive

a definite answer. On our return at that time we were told by Bro. Wise that Bro. Rutherford desired that we put our proposition in writing. Accordingly, returning to Philadelphia we wrote a very conciliatory letter covering the points above given, and addressed to the Board of the W.T.B.&T.S., in care of J.F. Rutherford, its President. We expressly in this letter told the Board that we were addressing it in the Lord's name and as the representative of a goodly number of Priests. We had the letter registered for personal delivery to J.F.R. with the request for the receipted registry card to be sent to us. This means that the mail-carrier was to deliver the letter to J.F.R. personally and to have the latter sign the receipt card, which was then to be sent to us.

(67) These things were done: we have now in our possession, not only a carbon copy of our letter, but the receipt card with J.F.R.'s signature in his own handwriting as its recipient. Our reason for sending the letter to the Board was this: the subject matter of our proposal was a matter of policy, controllership, and therefore was not a matter for the executive, but for the Board to decide. In other words, we refused to recognize as valid a usurped power that J.F.R., according to Bro. Martin's statement, was using. Several days later we received a letter signed by Bro. Goux, J.F.R.'s secretary, informing us that the Board was not in session (!); that our letter was received, but was not opened, nor would it be unless it were addressed to J.F.R., if meant for him, and that therefore our letter was returned enclosed! This was an evasive technicality worthy of a typical *lawyer!* The signature of the registry card, however, was in J.F.R.'s handwriting, not in that of Bro. Goux. We knew, of course, that Bro. Goux wrote the letter at J.F.R.'s direction; for he would not have dared to do such a thing on his own initiative. This procedure may have struck

J.F.R. as a good way of ignoring us. However, we were not surprised in the least at the whole procedure; it was characteristically *Rutherfordian*. What did we do? We destroyed the envelope in which our letter was originally sent, took the same letter, which as above said was written to the Board, and enclosed it in an envelope addressed to J.F.R., sending it by registry with instructions that it be for personal delivery only, and that the receipt card be sent to us. In due time the receipt card containing J.F.R.'s signature in his handwriting came to us.

(68) This time our letter was opened, and was presented to the Board. Our request contained in the letter was denied by the Board; and its answer, signed by Bro. Van Amburgh as the Society's Secretary, was sent to us by letter. This letter, while offering to sell us literature that they had on hand *at the same price as the public paid*, not only curtly refused our request, but derided us in a number of particulars and treated our request, as though it were a personal one. Their insulting letter we politely answered, telling them that our request was not a personal one, but was made by us as a representative of the Lord and of many Priests, and asking whether, in view of the Lord giving them charge of the Truth literature that they might furnish it especially for the use of the Priests, they would really refuse to use their stewardship according to the Lord's intention in entrusting them with this stewardship? To this letter sent to Bro. Van Amburgh under registry with directions for personal delivery and return of receipt card we never received an answer, but did receive the receipt card through the registry branch of the Post Office. When it became known that the Board had denied our request, in answer to Societyites' questions as to why it had been refused, J.F.R., at a convention question meeting, said that it had been refused because, he alleged, we told the Board that the Society was of the Great Company

and therefore was obligated to grant it to us as a representative Priest. Our letter said not a word to the effect that the Society was of the Great Company and hence was obligated to furnish us the requested literature. Thus J.F.R. in this, as in hundreds of other cases, falsified about our act, as our pertinent letters prove.

(69) Let us look at the above given facts in the light of vs. 5 and 6, which we believe typify these facts. As the bread that Gideon requested would have replenished the depleted stores of the three hundred, and would have refreshed them in their weakness, so would the above-described literature have replenished the depleted stores of antitypical Gideon's Three Hundred and would have refreshed them in their weak resources ("faint"). As Gideon told the men of Succoth that he was pursuing Zebah and Zalmunna, the kings of Midian, so the Lord Jesus through us told Bros. Wise, Martin and the Board that He with His Faithful was preparing to wage warfare against the doctrines of Eternal Torment and the Consciousness of the Dead as the chief errors ("kings") of the errorists. And as Gideon told the men of Succoth that his three hundred were faint, so the Lord Jesus through us told the Society leaders that the brethren associated with us were weak in numbers and resources. But as the princes of Succoth disdainfully refused Gideon's request, so the Society leaders disdainfully refused our Lord's request, presented to them through us. And as the princes of Succoth to their disdainful refusal added reviling and depreciation of Gideon's office, works and powers, so did the Society's Board do to antitypical Gideon, as He has been pleased to work through us as a representative of Him and His Three Hundred.

(70) The conduct and answer of the princes of Succoth, as Gideon comments on the former and quotes the latter in v. 15, imply the following thoughts:

Gideon, You have not an army strong enough to hold in your power the might of Zebah and Zalmunna. No sane person would believe that you have so exalted a work to do as you arrogate to yourself. Therefore it would be out of the question for us to give material support to your attempt. We will have nothing to do with you and your warfare. Had the men of Succoth realized who actually was speaking to them they certainly would have answered differently; even as the Board would have answered us differently had they realized that the Lord Jesus was addressing them through us, which in our letter to them we indicated was the case. But as we have paraphrased the conduct and the answer of the men of Succoth, as Gideon refers to these in v. 15, just so were the conduct and the answer of the Board to the Lord speaking to them through us; for the following thoughts are implied in their conduct and letter: (1) The few that associate with us could with impunity be ignored, and thus be treated as unable to overpower the two (king) errors; (2) their regarding us as a representative of the Lord seemed to the Board a sure evidence of their insanity, as its letter intimates; (3) we ourselves could not be used by the Lord in any sense, because we had a bad spirit; and (4) they wanted nothing to do with us and our work. But their answer as expressed in their acts and letter was not given to us, but to the One for whom we were then privileged to be a mouth and hand; and by their arrogant conduct and insolent answer they antityped the arrogant conduct and insolent answer of the princes of Succoth, and thus reproached the Lord Himself (Luke 10:16; Num. 15:30).

(71) Gideon's answer (v. 7) showed his faith that the Lord would deliver Zebah and Zalmunna into his hand; that by God's support his small army would get into their power these two kings; and then he added that he would tear (thresh—margin) the flesh of the

leaders of Succoth with the thorns and briars that grew in the wilderness, which therefore were harder and stronger than ordinary thorns and briars. In the antitype the Lord has sent forth the word that surely antitypical Zebah and Zalmunna will be overpowered and captured by antitypical Gideon and His Three Hundred. He has also proclaimed with reference to the leaders of the Society that when He comes back from the war with the king errors, Eternal Torment and the Consciousness of the Dead, in His power, no more surrounded by their advocates, He will use as symbolic scourges the symbolic thorns, Scripture passages, and symbolic briars, facts, that come to maturity in the wilderness condition in which the Faithful have been, ever since usurpers have arrogated to themselves the places of power among the bulk of God's people; and by these symbolic scourges He will tear, or thresh, the fleshly conduct of these sinners in Spiritual Israel. If the Society leaders knew but one-tenth of what we know the Scriptures tell of their wrong conduct they "would be of all men the most miserable." And now in the Lord's name we declare, as we have done on many occasions before, of these unpatriotic Spiritual Israelites, that those Scriptures and facts in due time will be published from the housetops, and as a scourge in the Lord's hands will thresh their fleshly minds.

(72) Gideon (v. 8) then requested help of the men of Penuel (*before God*), who like the princes of Succoth refused it. What does this type? We answer: The P.B.I.'s refusal to help, at antitypical Gideon's request. The reply that Bro. Martin gave us May 17, that our proposition would have to be submitted to J.F.R.'s decision, made us feel sure that it would be refused. Therefore we went from Bethel to the P.B.I. Headquarters. We knew that they had the Hell booklet in Herald form, and had also the tract "Where are the Dead?" the latter in an undesirable

form because of being in too small type. Meeting Isaac Hoskins there, we suggested that he have a witness to our conversation. We accordingly went to the Angelophone office, where was Bro. Cook, a P.B.I. Director. We asked them to furnish at wholesale rates these two pieces of literature, printed in one edition of their paper. In answer to a prefatory question of ours as to whether they yet had the forms of the Hell Herald set up, Bro. Hoskins assured us that they did, and that several weeks before he was at the P.B.I. printer's and saw the forms of the Hell Herald set up. This would have made the expense of publishing these rather cheap. Both of these brothers told us the matter would have to be referred to the P.B.I. Board. We asked Bro. Hoskins whether he would not present it favorably to the Board. He refused to commit himself. Previously when we told him that we wished to insert a note (the one that appears in the book *Life-Death-Hereafter* on pp. 86, 87) giving, as Bro. Hoskins remembered it, our Pastor's last thought, on the Greek words translated *torment*, he said that he was absolutely opposed to any such addition. His manner strongly impressed us as unfavorable to our proposition. Both brothers also asked us to put the matter in writing. This we did.

(73) The Board's answer was to the effect that they would not furnish the Hell Herald with our note. Their answer was so worded as to imply that we were seeking to corrupt our Pastor's Hell treatise, for which they would not stand. They so refused our request as to place the blame of the refusal upon us. We answered to the effect that we considered this treatise most excellent, and would be glad to get it from them without our suggested note, if they would not entertain the thought of its insertion. Their reply was to the effect that unknown to them their printer had some considerable time before destroyed the forms of the Hell Herald. This was in conflict with Bro. Hoskins'

statement to us that they were preserved, and that he had but recently seen them. We believe in this case that the latter told the truth; because he told us of the forms as preserved before he knew what we wanted; and because it is most improbable that a printer would destroy forms that he was asked to preserve, unless later he had been ordered to do so. This answer, suggesting that we print the Hell booklet, if we wanted it, in spite of their offering to furnish us at a cent apiece their very small-typed tract, *Where are the Dead?* which with difficulty can be read by average eyes, satisfied us that like the Society they did not want to help us and were, while refusing us, trying to answer in a way that their answer would shield them and throw the blame of their refusal upon us. We were willing to use that (to most people) almost illegible tract, only if we could get the treatise on Hell. The latter being refused us, we no longer sought to get the former, which in itself all will recognize is unsuitable for most eyes to read. The P.B.I.'s answer, like that of the Society, was a refusal, without however being written in the disdainful manner of the Society's answer, though we believe it contained a falsehood, made to screen their refusal to furnish the Hell treatise to us. Recognizing it as a refusal we dropped further correspondence with them. We believe that in the facts just given respecting the request made to the P.B.I. for help and their treatment of it we find the antitype of v. 8 given.

(74) In v. 9 we find Gideon's reply to Penuel's refusal to help. In it he expressed His assurance of victory ("when I come again *in peace*"). In it was also a threat that he would break down the Tower of Penuel; and according to v. 17 he not only fulfilled this threat, but also did more than that—he slew the men—leaders—of the city. We understand the Tower of Penuel to represent the charter of the P.B.I.—a charter which in not a few points deviates from that

sample of charters for controlling corporations among the Lord's people given by the Lord through "that Servant," and which those who are now the leaders of the P.B.I. formerly in print claimed to be of Divine obligation in corporational matters among the Lord's people. If our understanding of the significance of the Tower of Penuel is correct, we are to expect the Lord to set aside the charter of the P.B.I. We will say here that the deeds of the P.B.I. leaders in breaking up the Fort Pitt Committee and in forming their present organization is typed by probably the most reprehensible act recorded in the entire Old Testament. When this will be made clear that charter and those leaders will be repudiated (v. 17).

(75) The narrative (v. 10) now describes the camp and host of Zebah (*sacrifice*) and Zalmunna (*shade, or shadow denied*). As before suggested, we understand Zebah to represent the doctrine of Eternal Torment, the foremost of the two chief errors of the antitypical Midianites. This word is derived from the Hebrew verb *zabach*, which means to sacrifice, and which is used both with reference to sacrificing to Jehovah (1 Sam. 1:3; Ps. 4:5; Gen. 31:54), and with reference to sacrificing to devils (Deut. 32:17; 2 Chro. 28:23; Ps. 106:37, 38; Hos. 11:2). When the name is applied to a heathen, as in v. 10, it refers to sacrifice offered to devils, especially to Molech (Lev. 18:21; 20:2-5; Jer. 32:35), who we understand is the type of the misrepresentation of God worshiped by believers in eternal torment. Hence the heathen Zebah suggests the doctrine of Eternal Torment. Zalmunna according to some means *shade, ghost*; according to others it means *shadow, i.e., protection, denied*. The former definition directly suggests the doctrine of the Consciousness of the Dead, the latter meaning, when connected with the idea of Eternal Torment, as the name Zalmunna is always connected with that of Zebah, also implies the doctrine of the Consciousness of

those Dead who are denied protection. It matters not, therefore, which definition we accept; in either case the antitypical significance is the doctrine of the Consciousness of the Dead. This is also one of the king errors of antitypical Midian. Karkor, where Zebah and Zalmunna were entrenched, means *foundation*, and it types the doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul, which is the doctrine in which both the doctrine of Eternal Torment and that of the Consciousness of the Dead are entrenched. It is indeed the foundation (Karkor) of these two doctrines. Through the preceding two battles, Gideon's first battle, and that engaged in by the men of Naphtali, Asher, Manasseh and Ephraim, eight-ninths of the host of the Midianites were killed, only fifteen thousand remaining. This types how before the second battle of antitypical Gideon the great bulk of the people who have supported ("men that drew swords") the main doctrine by which Satan kept his empire in control had given these doctrines up; and that for his original falsehoods (Gen. 3:4, 5; John 8:44) he has a greatly diminished number of defenders ("about 15,000 men, all that were left").

(76) V. 11 describes the final march toward and the entrance into the second battle. Gideon in some unmentioned way got sufficient supplies for his small but faithful army. So, too, has antitypical Gideon, in the book *Life-Death-Hereafter*, in the booklets, *The Hell of the Bible and Spiritism—Ancient and Modern*, and in five among the best tracts of our Pastor on pertinent subjects, gotten sufficient supplies for His small but faithful army. And both Gideons, so supplied, marched onward in pursuit of their enemies. As the typical Gideon marched past those who dwelt in tents ("went up by the way of them that dwelt in tents"), so did antitypical Gideon pass by those who dwelt in antitypical tents. As a city represents a religious government, a religious organization, like the Society and the P.B.I., so those who dwelt in tents

represent those who are not in a religious government, or religious organization. We, therefore, believe that the Kohathite Levites in their Amramite branch are typed by "those who dwelt in tents." The thought seems to be this: as the Lord was preparing for His second battle with the antitypical Midianites He passed by and left behind Him, as non-participants in His preparations for, and in His participation in, His second battle, the Amramites, unorganized Levites, hence Kohathites, who have no symbolic chariots, organizations (Num. 7:8). This is exactly what took place: both at Philadelphia and at Jersey City the separation of the Amramites from the Priests about to become active in the Laymen's Home Missionary Movement began in March 1920, and was very well over by July 18, 1920, when the second battle began. Going up by the way of these implies that He would be more or less occupied with them before entering the battle; and leaving them behind means that they, separated from His Three Hundred, would not share in the battle. And this was true, as can be seen from our article on Amramism Revealed, in The Present Truth, Nos. 22, 24 and 25. And singularly enough they have had no part in this glorious second battle of antitypical Gideon. How very providential and reasonable that the battle should be deferred until the last subdivision of Truth Levites under bad leadership should have been separated from the Faithful!

(77) Marching eastward of Nobah (*barking*) and Jogbehah (*high, proud*) seems to represent that, while on the one hand symbolic dogs among Truth people (Matt. 7:6, see Berean Comments), as partisans, would bark and growl, snarl and snap at the faithful few, and that while on the other hand haughty ones among the Truth people would despise the efforts of the faithful few, these would be east of them—toward the sun-rising—nearer the Lord, and thus safe from the contentions of the one class, and immune to the despisings of the other.

(78) The attack both in type and antitype was a surprise ("for the host was secure"). Surely this is true in every branch of the antitypical attack. The attack began with the public lecture in Philadelphia, July 18, 1920. The subject, "America's Fallen Heroes—Comfort for their Bereaved," and its accompanying advertisements, looked innocent enough to all antitypical Midianites. They did not suspect that behind that subject and its advertisements lurked an attack on Eternal Torment and the Consciousness of the Dead. They were indeed surprised! Our prayer meeting workers going to Testimony Meetings of the Nominal Church, offer hearty testimonies that refresh the people. These are not suspected as attackers of these doctrines, as they give out the Tracts and secure names and addresses for the Colporteurs and Sharpshooters. Our Colporteurs and Sharpshooters using our canvass introduce a book and booklets that are at first sight little suspected as attacking these doctrines. Yea, the attack is a surprise! But the attack is more than a surprise; it throws the enemy into confusion and flight. *E.g.*, after pointing out the heroism of America's Fallen Heroes, in the public lecture the request is made of any who believe that the unsaintly fallen heroes are now being tortured in hell to arise to their feet and tell their faith to the audience! Except in one case, against whom the audience so vigorously protested as to frighten him into silence, to date none have dared so to do. They flee in fear from the field in the face of such an attack. The pursuit of v. 12 seems to refer to the follow-up work; the first public lecture is followed up, first by those who gather cards for follow-up Colporteurs, then by Volunteer workers distributing tracts as the audience leaves the auditorium, then by the follow-up Colporteurs and Herald subscription workers, who do their follow-up work. Then the following Sunday another public lecture—a follow-up lecture, a pursuit lecture—is given, with similar follow-up work coming

after it. Truly these two doctrines cannot escape the pursuit, and truly their defenders are discomfited, or as the margin puts it, terrified.

(79) The battle is not yet over, lasting longer than we had expected. Therefore we exhort all Epiphany enlightened saints quickly to enter the fray, ere it becomes too late. We stand ready to assist all such with suitable literature, as Colporteurs or Volunteers. Let the Classes who have not yet done so arrange for the public lectures. Yea, we exhort those of the antitypical Three Hundred who mingle with the various Levitical bodies to concentrate their attention to attacks on these two king errors of antitypical Midian. Let such do this work, leaving to the Levites the work of proclaiming Millions now Living, etc., of canvassing for the Golden Age, of distributing Bible Truth Witnesses on Babylon is Fallen, tracts on the Establishment of God's Kingdom Preceded by Distress of Nations, etc., etc. Antitypical Gideonites, whether in or out of the Epiphany Truth, let us concentrate our attacks against the doctrines of Eternal Torment and the Consciousness of the Dead! If any of us are among the P.B.I., let us circulate their *Where are the Dead?* and their *Hell Herald*; if any of us are among the Society friends, let us circulate the pertinent booklets and tracts of our Pastor. We invite all, in the Lord's name, if they cannot get suitable literature among their associates, to write to us for it; and we will be very glad to furnish it to them. Forward let us all go in God's name! Gideonites, a few more sacrifices, a few more blows, a few more miles of pursuit, and antitypical Zebah and Zalmunna will be captives in the hands of our Gideon! Forward, then, under Him, in God's name, to final and complete victory!

(1) What did The Present Truth do with antitypical Gideon's first and second battles? Why? What effects attend a study of these battles? Give a brief account of how the details of this type became clear? How much of the Book of Judges is covered in this study?

(2) How do we know that Gideon is a typical character? What proves that his battles were typical? Whom does he type? Why? Who are the antitypes of Israel in Judg. 6, 7, 8? What does Midian mean, and what do the Midianites type? What does Gideon's first battle type? By what other types is its antitype pictured? What do the seven years of Judg. 6:1 type? Why? What brought the antitypical oppression? How did God's Israel seek to protect themselves from the oppressors? What was done with the fruits of their labor? Who were the typical and the antitypical oppressors? How and to what extent were antitypical Israelites overcome? Of what were the Israelites robbed, in the type and in the antitype? How did their oppressors come up against them, in type and in antitype? What two things do the cries of Judg. 6:6 type? How did these cries affect Jehovah?

(3) What is typed by the prophet and his message, referred to in Judg. 6:8-10?

(4) What does Judg. 6:11-24 type? What does the angel instructing Gideon type? Why? What do trees type? What proves this? What does the oak of this section type? What do the names Ophrah, Joash and Gideon mean, and what do they type? Why? What does v. 11 type? What is typed by the angel's salutation of Gideon? How was the angel's salutation given in antitype?

(5) What do Gideon's questions in v. 13 type? What do the Lord's three answers in v. 14 type?

(6) What is typed by Gideon's answer (v. 15) in its three parts?

(7) What does the Lord's answer (v. 16) type? What is typed by Gideon's answer and request in v. 17? What are typed by Gideon's request and the angel's promise in v. 18?

(8) What things in general are typed in vs. 19 and 20? What is typed by the expression, "Gideon went in"? What are typed by the kid, the unleavened cakes, the ephah of flour, the flesh and the broth? What is typed by Gideon's presenting these under the oak? What is often typed by a rock? What is typed by the rock of v. 20? Why? What is typed by laying the offering on the rock? In what two ways did our Lord fulfill all righteousness?

(9) What is briefly typed in Judg. 6:21-23? Of what

is a staff symbolical? Prove this. What do the angel's staff and its end touching the sacrifice type? What do the fire and its consuming the sacrifice type? What is typed by the angel's leaving Gideon, by the latter's recognition of the angel as such, and by his consequent fear? What is typed by the Lord's comforting Gideon and by the latter's erecting an altar in Ophrah of the Abi-ezrites?

(10) What are the two lines of thought typed in Judg. 6:11-24?

(11) What is one of the chief Gospel-Age activities of our Lord? Where is this typed? What do the second bullock of Gideon's father, its offering after his erecting of the altar, and its age type? What do Baal's altar and the sacrificing on it type? Why does Joash not type Jehovah, our Lord's Father? Whom does Joash type? What type furnishes an illustrative parallel? What is the antitype of Joash's having an altar to Baal? What is typed by Gideon's destroying Baal's altar? What do the grove and its cutting down type?

(12) What is typed by the altar of Judg. 6:26? Why was it built on the rock on which Gideon made his first offering? What is typed by the expression "in the ordered place"? What does the offering of the second bullock type? What is typed by the wood of the grove and by its consuming the sacrifice? How does the type show that the Church's sacrifice is acceptable?

(13) What does the number 10 symbolize? What is typed by the ten helpers of Gideon? What does their assisting of Gideon in cutting down the altar and grove type? What is typed by their doing this by night?

(14) What events are typically described in Judg. 6:28-32? Who are typed by the men of the city and by their seeing the altar and grove overthrown and the second bullock offered up?

(15) What is typed by their searching for the one responsible for these works and by their demanding of Joash that he deliver up Gideon for death? What is typed by Joash's threefold answer? What is typed by his calling Gideon Jerubbaal?

(16) What things does Judg. 6:33-40 typically summarize? What is typed by the Midianites, Amalekites, etc., gathering together and their going and pitching in the valley of Jezreel? What is typed by Gideon's being

impelled by the Lord's Spirit to blow a trumpet, and by Abi-ezer being gathered after him?

(17) What does Judg. 6:35 briefly type? Where else do we find this same antitype typically elaborated? What does the calling to battle of the four groups—Manasseh, Asher, Naphtali and Zebulum—type? Give a brief summary of the antitype of each typical movement and its leaders. What kind of response was given by the faithful to the calls of each movement? How was this typed?

(18) What two movements does Judg. 6:35-40 briefly type? What did the two signs given Gideon pledge, in type and antitype? What does the fleece of wool type? Why? What does the dew type? What is typed by the fleece being full of dew and the ground about it being dry? In what two ways did the antitype of this assure our Lord of the overthrow of the errorists? What does the bowl *full of water* type? What does the wringing out of the dew type? What does the bowl seem to type?

(19) What does Judg. 6:39, 40 type? What did the Reformation and the Harvest give for the errorists' overthrow? Accordingly, what did the Harvest give to our Lord? What is typed by the fleece being dry and the ground about it wet with dew? What pledged sure victory to our Lord?

(20) What is a summary of the antitypes pictured by Judg. 6?

(21) What is a brief summary of the antitypes of Judg. 6? What things are typically set forth at the end of Judg. 6? What are the five lines of thought contained in Judg. 7?

(22) Give a geographical description of the localities mentioned in Judg. 7:1. What is typed by the localities and persons as mentioned in Judg. 7:1?

(23) Give a summary—type and antitype—of the lesson contained in Judg. 7:2-8. Why is this lesson an important one? How did the Lord in this case impress this lesson? What two facts prove the truthfulness of this lesson? How many were in Gideon's army before it was tested? What was its proportion to the size of the opposing army? Why did it have to be reduced in numbers? Whom do the 32,000 represent?

(24) What proclamation was made to the 32,000? What does this type? In what did it result, in type and

antitype? How was the antitype enacted? What do both type and antitype prove of the majority of justified believers?

(25) Whom do the rest—the 10,000—type? To whom even could the privilege of sharing in the victory not be given, in the type and in the antitype? How was a distinction made between the rest resulting in the formation of two classes, in the type and in the antitype? Who did and who did not decide on the nature and outcome of their trial in both the type and the antitype? Who in type and antitype were the agents in applying the test?

(26) What was the test in the type? How was the decision rendered? What seven things were done in the type and the antitype by the 300? What did these seven antitypical acts do for their performers? In what did the failure by others to do these seven antitypical things result?

(27) What six things were done by the other drinkers, in type and antitype? What resulted in the type and antitype from the two kinds of drinking? To what period does the antitype somewhat more particularly apply? By whom else are these two classes typed? What are we and what are we not to understand from the numerical difference of the two classes in the type? When was the antitypical test completed, so far as the Great Company was concerned?

(28) What does the typical statement in Judg. 7:7 prove? When did this knowledge begin to be manifested to us? What was probably done anticipatorially in the Fall of 1914? Why is this probable? May the opposite course not be probable also? Before what event was all the prone drinking done, in the antitype? Despite the setting aside of the Great Company, what was the state of heart of Jehovah and Jesus when all the Faithful were proven?

(29) What is typed by taking the victuals and trumpets and the sending of the rest away? How, antitypically, were some sent away and others kept? What seems to have been the relative location of the two hosts? What is typed by the one host being on Mt. Gilboa and the other in the valley of Jezreel?

(30) What is a summary of Judg. 7:9-15, type and antitype? What observations, type and antitype, did Jehovah command? What assurance did He couple with

the command? By what did He antitypically give the assurance? Whom did Phurah type? As what? What antitype illustrates the usefulness of the employing of antitypical Phurah? What was the purpose of the observation trip in the type and in the antitype? What is typed by Gideon and Phurah alone during the observing? What is typed by those who were in the outermost part of the Midianites' camp?

(31) What is typed by the multitudes and the camels of the Midianites, etc?

(32) What is typed by the Midianite who dreamed and by his comrade who interpreted the dream? What is the antitype of the dream, of its interpretation, and of its barley bread especially?

(33) How were Gideon, the 300 and the Midianites, affected by the dream and its interpretation? What did this type?

(34) What kind of faith and courage did the 300 exemplify? Whose courage even did they surpass? Prove this. What resulted for God's interests from this course? Who are typed by the three companies of Gideon's 300? What was typed by the trumpets, by their being in their hands, by the pitchers, by their being empty, by the lamps, by their lights, and by Gideon's making himself an example for imitation?

(35) By what means did our Lord charge us to do as He did? What is the antitype of Gideon's blowing the trumpet first and the 100 with him doing so next? What did the battle-cry in its two parts type? What is an analysis of the features of the antitypical battle-cry? When were we instructed to give these parts of the antitypical battle-cry?

(36) When, in type and antitype, was the attack begun? What two facts prove this in the antitype? How did the World War furnish the opportunity for the antitypical 300 to launch their attack? How did our Lord begin the attack? How did the Volunteers follow Him in the attack? What were the main B.S.M.'s that they used in blowing their trumpets?

(37) What was the second antitypical group to enter the battle? What subjects did they use in blowing their

trumpets? Which ones only remained among this division of the antitypical 300?

(38) Which group was the last to enter the antitypical battle? On what did they specialize as their trumpet? Who only of them are represented in the third division of the antitypical 300?

(39) What was typed by the breaking of the pitchers? How were the Faithful affected by enacting this antitypically? What was typed by holding the lamps in the left and the trumpets in the right hand? What seems to prove this distinction?

(40) What is typed by the fact that each of the 300 stood in his place about the camp? Amid what difficulties did they thus stand? What was the result?

(41) What three things were typed by the host running, crying and fleeing? Why was each of these three things done in the antitype?

(42) Why is it stated three times that the 300 blew their trumpets? What did this type? What was typed by God's setting the Midianites to fighting one another? What has resulted in the antitype from this battle? What was typed by the Midianites' retreating from the valley of Jezreel?

(43) What does the last sentence of Judg. 7:22, properly translated, teach? What does this type? What parallel type pictures the same thing? What class was typed by the Midianites who fled to Zererah and Beth-shittah? Why? What class was typed by the Midianites who fled to Abel-Meholah and Tabbath? Why?

(44) What is a brief summary of the antitypes of Judg. 6:1-40 and Judg. 7:1-22? What two things should the foregoing study inspire in us?

(45) What is a brief summary of the main thoughts so far given in our study in the Gideon story?

(46) What does Judg. 7:22, 23 teach? What did the 9700 from Naphtali, Asher and Manasseh type? What parallel type gives these three groups? What is the antitype of the men of these three tribes gathering themselves together and then pursuing the Midianites? What do the facts of the antitype show as to the fulfillment? Under what delusion have they labored? What was the first Great Company group to engage in this pursuit? Into how many parts has it divided? What parallel type shows this?

Of whom are they the antitypes in the Gideon picture? What implies this? By what activities did they antitype the Naphtalites pursuing the Midianites?

(47) What is the second Great Company group to pursue the antitypical Midianites? What parallel type illustrates this group? Under what delusion have they labored? Who have joined them in this pursuit? Of whom are they the antitypes in the Gideon picture? What is the third Great Company group to join in the antitypical pursuit? Why was their sharing in this pursuit not for a long time apparent? What publications of theirs prove that they have been pursuing the antitypical Midianites?

(48) Whom did Gideon invite to war with him and whom did he not invite? What do these facts type? Why does the Lord not accept the services of these three Great Company groups? Why were the 9700 in three groups introduced into the type? What do the facts prove of the antitype?

(49) Give an account of the events told in Judg. 7:24—8:3.

(50) What other fulfilled types and, what fulfilled prophecy will help us to understand the antitypes of these verses? How do the fulfilled types and prophecies help us to understand the antitype of Judg. 7:24—8:3? Whom, therefore, did the men of Ephraim type? What five things, especially, constituted a call to the Youthful Worthies? What did the charge to take the waters of Jordan to Beth-barah type? How is this so?

(51) What did the two princes—Oreb and Zeeb—type? Prove this. What was typed by the capture and execution, and by the rock, of Oreb? How did the Youthful Worthies, antitypically, execute Oreb at his rock?

(52) Why does Zeeb type Clericalism? How did the Youthful Worthies capture and execute antitypical Zeeb? What is typed by the winepress of Zeeb, and by his execution there? What was the literature that the three groups of Youthful Worthies used? What were the two chief erroneous practices that this literature attacked? What was typed by the Ephraimites' bringing the heads of Oreb and Zeeb to Gideon beyond Jordan?

(53) In the type, to whom is and to whom is not given the honor of capturing and executing Oreb and Zeeb? What is the lesson in the antitype? What facts at first

thought seem to be out of harmony with such a lesson? Why is this first thought a mistaken one? Give a parallel case as illustrative of this principle. Why is the Great Company in its three groups not considered the captors and executioners of antitypical Oreb and Zeeb? What do these facts prove as to the Youthful Worthies' heart attitude toward Sectarianism and Clericalism? To what should these facts arouse the Great Company?

(54) What fact does Judg. 8:1 type? According to Rev. 16:17, who made the first announcement of the close of the High Calling? What false date was given for it? What is the date for the complete sealing of the elect in their foreheads? When was this learned? What was done with this date by the Epiphany-Truth servants? What effect did its announcement have and that, among others, on certain members of the Philadelphia Church? In what forms and ways has this resentment shown itself? Whom, beside the Lord, did these upbraid directly? What did announcing the cessation of Spirit-begetting not do to the Youthful Worthies? Why not? Against whom did they really murmur?

(55) What did the withholding of the High Calling from the Youthful Worthies not do to them? Why not? Who alone has the right to decide the question as to candidacy for the High Calling? How should we regard His decision? Why have the Youthful Worthies not been favored with the High Calling? What three lines of evidence prove Spirit-begetting to have ceased? What three considerations should pacify the Youthful Worthies on their exclusion from an invitation to the High Calling? How should these three considerations affect them? What should be the attitude of the Priesthood toward their own favor and the Youthful Worthies' disappointment? In this matter, whose example should they follow?

(56) How did Gideon answer the Ephraimites? What was Gideon's vintage and their gleaning? What was the antitype of Gideon's answer? From what standpoint could our Lord in truth say that the Youthful Worthies' battle was greater than the antitypical Three Hundred's battle? Point out facts that prove this.

(57) As what does our Lord antitypically speak in Judg. 8:2, 3? What was, antitypically, the gleaning of v. 2? Who did and who did not do the slaughtering in

the first battle—type and antitype? To whom only was the victory due? What, antotypically, was the vintage of v. 2? How did our Lord give the answers antitypical of Judg. 8:2, 3?

(58) What did the mild answers in type and antitype accomplish? How should the Priesthood as the Lord's mouth answer, and what should they say to the Youthful Worthies in the latter's resentment?

(59) How did the Epiphany-enlightened Youthful Worthies who co-operated with the Priests share in capturing and slaying antitypical Oreb and Zeeb? How does their share therein compare with that of the Great-Company-co-operating Youthful Worthies?

(60) What is the character of this Gideon discussion in the type and antitype? What is not found in the foregoing interpretations that is found in Levitical interpretations of the subject? What conclusion follows from such a comparison?

(61) What chronological peculiarity do we find illustrated in Judg. 7:25—8:3 and Judg. 8:4? What proves that this peculiarity occurs in these verses? What order rather than the chronological order is given here?

(62) Why is the statement of Judg. 8:4 inserted where it is? What do Gideon's experiences with the men of Succoth and Penuel and his passing beyond those who dwelt in tents prove as to the events that preceded antitypical Gideon's second battle? What events show this in the antitype?

(63) What is typed by the expression, "faint, yet pursuing"? What encourages the antitypical 300? What will they eventually accomplish?

(64) When and with what did the antitype of Judg. 8:5-9 begin? What was typed by Succoth and its princes? Why? What was expected before antitypical Gideon's second battle? Why? What induced entering into preparations for that battle? What were these preparations? What considerations seemed to preclude the publication of the necessary literature by the Epiphany Bible House?

(65) What step was taken as a result of these considerations? What made this step seem strange? How was the request for the literature made?

(66) What were the answers given at the three successive visits to Bethel? What was done after the third

answer was given? Describe the letter, its addresses, and the precaution taken for assurance of its safe delivery.

(67) What records of this transaction are in the Epiphany Bible House? Why was the letter addressed to the Board and not to the President of the Society? At first, how was the letter treated by J.F.R.? What evasion was practiced in the answer respecting it? Of what was such a procedure characteristic? What was done with the same letter? With what precautions?

(68) What was done with the letter when received the second time? Describe the Society's reply. Describe the answer to the Society's reply. How was this answer treated? What is the evidence that it was received by the Society? What false reason for its refusal did J.F.R. give?

(69) Of what are these events the antitype? What are the antitypes of the faintness of Gideon's 300 and of the bread that he requested? What would the supply of the bread—type and antitype—have effected? Trace—type and antitype—Gideon's statement to and request of the men of Succoth. Trace—type and antitype—their disdainful refusal and their reviling answer.

(70) What thoughts are contained in the conduct and answer of the princes of Succoth—type and antitype? What would not have been likely to occur in type and antitype, if the real petitioner had been recognized? To whom was the answer really given, in type and antitype? What did the answer do to the Lord?

(71) Explain—type and antitype—the two parts of Gideon's reply (v. 7). What will be done with the Scriptures and facts relating to the evil deed of the Society leaders?

(72) Explain Judg. 8:8—type and antitype. What two things occasioned the appeal to the P. B. I? Describe the interview with two P.B.I. officials. What did one of these officials say as to the printers' forms of the Hell-Herald? What answer did both officials give to the request? On what did one of them refuse to commit himself? How was the suggestion to add a note to the Hell-Herald treated? What impression did these two brothers' manner make? What did they ask to be done with the request?

(73) What did the P. B. I. Board answer? How was their answer worded? Upon whom did it place the blame for the refusal? How was their reply answered? What did they write in answer to a second letter? What evidence proves them to have falsified? Why was their tract without their Hell-Herald unavailable? Compare and contrast the P.B.I.'s course with that of the Society on this subject. How was their answer accepted? Of what are these facts the antitype?

(74) Explain—type and antitype—the two parts of Gideon's answer to the men of Penuel.

(75) What are typed by Zebah and Zalmunna? Prove this of Zebah. Prove this of Zalmunna. What does Karkor mean and type? How many Midianite soldiers were there before the first battle? How many just before the second battle? What is typed by these two numerical showings?

(76) What is described—type and antitype—in Judg. 8:11? What was gotten in sufficient quantities by Gideon, type and antitype? Describe those gotten by the antitypical Gideon. What is meant—type and antitype—by going up by the way of, and passing beyond those that dwelt in tents? What events, reasonably, were to be expected to be in the past before the second antitypical battle began?

(77) What was typed by Nobah and Jogbehah, and by marching eastward of them? Why?

(78) What was the nature of the attack in both type and antitype? How and when did the antitypical attack begin? Show how the attack is a surprise, in the lecture, prayer meeting, Volunteer and Colporteur work. What, further, does the attack do? Give an illustration of this. What do the flight and the pursuit of Judg. 8:12 type? Give illustrations.

(79) What as to duration did we not expect of the second antitypical battle? To what should this incite all of us as we are able to do? What should the representatives of the 300 who are among the Levites do and what leave undone in this matter? What should those of them do who cannot get suitable literature from their associates? What must we do to achieve final and complete victory?

CHAPTER V.

THE SMALL AND LARGE EIGHT WONDERFUL DAYS.

JESUS' LAST EXPERIENCES TYPICAL OF THE CHURCH'S LAST EXPERIENCES. THE SMALL EIGHT WONDERFUL DAYS. A POSTSCRIPT WRITTEN IN MARCH, 1930. THE LARGE EIGHT WONDERFUL DAYS. FIFTEEN EARLIER EVENTS OF THE LARGE SIXTH WONDERFUL DAY FORECAST. LATER EVENTS OF THE LARGE SIXTH WONDERFUL DAY. PARTS OF MATT. 27:51-54 AN INTERPOLATION. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

LITTLE FLOCK experiences, belonging in part to the future, and in part to the past, are typed by the last six days of our Lord's life and by the two following days. The details of these eight days are highly interesting, typically and antitypically, as the following will show: That Jesus' final experiences are typical of the cutting off of the Church's privileges, as mouthpiece to Christendom, by church and state, is evident from the fact that the brethren, including the Apostles (Acts 4:23-28), quoted Ps. 2:1, 2 and applied it to Jesus' cutting off by church and state; and yet we know that Ps. 2:1, 2 applies to the end of this Age. The propriety of applying this passage, that applies to the end of this Age, to Jesus is apparent from only one standpoint—that the events associated with Jesus' cutting off type those of the Church's cutting off, at the end of the Age, from her mouthpiece privileges in Christendom. This is our first reason for concluding that Jesus' final experiences type those of the Church in the end of the Age. Our second reason is the following: Matthew (27:8, 9) [the name, Jeremiah, by a copyist was inserted here for that of Zechariah] applies Zech. 11:12, 13 to Jesus' betrayal; yet the connection shows that the latter passage applies to the Church's betrayal in the end of the Age. How then could Matthew by inspiration have applied this passage to Jesus? Only from the standpoint that Jesus

in His final experiences types the Church in her final experiences could a passage applying to her be applied to Him. We have a parallel case showing the operation of the same principle. Undoubtedly the connection, (vs. 1, 2, 6-11) of Is. 40:3-5 shows that it refers to the Church's mission in the end of the Age. Yet Matthew (3:1-4) applies it to John the Baptist. This application can be justified on the sole ground that John the Baptist is a type of the Church (Matt. 11:14, see Diaglott and A.R.V.), particularly from the Miller Movement onward, according to Is. 40:3-5. The above-mentioned two points and the foregoing third point as a corroboration of the involved principle warrant our application of the last six days of Jesus and the two following days as a type of the final experiences of the Church as to Christendom.

(2) But one may ask, How does the connection of Zech. 11:12, 13 show that these two verses apply to the Church in the end of the Age? We reply, A brief analysis of the chapter will show this. Vs. 1, 2 describe how the nominal people of God, great and small, will be devastated by error and wrong practices at the end of the Age, particularly during the Time of Trouble. Vs. 3-9 treat of various shepherds among God's nominal and real people. V. 3 refers to the shepherds among God's nominal sheep as being greatly distressed in the end of the Age. V. 4 shows that they were charged to feed the Little Flock (the flock of the slaughter [by sacrifice]). V. 5 shows that the clergy were slaying instead of feeding them, and considering themselves guiltless; betraying (selling) them, and thinking they did God a service (blessed be); boasting of their supposed riches ("I am rich, etc."), but having no mercy upon these sheep of the Little Flock. V. 6 shows that for this reason God would bring wrath (the great Tribulation) upon all Christendom. V. 7 shows that God's servants, as true shepherds, will feed the Little Flock with the two forms of

Truth due in the end of the Age—Beauty, the Parousia Truth, and Bands, the Epiphany Truth. V. 8 shows that Messrs. Barbour, Paton and Hennings, as three wicked shepherds, would be cut off from feeding, and membership in, the Little Flock in one symbolic month, the thirty years from 1878 to 1908. V. 9 shows that God's servants would neither feed the Second Deathers (that dieth), nor the nominal church (that is to be cut off) and that the worldly would devour one another. V. 10 shows that as God's mouthpieces God's servants would bring forth, expound and rightly divide the Parousia Truth (cut it asunder), to the end that God may set aside the covenant that He had made with the nominal church, *i.e.*, to use it as His mouthpiece. V. 11 shows that the Parousia Truth, so brought forth, expounded and rightly divided, will satisfy the Little Flock (poor, humble, of the flock) that it is God's Word. V. 14 shows that God's servants will bring forth, expound and rightly divide the Epiphany Truth. This was to the end that the Little Flock (Judah) and the Great Company (Israel) may be separated. Vs. 15-17 treat of J.F.R. as the foolish and unprofitable servant.

(3) If our understanding of this picture is correct [written Aug., 1922], we are now near the time antitypical of that of the last supper. In this picture we understand Jesus to type the Priesthood; Judas to type the Second Deathers; Peter, John and James, the three general groups of Levites—Merarites, Kohathites and Gershonites—more especially in their Truth representatives; the other eight disciples, the eight subdivisions of these three general groups of the Levites, more especially in their Truth representatives; the Jewish clergy, the clergy of Christendom; Pilate, the civil powers; our Lord's capture, the saints' apprehension by the clergy; His mock trial before the Sanhedrin, the mock trial of the Faithful by the nominal church clergy; the trial by Pilate, the trial by the civil

powers; the condemnation by the Sanhedrin, the decision of the clergy that the Faithful are blasphemers against God; the condemnation by Pilate, the decision of the civil powers that the Faithful are rebels against the state; the crucifixion, a symbolic death, *i.e.*, cutting off from the right of mouthpieceship as respects religious and civil Christendom, but not a passing beyond the veil. From after this symbolic death until, perhaps, after the symbolic "earthquake" the Little Flock, in antitype of Jesus' being in the death state, will have no recognized mission toward Christendom; but after, perhaps also during, the "earthquake" the Faithful, in antitype of Jesus' resurrection, will again appear—not as antitype of John, but as antitype of Elijah—as a mouthpiece to the world, though not to Christendom, to which antitype of John's mouthpieceship exclusively belongs, while antitype of Elijah's mouthpieceship is to the whole world including Christendom. Thus when Christendom is destroyed, antitype of John's ministry being limited to Christendom, it could no longer be enacted—antitype of John will not get back his head! But the order of affairs in state, religion and society that will come during the reign of the socialistic laboring classes will not be Christendom; hence the true Church as mouthpiece then could not be antitype of John; for the latter's mission, unlike antitype of Elijah's, is limited to Christendom alone. As such a mouthpiece the Church will be antitype of Elijah—not antitype of John.

(4) The above setting is the large picture, applying as we will later show from 1874 to 1954 and 1956. But there is a smaller picture enacted within the time of the larger picture. This smaller picture, which we will call that of the small eight wonderful days, we will first explain. Thereafter we will expound the larger picture, which we will call the large eight wonderful days. The small eight wonderful days began early in the Epiphany and are to last but eight years

and a few months. Above we explained that the staff Bands represent the Epiphany Truth, and its breaking represents the proper division and exposition of the Epiphany Truth, which is due for such use during the Epiphany. The first rays of the Epiphany Truth began to shine November 10, 1916. Those rays of light, and some other subsequent ones, were the dawn gleams of the Epiphany Truth, heralding the coming of the Epiphany Sun. In its proper sense the first sunburst of Epiphany light to be rightly divided and expounded to the Church was that which pertained to the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha, which progressively became clear to us in 1917, from early in September to early in December, and which was first presented in a meeting at Philadelphia, Dec. 17, 1917. From the standpoint of the small picture Zech. 11:12, 13, compared with Matt. 27:8, 9, has as shown above, an application to our Lord's betrayal, because, *and only because*, as the connection shows, He types the Epiphany-enlightened saints as Truth servants, just as Ps. 2:1-3 compared with Acts 4:23-28, as shown above, applies to our Lord, because, *and only because*, as the connection shows, He types the Epiphany-enlightened saints as Truth servants. Strictly speaking, as the connection shows, Zech. 11:12, 13 applies to the Epiphany saints as Truth servants. The location of these verses and their relation to the two preceding and the four following verses, especially to the next following verse, seem to prove that they refer to the Epiphany saints as God's special servants beginning to undergo a betrayal experience from the standpoint of *both* pictures *after* the whole of the Little Flock was fed by the staff Beauty; and hence they are inserted between the account of the two staves (vs. 7, 10, 11, 14). Hence both betrayals began some time after our Pastor died—October 31, 1916—and the smaller one between Nov. 10, 1916 and Dec. 17, 1917.

(5) We suggested (P '21, 120, col. 2, line 11) that such betrayal began late in 1916; but maturer reflection convinces us that all of the Truth-leaders' specific works of power-grasping before July, 1917, belong, not to the acts of betrayal, but to those that brought upon the stage of activity a class that would later for the price of power betray the Epiphany-enlightened saints as Truth servants. The emphasis given to antitypical Elijah's and Elisha's separation, in the Scripture and in the Pyramid, convinces us that the betrayal began after that separation began. Hence we date the beginning of the small betraying work with the two weeks' trip of J.F.R. in the first part of July, 1917, during which, for the price of power, he grossly misrepresented to various prominent brethren our British activity and that of the Board's majority, thereby securing the support of the former for his ousting the Board's majority, and later for his misrepresenting them and us with our supporters to the whole Church through Harvest Siftings, etc. Consequently about July 1, 1917, the fulfillment of Zech. 11:12, 13, in the small picture, began. These facts as the fulfillment beginnings of Zech. 11:12, 13, enable us to locate the time when the small antitype of the last six days of Jesus' earthly career began. The feast at Bethany, toward whose end Judas faulted Mary and Jesus, and immediately after which his betraying activity began, was held six days before our Lord's death (John 12:1-8; Matt. 26:6-16). Apparently sometime Saturday afternoon Jesus arrived at Bethany, and late that afternoon they made a feast in the home of Simon, the leper, which He attended. Very early Saturday evening, after bitterly denouncing Mary, and impliedly Jesus also, Judas made his first visit to the chief priests to betray Jesus. These acts correspond with the acts of J.F.R. and his co-conspirators beginning about July 1, 1917, as set forth above. Hence the beginning of that Saturday evening corresponds to about

July 1, 1917. Taking a day to represent a year, as it usually does in Bible types and prophecies, the next eight days, starting with that evening whose beginning corresponds with about July 1, 1917, will give us a set of antitypical dates that, so far as fulfilled, set forth some remarkable matters, with still more remarkable matters to come in those not yet fulfilled, if our understanding is correct [written in Aug., 1922]. To clarify this we offer the following time table of type and antitype:

	TYPE		ANTITYPE
Sat.	6 P.M. to Sun.	6 P.M.	July, 1917 to July, 1918.
Sun.	6 P.M. to Mon.	6 P.M.	July, 1918 to July, 1919.
Mon.	6 P.M. to Tues.	6 P.M.	July, 1919 to July, 1920.
Tues.	6 P.M. to Wed.	6 P.M.	July, 1920 to July, 1921.
Wed.	6 P.M. to Thurs.	6 P.M.	July, 1921 to July, 1922.
Thurs.	6 P.M. to Fri.	6 P.M.	July, 1922 to July, 1923.
Fri.	6 P.M. to Sat.	6 P.M.	July, 1923 to July, 1924.
Sat.	6 P.M. to Sun.	6 P.M.	July, 1924 to July, 1925.

(6) Briefly would we trace the small antitype of the events from the Saturday afternoon to the late Saturday evening before our Lord's death, as given in John 12:1-8; Matt. 26:6-16; Mark 14:3-11, corresponding to the events of the time from shortly after our Pastor died to the Fall of 1917. Simon, the *leper*, seems to type the Great Company, especially in its leaders, as is suggested in Miriam, Moses' sister, becoming leprous while typing the Great Company (Lev. 13; 14; Vol. IV, Chapter IV). The feast represents the opportunities to appropriate to themselves proper powers and to usurp for themselves improper powers, and the use of them on the part of the Great Company leaders after our Pastor's death, as well as for the Epiphany-enlightened saints to use their proper powers. The leaders of the Epiphany-enlightened saints (Jesus), the good Levites in all Levite groups (the eleven Apostles), and the Truth Levites who betray the Faithful for power (Judas), were guests on that occasion. Those not leaders in the Great Company (Martha) served

actively on that occasion; while those not leaders in the Little Flock (Mary) gave their best and most gracious support to the leaders among the Little Flock (Jesus), making their teachings, activities and conduct fragrant before others. All the Levites (the Apostles) complained at this, but more especially their power-grasping and brethren-betraying leaders (Judas). Lazarus probably represents the Youthful Worthies, who toward the end of our Pastor's ministry were more or less energized in the Lord's cause, as the begetting ceased and the gleaning began, proceeded and ended.

(7) The power-grasping leaders, angered at the loving, self-denying support given to the Little Flock leaders (Jesus) by its less prominent members (Mary), went forth to leading Levitical brethren (the chief priests, etc.), and bargained for the betrayal of the leaders in the Little Flock for the price of power. Thus we see that the events from Saturday afternoon until late Saturday night correspond quite well with the events beginning shortly after our Pastor's death until the Fall of 1917.

(8) We harmonize the various accounts given in the above references with St. Luke's account (Luke 22:1-6) as follows: Sts. Matthew's and Mark's account connect the visit of Judas to the priests with the feast at Bethany, which St. John shows (John 12:1-12) occurred the Saturday before the crucifixion; but because there was also a special meeting of the Sanhedrin Tuesday night before the crucifixion, when also Judas visited them (Luke 22:1-6, comp. with Matt. 26:1-5 and Mark 14:1, 2), Sts. Matthew and Mark, because of following the principle of grouping some-what related events, tell of the Tuesday night meeting before telling of the feast and Judas' first visit to the priests the previous Saturday. Luke is the only Evangelist who tells of the Tuesday night's visit to the priests on Judas' part.

(9) We now find it necessary to prove that our

Lord entered Jerusalem as King in triumph Monday morning, and not Sunday morning, as is generally believed. We are all agreed that the day of that entrance was Nisan 10, when as the antitypical Lamb He was set aside for death (Mark 11:18), and that the day of His crucifixion was Nisan 14, when He died as the antitypical Lamb (1 Cor. 5:7, 8), as we are also agreed that by God's reckoning that day began at 6 P.M. Our Lord's death occurring on Nisan 14, and that on Friday, that Nisan 14 must have begun Thursday at 6 P.M. Therefore Nisan 13 began Wednesday at 6 P.M.; Nisan 12 began Tuesday at 6 P.M.; Nisan 11 began Monday at 6 P.M.; and Nisan 10 began Sunday at 6 P.M. Hence that Nisan 10 was from Sunday, 6 P.M. to Monday, 6 P.M. Therefore it was Monday morning that Jesus made His triumphal entry into Jerusalem and not on Sunday, as is implied by the Nominal Church festival called Palm Sunday. But some object to this that St. John (John 12:12-19) shows that Jesus' entry into Jerusalem was on the day following His anointing and Judas' first visit to the priests assembled to plan for Jesus' death. To this fact we agree, but reply that the objection is based on the supposition that the next day was Sunday, whereas it was Monday; for, according to the Jewish way of counting days, Judas' visiting the priests occurring after 6 P.M., the day on which this occurred was therefore Sunday; hence the "next day" of John 12:12 was Monday. Accordingly, none of the Evangelists give any events as occurring during the daylight part of that Sunday.

(10) The next set of events that we would briefly set forth, type and antitype, occurred in the type on Monday, which day began at 6 P.M., Sunday, and ended at 6 P.M., Monday; and the antitypes occurred between July, 1918 and July, 1919. In the type the events are recorded in Matt. 21:1-17; Mark 11:1-11, 15-19; Luke 19:29-48; John 12:12-18. They include the

triumphal entry, Jesus' foretelling Jerusalem's overthrow, His cleansing the temple, His acclamation by the children, and the envious objections and death plans of the Jewish leaders.

(11) Jesus entered Jerusalem on Monday morning, that is, when about a half of the Jewish day was ended. This time would correspond to about January 1, 1919. What is the antitype? The Epiphany-enlightened saints about that time entered the Levitical City, riding on teachings contained in *The Present Truth*, Nos. 1 and 2—the antitypical ass and colt—which were published December 9 and 24, and these teachings by January 1, 1919, were by the first of the Epiphany-enlightened saints well digested, and the latter as the result were supported (riding) by these teachings in their activity toward the Levitical City. And many who were not Epiphany-enlightened saints hailed them as bringers of good news and helpers to, as well as harbingers of a better time, as all of us remember, even as in the type many hailed our Lord. Jesus foretelling Jerusalem's overthrow represented repeated announcements made in *The Present Truth* that the religious government which the Levites were developing would be destroyed. Such announcements were made in *The Present Truth*, Nos. 2-4, especially. The cleansing of the temple types the Epiphany-enlightened saints' use of cleansing truths by which the power-grasping and revolutionistic Levites were scourged. This was done in *The Present Truth*, especially Nos. 3-5. The children's acclaiming Jesus types how some of the less mature brethren hailed the Epiphany-enlightened saints in this activity, while the murderous plans of the priests, etc., envious of the reception that Jesus' teachings were receiving, type the plans that the Levite leaders made to destroy among Truth people the activities of the Epiphany-enlightened saints, and to cut off such saints from the fellowship of Truth people.

(12) The only incident recorded as occurring on Tuesday, which corresponds with the time from July, 1919 to July, 1920, is the cursing of the barren fig tree (Matt. 21:18, 19; Mark 11:12-14). In the first instance this types the curse upon the Israelitish system as a religious government; but for our line of thought this tree represents the system of religious governments that the Levite leaders have set up among Truth people. Hence the cursing of the barren fig tree represents how the Epiphany-enlightened saints taught that the revolutionistic religious systems that the Levites were establishing as evil systems among the Truth people would wither. Repeatedly they taught that these would not prosper, and that the Levites would have to cleanse themselves of their revolutionism and revolutionistic practices before they would prosper. Such sentiments were repeatedly expressed in *The Present Truth* between July, 1919 and July, 1920. As illustrations on this line we might cite Nos. 13-19; and, of course, the Epiphany-enlightened saints repeatedly gave expression to such thoughts. As in the type, so in the antitype, the reason no fruit was found is that the time for fruitfulness has not yet come—the Divinely approved future Levitical systems will produce no fruit until the Levites' due time for fruitfulness has come—after they cleanse themselves. The withering of the fig tree corresponds to the decay manifested by the Levite systems, which were proven to be decaying by their continued and increased revolutionism, *e.g.*, electing the Society's officers for 3¾ years at the Jan., 1920 shareholders' meetings, deciding then to change the Charter, errors on tentative justification, on the Youthful Worthies, on the Court, etc., in the Society; errors on the Ransom, the Sin-offerings, etc., among the Olsonites; and errors on various phases of Revelation among the P.B.I.

(13) The first recorded event on Wednesday, which corresponds to the time from July, 1920, to July, 1921,

was Judas' second visit to the priests in his betraying mission. This occurred after 6 P.M., Tuesday evening (Wednesday in God's time), and is mentioned only in Luke 22:1-6. Compare his account with Matt. 26:1-5 and Mark 14:1, 2 to fix the date of this second visit. Above we showed how to harmonize the accounts of his first and second visits. It will be recalled that the Amram Levites were developed from Feb. to June, 1920, and that from about July 1 certain of their leaders began their betraying acts in order to gain power, which proved to be Levite power. R.H. Hirsh's course at Jersey City is an example of this, particularly the night of July 11 (God's time, July 12, the anniversary of the day on which J.F.R. falsely swore that there were four Board vacancies, which he then proceeded to fill), when to gain power and influence, first at Jersey City and then elsewhere, he misrepresented, especially before some leading Amram Levites, the entire situation connected with the Amram sifting. And soon he won as against the Epiphany-enlightened saints the sympathy of those who had previously betrayed such saints as well as that of the supporters and rewarders of such betrayers (the antitypes of the Jewish Sanhedrin). Jesus' foretelling at that time His full betrayal (Matt. 26:2) corresponds to the Epiphany-enlightened saints announcing their full betrayal by the power-grasping Levites. This announcement had its beginning between July, 1920 and July, 1921. We made such announcement in warning R.H. Hirsh and wife at Jersey City the evening of July 11, 1920, as the brethren who were present will remember. Such warnings were also given in *The Present Truth* from time to time during the period which we are now discussing. Other Epiphany-enlightened saints did the same thing at that time.

(14) The second recorded event of Wednesday occurred in the morning—the disciples seeing the barren fig tree entirely withered (Matt. 21:20-22; Mark 11:20-26).

These disciples type the good Levites, who in the Society's Tabernacle Shadows revisions, in the teaching of the Ancient Worthies' return in 1925, in the millions message, in the Olsonite prophetic program collapsing, and in the P.B.I. chronological and prophetic errors, saw the evidence of the Levite systems as withered—root, trunk and branch. Jesus' exhortation in connection with this event types how the Epiphany-enlightened saints testified that faithfulness to the Lord's Spirit would lead to the removal of all obstacles in the way of the good Levites fulfilling their mission with success in due time. Such thoughts are found in various articles—in the Gideon article in No. 29, as well as in other articles. Many of the Epiphany saints have given the same assurance.

(15) As Christ's authority was questioned by the Jewish leaders (Matt. 21:23-27; Mark 11:27-33; Luke 20:1-8), so the right of the Epiphany-enlightened saints to exercise a ministry toward the Truth Levites has been questioned by leaders among the Truth Levites. And as Jesus check-mated the cavilers, so did the Epiphany-enlightened saints. The parable of the two sons (Matt. 21:28-32) seems to refer to the good and the bad Levites, the former at first refusing to serve and then later doing so, while the latter promised to serve and did not. Repeatedly the Epiphany-enlightened saints described these classes during the antitypical Wednesday—July 20, 1920, to July 20, 1921. The parable of the wicked husbandmen (Matt. 21:33-46; Mark 12:1-12; Luke 20:9-19) types the teachings of Epiphany-enlightened saints on the bad Levite leaders, their wicked conduct toward the leaders among the Epiphany-enlightened saints, and, finally, toward the latter as a class, to result later in God's destroying the present Levitical systems and severely punishing their bad leaders. Such announcements, of course, led the bad Levites to seek to undo the Epiphany-enlightened saints, as their types

attempted to undo Jesus, when they perceived that this parable was spoken against them. The Parable of the Marriage Feast (Matt. 22:1-14) represents for Epiphany purposes the invitation to partake of the Epiphany privileges, which was declined by the leading Levites, but which was accepted by the humbler of the Truth people, the one casting off the wedding garment seeming to represent those who feasted awhile and then, losing faith altogether in the Truth and the Lord, have gone into outer darkness. This has had a fulfillment in the cases of certain ones of whom we and others have also testified, and will, we opine, have a still larger fulfillment later.

(16) The insidious questions of the Pharisees (Matt. 22:15-22; Mark 12:13-17; Luke 20:20-26), and of the Sadducees (Matt. 22:23-33; Mark 12:18-27; Luke 20:27-40) and the testful one of the Lawyer (Matt. 22:34-40; Mark 12:28-34) represent all sorts of catch questions, and questions based upon errors, and questions asked in search of knowledge, that have been put to Epiphany-enlightened saints by various groups of Levites and their adherents. Christ's refuting their errors, frustrating their efforts to bewilder Him, and giving valuable information types the answers that the Epiphany-enlightened saints have given such questioners. Not a few of the articles in *The Present Truth* and most of its answers to questions in the *Questions of General Interest* are the antitypical replies to such questions. The questions on the Bible's pointing out the Epiphany-enlightened saints, which these saints have put to their Levitical detractors, and which the latter have not been able to answer, antitype Jesus' questions put to the Pharisees (Matt. 22:41-46; Mark 12:35-37; Luke 20:41-44).

(17) Another feature of Jesus' teachings on Wednesday of His last week is noteworthy—His severe denunciation of the unfaithful religious leaders in Israel (Matt. 23:1-39; Mark 12:38-40; Luke 20:45-47).

This types the severe criticisms that the Epiphany-enlightened saints have made on the Levite leaders, especially from July, 1920, to July, 1921. These severe criticisms are found in *The Present Truth*, Nos. 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 29 and 30. Perhaps each one of these numbers corresponds to one of the seven woes that our Lord pronounced upon the Jewish leaders. Of course, the Epiphany-enlightened saints joined in giving these criticisms. We have been severely denounced for making such criticism, just as our Lord was for making those in the type. However, we are confident that not we, but those who denounce the Epiphany-enlightened saints for such activity, are in the Lord's sight blamable, even as, not Jesus, but His denouncers were blamable. The Lord's noting and remarking on the gifts put into the treasury (Mark 12:41-44; Luke 21:1-4) find their correspondencies in our observation and remarks in the annual report found in No. 25 on the large gifts bestowed by the Levites and the comparatively small gifts bestowed by the Epiphany enlightened saints. Of course, the latter also noted and commented on these givers and their gifts.

(18) The account of the Greeks desiring to see Jesus, His remarks thereon, Jehovah's acknowledgment of Him and the connected remarks (John 12:20-36), seem to type things connected with antitypical Gideon's Second Battle, and antitypical Elijah's renewed activity after his reappearance, which began July 18, 1920. Certainly by such activity not a few worldlings have desired to understand the Epiphany-enlightened saints in their teaching and work. Certainly this has led the latter to recognize themselves as highly privileged and has prompted them to testify to the need of consecrated living, in conducting the public work. Certainly they have been in more or less distress because of the approaching end of their ministry toward the Truth Levites—which

from that time onward they spoke of as in the near future. And surely they have made remarks connected with Satan's being cast out and his empire destroyed both in great and little Babylon. God's answer from heaven acknowledging Jesus seems to type His acknowledgment of the Epiphany-enlightened saints by the Pyramid's testimony as to Elijah's reappearance on July 18, 1920—the testimony first being given to them at Jersey City on the evening of Apr. 17 (Apr. 18, God's time), 1921, and published in the May, 1921 Truth, both acts occurring during antitypical Wednesday. The people being doubtful as to the sense of the voice types the doubts of many Truth people on this particular Pyramid testimony; and Jesus' showing what He would accomplish as God's Christ, and exhorting the people to act in harmony with the Truth correspond with what the Epiphany-enlightened saints said they would accomplish toward the Great Company and what they exhorted the Truth people to do with the Truth. This can be seen in Nos. 30 and 31.

(19) In Matt. 24:1-51; Mark 13:1-37; Luke 21:5-36, is found Jesus' great prophecy of the Gospel Age, which Jesus delivered after 6.00 P.M. Wednesday, as also the parables of Matt. 25 were delivered a little later that evening. The antitypes, therefore, were between July, 1921, and July, 1922 (Luke 21:37; Matt. 24:1-3; Mark. 13:1-3). This for Epiphany purposes, broadly speaking, seems to type how the Epiphany enlightened saints have foretold the overthrow of the bad Levitical City; the rejection and persecution of the faithful who mingle with the Levites until the latter are cleansed; their longing for the time when the Epiphany-enlightened saints will deliver these Priests, which will occur when they shall turn their attention to the successful cleansing of the Levites; their showing forth the fact that at that time the work will not be understood nor anticipated, but that it will quietly and suddenly set in; their warnings on the necessity

for watchfulness for the signs indicating such events; their showing how through an individual mouthpiece they would then work; and that this work would be followed by a brief work of an evil Levite, who would be utterly cast off. These three latter lines of thought have been expressed orally and not in print among a few Epiphany-enlightened saints. From the standpoint of the small picture the giving of the three parables of Matt. 25:1-46 seems also to be typical: that of the ten virgins (Matt. 25:1-13) seems to type those teachings that the Epiphany-enlightened saints gave between July, 1921 and July, 1922 on the subject of the bewildered priests and the Levites, of their different attitudes when the time of the full separation comes, and of the difference of their rewards thereafter. The parable of the talents (Matt. 25:14-30) seems to type those teachings that the Epiphany-enlightened saints gave from July, 1921 to July, 1922 on the subject of various good uses that the bewildered Priests make of their opportunities and of the failure of the Levites to make such use of their opportunities, with the difference of results that will come to these at the time of the Levites' cleansing. The Parable of the Sheep and Goats (Matt. 25:31-46) for Epiphany purposes seems to type the teachings of the Epiphany-enlightened saints on the cleansing operation into which the Levites will be placed, those on the right in the parable corresponding to the Great Company members who will gain life, and those on the left in the parable corresponding to those who will go into the Second Death. The parable of the pounds (Luke 19:11-27) was given at Jericho (Luke 19:1, 9, 10, 28), before Jesus arrived at Bethany, hence does not belong to the eight wonderful days.

(20) There seems to be but one other event in our Lord's experiences relating to the time between Wednesday evening and Thursday evening—which corresponds to July, 1921 to July, 1922. This is recorded

in John 12:36-50. During that day Jesus remained away from the Jewish leaders, even as the Epiphany-enlightened saints during that antitypical time did nothing *new* toward the Levites: for what was done in and as a result of Nos. 32, 33 and 34 was simply an elaboration or a continuance of what had been done previously toward the Levites. This would correspond, then, to Jesus' silence toward Israel's leaders during Thursday. St. John's and the Lord Jesus' reflection on the unbelief of the Jews correspond to what the good Kohathite Levites and the Epiphany-enlightened saints have said on the unbelief of the rebellious Levites during the antitypical Thursday.

(21) Above we have very briefly given the small antitypes of Jesus' experiences and teachings in five of His last six days in the flesh. We are not to be understood as meaning, for example, that the parables and prophecies given in those days have no other applications than given above. They certainly do have other and more prominent applications than those we have given; but our purpose in the above was simply to give their small, not their primary, applications, and our justification for giving them the small applications is the fact that, as shown above, the eight days from Judas' first betraying work until the end of Jesus' resurrection day type the period from July, 1917 to July, 1925. Seemingly the fulfillments, so far enacted, seal the above applications as true.

(22) We do not feel it to be the Lord's will that we attempt to set forth details of the small sixth, seventh and eighth days, because we have just entered into the antitypical sixth day—July, 1922 to July, 1923; consequently the time of these days is almost entirely future; and being connected with severe trials, their experiences cannot be understood in detail; for the Lord never lets us understand the details of future events *connected with trials*; for they always come

in unexpected ways and to understand them beforehand would prevent their being trialsome. Hence it would be pernicious speculation to attempt to pry into such details. Therefore we offer merely some generalities. The Passover feast of that Thursday night seems to represent privileges with the Truth and its services that we are now having and that we are about to enter. The eleven represent good Levites measurably sharing in them. Judas leaving the feast represents power-grasping Truth Levites and possibly power grasping Nominal Church Levites, setting out for the final betrayal acts. If our time-setting is correct, the time of the death of Jesus corresponds to about May 1-15, 1923. About that time, it seems, the Epiphany-enlightened saints will have entirely entered into a symbolic death—a cutting off from all Epiphany activity toward Truth and, perhaps, Nominal Church Levites and, perhaps, nominal people of God, as blasphemers and rebels, and thus will be utterly inactive in Epiphany respects toward them, apparently utterly and completely overthrown, but mourned, honored and defended by a few timid friends (Matt. 27:54-61; Mark 15:39-47; 16:1; Luke 23:47-56; John 19:31-42).

(23) As during the time from Saturday morning until early Sunday morning (Matt. 27:62-66) the priests tried to perpetuate their triumph by their guard at the sepulchre, so from about January, 1924 to about January, 1925 the Levite leaders will try to perpetuate the oblivion of the Epiphany saints with special restrictive acts and agents; but as in the type, so in the antitype, the effort will in due time be in vain; for as our Lord came back on the third day—the typical eighth day—with more power than He ever before had, and as He before the day was over convinced most of His disciples of His glorious change and mighty power, so between July, 1924 and July, 1925 the Epiphany-enlightened saints will come back again with greater power than we have yet had, and

shortly thereafter will convince increasing numbers of the good Levites and a little later the less good Levites of the Epiphany Truth and Work, and thus lead them to their cleansing. Let us, beloved Epiphany-enlightened saints, arm ourselves for the antitypical experiences ahead of us, as Christ armed Himself for the corresponding typical ones ahead of Him, and like Him we will obtain strength from the Lord to meet our Gethsemane, Sanhedrin, Pilate, Praetorium, Via Dolorosa, Calvary and Joseph's tomb, fully assured that on the third antitypical day we shall come back with invincible power from seeming and ignoble defeat to certain and glorious victory!

(24) A postscript: The foregoing part of this chapter was written early in August, 1922, and was first published in the September, 1922, Present Truth. Since its appearance the sixth, seventh and eighth of the Small Eight Wonderful Days have passed and they have witnessed the small antitypes of what occurred in the sixth, seventh and eighth day after our Lord arrived at Bethany, *i.e.*, Thursday, 6 P.M., to Friday, 6 P.M.; Friday, 6 P.M., to Saturday, 6 P.M., and Saturday, 6 P.M., to Sunday, 6 P.M. We are writing paragraphs (24)-(28), as a postscript to the foregoing. In this postscript, written in March, 1930, we desire to set forth briefly the salient points of these three antitypical days' fulfillments. The feast in the upper room, with its discourses, warnings, encouragements and forecasts, types the privileges of pertinent Truths and of service that the Epiphany-enlightened saints (the small Jesus) and the eight sets of good Levites (including those in the Epiphany Truth) distributed among the three large Levitical divisions (the eleven good disciples) were privileged to have from July, 1922, until toward January, 1923. This can be seen in the articles in The Present Truth that appeared during that time: the articles against certain P.B.I., Society and Olsonite errors, and the

prophetic, the service, the character-building, etc., articles, together with participation in the implied service privileges.

(25) Judas types the evilly and treacherously disposed among Truth people seeking personal advantage, even to the betrayal of the Epiphany-enlightened saints, especially of their leader. Judas leaving the feast before it was through represents these evil Truth people from all the groups severing themselves in heart's attitude from the good ones and treacherously turning against the faithful Epiphany-enlightened saints. A noted example of such was a certain sister in the Philadelphia class stumbling and going over to the Amramites, where she did her part in the betrayal. The anger that our exposures of Levitical errors previous to July, 1922, and immediately following it up to November, 1922, aroused in the false teachers, made them, as the little antitypical Sanhedrin, anxious "to get" the leader of the Epiphany-enlightened saints and his faithful supporters, so as to destroy their work among the followers of this little Sanhedrin. Our Lord's Gethsemane trial represents the grief and fears of the Epiphany-enlightened saints in view of the thoughts of their probable past failure or of their probable future failure in the forecast experiences of the Sixth Small Wonderful Day. In that scene Peter represents the good Merarite Levites, James the good Gershonite Levites and John the good Kohathite Levites (including the crown-losers in the Epiphany Truth). The drowsiness of all eleven types how their antitypes did not appreciate the trial of the Faithful at that time.

(26) The betrayal consisted in the acts whereby the little Judas gave any information against the Little Jesus, whereby his mouthpieceship toward the Truth part of the Great Company and Youthful Worthies could be hindered and stopped. The trial before the little Sanhedrin consisted of an investigation of the

teachings and acts of the Little Jesus that could be construed as related to his being the priestly mouthpiece toward the Truth Levites and Youthful Worthies. The false testimonies of the type against our Lord represent the perversions of the teachings and acts of the Little Jesus that various individual supporters of the little Sanhedrin rehearsed to it. The high priest adjuring Jesus to tell if He were the Christ corresponds to the challenge thrown out to the Epiphany saints to declare if they were the special-mouthpiece of the Lord at this time to the Great Company and Youthful Worthies. Many offered this challenge. A very marked case of this challenge is found in quite a few Towers, particularly in Z '23, 68, 72. And the answer of the Little Jesus was given by the Epiphany-enlightened saints on many occasions and to many challengers. The author's answer to it, as given in Z '23, 68, 72, is found in P '23, 77, 78. These answers made the false teachers decide to seek the cutting off of the Little Jesus from all mouthpieceship among their followers—the Levites. Peter's denial represents good Society Levites whose fear moved them to disclaim sympathy with, and support of the Epiphany-enlightened saints and their work.

(27) While Judas types, in the Small Eight Wonderful Days, the bad Levites who for personal and official gain sold the Little Jesus, and the false *teaching* Levitical leaders correspond to the little Sanhedrin, Pilate represents the Levite leaders, not as false teachers, but as having and exercising official powers *in controlling, executive and managerial ways, e.g.*, the various board directors, officers, managers, general and local, and their subordinates, in the various Truth Levite groups. Pilate's hesitating to condemn Jesus to the cross types the temporary efforts of these to prevent a symbolic crucifixion of the Little Jesus, *i.e.*, a public setting forth of these as being evil in their service (nails through the hands) and character (nails through

the feet). The little Pilate finally acceded to this. We will offer two illustrations of this symbolic crucifixion and its accompanying ridicule. In an Amram convention in Philadelphia, R.H. Hirsh severely and falsely excoriated the editor and his loyal supporters as evil in their service and characters, and that amid the ridiculing of his partisan Amram hearers. R.H. Barber, one of the Tower editors, at the Rochester Convention told the audience that we and our consecrated supporters were Second Deathers, and as such should not be given the least hearing. Certainly such statements, greedily and mockingly received, cut off such slandered brethren from effective mouthpieceship—the death of the Little Jesus—among the Levites. The two thieves type evildoers among the Levites who at the same time were cut off from their activities among the Levites. At the crucifixion John represents the good Levites in the Epiphany Truth. Mary, Jesus' mother, represents the Epiphany-enlightened Youthful Worthies and the other three women represent the good Levites in the three Levite groups. The other women represent the smaller Levite divisions. The good Levites in the Epiphany Truth (John) received the charge to care, especially, for the Epiphany-enlightened Youthful Worthies. The burial of Jesus types the defense of, and respect shown to the Faithful by their sympathizers in their cut-off condition, two of the Epiphany leaders (Joseph and Nicodemus) joining therein.

(28) Jesus' being in the death state parts of three days types the complete inactivity of the Epiphany saints from new Epiphany effort toward the Levites, necessitated by its uselessness under the circumstances, from the middle of May, 1923, until December, 1924, these three days, beginning July, 1922, and ending July, 1925. His resurrection corresponds with the renewal of Epiphany efforts, begun in the writing, publication and circulation of the January, 1925, Present Truth, which treated of Society and P.B.I. errors

taught since the suppression of Epiphany work toward them. The soldiers' reporting our Lord's resurrection to the high priest represent certain of the Society's and P.B.I's guards bringing to the attention of the false teaching leaders in these two bodies this renewed activity. And the efforts at refutation of the teachings of that Truth and suppressing its effects correspond to the efforts of the Sanhedrin to deny Christ's resurrection. The very active interest that this issue aroused among many good Levites out of and in the Epiphany Truth corresponds to the effect of the news of our Lord's resurrection on the disciples. The May, 1925, Truth served to convince more thoroughly such good Levites, corresponding to the growing conviction of the disciples in the Lord's resurrection, culminating in the manifestation at Emmaus. The article, "What Does It All Mean?" in the September, 1925, Truth, in its effects on almost all good Levites, corresponds to the upper-room manifestation and its effects on the disciples. Thomas' absence and unbelief on that occasion represents the failure of some good Levites to respond to the three stages of the little Jesus' manifestation just described.

(29) Some of the dear ones have been questioning whether we were not mistaken in our presentations on the above Small Eight Wonderful Days, originally written in August, 1922, and published in P '22, 132-136. Our reply [written Nov., 1923] is that we were not mistaken in that article, though we did not at its writing understand all about the eight wonderful days. Its thoughts have been fulfilling right along among the Truth people. We are now in the seventh wonderful day, antityping the time from Friday evening to Saturday evening, during which time our Lord was in the tomb. And so far as concerns any work toward the bad Levite leaders and their partisan supporters, and even toward the good Levites among them, *as to their activities since May 16, 1923*, we are (to them) dead

and buried, though, of course, we continue to send to all Truth people whose names and addresses we can get, the Volunteer Truths treating of revolutionisms committed prior to May 16, 1923. We are letting the bad Levite leaders *as such* alone, as far as concerns resisting *among them, their partisan supporters and their fellowshipping good Levites*, their present revolutionisms. This is because the bad Levite leaders and their partisan followers have wholly cut us off from all our rights of fruitful working among them, have antitypically condemned and crucified us as respects our working among them from the standpoint of our teachings and practices as against their misteaching and mispractices entered into since May 16, 1923. Hence we are sending no resisting literature among them treating of their teachings and practices inaugurated since May 16, 1923, though as P '23, 139, 140 and several articles show, we point these out to the Epiphany-enlightened saints.

(30) When we wrote on the Eight Wonderful Days originally, we expressed uncertainty as to whether the application of the thought as we then gave it should in the sixth wonderful day be enlarged so as to include the nominal people of God, or be restricted to the Truth people only (P '22, 138, par. 22; see above). We knew from Ps. 2:1-3 and from Acts 4:23-31, that in some way the eight wonderful days would include the participation of the nominal people of God from the standpoint of church and state; but our uncertainty arose from the fact that apart from one clear reference to the nominal people of God typed by the heathen Greeks (John 12:20-36), and one possible reference to the clergy (Matt. 23:1-39), and that only, if Matt. 23:1-39 be given a double application, everything in the first five wonderful days as they were then understood by us applied exclusively to the Truth people. But when May 16, 1923, came, and when instead of finding ourselves as having been

symbolically condemned and crucified by the nominal church and state, we began an activity toward them which proved that we were very much alive toward them, we saw, of course, that the eight wonderful days as we had viewed them did not include the nominal church and state. Knowing from many other things that there are larger antitypes and smaller antitypes to many Scriptural types, we began after May 16, 1923, to wonder whether such were not the case with the eight wonderful days, and found to our enlargement of understanding and joy that the facts so far fulfilled corroborate such a double application of the eight wonderful days. Our study revealed to us the fact that if we should consider the eighty years of the Parousia and Epiphany periods—1874 to 1954—to be the period corresponding to what we call the large eight wonderful days, we would find a large application, antitypical of everything recorded of the first five wonderful days of our Lord's last week in the flesh, in the time from Oct., 1874, until now, the large fifth wonderful day from this viewpoint ending with Oct., 1924. From this standpoint eighty years would antitype eight days, ten years would antitype one day, and five months would antitype one hour.

(31) We will now proceed to the explanation of a few details: First, we offer a table giving the type and antitype from the standpoint of the chronology of the large eight wonderful days:

TYPE	ANTITYPE
Sat. 6 P.M. to Sun. 6 P.M.	Oct. 1874 to Oct. 1884
Sun. 6 P.M. to Mon. 6 P.M.	Oct. 1884 to Oct. 1894
Mon. 6 P.M. to Tues. 6 P.M.	Oct. 1894 to Oct. 1904
Tues. 6 P.M. to Wed. 6 P.M.	Oct. 1904 to Oct. 1914
Wed. 6 P.M. to Thurs. 6 P.M.	Oct. 1914 to Oct. 1924
Thurs. 6 P.M. to Fri. P.M.	Oct. 1924 to Oct. 1934
Fri. 6 P.M. to Sat. 6 P.M.	Oct. 1934 to Oct. 1944
Sat. 6 P.M. to Sun. 6 P.M.	Oct. 1944 to Oct. 1954

(32) The first item that suggested the correctness of this large view was the threefold visit of Judas to the chief priests. We have shown above that Judas visited them on a betraying mission three times—Saturday, Tuesday and Thursday nights. Antityping the first and second of these nights we find that the ransom deniers began their betraying activities in 1878, corresponding to Judas' first visit to the chief priests; that the Sin-offering deniers began their activities in 1908—thirty years, *i.e.*, 3 antitypical days, later, therefore on antitypical Tuesday evening corresponding to Judas' second visit to the chief priests; hence we concluded that each day stood for ten years and therefore that sometime after Oct., 1924, and before Oct., 1929, the bad Levite leaders in the nominal church, assisted by the bad Levite leaders in the Truth, will consummate the betraying activity of antitypical Judas. We cannot be certain beforehand of the exact time of this third betrayal, because the exact time of Judas' third visit is not stated. The first exact hour expressly mentioned between Thursday 6 P.M. and Friday 6 P.M. is the hour of our Lord's nailing to the cross (Mark 15:25), though Jesus and the disciples sat down to the supper just after 6 P.M., Thursday evening (Friday, God's time, Matt. 26:20; Luke 22:14), corresponding to Oct., 1924, and though His final sentence by the Sanhedrin was about 6 A.M., corresponding to Oct., 1929; and just a few minutes later His delivering to Pilate occurred (Matt. 27:1, 2; Mark 15:1). The antitype of the third visit being yet future, and the exact time of the type not being given, its nature and time cannot be accurately described now, though reasoning from the time of the other two antitypical visits the third may be sometime in 1928. But it is very remarkable to find from the time setting here presented that the first and second antitypical visits occurred in the required periods. These two antitypical visits are also the antitypes of what the Scriptures

type respectively by the first and the second smiting of the rock by Moses, which we know respectively represent (1) denying the Ransom, and (2) denying the Church's share in the Sin-offering. But, as we shall see, all the other details are, in their time and fact correspondence of type and antitype, just as remarkable.

(33) We will now proceed to a description of the details, making it brief, because our explanations made on what by contrast we above call the small eight wonderful days, which might be profitably reviewed before proceeding further, make necessary only a brief statement of these details. The feast at Bethany (John 12:1-8; Matt. 26:6-16; Mark 14:3-11) types the participation in the first features of the Parousia Truth, especially those connected with the manner, time and object of our Lord's Return and with Israel's return to favor, and participation in privileges of service therewith connected, as these were given from 1874 to 1878. Simon, the leper, seems to represent the Great Company, particularly in the nominal church, his house; Jesus, the Little Flock, especially its leaders; Mary, the Little Flock, especially from the standpoint of giving support to its leaders; Martha, the Great Company members in the Truth and in the nominal church as serving; Lazarus, Fleshly Israel who for a little while before 1874 began to look Zionward, though no favor as yet returned to them—still their first modern colony settled in Palestine in 1874; Judas, the Second Deathers in the Truth and in the nominal church, especially in this event, the no-ransomers (see Chapter II); and the other eleven disciples, the Great Company in the Truth and the nominal church, anticipatorily divided as they actually now have been in the finished picture into three large groups, which later were subdivided into eight smaller groups. The eleven also type the justified as tentative Levites and prospectively the Youthful Worthies as persisting

Levites. For power and leadership the antitypical Judas, both in the Truth and in the nominal church, bargained to betray the true teachers, the bargaining being their bid for power by the denial of the ransom. This was done after faulting antitypical Mary for supporting the Little Flock leaders, in which fault-finding the Great Company members, the tentatively justified and (later) even many Youthful Worthies in and out of the Truth joined.

(34) The type mentions nothing as being done after Judas' first visit to the high priests until Monday morning when the triumphal entrance into Jerusalem occurred. As our table shows, the time from 6 P.M. Sunday until 6 P.M. Monday corresponds to the time from Oct., 1884, to Oct. 1894. Monday 6 A.M. would correspond to October, 1889. The events antitypical of Jesus entrance into Jerusalem, His cleansing the temple, His acclamation by the children, and the envious objections and death plans of the Jewish leaders, are, therefore, to be sought in events from about Oct., 1889, to Oct., 1894. The first and second volumes of *Studies In The Scriptures* seem to correspond to the ass and its colt respectively, on which the Little Flock, especially our Pastor, made a very public entrance into Christendom as respects Truth teachings relating to its religious condition. See in Chapter II, the third call, sifting and slaughter weapon. Certainly the Faithful were, for their teachings, hailed by the meek in and out of the Truth—the antitypical children, as multitudes of others hailed the Little Flock for its pertinent work. The cleansing of the temple was effected especially by the pertinent teachings of the Harvest Work chapter of Volume III and by our Pastor's article in the Nov. 1 and 15, 1893, *Double Tower* against the Parliament of Religions as exposing and purging the defiled condition of the (nominal) temple of God. The antitypical envious objectors—the clergy—put forth efforts to stop the harvest work;

and the steadfast continuance in the work by the Faithful constituted the refusal of antitypical or large Jesus to stop the antitypical children's hailing him and to desist from his cleansing work. The death plans of the Jewish clergy type the determination of the clergy of Christendom to cut off the Harvesters from all fellowship and activity in Christendom.

(35) The only incident of Tuesday, corresponding to the time from Oct., 1894, to Oct., 1904, was the cursing of the fruitless fig tree (Matt. 21:18, 19; Mark 11:12-14), which for the large eight wonderful days types the denunciation of sterile Christendom and its sentencing to perpetual unfruitfulness. This was especially done in Volume IV, which appeared in 1897, and whose message, in the book and in the preaching and conversation of the Truth people, certainly condemned Christendom for failure to produce the Divinely sought fruit, and sentenced it to eternal sterility as respects such fruit. And certainly Babylon's increasing perversions of Truth and righteousness and increasing worldliness, unbelief and misbelief have been abundant evidence of such a curse going into effect.

(36) The time from Tuesday 6 P.M. to Wednesday 6 P.M. of Jesus' last week in the flesh, corresponding to the period from Oct., 1904, to Oct., 1914, was full of events and teachings, even as the time antitypical of it also was, from the standpoint of the large eight wonderful days. As already shown, Judas' second visit to the chief priests (Luke 22:1-6) corresponds to the contradictionism movement (1908-1911). For particulars please see Chapter II, under the fifth sifting and slaughter weapon. The resultant opposition aroused in Christendom to the faithful Truth people, particularly toward our dear Pastor, occasioned them to forecast their betrayal to, and casting off by, Christendom. Its being forecast as taking place "after two days" we explain as follows: These antitypical

forecasts were begun in antitypical Wednesday. We are now in antitypical Thursday. The "after two days" will end in antitypical Friday, Oct. 1924, to Oct., 1934, during which the betrayal will take place.

(37) The second recorded event of Wednesday occurred in the morning—the disciples seeing the tree entirely withered and calling the fact to our Lord's attention (Matt. 21:20-22; Mark 11:20-26). These disciples represent the tentatively justified, the Youthful Worthies and the prospective Great Company in the Truth—antitypical Elisha—and in the nominal church, calling to the attention of the Faithful, by their words and writings, the devastated faith and life of the nominal church. The Towers of those years in the views from The Watch Tower contained many testimonies to this effect, quoted from such as were of the three classes represented by the disciples.

(38) As Christ's authority was questioned by the Jewish leaders (Matt. 21:23-27; Mark 11:27-33; Luke 20:1-8), so were the faithful Harvest people questioned as to their ordination to preach and to do the Harvest work. In both aspects the cavilers were check-mated. Jesus' declaring the parable of the two sons (Matt. 21:28-32) types the Faithful telling of the good and the bad Great Company members and Youthful Worthies in the Truth and in the nominal church, the good at first refusing to serve and later entering into the Lord's service; the bad promising to serve, and refusing to keep their promise. Such have been noted and commented on by the faithful Truth people. The parable of the wicked husbandman (Matt. 21:33-46; Mark 12:1-12; Luke 20:9-19) corresponds to the teachings of the faithful Truth people on the clergy's rejection of the faithful pre-Harvest servants of God and of their rejection of the faithful Harvest servants of God, with the consequent overthrow of the clergy in the Time of Trouble. The parable of the marriage-feast guests (Matt. 22:1-14) corresponds to the faithful

Harvesters teaching how first the clergy, then the laity and then certain worldlings were invited to the High Calling privileges during the Gospel Harvest. The teaching on the guest casting off the wedding robe, from the standpoint of the large eight wonderful days, shows their teaching on the sifters' giving up their privileges of grace, mercy and truth.

(39) The dishonest questions of the Pharisees (Matt. 22:15-22; Mark 12:13-17; Luke 20:20-26) and of the Sadducees (Matt. 22:23-33; Mark 12:18-27; Luke 20:27-40) and the testful question of the lawyer (Matt. 22:34-40; Mark 12:28-34) represent all sorts of dishonest, catch and testful questions that the orthodox, unorthodox and the more or less quibbling clergy have put to the faithful Harvesters. Jesus' refuting their errors, frustrating their efforts to bewilder Him, and giving useful knowledge to the questioners, types the similar activities of the faithful Harvest people. These answers are found in "that Servant's" writings and in the oral replies of the Faithful, while Christ's questions put to the Pharisees, etc. (Matt. 22:41-46; Mark 12:35-37; Luke 20:41-44), type the questions that the Faithful have put to the clergy, who have been unable to answer them.

(40) It was also on Wednesday that our Lord severely denounced the Scribes and Pharisees (Matt. 23:1-39; Mark 12:38-40; Luke 20:45-47). These denunciations type the severe denunciations of the clergy given by the Faithful in writing and by word of mouth. As examples of such denunciation we might cite many of our Pastor's sermons, B.S.M.s, like Clergy Ordination Proven Fraudulent, pilgrims' and elders' lectures, etc., etc. The seven woes on the Pharisees may correspond to the seven forms in which these denunciations were given: (1) in the Volumes, (2) in the sermons, (3) in the B.S.M.s, (4) in the Tower, (5) in the Photo-Drama, (6) in the lectures of the pilgrims and elders and (7) in the

conversations of the Faithful, or more likely there may have been seven distinct charges brought against them. The Lord's noting and commenting on the large and small gifts put into the treasury (Mark 12:41-44; Luke 21:1-4) types for the large eight wonderful days, the Faithful noting and by comparison disparagingly commenting on the large contributions of the nominal people of God, and noting and favorably commenting on the comparatively small gifts of the Faithful. This was done in Towers and in lectures and conversations, and always with praise to the Truth people in contrast with the others.

(41) The Greeks' inquiring for Jesus (John 12:20-36) seem to correspond to the Jews' inquiring respecting the Truth people in connection with the latter's Zionistic activities in 1910-1912. The revived hope of the Jews and their inquiries as to the Truth people prompted the Faithful to speak of these as signs of the near overthrow of Satan's empire, typed by Jesus' remarks connected with the inquiry of the Greeks. They also were more or less distressed at the thought of the approaching end of their public ministry, which they looked upon as near, typed by Jesus' distress on that occasion. God's answer seems to type the Divine declaration from the Word beginning in 1913 that the Church would remain after 1914 and have another glory—a second glorifying of God's character—the glory referred to in Ps. 149:5-9, otherwise typed by Elijah's smiting Jordan, Aaron's confessing the sins over Azazel's Goat and Gideon's first battle. The doubts of the people as to the nature of the voice types the doubts of many Truth and other people as to the meaning of such a message, especially as related to the hopes that had been entertained as to 1914.

(42) There is Scriptural ground proving that our Lord's great prophecy, and the parables of Matt. 25, were delivered after 6 P.M. Wednesday evening; for

Jesus remained in the temple until night and the discourse was given at night after He had left the temple and come to the mount of Olives (Luke 21:37; Matt. 24:1-3; Mark 13:1-3). Therefore Jesus' great prophecy (Matt. 24:1-51, Mark 13:1-37; Luke 21:1-36), as well as the whole of Matt. 25, belong to the time between 6 P.M. Wednesday and 6 P.M. Thursday, corresponding to the time from Oct. 1914, to Oct., 1924. Corresponding to Jesus' great prophecy are the prophetic teachings of the Faithful from Oct., 1914, onward, on the Epiphany, on the doings and sufferings of the Lord's people during that time and of the Lord's oversight of, and provision for, them amid these troubles. And in harmony with the time setting of this type the forecasts antitypical of those of the Lord's great prophecy have been uttered after the Epiphany had set in. The large antitypical utterances are the forecasts between 1914 and 1923 on the Epiphany as a miniature Gospel Age; and some of these have been already fulfilled, some are now fulfilling and some are yet to fulfill in the miniature Gospel Age. Corresponding to Jesus' giving the parable of the ten virgins is the Faithfuls' teaching on the two classes of God's people, Priests and Levites, as to our Lord's symbolic return at the end of the miniature Gospel Ages. Corresponding to Jesus' giving the parable of the talents is the Faithfuls' teaching on various opportunities for service given during the miniature Gospel Ages, and the Lord's dealing with those therewith intrusted at His symbolic return at their ends. And corresponding to Jesus' giving the parable of the sheep and goats is the Faithfuls' teaching as to the faithful and unfaithful Levites during and at the end of the miniature millenniums. The only other event with its connected remarks given as occurring between 6 P.M. Wednesday and 6 P.M. Thursday, is that recorded in John 12:37-50. Its large antitype is the reflections that the good Levites in and out of the Epiphany Truth

(John's remarks, vs. 37-43) and that the Priesthood (Jesus' remarks, vs. 44-50) in and out of the Truth make on the unbelief and weak belief of the others in and out of the Truth.

(43) Since we are now [written Dec., 1923] at about 4.15 P.M. of antitypical Thursday in the large picture, we will not attempt to speculate on details that are to come in the three antitypical days following. It will be noticed that no hours are mentioned expressly or implied from 6 P.M. Thursday until about 6 A.M. Friday when Jesus was sentenced by the full Sanhedrin and was immediately thereafter led to Pilate (Matt. 27:1; Mark 15:1; John. 18:28). About 6 A.M. Friday corresponds to about Oct., 1929, when we might expect the Faithful to be sentenced by the clergy to a complete cutting off from mouthpieceship to Christendom and to be delivered by the nominal church to the civil powers. Jesus' crucifixion began in the third hour, *i.e.*, sometime between 8 and 9 A.M. This will correspond to the time from Aug. 1930, to Jan. 1931, when a cutting off of the Faithful as mouthpiece to the public will set in. The darkness set in during the sixth hour, hence sometime between 11 A.M. and 12 M., corresponding to the time from Nov., 1931, to April, 1932, during which society in general will enter a time of darkness, which will last until the antitypical ninth hour—from Feb., 1933, to July, 1933—when the antitypical crucifixion will reach seemingly the beginning of its end; and the antitypical burial will have ended before Oct., 1934.

(44) If the earthquake of Matt. 27:51 refers to the great revolution in America, as we are inclined to think it does, it will come some time after the beginning or ending of the antitypical ninth hour—from Feb. to July, 1933, at any rate before Oct., 1934. Accordingly, by the death of the large Jesus, we are not to understand the last one of the Church leaving the world, which is not to be until during Anarchy, but their

cutting off from mouthpieceship toward nominal Spiritual Israel; even as the absolute refusal of the bad Levite leaders and their partisan followers to pay the slightest heed to our corrections and their rejecting us in every respect having temporarily cut us off from mouthpieceship to them on any new item, constituted the death of the antitypical Jesus in the picture of the small eight wonderful days.

(45) The time from 6 P.M. Friday to 6 P.M. Saturday corresponds to the time from Oct., 1934, to Oct., 1944. As Christ was in the tomb then, so the Little Flock seemingly will at least exercise no mouthpieceship to the public at that time. From 6 P.M. Saturday to 6 P.M. Sunday corresponds to the time from Oct., 1944, to Oct., 1954. Not knowing the exact hour of Jesus' resurrection, though it seems to have been just before 6 A.M., we cannot tell just when between a little before Oct., 1949, and Oct., 1954, the antitype of His resurrection will set in. We understand Jesus' resurrection to type the Christ class beginning to make themselves known as nearing their final exercise of power as mouthpiece to the world. His various appearances during that day to the disciples, probably type the entire Christ class this side of the vail manifesting themselves as active in such power to the last part of the Great Company and Youthful Worthies to come into the Truth and the tentatively justified who will not become Youthful Worthies, but yet remain loyal to the ransom and righteousness. The manifestation in the upper room occurred considerably after 6 P.M. Sunday; because the two disciples did not leave Emmaus for Jerusalem until after 6 P.M. and it took over two hours to travel the intervening eight miles of very uneven roads. We opine from the lapping of the Parousia into the Epiphany for two years and one month that by Nov., 1956, the Epiphany's lapping into the Basileia will likely end. This date would correspond to Sunday, 11 P.M., five

hours after the eighth day ended. Probably the convincing of the last ones of the ten disciples corresponds to the Christ epiphanizing themselves to the last of the living Great Company and Youthful Worthy members and tentatively justified ones. There the picture stops, so far as we now know.

(46) If, generally speaking, the above setting, especially up to Oct., 1934, may be considered correct, as it quite probably is, though we will not assert it positively—at most it is a matter of faith and not of knowledge—we have over five years of rather unrestrained activity in our public work. Then probably shortly after Oct., 1929, will come a time of restraint, then of a total cutting off from public work, probably beginning sometime between Feb. and July, 1933. We hope [written Dec., 1923] later to set before the brethren an extension of John's Rebuke in the form of volunteer work, for which the above chronology will give the time opportunity, and for which there seems to be an abundant necessity in prevailing conditions. Certainly the clarifying of the light on the small and the large eight wonderful days, manifests the gradual unfolding of the truth—"here a little, there a little!" And for this we praise our Heavenly Father through Jesus Christ, our Lord.

(47) Foregoing we have set forth two kinds of wonderful days, the small and the large eight wonderful days. At first we saw only what turned out to be the small eight wonderful days, not realizing for a while that there was also a set of large wonderful days. The Scriptures Ps. 2:1-5, compared with Acts 4:23-28; and Zech. 11:12, 13, compared with Matt. 27:8, 9 (see for a parallel case Is. 40:3-5, compared with Matt. 3:3) gave us the clue to the antitype of the eight involved typical days. Ps. 2:1-5 and Acts 4:23-28 prove that Jesus' final experiences were typical of the Church's final experiences; and Zech. 11:12, 13, compared with Matt. 27:8, 9, in

addition to giving us this thought, also enabled us to see the day for a year in the small, and a day for ten years in the large wonderful days. They prove that Christendom, civil and ecclesiastical, would be involved in the antitype. It was this fact that in Sept., 1923, enabled us to see the large eight wonderful days as distinct from the small ones. By Sept., 1925, everything in the small eight wonderful days was fulfilled, but since Oct., 1924, we have been in the large sixth wonderful day, and we will continue to be therein until Oct., 1934. As it was the fulfilled facts of nearly all of the five of the eight small wonderful days that enabled us to see that in the type each of the small eight wonderful days stood for a year in the antitype, so the fulfilled facts of nearly all of the first five of the large eight wonderful days enabled us to see that in the type each day stood for ten years in the antitype. This can be seen, *e.g.*, from the fact that the first and second betraying visits of Judas, three evenings apart, Saturday and Tuesday evenings, represent the no-ransomism sifting of 1878-1881 and the no-church-sin-offering sifting, 1908-1911, thirty years apart. Thus as three days represent thirty years, one day must represent ten years, and eight days, eighty years: 1874-1954, *i.e.*, the Parousia and the Epiphany. On these matters, as on all others, the Truth gradually clarified, and, of course, while only the small set of wonderful days was seen, some immaturities were naturally expressed in its pertinent article, which a comparison of it with later developing facts and the article on the large set will show. But we rejoice to know that the Lord gave us the Truth as due on each set of these eight wonderful days.

(48) In a number of issues, beginning with that of January, 1924 [above, from pars. (29)-(46); P '26, 153; '27, 43, 44, 70, 71; '28, 2; '30, 150], which was toward the end of the large fifth day, we set forth our tentative forecasts of the sixth, seventh and eighth large

wonderful days. Now [Oct., 1933] our special object is to deal with the things forecast for the period of the sixth large day, from Oct., 1924, to Oct., 1934. It will be well for us again to read these forecasts, which appear above and in the just cited issues of *The Present Truth*. It will be noted that these forecasts became ever clearer as the time of their fulfillment came nearer. The first of our tentative forecasts on the large antitype is found above in pars. (43)-(46), taken from P '24, 14, pars. 3, 4.

(49) While in the above-cited paragraphs it will be seen that we forecast the more important events of antitypical Friday, with their dates, we omitted several of those and their time features, which were rather less important, and which we gave in later forecasts, *e.g.*, some of these features omitted in the above quotation are found in P '26, 153, par. 1, as follows: "In the large picture 6 P.M. of our Lord's last Wednesday corresponds with Oct., 1914. Therefore, antitypical Thursday—6 P.M. to 6 P.M.—was from Oct., 1914, to Oct., 1924, since which time we are in antitypical Friday. It is now [the time this was written] 10.48 P.M. of what we would call antitypical Thursday; but God counts Friday as beginning at 6 P.M. of Thursday in our way of speaking. Therefore, from His standpoint we are at 10.48 P.M. of the sixth large wonderful day, corresponding to the evening that our Lord instituted the Memorial Supper. We are still from that standpoint in the upper room. Between now and Oct., 1929, which corresponds to 6 A.M. of Friday, Gethsemane, the arrest, the Jewish trial and the delivery to Pilate will be antityped."

(50) In an article that our diary shows was written Feb. 1, 1927, though the pertinent line of thought we had for several years before expressed orally in various ecclesias, the following is found, in P '27, 43, par. 5: "We meet a peculiar feature in that typical Thursday night: the entire absence of the hour indications in

which the typical events occurred between the beginning of the Passover meal ("when even was come") at 6 P.M. until Jesus' delivery to Pilate, 6 A.M. Consequently we cannot positively give the time of the antitypical events between Oct., 1924, and Oct., 1929. If the Lord had intended us to know [dogmatically] the time of such events, He would have indicated [clearly] the time of their types. There is one probable time indication here, but we cannot be sure [positive], because it is an uncertain inference. This probable indication is that the antitypical large Judas may meet the antitypical priests in the third betraying work from Passover to June, 1928. The basis for this probable time fixing is the following: Corresponding to Judas' Saturday night visit to the high priests, the no-ransomers began their heart treachery at the Passover of 1878, and openly proclaimed it beginning with the June issue of *The Herald Of The Morning*. Corresponding to Judas' Tuesday night visit to the high priests, the murmursome contradictors began their heart treachery at the Passover of 1908, and openly manifested it in murmurs against that Servant in the Allegheny Bible House parlor in June, 1908. Since the first two acts of treachery occurred initially thus from the Passover until June, it is probable that the large antitypical Judas will begin the antitype of Judas' Thursday night visit—the third one—to the antitypical high priests from about Passover, 1928, until June. But all we can claim for this matter is probability. It would be reasonable to expect somewhat more than a year's involvement of the larger Jesus with the clerical powers before His delivery to the civil powers. But it may take place at another time, before or after that above indicated. It thus behooves us not to be dogmatic on this point." The article on "One Of You Shall Betray Me" (P '27, 70, 71) is too long for quotation here; but it shows the same line of thought as given in the preceding quotation, and we

suggest that it be restudied before proceeding with the following.

(51) Our tentative forecast on the probable date of the final betrayal implied that the Gethsemane experience, which lasted but one hour (Matt. 26:40, 45), would begin in Nov., 1927, and end in April, 1928; for that hour ended at the time of the betrayal, as the preceding references prove. Thus, without the data being given us in the time features of the history of our Lord's typical Friday, it was correctly inferred from Scriptural data elsewhere given. This also implies that, while the Gospel record shows that feasting on the Truth, typed as given by our Lord's famous discourse of His last evening with the disciples, began at antitypical 6 P.M., *i.e.*, Oct., 1924, that discourse would end taperingly at about April, 1928; for in the type the discourse began as the Lord and the disciples sat down at the paschal feast (Matt. 26:20, 21; Luke 22:14, 15), was continued throughout the time they were in the upper room, was kept up from the time they left the upper room until they reached Gethsemane (John 14:31; 15; 16; 17; 18:1) and was brought intermittently to an end by the few things that at intervals He spoke to Peter, James and John during the Gethsemane hour (Matt. 26:38, 40, 41, 45, 46). Thus at various times the forecasts were made of the antitypes of the main events of our Lord's last day on earth, the last two of the forecasts being made in writing over a year before the antitype was due, and the others from two to eleven years before.

(52) The following, then, were the main events that were forecast, sixteen in number: (1) A feast of Truth would, from Oct., 1924, to April, 1928, be given to the three general Levite groups (antitypical Peter, James and John, *i.e.*, the antitypical Merarites, Gershonites and Kohathites), the eight sub-Levite groups (the eight disciples outside Gethsemane's gate, *i.e.*, the two antitypical Merarite groups [Mahlites and Mushites], the

two antitypical Gershonite groups [Libnites and Shimites] and the four antitypical Kohathite groups [Amramites, Izeharites, Hebronites and Uzzielites]) and temporarily to the antitypical Judas class; (2) the antitypical Gethsemane experience from Nov., 1927, to April, 1928; (3) the antitypical betrayal at Passover, 1928; (4) the arrest shortly afterwards; (5) the large Jesus' three hearings, before antitypical Annas, Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin, by Oct., 1929; (6) the clergy sentencing the large Jesus to a symbolic death; (7) the delivery to antitypical Pilate, Oct., 1929; (8) Pilate's declaring Jesus guiltless before Aug., 1930; (9) the antitypical crucifixion beginning between Aug. and Dec. 31, 1930; (10) the antitypical rabble and thieves beginning their railing between Aug. and Dec. 31, 1930; (11) the symbolic darkness beginning between Nov., 1931, and March, 1932, and lasting into the antitypical ninth hour—Feb. to July, 1933; (12) the death of the Large Jesus between Feb. and July, 1933; (13) [So far these forecasts have been fulfilled (written Oct., 1933). The following belong to the future] the spear thrust as the end of the ending of our public work; (14) the antitypical taking down from the cross; (15) the preparation of the body for burial and (16) the burial itself, these last five to set in sometime between now [The part of this chapter treating of large Friday was completed Oct. 5, 1933] and Oct., 1934, when large Friday ends. It will be noted that these forecasts (1) not only involved certain events, but (2) also quite a variety of classes of people and (3) required those classes to take part in these events at certain specified times. A forecast is quite a test of one as a teacher. The test is all the more crucial, if it involves various humanly unmanipulatable classes. But the test is in cruciality magnified to the extreme, if these events as performed by these classes are limited to certain specified times.

(53) When we appeared before the Little Flock, the

Great Company and the Youthful Worthies with these forecasts, we put ourself into a position in which it could be easily demonstrated whether we were a Divinely illuminated teacher of the Lord's Word or whether we were a false prophet, and whether our traducers were one or the other of these. It has been a favorite pastime of Levites, especially of their leaders, to accuse us far and wide of being a false prophet. In our Nov. 1933, issue we pointed out their efforts to prove us a false prophet as to the hour of Rev. 17:12 and exposed their failure therein. So in that effort they failed to prove their accusation; and their accusation is reverting with stunning effect on their own heads. They have also been charging us with being a false prophet on the matter of the large eight wonderful days, especially with reference to the forecasts that we made as to the sixth, seventh and eighth large wonderful days. Their wish, of course, is father to the thought. They have been waiting with illy concealed impatience for the time to come when they could pounce upon us as a factually proven false prophet. The fulfillments coming in unexpected ways, as the trialsomeness of the involved experiences suggested that they would come, and our traducers' Divinely blinded eyes (Is. 28:13) being unable to see the actual fulfillments, they have been making the air blue with their united croakings, "Johnson is a false prophet!" And, doubtless, the Lord arranged for our making these forecasts, that, among other reasons, the question as to the kind of a teacher that we are among the Lord's people may be brought to the most crucial kind of a test. In other words, our forecasts have providentially put us as to these Levite leaders into somewhat the same relation as Elijah's Divinely ordained challenge of the priests of Baal put him in relation to them. Here, then, through our forecasts and their pertinent charges of our being a false prophet, the situation has been created wherein the answer can be readily

given as to whether the Epiphany meat in due season is being given by the Lord through them or us. At the time we made the forecasts such a providential overruling of the situation was not thought of by us. It was, doubtless, Divinely arranged. How has it turned out?

(54) A study of the twelve forecasts so far due for fulfillment, the other four pertaining to yet future events, will give to the properly disposed a convincing answer on this question. By this study we do not hope to convince the blind Levite leaders whose railings continued into the ninth hour, and who are thus proven to be parts of the large impenitent thief. Such we can have no hope to convince. Their unholy course of power-grasping has made them in word and deed sin presumptuously (Ex. 20:26; Num. 15:30, 31; Deut. 18:20-22). But with this study we do desire to serve and bless the meek (Ps. 25:8, 9), whom to serve and bless is our delight. The first of these forecast events is, that by the Large Jesus, the priesthood, there would be given a feast to the Truth and Nominal Church Levites in their three large divisions and eight subdivisions and also part of the time to the large Judas. We have in these columns already explained the three divisions and eight subdivisions of the Truth Levites to which the Nominal Church Levites will later be added and are thus now reckoned as such, and will not here again explain them, our purpose being to show the feasting that these received from Oct., 1924 to April, 1928. It was especially by the articles of *The Present Truth* of those years, backed by pertinent discourses, lessons and conversations, that the Truth Levites (both good Great Company and Youthful Worthy brethren) were feasted in those years. And it was especially through the articles of *The Herald Of The Epiphany* of those years, including the Extras volunteered during those years, through discourses public and private, lessons and conversations, that the

Nominal Church good Levites, Great Company and Youthful Worthy brethren, were feasted in those years. A comparison of the pertinent articles, etc., with the sayings of Jesus during the typical feast will show the close similarity of the involved thoughts, *e.g.*, the foretold persecutions, lessons on the graces, prayer, God's Father-love, Jesus' ministry for us, the Spirit, etc. Accordingly, the first forecast has been fulfilled.

(55) The second forecast in the time order of its type was that the Church would have a Gethsemane experience from Nov., 1927 to April, 1928—the symbolic hour before the symbolic betrayal. A day of ten years, or 120 months, gives us as an hour 1/24 of 120 months, 5 months. The Gethsemane scene is described in Matt. 26:36-46; Mark 14:32-42; Luke 22:40-46. The record shows that the eight were entirely unaware, and that the three were almost entirely unaware of Jesus' Gethsemane experience. This experience consisted in part of His fear that He had perhaps not hitherto done perfectly and in part of His fear that He might be unable to meet the approaching sufferings perfectly, and thus would have to go into the Second Death. This moved Him with loud cries and tears to pray to have the cup, not His death, but the special rigors of that death, removed, knowing that if He did not amid them do perfectly, He would die the Second Death (Heb. 5:7). Did the antitype set in at the forecast time—Nov., 1927 to April, 1928? Our answer is, yes, and, as typically indicated, in a way that the Great Company and Youthful Worthies did not understand that it was taking place. Our correspondence and our interviews with various brethren show that at that time many brethren feared that they had lost out in the race or would by the coming trials be made crown-losers, and therefore in deepest distress sought an amelioration of the coming experiences. To these testimonies we can add our own; for we were then in great fear of being a castaway or of becoming one. Do the

Levites say that such one-sided evidence proves nothing to them? Our answer is: Neither did the typical experience of Jesus mean anything to the types of those Levites. The only way they could get the proof was from Jesus' testimony thereon. Similarly in the antitype, the drowsy Levites can get the proof of these antitypical experiences only from the testimony of the Large Jesus. And as cleansed Levites they will accept this testimony. That this experience was to take place between Nov., 1927 and April, 1928 is evident from the fact proven above on the betrayal setting in, in April, 1928 and the Gethsemane experience lasting one hour (5 months) and ending at the betrayal.

(56) The third forecast in the time order of the type is that the betrayal of the Large Jesus would take place at about the Passover of 1928. We have above quoted The Truth statements showing apart from the Gospels' accounts, which are silent as to what hour the typical betrayal occurred, that the betrayal would likely set in about the Passover of 1928. The antitypical betrayal was the delivery of the Large Jesus into the hands of the Romanist clergy by members of antitypical Judas. It occurred in connection with the probating of the will of a certain sister, Sr. McCleary of Philadelphia, Pa., U.S.A. She in 1924 made a will that was to dispose of her estate as follows: \$6,000.00 were to go to a niece, \$1,000.00 to the Truth Fund, and the balance of her estate, about \$20,000.00, after inheritance taxes, etc., were deducted, was to be held in trust during the life of her brother and sister-in-law, the income thereon to be given to them, and then at their death the principal, about \$20,000.00, was to go to the Truth Fund. As long as her brother, who expressed satisfaction with the will, lived, the sister assured us that no one made efforts to have her change her will; but after he died she told at least six of the brethren, ourself among them, that her sister-in-law, an Amramite Levite, who was much opposed to the

Epiphany movement, and her niece, who never was in the Truth, were destroying her peace of mind to the degree that her sleep was almost ruined by their efforts, extending over a couple of years, to make her change her will, which she said she did not wish to change; and through these two years she repeatedly told them, so she said, that she did not desire to change her will. The last time we saw her was after the middle of July 1927—after our return from our trans-Mississippi pilgrim trip. On this occasion she, by that time about 88 years of age, not only repeated to us the complaints that she often before had made to us, to the effect that her sister-in-law and her niece were ruining her peace and thus her nerves and sleep, by insisting on her changing her will more in their favor, but also said that her health was so broken by their course toward her in the matter of the will that she was unable to resist them any longer, that she must have relief from her troubled state of mind, even if it meant that she make a will more to the pleasing of her sister-in-law and niece, that if, after her death, another will than the one she had made in 1924 were presented for probate, we were to understand that she had made it against her will, in order to purchase peace for her remaining days, and that she desired us to fight such a will and secure the probating of the 1924 will, which, she said, was a will fair to all interests concerned.

(57) As the sequel proved, she on Aug. 5, 1927, about two weeks after we last saw her, signed a will that bequeathed to the Truth Fund \$5,000.00, and the balance of her estate to her sister-in-law and niece in equal parts, and in case of the death of either of these, the other was to get her share. This dear sister died toward the end of Dec., 1927. We learned of her death the night before her funeral. Remembering her last charge to us as an executor and trustee under the 1924 will, we presented the matter to the lawyer who had drawn up that will; and in harmony with her charge

and his advice, the 1924 will was by its executors and trustees presented for probate. Then we learned from a clerk in the office of the Registrar of Wills, as we had reason to expect, that a later will was in existence. Against probating this new will we had a *caveat* entered, which naturally resulted in the necessity of a hearing on the two wills. This hearing was held before the deputy of the Registrar of Wills. Various circumstances interfering, the case did not come to a hearing until March 22, 1928, when the other side presented its case. Then occurred an adjournment until April 18, when our side presented its case. Another adjournment was made until April 24, when the final, *i.e.*, rebuttal testimony of both sides was given. Eliminating from the betrayal the hearings of April 18 and April 24, which are the antitype of the scene of John 18:4-8, and considering the betrayal to be the acts of the sister-in-law and her Levite supporters in their representatives before the registrar's deputy from 10:00 A.M., March, 22, onward to 10:00 A.M., April, 18, all of which acts were then before him for his attention, until our answer came at 10:00 A.M., April, 18, the time the Lord's Supper at Philadelphia ended, *i.e.*, 10:00 P.M., April, 4, was exactly midway between the beginning of the first hearing, 10:00 A.M., Mar., 22, when the betrayal began, and the beginning of the second hearing, 10:00 A.M., April, 18, when the betrayal acts had ended, and the Large Jesus was called on to speak (John 18:4-8) as to the betraying act. This shows that the *completed* Passover supper was the point of time exactly in the middle of the betrayal act, which proves the accuracy of our forecast's fulfillment as of the Passover of 1928. The gentleman who heard the case, we learned after the first hearing began, was a Romanist. We also learned that the sister-in-law was encouraged in her course by other Amramite Levites, who also stood ready to assist her with their testimony. The above course of events necessarily

arising out of what the sister charged against her sister-in-law and niece, *i.e.*, she charged them with unduly influencing her into making the new will, and out of what she charged us to do as an executor and trustee under the 1924 will, under the given circumstances, forced the matter to come to a hearing; and this created a situation that resulted in putting the Large Jesus into the hands of the Romanist clergy. Thus the antitypical betrayal was being enacted with the 1928 Passover's end as its exact middle, a date forecast for it orally several years before, written out for publication 14 months before and published 13 months before. Of course, this forecast, made on as yet many non-existent factors, coming true, was neither a matter of accident nor of manipulation on our part. Indeed, we did not interpretationally associate this course of events with the antitypical betrayal until a few days before the hearing began, Mar. 22, 1928. Hence the forecast can be explained alone on the basis that its maker was Divinely illuminated on the meaning of the type. It might be remarked that the sister-in-law died before the bequests could be legally paid out and thus she and her encouraging Amramite supporters got no benefits under the will, her part going to her daughter and son-in-law, and will buy an antitypical burial for these and their unbegotten helpers as antitypical strangers.

(58) The next forecast event (the fourth) as given in the order of the type was to be the arrest of the Large Jesus. No definite time in the type is given for this occurrence. It is merely presented as coming shortly after the Passover, when the betrayal was to be enacted, and considerably before Oct., 1929, when the type, after many intervening events would occur, shows the Large Jesus would be delivered to antitypical Pilate. To make one a prisoner in Bible types does not mean antitypically to imprison him literally, but to put him under restraint. Thus the imprisonment

of John the Baptist does not type the literal imprisonment of the Church, but her restraint in her public work, which began with our being cut off from second-class mailing rates for John's Rebuke and Elijah's Letter, and has continued with various other restraints, especially by Romanist non-official persecutors, and by Romanist policemen and prosecutors, with the assistance of magistrates, hindering the circulation of these two papers, and literally arresting and securing the fining of some of their distributors. Hence Jesus' arrest restraining Him in the exercise of His powers types restraint put upon the Large Jesus. The antitypical arresting began through the decision of the Registrar of Wills handed down on May 10, 1928, and was completed by the paying over of the bequest of \$5,000.00, instead of \$21,000.00, on Feb. 5, 1929. He decided the contest in favor of the other side, which resulted in our receiving \$5,000.00 instead of \$21,000.00. Certainly, losing \$16,000.00 put quite a restraint upon our activities; for with that money we could have published millions of Extras for free distribution, printed tens of thousands of books and booklets and financed many pilgrim trips, which we could not do through losing this amount. Thus it restrained our powers of activity and came within the time forecast. The arrest [restraint] of the two brethren, later to be dealt with, on Nov. 18, 1928, was as will shortly appear also a part of the arrest of the Large Jesus. This fulfillment could not be explained as an accidental coincident to our forecast; nor, of course, would we for obvious reasons have manipulated such an issue of events. Our pertinent forecast must have been due to Divine illumination on the type, as in the other cases.

(59) The next three sets of events, the fifth, sixth and seventh, forecast for the sixth large wonderful day were the three hearings of the Large Jesus, antitypical of the hearings (1) before Annas, (2) before Caiaphas and (3) before the Sanhedrin, the Large

Jesus' condemnation and His delivery by them to antitypical Pilate. In the antitype of these, three hearings were to take place between the Large Jesus' antitypical arrest and the delivery to antitypical Pilate, *i.e.*, between sometime after the antitypical arrest was completed, which, as above shown, began May 10, 1928 and ended Feb., 5, 1929, when the bequest of \$5,000.00 instead of \$21,000.00 was paid over, and sometime early in the first hour of large Friday A.M.—Oct., 1929 to March, 1930—corresponding to Jesus' delivery to Pilate early during the first hour of typical Friday. All that we can get from the type, as such, unassisted by the data furnished by the previously fulfilled antitypes, is that, the arrest coming sometime after Passover, 1928 and the antitype of the delivery to Pilate coming early in the five months' period of Oct., 1929 to March, 1930, the three antitypical hearings were due sometime between after the Passover of 1928 and early in the period between Oct., 1929 and Mar., 1930. But the antitype of the arrest occurring during the entire period between May, 10, 1928 and Feb., 5, 1929, we were to expect the three hearings to come after Feb. 5, 1929 and several months before Mar., 1930; because, the Sanhedrin condemning Jesus and binding and leading Him to Pilate early in the first hour (Matt. 27:1, 2; Mark 15:1; John 18:28), we are to expect that early in the five months' period, Oct., 1929 to March, 1930, the antitypical Sanhedrinal condemnation and delivery to antitypical Pilate would occur. Hence the run of events would put these three hearings between sometime after Feb. 5 and sometime, say in Oct. 1929. And the fulfilled facts prove this setting to be true. We will now give some explanations and set forth the pertinent facts.

(60) Here in Philadelphia Romanist laymen, egged on by their priests, incited papal policemen to arrest our brethren who volunteered Extras Nos. 18 and 23 (Elijah's Letter and John's Rebuke). Among others

who were thus arrested, locked up and fined, were a brother and sister who were arrested Nov. 18, 1928. This, accordingly, was between May 10, 1928 and Feb. 5, 1929, during which time the antitypical arresting was going on. They were falsely charged by the Romanist district attorney with inciting to riot, despite the fact that they were entirely alone during the distribution and at the time of the arrest. An incitation to riot implies the presence of a number of persons, whom the inciter seeks to arouse to rioting. Such a condition did not prevail on this occasion; hence there could be no incitation to riot. Every one connected with the prosecution was a Romanist—the accusing women, the arresting policeman, the district attorney, his deputy, the witnesses and the trial judge during the first three hearings. These three hearings occurred April 16, 1929, May 21, 1929 and Oct. 24, 1929 respectively. Of course the Romanists were not particularly aiming at these two brethren. Their aim was through their condemnation to secure a Court decision against the Epiphany work, and thus to close it up. Accordingly, the Epiphany priesthood was the real accused and was merely represented through the two accused brethren. We are not to understand that the judge in these three hearings was the antitype of Annas, Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin. Rather we are to understand his part as a mere winding up of the pertinent antitypical hearings, a sort of court crier of these three antitypes. The first antitypical hearing began and progressed before the lower priests as antitypical Annas, who examined our movement in its writings and work and thus ended their investigation in not coming to a decision, the end coming by the Romanist judge announcing the postponement of the hearing for another occasion. This brought to an end the antitype of Annas' examination of Jesus. The Romanists in their eagerness to secure a verdict against the two brethren gave the latter's attorney a copy of the charge

and a notice of the trial just about two hours before it was scheduled to begin, and the said attorney, not having had time enough to study the charge, prepare his brief and secure his witnesses, moved the case be postponed, which the judge under the circumstances had to grant as a matter of elementary justice.

(61) For five weeks more, apparently a higher set of the Romanist clergy examined the case, whose examination also was not final, a fact that was implied by the case being again postponed by the judge, May 21, 1929, the external reason being that, the attorney of the accused having a case in a higher court at the same hour, the lower had to give way to the higher. This five weeks' examination corresponds to the Lord's hearing before Caiaphas. Antitypical Caiaphas thought the Large Jesus worthy of a cutting off from access to the public, but made no final decision, announcing a postponement through his "court crier," the judge. The third examination thereafter set in, corresponding to the hearing before the Sanhedrin; and its decision was announced through their "court crier," the trial judge, who after hearing part of the testimony, stated he would not try the case further, that he would leave the accused under indictment to be tried by an impartial, a non-Romanist, judge. This antitypes the Sanhedrin's announcement that they were to deliver Jesus bound to Pilate. The judge gave as his reasons for his course the following: This case involves the Catholic Church, of which I am a humble member. If I should decide the case against the accused, the newspapers of the country would censure me; and if I should decide the case in favor of the accused, my church would be displeased with me. By this latter remark he let the Romanist cat out of the bag, clearly revealing that, not only was his church back of the prosecution, but also that he knew that it wanted the condemnation of the accused. We have very good reasons to surmise that his decision not to try the case

to the end was made at clerical advice, to spare his church from exposure as a persecutor, which would explode the hollowness of the hierarchy's claim to tolerance. He, therefore, said that he would decline to hear the case further, in order that an impartial, a non-Romanist, judge, might hear it. By this remark he disclosed the fact that he was not in such a case an impartial judge, which we believe is true of every Romanist judge in cases affecting his church. The remarks that he made on what would happen, if he decided the case *pro* or *con*, likewise seem unsound. It was, of course, not for him to decide whether the accused were guilty or not; this was the jury's business. His only work was to see that a fair trial was given according to the rules of evidence, and then pronounce sentence according to the jury's decision and his view of its desert, if the accused were found guilty. His remarks seem to betray the thought that he was in a bad position from which he sought to retreat.

(62) Above we remarked that we have good reasons to surmise that at clerical advice, to spare his church, he declined to hear the case to an end. We, of course, are not certain thereon and desire our remarks on this phase of the case to be considered no more than a reasonable surmise in view of the circumstances and his above-described utterances. A record of how the case was developed on both sides will show the reasonableness of this surmise. On the Romanist side the case showed manipulation of the entire pertinent judicial machinery. Neither the arresting police, the station police who gave the case to the magistrate, nor the magistrate, brought a specific charge against the accused. Secondly, after the magistrate's hearing, the station police had a deputy of the district attorney study John's Rebuke some days; and the latter then formulated the charge of inciting to riot. Thirdly, the same Romanist judge sat to hear the case in April, May and October, 1929 (court not being held in July

and August), while the rules of the Philadelphia Court require each class of cases to be heard in the court room assigned for its kind of cases and also arrange for the judges generally to rotate monthly from one to another of these rooms, so that each judge will every so often hear every kind of case. Without manipulation this Romanist judge, according to this rule, could not have been in the room where and when that case was heard oftener than during one month. It would not surprise us, if his being there even one month in those particular months was due to manipulation; for during July and August, court not having been in session, he was in that room during all four of the involved court months; the third hearing was originally set for September, but by the prosecution was postponed, partly because of the room undergoing repairs, and partly because of there being too many cases on hand. The same judge was there also in September, when it was expected for a while to be heard. Each time a Romanist deputy of the Romanist district attorney appeared as prosecutor. The juries each time had a liberal sprinkling of Romanists. All of their witnesses were Romanists. Of course, the times of calling the case were always in control of the Romanist district attorney, who used that control to gain Romanist advantages against the accused. When all of this is considered in connection with the judge's admission that his church would be displeased, if he should free the accused, *i.e.*, his church wanted them condemned, we have good ground for surmising that the judge likely was clerically advised to get rid of the case, in order to spare his church from unfavorable publicity. This surmise becomes still more strongly grounded when certain other things are considered. The fact that it is Rome's settled, but more or less hidden policy to crush by boycott and court prosecution all criticism of it in the press and on the radio, evidenced

by a large number of facts that we have elsewhere presented in our Signs Of The Times is in line with the clergy's surmised advice in this case.

(63) Because Rome seeks to hide her hand while crushing opponents, some of the brethren were determined to make an exposure of her hands and methods in this case. There lives in Chicago an Epiphany brother who is a newspaper man and a friend of influential statesmen. He decided to take a hand in the defense. One of the accused, knowing that the Romanists were seeking illegally to railroad him to prison, wrote to this Chicago brother, who was from boyhood days onward a close friend of the then Governor of Pennsylvania. He wrote to his Governor friend what the Romanists were seeking to do in this case. The latter replied that he would keep his eye on the case and see that justice was wrought thereon. Whether the Governor, who as such had the right to unseat an unjust judge, warned the Romanist judge to act justly in this matter, we do not know; but he probably did. If so, that may have had something to do with his course. The correspondence between our Chicago brother and the Governor was just before the third calling of the case. Our Chicago brother as a newspaper man advised a further matter: that a letter be sent from the Bible House to the editors of Philadelphia's newspapers, informing them that the case was one that involved the freedom of the press, in which each of them was vitally interested, and requesting them to have their reporters make extensive reports on the case and give it wide publicity. A letter to this effect went out of our office to the Philadelphia newspaper editors. If Rome fears anything, it is publicity on her plots against the public welfare. Practically every large newspaper of the country is encumbered in its staff with Jesuits placed at strategic points in Rome's interests. Quite likely into the hands of some

of these a copy of this letter fell; and, if so, the character and objects of Jesuits could be depended on to forestall a course fraught with possibilities of much unfavorable publicity for Rome. Since Jesuits are pastmasters in plots cunningly and secretly devised and executed, we are doing them no injustice by such a surmise. The combination of the above facts and probabilities make our pertinent surmise reasonable. And the type and antitype give us on the matter the assurance of faith, but not the demonstration of facts such as would be accepted as evidence in a court of civil justice.

(64) It would be well for us to note the time feature in the threefold hearing before the condemnation and delivery of the Large Jesus by the Romanist clergy to antitypical Pilate. The arrest of the two brethren occurring Nov. 18, 1928, came during the period of the antitypical arrest (May 10, 1928 to Feb. 5, 1929). The three hearings, the condemnation and the delivery to antitypical Pilate, were to come between Feb. 5, 1929 and early in the five months' period from Oct. 1929 to March, 1930. As shown above, the first hearing ended at the court session on April 16, 1929; the second at the court session on May 21, 1929; and the third, the condemnation and the delivery to antitypical Pilate, at the court session on Oct. 24, 1929. Thus all came within the forecast period. This forecast was made over five years before the fulfillment. It cannot be explained on the ground of accident. The factors in the case are so varied, embrace forces so antagonistic to one another and concern so many various classes, that it cannot be explained on the ground of manipulation on our part, as Levites have sought to dispose of some of our fulfilled forecasts. This set of fulfillments forms a most impressive proof that the forecast was a result of Divine illumination on the type.

(65) The eighth thing forecast for the large sixth wonderful day was typed by Pilate's saying, "I find no

fault in this man." This was fulfilled by the civil power, through a Protestant judge, declaring the Epiphany work lawful, which was done on May 23, 1930, when said judge, after hearing the case, took it out of the hands of the jury and declared the two accused brethren not guilty and freed them. The case was clearly proven to be a Romanist attempt against the freedom of the press. Special parts of John's Rebuke, Extra No. 23, were read to the jury by the prosecutor. The main Romanist witness, the arresting policeman, since the last hearing (in which the accused brethren stated he perjured himself by claiming that a riot was narrowly averted at the time of, and by the arrest, while as a matter of fact nobody, except the policeman and the two brethren, was then present, nor was about the two brethren before the arrest) had committed so gross an offense against the law as to be dismissed from the police force, and hence dared not appear as a witness. The two Romanist women who had the policeman arrest the brethren also failed to appear. This was perhaps at hierarchical advice, since the hierarchy now feared unfavorable publicity. The testimony of the station policemen who appeared as the only witnesses against the brethren was hearsay, since they were not actual witnesses of the alleged offence. The result was that all the Romanist prosecutor could urge was that the contents of John's Rebuke were of a character to incite to riot.

(66) Thus the charge simmered down to an accusation against a part of the Epiphany literature, and consequently was a charge against the whole priesthood. Thus in reality, not only the two accused, but the whole priesthood were on trial, as the picture of the Large Jesus requires. The judge read over the parts of John's Rebuke most inveighed against by the Romanist prosecutor, declared that such statements would not cause normal people to riot, moreover were entirely lawful and were uttered on patriotic and

religious grounds. The result made the Romanists leave that court room crestfallen, like beaten dogs running away with their tails between their legs. It will be noticed that the Gospels do not state the hour time that Pilate declared our Lord faultless, but place it between the beginning of the first hour, when the delivery to Pilate set in, and the beginning of the third hour, when the crucifixion set in. In all likelihood, this declaration of Jesus' innocence occurred in the second hour; for the hearing of the accusation and its grounds against Jesus and the examination of Jesus by Pilate took about an hour before Pilate declared Jesus innocent. In the antitype the declaration of the Epiphany movement's innocency did take place during the second hour of antitypical Friday morning—March to August, 1930. Here again, the forecast, made nearly seven years before, could not have been of accidental fulfillment, nor could the fulfillment be explained as having been manipulated by us. The only reasonable explanation of the fulfillment is that the forecast was of Divine illumination. And it was fulfilled during the period in which the Bible shows it should have been fulfilled, *viz.*, on May 23, 1930, which was during the second hour—March to August, 1930.

(67) The ninth forecast was that the antitypical crucifixion would set in during the third hour of antitypical Friday—Aug., 1930 to Jan., 1931 (Mark 15:25). In our Lord's crucifixion nails were driven through His hands and feet. In Bible symbols the hands are used to represent one's service and the feet one's conduct (Rev. 13:16; 14:9; Ex. 40:31; Ps. 40:2; 116:8; 119:59, 101, 105). As a result of a judicial sentence, to drive nails through the hands would represent the treating of one's work as penal; and to drive nails through one's feet would represent the treating of one's conduct as penal. Despite the County Court of Philadelphia giving our work a clean bill of health, first in this city, then in Jersey City and then in other

cities, Romanist policemen, egged on by priest-driven Romanists, arrested our volunteers who distributed John's Rebuke and Elijah's Letter. But knowing that they could gain nothing by taking these before the county courts, where our pertinent activities were declared legal, which courtfinding made it legal everywhere in Penna., unless a higher court would repeal it, which it did not do, they took the arrested brethren to lower courts, magistrates' courts, where the Romanists succeeded in getting them jailed and fined. Thus our work and conduct were judicially condemned as penal, *i.e.*, a symbolic crucifixion set in. The tongue lashings that the courts' attendants, etc., gave the arrested brethren, and in them the entire priesthood, correspond to the scourging of Jesus. These arrests, jailings, tongue lashings and finings began on time, in August, 1930, and continued for several years afterward. Here is a forecast, made about eight years ahead of time, and its fulfillment on time cannot be explained as accidental or as manipulated by us. The only honest explanation of this fact is that we were Divinely illuminated to understand and explain the type.

(68) The tenth forecast event was the railing at the Large Jesus on the part of the antitypical rabble, clerics and the two large thieves (Matt. 27:39-44; Mark. 15:29-32; Luke 23:35-37, 39-43). As the record shows, the railing set in immediately after the crucifixion, hence in the antitype between Aug., 1930 and Jan., 1931. And, true enough, the railing set in at the time forecast. The antitypical thieves are those leaders of Truth movements who have stolen spiritual prerogatives, and their partisan supporters, *e.g.*, J.F. Rutherford's stealing, we should call it *pirating*, the controllership of the Society from its board and the editorship from the Tower Editors, and others, like G.K. Bolger, C. Olson, R.H. Bricker, the St. Joseph, Brooklyn, Brockton (Eagle's) and Kearney Ecclesias,

T.D. Clemons, W. Lewis, Adam Rutherford, H. Hollister, the Editors of *Elijah's Voice Monthly* and of the *Straz*, M. Kostyn, W.J. Zaborowski, A. Stahn, etc., who never were by the Lord appointed through that Servant as general elders, and who have stolen the privilege of addressing the General Church on Parousia matters. A.M. Saphore and W.J. Laughlin are examples of general elders who were by the Lord through that Servant dismissed from their office, who were never by him reinstated and who have since that Servant's death usurped the pertinent office. These and others, including many in Europe, are parts of these symbolic thieves. Those of them who continued their railing on the Large Jesus, the priesthood, into the ninth hour, are thereby proven to be of the impenitent thief; for the members of the penitent thief long before the ninth hour ceased their railing. Then there is a large number of more private individuals among Truth people who did more or less of this railing, some of whom repented before the ninth hour, others not doing so. J.F.R. in the Sept. 15, 1930 Tower, thus within a month and a half after the third hour began, as might be expected, started off the railing against the Large Jesus in his article on *The Man Of Sin*, in which he called the faithful priesthood, among other vile epithets, the man of sin, Antichrist, workers of iniquity, that evil servant, Judas, the wicked one, and in later articles railed on them as the foolish and unprofitable shepherd, Cain, Korah, Dathan, Abiram, Balaam, Saul, Haman, etc. With such a band leader, the rest of the band of symbolic thieves tooted away on their discordant instruments of railing, making Satanic noises. When J.F.R. tired awhile, he had a willing assistant leader in G.K. Bolger, who took his place as the band leader in inciting and encouraging such railing. These and others railed into the ninth hour.

(69) Then, non-Truth sectarians joined in this railing.

Almost always when John's Rebuke and Elijah's Letter were distributed we were made aware of it by a deluge of railing letters that our Romanist friends sent us. Some of the mildest names that we have been called are *skunk* and *rattlesnake*. Some of the names and expressions are unprintably vile. Not infrequently would "good Catholics" send us through the mail copies of John's Rebuke and Elijah's Letter which they had used as toilet paper, saying such was the proper use to make of such papers. Not infrequently their letters contained threats to dynamite the Bible House and to shoot and lynch us. Often, when the literature was distributed in Philadelphia or neighboring cities, our telephone was kept hot by angry Romanists who emitted the vilest and most bitter railings. Our name, Johnson, made some of them take us to be a Swede; and certainly our dear Swedish brethren would not feel themselves complimented, if they knew how they spoke to and of us as an alleged Swede! These letters and phone messages were a sad commentary upon the spirit that the papal priests had developed in these "good Catholics." Frequently such railing Romanists sought to palm themselves off as Protestants. In most cases such said that our papers were influencing them to investigate the Catholic Church, whose teachings, to their surprise and delight, they found wonderfully inspiring. This statement came so often that we think the priests as a part of their stock in trade put it into the mouths of the writers, thinking that we might thereby be influenced to discontinue circulating such literature, if we could be convinced it would have such effects! Usually these letters were anonymous; and often the Romanists who phoned to us refused to give their names, which moved us to decline to give them a hearing, because we have the rule not to speak over the phone to a person who, on being requested, refuses to give his or her name. One day a woman who refused to give her name, but

who was determined to scourge us with her tongue, was rung off seven times and seven times she called us up again! So, beloved, the railing came; and it came on time, as forecast, and in some cases continued throughout the entire antitypical crucifixion time—the antitypical six hours of 30 literal months. We rejoice to state that someone who railed awhile later repented and wrote us very humble apologies, which we always answered with comforting letters. The fulfillment of this forecast on the large penitent and impenitent thieves could not be accidental nor manipulated. The forecast evidently was due to a Divine illumination that enabled us to make it; for in parts of its fulfillment the forecast was made nearly ten years in advance.

(70) The eleventh forecast event in large Friday was the antitypical darkness. For this we gave two probability suggestions: (1) that it likely would be the terrible effect on America of Europe's Armageddon; (2) that it would likely be the terrible effect on America of Europe's pre-Armageddon conditions (P '30, 197, pars. 4, 5; '32, 13, par. 4). The latter of these suggestions proved to be the correct one. We are to remember, as shown in the Nov., 1932, Present Truth, that we wrote the article of P '32, 12, 13, on 'The Ten Horns' and Beast's One Hour Of Authority, in Nov., 1931, but for sometime before that held the thoughts there set forth; and the thought of European pre-Armageddon conditions as likely causing the symbolic darkness was one of such thoughts and is offered as possible in P '30, 197, pars. 4, 5. Hence this suggestion was made more than a year before the symbolic darkness began in Nov., 1931; for the antitypical sixth hour was from Nov., 1931, to April, 1932, and the large ninth hour was from Feb. to July, 1933, the period of the large darkness being, accordingly, from Nov., 1931, to between Feb. and July, 1933. The antitypical darkness we understand to be the American

depression *in its second phase*. The first phase of America's depression set in shortly after the collapse of the stock market, Oct., 24, 1929. But under the efforts of state, capital and labor, it was fairly well, but not wholly overcome by Oct., 1931. In Nov., 1931, the second phase of America's depression set in. It came about as follows: In Oct., 1931, the Reichsbank of Austria failed, which caused a number of German banks to go to the wall. In these latter banks some of the most powerful British banks were heavily interested and were required to cover their liabilities in these failures. Knowing that they could not cover these losses by gold without creating the worst panic in British financial history, believing that they could cover them, if Britain would go off the gold standard, which would enable them to escape being forced to pay their obligations in gold, and, furthermore, believing that if Britain went off the gold standard its debased currency would enable British merchants to undersell American merchants in the world's markets, to Britain's great financial gain, these banks persuaded the British government for these three reasons to desert the gold standard; and other countries followed suit. The result was immediate on America. The first phase of its depression, almost overcome, was made to pale into insignificance by its second phase, which began in Nov., 1931, and spread disaster and suffering.

(71) The second phase of the depression was indescribably severe. Its cause was discerned by President Hoover, but he seems to have been too internationally minded, especially British-minded, to take the step that England's desertion of the gold standard, with its effects on America's commerce, suggested, *i.e.*, leave the gold standard and thus enable American manufacturers and farmers to compete on even terms with Britain and certain other gold standard forsaking nations. The special discrimination against American goods, apart from tariff barriers, increased America's

commercial disadvantage; for certain European governments forbade their subjects to buy from America, except under very stringent restrictions and in very limited amounts. Of course overproduction played its part as a third cause of the depression. As a result unemployment in America greatly increased, until in March, 1933, there were between 13,000,000 and 15,000,000 unemployed in America, while many other millions worked on shortened time and lower proportionate wages. So great did the resultant suffering of this vast unemployment, shortened working time and reduced wages become, that between 40,000,000 and 50,000,000 people in America were supported in whole or in part by public or private charity, the latter form of it coming mostly from relatives, whose work or savings enabled them to help their less fortunate kindred.

(72) Such suffering America never before felt. The second phase of the depression in America was indeed the antitypical darkness. And as the typical darkness lasted from the sixth into the ninth hour (Matt. 27:45; Mark 15:33; Luke 23:44, 45), so did the antitypical darkness last from the sixth into the ninth hour of large Friday—from Nov., 1931, to between Feb. and July, 1933. Accordingly, our second probability forecast as to the cause of the antitypical darkness proved correct; and all along our general forecast on its being a distressful experience in America between Nov., 1931, and Feb.-July, 1933, proved true. This darkness slowly and gradually began to give way under the Rooseveltian policies, started in March, 1933. Certainly, this fulfillment cannot be explained away on the theory of accident or manipulation on our part. It can be explained on the ground of Divine illumination alone. It will be noted that the Bible does not give the cause of the darkness; hence we would have done more wisely, had we not attempted to explain the cause of the forecast darkness, which

without assigning its cause we gave in Sept., 1923, and published in Jan., 1924; for, while the one possibility suggested proved correct, the other proved incorrect and hence became the occasion of the Levites' railing, though unfairly, at us as a false prophet; for we suggested as one of the possible causes of the symbolic darkness Europe's Armageddon fighting as probably coming between Nov., 1931, and April, 1932. This is a good illustration against attempting to go beyond what is written. Our simple forecast of P '24, 14, par. 3, wherein we did not attempt to assign a cause of America's darkness, was enough for a true forecast.

(73) The twelfth forecast event for large Friday was the death of the Large Jesus in the large ninth hour—Feb. to July, 1933 (Matt. 27:46-50; Mark 15:33-37; Luke 23:44-46; John 19:28-30). On this death we offered two possibilities: (1) at first, and preferably, in P '24, 14, par. 3, we suggested that it would be the beginning of the end of our public work, which would come between Feb. and July, 1933; and (2) later we suggested that it might be the end of the end of our public work, and that sometime between Feb. and July, 1933. The former suggestion proved true, as the following will show: Beginning about the middle of March, 1933, and ending June 14, 1933, hence within the ninth hour, Congress voted President Roosevelt dictatorial powers in many varied respects, to enable him to put through the New Deal, a part of which was the N.R.A. These policies have turned our form of government into a *churchianityized* Fascism, because the papacy originated the New Deal and the Federation of Churches has advocated it theoretically and practically. Constitutionally, our public work cannot be stopped, because the U.S. Constitution guarantees the freedom of the press, speech, conscience, assembly and propaganda. Hence our public work cannot be stopped legally in the U.S. It is true

that a judge could declare it illegal, but could not do this legally. Consequently it can be stopped only by the exercise of dictatorial powers. When it will actually be stopped it will be by dictatorial powers, as the beheading of John, the spear-thrust in Jesus' side, the casting of the three Hebrew youths and Ahaziah's chariot ride in the field of Naboth imply, all of which were dictatorial acts. This being so, Congress began the end of our public work in voting dictatorial powers to the President, which will be used to end the end of our public work. Thus the beginning of the end of our public work set in during the ninth hour, *i.e.*, between Feb. and July, 1933; for those dictatorial powers were by Congress voted our President from March 15 to June 14, 1933. Again, the fulfillment of this forecast cannot be explained away on the theory of accident or manipulation on our part. The only explanation applicable here in connection with a forecast made nearly ten years before the fulfillment is that we were Divinely illuminated to understand the type, and from it to make the forecast.

(74) The other things of large Friday, the large sixth wonderful day, *i.e.*, (13) the large spear-thrust, (14) the taking down from the cross, (15) the preparing of the body for burial and (16) the burial itself, belong to the future. We understand the spear-thrust to be a decree that will completely end our united public work, the taking down from the cross to be the proof given by supporters of the Large Jesus that He was undeservedly crucified, the preparation for burial to be the work that the supporters of the Large Jesus will perform in arranging fittingly and reverently to pay their respect, and honor to the Large Jesus in memory of His public ministry, and the burial itself to be the paying of fitting and reverent respect and honor to the Large Jesus in memory of His public ministry. The exact hour during which the involved typical items will in each case occur is not indicated

in the Bible, which, however, shows that they were all finished between the ninth and the end of the twelfth hours on the day of our Lord's death; for the burial was hastened in order to be completed by 6 P.M., both because the law of Moses forbade keeping one hung on a tree unburied until the beginning of the next day, which was at 6 P.M., and because, the next day in this case being the Sabbath and also the Passover's first feast day, it was especially prohibited to keep a dead body unburied into the Sabbath, more particularly, if that Sabbath be a holy day of a festival (John 19:31, 42; Deut. 21:22, 23). We will not attempt to speculate on the details of these four future acts; for not only is speculating dangerous, but, like the other events of antitypical Friday, they will also be trialsome; hence their details cannot be known in advance; for that would prevent their being trialsome; and thus their Divinely intended purpose would be frustrated. While we understood the generalities of antitypical Friday beforehand, and thus were able to forecast them, the details always surprised us when they fulfilled, and this will doubtless be the character of the four general future events of this large Friday. On account of the lack of space in this article we could give but few details. To many of the typical details we have not given any explanation whatever, *e.g.*, our Lord's agony on the cross when He cried out, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" and His other words on the cross, etc. These details were very accurately fulfilled, but had to be omitted for the reason given.

(75) We could draw very many lessons from our study, but will limit ourselves to but one. This study proves that the Epiphany movement is the official priestly movement. It proves that the Epiphany movement is the priestly successor of the Parousia movement. It therefore proves that the other movements among Truth people are for the most part Levitical

movements, though Second Death movements that have various ramifications among the Levite movements are also indicated in this study. As we pointed out in the Nov., 1932, Present Truth, it is a favorite pastime of the Levite leaders and their partisan supporters to decry us as a false prophet. This study and many another in these columns bring to us God's own answer to this charge, proving that it comes from Satan, the source of all evil and error, and is given in the interests of his wicked cause. He knows the uses the Lord is making of us; and because such uses are against his fell purposes among God's people, he seeks in every way possible to discredit us and finds the Levite leaders and their partisan supporters ready agents to further his wicked designs against the Lord, the Truth, His priestly servants and people among the Truth people. But the Truth is mighty and will prevail; and its enemies will come to shame and confusion. Beloved priestly brethren, that God is using us all to do His priestly work is, among other things, unanswerably proven by this study, for which the Lord be praised!

(76) The foregoing on the large sixth wonderful day, which appeared in The Present Truth, June, 1934, treated of the main things only of large antitypical Friday up to and including the death of the Large Jesus. That subject, according to our diary, was first given as a discourse at Poznan, Poland, June 9, 1933, and also in every ecclesia, except one, thereafter visited in Europe during our 1933 pilgrim trip. Between Sept. 26 and Oct. 4 it was written out as an article, the thought being to publish it in the Dec., 1933, Truth; but, crowded out of that issue, it appeared in the Jan., 1934, issue. We gave it as a discourse at the Philadelphia and Chicago conventions, Sept. 3 and Oct. 14, 1933, respectively, and at five ecclesias during our fall trip that year, the last time being at Cleveland, Ga., Nov. 1. This discourse was thus given the first time

just ten days after the ninth hour ended, June 30, 1933, *i.e.*, four antitypical minutes after the tenth hour had set in. The fact that that discourse, afterward worked up into an article, gave only 15 of the chief events of the large sixth wonderful day implies that a number of the events of that day were not set forth. The main ones of these we will now proceed to set forth [written May 22-30, 1935]; and then, beginning with the events following those set forth in that discourse and those set forth above, we will give the closing events of the large sixth wonderful day here. An attentive study of it will prove that every event of the type found an antitypical fulfillment between July, 1933, and Oct. 1, 1934. That the earthquake referred to in Matt. 27:51, 54, did not have an antitype, as we expected, is due to the fact that, as an interpolation, it was never a part of the type, and hence could not have an antitype. This interpolation crept into the Bible before the most ancient MSS. that we have were written; hence it is in all the ancient MSS. in our possession. Like 1 John 5:7, it probably originated as follows: Someone wrote the pertinent words and those of vs. 52, 53, in his copy of Matt. as a marginal note, and a copyist, mistaking it as a part of the text, wrote it into his copy as a part of the text. This probably occurred in the second or third century, when exaggerated stories of our Lord were invented, resulting, among other things, in the production of the apocryphal books of the New Testament, so full of grossly exaggerated miraculous and puerile stories of our Lord, etc.

(77) The Lord having privileged us to take a rather prominent part in the antitypes of the large sixth wonderful day, in order to set forth the pertinent antitypes clearly, it will be necessary for us to write of certain of our activities, which we will do as a necessity of the case, and not as setting ourself forth as some great one or imaginary great one; for we assure our dear readers that as Jesus spoke and Paul and our Pastor spoke and

wrote of personal things that clarification or defense of the Truth required, without pride or ostentation, so the Lord's grace enables us in the same way to write of things about our activities that for the clarification and defense of the Truth must be said. The Epiphany-enlightened saints will understand this matter as it is intended, while we know that the unclean Levites will criticize it. Among the persons and their activities that we did not expound antitypically above were the four soldiers, who, as four, according to Roman law, under a centurion, had charge of Jesus' crucifixion (Matt. 27:27-37, 54), and who divided Jesus' garments, casting lots for His robe (v. 35). We understand these four soldiers to represent the following: (1) arresting and otherwise mistreating policemen; (2) legal advisors for the prosecution and prosecuting attorneys; (3) condemning magistrates; and (4) police station officials who jailed various brethren. Each of these took away some of the separate official powers (garments) of the Large Jesus and all of them by lot, or chance, agreement, left it to the magistrates to take away for themselves from the Large Jesus His office as public mouthpiece (the seamless robe). The stupefying drug that they offered the Large Jesus was their false legal opinions that they desired the Large Jesus to accept as true, but that He rejected as erroneous. The soldiers watching Jesus represent the four above-mentioned classes in their hostile attitude closely and hinderingly watching the Large Jesus as He still sought to perform His work as mouthpiece to the public, in lecture, conversation, colporteur and volunteer work for the Lord.

(78) Above we did not explain the antitypes of Jesus' seven sayings on the cross. We will do so here. The first of these was: "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do" (Luke 23:34). Biblical Numerics proves that this passage is genuine. We are, therefore, to understand it to mean that Jesus desired

the Father to forgive His crucifiers, not then, but when due, *e.g.*, 1878 for the Jews as a whole (Is. 40:1, 2) and for the misled Israelites indeed, like Paul, those whom Peter accused of crucifying the Lord (Acts 2:23, 36; 3:13-17), etc., whenever they would be brought to repentance and faith, and for the Gentiles connected with His crucifixion in the Millennium, if not ready for it before. Antotypically the Large Jesus prayed forgiveness on their crucifiers. Its antitype occurred in the prayers of persecuted priests for their persecutors' forgiveness. The next statement on the cross was Jesus' telling the penitent thief that he would be with Him in the Millennial Kingdom, especially in its Little Season (Luke 23:40-43). This found its antitype in some of the Levites' resenting the impenitent Levites' railing on the Large Jesus, in asking for forgiveness for their past railing and for help, when the Jesus class would have the power to render it. These received comforting assurances. Such apologies and requests were made, among others, to the Editor and he always gave comforting replies, in word and act. His correspondence as set forth in part in *The Present Truth* proves this to be true. The third saying of Jesus on the cross was His commending His mother, Mary, and John to one another as mother and son (John 19:25-27). Mary, as the mother of Jesus' humanity, here types the good Youthful Worthies, who at times in the Bible are set forth as a class by themselves and at times as of one class with the Ancient Worthies, of whom Jesus' humanity was a member, *i.e.*, a son. Hence from the second viewpoint, *i.e.*, that of the Ancient and Youthful Worthies as being one class, the usual viewpoint from which our Pastor set them forth, the Large Jesus in their humanity would be a figurative son of the Worthies. John represents the good Levites who are in the Epiphany Movement, not yet manifested as Levites. In the Epiphany Movement from 1931 onward more stress has been laid on winning

new Youthful Worthies and on seeking to develop the other Youthful Worthies than before, which stress doubtless has deeply impressed this antitypical John; and this is the antitype of Jesus' commending Mary and John to one another as mother and son. These three sayings of Jesus probably were uttered between the third and sixth hour on the cross.

(79) The other four sayings of Jesus on the cross were all uttered during the ninth hour (John 19:28; Matt. 27:45, 46; Luke 23:46; John 19:30). Accordingly, there was silence on Jesus' part for about three hours between His third and fourth saying; and there was an average of one hour silence on Jesus' part between the first, second and third sayings. He thus was silent most of the time on the cross, doubtless finding it necessary to remain silent in order the better to overcome amid His stressful trials. Judging from the time order of the fulfillment, Jesus seems to have uttered the cry, "I thirst," as the first of His last four sayings on the cross, though from the Gospels we can draw no certain conclusion on this point. What is the antitype? The great thirst for an understanding of the pertinent condition felt by not a few of the Priesthood, perhaps by all. We will give an illustration from our experience. We all recall that the ninth hour of large Friday was from Feb. 1 to July 1, 1933. During that time we were looking for the death of the Large Jesus—either the beginning of the end, or the end of the end of our public ministry, we were not certain which. As the days, weeks and months of that symbolic hour wore on, our watching for the expected event became all the more tense. When June 7, the date for our leaving for Europe on our annual pilgrim trip there, came, no word had yet come from Washington which seemed to indicate that death. It was now only about three weeks until the ninth hour would be over and we became much concerned for information, since everything else up to the ninth hour had been antityped.

(80) No word coming before we had to leave, we told Sr. Johnson of our deep concern, asking her to let us know immediately of any word coming from Washington connected with the shutting down of our work. We arrived in Britain June 15, where day after day until we left for Norway, June 24, we went to the Post Office wherever we were, eagerly expecting some word. In every letter that we wrote home we anxiously asked for pertinent information. Arriving in Bergen, Norway, Sunday, June 25, we had to wait until the next day for the P.O. to open. By now our desire for the pertinent information was intense; but it was not satisfied at Bergen, where on Monday and Tuesday we made frequent calls at the P.O. We reached Oslo on June 28, only two days before the ninth hour was over, which thought only increased our anxious desire for the requisite information. We went at once to the P.O., where a letter from our secretary awaited us. It contained newspaper clippings, among which were some that showed that on June 14 Congress had finished with the legislation that gave our President quasi-dictatorial powers and that he had signed these on June 15. Immediately we saw in the conferring of such powers, which later on might be used to suppress our public work, the beginning of the end of our public work—the death of Large Jesus. Thus this consuming thirst for the involved information was our part in the thirst of the Large Jesus. Many brethren in Europe and then later in America told us of their similar anxiety for the same information. Thus was antityped Jesus' thirst in the ninth hour.

(81) What was the antitype of the fifth saying on the cross, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" Its antitype was the sense of abandonment from God that the Priests then felt. Again we will give our part in the antitypical experience as illustrative of the whole. While kept waiting for word to come to us from America as to the death of the Large Jesus, we

suffered keenly in mind; for it looked much as though that symbolic death would not set in before July 1, the end of the ninth hour. As day after day passed in England, Scotland and then in Bergen, Norway, our mental distress continued to increase over the seeming non-fulfillment of the pertinent feature of the type, all others preceding it having been fulfilled. Finally we began to feel that the Lord's withholding this information from us was an evidence of His forsaking us; and in much distress we cried out to Him, asking why it was. We were later assured by other brethren, both in Europe and America, that they had similar experiences. In these we recognize the antitype of our Lord's agonizing cry on the cross, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" What is the antitype of the sixth saying, "Father, into Thy hands I deposit [I.V.] My spirit [right to life, etc.]"? From the Bible account we cannot tell whether this statement of Luke 23:46 or the statement, "It is finished," of John 19:30, contains our Lord's last words; but here again, as in the case of the fourth and fifth sayings on the cross, the antitype gives us the time order; for of the last two sayings on the cross Luke 23:46 was fulfilled first.

(82) Again, we will give our part in the antitype as an illustration of its fulfillment in the whole class. Remembering that the arrest of the Large Jesus consisted of a heavy financial loss—\$16,000.00 lost through the decision on the will case—before the ninth hour was 15 antitypical minutes old we began to fear that the death of the Large Jesus might bring with it an even greater financial loss. And as the ninth hour wore on, this fear continued to increase, with consequent increased mental distress. Nor did we succeed in casting it wholly upon the Lord until during our pilgrim visit at Bergen, Norway, June 25-27, when in complete resignation we told the Lord we left it entirely to His disposal. With that we became peaceful on this score. Other brethren had more or less distress with the same problem, particularly

two of the managers of Branches in Europe. The pertinent questions of many others make us feel that they, too, were distressed over the same matter, but finally cast the burden upon the Lord. The final word, "It is finished," had its fulfillment, so far as the Editor is concerned, at Oslo, Norway, June 28, when we got the above-mentioned news clippings from America, and therefrom immediately recognized the relation of the pertinent news to the death of the Large Jesus. Then we knew that our pertinent sufferings were over, that we had been victorious in the involved fight and that we would go forward successfully with the Epiphany work unto a completion to the Divine pleasing. And our above-mentioned discourse and its publication as an article gave the same three assurances to the Faithful everywhere who heard and read it. Thus in these three assurances was the seventh saying on the cross fulfilled.

(83) We are now ready to take up the events of the large sixth wonderful day following our Lord's death. The first of these was the rending of the vail between the temple's holy and most holy into two parts from top to bottom. This turned the two parts of the temple into one, which undid both parts in their own peculiarity, *i.e.*, unmade them as the holy and most holy, which symbolized that no more did God recognize the services performed in either. This was also shown in another way: the rending of the vail itself, which, without considering its making one apartment out of the two, would symbolize the abrogation of the typical sacrifices and their consequent non-recognition any more by God; for the second vail to the Jews meant the completion of the sacrifice of the typical bullock and goat, and to rend it in two from top to bottom represents demolishing the typical sacrifices as Divinely acceptable offerings. What is typed by the rending of the vail? God's manifestation of His complete dissanctioning of Babylon's services as offerings to Him. What

external acts are evidences of such a dissanction: (1) the Truth proclaimed on this subject as a part of a lecture on the Hour of Rev. 17:12 that we delivered in Europe during our 1933 pilgrim trip and that in *The Present Truth*, No. 180, appeared as an article; (2) the complete collapse of papal efforts to control Mussolini, as the beginning of the collapse of all papal efforts to control the last phase of antitypical Jehoram of Israel and antitypical Ahaziah of Judah—dictatorships; (3) the subservient support that both the beast and the image are giving to dictators, which will increase until Armageddon hurls these two and the dragon into the symbolic lake of fire.

(84) We will reserve considering the earthquake and the awakening of the Ancient Worthies until later, and consider now the scene at the foot of the cross at Jesus' death. At the foot of the cross stood, bewildered and sorrowing, Mary, Jesus' mother, and John, the beloved disciple (John 19:25-27), which types the bewildered yet sympathetic interest that the Epiphany Truth Youthful Worthies and Levites (not yet revealed as such) took in the sufferings and death of the Large Jesus. For awhile there also stood at the foot of the cross, during the earlier stages of the crucifixion, Mary, the sister of Jesus' mother and also Mary Magdalene (v. 25). These represent: the former the good Merarites, and the latter the good Kohathites (unorganized Levites). Their standing at the foot of the cross during the earlier stages of the crucifixion types their antitypes' bewildered and sympathetic interest in the Large Jesus undergoing the earlier stages of His crucifixion. Their later withdrawing to a distance (Matt. 27:55, 56) and viewing Him "afar off" represents the decreased sympathy of the two antitypical classes as the Large Jesus' crucifixion was in its later stages. These two women are the only ones expressly named among those women who were present at Jesus' burial. It will be noticed that many other

women, who ministered to Jesus from Galilee onward, and among whom was Salome, seemingly James' and John's mother (Matt. 27:56; Mark 15:40) stood afar off. Salome types the better Levites among the antitypical Gershonites, bewildered and somewhat sympathetic ("afar off") toward the Large Jesus throughout His crucifixion stages. The unnamed women type the better Levites among the eight subdivisions of the three main divisions and among the many sub-subdivisions of the Levites. All of these had a bewildered and somewhat sympathetic ("afar off") interest in the crucifixion of the Large Jesus. While nothing in the type shows it, undoubtedly the railing of the two large thieves had something to do with the decreased sympathetic interest of the better antitypical Kohathites and Merarites, as it also was in part responsible for the little sympathetic interest of the better antitypical Gershonites and that of the better members of the Levitical subdivisions and sub-subdivisions. Thus slander defiles.

(85) As pointed out above, the impenitent and penitent thieves type respectively the impenitent bad Levite leaders and their impenitent bad partisan supporters, and the penitent Levite leaders and their penitent partisan supporters. The Jews requesting the breaking of the legs of Jesus and the two thieves represent the nominal church clergy and their partisan supporters requesting special repression against all the Truth people from about Jan., 1932, until about July, 1933, which would result, they thought, in proving them not to love God supremely and the neighbor as self; for as shown in *The Present Truth* the legs represent these two parts of justice whereby people walk in the paths of righteousness. Such special persecutions did reach the large thieves, *e.g.*, the jailings, etc., of partisan Societyites during those times in America, with the intended design of manifesting their unrighteousness attained. They did not attain such effects with

the Large Jesus. The increasing persecutions against the Truth people in lands where dictatorships and quasi-dictatorships hold sway is not involved in this picture. Such come under the picture of the fiery furnace. *E.g.*, the restraints put upon the Epiphany and other brethren in Poland, Germany, Austria, Italy, etc., belong to the antitypical fiery furnace experience. The breaking of the thieves' legs and the piercing of Jesus' side (John 19:32-37) evidently occurred before the centurion's harsh four subordinates declared Jesus to be a righteous man (Matt. 27:54); because after such a conviction none of the soldiers would have inflicted on Jesus the indignity of the spear-thrust. As we will see, the chronology of the antitype corroborates this view.

(86) The next episode of the crucifixion day was that of Joseph of Arimathea going to, and asking of Pilate Jesus' body. He went as soon as the evening came. The Jews had two evenings: the first from 3 to 6 and the second from 6 to 9. Evidently here the first evening was meant, because Jesus had to be buried, and actually was buried before the second evening began (John 19:31, 42). The Lord privileged Bro. Jolly and the writer to antitype Nicodemus and Joseph respectively. The journey of antitypical Joseph to Pilate was a mental one, consisting of two parts. The weighing of, and determining on going, began in the preparation of a discourse, the one on *The Signs of the Times*, which was preparatory to the preparation of the one on the large sixth wonderful day reproduced above, and one on Rev. 17:12. We began (1) to prepare the second of these immediately after July 1, 1933, and (2) for the first time delivered it at Poznan, Poland, July 9, less than 4 symbolic minutes after 3 P.M. of the large sixth wonderful day, these two acts being the start of the journey. As Joseph's mind was filled with the thoughts of that literal day's events as he went to Pilate, so our frequent delivering of that talk that

summer and early fall filled our mind with the scenes of the antitypical day, even as our writing of the discourse out as an article, intermittently from Sept. 26 to Oct. 5, did the same. So far we have described the first part of the journey—its thoughts. The second part of the typical journey consisted in its walking. The antitype consisted in our preparing the discourse, afterward written out as an article, entitled, *The Hour of Rev. 17:12, for The Present Truth*, No. 180; and in our giving it from Poland onward in the summer of 1933. What we gave in England and Scandinavia in a discourse on, *The Signs of the Times*, was a preparation for, not of, this discourse and for the one on the large sixth wonderful day; and seems to be the antitype of Joseph's weighing the question of going to Pilate and determining to do it, while the physical walking proper corresponds with the giving and publishing of the discourse, *The Hour of Rev. 17:12*. The second time we delivered it we became involved with the civil powers, resulting in certain court and police actions in Poland, from which the Lord delivered us; and scarcely had the article been published when we found ourself in the presence of antitypical Pilate, from whom we asked for what proved to be possession of the body of the Large Jesus, *i.e.*, this class as in the condition of the beginning of its public ministry's end.

(87) One of the largest contributors to the Truth Fund, in making out his income tax declaration according to the law, asked the U.S. Treasury for tax exemption on his contributions to the Laymen's Home Missionary Movement, the name of our public work. This occasioned the U.S. Treasury to ask us, in a letter dated Nov. 23, 1933 (Large Friday at 3:57 1/5 P.M.), to give it: (1) "all facts related to its operations, which affect its right to exemption"; (2) its "latest financial statement"; (3) "a copy of the By-Laws"; (4) "a copy of the Charter or Article of Incorporation."

From these questions it will be seen that the Treasury Department believed that the Laymen's Home Missionary Movement was not a movement, but a corporation, an association or a society, *i.e.*, a symbolic wagon. In our reply, dated Nov. 27, 1933 (3:58 4/5 P.M., Large Friday), we assured the Department that the Movement was none of these and thus had no by-laws, charter or article of incorporation. Then we gave a description of the Movement in about a page and three-fourths of a single spaced typewritten letter, 8 x 11 inches. The agent of the Department who wrote to us was a Roman Catholic. This prompted us, while giving a clear and fearless statement, on the nature, work and finances of the Movement, tactfully to present the matter so as not to prejudice a Romanist (Mark 15:43, "boldly"; John 19:38, "secretly for fear of the Jews"). On Dec. 21 (4:08 2/5 P.M., Large Friday) the Treasury Department's agent in Philadelphia wrote to us to the effect that he had on Dec. 2, 1933 (4:00 4/5 P.M., Large Friday), forwarded ours of Nov. 27 to the Department for a ruling on whether the Laymen's Home Missionary Movement is to be considered an exempt Movement, which, if so considered, would mean that its contributors would be exempt from income taxes on their contributions up to 15% of their entire net income. He further stated that the Department at Washington further required that we make our statement as an affidavit, and, because it was not yet certain as to the Movement's nature, that it requested that we add to the explanations in ours of Nov. 27 the following: (1) who has title to the Movement's finances and property; (2) to whom and for what purpose the funds of the Movement have been paid; and (3) that we give a classified list of receipts and disbursements for the last year.

(88) On Dec. 28 (4:11 1/5 P.M., Large Friday) we answered, incorporating the new things requested and the pertinent matters of the one of Nov. 27 into

one letter, which was of nearly five full pages, 8 x 11 inches, single spaced typewritten matter. In this letter we claimed exemption on the legal ground that, while the involved property: the magazines, books, booklets, plates, etc., were ours, and the contributions were deposited in the bank in our name, this was not because the contributions were our personal property, but because they were placed in our care as a trustee. On Dec. 30, 1933, we handed our letter of Dec. 28 to the Department's agent here; and after he, his lawyer and we discussed the subject, we were all agreed that as a trustee we were entitled to the exemption; and the agent here so recommended the matter to the Department in his communication accompanying our letter of Dec. 28. Then followed a long silence. On March 15 the legal counsel of the Treasury Department at Washington wrote out an opinion and sent it to the Department's agent here, to the effect that the Laymen's Home Missionary Movement was a non-existent thing, *i.e.*, the priesthood was not working as such a movement, rather it was the private business "venture of Mr. Paul S. L. Johnson," *i.e.*, it was only a name for the private business of Paul S. L. Johnson, and that therefore exemption was denied. On March 16 the Philadelphia Internal Revenue agent mailed us a summary of this decision; and we received it March 17, recognizing it immediately as the spear-thrust. Several days later we visited this agent, telling him that we considered the decision unjust, and then asked, since the government's view implied that our contributions were private gifts to us personally, whether we had to report them as a part of the income of our (alleged) "private business." He replied that gifts are not a part of a business' net income, hence were not to be reported in an income tax declaration, which means that, since in America there has never been a net income of \$5,000.00 in the business end of our work, we need make no income tax return. In the series of facts

just given we have the antitype of all Joseph's dealing with Pilate and the related acts up to and including the latter's permission to take Jesus' body down from the cross and to bury it. Let us now look at these facts as such antitypes.

(89) The Treasury's letter of Nov. 23 seemingly is no part of the antitype. It simply furnished an occasion of requesting the body of the Large Jesus, antitypical of Joseph's requesting Jesus' body. Joseph's request for Jesus' body finds its antitype in our letter of Nov. 27, 1933. Please note its time: 3:58 4/5 P.M. of Large Friday, which would agree quite well with the time of Joseph's arrival in Pilate's presence. At the time we wrote this letter we had for nearly five months seen and proclaimed that the death of the Large Jesus, the beginning of the end of the Priesthood's public mouthpieceship, had set in by June 28, 1933. Hence we were asking for possession of the symbolically dead body by our letter of Nov. 27, 1933, freedom from government control, *i.e.*, as to responsibility to it on taxes. The Treasury's letter in answer to ours of Nov. 27, 1933, to the Philadelphia Internal Revenue agent was antitypical Pilate's unbelievably asking the centurion whether Jesus was already dead; for the Department's letter implied that the Laymen's Home Missionary Movement might be an existent organization and asked for information that might help it to find out whether it was so or not. That part of the agent's letter that accompanied our answer of Dec. 28, 1933, and that implied that the Laymen's Home Missionary Movement was not a corporation or a society, was the antitype of the centurion's reply that Jesus was dead, *i.e.*, to the Department the Movement, before by it believed to be a Society, was thus reported by its agent to be non-existent as a Society, which to it would imply the priesthood was not cooperating in such a movement, while that part of his letter that recommended exemption on the ground that we were in the

Movement's [priesthood's] actual activities functioning as a trustee, a steward, corresponds to the centurion's cry: "This was a righteous man"—one just before the law as to exemption (Luke 23:47). The counsel of the Treasury Department in holding the thought that to the government the Movement was non-existent [and therefore was not a priestly movement] antitypes the soldier who recognized that Jesus was dead (John 19:33). His debatingly writing that thought was the spear-thrust.

(90) The following will clarify this: David's spearmen type that Servant's warriors who controverted by writings; his swordsmen, that Servant's warriors who controverted by discourses; his slingers, that Servant's warriors who controverted by the question and answer method; and his archers, that Servant's warriors who controverted by sharp piercing Bible and other sayings in conversations. Accordingly, the counsel's letter in controversy against our defense of our claim of exemption as a trustee was the spear-thrust, delivered into what he considered non-existent, dead. The government's ruling expressed by its Philadelphia agent, to the effect that (1) contributions, *i.e.*, gifts, were not to be considered as a part of a business net income in the sight of the income tax law, and that (2) we need make no report unless the net income be \$5,000.00 or more—a thing that never happens, because no profit is made on our publications, which are actually sold at a loss, made up by contributions—corresponds to Pilate's giving Joseph permission to take Jesus' body down from the cross and bury it; for in the twofold involved rulings the government gave up to us the Laymen's Home Missionary Movement free from all government claims upon it; for while its ruling against giving the Movement exemption is against the interests of its contributors, its ruling on the other two points actually leaves the Movement as free from making income returns as though it had granted it exemption.

During this conversation with the Department's Philadelphia agent he showed us a list of organizations, etc., that enjoyed such exemption, among which were hospitals and clinics for sick dogs and cats! In this connection he remarked you and your supporters are doing a good religious work that certainly deserves exemption greatly above such dog and cat hospitals and clinics! Perhaps this statement was the antitype of the Centurion saying, "This was the Son of God" (Mark 15:39). Please note the difference in both the type and antitype between this and the expression, "This was a righteous man" (Luke 23:47). At the Detroit Convention, May 26, 1934, we made a lengthy statement on the government's and our income tax exemption dealings and on the earthquake of Matt. 27:51-54. This report on the former fact proved to be the antitype of taking the body of Jesus down from the cross, the primary act of preparing that body for burial. How so? That statement started both Bro. Jolly and the writer in their work as the second part of the burial's preparation, as we will later show, and started the conventioners into a sympathetic cooperation therein.

(91) A careful listener at the Detroit Convention to our explanations on the events of our dealings with the U.S. Treasury Department and to our proofs against the genuineness of the earthquake and Ancient Worthies' resurrection references in Matt. 27:51-54, was Bro. Jolly. This led him shortly after the Convention to prepare a discourse on the interpolated character of these verses, as a vindication of the correctness of our view of the large eight wonderful days against the charge that it was a false view on account of Armageddon's not occurring. Such a discourse would, of course, preserve the symbolically dead Large Jesus from the charge of corruption with deception, which the Levites charge against the Epiphany Priestly movement. Having in a question and answer in The

Present Truth, Nos. 193, 190, pars. 7, 8, reproduced toward the end of this chapter, given the arguments against the genuineness of vs. 52, 53, given by us at the Detroit Convention and used by Bro. Jolly in his pertinent discourse prepared shortly after that Convention and then by him delivered in many places during his subsequent pilgrim visits that summer and fall, we will here omit them and give those that he offered in proof of the interpolated character of the earthquake references in vs. 51, 54: (1) If the earthquake had occurred we should naturally expect it to be mentioned by several evangelists, who mention severally many a less important event, while in the Matthew passage alone is any reference made to the earthquake. (2) The juxtaposition of the earthquake and the recognizedly interpolated character of vs. 52, 53, would arouse suspicion as to the genuineness of the earthquake reference, and that naturally.

(92) We proceed with Bro. Jolly's third proof: (3) The relation of cause and effect as between the earthquake, as cause, and the opening of the graves, as effect, suggests the likelihood of the interpolation of the earthquake as the ground for what is stated in the recognizedly interpolated character of the reference to the Ancient Worthies' resurrection. (4) Had there been an earthquake, Matthew would likely have stated the fact before telling of the vail's being rent, *as giving its cause*. (5) Mark and Luke would also have mentioned it before mentioning the rending of the vail. (6) The omission of the word "other" in v. 54 before the word "things" would not likely have occurred, if the earthquake had really happened. (7) The fulfillment of everything in the large sixth wonderful day as due and in its chronological order, and the non-fulfillment of an antitype for the earthquake, suggests the interpolated character of the earthquake reference. So far Bro. Jolly's points on the subject. On Nov. 25, 1934, *i.e.*, 22 symbolic minutes after the large sixth

wonderful day ended, the Lord gave us the corroboration of Biblical Numerics as to the interpolated character of the earthquake and Ancient Worthies' resurrection references in Matt. 27:51-54; and the next day we wrote out our finding on the subject as an article for *The Present Truth*, No. 194, reproduced at the end of this chapter. In Bro. Jolly's preparing that discourse we find the antitype of Nicodemus securing the 100-weight (the square of 10, the number of perfection in natures lower than divine, Nicodemus' bringing these to preserve the perfect humanity of Jesus from corruption) of myrrh and aloes (respectively Bro. Jolly's counter-corruption arguments against the Ancient Worthies' resurrection and the earthquake as preservatives against the error-corruption of the Large Jesus claimed by the Levites); and in his delivering that discourse we find the antitype of Nicodemus putting these preserving spices into contact with Jesus' body, as a part of its preparation for its burial (John 19:39, 40).

(93) We read that Joseph not only took down (with others' help) the body of Jesus from the cross, but also bought fine clean linen cloth, and with and in it (and the spices) wrapped the body of Jesus as a preparation for its burial (Matt. 27:59; Mark 15:46; Luke 23:53; John 19:40). The antitype of the buying the fine linen cloth we find in the writer's preparing the first discourse on Daniel, which later appeared in *The Present Truth*, No. 191. The antitype of wrapping the body in the fine clean linen cloth we find in the writer's delivering that discourse. In Israel such a preparation of a body for burial was the first of the three tributes of respect given to the dead, the second being the funeral and the third the burial. Some explanations will clarify this matter. In Bible symbols fine linen represents the righteous acts of saints (Rev. 19:8). Righteous acts of our Pastor as the antitype of Daniel in Dan. 1-6, were set forth in that

discourse and article. But some may object that, while that article set forth righteous acts of our Pastor, it did not do so of the whole Large Jesus. We reply that since he was their main leader and they cooperated with him in most of the events and teachings of Dan. 1-6, they are involved in what is said of him. Hence complimentary things said of a leader include the led when they cooperate with the leader in those complimentary things, *e.g.*, the army shared in the honor of a triumph accorded an able victorious Roman general. Hence the preparation of that discourse was the antitype of the buying of the linen that, therefore, symbolizes the righteous acts of the Large Jesus. It will be noted further that Daniel did not type our Pastor in all respects, but only in his mouthpieceship to the world on the religious bearing of secular things; hence the antitype implies the Large Jesus as mouthpiece toward the public on the religious bearing of secular things. The things said of our Pastor in that discourse and article are very complimentary of him; hence are fitting as a partial tribute of respect to the Large Jesus. The delivery of that discourse and its publication as an article enclosed [clothed] our Pastor, and thus in consequence the Large Jesus, in these complimentary sayings, as a tribute of respect to them.

(94) What antityped the funeral and burial of Jesus? The preparation of the discourse on Dan. 7-12, and its writing out as an article, antityped the funeral of Jesus; and the delivery of that discourse, and its being afterward published as an article in *The Present Truth*, No. 192, were the antitype of the burial. A funeral is a public tribute of respect for the dead; and people that come to a funeral come there with that intention, at least externally expressed. Undoubtedly that discourse as prepared and as later written out for publication was a tribute of respect to our Pastor, not only from the standpoint of its contents, but

also from the standpoint of its and its predecessor's being printed as the annual memorial article for him. Hence, for the reason given in the preceding paragraph, the preparation of that discourse and the writing of that article were a tribute of respect to the memory of the Large Jesus, hence was an antitypical funeral. So, too, is a burial a tribute of respect to the dead. That discourse and article on Dan. 7-12 was certainly a tribute of respect to our Pastor and, accordingly, to the Large Jesus. A burial is an encasing of one in a tomb, regardless of whether that tomb is a grave in the sense of a covering of earth or of a sepulchre. Certainly, Bro. Russell, and thus the Large Jesus, was encased in that discourse and article, as in a tomb. Moreover, in that discourse other leaders of the Large Jesus, as antitypical Gabriel, are mentioned in complimentary terms, which would also include the entire class of those led by these—the Large Jesus. It will be noted that the burial was in a rock-hewn sepulchre (Matt. 27:60; Mark 15:46; Luke 23:53), which, since a rock often represents Divine Truth (Matt. 16:18), represents in this case the Divine Truth typically contained in Dan. 7-12, as encompassing Bro. Russell and certain other leaders, and thus the whole Large Jesus.

(95) It will be further noted that the tomb was one that Joseph made, typical of the fact that the antitypical Joseph would prepare the antitypical tomb. Furthermore, it was a new tomb (John 19:41). This types the fact that, while our Pastor gave us a number of indications of himself as typed in Dan. 1-6, the thought as given in the discourse and article on Dan. 7-12, that in Dan. 7-12 Daniel also types our Pastor, was an entirely new one. It had never before been seen and set forth. The fact that never before had anyone been buried in Joseph's sepulchre (Luke 23:53; John 19:41) types the fact that never before was one encased as a tribute of respect in the typical

Divine Truth of Dan. 7-12. The haste to accomplish the burial (John 19:42) before 6 P.M. typifies the haste that we made in preparing and giving the discourse for the strengthening of the weak brethren and in writing it out; because in the latter case it had to be written out, transcribed and corrected before Sept. 29, 1934, the day we took it to the printer in order that it would be completely through the press before we left the Bible House, Oct. 9, on our fall pilgrim trip. The burial ended with closing the door of the sepulchre and the rolling of the huge stone against it. The closing of the door of the sepulchre (Matt. 27:60; Mark 15:46) types the ending of the exposition of Dan. 12 in the statement that Bro. Russell would in the beginning of the Millennial reign enter fully into his Millennial office. The great stone types the teaching set forth in the end of the discourse and article on Dan. 7-12, that Bro. Russell, the chief earthly leader of the Large Jesus, is the one on our Lord's right hand in the Kingdom, which again is complimentary to the Large Jesus as having had him as its chief earthly leader. The rolling of that stone to the door of the sepulchre types the firm proof offered on Bro. Russell as being the one on our Lord's right, which also involves complimentarily those led by him—the Large Jesus, even as that stone made the sepulchre secure. The two Marys and the other women that came with Jesus from Galilee (Matt. 27:61; Mark 15:47; Luke 23:55), following the body to the grave, seeing the sepulchre and how the body was laid, type the better members of the antitypical Kohathites and Merarites and better Levites of lesser groups participating in the antitypical funeral and burial, while the two Marys sitting over against the sepulchre types the better antitypical Kohathites and Merarites mourning over the death of the Larger Jesus, Jewish mourners sitting while mourning.

(96) The above 20 paragraphs and the preceding

ones on the large sixth wonderful day, give us clear antitypes of every general thing that occurred on the Friday of our Lord's death, which demonstrates the correctness of our understanding. And whenever the type offers a time indication, the antitype in every such case occurred at the corresponding time, which completes the demonstration. We were mistaken in only one thing that we expected as probable, *i.e.*, the American Armageddon not occurring before Oct., 1934, which with a fair degree of faith we expected as probable, though we cautioned the brethren several times that it might not happen then, though we were inclined to think it would (The Present Truth, Nos. 62, 14, par. 4; 145, 198, par. 1). Our expectations, which were never expressed otherwise than as probable, were not in this particular fulfilled. But in view of the now proven interpolatory character of the reference to the earthquake, the only thing on which we based that probable expectation, even this failure strongly proves the correctness of our general position; for everything else in the story antityping, the expected earthquake should not have happened in the specified time, since it was no part of this Divinely inspired type. This, we say, all the stronger proves our viewpoint of the large eight wonderful days; for if an interpolation had an antitype, that fact should throw doubt on the entire viewpoint, and reversely, if it had none. We are being greatly accused by those Levites whom the antitype proves to be the large impenitent thief, as being a false prophet because of our expectation [expressed as a probability] of America's Armageddon coming before Oct., 1934. These parts of the large impenitent thief in their shouts, "Johnson is a false prophet," ignore the fact that every Divinely given part of the history so far due has fulfilled as we forecast it, which evidently proves that we are not a false prophet. The many true forecasts should have made them draw the reverse conclusion.

But they do not see these and they focus their eyes on the one mistake (based on a supposedly correct Scripture) made amid perhaps a hundred correct forecasts. In this they remind us of a person who once saw an exceptionally beautiful picture, having on it but one lone fly speck, which fly speck was the only thing about the picture that that person could see! If these members of the large impenitent thief prefer looking at a fly speck to a very beautiful picture—well, every man to his taste! We are sure the Priesthood has better taste than that by a great deal!

(97) Yes, a probability mistake, which we regret, was made. But after all, it was both an inconsequential mistake and an inevitable one. It in nowise impinged against any truth item, nor any feature of Christ-likeness. It really could not cause a sober-minded and sympathetically disposed person great regret that Armageddon has been longer in coming than we expected. Surely, only very immature persons could be sorry that Armageddon has not come so soon as we thought it would likely come. If bad Levites scoff at the mistake, let that not cause us dismay; for they will surely seek and find something to scoff at, despite our best efforts to prevent it. If weak brethren are somewhat shaken thereat, as doubtless some have been, let us remember that if their hearts are right, the good Lord will use the experience for their good; for He will never let a faithful one stumble unto a fall, even if He is pleased sorely to try him. And if such a weak one's heart is not good, the Lord wants such an one to stumble; and He sometimes is pleased to allow mistakes, even of His most faithful servants, to stumble such. So, beloved, let us remember that the Lord can and will work good out of this mistake, which in all fairness in facing the facts must be called an inconsequential one; and if the large impenitent thief does not have the fairness to concede this, let us remember the source of the unfairness,

which will enable us to put a proper value on their views.

(98) Mistake that it was, every just person who understands Biblical symbols and our view of the wonderful days must admit the following extenuating points: (1) Assuming that the earthquake of Matt: 27:51, 54 was genuine, in harmony with Biblical symbols we were warranted in accepting the passage as referring to a great revolution. (2) The great revolution that all Bible Students have for 40 years or more been expecting is Armageddon. (3) The setting of the antitype being mainly American, we were quite warranted by considerations (1) and (2) in applying the earthquake to America's Armageddon. (4) The factually proven time setting of the large sixth wonderful day required the expected earthquake to come between Feb., 1933, and Oct., 1934, if the earthquake reference were genuine. (5) The reference to the earthquake is without exception in all Greek MSS. of the New Testament, containing Matt. 27. (6) Apart from Biblical Numerics, there is no *compelling* argument, like doctrinal, logical and factual errors, as is the case with the reference to the resurrection of the Ancient Worthies in Matt. 27:52, 53, in and about the earthquake reference that proves its fraudulent character. And (7) apart from Biblical Numerics as a proof of the charge against the earthquake reference as an interpolation, we could not, apart from the fulfillment not occurring, as it did occur with every inspired part of the story of our Lord's last day on earth, know that the passage was fraudulent. These seven considerations demonstrate that under the circumstances the mistake, apart from Biblical Numerics, was inevitable, and, therefore, was to be expected under the circumstances, and that, therefore, we should not be blamed much for it.

(99) But one disposed to blame us might say: You are acquainted with the science of Biblical Numerics;

why did you not years ago apply to the earthquake reference the test of Biblical Numerics, which, if done, would have saved you from the mistake? In reply, we would say that we did not suspect the earthquake reference to be an interpolation and, therefore, did not apply to the Biblical Numerics as a test of its genuineness, though to several pilgrim brethren we remarked that the earthquake reference (even as almost any other passage could be interpolated) might be an interpolation; but the thought of this possibility was set aside in our mind by the fact that v. 54, as well as v. 51, refers to the earthquake. Then, too, the earthquake reference could have been Divinely given as the reason for the rending of the vail in twain from top to bottom, despite the fact that the more likely order for its giving would be before the statement on the rending of the vail. These two considerations, combined with the fact that all pertinent Greek MSS. contain the section, convinced us fully that the earthquake reference was genuine. Therefore they and the seven reasons given in the preceding paragraph restrained us from applying the test of Biblical Numerics to the reference; for it takes hours of time and careful work to test a passage by Biblical Numerics. If we were to test by Biblical Numerics every passage that we quote and explain, which to doubt we see no ground, all our time would be spent on Biblical Numerics, which would make us do a Gershonite Amramite work as a text recensionist, and we would not be able to do our Priestly work. Hence when we do not have a compelling reason to doubt the genuineness of a text, we cannot give our time to investigate its genuineness by Biblical Numerics. Up to about April, 1934, we had no compelling reason to begin to doubt the genuineness of the earthquake reference. The fact that certain events occurring after the earthquake reference were fulfilling, whereas the symbolic earthquake had not yet taken place either in America or in

Europe, which is to precede that in America, first raised doubts in our mind on the genuineness of the pertinent matter. But as there were yet six months until Oct., 1934, with the possibility that the time order in the antitype might be different from that in the type, we could not see our way clear to set aside the genuineness of the passage. Our being overcrowded with work prevented our examining the passage by Biblical Numerics before Nov. 25, 1934, a date 56 days after the limit for the antitypical earthquake to set in, if the passage had been genuine. These are the answers that we give to the question, Why did you not years ago examine the earthquake reference by Biblical Numerics?

(100) Therefore, dear brethren, under the circumstances given in the four preceding paragraphs, we do not blame ourself much for the mistake. Nor do we believe the Lord blames us much therefore. We believe the Lord permitted the mistake for the good of all of us, *e.g.*, (1) to test the writer's humility as to whether he would honestly and openly acknowledge the mistake, his faith in the general situation and his endurance of the large thief's "false prophet" shouts; (2) to test the humility, faith and endurance of the Epiphany brethren in the same ways; and (3) to manifest the unfaithful among them and among the various Levite groups. Let us, beloved brethren, stand faithfully under these tests. Let us not be like the large impenitent thief—closing our eyes to the surpassingly beautiful picture the Lord has painted for us in the large six wonderful days already finished, and seeing only a lone fly speck instead! Let us not by this little mistake reject or doubt the Epiphany message, for which the Lord has given us so many proofs, among which are the fulfilled facts of the small eight wonderful days and of six of the large eight wonderful days, in the first set of which the forecasts for the sixth, seventh and eighth days were wonderfully

fulfilled, and in the second set of which the same is true of those of the sixth. After all, beloved brethren, it is the heart's attitude that mainly counts with, and that is being tested by the Lord, rather than the infallibility of our heads, which in all of us are fallible. Let us also from this experience learn that as a part of the mother of the daughter, the Epiphany messenger as a servant of the Great-Company-developing Truth, is not to be entirely cleansed from error until 1954, and that until then gradually will his purification be accomplished. This will help keep us from stumbling at any mistake he may make, which will not be on any vital matter, and will bring us increasingly the blessings that the Lord will minister to us through His labors and prayers for us. Nor should we leave our subject without thanks to the Lord for purifying all of us from the mistake as to the earthquake reference in Matt. 27:51, 54; and above all in this connection let us praise, worship and adore the Lord for His gracious light on the detailed clearness that He has given us on the multitudinous antitypes of the small eight wonderful days and of six of the large eight wonderful days, particularly on those of the large sixth wonderful day!

(101) In this connection arises the following interesting question: Since the twelfth hour of the sixth large wonderful day ended in October [1934] why did not the earthquake antitypical of Matt. 27:51, 54 take place before October [written in Nov., 1934]? To this we answer: The reference to the earthquake in vs. 51, 54 has been proven to be an interpolation, and therefore could have no antitype. For years we have known that vs. 52, 53 were interpolations. Please see Comment. Our Pastor held that vs. 52, 53 were interpolations, because they taught false doctrines, *e.g.*, that the bodies of the dead return (1 Cor. 15:35), that the Ancient Worthies are saints, which only the Gospel-Age Faithful are, that cast-off Jerusalem

was the holy city. The following absurdities also appear in these verses: that those alleged saints remained in their open graves alive for three days before coming out and showing themselves; that they appeared to many Jerusalemites, whereas Jesus would show Himself to none because of their unbelief; that they were recognized, whereas no one could know most of them, never having seen many, if any, of the Ancient Worthies before. Again, against their genuineness our Pastor held the fact that so tremendous a thing as is set forth in vs. 52, 53 would have been mentioned by Mark, Luke and John, who narrate much less important things in common with Matthew. The doctrinal and unreasonable considerations that hold against the genuineness of vs. 52, 53 do not hold against the reference to the earth quaking and the rocks rending in vs. 51, 54. The silence of the other three Evangelists is the only reason against the genuineness of vs. 52, 53 that holds against the genuineness of the earthquake of vs. 51, 54. It was for this reason that we for years held that this was also possibly an interpolation and expressed this possibility to Bros. Jolly, Danielsen and some other leading brethren; but did not feel that the genuineness of the statement could be successfully impugned on the ground of its being just a possibility. Hence we had to wait for the event, which, everything else in the type fulfilling on time, and it failing, arouses strong suspicion of the unguineness of the two pertinent clauses of v. 51—"the earth did quake and the rocks rent"—and the words of v. 54—"the earthquake and" to be interpolations. We did not base the thought of the earthquake's coming in America before October on any other thing than these two clauses. These being interpolations, which however we could not of certainty know before the event, of course, there could not be an antitype of their statements; and the thought based on them as types; *i.e.*, that the

earthquake would occur in America by October has proven to be a mistake. At least we can get this much good out of the experience—the knowledge that the pertinent parts of vs. 51, 54 are interpolations.

(102) Like letters of the Latin alphabet, the letters of the Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic alphabets have not only sound, but also number values. Thus the first letter of the alphabets of these languages stands for 1, the second for 2, the third for 3, etc. This same phenomenon occurs in other, especially Semitic, languages. This results in every Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic word standing not only for an idea, but for a number, which is the sum of the numeric values of its component letters. Accordingly, every word in the Hebrew and Aramaic of the Old Testament and every word of the Greek of the New Testament stands not only for an idea, but also for a number, which is the sum of the numeric values of its component letters. God, knowing this, has constructed the sentences of the Bible in its original languages in such a way as, among other numeric multiples, to make the sum of the numeric value of their words multiples of the number 7. This same principle of the occurrence of the number 7 is often used apart from the numeric values of letters, *e.g.*, the number 7 underlies the whole book of Revelation, not only in the numeric values of its sentences, but of its visions and of the objects treated in its visions, *e.g.*, 7 churches, 7 stars, 7 spirits (teachings), 7 horns and 7 eyes (of the Lamb), 7 seals, 7 trumpets, 7 vials, etc. In fact there is a sevenfold picture given of each general vision of that book. Thus the number 7 underlies it.

(103) Another example of the use of sevens is in the genealogy given in Matt. 1, which helps to overcome one of the difficulties of the genealogy. In this genealogy there is a threefold mention of 14 generations, thus a threefold occurrence of 14, *i.e.*, a total of 42, which is a multiple of 7. Actually this genealogy

omits the names of three of Jesus' ancestors. Why is this done? Did God make a mistake therein? Assuredly not! Why then was it done? To give us a clue on the structure of the Bible as consisting of numerics, especially of the numerics of 7, which God worked into this feature of Matt. 1, even to the extent of abbreviating the genealogy to work the multiple of 7 into the genealogy. Accordingly, Bible sentences consist of words the sum total of whose numeric values in their letters is a multiple of 7. And when these values in our present manuscripts are not a multiple of 7, there has some change occurred from what the sentence was as originally given by God. This change may be in the omission of letters or of words, or of phrases, or of clauses, or of sentences, or it may be in the addition thereof. Hence Biblical numerics furnishes us a fine criterion whereby we can determine whether a letter, a word, a phrase, a clause or a sentence as it stands in our present Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Biblical manuscripts is genuine, in whole or in part, or which reading is genuine when there are variant readings in the manuscripts. The celebrated interpolation in 1 John 5:7 on the three that bear witness in heaven under the test of Biblical numerics breaks down. So does every other interpolation in our Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic manuscripts of the Bible. The failure of the American Armageddon to set in before Oct., 1934, while every other feature of the first six of the eight large wonderful days did fulfill before that date, moved us to examine Matt. 27:51-54 by the numerics of 7 and we find thereby that the references to the earthquake and the rent rocks in vs. 51 and 54 and the entirety of vs. 52 and 53 to be interpolations. Hence, of course, the involved type as God gave it did not contain the reference to the earth quaking and the rocks rending, etc., and therefore did not refer to the American Armageddon, which, accordingly, the inspired type did not teach would occur during the sixth large wonderful

day, but which, accepting as genuine the involved words of vs. 51, 54, we had set forth in the picture of the sixth large wonderful day as to come before Oct., 1934.

(104) Above proofs were given that the last two clauses of Matt. 27:51 and the whole of vs. 52 and 53 and part of v. 54 were interpolations. Hence we give in this article the proof of the same thing from the standpoint of Biblical numerics. We will quote the entire section from the I.V., italicizing and bracketing the interpolated words: (51) "And, lo, the veil of the temple was rent into two [parts]; [*and the earth was shaken, and the rocks were rent, (52) and the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints that have slept were raised; (53) and after coming forth out of the tombs, after his rising, they entered into the holy city and appeared to many;*] (54) but the centurion and those with him guarding Jesus, after seeing [*the earthquake and*] the things that happened, were greatly affrighted, saying, Truly this was God's Son." We first added all the numeric value of all the words as they occur in the Greek of the entire passage above quoted. They totaled 39,506, which divided by 7 = 5,643 $\frac{5}{7}$. This showed that there was something wrong with the passage as it now stands in the Greek. We then added the numeric value of the suspected words and found that they totaled 18,583. This we divided by 7, getting as a result, 2,654 $\frac{5}{7}$. Both results being $\frac{5}{7}$ out of line, we knew, before we divided them, that the numeric value of the unsuspected words were divisible by 7. The numeric value of the unsuspected words is 20,923, which divided by 7 = 2,989. This, again, divided by 7 = 427, which in turn divided by 7 = 61. Thus the unsuspected words are not only a multiple of 7, but a multiple of $7 \times 7 \times 7$. This is trebly convincing.

(105) To test this result by the other possibilities of the situation, we decided to work on them further.

Thereupon we added the numeric value of the unsuspected Greek words and the numeric value of the suspected Greek words in v. 51: $20,923 + 2,298 = 23,221$. This divided by 7 = $3,317 \frac{2}{7}$. This is in line with the thought that the suspected words are interpolations. Thereafter we added the numeric value of the unsuspected words of vs. 51, 54 and the suspected words in vs. 52 and 53: $20,923 + 16,227 = 35,304$ [PT '35, p. 32: $20,923 + 15,304 = 36,227$], which divided by 7 = $5,175 \frac{2}{7}$, which shows vs. 52 and 53 to be interpolations. The interpolation of vs. 52 and 53 has for years been recognized, but here for the first time is proven so by numerics. The crucial test would be the total of the unsuspected words in the entire passage and the suspected words in vs. 51 and 54; for the suspected words in these two verses are inseparably interlinked. The numeric value of the suspected Greek words in v. 54 is 981. Hence $20,923 + 2,298$ [as given in line 5 of this paragraph] + 981 = 24,202, which divided by 7 = $3,457 \frac{3}{7}$. Hence the suspected words hitherto not known to be interpolations are hereby proven to be such. There is another possibility—that the suspected words in v. 54 are interpolations, but that the rest of the suspected words are not such. But this possibility was disproven by the numeric total of the passage minus the suspected words in v. 54: thus (as above) $39,506 - 981 = 38,525$, which divided by 7 = $5,503 \frac{4}{7}$. This disproves the thought that the whole passage as it stands, except the interpolated words of v. 54, is entirely genuine.

(106) Another set of considerations proves that the unsuspected parts of the whole passage form but one sentence, which is another way of proving that the suspected parts form no part of the genuine original; for every sentence of the genuine original is based upon Biblical numerics. Thus the numeric value of the unsuspected part of v. 51 is 8,038, which is not a multiple of 7. Hence that part is not a full sentence. Since the numeric value of the unsuspected part of v. 51

is 8,038, and of its suspected part is 2,298, their total is 10,336, which is not a multiple of 7. Therefore they do not form a complete sentence. Neither does the total numeric value of the unsuspected and suspected parts of vs. 51-53 form a multiple of 7, for $8,038 + 17,602 = 25,640$, which is not a multiple of 7. Hence vs. 51-53 do not form one sentence. The first point that we presented above proves from the numerical value of all four verses that they do not form one sentence. From the data given as the last point of the preceding paragraph, we see that the omission of the suspected words in v. 54 does not result in the rest of the vs. 51-54 forming one sentence. The only other possibility is the omission of all the suspected parts of these four verses, and that possibility yields the following results: The numeric value of the unsuspected part of v. 51 is 8,038 and the numeric value of the other unsuspected words of this section (parts of v. 54) is 12,885. The total of the numerics of these two members is 20,923, which, as shown in the first paragraph, is not only a multiple of 7, but a multiple of $7 \times 7 \times 7$. Accordingly, in the first place, Biblical numerics proves that no one sentence can be formed, harmonious with Biblical numerics, out of vs. 51-54, except by combining into one sentence the Greek words for the words that we have left unitalicized and unbracketed in our quotation of vs. 51-54 above. Thus, in the second place, Biblical numerics proves that the reference to the earthquake and the rending rocks, as well as vs. 52 and 53, in the passage of vs. 51-54, is an interpolation. Hence these involved words are no part of inspired Scripture, hence do not belong to the types of the sixth small or large wonderful day, and hence the Bible does not in the eight large wonderful days forecast the American Armageddon as coming before Oct., 1934. The mistaken forecast was based on the very natural assumption that the pertinent words were genuine Scripture, which Biblical numerics,

and now the fulfilled facts prove them not to be. This interpolation crept into the Bible before our oldest extant manuscripts of the Greek New Testament were written.

(1) What are typed by our Lord's experiences in His last six days and the following two days? What character do the typical and antitypical experiences have? Of what were Jesus' final experiences typical? What two passages give the first proof of this? How do they prove it? What two passages give the second proof of this? How do they prove it? What parallel case lends corroborative proof? What two passages give this corroborative proof? How do they give such proof? What conclusion may we draw from these three points?

(2) How does the connection of Zech. 11:12, 13 prove that these two verses apply to the Church in the end of the Age? What is the teaching of Zech. 1:1, 2? 3-9? 3? 4? 5? 6? 7? 8? 9? 10? 11? 14? 15-17?

(3) At the writing of this matter near what were God's people? In this picture whom does Jesus type? Judas? Peter, John and James? The other eight disciples? The Jewish clergy? Pilate? What does our Lord's capture type? His trial before the Sanhedrin? Before Pilate? His condemnation by the Sanhedrin? Pilate? The crucifixion? Jesus' being in the death state? His resurrection? What in this connection is the difference between the antitypical John the Baptist and Elijah? How will this distinction help us to understand the possibility of a public ministry of the Church after antitypical John's beheading?

(4) What picture was described in the preceding three paragraphs? What other picture do the involved eight days give? What is it called? In what order will these two pictures be set forth in this chapter? What is the second picture called? When was the small set of days to begin? How long was it to last? What does the staff, Bands, represent? Its breaking? When did the first rays of the Epiphany Truth begin to shine? What really were they and some later unfoldings? In its proper sense what was the first sunburst of the Epiphany light? When was it first clarified? When and where was it first presented?

Why, and only why, can Zech. 11:12, 13, according to Matt. 27:8, 9, be applied to Jesus? Why, and only why, can Ps. 2:1-3, according to Acts 4:23-28, be applied to Jesus? Strictly speaking, to whom does Zech. 11:12, 13 apply? Why? Of what pictures is this true? Why is this true? When did both betrayals begin, relatively to our Pastor's death?

(5) What was first suggested as the beginning time of the small betrayal? What does maturer thought show? Why is this true? With what was the betrayal work begun? When was this? Of what acts did its first phase consist? In fulfillment of what Scripture? When in the small picture did the eight wonderful days begin? What occurred at the feast at Bethany? How long was it before our Lord's death? When did Jesus arrive at Bethany? When was the feast held? After what acts, and when did Judas make his first betrayal visit? What is the small antitype of these acts? With what does the beginning of that Saturday correspond? What in the small picture do the involved eight days represent? What corroborates such a use of a typical day? So viewed, what is brought to our knowledge? How, according to the subjoined table, do the typical and antitypical days stand related to one another *as to time*?

(6) Where are the events of the involved Saturday afternoon and evening recorded? To what do those events correspond in the small picture? Whom does Simon, the leper, type? What things corroborate this? What does the feast represent? Whom does Jesus type in the Bethany supper scene? The eleven Apostles? Judas? Martha? Mary? What was typed by Mary's anointing Jesus? By the complaints of the Eleven? Of Judas? Whom did Lazarus type? What did they show after our Pastor's death?

(7) What is typed by Judas' visiting the priests at his first betraying visit? What influenced him thereto, type and antitype? What did he do there, type and antitype? What does our study of the involved late Saturday afternoon and Saturday evening show as to type and antitype?

(8) How are the references on the feast already given to be harmonized with Luke 22:1-6? Who alone of the

four evangelists tell of Judas' Tuesday night visit to the priests?

(9) What is found necessary to prove? On what day of Nisan did Jesus hold His triumphal entrance into Jerusalem? What was done on that day with the typical lamb? On what day of Nisan was Jesus crucified? As what did He then die? How does 1 Cor. 5:7, 8 prove Him to be the antitypical Passover Lamb? When does God reckon that Nisan 14 to have begun? When did that Nisan's 13th begin and end? Its 12th? Its 11th? Its 10th? Accordingly, when did the triumphal entry occur? What nominal-church teaching does this refute? How is John 12:12-19 to be harmonized with this view? What do the evangelists record as occurring during daylight, Sunday?

(10) When did the involved Monday, type and antitype, begin and end? Where are its typical events recorded? What are these events?

(11) In what part of Monday did Jesus enter Jerusalem? What time does this type? What is the antitype of His entrance? Of the colt and ass? Of the riding into the city? What does the multitude's hailing and rejoicing type? Jesus' announcing Jerusalem's overthrow? Wherein was the antitypical announcement made? What is typed by the children acclaiming Him? By the murderous plans of the priests, etc.?

(12) What is antitypical Tuesday in the small picture? What is its only recorded incident? Where is it recorded? How does it read? In the first instance what does it type? For our line of thought what does the tree type? What does the cursing type? What did the Epiphany priesthood teach of the revolutionistic Levite systems? Wherein were such teachings given? What special numbers? Why, in type and antitype, was no fruit found? What is typed by the withering of the fig tree? What are some illustrations of the antitypical withering?

(13) To what does the involved Wednesday correspond? What is its first recorded event? When did it occur? Read its record. How does a comparison of Luke 22:1-6 with Matt. 26:1-5 and Mark 14:1, 2 show that this was the second betraying visit? What was shown

above? What Levites were developed from Feb. to June, 1920? When did certain of their leaders begin their betraying acts? What did R.H. Hirsh do in this connection? Parallel in fact and time to what acts of J.F.R. was this act? What did the former soon gain? Of whom were these the small antitypes? What is typed by Jesus' foretelling in Matt. 26:2 His betrayal? At what antitypical time? What was one feature of such antitypical warning? A second? A third?

(14) What is the account of the second recorded event of the involved Wednesday? What did the good Levites recognize as evidences of the withering of the Levite systems? In small antitype of whom did they therein act? What did Jesus' pertinent exhortation type in the small picture? Through what two ways did the small Jesus give this encouragement?

(15) What is the record of our Lord's authority being questioned? What is its small antitype? What was the result, type and antitype? How does the parable of the two sons read? Whom do they symbolize? What is the antitype of Jesus' giving the parable of the two sons? When was it fulfilled? What is the record of the parable of the wicked husbandman? What does Jesus' giving it type? To what did such announcement lead, in type and antitype? What is the record of the parable of the marriage feast? What does Jesus' giving it type? Who have testified of the fulfillment in the case of the small antitypical off-casting of the wedding robe?

(16) What is the record of the insidious questions of the Pharisees? Of the Sadducees? Of the testful question of the Lawyer? What is the small antitype of these questions? Of Jesus' refuting the involved errors? Whereby were part of the refutative answers given? What is the record of Jesus' confounding His detractors by questions on the source of John's ministry and on His own person and office? Of the inability of said detractors to answer? What are the small antitypes of these involved actors and things?

(17) What is another feature of Jesus' teachings on the involved Wednesday? What is the record of these? What is the small antitype? Where are these severe criticisms recorded? How many of them were there? What may be

their numerical types? Who, of course, joined in these criticisms? What is typed by our Lord's being denounced for making the typical criticisms? Who really, in type and antitype, were not, and who were proper objects of the involved criticisms? What is the record of casting gifts into the treasury? What is typed by our Lord's noting and remarking on the givers in the temple? In what two ways was the small antitype fulfilled?

(18) What is the story of John 12:20-36? With what are its events and remarks connected in the small antitype? What did not a few worldlings desire in the small antitype? As what did this lead the Epiphany-enlightened saints to recognize themselves? To what did it move them to testify? What fourth thing occurred in them? How are these four things typed in the passage under discussion? What did they say of Satan and his empire? How is this typed? What is typed by God's answer from heaven? When and where was the antitypical answer first given? When and where was it first published? On what antitypical day? What is typed by the people's doubts on the sense of the answer? What is typed by Jesus' showing what, as God's Christ, He would accomplish? By His exhorting the people to act in harmony with the Truth? Where can this be seen?

(19) What is the record of our Lord's great prophecy? When did He deliver it and the parables of Matt. 25? How is this shown typically in the three cited passages? Broadly speaking, what seven things does Jesus' telling the things of this prophecy type for the small picture? How were the last three things not told? How were they told? From the standpoint of the small picture, what did Jesus' telling the parable of the ten virgins type? The parable of the talents? The parable of the sheep and goats? Why does the parable of the pounds not belong to the eight wonderful days?

(20) What is the antitype of the time between 6 P.M. of the involved Wednesday and 6 P.M. of the involved Thursday? How many other events are recorded of that time? What is the record? What is typed by Jesus' staying away from, and being silent toward the Jews on the involved Thursday? Why are the things said and done in *The Present Truth*, Nos. 32-34, no contradiction of this?

What is the small antitype of John's and Jesus' reflections on the unbelief of the Jews?

(21) What was given above? What is not to be construed therefrom? Why would such a construction be wrong? What is the purpose of making the above-mentioned applications? What justifies us therein? What seals such applications?

(22) What was not the Lord's will as to the remaining three days? Why not? Why are trialsome experiences not to be understood beforehand? Of what character would prying into them beforehand partake? What, accordingly, will be offered instead of such details? What does the Passover feast of the involved Thursday night type? Whom do the feasting Eleven type? Judas' leaving the feast? If our time setting is correct, when was the death of the small Jesus to occur? What will then occur to the Epiphany priesthood? As what? What will be their resultant condition? How regarded by a few? What do the pertinent Scriptures say of the typical events?

(23) What is recorded of the Sanhedrists' activities on the seventh day? What is the small antitype of the seventh day? What is the small antitype of the Sanhedrists' activities on that day? What is typed by the failure of their efforts? Why so, in type and small antitype? What is the small antitype of the eighth day? What is the small antitype of Jesus' resurrection? What is the small antitype of Jesus' convincing increasing numbers of His resurrection? What should the anticipation of these events move the Epiphany saints to do? After the type of whom? What would thereby be accomplished? Assured of what?

(24) When was the foregoing part of this chapter written and published? By 1930 what had already been passed? What did they witness? When were these small antitypes enacted? How many paragraphs does the postscript contain? When was it written? What was its object? What does the feast, with its discourses, in the upper room type in the small picture? How long did the antitypical feast last? Wherein can this be seen? What were some of these articles and opportunities of service?

(25) Whom does Judas type in the small picture? In what respects? His leaving the feast, before it ended? What is a noted example of such? What is the small

antitype of the Sanhedrists' anger at Jesus for His rebukes and their determination "to get" Him? What was their object in the type and the small antitype? What does our Lord's Gethsemane experience type as to the small picture? In that scene what do Peter, James and John type? The drowsiness of all the Eleven?

(26) What were the little Judas' betraying acts? Of what did the trial before the little Sanhedrin consist? What in the small picture is typed by the false testimonies against our Lord before the Sanhedrin? By the high priest's adjuring Him to tell whether He were the Christ? What is a marked case of such a small antitypical challenge? By whom was the answer to the challenge given? To whom? Where and to what did the author give an answer to the challenge? What effect did these answers have, type and antitype? What does Peter's denial type in the small picture?

(27) What is the difference between the little Judas and little Sanhedrin, on the one hand, and the little Pilate, on the other? What are some examples of the little Pilate? What is typed by Pilate's hesitating to condemn Jesus to the cross, in the small picture? What is symbolized by the crucifixion? The nails through the hands and feet? What did the little Pilate finally do? How many illustrations of the small crucifixion will be given? What is the first of these? The second? What did such slanders effect? What do the two thieves type? For the small crucifixion, whom do John, Mary, Jesus' mother, and the other three women, and the still other women represent? What charge did the little John receive? What does Jesus' burial type in the small picture? Whom do Joseph and Nicodemus type in the small picture?

(28) What is typed as to the small picture by Jesus' being parts of three days in the tomb? What were the parts of the three small days? What were the whole of them? With what does Jesus' resurrection correspond? When and with what did the small antitype occur? Of what did that truth pertinently treat? For the small picture, what did the soldiers' report to the chief priests type? What is the pertinent antitype of the Sanhedrin's efforts to discredit Jesus' resurrection? Of the first effects of the news of our Lord's resurrection on the disciples?

Of its second effects? Of its third or culminating effects? As to the small picture, what is typed by Thomas' absence from the upper-room manifestation and his unbelief as to the other ten's report?

(29) On what have some of the friends been questioning? When was the pertinent subject treated? What reply do we give to their questions? In what time are we now (at the original writing)? Of what in the small picture was the wonderful seventh day a type? In what sense were the Epiphany saints then dead? Despite what? What were we then doing to the bad Levites and their associates? Why? As to what of their activities was this the case? What resulted from this course? Despite what was this the case?

(30) On what was doubt entertained when writing 16 months before on the eight wonderful days? What was known from Ps. 2:1-3 and Acts 4:23-31? From what facts did the uncertainty arise? What happened May 16, 1923? Instead of what expected thing? What did this prove? To what conclusion did this lead? What two kinds of antitypes do many types have? What did the knowledge of this fact occasion after May 16, 1923? What was found out as a result of the involved study? More precisely expressed, what was found out in this respect as to the Parousia and the Epiphany periods? From when to when do these periods extend? How many years do they total? What was found out in 1923 as to the past 49 years of 50 years in relation to our Lord's last five days on earth? From this viewpoint, when was the fifth of these days to end? From this standpoint, of how many symbolic days were the pertinent 80 years to consist? What, accordingly, would antitype a day? An hour?

(31) What will first be given? From what standpoint? What times are the type and antitype of each of the eight typical and antitypical days in the large picture?

(32) What was the first item that suggested the correctness of the large eight wonderful days' viewpoint? What was shown above as to the number and nights of Judas' betraying visits? What were found to be the antitypes of the time of the Saturday and Tuesday night visits of Judas to the high priests? Of these two visits themselves? How long, accordingly, was each large day?

What conclusion, accordingly, was drawn from the fact that the third betraying visit occurred two nights after the second, *i.e.*, Thursday night? Why was there no certainty beforehand on the time of the actual betrayal? What is the first hour expressly mentioned on our Lord's death day? What two hours are implied by the evangelists? Why (in Nov., 1923, when the large eight wonderful days were written upon) could the antitype of the nature and time of the third large betraying visit not be accurately given? Reasoning from the time of the other two large betraying visits, what date as the probable one was suggested? What is remarkable in the two large betraying visits? What other type represents the same events as Judas' first and second betraying visits? What will we see as to all the other details of the type and its large antitype?

(33) How will the details be presented? Why this? What is typed by the feast at Bethany? By Simon, the leper? His house? Jesus? Mary? Martha? Lazarus? Judas? The Eleven? What did Judas' bargaining to betray Jesus type? After what was this done, type and antitype?

(34) What is passed over without mention in the type? What thereafter is first mentioned? As occurring when? When did the large Monday begin and end? With what did Monday, 6 A.M. correspond? What four events are to be sought antitypically between Oct., 1889 and Oct., 1894? What are the large antitypes of the ass and the colt? Of Jesus' entering Jerusalem? What in Chapter II describes the same events? What is the antitype of the children hailing Jesus? Multitudes of others? What is the antitype of Jesus' cleansing the temple? Of the Jewish clergy's objecting? Of Jesus' refusing to stop the children's hailing Him and the cleansing work? Of the death plans of the Jewish clergy?

(35) What is the period of large Tuesday? The antitype of what event occurred then? What is the record of the type? Whereby was the antitypical curse expressed? What proves that the curse then set in and still continues?

(36) What is the period of large Wednesday? With what was this typical and antitypical Wednesday full? What is the record of Judas' second betraying visit? What

was its antitype in the large picture? Where are particulars thereon found? What did the resultant opposition cause the priesthood to forecast? When will the period "after two days" end? What will, therefore, take place on large Friday?

(37) What is the second recorded event of typical Wednesday? What is its record? What is its large antitype? Where are pertinent testimonies to be found?

(38) What is the record on Christ's authority being questioned? What is its large antitype? What was done, type and antitype, with the cavilers? What is the parable of the two sons? What is the large antitype of Jesus' declaring this parable? What is the parable of the wicked husbandmen? What is the large antitype of Jesus' declaring it? What is the parable of the marriage feast guests? What, in general, is the large antitype of Jesus' declaring it? In particular, as to the guest who cast off the wedding robe?

(39) What is the record of the dishonest questions of the Pharisees and Sadducees and the testful question of the scribe? What is the large antitype of these questions and Jesus' answers? Where are these answers to be found? What is the record of Jesus' question put to the Pharisees? What is the large antitype of this and of the Pharisees' failure to answer?

(40) When did Jesus denounce the scribes and Pharisees? What is the record of this? What is the large antitype? Through what were the antitypical denunciations given? What are the large antitypes of the seven woes that Jesus denounced on the scribes and Pharisees? Of the Lord Jesus' noting and commenting on the large and small gifts put into the treasury? Whereby was this done antitypically?

(41) What is the record of the Greek's inquiring for Jesus? What is the large antitype? Of Jesus' speaking thereon? Of His expressing distress at the approach of His sufferings? Of God's answer? Of the doubts of the people as to the nature of the voice?

(42) What is the Scriptural proof that our Lord's great prophecy and the parables of Matt. 25 were uttered after 6 P.M. of His last Wednesday? To what time does this make them belong, type and antitype? What in the large

antitype does Jesus' uttering His great prophecy forecast? In harmony with the time setting of large Wednesday, when will the large antitypical prophecy set in? What did the large utterances give? When were they made? What of their fulfillments in relation to the present? What is the large antitype of Jesus' giving the parables of the ten virgins, the talents and the sheep and goats? What is the only other event with its connected remarks of our Lord's last Wednesday? What is the large antitype?

(43) At what time in the large picture was the part of this chapter on the large eight wonderful days written? What will this fact prevent the author from attempting? Until what time are no time features mentioned or implied as to Jesus' last Friday? How is the time of Jesus' sentence by the Sanhedrin indicated? To what does Friday, 6 A.M. correspond in the large picture? What might be expected then? When did Jesus' crucifixion begin? To what will this correspond in the large picture? What will be the large antitype at that time? When did the darkness set in and end on that Friday? To what will this correspond in the large picture? When will the antitypical burial have ended?

(44) What is probably the large antitype of the earthquake of Matt. 27:51-54? When will it likely come? Before what? What are we not to understand by the death of the Large Jesus? What are we thereby to understand? What parallel thing in the small eight wonderful days' picture suggests this?

(45) What was the time of the Saturday of Jesus' being in the tomb? When will be the time of the Large Jesus' being in the antitypical tomb? What is the large antitype of Jesus' being in the tomb? To what does the time from that Saturday, 6 P.M. until Sunday, 6 P.M. correspond? What results for the large antitype from the fact that we do not know the exact time before 6 A.M. that Jesus arose from the dead? What is the large antitype of Jesus' resurrection? What is typed by Jesus' manifesting Himself to the disciples up to 6 P.M. of Sunday? When did the manifestation in the upper room occur? What may be concluded from the Parousia's lapping for over two years into the Epiphany? To what

will that Sunday, 11 P.M. correspond? To what will the manifestation in the upper room perhaps correspond?

(46) What may the above setting, especially up to Oct., 1934, be probably considered? How must our statement of it be regarded? How much time would this probably give us for public work? What will probably come after Oct., 1929? After the period between Feb. to July, 1933? What hope is expressed as to John's rebuke? What would justify such work? What does the clarifying of the light on the small and the large wonderful days manifest? What should we do for this increasing light?

(47) How many sets of eight wonderful days are there? What are they? What was the order of their understanding? At first, while the small eight wonderful days were seen, what was not suspected? What Scriptures gave the clue to these days? What did each set of these passages show in this matter? What do they prove to be involved in the type? What did this lead us in Sept., 1923, to see? When were the small eight wonderful days completely fulfilled? In what large wonderful day have we been since Oct., 1924? When will it end? What showed that each of the small wonderful days was a period of one year? Each large day a period of ten years? What fact proves the ten years' day? What periods are covered by the large eight wonderful days? How did the Truth clarify on these matters? What resulted from this while only the small days were seen? How is this seen? What should give us joy despite immature views before the light was fully due?

(48) Wherein have we set forth our tentative forecasts on the sixth, seventh and eighth large days? Which of these will be especially treated in this chapter? What period is the sixth large day? What would be good to do in this connection? What happened with these forecasts as time passed? What will we first cite? Where is it found? At the time of its writing, in what large day were we living?

(49) What was omitted in the two quoted paragraphs? Where are they to be found? When did large Thursday begin and end? When did large Friday begin? At what time of large Friday were we when the quoted words were written? Of which large day was it a part? What

thing was instituted in that typical evening? Where were we at the antitypical time? What things were forecast to occur between that time and Oct., 1929?

(50) When was the article in P '27, 43, 44, written? What was done with its thoughts for several years previously? What is absent in the Gospel accounts of the first half of large Friday? When was the Passover meal begun? What can we not give from the Gospel account as to the events of that night? What does this lack of time indications coupled with the third betraying visit likely prove that God designed by the time omissions in the Gospel records of that night? What time indication does the third betrayal disclose? What is the first fact that made this before the fulfillment seem likely? What was the second pertinent fact? What thought as to the probable length of time of Jesus' involvement with the Jewish hierarchy was suggested as a forecast? On such probable matters what should characterize our statements? In what article is the same line of thought in a forecast set forth as is given in the last quotation?

(51) What did the tentative time forecast on the final betraying act imply as to the time of the large Gethsemane experience? How is this indicated? What were we thus able to forecast without the hours being mentioned in the Gospel record? What does this fact enable us to do as to the duration of our Lord's last discourse? When did it according to the Gospels begin, type and antitype? How do the cited passages prove this? Where was it begun, continued and ended in the type? How do the cited passages prove this? How was its last part given? What do our various citations prove on the times of giving various features of these forecasts? What were the various time intervals between these forecasts and their fulfillments?

(52) How many of large Friday's events were forecast in The Present Truth? What are the twelve so far fulfilled? Why have the rest not been fulfilled? What are the four whose fulfillment is yet future? What three kinds of things are pointed out in these forecasts? What is a test of a teacher's reliability? What increases the severity of the test? What makes the test one of utmost extremity?

(53) Into what position did the Editor place himself

before the consecrated when making these forecasts? Into what position did this place our traducers? What has been a favorite pastime of Levites, especially of their leaders? What on this line was pointed out in our last November issue? In what did their efforts result? As to what also have they been accusing us of being a false prophet? In what particulars? What motivates their charge? On what have they been waiting? How? What two causes prevent their seeing the fulfillments of large Friday? What, as a result, have they been doing? Why did the Lord doubtless arrange for the making of these forecasts? Into what similar relation have our forecasts and these Levite leaders' railings brought them and us? What kind of a situation has thereby been created? Did the Editor know of such a situation's being created at the time he made the forecasts? How was it doubtless arranged? What should this situation prompt us to investigate?

(54) How many of these forecasts have so far been due for fulfillment? To what do the other five pertain? What will the study of these twelve give to the properly disposed? Whom do we not expect by this study to convince? Why not, in the first place? In the second place? Who are to be expected to be blessed by this study? How do the cited Scriptures prove these matters of both classes? What was the first of these forecasts? In how many groups and sub-groups would those feasting be? What will not here be done as to these? Why not? What is the object of dealing with them here? By what were the Truth Levites feasted? The Nominal Church Levites? What will show the similarity of the thoughts of the typical and antitypical feasts? What do these facts prove?

(55) What is the second forecast to be considered? What was the symbolic hour before the symbolic betrayal? How do we reach the thought that each hour represents five months? Where do we find the typical Gethsemane scene described? What does the record show of the eight and the three disciples as to Jesus' Gethsemane experience? On what two things was Jesus' fear grounded? What did He fear? What did this move Him to do? What was not, and what was the cup? What would failure under trial have brought to Jesus? What set in between Nov., 1927, and April, 1928? Who did not understand its

going on? How was its transpiring made known? Whose personal testimony shows this experience? What would the Levites say of these testimonies? What is to be said in answer to them? How only could their types get pertinent proof? How only can the antitypes of the three and the eight disciples get the pertinent proof? When will they accept this testimony? What proves that this experience was to occur from Nov., 1927, to April, 1928?

(56) What is the third typical and antitypical event to be considered? What do the Gospels have to say on the hour of the betrayal? How do we reach this hour? What is the antitypical betrayal? In connection with what did it occur? What bequests and provisions did a certain will made in 1924 make? Who was satisfied with the will? What was not done while he subsequently lived? What was done after his death by his wife and daughter? To how many at least did she tell this? What was the relation of her sister-in-law and niece to the Truth, especially to the Epiphany Truth and work? How long did they seek to get the sister to change her will? How did their efforts affect her peace of mind? Her desire as to changing the will? When and after what did the Editor last see her? What did she repeat on this occasion? How old was she then? What did she add to the repetition of her former complaints? What pertinent instruction did she give the Editor as to the character of another will, if offered for probate? What did she desire him to do in such an event? Why?

(57) What does the sequel prove? What were its bequests and conditions? When did this sister die? What did the news of her death move the Editor to do as an executor and trustee under the 1924 will? What was done as a result of her charge and the attorney's advice? What did a clerk of the Registrar of Wills make known on that occasion? What was done as a result of this information? In what did this result? What occurred therein March 22, 1928? April 18? April 24? Which of these hearings do not belong to the betrayal act? Why not? What was the middle time point of the betrayal act? What does this prove? What were the church affiliations of the gentleman who heard the case? Who encouraged the sister-in-law in her course? What additional thing

were they ready to do? What forced this matter to come to a hearing? In what did this result? What was actually this result? When did it set in? How long before was this forecast? Written out? Published? How can the fulfillment on time of the forecast not be explained? What disproves the second alleged explanation? How only can this event be explained? What happened to the sister-in-law before the bequests were due to be paid out? In what did this result to her and her daughter? What did the latter's part serve to buy?

(58) What was the fourth typical event used in the forecast? What is not definitely stated as to its time? How is it to be presented as to time relations? When, according to the type, was the Large Jesus to be delivered to antitypical Pilate? What is not, and what is typed by making one a prisoner? What, type and antitype, prove this? What began the antitypical imprisonment? What has continued it? What therefore is typed by Jesus' arrest? How and when did the arrest of the Large Jesus begin? How and when was it completed? What did the Registrar of Wills decide in this case? In what did this result? How did such a decision and consequent settlement of the estate make the Large Jesus a prisoner? Why so? How as to fact and time did this antitype fulfill? On what two grounds can such fulfillment not be explained? Why not? On what ground alone is it to be explained?

(59) What were the fifth, sixth and seventh typical events used as a basis of forecasts? Of how many parts was the fifth of these? When was the antitype of the three hearings to take place? Between, after and before what dates did the antitype take place? How do we reach these data? What are we to expect in the antitype from the fact that Jesus was delivered to Pilate early in the first hour of Friday morning? Explain the cited passages thereon? When does the run of events place these three hearings? What proves this?

(60) What did Romanists do in Philadelphia with some who volunteered Extras Nos. 18 and 23? Among others, who were thus arrested, locked up and fined? When? During what period and activity did this occur? What false charge was brought against them? Despite what fact? What does an incitation to riot imply? What follows

from this as to the present charge? Who were connected with the prosecution? What were their church affiliations? When did the first three hearings occur? Against whom did the Romanists not particularly aim? What was their real object in this case? Who were the real accused? How were the two brethren related to them? Who in these three hearings is not the antitype of Annas, Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin? What was his part therein? Who are the antitype of Annas? How did the first hearing begin, progress and end? What did the judge's postponing the hearing effect? What tactics did the Romanists pursue as to serving notice of the trial? In what did this result first? Afterward?

(61) Who for five weeks then examined the case? What character did their examination not have? What indicated this? What was the external reason for this? Of what was this examination the antitype? Of what was its postponement an antitype? What thereafter set in? Of what was it the antitype? How did it come to an end? Of what was his double decision the antitype? What were the reasons that the judge gave for this step? What two things did his second reason prove? For what does good reason exist as to why he did not hear the case to the end? To what kind of a judge would he give way? What did he thereby disclose? How does this remark affect all Romanist judges when their church's interests are at stake? What is the character of his remarks on his deciding the case *pro* or *con*? Why so? What did his remarks indicate?

(62) Of what can we not be as to our above-indicated surmise? How do we desire it to be regarded? What will show the reasonableness of the surmise? On the Romanist side of what was there a manipulation? Who brought no specific charge against the accused? What did the station police have done? What rule of Philadelphia County Courts was violated by the same Romanist judge occupying the same court room during the months of April, May, September and October, 1929? Without what could this not have been done? What might have been present for this Romanist judge to have been in that particular room even one time out of the four? How often during four court months was he in that

room? What was done by the prosecution with the third hearing, set for September? What kind of a prosecutor appeared each time for the Romanist district attorney? With what were the juries liberally sprinkled? What kind of witnesses were those of the prosecution? Who controlled the times of calling the case? How did he use such control? What do all these circumstances, connected with the judge's implication that his church desired the condemnation of the accused, suggest as to why the judge refused to hear the case to the end? What other fact strengthens the reasonableness of this surmise?

(63) What did Rome's course in this case determine us to do? What did a Chicago Epiphany brother who is a newspaper man and friend of influential public men decide to do? How was his help enlisted? On what terms was this brother from boyhood onward with the then Governor of Pennsylvania? What did he do with the case to this Governor? To what effect did the latter reply? What pertinent power did he have? Of what in his course are we uncertain? What did he probably do? If so, what would be the probable effect? When did the correspondence between the Chicago brother and the Governor take place? What further advice did our Chicago brother give? What was, accordingly, done? How does Rome regard publicity on her plots against the public welfare? How as to the large newspapers are Jesuits placed? What likely happened to a copy of this letter? If so, what would the character and objects of the Jesuits move them to do? Why is our surmise no injustice to them? What does the combination of the above-given facts and suggested probabilities make our pertinent surmise? What do the type and antitype suggest on this point? How would the rules of court evidence regard this surmise?

(64) What would be well here to note? When did the arrest of the two brethren occur? In what period did it fall? Within what were the three hearings and the condemnation and delivery to antitypical Pilate to occur? What were the dates of these? How are these dates related to the forecast time? How long before the fulfillment was the forecast made? On what two grounds can these three fulfilled forecasts not be explained? Why not?

Who have sought to explain away the fulfilled forecast of ours on the second ground? Of what are these three sets of fulfillments an impressive proof?

(65) What was the eighth thing forecast for large Friday? By what was it typed? When was it done? How did the judge dispose of the case? What was it proven to be? What was done by the prosecutor with Extra No. 23? Why did the prosecutor's main witness fail him? What two acts prove him to have been an unreliable witness? What did the two Romanist women witnesses fail to do? Why did they likely not appear? What was the character of the station house policemen's testimony? Why? What only could the prosecutor urge?

(66) To what did the prosecution simmer down? What did this actually mean? What did the judge do with the specially attacked parts of John's Rebuke? What did he remark thereon? What was the result on the Romanists? How do the Gospel records not have the exact time of Jesus' being declared not guilty by Pilate? How do they have it? When did it likely occur? Why? In what antitypical hour did the declaration of "not guilty" take place? How long before was the forecast made? On what grounds can it not, and on what ground can it be explained?

(67) What was the ninth forecast for large Friday? What is represented by the hands and feet? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? What is meant by the crucifixion of the Large Jesus? How was the antitypical crucifixion instigated? How did the persecutors act as to the County Court's decision? To what courts did they turn? What did they secure there? What resulted therefrom? What were the antitypical scourgings? When did these arrests, jailings, finings and tongue lashings set in? How long did they continue? How long beforehand was this fulfilled forecast made? On what two grounds can it not be explained away? What is its only reasonable explanation?

(68) What was the forecast event of large Friday? What say the Scriptures thereon? When did the typical railing set in? The antitypical railing? What are the antitypical thieves? Who is the chief one of these? Who are some other English-speaking ones? Polish-speaking

ones? What churches have made themselves such? Unnamed editors? Why are these symbolic thieves? On what matters do they presume to address the General Church? What dismissed and never reinstated pilgrims are examples of such? What is the character of those who continued this railing into the ninth hour? Who ceased railing before? What was the first of such railing? How long after the third hour? What vile epithets did he hurl at some of the priests? Who joined him as a leading railer? Into what time did these and others rail?

(69) Who else joined in the railing? What literature especially occasioned such railing? In what form? What were some of the mildest names called? How vile are some of the railings? What would "good Catholics" even do? What are some of the railers' threats? How would they rail, when our Romanist literature was passed out in Philadelphia and vicinity? What railings did the Editor's name occasion? Of what are such letters and phone calls a commentary? What mask did railing Romanists sometimes wear? What did they often say? What did the frequency of this remark suggest? How were the letters usually written? What was done, if the phone railers refused to give their names? How did one such woman persist? How as to time did the railing come and in some cases last? What did some of the railers do? On what two grounds can the forecast fulfillments not be explained? On what ground alone are they to be explained?

(70) What is the eleventh forecast event of large Friday? What two probability suggestions were given thereon? Which of these proved true? What must be remembered as to the article of P '32, 12, 13? Where else was this true suggestion alluded to? How long before the antitypical darkness was this suggestion made? When did the large sixth and ninth hours come? What is the large darkness? What occasioned the depression's first phase? By what and when was it fairly overcome? When did its second phase set in? What occasioned it? What reasons moved British financiers to urge the government to leave the gold standard? What was the speedy effect of Britain's leaving it on America? How do the two depression phases compare? When did the second set in?

(71) What was the character of the depression's second

phase? Who discerned its cause? What step should America have taken to ward off this blow? Why did she not take it? What second European policy increased the second phase of this depression? What was the third cause of the depression? What resulted from these three causes? How great did unemployment and short time work and reduced wages become? What resulted from these conditions? Who mainly supplied private charity?

(72) What antotypically were the sufferings of the depression's second phase? How long did the typical and antitypical darkness last? Which of our probability suggestions as to the cause of the antitypical darkness proved correct? What is happening with this darkness? What two explanations fail to clarify the fact of the fulfilled forecast? What only can explain it? What as to the darkness does the Bible not give? What course of wisdom should this fact have suggested? Why would it have been wiser not to have suggested it, even if one of our suggestions did prove true? What as to the first suggestions has become the occasion of Levitical railing? Against what is this experience a good illustration? What would have been sufficient for the forecast?

(73) What was the twelfth forecast event of large Friday? What are the two probability suggestions made as to this forecast? Which of these proved true? What produced the death of the Large Jesus? Into what has the use of these dictatorial policies turned America? What has made it a *churchianityized* Fascism? How can our public work not be stopped? Why? How could it be illegally stopped? How only could it be stopped? What Scriptures imply that it will actually be ended by the use of dictatorial powers? This being so, what in reality was the voting of those powers as to our public work? When were they voted? On what two theories can this forecast fulfillment not be explained? On what theory can it be explained?

(74) What are the remaining forecast events of large Friday? How do they stand as to fulfillment? How many are they? What will each one of these be? What particular thing as to the time of the type of each is not Biblically given? What does it show on this head? What three reasons effected that the last event was completed

before the twelfth hour was ended? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? From what as to these four future events will we do well to refrain? Why could their details not be understood in advance? What did we understand in advance? What did the details always do to us? What, accordingly, may be expected of the future four things of large Friday? Why have we given only meager details on the large sixth wonderful day? What has been left undone as to many details? What are some examples of omitted details? What happened as to these details?

(75) What could be done as to this study? How many will be given? What does this study prove as to the Epiphany movement? What else as to it does it prove? What do these two facts prove as to most of the other movements among the Truth people? What other movements does this study prove to have had various ramifications among them? What has been a favorite pastime among Levite leaders and their partisan supporters? What do this study and many others in these columns bring to us on this charge? Who is the source of this charge? Why does Satan advance it? What will be the final outcome as to the Truth? To its enemies? What is unanswerably proven by this study? To what should this lead us, if faithful members of the priesthood?

(76) Of what did the article on the large sixth wonderful day, in No. 182, treat? When and where was its contents as a discourse first given? Where else thereafter in Europe? When was it written out as an article? When was it intended to be published? When was it published? Where and when was it in America delivered as a discourse? How long after the ninth hour ended was it first given as a discourse? What is implied in the fact that the article gave only 15 main facts of Christ's last 21 hours? What will be done in this article with the ones not yet treated? Into what two time groups do they fall? What will an attentive study of it prove? Why is this not true of the earthquake? Before what did the earthquake interpolation creep into Matt. 27:51, 54? In what has this resulted? Like 1 John 5:7, how did it likely occur? When did this probably occur? What is in harmony with this thought?

(77) Why will the Editor have to speak of some of his

experiences in explaining matters pertinent to our subject? How will this be done? And how not? After whose examples may this be rightly done? Who will understand this aright? Who wrongly? What persons and activities did we not expound in No. 182? Whom do the four soldiers represent? What did each of these four antitypes take belonging to the Large Jesus? Of what by lot did they dispose? To whom did it fall? What is typed by the stupifying drug that the soldiers offered Jesus? Their offering it to Him? His refusal to take it? By the soldiers watching Jesus?

(78) What else was not explained in No. 182? What will be done with it here? What was the first of these sayings? What is its character as genuine Scripture? What proves this? How are we, therefore, to understand its meaning? How was it answered as to Israel as a whole? As to Israelites indeed who consented to the crucifixion? As to the other guilty ones? How was it antityped? What was the second statement on the cross? How did this fulfill in the antitype? What was the third saying on the cross? What is the antitype as to Mary and John? What are the thoughts that make the antitype reasonable? How was this antitype fulfilled among the Epiphany brethren? When were the first three sayings of Jesus on the cross probably uttered?

(79) When were the remaining four sayings of Jesus on the cross uttered? What Scriptures show this? How do they do it? How long was Jesus silent between His third and fourth sayings on the cross? How long did His silences average during the first three sayings? Why was Jesus so silent on the cross? Why was the cry, "I thirst," probably the fourth saying on the cross? From what can this not certainly be inferred? What is the antitype of this thirst?

(80) In the Editor's experience in America from Feb. 1 to June 7? In Britain? In Bergen, Norway? In Oslo, Norway? What gave him the stilling of his symbolic thirst? How? Of what was this a part in the antitype? Who else had similar experiences? What did these fulfill?

(81) What was the fifth saying on the cross? Its antitype? Whose experience as illustrative of the antitype will here be given? What was the course of this experience?

Who else had similar experiences? What do we recognize these experiences to be? What was the sixth saying of Jesus on the cross? What can we not from the Bible determine as to the time order of Luke 23:46 and John 19:30? What in this case, as in the case of the fourth and fifth sayings, gives us the clue to the time order? Which of the last two sayings was antityped first?

(82) How and when did the antitype set in for the Editor? Proceed? End? Who else had similar experiences? How did the seventh saying on the cross have its fulfillment in the Editor? In others?

(83) What are we now ready to study? What is the first of these? What did it effect in the type? What did it mean in the type? How, in the first place, is this apparent? In the second place? What is typed by the rending of the veil? What three external events corroborate the antitypes' having set in?

(84) What will here be done as to the earthquake and the rising of the Ancient Worthies? What will next be considered? What first at the foot of the cross engages our attention? What is thereby typed? What is typed by two others there? By their activities there during the first stages of the cross? By their later withdrawing to a distance? Viewing Jesus, afar off? Who else were there? What individual? Whom does she type? What is typed by her standing afar off? Who are typed by the unnamed women? By their standing afar off? What in part decreased the sympathy of the antitypical women?

(85) Whom do the impenitent, and the penitent thief type? What is typed by the Jews requesting that the legs of the three crucified be broken? Whom did the antitypical breaking affect? Whom not? Of what is not, and of what is the present increasing persecution of the Truth people an antitype? Before what did the leg breaking and side piercing occur? What two things prove this?

(86) What is the next episode of the crucifixion day? When did Joseph start out for Pilate? How is this to be proved? Who were privileged to antitype Nicodemus and Joseph? What kind of a journey was the antitype of Joseph's to Pilate? How and when did the preparation for it begin? How, where and when did its first part begin? How, where and when did it proceed and end?

What was the second part of Joseph's journey? Its antitype? In what did its preparation consist, type and antitype? To whom did its end bring the traveler? What was done by him to Pilate, type and antitype?

(87) What occasioned the correspondence between the U.S. Treasury Department and the Laymen's Home Missionary Movement? When did it begin? On what four things did the Department request information? When was the answer given? What did it say in the first place? In the second place? What two qualities did the fact that the Department's Philadelphia agent was a Romanist require to be exercised in the reply? When was the second letter sent to the Bible House on this subject? What did it say in its first part? In its second part? What effect on our contributors would the granting of exemption to our Movement have had? What, in the third place, did this letter say as to three things?

(88) When was this letter answered? What did the answer contain? How large was the letter? On what grounds was exemption claimed? Despite what? When was this letter handed to the Treasury's agent at Philadelphia? What was the opinion of the agent, his lawyer and the Movement's manager? What, accordingly, did the agent do as to the letter of Dec. 28? What followed? What was done March 15? What was the viewpoint of this letter? When was a summary of it mailed to the Bible House? When was it there received? As what was it immediately recognized? What was done several days later? What opinion was expressed then? What question was then asked? What was the answer? What were these acts antitypically?

(89) Of what was the Treasury's first letter not a part? What did its function seem to be? What is the antitype of Joseph's request for Jesus' body? How does the time feature agree with this? What had been going on for nearly five months before the letter of Nov. 27, 1933, was written? What in reality did the letter of Nov. 27 request? Of what was the Treasury Department's letter of Dec. 21, 1933, through its Philadelphia agent, the antitype? What is in line with this thought? What was the antitype of the centurion's answer to Pilate? What was the antitype of the centurion's declaring Jesus to be a

just man? What is the antitype of the soldier recognizing that Jesus was dead? Of his spear-thrust?

(90) What is typed by David's spearmen? Swordsmen? Slingers? Archers? Why was the counsel's letter the antitypical spear-thrust? What is the antitype of Pilate's giving Joseph permission to take Jesus' body down from the cross and to bury it? Why is this so? Despite what? What was the antitype of the centurion's statement, "This is the son of God"? What differences should here be noted? What was done as to this matter at the Detroit Convention? What else was there treated? Of what was this the antitype? How so?

(91) Who, among others, listened attentively to this matter at the Detroit Convention? What did this influence him to do shortly thereafter? As what? What would be the tendency of such a discourse? Why was it needed? What will be here omitted as to the contents of Bro. Jolly's talk? Why? What of it will be given? What is the first of these proofs? The second?

(92) What was Bro. Jolly's third proof? The fourth? The fifth? The sixth? The seventh? What did the Lord give in corroboration of these seven arguments? When? What was done thereon the next day? What is typed by Nicodemus' securing the myrrh and aloes? What is typed by the 100-weight? The myrrh and aloes? What is typed by his putting them in contact with Jesus' body?

(93) What did Joseph first do with the body? What did he buy? What did he do therewith? What is the antitype of buying the linen? Of wrapping the body therein and therewith? In what three ways did Israelites pay respect to the dead? What does clean fine linen symbolize? How does the Bible prove this? What set of acts is found in the antitype? What objection is made against this involving the entire Large Jesus? How is it refuted? What consideration as to Daniel typing our Pastor is also in line with the antitype—the Large Jesus? How was our Pastor and the Large Jesus described in that discourse and article?

(94) What antityped Jesus' funeral and burial? For what is a funeral intended? How did the discourse and article on Dan. 7-12 treat of Bro. Russell? From what two standpoints? What, accordingly, were that discourse

and article as to the Large Jesus? Why? For what is a burial intended? What is a burial? Regardless of what? What did that discourse and article do to Bro. Russell and the Large Jesus? Who else were also symbolically buried expressly in them? What is typed by the burial taking place in a rock-hewn tomb?

(95) What is typed by Joseph's making the tomb? By its being a new tomb? By its never before having been used a tomb? The haste of the burial? By the burial ending with the closing of the door? By the great stone? By rolling the rock against the door? By the two Marys and the other women following the body to the grave? Seeing it? And how the body was laid? By the Marys sitting over against the sepulchre? Why?

(96) What does our study of the large sixth wonderful day give us? What does this prove? In what particular do we also find antitypes therein? What does this complete? Only in what was a mistake made? What was our mental attitude in this phase of the subject? What actually results for our general view through this mistake? Why? Why should not the antitypical earthquake have happened then? Why does this strongly prove our viewpoint? Who are finding great fault on this point? What do they, accordingly, call the writer? What do they ignore? To what should these fulfillments have moved them? What, on the contrary, do they do? Of what do they remind us? What, accordingly, should we say of them? How will the Priesthood act therein?

(97) What pertinent acknowledgment is herein made? What kind of a mistake was it? What could it not cause? In whom? In whom only might it cause regret over Armageddon's not coming sooner? How should we regard the unkind and unjust use that bad Levites make of this mistake? What should we remember as to weak brethren with good hearts? With bad hearts? What at all times should we remember thereon? As to bad Levites' unfairness therein?

(98) What is the first extenuating consideration as to this mistake? The second? Third? Fourth? Fifth? Sixth? Seventh? What do these seven considerations prove? What should result therefrom in estimating the quality of the mistake?

(99) What might one disposed to fault-finding say on this matter? In reply, what should be said to him? Despite what fact? What two considerations cast out of the writer's mind the thought of the possibility of the unguineness of the earthquake reference? From what did these two and formerly given seven reasons restrain him? What other reasons acted as a restraint therein? Only under what circumstances can and should he resort to Biblical Numerics as a test of a passage? Only after what time did he have a compelling reason for testing Matt. 27:51-54 by Biblical Numerics? What first raised doubts on the passage's genuineness? What still kept his mind undecided? Why also was the test of Biblical Numerics not applied until Nov 25, 1934?

(100) What results from these considerations? Why, generally speaking, did the Lord permit the mistake? Specifically for the writer's sake? For the other faithful Epiphany brethren's sake? For the unfaithful among them and among the bad Levites? What is the first exhortation appropriate to the case? Whom should we not imitate in this matter? What other thing should we not allow it to influence us to do? Why would that be especially inappropriate? What, mainly, counts in our standing and testing? And what not mainly? What else should we learn from this experience? From what will this help keep us? What will it bring us? Without what should we not leave our subject? With what should we leave it?

(101) What interesting question arises in this connection? What has the earthquake reference been proven to be? What, therefore, could it not have? What has for years been known as to the character of vs. 52, 53? What three false doctrines do these verses teach? What absurdities do they teach? What other reason did our Pastor hold as against their genuineness? What reasons against the genuineness of vs. 52, 53 do not hold against that of the pertinent parts of vs. 51, 54? What sole reason against that of vs. 52, 53 holds against that of the pertinent parts of vs. 51, 54? How did this fact impress the author for years? To whom did he express this possibility? To what degree did he not allow this possibility to affect him? Why not? Accordingly, what had to be done in the case of the pertinent parts of vs. 51, 54? What aroused strong

suspicious of their unguineness? Upon what alone was the expectation of America's Armageddon before Oct., 1934, based? What could not be known of the pertinent parts of these verses before the event? What can interpolations not have? What has the thought based on them been proven to be? At least what gain has resulted from this experience?

(102) Like Latin, what peculiarity, in addition to sound values, do the Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic alphabets have? What are some examples of this peculiarity? Where else does this peculiarity exist? What two things does this make each word be? What number do these letters make? What results from this as to every Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic word in the Bible? Among other numeric multiples, of the multiple of what number has God made the sentences of the Bible to consist? How otherwise is the number 7 used in the Bible? How is this illustrated in the Revelation?

(103) What is another illustration of the use of the number 7 in the Bible? How does it there appear? What does this genealogy actually do as to certain of Jesus' ancestors? Why was this not done? Why was it done? What, accordingly, is the pertinent situation as to Bible sentences? What does this prove when the numeric values of Bible sentences are not multiples of 7? In which ways could the changes have occurred? What conclusions result from this fact as to Biblical numerics? What, *e.g.*, does this show of the character of the bulk of 1 John 5:7? Of other interpolations? What did the failure of America's Armageddon to come by Oct., 1934, move the author to do with Matt. 27:51-54? With what result? As God gave this section of the Bible what did it not contain? To what did it, therefore, not refer? Why not? What did the author do as to these verses before he learned that they were interpolations?

(104) What was given above? How does the I.V. of Matt. 27:51-54 read? What did the author first do with the numeric values of the Greek words of the whole passage? What was their total? How did 7 divide into this sum? What did this show of the passage? What did we then add? What was their sum? How did 7 divide into this sum? What did we know of the sum of the

unsuspected words before we divided them, from the fact that both totals were 5/7 out of harmony? What is the sum of the numeric values of the unsuspected words? How does 7 divide into it? Into its quotient? And the quotient of this quotient? What was the result? What is the convincing power of these phenomena?

(105) Why did the author work on the further numeric possibilities of this passage? What did he, accordingly, do with all the words of v. 51? What is their numeric value? What is their total? How does 7 divide into this total? In line with what is this result? What was then done with the unsuspected words of vs. 51, 54 and the suspected words of vs. 52, 53? What did these total? How does 7 divide this total? What does this prove of vs. 52, 53? While their interpolatory character had been for years known, what was of them here proven for the first time? What would be the crucial test? Why? What is the numeric value of the suspected words of v. 54? What is the total of these three involved numeric values? How does 7 divide this total? What results from this? What other possibility exists? How is this possibility disproven?

(106) What other set of considerations proves that the unsuspected parts of Matt. 27:51-54 form but one sentence? Of what is this also another proof? How so? What proves that the unsuspected parts of v. 51 are not a complete sentence? That v. 51 is not such? That vs. 51-53 are not such? That vs. 51-54 are not such? What is the other remaining possibility? What results does it yield? What does this prove, in the first place? What second conclusion does Biblical numerics prove as to parts of vs. 51, 54 and the whole of vs. 52, 53? What results from this second conclusion? On what assumption was the mistaken expectation based? By what two things are these interpolations proven to be such? Before what did this interpolation creep into the Greek text?

CHAPTER VI.

OUR LORD'S PAROUSIA AND EPIPHANY MISSIONS.

JESUS' SECOND ADVENT SEVENFOLD MISSION TO HIS OWN. IN ONE HOUR. SOME THOUGHTS ON REVELATION 17. THE HOUR OF REV. 17:12. GOD'S POST-APOSTOLIC MOUTHPIECES WHILE FALLIBLE ALWAYS GIVE THE TRUTH AS DUE. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

IN MAL. 3:1-3 we have a passage that undoubtedly applies to our Lord's Second Advent, though in some of its particulars it has a secondary application, *i.e.*, to the First Advent. With the former thought before us we will examine this passage, particularly vs. 2 and 3. The messenger (v. 1) that goes before the Lord, preparing His way, is antitypical Elijah (Mal. 4:5, 6), who by the Holy Spirit, in rebuking the world for sin, righteousness and the judgment to come (John 16:8-11), sought to prepare the world for our Lord's Second Advent. The Lord who comes to His temple is Jesus Christ in His Second Advent, while the temple itself is the true Church (1 Cor. 3:16, 17; 2 Cor. 6:16; Eph. 2:19-21). His coming to His temple occurred in 1874, as the first clause of v. 2 ("the day of His coming") and the signs of the times prove. The Lord is described as the one whom true Christians ("ye") seek and delight in; for they earnestly longed, waited for and searched for His coming, because He was the delight of their hearts. Long did He seem to them to tarry; and to them His coming was sudden, because they were beforehand unaware of its manner and did not know of it, until about a year after He had come. But all along they had assurance as to the certainty of His coming—"Behold, He cometh" (v. 1; Rev. 22:20). His coming, among other things, was as the Angel of the Covenant, the Administrator or Mediator of the New Covenant. Thus v. 1 gives us a brief

prophetic summary of the Gospel-Age mission of the Church and her ardent love for the Lord and her longing for His Second Advent. As such it is introductory to vs. 2 and 3. For this reason we have briefly commented on it as an introductory thought for more or less details to be brought out in this chapter on vs. 2 and 3, which prophetically describe our Lord's Second Advent mission to His own. Our study of these verses will show that His Second Advent mission toward them is sevenfold.

(2) In the two questions of v. 2 the first and second missions of His Second Advent are set forth: "But who may abide the day of His coming? and who shall stand when He appeareth [literally, *maketh manifest*]?" Most Bible readers peruse it carelessly and superficially. To such these two questions mean the same thing; but a careful heed given to the exact wording of the questions soon reveals the fact that in each of them a different period and activity of our Lord's Second Advent is brought to our attention. These two periods are noted respectively by the expressions, "the *day of His coming*" and "*when He maketh manifest*." What is "the day of His coming"? We answer, the Parousia day; for that is the time, at its beginning, when His Second Advent set in. What is the period "when He maketh manifest" especially? We reply, the Epiphany day; for that is the special time when, by the bright shining of the Truth, He makes persons, principles and things manifest. Thus the terms of these two questions prove that different periods of time are respectively implied by them. This and additional matters are brought to our attention by the words *abide* and *stand* occurring in these questions. What is the force of the word translated *abide* in the first question? It means to *sustain* in the sense of enduring hardships amid which one perseveres in his course. Thus when we say that an army sustained an attack, we not only mean that it resisted that attack, but

resisted it and drove back the attackers, *i.e.*, not only endured it, but beat it off in the defeat of the attackers. This is the force of the word translated *abide* in this text. This, question, therefore, asks who will persevere as new creatures in the word and work of the Lord amid the difficult trials, attacks of the devil, the world and the flesh, during the Parousia. This question implies several things: (1) that to exercise such perseverance as new creatures would be very difficult indeed; (2) that some, not being careful to resist and fight, would fail to persevere as new creatures therein; and (3) that the others only by dint of hard endeavor would succeed to persevere as new creatures therein. In ultimate analysis this implies that some would cease to exist as new creatures and that others would continue so to exist, or, in other words, some would lose, and others would retain the Holy Spirit.

(3) This the text shows will characterize "the day of His coming," *i.e.*, the Parousia day. Looking back now at the Parousia period, we recognize, from a contemplation of its five gatherings and siftings (Matt. 20:1-16; 1 Cor. 10:1-14), that it was a period devoted to gathering the new creatures into the Parousia Truth and to testing them crucially, to the end that those who retained the Holy Spirit might continue to enjoy the Lord's favor and be manifest as such, and that those who failed to retain the Holy Spirit might be cut off entirely from the Lord's favor and be manifested as such, these activities effecting the separation of the Second Deaths from those retaining the Holy Spirit. Such trials and manifestations were generally, though not exclusively, enacted in and by the five harvest siftings—the No-Ransomism sifting beginning in 1878, the Infidelism sifting beginning in 1881, the Combinationism sifting beginning in 1891, the Reformism sifting beginning in 1901, and the Contradictionism sifting beginning in 1908. That

these siftings were calculated to manifest the Second Deathers as such is evident, when we consider, especially the first, in which the ransom was denied, the second, in which the Plan and Word of God, including the ransom, were denied, and the fifth, in which the hidden mystery and the Church's share in the sin-offering were denied (Heb. 10:26-29). Thus, then, the Lord's Parousia activities, from the standpoint of the first question of our text, was to separate the Holy Spirit retainers from the Holy Spirit losers, the persevering new creatures from the Second Deathers. Hence we infer that one of our Lord's Second Advent missions was to separate the Second Deathers from among His real people; and this He actually did, and that almost entirely by the five harvest siftings.

(4) Another one of our Lord's Second Advent missions is the separation of the Great Company from the Little Flock. This will, by a careful examination of the second question, be seen to be true. We have above called attention to the proper translation of the second question: "Who shall stand when He maketh manifest?" and to this proper translation as implying the special Epiphany period to be meant by the expression, "when He maketh manifest." Thus the question covers the main Epiphany purpose in contrast with the main Parousia purpose covered by the first question. That the second question implies the separation of the Great Company from the Little Flock to be an Epiphany activity, is indicated by the meaning of its word *stand*, in contrast with the meaning of the word translated *abide* in the first question. What does this word *stand*, as used in this verse, imply? Rom. 5:2 gives us help to answer this question. Having in v. 1 spoken of our faith justification as the first stage of the Gospel-Age salvation, St. Paul in v. 2 speaks of the high calling as its second salvation stage in these words: "By whom

[Christ] also we have access by faith into this [high calling] grace wherein we *stand*." Here St. Paul shows us that the Faithful have their standing before God in the high calling. Accordingly, those who retain the high calling *stand*, while those who lose the high calling no longer *stand* in, but *fall* from it. Therefore, according to the second question of v. 2, the special thing determined during the Epiphany is whether those who had sustained the day of Christ's coming, the Parousia, will stand in, or fall from the high calling during the Epiphany. This implies that the Epiphany is the period for the separation of the Great Company from the Little Flock. Hence we infer that our text sets forth as the second of our Lord's Second Advent missions, the separation of the Great Company from the Flock.

(5) Other Scriptures, also, show this thought. In view of the fact that the Time of Trouble and the Epiphany are identical (see Vol. IV, Chapter I), and in view of the fact that the Great Company as a *class*, as distinct from individual crown-losers living throughout the Age (1 Cor. 5:5; 1 Tim. 1:19, 20), first comes into existence and is developed in the Time of Trouble (Rev. 7:14), we infer that the Epiphany is the period in which the Great Company is dealt with, and that as one of the first steps in such dealing, its separation from the Little Flock must be enacted. Thus Rev. 7:14, like our text, proves that the Epiphany is the time for the separation of the Great Company from the Little Flock. This thought is also given in 2 Tim. 4:1: "Jesus Christ, who shall judge the living and the dead during His Epiphany and Kingdom." By the dead of this verse Adam's condemned race is meant. These will get their judgment, separation into sheep and goats (Matt. 25:31-47), during the Kingdom, or Millennium. Consequently, the living of this text must get their judgment during the Epiphany. Who are the living? Those not under the

Adamic death sentence, *e.g.*, New Creatures are among the living (John 5:24; 1 John 3:14; 5:11-13). These consist of crown-retainers (Little Flock) and crown-losers (Great Company). The text says that they get their judgment, separation from one another (for that is what their judgment implies, Matt. 25:32) during the Epiphany. As during the Parousia time, looking about us at the siftings, we saw the Second Deathers being separated from those who retained New Creatureship; so now in the Epiphany, looking about us, we see the crown-losers (Great Company) being separated from the crown-retainers (Little Flock) by the Epiphany siftings. On all sides, by their revolutionism against the Lord's teachings and arrangements, the fall of the crown-losers can be seen; for they, antitypical Benjamin (son of the right hand), are the 10,000 who fall at the Church's right hand (Ps. 91:7). Now applies the second question of our text, "Who shall stand [retain his standing in the high calling] when He maketh manifest?" This question also implies three things: (1) that the Lord's people in the Epiphany will be sorely tried; (2) that some with difficulty will retain their standing in the high calling; and (3) that some by the difficulty will fall from the high calling as Great Company members.

(6) These two questions imply two negative things: (1) that it was not God's purpose to separate the Great Company from the Little Flock during the Parousia; and (2) that it is not God's purpose to keep united the Little Flock and the Great Company during the Epiphany. From these things several conclusions should be drawn. The first is the propriety of our Pastor's warning during the Parousia against the brethren pointing out this or that one as being of the Great Company. The propriety of that warning lay in the fact that at that time there was no Great Company as yet, the Great Company being an Epiphany development,

though there were then individual unmanifested crown-losers. It was, therefore, then wrong to "judge" this or that one as being of the Great Company, and that for two reasons: (1) none of us being able to read and test the heart, and the same act being committed by two might have led in one case to the forfeiture of one's crown and not of the other's, because of different spiritual abilities, etc., or to both losing it, or neither losing it, manifestly we could not then know what act would cause a person to lose his crown and thus could not know who lost it; and (2) God at that time not having manifested to us what the thing is that revealed Great Companyship, we did not know by what means one could decide as to who had forfeited his crown. Accordingly, we were not then equipped to know who among New Creatures was and who was not a crown-loser. Hence the impropriety of our then pointing out any New Creature as a crown-forfeiter and also the propriety of our Pastor's then warning against attempting so to do.

(7) Another conclusion to be drawn is this: that now it is proper to point out manifested crown-losers as such, since now is the time for the separation of the crown-losers and the crown-retainers, even as our Pastor told us that after antitypical Elisha would be manifested, separate and distinct from, antitypical Elijah, it would be proper to point out such manifested individuals of antitypical Elisha as members of the Great Company (Convention Report, 1916, 198, Question 10; Z '16, 264, 1). There must, therefore, now be some mark whereby we may recognize them, not known to us as such during the Parousia. This mark is not a matter of character; for we are as little able now as we were in the Parousia to decide this on the basis of character. The mark that God has given us as revelatory of Great Companyship is not character but revolutionism (Ps. 107:10, 11) against the teaching and arrangement, of the Lord, *i.e.*, setting

aside the Lord's teachings and arrangements and putting others in their place. A third conclusion is that those who take over the Parousia rule, not to point out individuals as Great Company members, and make it applicable now, are violating the Lord's instruction on rightly dividing the Word of Truth; for they are applying to Epiphany conditions a rule that applies exclusively to pre-Epiphany times, and that contradicts Epiphany priestly duties of dealing with manifested crown-losers as Great Company members. Certainly, if the Church is now dealing with Azazel's Goat, they would have to know who are of it in order to deal consciously and wisely with them, and so as not to treat as such those who are not of it. It is as wrong *not* to judge *after* the time, as it was to judge *before* the time (1 Cor. 4:5). A fourth conclusion is that priests not only are not to endeavor to keep united with manifested Levites, but to force the separation of such Levites from the priests, and oppose all efforts for their reunion in priestly fellowship as being opposed to God's Epiphany purposes for these two classes of His people.

(8) In v. 2 there are two other parts of our Lord's Second Advent mission toward His own given: "For He shall be (1) like a refiner's fire and (2) like fullers' soap." The surface reader and student of the Word fails to see that two distinct things are set forth in the words just quoted; but when the two distinct things herein set forth are recognized, the third and fourth Second Advent missions of our Lord to His own are seen. We will study each in turn. To understand the expression, "for He shall be like a refiner's fire; and He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver," the figure implied in this language and the Biblical symbols connected with that figure must be understood. The figure is that of an ancient silversmith refining silver. He took the silver ore, which consisted of silver and dross, and putting it into a

crucible, lit and kept burning under it an ardent fire. Under the influence of the heat the ore began to disintegrate. Like figurative sweat the dross began to ooze out of the ore's pores. As a considerable quantity of this dross accumulated, the refiner scooped it out with a large spoon. Finally, the heat of the fire burned all the dross away from the silver; and when the dross was all scooped out, the pure silver was left in the crucible—the refining fire had completely refined the silver. What does this represent? We answer: In the symbols of the Bible silver is generally used to represent Truth (Prov. 10:20; 25:11; Cant. 3:10; Is. 1:22; 60:9; Joel 3:5; Luke 15:8; 1 Cor. 3:12). Silver ore, as a mixture of silver and dross, would fittingly represent a mixture of Truth and error. Accordingly, our Lord's being presented in the above words as a refiner's fire during the Parousia and Epiphany suggests the thought that He by figurative heat burns away the dross of error from the silver ore of Truth out of the minds of God's people. This He did in the Parousia and is now doing in the Epiphany.

(9) But, one may inquire, why has such an activity been necessary? A certain *woman's* work has made it necessary. Of course, we do not mean a literal, but a symbolic woman. That woman is referred to in Matt. 13:33 as the one who took leaven and hid it in three measures of meal, resulting in the whole lump becoming leavened. We understand this woman to be the nominal church, especially the Catholic Church, who mixed the leaven of error in the true faith, the true hope and the true love (the three measures of meal) given by Jesus and the Apostles, until these were permeated with error. When our Lord returned in the Parousia, in harmony with His question, "When the Son of Man cometh again, will He find the faith in the earth," He did not find it in the minds of His own, but found there a mixture of Truth and error, symbolic silver ore. And to purge the dross of

error out of our minds He had to put us into the crucible of various situations, wherein He lit an ardent fire under us, gave us many sore trials, severing from our Truth the intermixed error. The shocks that we got from our creeds, from our denominational ties and friends, from Truth defenders and opposers, from the process of our being undeceived, from the blasting of our pet theories, from the humbling of our opinion as to our past attainments—in *error*, not in Truth as we had supposed—from the difficulty of seeing some truths, especially truths due in siftings, and from the opposition of errorists, are some of the heat of the burning coals that made the crucible hot and burned out of our minds the dross of error. These were surely Parousia experiences.

(10) In the Epiphany there are three miniature Gospel Ages, one of them lasting as many days as there were years in the Gospel Age. This one we may call the small miniature Gospel Age, and the second the larger miniature Gospel Age; the latter beginning in 1918 has till about 1938 to run, and the third, the largest miniature gospel Age, which is from 1914 to 1954. The first was devoted to the manifestation under bad Levite leadership of the three major Levite divisions, in eight subdivisions. It began in 1915 and ended in 1920. In this one, the smaller miniature Gospel-Age nominal church mixed certain true teachings and right arrangements with certain errors and wrong arrangements, and thus in Levite circles there prevailed more or less symbolic ore in priestly minds. At our Lord's small miniature Gospel-Age Second Advent, which occurred in the early summer of 1920, a small miniature symbolic lump of leaven was found and trialsome conditions, similar to those mentioned above in connection with the Parousia, were applied by Him to burn out of those coming into the Epiphany Truth certain errors of doctrine and arrangement that they had imbibed

in the Levite movements. So, too, corresponding to trialsome Gospel-Age experiences between the Harvests, from the standpoint of the larger miniature Gospel Age, since 1918, have brethren coming into the Epiphany Truth had to undergo the symbolic silver-ore refining process under trials similar to those mentioned above, whereby the dross of error has been burned away from the silver of Truth in their minds, this mixture having been produced by the larger miniature Gospel-Age nominal church. This refining process will continue throughout the rest of this larger miniature Gospel Age, coming to a head in its Harvest period, when our Lord will do to Truth people in the Levite groups on a small scale what He did on a large scale from 1874 to 1914 as the refiner's fire. The largest miniature Gospel Age is to do the same refining work in the minds of the Levites who remain in Babylon until she is destroyed. But the purpose of these refiner's-fire experiences is to purge away the dross of error from the silver of Truth in the minds of God's Epiphany priests and Levites. And thus to refine them is the third part of the Lord's Second Advent mission to His own. And this has certainly gone on among God's people ever since 1874.

(11) The fourth part of our Lord's Second Advent mission is set forth in the following words: "and like fullers' soap," "lye," according to the E. & A.R.V. The average Bible reader sees no difference between the meaning of this expression and the preceding one, but the Scriptural symbols plainly indicate a difference, Whereas the preceding expression refers to the Lord's activity in severing errors from the truths in our minds; this expression refers to His ridding us of our faults and weaknesses. This will appear from a consideration of the symbols underlying these words. In Israel fullers did three things with the soiled and spotted clothes given them for

their attention: (1) they washed, (2) shrank and (3) bleached them. In this text reference is made to only the first of these three parts of a fuller's work. In washing the soiled garments he used soap or lye to cut the grease. Some of the grease spots yielded readily to his rubbing and others did not. Of the latter some were cleansed without any injury to the garment; others were by it worn rather thin where the spots were; and still other spots could not be removed without rubbing holes in the garment. The following explanation of the involved symbols will make this part of our text clear. In the symbols of the Bible water is used to picture God's Word, especially in its nourishing, thirst-quenching and cleansing effects (Deut. 32:2; Ezek. 36:25; John 4:10-14; 15:3); garments are used to represent our characteristics and characters (Col. 3:10-12; 1 Pet. 5:5; Rev. 16:15); clean white garments represent good characteristics and characters (Rev. 19:8; 3:4, 5); defiled and spotted garments represent characteristics and characters soiled by faults and sins (2 Cor. 7:1; Jude 23; Jas. 1:27; Eph. 5:27). The blood of Jesus washes us clean from the condemnation of these sins and faults (1 John 1:7; Rev. 1:5); and the Word of God washes us clean from their power (Eph. 5:26; Heb. 10:22; Num. 8:7). The fuller washing the soiled garments in water and cleansing them from their grease and filth spots represents the Lord in the Word washing and cleansing our characteristics and characters from sins and faults. The soap and lye that the fuller used would respectively represent the mild and sore providences that the Lord combines with His Word to rid our garments of their filth and spots. Some of our grease and filth spots do not yield to the water of Truth alone. Therefore, sometimes mild, sometimes severe afflicting providences are added. These rid the faithful, whether readily or hardly, from their spots. With the measurably unfaithful considerable attenuating

of character and characteristics sets in before the spots are removed and with the entirely unfaithful their symbolic spots are not washed away, but the ruin of their symbolic garments is wrought by the rubbing process, so inseparable from their characters have these spots become therein.

(12) Looking back over the entire Parousia and over the 16 [now 24] years of the Epiphany now past, we see that our Lord has been as the fullers' soap and lye. For all the Truth people in both periods has He applied the cleansing Word, backed by more or less hard providential experiences, to cleanse their spotted and filthy garments. All the Truth that they have needed to recognize this uncleanness and these spots He has given them. All of the power that they have needed to energize them against such filthiness and spots He has put into the Word pertinent to the cleansing of these from their garments; and when these did not suffice, He put them into exacting situations and severe experiences calculated "to cut" the "grease" in this filthiness and in these spots. These experiences have come to us mainly in connection with the siftings amid which we have been, in our contact with the weaknesses of our brethren and of ourselves, in our relations with our families, neighbors, business associates and the nominal church; and we have felt the pinching and the restraints and other hardships of these situations and experiences. These have served to reinforce our knowledge of this filth and of these spots, as well as to arouse us to submit better to our Lord's cleansing work on us; for it has been He who has in all these things been working upon us to cleanse us. In so doing He fulfilled the prophecy of our text which tells us that in the Parousia and Epiphany periods of His Second Advent He would be like the fullers' lye or soap. All of us can testify to such experiences at His hands. We experienced them in the Parousia and

we are now experiencing them in the Epiphany. And blessed are we, if we have been like the garments that yielded up their filth and grease spots at the washing of the earthly fuller.

(13) It will be noticed that the refining and cleansing works are set forth as the reason for the great difficulty of sustaining the day of His coming and of standing when He maketh manifest. This is shown by the word "for" in the clause, "*For* He shall be like a refiner's fire and like fullers' lye." This clause, therefore, gives the reason why in the Parousia it would be so hard to retain the Holy Spirit, and in the Epiphany to stand in the high calling. Accordingly, in both periods the Lord's burning error out of the minds and cleansing faults from the hearts of His own have been the reason why it was so hard to abide as a New Creature in the Parousia and is now in the Epiphany so hard to stand in the high calling as a New Creature. These two works of our Lord have been so rigorous as to test to the utmost the Lord's people as to continuing or ceasing as New Creatures and as to standing in, or falling from the high calling. By no means are these two processes of our Lord in their Epiphany aspects finished. As they worked throughout the Parousia to a completion, so will they also do in the Epiphany. And they will do this so thoroughly as to manifest the fall of every crown-loser from the high calling, but will not avail to bring a single faithful one to a fall from the high calling. On the contrary, this will result in their refining from the dross of error and their cleansing from all filthiness of flesh and spirit without damage to their symbolic silver and garments, a thing that will not be true at all of the Second Deaths, and will be only measurably true of the Great Company class.

(14) Let us notice briefly how sharply and clearly the first four parts of Christ's Second Advent mission are set forth in our text as separate and distinct from

one another. As above remarked, superficial students fail to see the difference between the two questions of v. 2, taking them to mean the same thing; nor do they see the difference between the work represented by the refiner's fire and the fullers' soap or lye. But, as described above, we see four separate and distinct works set forth: (1) the Parousia separation of those who lost from those who retained the Holy Spirit; (2) the Epiphany separation of the Great Company from the Little Flock; (3) the Lord's purging of error from the Truth out of the minds of His own; and (4) His cleansing their heart characteristics from faults and sins. Certainly these distinctions are sharp and clear-cut and they make these four parts of our Lord's Second Advent mission to His own stand out with clarity as separate from one another.

(15) The fifth work of our Lord toward His own in His Second Advent is expressed in the first sentence of v. 3: "He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver." Of course, literal silver is not meant in this sentence; for surely none of our Lord's Second Advent ministries has to do with His smelting and polishing literal silver. Here evidently the word *silver* is used in its ordinary symbolical sense of Truth. Nor are we to understand the word translated *refiner* to mean the same as the word translated *purifier*. Ordinarily our English words *refine* and *purify* as applied to a silversmith's work with silver ore are synonymous. But the connection of thought here in view of our Lord's Second Advent work toward the Truth, forbids such a thought in this instance. Undoubtedly the word translated *refiner* here is well rendered; but not so for the connection the word translated *purifier*. The word *metaher*, here translated *purifier*, which is one of its senses, has also another meaning, *brightener*, or *polisher*; and this second meaning, doubtless, is the one that should be here used; for our Lord does both of these things with the Truth, the second of

which would not be maintained here, if this sense is not given to the pertinent word. This being so, the sentence gives us the thought that the fifth work of our Lord's Second Advent is not only to purge the dross of error from the silver ore of Truth but also to brighten or polish it, *i.e.*, unfold and bring out the beauties of the Truth. This implies the clear and full development of the secular and religious truths due during the Parousia and the Epiphany. But, one might ask, would this work not be the same as the third work of our Lord's Second Advent, as presented above? We answer, there are important differences: (1) The third work described above is limited to the Lord's ridding the *minds of His own* during the Parousia from the errors gotten in great Babylon and during the Epiphany from the errors gotten in little Babylon; while, so far as working against error is concerned, by His fifth work, not simply such error, but secular and other religious errors are likewise meant; (2) our Lord's third Second Advent work has been limited to errors in the minds of His own, whereas His fifth Second Advent work is for others as well; and (3) the third mission does not include the clear and full development of secular and religious Truth for Parousia and Epiphany purposes, whereas the fifth does. Thus, while in a certain limited respect they cover some common ground, in most respects they do not, and therefore may properly be viewed as separate parts of His Second Advent mission.

(16) Accordingly, in this work our Lord, set forth by the words "shall sit," *i.e.*, officially administer, *e.g.*, as a king sits on his throne, a judge sits on the bench, etc., is the official opponent of error and developer of Truth. Not only has Satan corrupted the religious Truth that Christ and the Apostles gave the early Church; but he has also corrupted secular Truth—political, sociological, economic, historical, scientific,

philosophical and moral Truth. In every domain of religious and secular Truth he has wrought this corruption. This he has done because Truth frees (John 8:32-36), while error enslaves (Eph. 4. 18; 2 Cor. 4:4); and therefore the former is inimical and the latter conducive to his enslaving mankind to himself. But Jesus returned to free both the Church and the world from Satan's influence. Therefore He finds it necessary to undermine the secular and religious errors that give Satan such influence and to develop secular Truth as the meat in due season variously ministered by Him to the Church and the world. During the Parousia the Lord attacked the errors then prevailing in the religious world mainly, but not exclusively, through the writings of that Servant, whose refutational religious thoughts, of course, were taken up and spread by others. If we look at the Studies, the booklets, the Towers, the sermons, the tracts, etc., we find that they contain very much of refutational matter. It is for this reason that the volumes are symbolized by the vials, literally bowls, of Rev. 15 and 16. When the Tower, as now edited, claims that it does not engage in controversy (it does write against our Pastor's views, but "prudently" avoids controversy with our replies to such attacks, its editors having from a number of experiences learned their inability to meet our refutations of such attacks), it unwittingly proclaims to the Church and the world that the Lord does not now use it anymore as one of His refining agencies, implied in His third and fifth Second Advent works. The same remark applies to the P.B.I. Herald, which has a similar policy.

(17) So, too, our Lord attacked the secular errors that Satan spread, not only before, but also during our Lord's Parousia. Against his political, sociological, economic, historical, scientific, philosophical and moral errors, the Lord not only used religious truths, again especially through that Servant's writings, but

He also raised up mainly a horde of secular writers, lecturers and others in the political, sociological, economic, historical, scientific, philosophical and moral domains, who during the Parousia greatly undermined such errors. Thus the rotten foundation and superstructure of Satan's empire were pitilessly exposed as such during the Parousia, with the result that as men became more and more enlightened on these subjects, the harder it became for Satan to keep them in subjection to his will. Thus by books, booklets, tracts, magazine and newspaper articles and by lectures, debates, conversational discussion and other agitations, the errors of Satan, both in the religious and secular domains, were during the Parousia mightily attacked and overthrown, to the increased liberation of mankind from Satan's power, *e.g.*, on the Divine right of rulers, clergy, aristocrats, consciousness of the dead, eternal torment, etc., etc. It was these exposures that bound Satan to the degree that he was forced to resort to the World War, despite his knowing that it would weaken his empire, as a means of preventing a revolution which he feared would utterly overthrow it, choosing, as he thought, the lesser of the two evils. But the Lord "catcheth the wise in their own craftiness"; for the war, which Satan thought would prevent the ruin of his empire, has paved the way all the quicker and fuller for its certain ruin.

(18) During the Epiphany the Lord is likewise overthrowing secular and religious errors, either brought over from the past or freshly invented. In the refutation of the *religious* errors of the Epiphany time the Lord mainly, but not exclusively, uses the writings of that Servant and of the Epiphany messenger (Deut. 32:30, 31; compare with Ps. 91:7). This is why also The Present Truth and The Herald Of The Epiphany contain so much of refutational matter. These uses that the Lord has been making of such controversial writings should make us beware of being deceived by

such pledges as those of the Society and the P.B.I. editors, not to engage in controversy, as though it were an evil to be shunned, and into a dislike of such controversial efforts; for such pledges and effects are an effort at deception, and this effort at deception is evidently from Satan in the interests of his aims, and is evidently against God's design to overthrow through "the controversy of Zion" the religious errors that have been deceiving and enslaving mankind, bewildering some priests and blinding the Great Company and many Youthful Worthies. The attack on Satan's *secular* errors has in the Epiphany been by our Lord subordinately made by the two sets of writings just referred to, but mainly by more or less secular experts in the pertinent subjects, using the same means of expression employed during the Parousia. And under these attacks and exposures Satan's religious and secular errors are being undermined more and more. Our Lord, being the one who is managing this entire attack, both in its religious and secular respects, regardless of who the instruments are that He therein uses, is thereby fulfilling His office work as He who sits as a refiner of silver.

(19) But He also sits, functions officially, as the polisher, *i.e.*, developer, of symbolic silver, Truth, as this fifth point also shows. This means that He functions as the one who during the Parousia and the Epiphany has been bringing advancing secular and religious Truth to the attention of His own and of others, that He has been constantly elaborating and increasing the contents of its various subjects, that He is ever clarifying, explaining and proving its new points as they become due to be understood and used. This results in the constant increase of the body of Truth made known and in the ever clearer unfolding of its various parts and details. In the religious domain we can see Him having done these things during the Parousia, as we read our Pastor's writings, which

constantly revealed new vistas of Truth, and constantly made them shine with greater brightness. In the Epiphany we can see Him doing the same thing through The Present Truth and The Herald Of The Epiphany. Doubtless He has done this through these writings, though in a considerably less degree through the writings and discourses of others also. While to some degree He has shed some light on secular Truth through these writings, especially through Vol. 4 and The Herald Of The Epiphany, He has unfolded secular truths during the Parousia and the Epiphany mainly through the lectures and writings of experts in the secular departments of learning indicated above. And for the spread of such Truth He has used instrumentalities similar to those noted above as used in overthrowing secular error.

(20) Let us, dear brethren, honor our Lord, and not the agents that He uses, as the One who sits—functions officially—as the Refiner and Polisher, Developer, of the silver of Truth. While we are to hold His pertinent agents as such in esteem, we are always to remember that they are not the source either of the secular or religious Truth to the Church and the World. The ultimate source of it is God and the proximate source of it is Christ. The highest honor that others can rightly have in this connection is that of being privileged religious or secular servants of God and Christ. Such an attitude will keep them humble and restrain others from the extremes of (1) worshiping messengers, as is done, *e.g.*, by the Channelites, and (2) of despising dignities, as is done, *e.g.*, by those who reject all human teachers (Col. 2:18; 2 Pet. 2:10); while it will enable us highly to love, honor and adore God and Christ as such sources of the Truth, and to esteem their agents no more than as *their* agents. Let us, therefore, ever remember that it is our Lord who sits as the Refiner and Polisher of

the Truth, and not His agents, however largely He may use them as His mouth and hand.

(21) The sixth part of our Lord's Second Advent mission toward His own is set forth in the following words: "He shall purify [thoroughly polish, develop] the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and as silver." The word translated *purify* is the verb from which is derived the noun translated in the preceding sentence, *purifier*, which we saw means, not to be one who purges out the dross of error, but to be one who develops the silver of Truth. Therefore the verb should be rendered here by the word *polish, develop*. The verb form here used in the Hebrew shows that the idea of thoroughly polishing, developing, is the thought. Above we saw under point four that the Lord rids us of our faults, which is the destructive part of character development. Here the other, the constructive side of such activity is brought to our view; for it means that our Lord enables His own to grow, become strong, balanced and crystallized in Christlikeness. The word *purge*, used in the second clause, does not contradict this. Rather it confirms it from the following point of view: That part of our constructive character development which is wrought already in us becomes an agency in us to destroy our faults and by such destructive work—exercise—is itself increased in character growth (Rom. 8:13; 12:21; Heb. 5:14; Gal. 5:16, 17). Hence this part of our text treats of our Lord's constructive work on our characters, as distinct from His destructive work thereon, brought to our attention above.

(22) By *the sons of Levi* in this text the Little Flock and Great Company are meant. This becomes manifest from the type. The typical sons of Levi were the descendants of Jacob through his son Levi. At Sinai these became divided into two classes, the sacrificers and their assistants, usually called priests and Levites. These took the place of the firstborn in

Israel (Num. 3:40-51), who, St. Paul assures us, type the Church of the firstborn—the Little Flock and the Great Company (Heb. 12:23; Rev. 7:1-8, 8-17). This is further suggested by their purging and development being pictured forth by the refining and developing of gold and silver. While ordinarily in Biblical symbols gold represents that which is Divine and silver represents the Truth (1 Cor. 3:12, 13), exceptionally gold is Biblically used to represent the Little Flock and silver to represent the Great Company (2 Tim. 2:20). According to this, our text teaches that the sixth part of our Lord's Second Advent mission to His own is to develop the Little Flock and the Great Company in character, growth, strength, balance and crystallization, among other ways of accomplishing which He uses their past attainments in this respect destructively against their faults ("purge them"). He accomplishes this through the Spirit, Word and providences of God. This text stresses mainly the providential experiences whereby He accomplishes these for His people, *e.g.*, losses, disappointments, delays, restraints, shelvings, siftings, our and others' faults, mistakes and failings, chastisements, necessities, hardships, misunderstandings, oppositions, poverty, riches, sorrow, sickness, suffering, persecution, etc. He also ministers the Word to them to this end, in its enlightening, energizing, strengthening and cleansing capacities. He likewise ministers the Spirit to them in the sense of increasing it in them and in the sense of energizing what they have of it unto exercise for good and against evil. By so doing He fulfills the sixth part of His Second Advent mission, expressed in the words, "And He shall polish [develop] the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and as silver." Of course He has done this throughout the Age to the crown-retainers and crown-losers; but this part of His work is not touched on in our text, its view being restricted to a description, brief, but comprehensive,

of the works that He would do toward His own during the Parousia and Epiphany periods of His Second Advent.

(23) In the rest of v. 3 the seventh part of our Lord's Second Advent mission to His own is brought to our attention in the words: "that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness," literally, "that they may be bringers of a meat offering to Jehovah in righteousness." This part of the verse shows one of the reasons why the Lord Jesus develops the Little Flock and the Great Company in character and purges them from faults. It is, among other things, to qualify them righteously to serve the Lord in proclaiming the Truth, especially its deeper and fuller features—the meat offering. As we have already learned, the drink offering represents the setting forth of the easier truths of the Word, and the meat offering represents the setting forth of its harder features. The Truth is for both the crown-retainers and the crown-losers to set forth. The less conformed they are to the Lord's character and the more glaring their faults are, the less qualified are they to preach the Truth helpfully, and the more hindrances do they present to its spread and influence. They are not to say, "Do as I say, not as I do," as certain preachers have brazenly said. They are to be so much like the Lord as to be able to say, "Do as I do and as I say." The former is the presenting to the Lord of a meat offering in unrighteousness; the latter, in righteousness. Therefore, to enable the antitypical sons of Levi to be bringers of a meat offering to the Lord in righteousness, our Lord, whose high-priestly work it is to make our sacrifice acceptable, to offer it and to enable us to keep in the proper offering attitude, works on our characters to develop, strengthen, balance and crystallize them, as well as to purge out of them their faults. This is gradually and increasingly done by Him. Consequently, we are gradually and increasingly qualified

by Him as the seventh part of His Second Advent mission to His own, to be bringers of a meat offering to the Lord in righteousness. Such making of the antitypical sons of Levi acceptable for sacrifice, such sacrificing of them initially and such enabling of them to co-operate with Him in their sacrificings, our Lord certainly has wrought during the Parousia and the Epiphany. Surely without this character-developing and cleansing work, the Truth could be neither clearly seen nor unctuously preached; hence the offering could not be made in righteousness; and His work it is to qualify and enable them to bring the meat offering, preach the Truth, in righteousness to the Divine pleasing.

(24) That His ministry has in this way increasingly qualified the Little Flock to bring in righteousness a meat offering to God, both in the Parousia and in the Epiphany, is evidenced by the facts. Certainly during the Parousia they presented its glorious truths, not only the simpler, but the deeper ones, and did it in righteousness. As a result of this they did, not all, but the main part of the reaping work, and thus were very efficient in winning the bulk of the feet members of the Christ, as well as many crown-losers and individual Youthful Worthies. Their characters, by the Lord's ministry becoming increasingly like the Truth that they presented, lent power, weight and influence to their message, which thus, ever more effectively, accomplished the reaping work. His ministry to them qualified them for the work of witnessing to the world of sin, righteousness and judgment, the Kingdom to come. This same ministry of our Lord has enabled them to do effectively and fruitfully the work toward Azazel's Goat. As a proof of, and reward for their faithfulness in retaining their crowns, the Lord has given them the honor of confessing the sins of antitypical Israel over Azazel's Goat (Ps. 149:5-9; Lev. 16:20-22), leading it to the gate and fit man and abandoning it to the

wilderness condition. Qualified thereto by our Lord's Second Advent ministry on them, they successfully from 1914 to 1916 brought to a completion the preaching that confessed the pertinent sins over that Goat. And ever since the Fall of 1916 they have been doing their other work of setting forth the Truth as to the other parts of the message pertinent to Azazel's Goat. In due time this will lead to the latter's cleansing and thus this feature of their work will be successfully concluded. The same ministry of our Lord on their behalf will qualify them for, and enable them to preach the Word that will help the cleansed Great Company to do its real Epiphany work in righteousness. It likewise qualifies and enables them to preach the Word that gathers and develops Youthful Worthies for Epiphany purposes. Thus we see that our Lord's ministry to the Little Flock during the Parousia enabled it so to preach the Word in righteousness as to gather most of the wheat into the Truth and to develop it aright, and to deal helpfully with the world, the crown-losers not yet manifested as Levites and individual Youthful Worthies, as well as in the Epiphany to preach in righteousness effectively for its work toward the Great Company and the Youthful Worthies according to God's will.

(25) So far as the past and present condition of the Great Company has permitted His developing and purging ministry to work effectively in them, He has been assisting them to preach in righteousness. This they did better as crown-losers not yet manifested as Great Company members, *i.e.*, during the Parousia, than they have been doing as manifested Great Company members in the Epiphany. Hence during the Parousia they righteously preached the Word to the winning of some of the feet members and some unmanifested Youthful Worthies. With the Youthful Worthies ("the strangers") they ("the poor") did most of the gleaning work (1914-1916), while the

Little Flock was mainly occupied in confessing the sins over Azazel's Goat. Their present work is done partly by the good side, but mainly by the bad side of their double minds, hence is not done in righteousness, and, therefore, will mainly have to be burned up. But after they are cleansed they will bring to the Lord a meat offering in righteousness. Theirs will be a glorious work, made real by our Lord's ministry toward them, after their cleansing. In the first place, they will convert the nominal people of God to the Truth in Studies Vol. 1. The Lord is now erecting His Epiphany Tabernacle, whose Most Holy is the Spirit-born part of the Little Flock, whose Holy is the crown-retainers, whose Court is the Great Company and Youthful Worthies and whose Camp will be those who will persist in believing in Jesus as Savior and King. The Epiphany Tabernacle proper is completed, and the Court is now in process of erection, *i.e.*, the posts are being erected, some 40 of which, the Great Company divisions among Truth People, are already in place, and in a few years the rest of the 60 will be put up. Then the curtain will be hung upon the posts and will by them be held up to the view of all in the Camp. This curtain represents Christ as Savior and King. The contents of Vol. 1 may well be summarized in the expression, Christ as Savior and King. This will be the substance of the Great Company's message after they are cleansed (Rev. 19:5; Num. 8:20-22). That message will be given by lectures, colporteuring, sharp-shooting, volunteering, conversation and pastoral work, whose classes will study Vol. 1 of the Studies by the Berean method. Thus they will convert God's nominal people to the Truth of Studies Vol. 1—Christ as Savior and King—after the earthquake has destroyed the beast and his image and destroyed the influence of the nominal church clergy. Thus will the Lord's developing and cleansing work in them enable

them to bring this meat offering to Jehovah in righteousness, which insures its effectiveness.

(26) One other great work will Jesus' developing and purging ministry qualify and enable the Great Company to do—preach so effectively to the Jews as to convert them to Christ. We have already shown that this work is to be done by them in attestation of their purification as a part of the antitypical mother of a daughter (Lev. 12:5-8), from 1954 to 1956, paralleling the Little Flock's attestorial work as the mother of a son, forty years previous. That the Great Company is to do such a work is also shown in Cant. 5:8—6:1. Their preaching to Israel is described in vs. 10-16; and Israel's conversion is shown in 6:1. That Israel's national conversion is to take place in Palestine in, and at the end of Jacob's trouble, is evident from Zech. 12:2-14; Jer. 30:3-9; Ezek. 39:17-29. In converting Israel through preaching the Word to them, the Great Company will be bringing a meat offering to the Lord in righteousness, effective in its purpose. And our Lord's ministry in their character development and cleansing will qualify and enable them to preach so unctuously, clearly and convincingly as to win Israel to the Lord. Certainly this will be a glorious result of their "meat offering," and is devoutly to be wished.

(27) When we deeply and devoutly consider the above-described seven parts of our Lord's Second Advent ministry for His own, we may well cry out, "What an excellent ministry He hath obtained!" But such is only a part of His Gospel-Age work; for all through the Age He has been working on the crown-retainers and crown-losers, developing and cleansing them in character for their varied service, as well as fitting them for their future service. This age-long work of His manifests such tact, faith, hope, knowledge, self-control, patience, charity, kindness, longsuffering, forgiveness, forbearance, zeal, generosity and faithfulness as find no equals in any other being

except God. When we consider His wondrous character and great works displayed in His Age-long dealings with the Little Flock and Great Company, especially in His Parousia and Epiphany mission, we are lost in wonder, love and praise. In appreciative adoration at being beneficiaries of so great a ministry, we cry out, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom and strength and honor and glory and blessing" (Rev. 5:12)! Let us unite every power of ours to show Him our appreciation for His loving kindness (O, how good!), by faithfulness to His Father, to Him, to His people and to His cause.

(28) Above we called attention to our Lord's sevenfold mission to His own in the Parousia and Epiphany. But His pertinent mission extends to others than His own. Among these others is Babylon, whose hour of judgment, wasting and destruction will now be briefly discussed [written March, 1922]. Lately we have been struck with the use of the expressions, "in one day," and "in one hour" (Rev. 18:8, 10, 17, 19), as describing the periods within which Babylon's judgment, wasting and destruction begin and end. We are all, of course, aware of the fact that a symbolic day may be a year (Rev. 11:3), or forty years (Ps. 95:8-11; Matt. 20:1-16), or a thousand years (2 Pet. 3:7, 8), and that there are also other Scriptural meanings for the word day, like an age, etc. It seems quite reasonable to assume that the day of Rev. 18:8 is not a year-day nor the Harvest day; for an hour of such days would be too short a time to fulfill the work described in Rev. 18:10, 17, 19. Moreover, the Harvest day is already past, and Babylon is not yet destroyed. The thousand-years day—the Millennial Age—as a day better fits the facts of these verses. We are all aware of the fact that that Age has several beginnings by reason of the lapping of the Gospel and Millennial Ages into one another—1874, 1878, 1881, 1914, etc.

(29) We already have pointed out (Chapter II) that an hour of such a day would be 41 years and 8 months, as we saw in the case of the hour of reaping, from Sept. 1874, to May, 1916, and in the case of the "hour of temptation," from April, 1878, to Dec. 1919. If our assumption is correct that the day of Rev. 18:8 is the Millennial Age, then the three hours of Rev. 18:10, 17, 19—one mentioned in each verse—would each represent a period of 41 years and 8 months. This being true, we know from the facts of the case that we must begin the hour of her judgment (Rev. 18:10) in Sept., 1874, and the hour of her wasting (Rev. 18:17) in April, 1878; but we could not start the hour of her destruction with either of those dates, because an hour from those dates ended in May, 1916, and Dec., 1919, respectively, and now is in the past, and has not witnessed the beginning of the end of Babylon's destruction. If we should date the hour of her destruction (Rev. 18:19) as beginning with Oct. 1881 (Sept. 24th was the first day of the seventh month, lunar time, in 1881), that hour would end by June, 1923. (May 16, 1923, will be the date in lunar time, according to which time the hour of reaping and the hour of temptation were reckoned.) If this time-setting is correct, then by June, 1923, Mystic Babylon will begin to go out of existence, which would mean that the antitypical "earthquake" will begin between now and that date.

(30) It will be noticed that there are three kinds of experiences mentioned as coming to Babylon during the day of her overthrow. We believe that these three experiences are mentioned in their chronological order in Rev. 18:10, 17, 19, *i.e.*, verse 10 refers to Babylon's *judgment*; verse 17 to her *wasting*; and verse 19 to her *destruction*. The items seem so to be stated in order to bring out these three beginning stages of her overthrow. The hour is also mentioned three times, in order to mark the three different time beginnings

and endings of these three works. We know that not only in October (to be exact, Sept. 12) 1874, the hour of reaping, but also Babylon's *crisis*—the initial stage of her judgment—began (Rev. 18:10); for just as our Lord in His First Advent (Oct., 29, to April, 33) by His ministry put the Jewish Church system into its *crisis*—the beginning of its judgment—so, as a parallel act, by His ministry in His Second Advent (Oct., 1874, to April, 1878), He put Babylon into her *crisis*—the beginning of her judgment. Thus when the hour of reaping began in 1874 Babylon's crisis also began (Rev. 14:15; 18:10).

(31) Again, just as our Lord in April, 33, at the end of the *crisis* feature of Israel's judgment as a system, declared Israel's house desolate—cast off and given up to wasting—and thereby ended her riches as the hand, eye and mouth of God and as the custodian of God's oracles and Covenant (Matt. 23:38, 39), and thereby began her wasting, so at the parallel time and as the parallel event in April, 1878, our Lord, at the end of the crisis feature of Babylon's judgment as a system, declared her desolate—cast off and given up to wasting and thereby ended her riches as the hand, eye and mouth of God and as the custodian of God's oracles and Covenant (Rev. 3:16; 18:17), and thereby began her wasting. Again, as in October 36 *exclusive* favor was withdrawn from all in the Jewish system, and nothing but destruction was left as the portion of that fallen system, from which every feature of special favor was thenceforth withdrawn, so at the parallel time and as the parallel event *exclusive* favor was in October, 1881, withdrawn from all in Babylon, and nothing but destruction was left as the portion of fallen Babylon, from which every feature of special favor was thenceforth withdrawn. As will be noticed, it is said that her judgment, which included her *crisis*, sentence and the final reading of her death warrant, would be within an hour, that her wasting

would be within an hour, and that her destruction, annihilation, would be within an hour. The first two already have been fulfilled, and we find that her judgment ended with the end of the hour of reaping—when the reaping of the last saint in Babylon, Apr. 18, 1916, occurred, though in each country this occurred just before it became involved in the World War; for the removal of the last saint from her midst was in each country a beginning of the final reading of Babylon's death warrant (Rev. 7:3). The wasting from its beginning to the beginning of its end occupied about the full hour allotted to it—from the time when the first sifting—1878—reached Babylon until the time that the sixth sifting—revolution in the Inter-Church and World movement—reached Babylon—1919. It will be noticed that these two hours were contemporaneous with the hour of reaping and the hour of temptation. The hour of her destruction has only a little over a year to run, if our understanding as just given is correct. And within this period the beginning of the end of Babylon's sudden destruction (1 Thes. 5:3) is to be expected, if the above viewpoint is a right one.

(32) The interpretation just given strikes us as reasonable. It may be that the hour of her destruction began later than October, 1881, but this seems improbable. There is no special event earlier than that date to begin it; for the time of an hour of 41 years and 8 months has ended already, if we should begin it either with Oct., 1874, or with April, 1878—the special dates preceding Oct., 1881. Nor does there seem to be any specially marked date later than Oct., 1881, at which to begin the hour of her destruction, unless we should take Oct., 1914, which would make the time of the "earthquake" come shortly before June, 1956—a date that seems to be too late to be entertained. Therefore Oct. 1881, seems to be the most reasonable date for the beginning of the hour of her destruction.

However, it is our recognition of the possibility of starting the hour of her destruction at a date between Oct. 1881, and Oct. 1914, that holds us back from positiveness in the matter. The most that we feel free in the Lord to say on the subject is that it is highly probable that the hour of her destruction began Oct., 1881; and with this very reasonable probability in mind, we would not be acting unwisely to look forward with some anticipation to Babylon's experiencing the beginning of the end of her overthrow by June, 1923. If this probability proves to be a fact, as it is quite likely to do, it means that antitypical John's rebuke and antitypical Elijah's letter are very near—yea, at the very doors. These considerations are so many exhortations from our Lord, who is leading us in our warfare, to renewed zeal in our public work, particularly in our special service. Brethren, let us renew our zeal and courage, and then press forward! Who is there among us that would not make for the Lord, the Truth and the brethren the best of the time yet left for this work?

(33) Over a year ago (written June, 1923) we wrote the above in P '22, 56. In it we set forth the thought of the probability of the beginning of the end of Babylon's destruction, and that probably through the symbolic earthquake, coming by June, 1923—to be more exact, by May 17, 1923. We based this probability on the likelihood of the hour of her destruction (Rev. 18:19) being the period of $41 \frac{2}{3}$ years lunar time from about Oct. 1881, to June, 1923—to be more exact from Sept. 25, 1881, to May 17, 1923. Knowing that prophecies usually fulfill in surprising manners, and also not being positive as to whether the date Oct., 1881—to be more exact Sunday, Sept. 25, 1881—when the distribution of the Food For Thinking Christians began at church doors (C 367, Note; compare Z '81, 293, col. 1, par. 2, Reprints) was the date with which that hour began, we cautioned the brethren

against being positive on the subject, since we ourselves saw that the thought was an inference based on what to us was not then entirely definite data. Knowing that the end of Babylon's destruction would be by the coming symbolic earthquake, we also inferred that that earthquake would probably begin before May 17, 1923. We continued to study Rev. 18:19, remembering that prophetic dates usually fix the beginnings and not the endings of the events to which they refer, and that they sometimes give the events that are Divinely causally connected with their fulfillments as such fulfillments.

(34) But May 17, 1923, came and went, and the [great] symbolic earthquake has not yet set in. From this we see that the thought of the probability of the symbolic earthquake preceding that date was not realized. Were we, therefore, wrong in suggesting as probably true the thought that by May 17, 1923, the hour of her destruction would be fulfilled? We reply, No. Not only were we not wrong, but fulfilled events demonstrate that that thought has proven correct. For by the beginning of the circulation of Elijah's letter, May 16, 1923, the last day of the hour of her destruction, the *beginning of the end* of Babylon's destruction set in. This letter is certainly doing a destructive work as respects Babylon, and events will, we believe, yet prove that it is the thing that is Divinely causally connected with her destruction through the symbolic earthquake coming from non-Truth sources.

(35) Some explanations will clarify the thought that by the circulation of Elijah's letter, *the beginning* of the end of Babylon's destruction set in. This will become clear, if we note what started Babylon's destruction, which set in, of course, with the beginning of the hour of her destruction. That event was the distribution of Food For Thinking Christians, at church doors, which began Sept. 25, 1881. That that booklet began the destruction of Babylon, we can

see from its destructive overthrow of Babylon's errors, and from what our Pastor said of it in the Nov., 1881, Tower, as found in the Tower Reprints, 291, par. 7: "The work ... was impelled by an unseen hand and *at such a special time*, too, that we cannot doubt that it is all of the Lord ... as ... one of the many instruments to be used in the overthrow of 'Babylon'." Please also see Tower Reprints, 274, pars. 16, 17, which show her destruction was due to begin about Oct. 1881. Thus we see that it was by His Priesthood that the Lord *began* Babylon's destruction at the outstart of the hour of her destruction. God has always honored His Priests with the privilege of beginning each feature of His plan, after that Priesthood appeared on the scene, as typed by the priests, bearing the Ark, entering Jordan and encircling Jericho in advance of the others. Therefore, when the beginning of the end of Babylon's destruction set in, it also naturally fell to the lot of that Priesthood to initiate that work. This it did by beginning the distribution of Elijah's letter at Philadelphia, May 16, 1923, the last day of "the hour of her destruction," which facts prove to be true.

(36) We desire now to set forth the main pertinent facts as a matter of record for the Church. As stated in our June, 1923 issue: In the first number of The Truth (P '18, 16, par. 1, reprinted among others in P '32, 130, [96]), we set forth the thought that Elijah's letter implied a future public ministry for the Church after its separation from antitypical Elisha. Later on we came to see that antitypical John's rebuke, though related to, would be somewhat different from antitypical Elijah's letter and would appear before the latter. This distinction is indicated by the contents of each as set forth in the pertinent types (2 Chro. 21:12-15; Matt. 14:4). In Luke 3:19, what types antitypical John's rebuke is set forth in the language, "Herod ... being reprov'd by him for Herodias his

brother Philip's wife," and what types the same as Elijah's letter is set forth in the language of the rest of the verse, "and for *all* the [other] evils which Herod had done." As we continued to reason on this distinction, we fell into the thought that, unlike John's rebuke, Elijah's letter would probably not be a specially widespread public work; rather that it would probably appear exclusively in a regular issue of the Herald, and as such a few copies of that particular issue would be sent directly by ourself and other brethren, or indirectly by us and other brethren through some postal clerks, to certain prominent civil officials. We gave this as our understanding to not a few of the brethren, and in P '23, 60, col. 2, par. 1, stated that Elijah's letter would not apparently be widespread. This was our thought up to the day, May 1, that the May 15 Herald was taken to the printer, when the thought first struck our mind as a question: "Should Elijah's letter also be printed as a Volunteer Herald?" May 3, we definitely concluded for some of the reasons given in our June, 1923 issue that it was the Lord's will that this letter be published as a Volunteer Herald. Intermittently, *i.e.*, from May 5 to May 7, we revised this letter for use as a Volunteer Herald. On May 7 we took this revised letter to the printer and ordered 200,000 copies of it printed.

(37) May 3, for the first time the thought struck our mind as a question: "May not Elijah's letter be related to Babylon's destruction?" Without our mind coming to any certain decision on the question, we, May 8, first began to wonder whether Elijah's letter might not be the act Divinely causally connected with the symbolic earthquake. Within two days we concluded that it would probably be so related to the symbolic earthquake; and with this thought in mind, we decided that we would recommend to the Philadelphia Church to begin the work of distributing this letter after 6 P.M., Standard Time, May 15, which was by

God's time, May 16, and which we had just definitely learned was the last day of the hour of Babylon's destruction. The work of distributing this letter was accordingly started on that date, so far as we ourself were concerned with the thought that it might in some way be connected with the *beginning of the end* of Babylon's destruction and also with the symbolic earthquake; but if so connected, just how it was thus related to these two events we did not see at that time. It was not until just one week later, May 23, that we came to see it as so related in the sense that it started the end of her destruction and will yet prove to be Divinely causally related to the symbolic earthquake. We now recognize that it was the Lord working on our mind, May 1-10, to influence us to take the successive steps necessary to have Elijah's letter printed as volunteer literature in time to begin its distribution exactly at the close of the hour of Babylon's destruction, in order to enable the Priesthood to begin the end of that destruction on the Divinely designated date. Enemies of ours, of course, will say that we have prearranged the whole matter in order to force the fulfillment of our understanding of a prophecy. But the Lord who has been working out the Parousia and Epiphany events on exact dates, knows that the facts of the case are as given above; and they seem to be of His ordering.

(38) Our experience with the subject of the hour of her destruction is a splendid illustration of the Scripture, "The path of the just is as a shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." About 2 1/2 years ago [Dec., 1920], a question was asked on Rev. 18:19, based on the presumption that it had long since been fulfilled. This question providentially started our mind to think on that passage and its related thoughts in verses 10 and 17. By March, 1922, we had a general, but not thoroughly clear understanding of the subject, with a misunderstanding

on the means especially to be used for what we later learned should be considered the beginning of the end of her destruction in that hour, which thoughts we set forth in P '22, 56. Further thought on the passage enabled us to see certain details more clearly, which we set forth in P '23, 59. Yet the subject was not entirely clear before our mind. It gradually cleared up before us from May 3 to May 23, from which we conclude that we do not now have sure data on the time when the symbolic earthquake will begin. And now we take pleasure in setting forth before the dear brethren what is clear to us, to enlighten their minds, to strengthen their faith, hope and love.

(39) Closely related to the thought given above, on Babylon's one hour of judgment, wasting and destruction, is the line of thought given in Rev. 17. We desire, therefore, by a study of Rev. 17 to call attention to some matters, which refer to the overthrow of the papal Antichrist and the Roman Catholic Church. It is not our design here to give a complete interpretation of Rev. 17. Rather it is our design to give some general thoughts on it to elucidate certain matters therein that have not until recently [written in April, 1929], (until about Feb. 1, 1929) become clear. In Studies, Vol. VII, 263 and 264, is a letter of Bro. Driscoll, Bro. Russell's publicity director, that gave Bro. Russell's latest thought on the probable meaning of Rev. 17:9-11. That letter shows that he had three probable thoughts on the passage; and then it proceeds to give the one which he thought the most probable of the three, but to which, however, he would not commit himself, being uncertain whether it would be the fulfillment or not. We suggest that all read this letter. In the late Summer of 1916, Bro. Russell stated in the Bethel dining room that he did not think it the due time for him to write his promised exposition on Revelation, because, if it were, he would understand everything

in it, whereas he did not yet understand four things in it: (1) its key; (2) the meaning of the number 666 [he thus indicated that he had given up the Adventist thought, once favored by him, that it stood for the sum of the Latin numerals in the title, *Vicarius Filii Dei* (Vicar of the Son of God), engraved on the pope's crown]; (3) the 1600 furlongs; and (4) Rev. 17:9-11. He further said that until these matters would become clear to him, he knew that it was not God's will for him to write his long-promised exposition of that Book.

(40) Since his death all four of these matters have become clear to the author. He has in a tentative and general way been holding to the interpretation that Bro. Russell gave Bro. Driscoll, as outlined in the above-mentioned letter; but has kept silent on the matter, in imitation of our Pastor's example, not to teach it until its fulfillment, because until that time it could not be proven to be true, and might, as he suggested, be merely a speculation. But the events that have been connected with the pope's recently regaining temporal power give, we believe, the missing links in the fulfillment of Rev. 17:9-11; and therefore we feel safe in announcing that our Pastor's general forecast has been proven true by the fulfilled events—another proof that God favored him with special enlightenment, *e.g.*, among other ways, on future things. He verily was that Servant, despite all denials coming from Great Company and Second Death sifters, whose denials really prove it.

(41) Much of this chapter, in general outline, has been made clear to us in Studies, Vols. II, III and IV, and in our Pastor's Tower articles. But many of its details were not by him made clear, and that because not yet due. We will find a summary of most of such thoughts of his in the Comments. But some of these things have been made more or less obscure to not a few of the Lord's dear people by erroneous

interpretations set forth in the Society's, P.B.I.'s and Olsonism's books on Revelation. One of these darkenings is as to what is represented by the angel (v. 1) whose explanation forms the contents of Rev. 17. Our Pastor properly explained the seven angels with the seven bowls (mistranslated *vials*) as representing the Lord's people in the Harvest time, while, *e.g.*, Vol. VII explains this particular angel to mean itself, *i.e.*, Vol. VII (in its Revelation part). Like our Pastor, who gave us privately his thought, we understand the seven vials to represent the seven volumes. It was not in his day yet seen that bowls, as distinct from chargers, cups and spoons, represent refutational teachings, while chargers represent correctional teachings, cups, doctrinal teachings, and spoons, ethical teachings—instructions in righteousness (Is. 52:11; 2 Tim. 3:15-17). This became clear in 1923, as set forth in a special article thereon. Please see P '23, 133-138. Accordingly, we understand the angels' bearing and pouring out the seven bowls (Rev. 15:16) to represent the Lord's people in their capacities of giving out, explaining, discussing, elaborating, etc., the refutative teachings of the seven volumes. Not only is the angel of Rev. 17 not Vol. VII, but he is not even the Lord's people in their capacity of giving out, explaining, discussing and elaborating the refutative teachings of Vol. VII. Rather, he is the Lord's people in their capacity of giving out, explaining, discussing and elaborating the refutative teachings of Vol. III, as this chapter, we believe, will show conclusively.

(42) Our definition implies that the pouring out is not limited exclusively to the refutative *contents* of the volumes. It also includes, as we understand it, whatever is germane to the subject matter there treated. For example, neither Vol. III nor any other volume explains how long the hour will last during which the eighth king and the ten horns will exercise authority together. But further on in this chapter, in

our explanation of matters germane to Vol. III, we will, as one of the Lord's people pouring out that vial, give that duration; and others of the Lord's people will thereafter join us in continuing to pour out that part of the refutative teachings of, or germane to Vol. III. It—the duration of the hour—is to be announced as a forecast, according to the statement of the angel, and it is precisely for this reason and the reasons given in vs. 13-17 that we are now publishing this article; otherwise we would leave the subject matter of this article over until *after the symbolic earthquake*, when we, *D.v.*, will write our promised exposition of Revelation. Not only in a general way does Vol. III, pages 19-226, cover the main features of Rev. 12, 13 and 17, but specifically on page 131 do we find a diagram that gives us a partial key to the seven-headed and ten-horned beast of Rev. 17 and a fairly full key to the seven-headed and ten-horned beasts of Rev. 12 and 13. Please see the diagram.

(43) The foregoing remark leads to another consideration that must be kept in mind to enable us to see daylight on the subject of Daniel's ten- (eleven, counting the little—papal—horn) horned beast and the three seven-headed and ten-horned beasts of Rev. 12, 13 and 17. While in general they represent Rome, they represent it from four not just identical standpoints. The ten horns of Daniel's beast are not the same ten horns as those of the three Revelation beasts. Again, the seven heads of the beast of Rev. 12 and 13 are not just the same as the seven heads of the beast of Rev. 17, though much alike. Our Pastor's diagram (Vol. III, 131) shows that he there counts Rome as a republic as the first head, and this is correct for the beasts of Rev. 12 and 13, but is not correct for the beast of Rev. 17. Why, one may ask, should we differentiate between the ten (eleven) horns of Daniel's beast and the ten horns of the three Revelation beasts? We answer that the ten horns of the Revelation

beasts are contemporaneous (Rev. 17:12-17), while the fact that three horns were plucked up to make way for the little horn proves that all of the horns of Daniel's beast were not contemporaneous, but successive, just as the seven heads of the Revelation beasts are not contemporaneous, but successive. Again, most of Daniel's ten horns exist no more, while the ten horns of the Revelation beast all now exist. Briefly, we would say that we understand the horns of Daniel's beast to represent successive powers that ruled in Italy, either in or outside of Rome, while the ten horns of the Revelation beasts represent the *ten language nations* of Europe reigning for the most of the time contemporaneously (Zech. 8:23). The connection shows this passage to apply at the end of this Age. Europe for centuries has consisted of more than ten nations. There are now over twenty of them there. But for centuries Europe has consisted, and still consists (as Zechariah says) of ten language nations—"ten men of all the languages of the [European] nations," even as Israel, with Hebrew as its national language, though citizenized in many nations, is spoken of as an eleventh man in the same verse. These ten language nations are as follows: Greek, Turkish, Slavic, Magyar, Scandinavian, English, Hispanian, French, Germanic and Italian. There is, apart from scattered Israel, no other language group in Europe than these ten. Thus Zech. 8:23 gives us the key to the ten horns of the three Revelation beasts.

(44) But why, one may ask, do we claim a difference between the seven heads of the beasts of Rev. 12 and 13 and the seven heads of the beast of Rev. 17? We reply: From our Pastor's diagram we see that Rome as a republic was the first head of Rev. 12 and 13. This cannot be true of the first head of Rev. 17; for Rome as a republic had ceased to be before our Lord's birth, Augustus being the first Roman Emperor and Tiberius, his successor, being on the throne years

before our Lord's baptism and death (Luke 2:1; 3:1-3), while, according to Rev. 17:9, 10, the Roman Catholic Church, which did not arise until nearly three centuries later, sat on all seven of the heads of the Rev. 17 beast, *i.e.*, was supported by all seven of these heads. Hence its first head came after Rome as a republic ceased to exist. Moreover, it was only after the Dioclesian persecution ceased, 313 A. D., that the Roman Catholic Church began to be supported by the Roman Empire, *i.e.*, after Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, came to the throne. Hence the Pagan Roman had changed into the so-called Christian Roman Empire, when the Roman Catholic Church began to sit on the first head on which she sat. Hence, from the standpoint of Rev. 17, we may call the first head of its beast, the so-called Christian Roman Empire. Its next five heads are the following: The Western Empire, the Kingdom of the Heruli, the Kingdom of the Ostrogoths, Papacy and the Kingdom of Italy founded by the house of Savoy in 1870, which, as our Pastor correctly taught, is the seventh head of the beasts of Rev. 12 and 13. A marked difference between the eleven horns of Daniel's beast and the seven heads of the three Revelation beasts is this: all of these heads ruled at Rome; but not all of Daniel's horns ruled at Rome. Some did, others did not, though all ruled in Italy.

(45) What is the seventh head of the beast of Rev. 17? It must have come into existence years after 1870; for the angel's statement (Rev. 17:10) that the sixth head—the Italian Kingdom as the seventh of the Rev. 12 and 13 beast—was in existence, was made from 1891 onward to 1914; and, as we will show that the State of the Vatican recently established is the eighth head, the seventh must have already come. What, then, is it? We reply: It is the Fascist Italian State, which, having overthrown the Italian Constitution adopted under the House of Savoy and having

destroyed parliamentarianism, an essential part of the Italian Kingdom, has organized an entirely different form of government from the limited monarchy established by the House of Savoy. Its establishment followed the Fascist Revolution of late Oct. 1922, whose climax was the Fascists' march to, and occupation of Rome. Hence it is another kingdom and is the seventh head of the Rev. 17 beast. The viewpoints of the pictures of Rev. 12 and 13, beginning with the Roman Republic, when Rome first came to view in prophecy, and stopping short of the Time of Trouble, 1914, naturally do not contemplate the Fascist Italian State within their scope, while the Rev. 17 viewpoint, embracing exclusively the period of the Roman Catholic Church in its being supported by the Roman State (the woman seated on the seven heads), begins with the time of Constantine, shortly after 313, and ends with the harlot's annihilation in Armageddon. From this last viewpoint, we understand the Fascist Italian State to be the seventh and the Vatican State, recently created, to be the eighth head of the Rev. 17 beast.

(46) There are some contrasted expressions that should be kept in mind while thinking on the subject of the beasts in Revelation. One of these is this: Whereas in Rev. 12, 13 and 16 the Roman Empire as a political power in its various phases is exclusively meant by the dragon, beginning with Rev. 13, and always afterward, the expression, the beast, applies to it as it exists *in the papacy*, one of its heads. Hence from Rev. 12 onward, the civil power as distinct from the papacy is called the dragon, while in contrast the papacy invariably from Rev. 13 onward is called the beast. This contrast can be seen especially as between chapters 12 and 13 and also in chapter 13, and is very manifest in Rev. 16:13, as it is also in part seen in Ps. 91:13. This also applies to chapter 17. Thus the sixth head of the beasts of Rev. 12 and 13 and the fifth and eighth heads of the beast of Rev. 17, are

the papacy; and, while at the same time it thus is meant by certain heads, it also from Rev. 13 onward is called, the beast. Another peculiarity of contrasted expressions that should be kept in mind is the clear cut distinction that Rev. 17 makes between the Roman Catholic Church and the papacy, which most people look upon as the same. The Roman Catholic Church is a denomination. The papacy (in its full sense) is the hierarchy, which has as its head the pope, and which has usurped control of the Catholic Church. The Roman Catholic Church existed before the papacy. This distinction is shown in several ways in Rev. 17. The Roman Catholic Church is the harlot who sits on the beast (Rev. 17:3), which is the papacy. Again, she is the woman that sits on the seven heads, one of which, as well as the beast, is the papacy (Rev. 17:9). This proves the distinction.

(47) The seven heads are defined (v. 9) first in a figurative way, as seven mountains, and then, literally, as seven kings, which word in prophecy is frequently used for kingdoms (Dan. 2:44; 7:17, 24; 8:20; 11:5, 6, etc.), while in many passages the word, mountain, is used figuratively to represent a kingdom (Dan. 2:35; Is. 2:2, 3; 11:9; 25:6, 7, 10; 30:29; 56:7; 57:7, 13; 65:11, 25; 66:20, etc.). The time that God's people began to expound, etc., the message of Vol. III as to the Roman Empire in its various heads was especially from 1891, when Vol. III was published, onward, and since the papal head ceased to be in 1870, the beast from 1891 until just recently could truly be spoken of as *having once been, as not longer being* and as *later coming to be again* (vs. 8, 11). This was repeatedly done by them, as all of us know, from 1891 onward. All of us know that they spoke of the beast (papacy) *being* from 539 until 1870, then of its being out of existence as a temporal power, and then as coming again later into existence as a temporal power. Certainly the papacy originally, when it

became the fifth head, ascended out of the abyss—error (Rev. 11:7); and in its second time becoming a head—the eighth—it came out of the abyss—the error of its claims to temporal power by Divine right, as an alleged necessity of its office requirements (v. 8); but God says it will shortly go down into destruction.

(48) At the time when God's people were expounding the message of, and matters germane to Vol. III, they taught that the so-called Christian Roman Empire, the Western Empire, the Kingdom of the Heruli, the Kingdom of the Ostrogoths and the Papacy—the five kings—had fallen—ceased to be—and that another (the sixth of the Rev. 17 kings or heads) reigned, *viz.*, the Italian Kingdom of the House of Savoy. They also, without understanding its character, forecast the coming of another—the seventh—which has proven to be the Fascist Italian State. They did not know exactly the length of the stay of what proved to be the Fascist Italian State, but from v. 10, as well as from the chronology, they knew that its stay would be short. It will probably last until the symbolic earthquake, although it could fall before, and if it should, the papacy would get exclusive power in Rome; for if another power should do this before Armageddon, there would be nine heads—a thing contradictory to the Scriptures (vs. 9-11). They often mistakenly spoke of an eighth beast coming, calling it a headless beast, mistakenly understanding that it would be the form of government following the revolution. Their mistake on this is not shown in the angel's speech. On the contrary, the first time the angel says anything about the eighth (king, *i.e.*, head) he speaks of it as an already existing thing—"The beast ... is himself an eighth [king]." This proves that the true interpretation would not be clearly declared by the Lord's people until the beast as the eighth (king, *i.e.*, head) would be here. The fulfillment has finally enabled us to understand its character

and the time of its coming, as we knew and declared beforehand, on the basis of Rev. 17:9-11, that some kind of an eighth power would come. The angel's statement, therefore, proves that now is the due time for the Lord's people to declare, especially to one another, the presence of its eighth king or head.

(49) The beast (v. 11)—the papacy—which was until 1870, and which, at least from 1891 onward until recently, was spoken of by God's people as not being, *i.e.*, not existing as a temporal power, becomes the eighth *king*. We add the word *king* after the word *ogdoos* (masculine), *eighth*, because the masculine adjective *ogdoos* requires a masculine noun for completeness; and the connection (vs. 9, 10) shows that the angel is speaking of the heads as representing *kings*—*basileis* (plural), *basileus* (singular). The word *beast* (*therion*), being neuter in Greek, cannot be supplied after the word *ogdoos*, whose masculine form cannot be used with the neuter *therion*. If *therion* were to be supplied, the word form for *eighth* would be *ogdoon*. Moreover, the facts of the case disprove the reading, *eighth beast*; for nowhere do the Scriptures speak of such a thing, when treating on this subject. Nor can the word *head* (though it is the proper symbol for the thing meant—v. 9) be inserted after the word *ogdoos*; for the Greek word for *head* (*kephale*), used in this connection, is feminine, and to agree with it the Greek word for *eighth* would have to be feminine in form which, therefore, would have to read *ogdoe*. Hence, properly, the connection shows that *basileus*, king, must be supplied after the word *ogdoos* eighth. Hence the following is the proper translation: "And the beast which was, and is not, himself is also an eighth [king], and is [one] of the seven." The papacy, as the fifth king of the Rev. 17 beast is self-evidently, as the eighth, one of the seven kings—kingdoms. Praise be to God for the next clause: "and he goes down into destruction."

(50) The first sentence of v. 12 refers to explanations of the ten horns already made by God's people, while the second refers to such as are now beginning to be made. The ten language nations of Europe (v. 12) are spoken of as receiving authority (*exousia*, here used, means *authority* or *authorization*, not power, whose Greek equivalent is *dynamis*). From the papal standpoint, unless recognized by the papacy, these ten kingdoms have no *Divine right*, *exousia*, to rule. And by papal recognition they allegedly, from the papal standpoint, are receiving (present tense in the Greek) such authorization, which will last *one symbolic hour*. We repeat a former statement: if it were not from this verse manifest that the Lord's people were to forecast the duration of such supposed ruling by Divine right, and to forecast the things of vs. 13-17, we would not have written on this subject; but the forecast being due to be made during the time the authorization was being received, as proved by the present tense, the Fascist government being the first to receive it, and the Lord having given us the understanding of the passage, we feel it to be the Lord's will to declare this matter that the rest of the Lord's people may join in with us in making this forecast; for, according to this Scripture, the antitypical angel—the Lord's people declaring, etc., the message of, and germane to Vol. III—*forecast* the duration of the alleged Divine right rule, after it had already started, as proved by the present tense: They *are receiving* authority one hour as kings. This we now proceed to do with the help of the Lord.

(51) Of course, the hour of this passage cannot be literal; for how could authority be conferred and exercised unto a completion throughout Europe in so short a time? Moreover, this authorization began with Fascist Italy some months ago; hence lasts more than a literal hour. Further, the fact that the word *hour* here occurs in a professedly symbolic book (Rev. 1:1)

implies that it is symbolic. In some Scriptures the word *hour* is used for the Gospel Age (John 5:25; 1 John 2:18), which sense cannot here apply. In some passages the word *hour* means a 24th of a year-day (Rev. 9:15) and, as such, stands for 15 literal days. This length of time has already been more than passed since the papacy gave Fascist Italy the recognition here referred to, so the hour of this verse cannot be a 15-days period. From the standpoint of the Millennial Day (1000 years) a symbolic hour is $41 \frac{2}{3}$ years, as we have seen in Chapter II and above in this chapter in the case of the hour of temptation (Rev. 3:10), of the hour of reaping (Rev. 14:15, A.R.V.), and of the hour of her judgment, wasting and destruction (Rev. 18:10, 17, 19). But this period is entirely too long; for it would put off Armageddon until the middle of 1970, whereas the Scriptures place the anarchy at about 1954. There is another period called in some passages a *day* and in others a *night*, e.g., the 155 years from 1799 to 1954, which would give us hours of twelve years and eleven months. This, too, is too long a period, when we keep in mind the large eight wonderful days. The Gospel and Jewish Ages as days would, of course, be inapplicable here. In Matt. 20:1-16, we have the reaping period—the day working time of 12 symbolic hours—set forth as a period of 40 years (Chapter II). Of such a day, an hour is three years and four months. This, we believe, is the period meant in Rev. 17:12.

(52) Where will we begin this hour? With the general agreement of the papal and Fascist negotiators on the terms of the recent treaty and concordat between the Fascist government and the papacy, and with their signing of these documents; because the agreement on them and the signing of them were the essential thing. We know that the signing of these documents occurred Feb. 11, 1929. It has since leaked out that the agreement was reached before

the American election of Nov. 6, 1928, and after Al Smith's nomination about July 1, 1928, and the fact was designedly left unconfirmed, though time and again rumored, as our Signs of the Times in our Sept. 15, 1928, Nov. 15, 1928, and Jan. 15, 1929, Heralds prove. The reason that this fact was not confirmed before the election is the pope's fear of its unfavorable effects on Al Smith's candidacy for the presidency. Hence we can now no more than approximate the date when this agreement was made—the agreement that made the pope, as a temporal sovereign and as Christ's alleged vicar, recognize Fascist Italy in a union of Church and State as ruling by Divine right. But with the act of signing the treaty and concordat the ten language nations of Europe in their Italian representative began to get the alleged Divine authorization to rule with the beast; and God says that this authorization to rule will last an hour (three years and four months, as we understand it). Parenthetically we remark that the fact of Fascist Italy being the first to be offered this authorization implies that the hour will end for her first, *i.e.*, that Armageddon will begin there, as our Pastor taught it would. Doubtless the date for this agreement will yet be made known; but it seems to have taken place between July 1 and Nov. 1, 1928—which was before the U. S. election of that year. The signing of the Vatican treaty and the concordat occurred Feb. 11, 1929 and it is from this time that the hour of authority with the beast begins. Hence its period was from Feb. 11, 1929 to June 11, 1932. The hour beginning Feb. 11, 1929, it ends June 11, 1932. We set this forth not positively, nor dogmatically, but only suggestively as a likely view of the subject.

(53) That this period is approximately correct we infer also from the large eight wonderful days. Our Lord's death day types the ten years from Oct. 1924, to Oct. 1934 (see above). According to the setting

just referred to, the ninth hour (2 to 3 P.M.), the one during which our Lord died, corresponds to the period of five months from Feb. to July, 1933, during which the Little Flock will begin to be deprived from mouthpieceship, to the public, typed by our Lord's death. The type does not tell us at just what minute of the ninth hour our Lord died. Hence we can say nothing more definite as to the time of this cutting off than that it will be sometime between Feb. and July, 1933. We have also given it as our thought that the earthquake following our Lord's death quite likely represents the symbolic earthquake—Armageddon—in America, not in Europe, which begins earlier in Europe than in America (2 Kings 9:22-26, 27). It will be noted that the Bible (Matt. 27:51) does not tell us whether this earthquake occurred in the ninth hour or afterward; therefore we cannot say whether the symbolic earthquake will set in America between Feb. and July, 1933, or afterward, if it is typed by the earthquake of Matt. 27:51, as we think it likely is. Hence we cannot say definitely just when in relation to the antitypical ninth hour—Feb. to July, 1933—the antitypical earthquake in America will set in.

(54) In question meetings at conventions and at various ecclesias during pilgrim visits, we have suggested that the darkness that covered the land of Palestine from the sixth to the ninth hour, on the day of our Lord's death, quite likely types the shadow that the European Armageddon or pre-Armageddon events will cast over America. We know that the European War cast a shadow of trouble over America long before the latter entered the war; yea, almost immediately on its start was this so. It is, therefore, to be expected that the European Armageddon or pre-Armageddon events will do the same, and that in a greatly magnified form, inasmuch as America is now more closely related politically, economically, socially

and financially to Europe than before the war. According to our setting of the sixth large wonderful day (Oct., 1924, to Oct., 1934), each hour of the 24 symbolizing 5 months, the sixth hour (11 A.M. to 12 M.) would be from Nov., 1931, to April, 1932; the seventh hour from April, 1932, to Sept., 1932; the eighth hour from Sept., 1932, to Feb., 1933. If our thought is correct on the darkness and the earthquake, then we are to expect Europe's Armageddon or pre-Armageddon events to commence during the antitypical sixth hour—sometime between Nov. 1931, and April, 1932. This, we note, is a period within which our time for the end of the hour of Rev. 17:12, given above, falls; for that time is from Nov. 1931, to March, 1932. It will thus be seen that the data that we derive from the large eight wonderful days and that we derive from Rev. 17:9-12, probably dovetail into one another. And the fact that the Lord's people are to know before the hour is ended, its general time, so as to announce it, is, we believe, the reason that moved the Lord to enlighten us on this subject, so as to enable us to give them the information necessary for them to tell it to one another before it happens, and thus fulfill the prophecy of the angel giving the symbolic explanation to John. At least the foundation seems strong enough for faith.

(55) It will be noted that the statements of vs. 13, 14, 16 and 17, may in part apply to the yet more distant future than those made in v. 12. This fact has likewise influenced us to write on Rev. 17. Therefore they require treatment here, which we will give briefly: The one *will* that the ten language nations of Europe will have, despite their many conflicting interests, is explained in v. 13: "and they will give their power [*dynamis*] and authority [*exousia*] to the beast." This can be done by these nations acting individually or in concert, *e.g.*, in the League of Nations, or in both ways. We would not understand this passage to

mean, *e.g.*, that they will do as King John Lackland, of England, did, when he gave Innocent III the power and authority to be the actual sovereign of England and himself thereupon received the kingdom as a fief from the pope; but rather that the European language nations will back with their power and authority the papacy in its advocacy and work of supporting the European order of affairs against the radicals, by accepting and putting into operation papacy's autocratic theories on governmental control of the nations. This will be, perhaps, only a part of the ten kings' giving to the beast their power and authority. The present and future stress in Europe will make this seem the thing to do, as the only means of averting communism and revolutionism.

(56) These European nations will make war with the Lamb (v. 14). Our Lord is now engaged in giving such truths as are more and more shaping matters toward the overthrow of Satan's empire, which will be accomplished by Armageddon. Additionally, He is also shaping the course of events and the general conditions so as to lead to the same result. The European nations are seeking now, and will increasingly seek to suppress, divert, distort and misrepresent such truths, and will send out contrary propaganda, with the view of maintaining the present state of affairs. Moreover, they will seek to suppress, divert, distort and neutralize the movements and events that tend toward bringing about the destruction of what actually is Satan's empire by Armageddon. Stricter laws and more violent prohibitions and enforcements will be set into operation to keep down the radical movements, which will be increasingly energized by the above-mentioned truths, events and movements. Suppression will become more and more active against the participants in such truth disseminations and their consequent movements and events. Thus, taking their stand against the Lamb's work in

leading up matters to the overthrow of Satan's empire in Armageddon, they will be warring against the Lamb. But ineffectual will be their efforts, however arbitrary and liberty-curbing they may be; for the Lamb will overcome them, giving such vast and influential truths inimical to Satan's empire, and in consequence arousing such movements with their resultant events, disconcerting and frustrating and nonplussing to the European nations, that their every counter blow will only bring nearer the disaster upon their own heads and will force them to Armageddon. The faithful Little Flock—"the called, chosen and faithful"—on this and the other side of the vail, co-operate with the Lamb in this fight, and will be with Him victorious, though the faithful on this side of the vail will by the suppression of their mouthpieceship to the public seem to mankind to fail in the fight, even as our Lord in the type seemed to man to fail in His fight with the clergy of His day. But this will be only a seeming defeat. Their victory will be manifest in two ways: (1) they will maintain the Lord's Spirit through it all; and (2) they will scatter such truths as are Divinely intended to lead Satan's empire to Armageddon.

(57) V. 15 we pass by as already made clear above, and as not especially calling for treatment for our present purpose. The hating of v. 16 we take in the sense of: doing evil to. The reason we give it this meaning is because the original of v. 16 says, not only that the ten horns will hate the harlot (the Roman Catholic Church), but that the beast (see the A.R.V.) will do it also. How could the papacy be brought to hate, do evil to, the Catholic Church which it controls? On this we can now only surmise: Perhaps the stress to which that church will be exposed by the European nations turning against her, will move her to make such concessions to these nations as will oppose the papacy's theories and

plans and thus anger it against her, and make it spitefully forsake her to the spoliations that she will suffer from them. Or the papacy may make such blunders in dealing with the European language nations as will induce them to devastate the Romanist Church in their lands in reprisals on the papacy, which would mean that the papacy's course will bring on that church the same results as would come, if it would deliberately plan to bring them about. It is enough, however, for our present purpose to know and declare that such hatred as is above described will fall to her lot from both the ten horns and the beast. The ten horns will make her desolate in the sense of withdrawing their support from her, thus leaving her a symbolic widow. They will make her naked in the sense of so exposing her wrong doings as to make her shameful character known and despised. They will eat her flesh in the sense of taking away all her prerogatives and severing their union with her, thus depriving her of all advantages coming from a union of state and church. They will burn her utterly with fire in the sense of annihilating her. At least the last one of these evils will be reserved until Armageddon for these ten horns to inflict upon her, and will be brought upon her by the ten horns in their transition to the Jehu aspect of these ten horns; for antitypical Jezebel is to be destroyed by antitypical Jehu (2 Kings 9:30-37; Rev. 2:20-23).

(58) V. 17, in its first clause, shows that these ten horns will be manipulated by Divine providence into a willingness to become God's agents in the fulfillment of His decree that the Roman Catholic Church be annihilated. This is also implied typically in Elisha's arranging, in accord with the Divine will, for the anointing of Jehu for the corresponding typical purpose (2 Kings 9:1-10). At least on one subject these ten kings will have one will before Armageddon, that is: to favor such a policy—"to agree" literally, to execute one volition—even "to give their kingdom"

—the deciding voice in their policy. Why will the Divine providence effect this result? Because in the stress of the conditions leading up to Armageddon papacy will impress these nations with the thought that her principles acted out will be the only thing that can enable the ship of state to weather the storm and to reach the haven of peace and prosperity. They will, therefore, accept the papal view of controlling the situation. But its dark-ages principles will be an anachronism amid modern conditions and peoples, enlightened out of the obscurity of the dark ages by the dawn of the Millennial Day, and accustomed to a large degree of liberty. Instead of controlling the situation, the application of papacy's repressive principles will make the dissatisfaction all the greater; and as a result the conservative labor group in great resentment will revolutionize, bringing Satan's empire to Armageddon for destruction. To manipulate such a situation into being, God will providentially influence the ten horns into the adoption of the above-mentioned policy—to execute one purpose. And this end will be pursued by God until His words as to the harlot's destruction will come to pass, "until the words of God shall be fulfilled," *i.e.*, on this subject.

(59) Our understanding on these points of Rev. 17 given above, implies that the fulfillment of vs. 13-17 is, in part, as yet future. We will here comment no further on this chapter, our present design, by the above comments, being accomplished. For details we refer the brethren to the future, when, *D. v.*, we hope to set them forth. We trust the study will be a blessing to all. We caution the brethren against being dogmatic on the above matters, and advise that they speak of these things as nearly as possible in a discreet manner to the Lord's people, mentioning only the more simple of them to non-Truth people.

(60) When first we wrote the above, especially on Rev. 17:9-12 [written in Feb., 1929], most of the

things in that passage were clear to us. We correctly understood the seven heads of the beast to represent the seven forms of the Roman government since the days of Constantine, with one of them, the fifth, the papacy, becoming the eighth. So, too, we correctly understood the ten horns to represent the ten language nations of modern Europe (Zech. 8:23). The duration of the hour as a period of three years and four months was also rightly apprehended by us at the time we wrote on these verses. We also saw aright the five fallen kings, the sixth existing and the seventh coming one; and we also correctly understood the beast that was, is not and shall be, as being the papacy. Thus the main things in this section were clear to us when we wrote on Rev. 17:9-12. But there were two things about the hour of Rev. 17:12 that were not clear to us. The first of these was positiveness as to the date at which the hour began and consequently the date of its end, as stated above, the treaty and concordat between Mussolini and the papacy. Therefore we suggested tentatively that, for definiteness of time, the date, Feb. 11, 1929, be taken as that by which the hour began, and that it would accordingly end on June 11, 1932, when Armageddon would set in, not in its narrow sense of fighting, but in its broad sense of embracing its conspiracy and following events up to and including its fighting. Further on we will set forth the factual proof that the hour ended June 11, 1932. The Lord let us see the truth as due on the beginning and ending of the hour *before it ended*. In 1917 He gave us the light on the duration of the hour, a fact that we told no one before Feb., 1929, when we wrote, as given above, on some thoughts on Rev. 17, for the May, 1929, Truth.

(61) The other point on the hour that was not clear to us; and that because not yet due when we wrote that article, was the thing that would end the hour.

When we wrote that article, we thought that it would be the fighting part of the European Armageddon that would come shortly after the end of the hour and sometime before the American Armageddon, which we expected before Oct. 1934. We came to this conclusion by thinking in the terms of the A.V. on Rev. 17:12. The A.V. renders the pertinent clause as follows: "The ... ten kings ... receive *power* as kings one hour with the beast." With the meaning of the word *power* in mind, we asked ourself the question, What will take away the power to reign from the ten language nations of Europe? The answer, of course, is, Armageddon's fighting (Rev. 16:18-20; 2 Kings 9:24-26). But the hour ended June 11, 1932, and Armageddon's fighting has not yet come [written in Oct., 1933]. Why did Armageddon's fighting not begin shortly after June 11? Because the verse in the Greek does not teach that the ten kings' *power* would last but one hour. It teaches that their *authority*, not their *power*, would last but one hour. The difference between the authority to reign and the power to reign is the following: the former means the right to rule as a king and the latter means the active ability to rule as a king. Ordinarily both the authority and the power to reign are in turn received, used and relinquished simultaneously. But there are cases in which one has the authority, but not the power to reign, and there are other cases in which one has the power, but not the authority to reign.

(62) God confers the authority to act as a priest or as a king by an anointing. Thus God conferred the right to act as Israel's priests upon Aaron and his sons by their anointing (Ex. 40:13-15; Lev. 8:12; Num. 3:2-4). Similarly, God bestows the right to act as the world's Kings and Priests on Jesus and the Church by Their anointing (Is. 61:1-3; Ps. 45:7; Matt. 3:16; Acts 10:38; 2 Cor. 1:21; 1 John 2:20, 27).
That

God by their anointing conferred authority on certain persons to act as kings in Israel can be seen from the cases of Saul (1 Sam. 10:1), David (1 Sam. 16:13), Solomon (1 Kings 1:39), Jehu (1 Kings 19:16; 2 Kings 9:3, 6, 12) and Joash (2 Kings 11:2, 12). As we consider some of these kings, we see that they had the authority to reign for awhile without having the power to reign. Thus Saul had the authority to reign, some time before he had the power to reign (1 Sam. 10:1, 24-26). Again, David had the right, the authority, to reign years before he had the power to reign (1 Sam. 16:13; 2 Sam. 5:4, 5). So, too, Solomon obtained the authority to rule as king before his father died, but did not exercise the power of reigning until after his father died (1 Kings 1:39; 2:10-12). Thus in each of these three cases the authority to reign was possessed some time before the power to reign set in. On the other hand, the cases of Saul and David are examples of kings who exercised the power to reign some time after they had lost the authority, the right, to reign. For years after David had obtained the authority to reign over Israel, he was without the power to reign, which power Saul continued to use years after he had through David's anointing lost to David the authority to reign. Thus, too, David, after losing to Solomon, by the latter's anointing, his authority to reign, continued to have the power to reign. These examples prove that not always are the authority and the power to reign held simultaneously by those who possess them.

(63) When first we wrote on Rev. 17:9-12 we saw and called attention to the distinction between the authority and the power to rule as kings (see above); for the Greek uses two distinct words to represent the word for *authority* and the word for *power*, the Greek word *exousia* standing for authority and the Greek word *dynamis* standing for power. Despite the fact that in the paragraph just referred to we pointed

out that verse 12 in the Greek uses the word *exousia* (authority) and not the word *dynamis* (power); while treating of how the papacy conferred an alleged authority that God, but not the papacy, limited to an hour, when thinking of what would end the hour we forgot the Greek word here used and thought of the matter in the terms of the A.V., *i.e.*, "ten kings ... receive *power* as kings one hour with the beast." And this caused us to make the mistake that it would be Armageddon's fighting that would come shortly after the end of the hour. Such would have been the case had the word *dynamis* been used in this verse; for without any doubt, as proven above, Armageddon's fighting will take the power to reign from the ten language nations. Apart from the thought of our fallibility, the only way that we can account for our making this mistake when knowing and in this very connection calling attention to the distinction between the words *exousia* and *dynamis*, is that the Lord designed to withhold the Truth for a while on what would end the hour in order to test the Church and us—us as to whether we would be humble enough to acknowledge a mistake, and the Church as to whether it would stumble over the mistake, or whether it would wait upon the Lord until the due time would come to clarify the matter. Please note exactly what the mistake was. It was not as to the length of the hour: on that we saw the Truth since the early Fall of 1917. It was on *what would come, came very shortly after the end of the hour*. The hour was not to end by taking the *power* to reign from the ten kings, which the A.V. teaches, and which will be done by Armageddon's fighting; but the hour was to end, as the Greek teaches, by taking the *authority* to reign from them. And their papally alleged authority to reign God in every sense of the word took away from them by anointing another to have the real authority to reign, which falsely and counterfeitedly the papacy claimed to give

the ten kings—an authority that God tolerated, but did not own during the hour.

(64) How do we know this? Because the passage says that their papally alleged *authority* (not their power) to reign, which, we repeat, God only tolerated, would last but an hour; and that authority God completely annulled by anointing His choice to take the real authority, which was usurpatorially claimed for them by the pope, and which was for the hour tolerated, but not recognized by God. And how do we know this? We reply, the type of Jehoram of Israel and Jehu proves it. Jehoram of Israel typing Allied Europe types, generally speaking, the same thing as the ten horns represent. But God by Jehu's anointing took away from Jehoram the authority to reign and gave that authority to Jehu, which types the fact that God would take away every semblance of authority to reign from antitypical Jehoram, the ten language nations of Europe, and give the real authority to antitypical Jehu, Conservative Labor, by the latter's anointing. Accordingly, we see that the anointing of antitypical Jehu ended the hour of Rev. 17:12.

(65) Despite the fact that we never put the matter of Armageddon's fighting as coming between Nov., 1931, and March, 1932, as more than a probable thing, and repeatedly by word and writing cautioned the brethren that it was a doubtful matter and was not to be presented dogmatically as a certainty, the Levite leaders have continually misrepresented us as putting it forth as a certainty. Some of them, like A. Stahn, did not even conceal their intention of waiting for the pertinent period to pass in order to pounce upon us as an alleged false prophet (Ps. 10:7-10; 71:10, 11; Prov. 24:15, 16).

(66) By way of emphasis it should be repeated that no actuality mistake on time was made on the matter in hand; it was a probability mistake on time. What we suggested as a *probability* did not materialize at

the suggested probable time. Had we set forth positively that the hour was one of $3\frac{1}{3}$ years and that it began Feb. 11, 1929, then we would have made an actual mistake on the time of Armageddon's fighting, based on the mistake that Rev. 17:12, as the A.V. erroneously puts it, expresses by the duration of the hour the end of the *power* to reign. What actually emerges from the facts set forth above is this: Only about five months after June 11, 1932, *i.e.*, after we had gotten proof that the post-anointing conspiracy was on, did we positively state that the hour was a period of $3\frac{1}{3}$ years. We desire to emphasize the fact that always before June 11, 1932, we taught only tentatively that the hour was a period of $3\frac{1}{3}$ years; and, therefore, even while holding the thought under the influence of the A.V.'s rendering of "power" in Rev. 17:12, that the hour would end the power of the ten kings to reign, our uncertainty as to the duration of the hour made us go no further than to say that Armageddon's fighting would *probably*, not *surely*, come between Nov., 1931 and Mar., 1932, a thought that we gave up as even probably true months before Nov., 1931, as shown by our dated publications.

(67) Hence our mistake was on a matter that we presented as a probability and not as a certainty. This raises the question, Why did God permit us to make a mistake even on a probability? The following we believe to be the reasons: (1) When we in Feb., 1929, wrote on Rev. 17, certainty as to the Truth on when the hour would begin and on what would end the hour were not due, and therefore any attempt to teach these even as probabilities would necessarily be immature and hence faulty; for not even Jesus could open a Scripture before it was due, as evidenced by His not knowing while in the flesh the date of the Judgment day (Mark 13:32), and after His resurrection and just before His ascension, the date of the restoration of the kingdom to Israel (Acts 1:7). Hence our

attempting to explain these undue things necessarily resulted in misunderstandings on probabilities. (2) The Lord desired to test us as to whether we would be humble enough to acknowledge and set aside even a probability mistake, or whether we would seek to shield ourself by hiding it. (3) The Lord wished by this experience to manifest both the faithful and the unfaithful, well knowing that the faithful, not making haste, would wait on the Lord to clear up the matter in due time (Is. 26:3; 28:16) and thus be preserved in the test (Ps. 119:165), and that the unfaithful would be manifested as such and stumble (Is. 28:13). (4) The Lord desired that the oppositional might have an opportunity to mock, that the bands of error might bind them all the tighter (Is. 28:22). In these four designs the Lord's purposes were carried out to His good pleasure.

(68) Please note the similarities between our mistake in this matter and that of our Pastor on the deliverance of the Church by Oct., 1914: (1) In both cases the Truth came out only piecemeal, as Is. 28:10, 13 shows the Truth becomes due; for the Lord never gives the full Truth on any one subject all at once. (2) In both cases the involved thoughts contained partial truths. (3) In both cases the foundations that were laid down remained firm. (4) In both cases an attempt was made to clear up certain obscurities before the due time. (5) In both cases the time forecasts were made as probable, not as certain. (6) In both cases mistakes were made as to the undue things. (7) In both cases the Truth as due was given through the pertinent servants, and not through their hostile critics. (8) In both cases the mistake was seen and corrected before the mistaken time came. (9) In both cases before the mistaken time came, the pertinent Truth as then due became clear to them and was announced by them. (10) In neither case did the mistake result in the Lord giving the pertinent Truth through others.

(11) In each case due acknowledgment was made, and that before the forecast time came. (12) In both cases Truth enemies unjustly and maliciously accused them of being false prophets. But please notice how differently real false prophets have acted as to a mistakenly forecast date. When Mr. Barbour's dogmatic forecast on the Church's leaving the world Nisan 16, 1878, failed, instead of humbly acknowledging and correcting it; lest he might lose his influence as a teacher he sought to divert the Church's attention from the mistake by involving it into the no-ransomism controversy. When J.F. Rutherford's dogmatic forecasts as to 1925 failed, he sought even as late as in 1926 to make his pertinent teaching seem true by intimating that the Ancient Worthies had returned and were in hiding in some Palestinian cave as a test to the Societyites!

(69) Thus gradually as due the Lord cleared up to our mind the two involved uncertainties and enabled us to set the clear light thereon before the Church before the forecast date came. He did not leave us holding the bag until after the forecast date was passed, as He did with Mr. Barbour, J.F. Rutherford, Zion's Messenger, Elijah's Voice, C. Olson, C.J. Woodworth, Adam Rutherford, etc., etc. Accordingly, when March, 1932, came and when June 11, 1932, came, neither we nor our readers expected the fighting of Armageddon to come at one or the other of those dates. Only those who, without informing themselves on our exact thoughts and on their gradual clarifying, were watching these dates in order to pounce upon us as a false prophet were themselves caught in the trap of their own making. Accordingly, the Lord graciously enabled us before Nov. 1931, to see that antitypical Jehu's anointing, not Armageddon's fighting, would end the hour, and in Jan. 1932, enabled us to see that the hour would end June 11, 1932. These two points, the beginning of the hour and the means of its

ending, being thus clarified, we approached June 11, 1932, not dogmatically, but tentatively, in faith, as the right date for the ending of the anointing of Jehu, as the thing whose end ended the hour.

(1) What is the primary application of Mal. 3:1-3? Secondary applications of parts of Mal. 3:1-3? Which of these will we study in this lesson? Who is the messenger of v. 1? What was his mission? Who is the Lord referred to in v. 1? What is His temple? What proves His coming to His temple in 1874? How did the Church feel toward Him and His return? Why did it seem sudden to them? Why is He called the Angel of the Covenant? What does v. 1 summarize? What is its relation to verses 2 and 3? Why is it here commented on? Of what do verses 2 and 3 treat? How many fold is it?

(2) Of what do the two questions of v. 2 treat? How do these questions not stand related? How do they stand related? What double set of contrasted things proves this? What is the sense of the word translated *abide*? What illustrates this meaning? What does the first question mean? What three things does it imply? What do these three implications further imply?

(3) What four things did the five Parousia gatherings and siftings effect? Through what were the pertinent trials wrought? What are their names and beginning dates? What proves that they were intended to manifest the Second Death class? In summary, what does the first question of v. 2 teach? What is to be inferred therefrom?

(4) What is the next part of our Lord's Second Advent mission? Whence is this concluded? What is the proper translation of the second question of v. 2? To what period does it, accordingly, refer? What is the contrast between the two questions? What contrasting words prove this of the second question? What is the force of the word *stand* here? What light is shed on this meaning by Rom. 5:2? How so? What special thing, according to the second question, is determined in the Epiphany? What two things follow from this?

(5) What also proves these two things? How does Rev. 7:14 prove it? How does 2 Tim. 4:1 prove it?

Who are its dead and living? How is this proved? When does each class get its judgment? What side light is thrown on the word *judge* in 2 Tim. 4:1 by Matt. 25:32? What is the contrast between the Parousia and the Epiphany work of Christ, according to the questions of v. 2? By what are the Great Company separated from the Little Flock? What three things are implied in the second question?

(6) What two negative things are implied in these two questions? What is the first conclusion to be drawn from these negative things? Why was this warning appropriate for the Parousia? What two reasons proved our unfitness during the Parousia to decide on who were crown-losers? What did this fact prove?

(7) What is the second conclusion to be drawn from these two negative things? Who said that this would be proper? Where did he say so? Why can we now decide this? What is not, and what is the mark revelatory of Great Companyship? What Scripture proves this? What is the third conclusion to be drawn from these two negative things? Why is this conclusion warranted? Why must the Priests know the Great Company as such? What conclusion on judging before and after the time should be drawn from 1 Cor. 4:5? What fourth conclusion should be drawn from these two negative things?

(8) What other parts of our Lord's Second Advent work are set forth in v. 2? What expressions give these? How does the surface reader regard these two expressions? What is necessary for an understanding of the expression, *a refiner's fire*? Please describe the figure. What in the symbols of the Bible is generally represented by silver? How do the cited Scriptures prove this? Of what is silver ore a symbol? By what is our Lord represented in this figure? By what is the Truth had by God's people cleansed from error? When has this work been done in them?

(9) Why has such an activity been necessary? What does Matt. 13:33 teach on this? On His return what did our Lord not, and what did He find in the minds of His people? What did He do to separate the error from the Truth in their minds? Of what did the symbolic heat and fire consist, whereby our dross of error was severed.

from our silver of Truth? In what period were such experiences undergone?

(10) How many miniatures of the Gospel Age are there in the Epiphany? What were the smaller one's duration, purpose, main works and experiences? What have been the larger one's past duration, main works, experiences and purpose? The largest one's? A part of what larger work of our Lord has His work in these miniature Gospel Ages been?

(11) Wherein is the fourth part of His Second Advent work set forth? What fact does the average Bible student fail to see? What is the difference between it and the preceding one? What shows this? What three processes constituted a fuller's work? To which of these does our text refer? Describe it in detail. What do the things involved in this process represent? What are the Scripture proofs for each point? What is the difference between the cleansing by the blood of Jesus and by the Word of God? Give Scripture proof for it. What is represented by the fuller's washing the spots away? What did his using soap and lye represent? Why were they used in the picture? Why used in the thing pictured forth? What are some of the features of this figurative lye? What are represented by the easy, hard and impossible yielding of the spots to the washing process?

(12) What in this respect has our Lord done since 1874? How has He proceeded in this work? In what relations have these washings come to us? To what end have they served? Of what prophecy are these experiences a fulfillment? To what can we testify on this point? What results from a proper undergoing of these experiences?

(13) How are the refining and cleansing experiences related to the sustaining and standing of our text? What proves this relation? What have these two processes done to all New Creatures? What have they effected in the three involved classes? What will they not effect in the Faithful? Why not?

(14) How does v. 2 distinguish between our Lord's four works described by it? What are these distinctions?

(15) By what words is the fifth part of His Second Advent mission to His own described? To what does

this language not refer? Why not? How are the words *refiner* and *purifier* ordinarily used? How are they used in this connection? Why so? What, then, is our Lord's fifth Second Advent mission? What does its second part imply? What are the differences between the third and fifth part of our Lord's Second Advent mission to His own? What have they and what have they not in common?

(16) According to this, what is His relation to error and Truth? What word in v. 3 implies this? How so? What manifold work of Satan makes this work of our Lord necessary? Why has Satan corrupted every branch of Truth? Through whom did our Lord mainly attack religious error in the Parousia? In what are these attacks contained? How is this symbolized in Revelation as respects the Volumes? What is the claimed attitude of the Tower and P.B.I. Herald as to controversy? What does this attitude imply?

(17) What kind of secular errors did our Lord attack in the Parousia? Through what two kinds of agencies? By what means were these attacks made? To what did these attacks force Satan to resort? How did the Lord foil Satan's purpose?

(18) What work on this line is our Lord doing in the Epiphany? By what writings mainly is this done in the religious domain? Why do the Epiphany publications contain so much refutational matter? Against what should the Lord's course with these publications arouse us? Why? What is the relation of these two sets of writings to secular error now? What is especially now being used against secular error? What are these attacks effecting? What office work does our Lord perform in managing these attacks on error?

(19) What other function does He perform in this fifth work? What does this mean? In what does this result? How has this been brought to our view in the religious domain? In the secular domain? What instrumentalities has He used for this work in the Epiphany?

(20) Who should be honored for such refining and polishing work? How are His agents to be regarded? How not regarded? Who should be regarded as the Sources of the Truth? How are they related as such?

What is the highest honor of their agents therein? From what extremes will this attitude deliver us? In what proper attitude will it keep us? What should this thought make us remember?

(21) In what words is the sixth part of our Lord's Second Advent mission set forth? What does the word translated *purify* mean here? Why? What thought does its Hebrew verb form give it? What two forms of character work does our Lord perform? What does each effect? What is not contradicted by the word *purge* in this sentence? Why not? What Scriptures prove this? What is the difference between the fourth and sixth work of our Lord's Second Advent toward His own?

(22) Who are typed by the sons of Levi in v. 3? How is this Scripturally proved? What other thing in v. 3 proves this? Give Scripturally the two sets of symbolic meanings in the words *gold* and *silver*. Accordingly, what is the sixth part of our Lord's Second Advent mission? By what means does He accomplish this? Which of these is specially stressed in v. 3? Along what lines do God's providences work to this end? How does He use the Word in this work? The Spirit? In what other time has He done this to crown-retainers and crown-losers? To which time does the text limit His pertinent activities?

(23) In what words is the seventh part of our Lord's Second Advent mission described? What is its literal rendering? What does it show? What is this which it shows? What is the difference between the meat offering and the drink offering? Who are privileged to preach the Truth? What effects do blemished characters and deeds have on one's preaching ability and influence? What are they not and what are they to say? Why? What are our Lord's three high-priestly works in this respect? What does He do to the characters of the antitypical sons of Levi in this particular? How is this done by Him? What results to them therefrom? When has He done the above three high-priestly works in them? For what are they indispensable?

(24) What do facts prove of our Lord's Parousia and Epiphany ministry on the Little Flock along this line? What did they do in the Parousia with the Word? What

great effects did it work? What did their improving characters do to their message to the Church in its three elect classes and to the world? What has it been doing to their preaching as to Azazel's Goat? What work has the Lord given them for retaining their crowns? What separate works toward Azazel's Goat has the Lord qualified and enabled them to do? What future work toward the Great Company will He fit and enable them to do? What present and future work toward the Youthful Worthies does and will He qualify them to do? What is a summary of their Parousia and Epiphany work? Who has qualified and enabled them to do it?

(25) What has limited the effectiveness of the Great Company's past and present preaching? When was their work comparatively better than now? What did they do during the Parousia by preaching? What work in the lapping of the Parousia and Epiphany did they do with the co-operation of the Youthful Worthies? In fulfillment of what type? What is a sober estimate of their present work? What will they do after their cleansing? What will be their first great work after their cleansing? What is the Epiphany Tabernacle? Explain its erection. How may the contents of Vol. 1 be summarized? What will it constitute? How will it be given? What will the Great Company accomplish through this message? What events will pave the way for this work?

(26) What other great work will Jesus' ministry for the Great Company enable them to accomplish? How does Lev. 12:5-12 show this? How does Cant. 5:8—6:1 show this? Where and when will the Great Company convert Israel? How do Zech. 12:2-14; Jer. 30:3-9 and Ezek. 36:17-29 prove this? What in our text implies this? To whose character-building and cleansing work will this be due?

(27) What estimate of our Lord's ministry should the above study cause us to form? What work did He do throughout the Gospel Age for crown-retainers and crown-losers? What qualities of His character are manifest in these works? How do they compare with others' characteristics? How should these considerations influence us to think, feel, speak and do as to Him?

(28) Beside His Parousia and Epiphany sevenfold

mission to His own, what other pertinent missions does He have? Which of these will we here study? What things in Rev. 18:8, 10, 17, 19 have aroused study? Along what lines? What are some of the symbolic meanings of the word *day* in the Bible? Why is the pertinent day not a year day? What day seems to be the one meant? Why did this day have several beginnings? What are they?

(29) What has already been pointed out as the length of this day? By what examples? What results from this as to the hours of Rev. 18:10, 17, 19? What are the beginnings of the first two of these hours? How do we know this? Why may we not begin the third-mentioned hour at either of these dates? If it is begun Sept. 25, 1881, when will it end? According to what time? If this be correct, by when will Mystic Babylon begin to go into destruction?

(30) How many kinds of experiences will mark Babylon's overthrow? What is done with these chronologically in Rev. 18:10, 17, 19? To what does each verse refer? How do these items seem to be stated? Why is the hour mentioned three times? When did the hour of reaping begin? What also began then? Why is this true as a parallel?

(31) What did our Lord do in April, 33 A.D.? At the end of what? What did He thereby accomplish? Accordingly, what is the parallel to this? What was done in Oct. 36 A.D.? What is the parallel to this? What three things are said to await Babylon within an hour? What have we found already to have happened? When as to the judgment? What did the removal of the last saint from Babylon really constitute? About how long did the wasting last? By what was it ended? With what were these two hours contemporaneous? If the above understanding be correct, how long is the hour of her destruction to last? What is to be expected to begin within this time?

(32) What character does this interpretation have? What improbable thing is possible as to this thought? Why is it not to be thought that it began earlier than about Oct. 1881? After 1881? At 1914? How, accordingly, does the date, about Oct. 1881, seem? What restrains from dogmatism on this point? What is the most

that should be said thereon? As a result, how may we regard the date, about June, 1923? If this is true, what does it imply as to John's Rebuke and Elijah's Letter? How should these considerations affect us? With what question does this paragraph close?

(33) How long before the following was the above written? In what year? What thought is presented in the foregoing? Probably through what? When, generally and exactly? On what was this based? What considerations admonished against positiveness on this subject? Why? Why was the symbolic earthquake expected to come probably by May 17, 1923? With what thoughts in mind was Rev. 18:19 continued to be studied?

(34) By what time held as a probability did the earthquake not come? Accordingly, what was not realized? What thought connected with May 17, 1923, was right? How so? What kind of a work does this letter do as to Babylon? What is believed as to the events and that work?

(35) What is needed to clarify this thought? What will clarify it? What was this event? When did it occur? What shows that Food For Thinking Christians began this destruction? What are our Pastor's two testimonies thereon? Who began this destruction? When? How has God always honored His Priesthood? How is this typed? What follows from this course of God? How and when did the Priesthood start the beginning of the end of Babylon's destruction? What would this seem to imply?

(36) Why are the main pertinent facts set forth? What pertinent thing was set forth in the first issue of *The Truth*? How do John's Rebuke and Elijah's Letter stand in relation and contrast? How do the cited passages show this? What was the author's first thought on the extent of the distribution of Elijah's Letter? How was this told? Until when? How did a change of view and practice develop between May 1 and 7? What was done May 7?

(37) What thought gradually developed between May 3 and 10? What did this thought prompt the author to do? Why was May 16 chosen as the day to begin this work? On what was he not definitely persuaded? What conviction set in May 23? What was thereupon recognized?

What will enemies say of this? Who knows that these are matters of fact?

(38) Of what is the experience with this matter a good illustration? What question, wrongly based, was asked on Rev. 18:19? What did it start? What had by March, 1922, set in? With what misunderstanding? Wherein were these thoughts set forth? What did further thought accomplish? When did the subject fully clear up? What conclusion flows from this? Why is that which is clear set forth before the brethren?

(39) What is closely related to the foregoing? What does this prompt us to do? What is and what is not designed in this study of Rev. 17? What is thereby designed? What letter would be helpful as to our present study? What kind of an interpretation did it offer on Rev. 17? Who was the giver of this interpretation? How did he hold it? What is the interpretation? What have facts proven it to be? What reason did Bro. Russell give in the late Summer of 1916 for not then giving his long-promised exposition of Revelation? On what four points did he then lack understanding? What does the second point prove he had done with the Adventist interpretation of the number 666? What did his lack of understanding these four points lead him to conclude?

(40) What has since happened with these four points? What has been the author's course on the interpretation that Bro. Russell gave Bro. Driscoll? Why did he follow this course? What recent events have fulfilled the bulk of Rev. 17:9-11? What does the fact prove of Bro. Russell?

(41) In what books and magazine has much of Rev. 17 been made clear? Why had the rest not yet been made clear? Where will we find a summary of most of his thoughts on this chapter? What has tended to make unclear many points in Rev. 17? Wherein was this done? What is one of these obscurings? How did our Pastor explain the angels who poured out the seven last plagues? How does Vol. VII explain the angel of Rev. 17:1? What do the seven bowls (vials) of Rev. 15 and 16 represent? What was not in Bro. Russell's day yet seen to be the antitypes of the bowls, cups, chargers and spoons? When and by what passages did this become clear? What do the seven angels' bearing and pouring out the bowls represent?

What even does the angel of Rev. 17:1 not represent? What does he represent?

(42) To what is this definition not limited? What does it include? What illustration proves this? Where will this example be explained? By whom will it be further discussed? As what was this hour to be announced? What influence did that consideration have on the writing of this article? What otherwise would be our course in this matter? How does Vol. III cover the beasts of Rev. 12, 13 and 17? What does its diagram on page 131 furnish?

(43) What other consideration must be kept in mind for clearness' sake? What in general do Daniel's and the three Revelation beasts represent? How do their horns differ? How do the beasts of Rev. 12, 13 and 17 differ as to their heads? What do the ten (eleven) horns of Daniel's beast in general represent? What do the ten horns of the three Revelation beasts represent? How is this proved? What are the ten horns of the Revelation beasts? How many others are there than these? What is the key to this point?

(44) Why is there a difference between the seven heads of the beasts of Rev. 12 and 13 and those of the beast of Rev. 17? When did the Roman Catholic Church begin to be supported by the Roman Empire? What change from former times had set in? What, then, is the difference between the first head of the beasts of Rev. 12 and 13 and that of the beast of Rev. 17? What were the latter's next five heads? Which is the seventh head of the beasts of Rev. 12, 13 and the sixth head of the beast of Rev. 17? What other difference is there between Daniel's and the Revelator's beasts?

(45) Since what time must the seventh head of the beast of Rev. 17 have originated? What is the seventh head of the beast of Rev. 17? What is its eighth head? What does this prove of its seventh head? How is the Fascist Italian Kingdom the seventh head, as distinct from the sixth head—the Italian Kingdom of the House of Savoy? What follows from this? What is the viewpoint of the beasts of Rev. 12 and 13, as distinct from the viewpoint of the beast of Rev. 17? What follows from this last viewpoint?

(46) What is the first contrasted expression necessary for clearness on the Revelation beasts? What names

are applicable to the civil and the papal power in that book? Where are they contrasted? Which head in Rev. 12 and 13, and which heads in Rev. 17 represent the papacy? How do we harmonize the contrast that the papacy is the beast, and yet some heads of the beast? What third contrast should be kept in mind? How do we distinguish between the Roman Catholic Church and the papacy? How is this distinction shown in Rev. 17?

(47) In what two ways are the seven heads of Rev. 17 defined? How are the words, kings and mountains, used in prophecy and symbol? When did the antitypical angel of Rev. 17 begin to expound, etc.? What in Rev. 17:8 proves this? What expression was applied by this angel to the beast, as applying from 539 to 1870? As applying from 1870 until very recently? What expression is applicable to it at present? What is meant by its ascending from the abyss? How many times did it make ascent? What is its end?

(48) What did the antitypical angel say of five of the heads of Rev. 17? Of the sixth? What did they at that time say of a seventh? What two things of it did they not understand? What did they know of its length of stay? How? Until what may it stay? If it does not stay that long, what will not set in, and what will set in? What two mistakes did they make? Where is this mistake not shown? After what event does the angel first mention the eighth (king, *i.e.*, head)? What does this prove? What has the fulfillment enabled us to do? On what basis did we know an eighth would come? What else does the angel's statement on the eighth (king) to John prove?

(49) What does Rev. 17:11 say the beast which was, and is not, would be? How do we prove that the Greek word for *king*, and not for *beast*, nor for *head*, is to be supplied after the Greek word for *eighth*? What else proves that the Greek word for *beast* is not to be supplied after the Greek word for *eighth*? What is the proper translation of Rev. 17:11? What proves that the eighth king is one of the seven kings? Into what does he go down?

(50) What is the time difference between the two sentences of v. 12? What do the ten kingdoms receive? What does the Greek word *exousia* not mean? What does

it mean? What Greek word means *power*? What, from the papal viewpoint, is necessary for kings to reign by "Divine right"? How long will they rule with such authorization? What former statement is here repeated? Why is this article written?

(51) How cannot the hour of v. 12 be understood? Why not? What further proves it to be symbolic? In how many senses is the word *hour* symbolically used in the Bible? What are they? Why do none of these fit here, except the one in Matt. 20:1-16? How long was it?

(52) With what does this hour begin? Why, in each case? When did the signing of these documents occur? When was the agreement on the treaty and concordat made? Why was the precise news of it withheld? What facts show this? What kind of a dating alone for the agreement is now possible for us to give? What did this agreement imply? What did recognizing Fascist Italy by the papacy mean as to its authorization to rule? What did this recognition begin? Where will Armageddon begin? What proves this answer? How long will this authorization to rule last? What will yet be made known? During what period was the agreement made? What would be the period of the hour's end? How is this to be set forth? Why?

(53) What general type proves this dating to be approximately true? According to this type, for what period does our Lord's death day stand? Its ninth hour? What will happen at that time? What does the type of the ninth hour not fix? What follows from this in the antitype? What does, and what does not the earthquake following our Lord's death likely type? What does the Bible not say of the earthquake in relation to the ninth hour? What follows from this in the antitype? How do we fix its time?

(54) What suggestion has been made as to the darkness from the sixth to the ninth hour of our Lord's death day? Where was this not stated? Where was it stated? What does that darkness likely type? What analogy makes this suggestion reasonable? What periods do the sixth, the seventh and the eighth hours type? According to these periods, if the above is true, when will the European Armageddon or pre-Armageddon begin? How does this period agree with our approximate date for the end of

the "hour" of Rev. 17:12? How do our data from the large eight wonderful days and the hour of Rev. 17:12 stand related? What fact corroborates our above-given setting of this subject? How will faith act toward this matter?

(55) How in time of fulfillment do vs. 13, 14, 16, 17 stand related to v. 12? What does this imply as to their being discussed here? What one will are the ten horns to have? In what three ways may this be done? What is not the degree of power and authority that the ten horns will give to the beast? What will it be? Of what will this perhaps be only a part? What will seem to make it necessary?

(56) What will the ten horns do, according to v. 14? What two things is our Lord doing in world affairs? What will the ten horns do in their war with the Lamb on these two points? By what means? How will they progress therein? Who will be the victor? Who will be His associates? In what two conditions do they act? How will those on earth appear? What two things will prove them victors?

(57) Why is v. 15 here left unexplained? What meaning does the word *hate* have in v. 16? Why? In what two ways may the *beast* be made to "hate the harlot"? What should suffice us on this point? How will the ten horns make the harlot desolate? Naked? Eat her flesh? Burn her utterly? When will this last act be accomplished on her? By what aspect of the ten horns? How is this proved?

(58) What does v. 17, in its first clause, show? How is this typically set forth elsewhere? What one policy will the ten horns favor? What is meant by giving their kingdom to the beast? Why will God affect this? What will be done as a result of this policy? Why will it fail of its intended results? What will be the actual outcome? Who actually will bring it about? Until what event will He pursue His course?

(59) What is implied, as to Rev. 17:13-17, by our understanding of the above-discussed items? Why are more complete comments on Rev. 17 not given here? What should we do for details? What trust should be cherished as to this study? What caution should be observed on this subject? And what advice?

(60) When was the above on Rev. 17:9-12 prepared? What was then seen as to the seven heads? The fifth that became the eighth? The beast? The ten horns? The duration of the hour? How many things were not clearly seen as to the hour? What tentative dates for its beginning and consequent ending were suggested? What were to follow its end? When was the light on its duration first seen? What was done on this point until 1929?

(61) What other point on the hour was not clear in 1929? What was at first thought would come shortly after the end of the hour? How was this thought reached? How does the A.V. render the pertinent clause in Rev. 17:12? What will take away the power to reign from the ten horns? How is this Scripturally proven? When did the hour end? What did not by then come? What Greek word on this point does Rev. 17:12 not use? What one does it use? How do they differ in meaning? Accordingly, what does this verse teach would last an hour? On what is this verse silent? Ordinarily, how are the authority and power to reign received, used and relinquished? Exceptionally how do they sometimes exist?

(62) By what does God confer the authority to act as a priest or as a king? What Scripture examples prove this as to typical priests? How do the cited passages prove this? What Scriptural examples prove this of the antitypical Priests and Kings? How do the cited passages prove this? What five examples of typical kings prove this? How do the cited passages prove this? How is the distinction between the authority and the power to reign shown in the cases of Saul, David and Solomon? How do the cited passages prove this? How do Saul and David illustrate the thought of having the power without the authority to reign? What do these examples prove?

(63) To what distinction was attention called in P '29, 72, par. 12? What Greek word means *authority*? *Power*? Which of these words is used in Rev. 17:12? Despite this fact, what was done by the Editor while thinking on this matter? What occasioned him so to do? To what mistake did this lead? If that thought had been correct, what word would have had to be used in Rev. 17:12? Why? Why did God permit the mistake? What was not, and what was the mistake? What was not, and what was to end the hour? By what act did God take away even their

false authority? What was His attitude toward that false authority?

(64) How do we know this? What type proves this? How does it prove this, type and antitype? What, therefore, ended the hour of Rev. 17:12?

(65) How was the period of the beginning of Armageddon's fighting put in *The Truth*? What cautions were frequently put in *The Truth* thereon? How did the Levite leaders put our position? How did some of them, like A. Stahn, act therein? What Scriptures accurately represent their spirit?

(66) What, by way of emphasis, should here be repeated? What conditions would have had to be fulfilled to have made an actual mistake? On what was the tentative mistake based? What actually emerges from the stated facts? How, before June 11, 1932, had we always set forth the hour? What kept us back from saying positively that Armageddon's fighting would set in between Nov., 1931 and March, 1932? Despite what view even was this done? When was even this thought given up?

(67) On what kind of a matter was the mistake? What four reasons seem to have moved God to allow this mistake?

(68) What twelve points of similarity are there between this mistake and our Pastor's on the deliverance of the Church by Oct. 1914? What is the difference between the way these two brothers treated these mistakes and the way Mr. Barbour and J.F. Rutherford treated their mistaken date forecasts?

(69) How did the Lord clear up these uncertainties? What resulted therefrom before the forecast date came? How did the Lord's course toward the Editor differ from His course toward five individuals and the editors of two named periodicals? What did the Faithful not expect at the forecast dates? How did the oppositional approach them? With what results? What did the Lord permit the Editor to see in Jan. 1932, as to June 11, 1932? What not? How did not, and how did we approach the date June 11, 1932? With the two difficulties solved, what other difficulty arose? How could certainty thereon not be reached? Why not? What typical things prove this? What, then, was our new difficulty?

CHAPTER VII.

TWO HOUSES BUILT AND TESTED

EXPLANATION OF MATT. 7:24-27. THE FOURFOLD BUILDING PROCESS: INSTRUCTION; JUSTIFICATION; SANCTIFICATION; DELIVERANCE. THE THREEFOLD TESTING PROCESS: DOWNPOUR OF TRUTH; A FLOOD OF ERROR; SPIRITUAL WARS. BEREAN QUESTIONS.

THE TEXT on which the theme of this chapter is based consists of two parables, that of the wise, and that of the foolish builder. On these our Pastor has given us three interpretations, all of which, we believe, are correct. According to the first, the wise builder is the Little Flock and the house is the true Church (the Church builds itself up; the Bride makes herself ready), while the foolish builder is the nominal church and the house is Babylon. According to the second interpretation, the wise builder is the Little Flock as a class and the house is its faith and character structure, while the foolish builder is the Great Company (crown-losers) and the house is their faith and character structure. The third interpretation is an individualizing of the second: the wise man representing the individuals of the Little Flock and the foolish man representing the individual crown-losers, while the houses represent the pertinent individual faith and character structures. If we remember that it was mainly the crown-losers—the crown-losing princes—who built Babylon, the inner agreement of the three interpretations becomes apparent. In this article we will use especially the third of these interpretations. The language of these two parables is almost as nearly alike as the difference in the thoughts

between them permits. This will appear from a parallel columned quotation of them:

Whosoever heareth
these sayings of mine,
and doeth them.

I will liken him unto a
wise man, which built his
house upon a rock:

And the rain de-
scended, and the floods
came, and the winds
blew, and beat upon that
house;

And it fell not: for it
was founded upon a rock.

Every one that heareth
these sayings of mine,
and doeth them not,

Shall be likened unto a
foolish man who built his
house upon sand:

And the rain de-
scended, and the floods
came, and the winds
blew, and beat upon that
house;

And it fell: and great
was the fall of it.

(2) Certain explanations will elucidate the meaning of these texts. The word *heareth* occurs here in the sense of *understand*. To hear is used in at least three senses in Biblical and current language: (1) to take in sound by the ear-drum; (2) to understand and (3) to obey. A good illustration of the use of the first and second of these meanings is found in Acts 9:7, where Paul's companions are said to have heard a voice, and in Acts 22:9, where they are said not to have heard the voice that spoke to him. Here a flat contradiction would occur, if we did not give the word in Acts 9:7, the meaning, *to take in sound by the eardrum*, and in Acts 23:9 the meaning, *to understand*. A good illustration of the third meaning of the word is found in Ex. 6:12, where it is said that Pharaoh would not hear—obey—the Lord. That the third meaning is not the one in our text is evident from the fact that the foolish builder represents a class which did not obey, though they heard, in the meaning of the word as it occurs in the text. That the first meaning does not here apply is evident from the fact that many hear the Lord's sayings in the first sense who never build at all, while all who hear in the sense of the text do build—"everyone," "whosoever." This leaves the second sense as the one here applicable; for to do the building here

referred to one must understand the Lord's teachings, at least to the degree necessary to build. The structure here referred to, of course, cannot be a literal one; for neither every one, nor even the majority of those who understand Christ's sayings in the Sermon on the Mount build a literal structure. Hence, it must be a symbolic structure. From 1 Cor. 3:9-15 this house is from one standpoint shown to be the Church and from another standpoint the faith and character structures that are built upon Christ. Accordingly, the building process means the development of the faith and character structures of New Creatures, which implies the building of the Church.

(3) What does the text's rock, on which the consecrated build, represent? We reply, Christ; for St. Paul in 1 Cor. 3:11 assures us that He is the foundation on which the consecrated build. What, then, does the sand represent? Again we answer, Christ; for, according to the same passage, He is the only foundation on which all the consecrated build, regardless of whether they are crown-retainers or crown-losers (1 Cor. 3:11-15). At first hearing, the thought that Christ is also the sand seems repulsive. But this is due to a false thought connected with the figurative rock, in contrast with which false thought the sand must be given an evil sense not compatible with Christ. The false thought associated with the meaning of the word rock in this passage is *strength of character*. Of course such a thought, if true, would by contrast suggest weakness of character as represented by the sand, which, if applied to our Lord, is, of course, repulsive to a sanctified mind. But since 1 Cor. 3:11 proves that both the rock and the sand represent Christ, evidently neither of these words in this passage suggests anything in His character. When we recognize that, not a characteristic of His, but attitudes and activities of His are represented by the rock and the sand, the thought becomes satisfying to the sanctified

mind. Accordingly, we understand the rock to represent our Lord as the Stayer and Supporter, the Helper and the Strengtheners of the Faithful in their trial time, and the sand to represent Him, not as the Stayer, the Supporter, the Helper and the Strengtheners of the measurably unfaithful, but their Forsaker, their Abandoner and the One who leaves them in the lurch during their trial time. Certainly the Scriptures teach the above thoughts as our Lord's attitudes and activities toward these two classes (Heb. 13:5, 6; Jude 23; 1 Cor. 5:5).

(4) Our remarks above show that our text and 1 Cor. 3:9-15 are parallel passages, *i.e.*, they treat of the same general subject. While this is true, they present with some identical features some different phases of the same general subject. These identicalnesses and differences will repay noting. The Corinthian passage presents no difference in the foundation, while the Matthew passage does in order to bring out the different attitudes and activities of our Lord toward the two kinds of builders. In the parabolic representation of the Matthew passage no difference between the materials used in the two buildings is brought out, while this difference—gold, silver, precious stones, on the one hand, and wood, hay, stubble, on the other—is very marked. Again, the means of testing, both in the figures—fire and rain, flood, wind—and in the things figured forth, are different. These differences, of course, are not contradictions. They merely emphasize different phases of the one general subject. Hence, these two passages are splendid illustrations of the Scriptural principle that the whole of a subject is not treated in any one place in the Scriptures, but rather each of its subjects is treated "here a little and there a little" (Is. 28:10-13).

(5) While in the parables proper of Matt. 7:24-27 no difference in the building process is brought out,

the difference being set forth as existing in the foundations, yet in the words introducing the parables such a difference is brought out. The wise builder is represented as doing "these sayings" and the foolish builder as not doing them. The doing of them is represented as erecting the house on the rock, and the not doing of them as erecting the house on the sand. Among other things, we desire here to point out in some detail how the doing of these sayings is indeed building on Christ as upon a rock, and how the not doing of them is indeed building on Christ as upon sand. The better to present these two kinds of building upon Christ, we desire to draw into our discussion of them 1 Cor. 1:30: "Who [Christ] is made of God unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and deliverance," because it is in response or non-response to Christ in the four respects indicated in this text that we do or do not these sayings of Christ. This passage is at one and the same time one of the most succinct and yet most comprehensive passages of Holy Writ on the steps of salvation, both for the four elect classes and for the world of mankind. None of our fallen race will ever attain salvation apart from making Christ his wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and deliverance. Especially pertinent, therefore, to the explanation of the kinds of building treated of in our text is this passage. We will explain how these two kinds of builders erected their faith and character structures as to these four aspects of our Lord's office functions in the salvation process.

(6) First of all, Christ is made of God unto us wisdom. What does this mean? It means that He makes the consecrated wise. This is done by His acting as their Teacher. To teach means to cause another or others to know and understand. The teaching process implies two things: a teacher and a learner. No one teaches another unless he makes him know and understand. One may explain, prove,

compare, contrast, argue and illustrate ever so well; but if he does not cause another to know and understand, he does not teach him. As our Teacher, our Lord does cause us to know and understand those features of God's Word and Plan that are due to be understood. The Faithful do take Him as their Teacher and do this especially in two ways: they learn from Him to know and understand the subject matter of His teachings—the various phases of the Truth that He teaches them—and they learn to know and understand these by the proper tests of Truth. Of course, He presents only Truth to them. Satan, however, presents to them a mixture of Truth and error. How may they know what things those are that come to them from Christ and what things those are that come to them through Satan? The Lord gives them certain axioms or criterions whereby the Truth or error on any religious subject can be recognized by the Faithful. Harmony of thought is the heart of these axioms or criterions. This harmony must be established in seven respects; and if it is, a faithful follower of the Lord may be sure that he has the Truth on the subject so harmonized. A teaching, to be true, must be harmonious (1) with itself; (2) with every Scripture passage; (3) with every Scripture doctrine; (4) with God's character; (5) with the Ransom; (6) with facts and (7) with the objects of God's Plan. If any religious teaching impinges against any one or more of these axioms, it is thereby proven to be untrue. We know that an understanding of a subject is given us by Christ, our Teacher, when it is in harmony with these seven axioms, as we also know that an understanding of a subject is given us by Satan when it contradicts one or more of these axioms. The Faithful build upon Christ in wisdom as the Rock by subjecting every thought that is presented to them for acceptance to the acid test of these seven axioms and only then accepting it, if it stands

this acid test (1 Thes. 5:21; 1 John 4:1-4; Ps. 45:1; Is. 8:20; Matt. 4:3-10; John 17:17). Thus they build the faith part of their structure in the right way and out of the right materials, and thus and thus only do they build upon Christ in wisdom as the Rock. Accordingly, they do His sayings as to their taking Him to be their Teacher in wisdom.

(7) But crown-losers fail to do His sayings as to their taking Him as their Teacher and that in two respects. They fail to seek His teachings in the right way and frequently take as His teaching things that He does not teach. The Lord guarantees to give the meek (Ps. 25:8, 9), the hungry (Matt. 5:6), the humble (Matt. 11:25), the honest and good (Luke 8:15) His Truth; but He will not give it to others. It is because the Faithful have the above-mentioned qualities and then use faithfully the seven axioms as the tests of Truth that they are freed from error and taught the Truth by the Lord. Those who do not do these sayings of His on teaching lack one or more of the five qualities just mentioned as pre-requisites of obtaining the Truth. Hence the Lord allows them to imbibe more or less of error. Their unhappy heart condition has a blinding effect on their minds, so that they are often prone to accept error for Truth. Moreover, they are not particular to scrutinize every thought presented for their acceptance with the seven axioms as tests of Truth and error. Consequently, they imbibe more or less of error. Some of them go to the extreme of receiving with blank and unquestioning minds whatever a real or fictitious channel of the Lord presents to them. It is even required of them in the Catholic wards of Great and Little Babylon to shut their eyes, open their mouths and swallow whatever is presented to them on the ground that it is not their, but God's business to keep the channel clean, while it is their business to drink whatever comes through the channel. Despite his teachings and warnings

to the contrary, some have even treated the real human channel, that Servant, in that way. Instead of heeding his instructions to build a personal faith structure, whose existence needed not to depend on any human being for its integrity under trial, some made a crutch out of him; and when he died, not having an independent faith structure that could stand in trial by its own inherent strength, they had to have another crutch, which Satan gave them in the form of the Society as "the channel," which they have been blindly following in its multitudinous errors of doctrine and practice against those that they swallowed from that Servant, and whose many changes prove it to be a rubber crutch that, bending in all directions, does not hold them erect, but as they lean upon it, makes them fall often. Of course, such built, as to wisdom, upon Christ as Sand, *i.e.*, they built such a faith structure as is in its trial time being forsaken by Christ; just as sand forsakes the building erected on it as a foundation when exposed to floods, etc.

(8) Early in our career as a pilgrim, a sister remarked to us, "Brother, I am sure that I am going to attain the Kingdom." On being asked how she was sure of this, she replied, "Bro. Russell as that Servant is going to get into the Kingdom and I will hang on to his coat tails, and in that way I will attain the Kingdom." On being asked what she meant by that, she replied, "Bro. Russell is that Servant. Accordingly, I will believe everything that he teaches and do whatever he says and that will bring me into the Kingdom." Instead of subjecting his teachings, as he frequently exhorted, to the acid test above described, and only then accepting and practicing them as they were proven by that test to be right, she blindly bound herself to him in angel worship, instead of binding herself to the Lord, and thus failed to build an independent faith structure that would stand every test, regardless of the agent through whom she learned

the Truth. This course always led to the forfeiture of one's crown, as the type of Gideon's selection of his 300 shows. The 32,000 who rallied to his call type all who during the Gospel Age accepted the Lord's invitation to enter the warfare of Truth and righteousness. The 22,000 who, fearful and afraid, turned back, represent those justified ones who, from fear of the battles ahead in consecration, do not go forward to consecration. The 10,000 who remained type the consecrated. These were subjected to a test as to how they would drink the water. Those who drank it on their knees, in which position they did not and could not look upward and did not and could not examine the water, were set aside by themselves, while those who drank it standing upright, lapping it out of their uplifted hands, which required them to look upward, were also put aside by themselves. The former—9,700—type the crown-losers, who, not looking wholly to the Lord while partaking of the waters of Truth, bowed down in human servility to the messengers and, as worshipers of angels, did not and could not while so doing clearly examine the Truth presented to them, and thus, swallowing it without proper examination, forfeited their crowns. The 300 type the Little Flock, who were very active (raising the water in their hands) in their study of the Truth, grasping a firm hold of it, who looked upward to the Lord as the Giver of the Truth as they imbibed it, who little by little but rapidly took it as it clung to the tongue of Biblical truth already theirs, and who did not worship the messengers, the stream's channel, though they properly came to them for the Truth and got it from them. Hence the latter built upon Christ in wisdom as the Rock, while the former built upon Him in wisdom as Sand.

(9) The second respect in which new creatures build on Christ as Rock or Sand is expressed in the word *righteousness* in 1 Cor. 1:30. Christ is made

of God to us righteousness in the sense that He justifies us (Rom. 3:20-26; 4:1-25; 8:1-4; 10:4; 2 Cor. 5:19, 21; Gal. 2:16, 17; 3:24; Phil. 3:9). God's grace provided Him to become our righteousness. His perfect human obedience worked out this righteousness. Our faith receives it, as He imputes it on our behalf to Divine Justice and God's grace then imputes it to us. Thus tentatively it was imputed to every believer and vitalizedly it was imputed to every consecrated believer who was about to be Spirit-begotten. Accordingly, every crown-retainer and crown-loser has Christ as his righteousness, *i.e.*, as his Justifier. Unless one had truly repented and believed, he could not at all have attained tentative or vitalized justification. Therefore, from this standpoint there is no difference between the two classes referred to in our text. Would it, therefore, be right to say that both alike build on Christ in righteousness? We answer, No. This answer must be given for at least two reasons. First, the building of our text does not begin until after one is a new creature, while Christ's merit is both tentatively and vitalizedly imputed before the begetting. Secondly, the implications of justification are a building work as to justice before and after the begetting. Hence both the crown-retainers and the crown-losers build upon Christ in righteousness. A little consideration will prove this. Christ's righteousness adjusts us reckonedly with Justice. It makes up whatever we lack of 100% of justice. But it implies that we practice justice as best we can, which doing progressively we need less and less of Christ's righteousness to make us 100% righteous. Therefore, God requires that we practice justice as much as we can, all the time covering our failures therein due to weakness and ignorance through Christ's imputed righteousness. Hence, the Faithful seek to develop a righteous, just character, *i.e.*, they seek in duty good-will to love God with all the heart, mind, soul and strength, and their neighbor

as themselves. If in any measure of willfulness they temporarily fail to do this, they by stripes and amendment make this up, so that they do develop a just character. This is the first feature of the character part of their faith and character structure, they in wisdom having built the faith part of their faith and character structure. Accordingly, we see that these do build upon Christ in righteousness as the Rock—yea, the Rock of Ages.

(10) Do the crown-losers build upon Christ in righteousness? We reply, Yes; but not on Him as the Rock, but as Sand. A little reflection will make this manifest. For the reason given above, we see that these, like the others, do not build at all in the sense of that word as used in our text before the Spirit-begetting. But a little reflection also shows that they were before their consecration loyal to righteousness; otherwise they would never have consecrated; for it is only those who are faithful in justification who proceed to consecration. Hence it is impossible that any building on Christ as Sand could have taken place before Spirit-begetting. But sometime after consecration, with some sooner, with others later, an increasing degree of disloyalty to righteousness sets in, which makes them build upon Christ as Sand. The sensitiveness of their consciences becomes dulled. Their hatred of, and revulsion at sin becomes less keen. Presently they become more or less indifferent to some calls of righteousness and more or less open to those of sin. Instead of retiring each night with a proper reckoning made with God, which gives them a clean slate for the next day, they leave some sin or sins unsorrowed for, unconfessed and unamended. This goes on with increasing failures of giving supreme love to God and equal love to man and with the commission of violations of these. Thus a more or less unjust, along with a more or less just strain of character

is developed; and this is a building of their character structure upon Christ in righteousness as Sand.

(11) Next 1 Cor. 1:30 brings to our attention Christ as our sanctification. This office of His has three separate functions, according to which He works upon us. In the first place, as our Sanctifier Christ enables us to consecrate ourselves to God. This He does by holding before our minds and hearts, through such animate or inanimate agencies as are at His disposal for the purpose, such parts of God's Word as work a consecrating faith and love in our hearts, whereby we are enabled to consecrate ourselves to God. Thus He consecrates us in the sense that by the Word He works in our hearts the two graces that enable us to consecrate ourselves to God; and in so doing He exercises the first function of His office of Sanctifier. But on this point of making their consecration there can have been no difference between those who retained and those who lost their crowns; for whoever did not make a whole-hearted and unreserved consecration could not have attained the Spirit-begetting; for God never begets of the Spirit any whose consecration was not whole-hearted and without reservations. Thus, again, we see that the building referred to in our text can be done by new creatures only. Therefore, it must be in the steps of sanctification following consecration and Spirit-begetting that we are to look for the differences between building on Christ as a Rock and as Sand in sanctification. And there, in deed and in truth, we find them.

(12) Our Lord's second function as our Sanctifier is His work, after our consecration and Spirit-begetting, of enabling us to keep our wills dead selfward and worldward and to sacrifice our human all unto death on behalf of God's cause. This He does by imparting through His Spirit, Word and providences all the enlightenment to the intellect, all the energy to the heart and all the external conditions to enable us to keep

our wills dead selfward and worldward and to sacrifice our human all unto death on behalf of God's cause. The Faithful submit themselves to Him in His exercise of this His second function as our Sanctifier, *i.e.*, under His tuition they study the Word to get all the enlightenment needed to enable them to see what, why and how to do to remain dead to self and the world. And that Word so studied under His ministry is received into their responsive hearts. So received, it is charged, as an electric wire is charged with electricity, with the energy—the Spirit—that gives the responsive heart the power to keep the human will dead selfward and worldward. Moreover, it also gives the responsive heart the power, through its above described enlightenment and energy, in the various circumstances of life, to keep on serving God's cause unto the expending, little by little and more and more, of one's human all in that service even unto death. Thus seen, it is recognized that our Lord as our Sanctifier, in His second official function as such, always takes the first steps in the acts whereby our wills are kept dead and our bodies are put to death sacrificially; and, thus seen, it is also recognized that the Faithful make a loyal response to His advances, and thus enter into the work of keeping their wills dead selfward and worldward and of laying down sacrificially unto death their human all. This they do in good report and in evil report, in joy and in sorrow, in health and in sickness, in pleasure and in pain, in victory and in defeat, in toward circumstances and in untoward circumstances, in prosperity and in adversity, in gain and in loss, always and everywhere, as the Lord indicates His will for them. If they are guilty of any imperfection in this work, they take recourse to the Throne of Grace for forgiveness and, as well as they can, seek to make amends in their thoughts, motives, words and acts. They let nothing make them give up such deadness to self and the world and such

laying down unto death of their human all. Faint, yet pursuing, they persevere unto the end, and thus they build their house upon Christ in this feature of His sanctification office as the Rock.

(13) With the crown-losers the matter ultimately is different. The momentum that the will to consecrate gathers is so great that, even if not reinforced, it pushes one on for awhile to remain dead to self and the world and to sacrifice of his human all. But unless reinforced this momentum peters out; and one is ere long brought to a standstill in the two respects just mentioned. Some crown-losers run well for a long while; others do almost nothing after the momentum of their faith and love-produced consecration comes to a standstill, and between these two classes of crown-losers there are all sorts of variations, for some crown-losers come within the skin of their teeth of gaining the crown, and some within the skin of their teeth of going into the Second Death. But all crown-losers, whether sooner or later, fail to respond whole-heartedly to Christ's enlightening, energizing and providential works exercised on them to enable them to remain dead to self and the world and to lay down their human all sacrificially unto death. Instead, they allow some selfish or worldly motives, along with some unselfish and heavenly motives, to control them; and this makes them "double-minded" (Jas. 1:8). As a result, they do not bring forth fruit unto perfection (Luke 8:14). They do not wholly give up their consecration; for this would make them sink into the Second Death class; but they are more or less compromising in their consecration. They do not like the unpopularity, or the reproach, or the weariness, or the painfulness, or the hardship, or the privation, or the loneliness, or the exclusiveness, or the peculiarity, or the inconvenience, etc., of the narrow way of sacrifice. They seek so to serve as to endure, if possible, a minimum of these. They shun what the world calls

the extremes of the Faithful and draw back from them. They are the greatest of fence straddlers, facers in two directions, carriers of water on two shoulders, riders on horses going in opposite directions—in a word, they are double-minded. They have been well described in the words, "Let not a wavering heart be mine, *that is the world's, and would be Thine.*" This course of theirs prevents their performing an acceptable sacrifice, and results in their building upon Christ in this aspect of sanctification as Sand.

(14) The third part of Christ's office work as Sanctifier is developing the new creature unto perfection in all the features of a Christ-like character. This implies the development of heavenly affections and of the resultant heavenly graces, which after being developed must be strengthened, balanced and finally perfected—crystallized. It also implies the cleansing of one's-self from all filthiness of the flesh and the spirit. This also is a work which in all its features Christ initiates and in which He takes the leading part as to its accomplishment. In this work He avails Himself of the Spirit, Word and providences of God. But He does not do it without the co-operation of the New Creatures involved. It is for them to respond to His helps: to listen to His instructions, to submit themselves to the influence of His teachings and to exercise themselves along pertinent lines amid the providences that He sets into operation for their assistance. This, too, must be done in good report and in evil report, in joy and in sorrow, in health and in sickness, in pleasure and in pain, in victory and in defeat, in toward and in untoward circumstances, in prosperity and in adversity, in gain and in loss, always and everywhere, as the Lord indicates His will for them. By so doing they grow in grace, knowledge and fruitfulness in service. In varying degrees the Faithful do these things, and thereby become in character more and more like our Lord, even unto crystallization of character; and

by so doing they build a part of the character part of their structure upon Christ as the Rock.

(15) Those who become crown-losers had this same ideal set before them; and Christ exercised this third function of His work as Sanctifier upon them in order to enable them to make their calling and election sure to the Kingdom. Some of them responded well for a long time; some of them responded well for some time; and some of them made almost no response at all. But finally all of them made but a feeble response. They grew weary of taking from our Lord the whole pertinent enlightenment; they failed to submit themselves loyally to the influence of the transforming Word; they failed to exercise their New-Creaturely powers enough unto becoming thoroughly heavenly in their affections and in their resultant graces; they failed to avail themselves sufficiently of the helping and hindering providences that our Lord set into operation on their behalf; and they wearied of the work of purging out the old leaven of sin, selfishness and worldliness sufficiently to become a new unleavened lump. Their blending with their heavenly thoughts, motives, words and acts, selfish and worldly thoughts, motives, words and acts, not only hindered their developing the New Creature in every good word and work, but produced a mixture of heavenly and worldly mindedness and a mixture of the graces of the Spirit and the faults of the flesh that gave them the quality called in Scripture double-mindedness. This could not result in their building upon Christ in this third feature of sanctification as the Rock, as was the case with their faithful brethren, but did result in their building upon Him as Sand in sanctification.

(16) According to 1 Cor. 1:30 Christ's fourth official work toward us in the salvation process is deliverance, which He has been made by God for us. His being made deliverance to us means that He has been given the work of saving us from all our enemies. He

does this partly in this life and partly after this life, when He will deliver us from the grave—the death state—in the resurrection. This phase of our deliverance does not belong to our subject; for it is something in which we will be entirely passive, and that long after the building work is completed. Therefore, we will not discuss it further here. Accordingly, we will limit our attention to His delivering work performed upon us in this life. In delivering us now our dear Lord, on condition of our following His directions, does two things: (1) He rescues us from all of the snares that the devil, the world and the flesh lay for us; and (2) He gives us victory in all our conflicts with them. In doing these two things He fulfills His present office functions as our Deliverer. But His doing these two things is conditional on our following His directions. He will not so act as Deliverer for those who disregard His plans and arrangements for deliverance. He is the cause of deliverance to those who obey Him and to them only (Heb. 5:9). Naturally, He cannot deliver those who will not obey Him.

(17) This will become manifest as we glance at the things implied in His delivering work. These are those of warfare, which implies that two hostile armies are engaged in campaigns against one another. Of one of these armies Satan is commander-in-chief. He has two lieutenant-commanders under him, the flesh and the world. His army consists of four corps. The first corps is that of error, whose soldiers are erroneous thoughts, motives, words and acts. The second corps is that of sin, whose soldiers are sinful thoughts, motives, words and deeds. The third corps is that of selfishness, whose soldiers are selfish thoughts, motives, words and acts. The fourth corps is that of worldliness, whose soldiers are worldly thoughts, motives, words and acts. Of the other of these armies, Christ is Commander-in-chief. He has

under Him two lieutenant-commanders, the Spirit and the Word. In His army there are five corps. The first is that of wisdom, whose soldiers are the New Creature's wise, Truth, thoughts, motives, words and acts. The second is that of justice, whose soldiers are the New Creature's just thoughts, motives, words and acts. The third is that of love, whose soldiers are the New Creature's loving thoughts, motives, words and acts. The fourth is that of power, whose soldiers are the New Creature's self-controlling and patient thoughts, motives, words and acts. The fifth is that of heavenly-mindedness, whose soldiers are the New Creature's heavenly-minded thoughts, motives, words and acts. As His soldiers fight obediently and courageously, Christ delivers the army from every ambush, trap or snare that Satan arranges for their undoing. And as they so fight Christ gives them victory, enabling them to come off more than conquerors.

(18) As our Pastor in Studies, Vol. V says, the Spirit's battle ground is the minds of the saints. Here it is where this spiritual warfare goes on and must go on until complete defeat overwhelms the unfaithful, temporary defeat the partially faithful and full victory crowns the Faithful at the end of the war, while incidental victories crown their every faithfully fought battle. God's oath (Gen. 22:16, 17) pledges the Faithful victories in all the incidental battles of this war and final victory at its end. These victories are not achieved by simply wishing for them, nor by perfunctory fighting, nor by half-hearted defense or offense. They are the rewards of wise bravery, undiminished loyalty, true obedience to orders and persevering following in detail of the plan of campaign mapped out by the Commander-in-chief. Moreover, the sentinels of this army must watch in all faithfulness; and the soldiers must endure the hardships of camp life, the weariness of long and forced marches, the heat of torrid summers and the cold of frigid winters. They

must rise above the bribes of self-indulgence, world indulgence and sin indulgence, offered them as the price of treason, and maintain the optimism of hope in victory. In temporary reverses they must be undaunted and undismayed. In drilling they must be persevering. In sickness and wounds they must be hopeful of cure; and in all things endure hardships as good soldiers of Jesus Christ, as they fight the good fight of faith. Those who so do, Christ's righteousness compensating for all unwillful weaknesses and all ignorance, come off more than conquerors through Him who loves them, their Commander, in this the best of all wars. And in so doing they build their faith and character house on Christ in deliverance as a Rock.

(19) But as Christian soldiers the crown-losers do not so wage war. For awhile all of these fight; but some sooner, some later, relax their soldierly qualities. They look too much at their enemies' advantages and too little at their own; too much at their reverses, sickness and wounds and too little at those of their enemies. They dread too much the hardships of the sentinelship, drilling, marching, fighting and enduring of their warfare. They think too little of the superiority of their officers, cause, equipment, drills, position, plan, prospects and booty, as compared with those of the enemy. This results in the chilling of their courage, the dampening of their ardor, the arresting of their perseverance and the acceptance of the defeatist mental attitude. They attempt to act out and often do act out, in many a fight the couplet of certain cowardly earthly soldiers:

"He who fights and runs away
Lives to fight another day."

(20) However such a sentiment may occasionally be true in earthly wars, it certainly is not true in our warfare of the Spirit. To yield in, and flee out of its battles, leads to discharge from the army of the King's

Own. Moreover, such yielding and fleeing expose one to greater danger than facing the foe; for it exposes one's unarmored back to the darts and thrusts of the enemy, who is sure to take advantage of this state of affairs to the flier's discomfiture, wounding and possibly death. It is only by always presenting an armored front to the enemy that the soldiers in this warfare continually prove invulnerable. The other course results in damage to the person and morale of the pertinent soldier; and only too often his bad example spreads the contagion of his cowardice; and when it does not so do, it always makes it harder for the Faithful to hold their position and to push on to victory. But as such a soldier perseveres in such a course of warfare he more and more disqualifies himself and ends in ruin as a soldier. He is not delivered from the ambushes of the enemy. He is captured and loses much valuable time and many valuable opportunities of participation in the war. And even if he is finally delivered from such captivity, he fails to become more than a conqueror in the war. Therefore, in deliverance he has failed to build upon Christ as the Rock, but has built on Him therein as Sand.

(21) We have now considered from the standpoint of the two kinds of building presented in our text, in relation to the four steps of salvation, the building processes of the crown-retainers and the crown-losers. Throughout this study we have seen that the crown-retainers built their faith and character structure on Christ as the Rock and that the crown-losers built their faith and character structure on Christ as Sand. We have seen that in each one of the four salvation steps the former built upon Christ the Rock by practicing His teachings—"whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them." And we have also seen that in each one of the four salvation steps the latter built on Christ as Sand by not practicing His teachings—"every one that heareth these sayings of

mine and doeth them not." Doing and not doing His teachings makes the difference in the two foundations. Doing them makes Him one's Strength, Stay, Support and Help in the trial time. Not doing them makes Him one's Forsaker and Abandoner in the trial time. Surely these considerations may well prompt us to ask ourselves, how have we built? Have we built on Christ as the Rock, or on Christ as Sand? Which?

(22) Having above discussed the building of two houses, the faith and character structures of the crown-retainers and the crown-losers, it will now be in order to discuss their testing. Their building is parabolically set forth in vs. 24, 26; and their testing is set forth in vs. 25, 27 of our text. We saw that whosoever did Christ's sayings built upon Him as a Rock; and that everyone that did not do Christ's sayings built upon Him as Sand. It is evident that there have been crown-retainers (Rev. 21:14) and crown-losers (1 Cor. 5:5; 1 Tim. 1:19, 20) from the beginning of the Gospel Age; but so far as the latter are concerned they were not in this life put into the Great Company, and thus treated as a separate class as such, until since the tribulation began (Rev. 7:14; 2 Tim. 4:1 [the Epiphany and the tribulation are identical as periods of time, see Vol. III, Chapter I]). Not only do the passages just cited prove this thought, but also the tabernacle picture confirms the teaching that the crown-losers have remained during the Gospel Age as priests and members of Christ in the Holy until after the last member of Christ's Body was laid on the Altar; for we are told (Lev. 16:20) that after completing the atonement for the brazen altar [*i.e.*, antitypically, after our High Priest had fully imputed His merit on behalf of the humanity (brazen altar) of the entire Church, which was only then finished when He imputed it for the humanity of the last one to come into His Body] Aaron began to deal with Azazel's goat [*i.e.*, antitypically, the World's High

Priest began to deal with the crown-losers as a class]. But this must be after the tribulation began; for Spirit-begetting and forehead sealing then ceased (Rev. 6:11; 7:3; Amos 9:13). Simultaneous with the leading of the antitypical Goat to the Gate was the leading of its New Creatures from the antitypical Golden Altar, Table and Lampstand to the antitypical first Vail; and simultaneous with the putting of the antitypical Goat out of the Gate of the Court was the putting of its New Creatures outside of the first Vail into the Court as the Epiphany Levites; which proves that dealing with the Great Company as such did not take place until after the tribulation began.

(23) Another consideration proves this: The Gospel-Age picture of the tabernacle allows no place for the Great Company as a class. This being true, it follows that there was no such class in existence during that Age. This proposition evidently is true; for the Gospel-Age Camp was the world—the nominal people of God; its Court was the faith justified; and its Holy was the New Creatures as priests. Hence there was no place for the Great Company in the Gospel-Age picture. Hence for the Gospel Age there was no Great Company as such; though there were, of course, throughout the Age individual crown-losers. These must, therefore, have been regarded by the Lord as priests and members of Christ's Body. Accordingly, the Great Company as a class is Epiphaniac as to the time of their being dealt with, *i.e.*, then for the first time God began to deal with the crown-losers as with a class separate and distinct from the Little Flock. It is necessary for us to keep this fact in mind in order to understand the time setting of our two parables. In the building time for awhile all builders were necessarily crown-retainers; for only after longsufferingly dealing with measurably unfaithful New Creatures did God take their crowns away. St. Paul's showing that the gold, silver, precious

stones, wood, hay and stubble get their tests as the possessions of two classes separate and distinct from one another, by fire during "the day," implies that this day must be the Epiphany, though evidently the testings that caused the loss of the crowns preceded the Epiphany; for by then all crowns had been assigned, and hence the last one to be lost was by then lost (Rev. 6:11). These latter-mentioned testings are not referred to in our texts nor in 1 Cor. 3:12-15. These same lines of thought are also taught in Mal. 3:2, 3, as we showed in the preceding chapter; and they also follow from the consideration that the Great Company as such is developed in the Time of Trouble (Rev. 7:14; 2 Tim. 4:1). These considerations prove, therefore, that the building time of both classes, as such, so far as these parables are concerned, is the Parousia and that the testing time of the parables for these classes as such is the Epiphany. Accordingly, the time of these parables as to these two classes as such is the end of the Age—the Parousia and Epiphany; though doubtless during the Age the Lord dealt with individual crown-retainers and crown-losers, but not as separate and distinct from one another as classes, along the same lines as indicated in the parable, so as to fit them respectively for the throne or for life (Matt. 28:20; 1 Pet. 1:6-9; 1 Cor. 5:5; 1 Tim. 1:19, 20), which they get as members of the Little Flock or the Great Company as classes in the resurrection. Hence as respects the classes as such we understand that the Parousia was the building time and the Epiphany the testing time of these parables. Facts as well as Scriptures demonstrate that this is true. These remarks do not apply to the first view of these parables, in which the houses are the true Church and the nominal church.

(24) With these preliminaries prefaced we are prepared to study the testings of our parables. The means whereby the faith and character structures of both

classes are tested are parabolically spoken of as rain, floods and winds. Of course literal rain, floods and winds are not here meant; for the faith and character structures of all God's people are not tested by literal rain, floods and winds. Moreover, the figurative character of all parables implies their figurative use here, a fact further confirmed by everything else in the parables being figurative. Accordingly, we must find out the figurative uses of these words in the Bible and apply these figurative meanings as meant in these parables. Of what is rain ordinarily used figuratively in the Bible? Truth—God's Word (John 17:17)—is the Scriptural answer to this question. Deut. 32:2 is to the point: "My doctrine shall drop as the rain; my speech shall distil as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass." This passage is so clear in proof of rain being used in Biblical symbols to represent the Truth as to need no comment. Beautifully does this symbol in the text show that the easier truths (small rain) are for the immature and that the harder truths (showers) are for the full grown. Ps. 72:6 gives the same thought: "He [the Christ] shall come down like rain upon the mown grass, as showers that water the earth." The following remarks will clarify this passage. In Biblical symbols grass represents human beings (Is. 40:6-8). By the curse they are mown grass, and the fierce heat of the experience with evil has burnt this mown grass. And just as in nature the mown and burnt grass is revived and made to grow again by copious supplies of rain falling upon it, so the Truth in the Millennium, coming down from the Christ, will cause the race, cut down by the death sentence and burnt by the experience with evil, to be revived and to spring up again—restitution (Acts 3:19-21). Showers [stronger truths] will water [make fruitful] the earth [society]. The following passages also use the word *rain* in the same

symbolic sense: Is. 55:10, 11; Hos. 6:3; Joel 2:23; Zech. 10:1; 1 Kings 17:1, 7, 14.

(25) The rain of our parables is, therefore, according to the Bible symbols, the Truth. Its falling upon both houses would imply that the Truth coming in contact with the crown-retainers and crown-losers would prove testful to both, and would be one of the factors determining whether one had built upon Christ as a Rock or as Sand and thus had either retained or lost his crown, *i.e.*, whether a New Creature was in the Little Flock or Great Company. Do facts show that there is now a downpour of Truth? If so, is it testing all builders? And is it instrumental in manifesting who are Little Flock members, and who are Great Company members? To each of these questions we answer, Yes. That there has been since our dear Pastor's death a downpour of Truth upon the Truth people is certainly true; for since that time the Parousia Truth is being reasserted and the Epiphany Truth is being newly asserted. The reason for the reassertion of the Parousia Truth is that many who once were its exponents as pilgrims, elders, etc., are seeking to overthrow it. As Satan's mouthpieces, in proportion to their abilities they are attacking the Truth that they once professed to hold as dearer than life itself. Some of these attack some of its features; others attack others of its features; and by the time that the 60 groups of Levites will have been formed, every feature of the Parousia Truth will have been repudiated and attacked by one or another of the 60 groups of Levite leaders. The Tower has attacked many of the Parousia doctrines, precepts, prophecies and types. The P.B.I. Herald has attacked much of its chronology, prophecies and types. The Olsonites have attacked some of its doctrines and many of its prophecies and types. The B.S.C. of England has supported the P.B.I. attacks. The Adam-Rutherfordites have attacked some of its chronology, prophecies

and types. All of the Kohathite, Merarite and Gershonite groups have attacked the doctrine that the World's High Priest now functions sacrificially. Beside these various individuals among the Truth people have arisen and attacked Parousia teachings.

(26) This has led to the reassertion of the Parousia truths thus attacked, by those who uphold such attacked truths. As these group attackers do not usually repudiate and attack the same truths, frequently some of these defend some of the attacked truths, *e.g.*, when J.F. Rutherford attacked tentative justification, the P.B.I. quoted articles from our Pastor in its defense against him; and when the P.B.I. repudiated the Parousia Truth chronology, the Tower defended it against them. Moreover, individuals have as such defended such truths, *e.g.*, when the Society's president attacked the Pyramid as the witness and altar of Is. 19:19, Bro. Morton Edgar ably refuted these attacks. But the main defense of these attacked truths has been by The Present Truth, one of whose three missions, as set forth among its standing announcements, is "the defense of the Parousia Truth, given by the Lord through that Servant, as basic for all further development of the Truth." It has fulfilled this mission by carefully and detailedly expounding and proving that Truth and by exposing the sophistries of the attacks made on it. In so doing it has waged pointed controversies in defense of the Parousia Truth and in refutation of the attacks made thereon. It has sought to make the expositions, proofs and refutations transparent, strong and irrefutable, and by the Lord's help has always succeeded in the defense of the Truth and in the overthrow of the attacks thereon. Much of its contents are of this character and, please God, will continue so as long as the Levites continue to attack the Parousia Truth.

(27) Some think that in this activity the author, as it were, goes about with a chip on his shoulder, daring

anyone to knock it off, and if it is attempted, gladly strikes the attempter with great severity. Such, dear brethren, is not the case. He abhors controversy with brethren, and at first had, by the Lord, to be pushed into it, greatly against his inclinations. But as he more and more came to see the adversary's purpose in these attacks, and as he came more and more to see that it was unholy ambition to get and keep a following (Acts 20:30) that was animating these repudiators and attackers of the Truth, he more and more ceased to shrink back from entering such conflicts, though it is always painful for him to have to do it. Just as after the Apostles fell asleep, Satan used crown-losing leaders who hungered for a following to pervert the Apostolic Truth, until it was lost from the earth through their efforts, culminating in the papacy; so after that Servant passed beyond the vail, Satan began to raise up crown-lost leaders to take away from the Church the Truth that the Lord gave by him, seeking by them to destroy it entirely. Knowing this, as a servant of the general Church who loves the Lord, the Truth and the brethren, the author set himself to the task of defending the Truth against all attacks and of refuting these attacks. Knowing that this is the Epiphany, which requires for its exposures the plainest of sober speech and the most cogent proofs and refutations, and that it is selfishness that animates the sifter's (2 Tim. 3:1-9), he cries aloud and spares not, because he knows this is to be the Lord's will in this time. The result is that the Truth repudiators and attackers are not by him patted with kid gloves; rather they are by him beaten with the whip of small coils and driven out of the Holy as Levites. Nor is he faulted for this by those who see through Satan's purpose with the sifters and the latters' unholy selfishness. It is only those, for the most part, who do not see through these evil characters, and who do not understand the Lord's Epiphany

purposes, who fault him; and he quietly awaits their enlightenment.

(28) This reassertion of the Parousia Truth is very trialsome to those who have built on the Rock, as well as to those who have built on the Sand. This is true from a number of standpoints. In the first place, with Parousia purposes and methods in mind, which sought to attract and hold all the consecrated, and seeking to make these purposes and methods active in the Epiphany, it is a sore trial to the Faithful, the wise builders, to see some of the brethren so severely handled with the Parousia Truth. It seems to them that the false teachers should be more gently dealt with. This they feel because they do not see the dispensational change in the priestly work, which requires the priests to repel and drive from them those who revolutionize against the Truth and its arrangements once accepted by them, *i.e.*, to lead these rebels as parts of Azazel's Goat from the Door of the Tabernacle to the Gate of the Court and as New Creatures from the Holy to the Court. For a similar reason this course is very trying to those who built on the Sand. This course is also very trying on the crown-lost partisans of the Levite leaders, because it grates hard on their sectarian and servile spirit and pride to see their leaders so unanswerably refuted, and thus proven and pointed out to be false teachers, and themselves proven to be followers of errorists. Again, the reasserted Parousia Truth, as contrasted with their freshly imbibed errors, is a trial to those who superficially and without thorough study swallowed the Parousia Truth, and who are as carelessly swallowing the new errors; for their shallowness makes them not conscious of the fact that their acceptance of the latter implies their rejection of the former, since the former, but dimly at first impressed on their minds, has in the meantime been mostly effaced therefrom, and they only too often think that

the reasserted Parousia truths are some new invention of the author.

(29) To others the analytical, logical and detailed reassertion of the Parousia Truth is sorely trying, because lacking industry and perseverance, they are unwilling to study hard enough and long enough to gain a proper insight into it, even being too lazy to look up the copious Scriptures quoted in proof. Some are sorely tried by this reasserted Parousia Truth, simply because their leaders deny it, and they trust their leaders. Some are sorely tried by the wealth of types and prophecies expounded in further proof of the Parousia Truth. Some are stumbled at the length of the pertinent articles, because they fail to recognize the many details that the Bible gives on such truths, which details God desires His faithful people to know (Rom. 15:4) as they become due. Many are sorely tried by the unpopularity of The Present Truth, in which mainly such reassertion of the Parousia Truth takes place. The sight of this magazine, as a red object to a bull, is enough to arouse resentment in some. Some are stumbled because the defenders of the Parousia Truth are not "witnessing the Kingdom message to the world," thinking that that is a sure evidence of God's exclusive use of its doers, failing to see that since 1917 this has become the Great Company's work and that since that time God has given the priests the work of dealing with Azazel's Goat. Others are greatly tested, because there are so few who stand four-square for the Parousia Truth, while the bulk of the Lord's people are not so standing. Others are tested by this downpour of the Parousia Truth, because they love, and seek to retain the fellowship of many who reject more or less of such Truth. Then this downpour of the Parousia Truth tests all as to whether they received it in the love of it or for some other reason. Thus we see that the reasserted Parousia Truth as a part of the descending

rain tests all who built on the Rock or Sand.

(30) Not only has there been a reassertion of the Parousia Truth since our dear Pastor left us, but there has also been an assertion of the newly due Epiphany Truth, which is also implied in our parables under the symbol of descending rain. So far as its literary expression is concerned, this has occurred through the publications of the Epiphany Bible House, and that mainly through *The Present Truth*. Through the ministry of that Servant the Lord gave as the Parousia Truth those teachings that won and developed the last members of the Little Flock, also those teachings that laid the foundations of those that are now developing the Great Company and Youthful Worthies, and also those that were then due on the justified, Israel and the world. The Epiphany Truth consists of such truths as are needed by the Little Flock to equip her for her Epiphany work, as are needed to furnish the superstructure of Truth required to develop the Great Company and Youthful Worthies, and as are needed to complete the pre-Millennial Truths respecting the justified, Israel and the world, due for God's people to know during the Epiphany. Such Epiphany truths, of course, are new unfoldings since our Pastor left us, and seem to be given by the Lord through the Epiphany messenger in a sense similar to that in which the Parousia Truth was given by the Lord through the Parousia messenger. Neither of these have been the source of these truths, which God alone is. Their highest privilege has been that of servants of God, God's Truth and God's people.

(31) The mere mention of some of these Epiphany truths will suggest the trialsomeness of them to both kinds of builders: *The Last Related Acts of Elijah and Elisha*; *Calls-Siftings-Slaughter Weapons* (especially the Sixth Sifting and Slaughter weapon); *The Society As Channel*; *The Church Completely*

Organized; The Time Of Reaping; End Of The Begettal and Sealing; The Epiphany; Azazel's Goat; Gideon—Type and Antitype; Olsonism; P.B.I.ism and other isms; Priests, Levites, Israelites—Typical and Antitypical; Youthful Worthies; The Great Company; The Pyramid; Revolutionism; Judging; That Evil Servant; The Foolish, Unprofitable Shepherd; Types; etc., etc., etc. It is especially so in connection with the Epiphany teachings on the close of the call before our Pastor's death and on the manifestation of the Great Company as a class and of individuals of that class. The Epiphany Truth has been very trialsome, because it shows that consecrators after Sept. 16, 1914, cannot be in the Little Flock, and consecrators, coming into the Truth after Passover, 1916, cannot be of the Little Flock, even if consecrated before Sept. 16, 1914. This has been trialsome to many faithful brethren, because ignorantly they have been offering the high calling to many since that date. It has been trialsome to those who built upon Christ as Sand, partly because their leaders, desiring a following, find that the offer of the high calling attracts numbers to them, and this Truth, proven, disapproves of their getting a following for such a reason. Others of those who built upon Christ as Sand are sorely tested by this teaching, partly because it excludes them from the Little Flock, and partly because they have certain friends whom they want to see in the high calling. But the most testful of all the Epiphany truths to both classes of builders are those that prove that certain ones are manifested as in the Great Company. This has always hurt the Faithful until they became properly instructed; and even thereafter for a while they have felt pain as a result. But more than all others are those who are pointed out as in the Great Company tried by this truth, to evade which they have repudiated many a previously accepted truth, like those on Elijah and Elisha type,

the present (sacrificial) ministry of the World's High Priest, the Penny Parable, the Pyramid, the chronology, the Youthful Worthies, the Epiphany as a period, Bro. Russell as that Servant, etc. The teaching that the World's High Priest is now leading Azazel's Goat to the Gate, delivering it to the fit man and abandoning it in the wilderness to Azazel, is very trying to those so dealt with and their sympathizers.

(32) The unpopularity of the leader of this work this side of the vail, whose official acts as such require more or less emphasis under present conditions, has been another very testful thing to both those who built on the Rock and on Sand. Such unpopularity is to be expected; for always has the priesthood, especially its leaders, been unpopular among those, apart from themselves, toward whom their ministry has been exercised. Thus our Lord was unpopular with the Jews. The Apostles were unpopular with Jews and Gentiles. In pagan Rome the Faithful, especially their leaders, were exceedingly unpopular with the pagans. In papal Rome the Faithful, especially their leaders, were very unpopular among the "Catholics." How very unpopular with the "Catholics" were the Reformers and their faithful supporters! How unpopular among most Protestants were the later members of the Philadelphia Star! Our dear Pastor's unpopularity with the nominal people of God and the clergy is well known. This principle has not changed with our change of work—its almost exclusive limitation to the Great Company and Youthful Worthies. The Epiphany-enlightened saints are, of course, unpopular with the Great Company, toward whom as outside of their own number their mission largely extends. It, therefore, need not surprise us that the Epiphany messenger has become very unpopular among those outside of the Little Flock toward whom his ministry extends. If he were not unpopular among the Great Company and those Youthful Worthies who

are associated with them, there would be good reason to fear that his mission is fraudulent. But this very unpopularity is a trial to those of the Faithful who do not yet understand the situation, and even more so toward the measurably faithful, the builders upon Sand. The fact that not many of the readers of the Epiphany Truth are among the great ones of the Truth people is also testful to all.

(33) One of the severest tests of all to both these classes is the Epiphany teaching that manifested Great Company brethren are by the priesthood to be pointed out as such. On this being done, they immediately recall that Servant's Parousia-applying teaching that brethren were not to be pointed out as Great Company members. The error in which they are is that they do not rightly divide the Word of Truth on this subject; for such prohibition is for the Parousia, not the Epiphany. While applicable in the Parousia, it is an error to apply it to the Epiphany. Those who do so fail to remember our Pastor's teaching that in the extreme end of the Age—the Epiphany is such—the Great Company would be manifested as separate and distinct from the Little Flock (Z '11, 22, 234, 349; Z '16, 39, par. 1; 264, par. 1; 1916 Convention Report, page 198, Question 10); and that when this separation would occur, it would be in order to point out these manifested Great Company members as such. They quote 1 Cor. 4:5, "Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts," and interpret it as though it forbade judging "until we are on the throne." But it does not so teach, but teaches that our judging begins with our Lord's return. Our Lord came in 1874 and His Second Advent has three stages of manifestation, and thus three judging stages: (1) the Parousia, when His judgments manifested the Tares and the Second Death class as separate and distinct from

those who retained the Holy Spirit; (2) the Epiphany, when His judgments manifest the Little Flock and the Great Company as such, separate and distinct from one another; and (3) the Basileia (Kingdom), when His judgments will manifest the Sheep and Goats as separate and distinct from one another. This passage forbids our judging in any of these periods any as belonging to its manifested classes until He has first manifested them in their pertinent classes; but this passage commands us to accept the manifested individuals in their proper class after He has manifested them as such. Hence with propriety during the Parousia we pointed out certain ones as Tares, others as of the Second Death class, not before, but after He had manifested them as such. So now we are warranted in pointing out individuals to be such that as a result of His Epiphany judgments He has manifested as Great Company members. This passage commands such activity on our part, not before, which it forbids, but after He has manifested them. But those who bring over into the Epiphany a principle that applies solely before the Epiphany and make it applicable now, will, of course, be sorely tried by our pertinent teachings and practices on that subject now in the Epiphany.

(34) Thus we have seen that the reasserted Parousia Truth and the newly asserted Epiphany Truth has proven a sore trial to both classes of builders. But while trying them sorely it has affected the faith part of the faith and character structure of the Faithful quite differently from that of the others. This downpour of these two forms of Truth has had no evil effect on the faith part of the Faithfuls' structure. Nor will future downpours of this symbolic rain have such an effect, because having built well into their faith structure the Parousia Truth, this Truth does not antagonize any part of their faith structure. The Epiphany Truth, being harmonious with the Parousia

Truth, will likewise not antagonize their firmly built Parousia Truth faith structure. Hence the downpour of these Truths, though under the circumstances trialsome, does not illy affect them in their faith structure. These are like a well built and rainproof house whose tile, slate, shingle or tarpaper roof, free of leaks, sheds torrential rains without damage to self.

(35) Far otherwise is the effect of this downpour of the reasserted Parousia, and the newly asserted Epiphany Truth on those who build on Christ as Sand. Their faith structure being composed of a mixture of Truth and error, their hold on the Truth being more or less superficial, resulting in a weak faith structure, their being unable "to see far off," due to their double-mindedness, their love for the Truth being more or less weak, resulting in their faith structure not being regarded as a treasure to be held at all costs, and above all Christ as a Sand foundation, not strengthening, supporting, staying and helping them against Truth-retaining requirements too hard for them to meet, but forsaking and abandoning them, they have not been able and are not able to stand this downpour of Truth. It finds the various weak points in their faith structure and works devastation thereon. How otherwise would they so easily reject the Truth on tentative justification, the Youthful Worthies, the robe of Christ's righteousness, the sacrificing World's High Priest, the time of the Harvest, antitypical Elijah and Elisha, seventy jubilees, Satan's princship of this world, the wise men, the gospel of the Kingdom, the Lord's great prophecy, that Servant, time of worldwide witness, the channel, twelve Apostles, the outpouring of the Spirit for all flesh, character development, many parables, types and prophecies, the chronology, Daniel, the organization of the Church complete, the Pyramid, the last related acts of Elijah and Elisha, the man of sin, the Epiphany period, etc., etc., etc.? How otherwise would they reject practically the

whole of the Epiphany Truth, which is grounded on, elaborated from and in harmony with the Parousia Truth? Is there not a state of mind existing, *e.g.*, in Society circles, that stands ready to reject anything of the Parousia Truth, and does it not act out this readiness promptly on the Tower's objecting to any one of the Parousia truths? Brother Wise's statement in Indianapolis in November, 1928, is a splendid illustration of this state of mind, when he told his Society audience there that they did not anymore believe as they used to in the reaping time, yea, five years before, yea, even the last year, and that there was no certainty that they would believe in the following year what they believed that year, and that the only thing on which they were certain was the Ransom!

(36) This devastation of their faith structure is both a group and an individual matter. Hence all groups among the Lord's people, except the Epiphany brethren, reject one or more features of the Parousia truths given through that Servant for the development of the Church. We can see the truthfulness of this remark when we consider the teachings of the Society, the P.B.I., the Olsonites, the B.S.C. (of Britain), the Elijah Voice Society, the Adam-Rutherfordites, the scattered Sturgeonites, the Chomiakites, Zion-Messengerites, etc., etc., etc., as indicated. Even the Kohathites have done this; for without exception they have rejected the Parousia truth that the Christ class, while in the flesh, is the sacrificing World's High Priest, claiming that the World's High Priest first comes into existence after the Church in its entirety passes beyond the vail. In other words, they accept only the glorified priesthood as the World's High Priest. The rejection of this particular feature of the World's High Priest seems to be universal among Levites. At least we know no exceptions to this among them. The Scriptures are plain that unless

we are a part of the abased and sacrificing World's High Priest, we cannot be a part of the glorified and blessing World's High Priest (Heb. 7:26, 27; 10:9; 13:10-16; 1 Pet. 2:5, 9; Rom. 8:17; 2 Tim. 2:10-12). This rejection is, of course, based on their desire to evade the conclusion that they are now being led to the Gate by the World's High Priest—Head and Body—on this side and the other side of the veil. But the rejection of some feature of the Parousia Truth is not only the act of groups; it is also in many cases an individual act apart from groups, as can be seen from the course of what we might call the Toms, Dicks and Harrys among Truth people arising in repudiation, orally or in writing, of Parousia truths.

(37) This course of these repudiators is the fulfillment of the parable's description of the damage done the house built upon sand, among other things, by the rain. Using the figure of our text, we might say that this house, unlike the other, whether roofed with figurative tile, slate, shingles or tar-paper, has breaks in these that prove to be veritable leaks in the Truth-rain time. Through these leaks the torrential Truth-rain finds its way into the house's attic, where it accumulates in increasing measure on the floor slats and plaster. These become thoroughly soaked, and under the weight of the other accumulating rain water, the plaster bulges downward until, unable to resist the weight, it drops to the floor, ruining the carpet and spoiling the furniture. As the rain continues its waters flow down the walls, spoiling the paper, which more and more soaked, begins to fall off in large strips. As time after time such Truth-rain falls on the house it causes the lumber of the house to become mouldy, and a mouldy scent fills the house, while the lumber rots. Thus the downpour of this symbolic rain causes much devastation to the structure of those who built upon the Sand.

(38) But this is only the first means of the testing.

Our text speaks of two others; and as we consider these carefully we come to recognize the thoroughness of the test. Under all of these tests the house built upon the Rock stands secure and strong, uninjured, unweakened and untarnished. But not so with the house built upon the Sand. Each successive means of testing it leaves it in a worse condition than the preceding one, until the final one leaves it a total wreck, whose sundered parts, as debris, float on the crest of the flood, pounded by the rain and blown hither and thither by the winds.

(39) The second thing by which both houses were tested is spoken of in our text as the floods—"the floods came." Floods made by rivers or streams overflowing their banks, or by rain covering grassless or near grassless land outside of rivers or streams, consist of a mixture of water and earth, and take on the color of the soil that their waters absorb. Thus floods overflowing black, brown, gray or red earth partake respectively of these colors. We have never seen a flood caused by rivers or streams overflowing their banks or by rain covering grassless or near grassless land outside of rivers or streams to consist of pure, transparent water. The floods spoken of in our text apparently were such as were made in one or the other or both of these ways, and hence their waters were not transparent, but mixed with earth—muddy waters. In Biblical symbols transparent, unmixed water is used to represent the pure Truth in its thirst-satisfying, refreshing and nourishing effects. The Revelator shows this in Rev. 21:6; 22:1, 2, 17, when he speaks of the pure, crystalline Millennial Truth unmixed with error under the symbol of the water of life. Other Scriptures give the same symbolic use of the word (Is. 12:3; 35:7; 41:17, 18; 44:3; Ezek. 36:25; John 3:5; 4:10-15; Eph. 5:26; 2 Pet. 2:17; 1 John 5:6, 8). The Scriptures also speak of the waters of Truth that have been symbolically

muddied—"fouled"—by the feet of the false shepherds treading in them, *i.e.*, mixing error and Truth as the portion that they have been giving to the Lord's flock (Ezek. 34:18, 19). Thus the Biblical symbols pertinent to our text suggest the thought that the floods of our text represent a mixture of Truth and error. Accordingly, the second tester of the two symbolic, houses—the faith and character structures of crown-retainers and crown-losers—is a mixture of Truth and error. If our understanding of the symbols of the text and the time setting of its fulfillment be correct, we are to understand that now a mixture of Truth and error is testing both the crown-retainers and the crown-losers.

(40) And this certainly is a thing that we now see to be testing them. Satan is too shrewd to give unadulterated and transparent error through any mouthpiece whom he may be using to give his thoughts to the Lord's people; for who would accept what they believe to be entirely erroneous? His hope of successfully seducing from Truth into error is to mix them with one another and make the partial Truth that one may hold a stepping stone toward the error that he seeks to inculcate. This is also one of his methods of spreading error among others than God's real people. Accordingly, we see an immense amount of error being now mixed among the truths that the Lord's people held in the Parousia time. In palming off this mixture Satan is using Levite leaders by pen and word of mouth as his agents. A brief look about us at what is coming through magazines, books, booklets, pamphlets, tracts and leaflets, circulated among the Truth people, and a brief hearing given to what is said in the addresses of many pilgrims, auxiliary pilgrims and elders, and in the conversations of the majority of the Truth people, will convince us that such a symbolic flood is testing all of the New Creatures on earth. *E.g.*, not everything coming in the Tower is Truth or error. There is much of Truth

there, *e.g.*, what they reprint from our Pastor's writings; but there is much error mixed in with this Truth, especially in the writings of J.F.R., Satan's chief mouthpiece among the Truth people. In his writings there is a Satanic attempt continually made to make the Truth a stepping stone to the error.

(41) We will instance some of these errors appearing in the Society's publications: No tentative justification; consecration at the gate; Christ's merit not deposited at Calvary, but after the ascension; Christ's death on a tree not necessary to satisfy Justice; the Church a part of the High Priest and sharing in the Sin-offering only after her glorification; Egyptian firstborn typing the clergy as such; no Youthful Worthies; antitypical Elijah transubstantiated into antitypical Elisha, both of them typing not classes but works; the seventy jubilee cycles ending in 1925 and many connected errors; confusion on the parables of the penny, the virgins, the pounds, the talents, sheep and goats, the wedding garment, wheat and tares and the robe of righteousness; Satan having had until 1914 the right to rule over the race; confusion on the gospel of the Kingdom and its time setting, on the star of Bethlehem and the wise men, on the point of the sword, on the three parts and the fires of Zech. 13:8, 9, and on the bound ones and prisoners of Is. 61:1; all New Creatures as such die; the faithful Society adherents are the "remnant" and "that Servant"; the "opposition" are the man of sin and that evil servant; the new birth takes place in this life, with no difference between it and the begetting of the Spirit; the Devil built the Pyramid; (two years ago) the Philadelphia Church was from 1874 to 1918, since then has been the Laodicean stage; (now) all seven churches were contemporaneous and from 1879 to 1918; Revelation 4-22 fulfilling and to be fulfilled since 1918; we are not to develop character; Enoch experienced death; confusion on repentance, faith, conversion and consecration;

our Pastor still directs the Society's work; a 50 years' Harvest; antitypical Elijah's work began in 1874, ending in 1918; the pre-anointing did not occur until between Christ's resurrection and ascension; there were 19 Apostles; time features are no more to receive special attention; the Spirit is now poured out on all flesh; a new dispensational work began for the Little Flock in 1919; Satan was in heaven until 1914; joy began in heaven in 1914 when Satan was cast out; the nominal church was completely rejected since 1918; Jesus came to the temple in 1918; Oct. 29 A.D. to April 33 A.D. parallels Oct. 1914 to April 1918; Mal. 3:1-4 applies to 1918 and onward; Matt. 24:4-14 applies from 1914 on; the earth was not redeemed; impingements against the ransom on at least nine points; God did not foresee Adam's fall; Ancient Worthies return with perfect characters; mankind was not sentenced with Adam; Christ was not a grain of wheat. The above are a selection from a list of 140 errors of J. F. Rutherford coming out in various Society publications and tabulated by us in P '26, 143, 144, with a few others selected from the multitudes coming out since that issue was published. Thus we see that muddy waters, fouled especially by the treadings of that foolish, unprofitable shepherd in the streams of Truth, are coming through the Society's publications among God's flock.

(42) So, too, are some of these flood waters coming through P.B.I. publications: Their books on Revelation insofar as they give our Pastor's interpretations give Truth; but they also give an immense number of interpretations of "foolish virgins," particularly of Adventists, many of which they know our Pastor rejected, and the bulk of which are certainly false, *e.g.*, that which they give on Mohammedanism, which is not referred to at all in Revelation. Their book on Daniel not only rejects practically everything that our Pastor gave in interpreting

its prophecies, but gives the false interpretations of "foolish virgins," they accepting the datings and events that Satan counterfeited in his misrepresentations of things set forth in Daniel and Revelation. They give the false nominal-church chronology, which makes them unable clearly to explain the 70 weeks of Daniel, the 2300 days of Daniel, the jubilee cycles, the parallel dispensations and the correct times of the Gentiles. Consequently they reject the years 29 A.D. for our Lord's baptism, 33 A.D. for His crucifixion and 1874 for the beginning of the Harvest, they not being sure about its date, but thinking it may have begun in 1893 and may end in 1933. Their alleged Harvest began after the Tower and Vols. I, II and III had appeared—after the sickle had been used for years!!! Their chronological errors make them ignore the Pyramid. Thus they reject practically everything in Vols. II and III and not a few things in Vol. IV. They reject, contrary to Tabernacle Shadows, the present ministry of the World's High Priest, alleging that He functions only in the glorified condition. Their teaching that a corporation is necessary for the management of the Church's general ministry is a denial of the organization of the Church as having been completed by Christ and the Apostles. They deny that the last related acts of Elijah and Elisha were typical. Their claim that that Servant is a class is a denial that Bro. Russell was exclusively such. Their radical group has gotten control of the organization, and not only fellowship with A.E. Williamson in pilgrim and convention work, but some of their pilgrims and elders have accepted his errors on the Sin-offerings, Mediator, Covenants and Ransom, thus going over to the errors of the 1908-1911 sifters, antitypical Korah! We pass by others of their errors, believing the above sufficient proof that these false shepherds have "fouled the waters" for the Lord's sheep.

(43) And what shall we say of the Olsonites, who have taught factually disproved errors on dates, prophecies and types? Of the Zion-Messengerites, who have done the same? Of the Adam-Rutherfordites, who have done the same? Of the Standfasts, who have done the same? Of the Elijah Voice Society, who have done the same? Of the Eagleites, who have done the same? Errors are appearing in the Berean Bible Student, the Bolgerites' organ. Similar things may be said of other Levite factional leaders. Then, too, individuals are teaching various errors and spreading them among the Lord's people. *E.g.*, Bro. Morton Edgar, who has done such good work on the Pyramid, has allowed himself to use a false inch symbol for certain parts of the Pyramid, *i.e.*, instead of limiting the Pyramid inch to symbolizing a year, he has in certain parts of the Pyramid connected the Pyramid inch with a false chronological month—a 30 days' month, while the Bible in its chronology used the lunar month, which averages about 29½ days—and on this false basis he forecast May 30, 1928, as the date for special trials beginning to come on the Church, whereas they began almost at once after our Pastor's death; and during the severest parts of them Bro. Edgar was preaching the "millions" message, even by letter exhorting us to cease our opposition to J.F.R.'s teaching and likewise preach the "millions" message, and only then became awake to the Society as a false channel when it in 1928 struck his specialty—the Pyramid. Bros. Horace Hollister, Saphore, Crawford and numerous other individuals in the Truth, among whom are the only locally knowns who we call the Toms, Dicks and Harrys, have arisen and taught perverse things to draw disciples after them. Some, not using the printed page, confine themselves to letters and personal conversations whereby they muddy the waters of Truth. Do we not on all sides of us see these mixtures of Truth and

error coming as floods among the Lord's people? Was there ever a time among the consecrated people of God when so many floods of errors flowed among them? If we look back at the five Harvest siftings, we find that none of them produced one-tenth of the errors mixed with Truth that we now see flowing among the consecrated in such great measure.

(44) Let us not forget what St. Paul says about the source of such errors (Acts 20:30). In this Scripture he tells us that they flow from the ambition of leaders desirous of a following. Most of those who presume by printed page to address the general Church have no right to do so, not having been appointed by the Lord through His special Servant to the office of general elder in the Church, without which office no one has the right to address the general Church. Accordingly, brethren like Bros. Bolger (Berean Bible Student), Adam Rutherford, Henning (Zion's Messenger), Lardent (Gleanings for Truth Seekers), Stahn, Bricker, etc., etc., etc., are usurping power-graspers, who, unauthorized by the Lord, "rush in where angels fear to tread." "My brethren, be not many teachers" (Jas. 3:1). Personally we warned Bros. Bolger, Adam Rutherford, Henning and Stahn against their power-grasping usurpations; but, bent on winning a following, they gave no heed; and as a result they are each now cutting down a tree that the Lord is fashioning into a post for the Epiphany Tabernacle's Court. The fact that so many of the pilgrims have gone into error should have deterred these lesser lights from usurping so dangerous a position; but lacking humility they judge themselves fit for an office to which the Lord never called them, and for which He evidently would not call them. To the fallen heart, to be a somebody is so enchanting a thing that it will impel to almost any course to attain its ambition. Even warnings of the

danger to themselves and others are not sufficient to restrain such.

(45) And certainly the numerous and rising floods of our day are sorely testing the house built upon the Rock and the house built upon the Sand, and each one in a different way. The guilelessness of the Faithful at first makes them open to the test coming from a mixture of Truth and error. Their trustfulness has the same effect. So does their love. The fact that most of them are not of "the wise" likewise leaves them open to these errors reaching them. Thus they are slow to suspect teachings as false when they come from brethren. But in the end these very qualities are their safeguard from falling. At most they have suffered bewilderment by the mixture of Truth and error that has reached them. They have not been deluded by the sophistries that have come to them in these symbolic flood waters (Matt. 24:24). Having dug deep, far below the surface to the bedrock and thereon laid firmly the foundation of their faith and character structure, no swirling, rushing and beating of the flood waters upon their house can take it away from its foundation, which well supports it. These flood waters may dash their spray and foam upon that house and discolor it, but cannot move it away from its foundation. The Truth that they hold in the love of it secures them from the flood-waves, so that as a house their faith structure is not injured; and the support that it receives from Christ, the Rock, holds this house immovable from its foundation.

(46) Some of these saw through the mixture of Truth and error as soon as it began to make its appearance among the Lord's people. This, of course, kept them free even from the bewilderment that some of their faithful brethren experienced. Others saw through it a little later, and some still later. Some are just coming to see through it, and others have not yet done so; but of this we may be confident: the

Lord will not allow one of the faithful brethren to be deluded, even if He suffers them temporarily to be bewildered. And when the time is due, each faithful heart, sustained in his faith and character structure in the meantime by the immovable Rock of Ages, will come to see through the situation, and thus be freed from the special trial of this symbolic flood. But as long as the trial is upon him, he has the Lord Jesus as his Rock, as his Sustenance, Support, Stay and Strength. And this keeps him safe and secure in his trial by the flood waters. Here, too, the passage has an indirect application for him: "When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee" (Is. 43:2). Blessed be the Lord for such assurance and the help that comes therefrom to those who have it (Ps. 91).

(47) But these symbolic floods test also the houses built on the Sand and manifest the faith and character structures built thereon to be quite different from those built upon the Rock; for these are indefensible against the floods beating upon them. The crown-losers' hold on the Truth in most cases never was very strong and well reasoned. In most cases it was lamentably superficial. In some cases it was almost zero. In all cases there were various errors more or less mixed up with the Truth that was received. They did not receive the Truth in such a love of it as would make them give up life rather than lose it or corrupt it with error. There is a more or less absence of the amount of humility, meekness, hunger, honesty and goodness necessary to receive and retain the full Truth. Their "worshiping of angels" made them fail to defend themselves against the specious claims of channels or other erroneous leaders with sufficient strength to present an impenetrable head and heart to their teachings. The inability "to see afar off" made them open to accept plausible, but misleading explanations, whose doctrinal consequences

they failed to take in. Their undue, deference to leaders, their leaning on channel-crutches, their unsteadfast heads, their wandering hearts and their double minds, all conspire to make them amenable to some frenzy of delusion with damage to their faith structure, to such a degree as ruins it (2 Thes. 2:9-11).

(48) Look at the Society partisans. Among them the flood waters have increasingly come. Doctrinal errors on multitudes of subjects are flowing wildly among them and are beating on their faith structure. Delusions on prophecies are engulfing them. Ethical teachings of vastly erroneous proportions are swirling about them. The swift currents of typical hallucinations beat relentlessly against their house. Look at the P.B.I. partisans. The same conditions on a somewhat smaller scale present themselves among them. On prophetic matters, particularly on large parts of Revelation and on almost all of Daniel, flood waters are washing away at their faith structure. On chronological matters these flood waters are swirling about them in almost damaging effects. Look at the Olsonites. Flood waters of doctrinal, typical and prophetic error are beating upon them, are rolling about them and are overflowing them. Look at the Adam-Rutherfordites. They are surrounded by rising, beating, swirling and tempestuous flood waters on chronological, typical, prophetic and pyramidal matters, that are working great havoc among them. The Zion-Messengerites, under the impact of the flood waters of doctrinal, typical and prophetic errors, are being shaken through and through. The Chomiakites are being greatly damaged by flood waters of error in almost every subject of the Parousia Truth. In Germany, Poland and Switzerland many of the P.B.I. adherents, under the leadership of a P.B.I. supporter, Bro. Sadlack, one of the joint authors of a German book entitled, *The Desolation of the Sanctuary*, which has been translated into English, and which is being distributed by the P.B.I.'s and

Bolgerites here in America, are denying that Jesus' Second Advent has set in. Their confidence in the chronology was undermined by the P.B.I., who leave the date of the Second Advent uncertain, and the latter having said the A of error on the time of the Second Advent, the Sadlackites are saying the B of error in denying its having set in. This illustrates the danger of going wrong on even one point; and shows the great responsibility of the P.B.I.'s on this subject.

(49) Many individuals are arising and are breaking up some other reservoirs of error, thus increasing these flood waters and the consequent damages wrought thereby. Pride and ambition as a rule are the causes of people imbibing error and spreading it. They get a thoughtlet. Not realizing that Satan injected it into their minds, they turn it about and look at it from many sides, patting themselves on their backs as inventors of deep and wonderful thoughts. The more they think of it, the more the thoughtlet grows in their estimation. Soon they think: "This is too good to keep to ourselves, for that would make no one wonder at the depth of thought in us. We must write a book, a magazine, a booklet, a pamphlet, a tract or a leaflet. This will convince others of what great thinkers we are; and we will have the pleasure of feeling how good it is to be leaders and have a crowd of followers!" This, dear brethren, according to Acts 20:30, is the way false teachers arise, teaching perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. This is the way the bulk of the error that is spreading among God's people has had its start. Satan is ever on the alert to find among crown-losers such as he can inflate with the sense of their imagined greatness and profundity, and thus make them misleaders of their brethren by bringing among them a flood of error. He, after all, is the source of all of these flood waters that are coming among those who built upon the Rock and upon the Sand.

(50) These flood waters are certainly doing their work of destruction on the house built upon the Sand. As a literal flood beating against a house built upon sand would first wash away the sand foundation and then, rising higher and higher, would lift a frame building up and carry it away; so this symbolic flood of error has created such a condition in the crown-losers who have received more or less of these errors as has made Christ in similar measure forsake them and leave them in the lurch in their time of trial, so that in matters of belief they are thrown upon their own resources and are soon carried away from Christ as wisdom. Thereby they are left to the pitiless surgings of the floods of error. Again, as literal flood waters, rising higher and higher, drive the occupants of the house to the second story and then to the roof; so the floods of error drive these crown-losers further and further away from formerly held truths into more and more error. As literal floods carrying a literal house on their crest will make it sway from side to side, turn it over, whirl it around and toss it hither and thither; so this symbolic flood causes its victims with their house to sway to and fro, turn upside down, whirl around and toss hither and thither until the occupants are almost too dizzy to hold to the house. At times they find themselves above, and at times under the floods of error. And under the pressure of these floods their faith structure creaks and cracks unto its increased weakening. Thus the flood waters of error ruin their faith structure.

(51) We now come to the discussion of our text's symbolic winds, as the third means of testing the two houses of our text. Of course, the winds of our text are not literal ones; for comparatively few of the Lord's people have received any trials from literal winds, while the winds of our text try every house built on the symbolic Rock or Sand. Hence, as in the other two cases, we must look for the Scriptural symbolic

use of wind and apply that use of the word in our text. In Biblical symbols wind is used to represent war. The wind that Elijah saw (1 Kings 19:11) rending the mountains and breaking in pieces the rocks before the Lord represents the World War rending the kingdoms and breaking up many of the strong fortresses of the nobility and of capital. In Rev. 7:1 the wind that was prevented temporarily from blowing on the earth, the sea and any tree, represents the same war held in check from damaging society, the lawless masses and great ones, until all God's servants were sealed on their foreheads. The same war as destructive of Britain's ships is set forth by the wind of Ps. 48:7. Among other passages in which the word is used to represent war are the following: 1 Kings 18:45; Ps. 147:18; Is. 32:2; Jer. 51:1; Dan. 2:35; Ezek. 13:11, 13; Eph. 4:14; Rev. 6:13. These passages prove the point.

(52) Some might ask, Was the World War the winds of this parable? We would answer that while undoubtedly the World War was a sore test to many of the Lord's people, it was more than half over before any of the trials symbolized in our text started. Moreover, it was but one, not more than one symbolic wind. Nor did it test all of the Lord's people. Nor was its testing of so crucial a character as the winds of our text. There are other wars to which the winds of our text refer—spiritual wars. They are the wars referred to in many passages. These are not fleshly, but spiritual, one along lines of justice, another along the lines of love, and another along the lines of power (2 Cor. 10:4, 5). These are good wars (1 Tim. 1:18, 19). They require one to fight the good fight of faith (1 Tim. 6:12); to fight against the devil (Eph. 6:12; 1 Pet. 5:8), the flesh (Rom. 7:23; 1 Cor. 9:25-27; Gal. 5:17; 1 Pet. 2:11) and the world (John 16:33; 1 John 5:4, 5). They require endurance of hardship (2 Tim. 2:3, 10). They require our having on and using

the whole armor, if we would be victorious (Eph. 6:12-17). Our Pastor speaks of these as follows: "The battle ground of the Spirit is the minds of the saints." It is these spiritual wars that facts prove to be the symbolic winds of our text. And, beloved, by many an experience each one of us knows these wars, and what it means to share in their battles, sentinelships, marches, maneuvers and privations. These are internal wars, and often go on amid a calm exterior, nobody suspecting the battles that are on in the minds of the saints. And these battles furnish results that undeniably prove whether one is a crown-loser or a crown-retainer.

(53) This test of our text affects mainly our character—that which we developed while building on Christ as righteousness [justice], sanctification [love] and deliverance [power], while the other two tests of the text, the rain and the flood, mainly affect our faith—that which we built upon Christ as wisdom. Accordingly, we see that both parts of the houses are tested—the faith structure and the character structure, but as a rule by different testing agencies. Accordingly, we ought to see character tests amid spiritual battles. These battles are the conflicts that we have *in temptation*. And as we examine our own hearts and listen to the testimonies of our brethren we learn that there are now hard-fought battles within and without going on. Perhaps in no previous time were there so many temptations abroad in the world as now. The general world spirit is one that comes laden with temptations above that of any other time. The means of self and world gratification on account of the many inventions of our day, the possibilities of travel, abundance of riches and prospects of position, influence, education, pleasure, ease and comfort make such tempting appeals to God's people as never were made before with nearly so great force. Never did sin so greatly abound, nor more subtlety attack the minds of saints

in allurements. Satan never was busier in seeking to seduce the consecrated from the narrow way. Therefore, he strews temptations thick and fast at the feet of the New Creatures, making them fight hard and constantly, if they would maintain the good fight of faith without falling and wavering.

(54) These battles in temptation strike every phase of character. As our Lord, the Captain of our Salvation, was tempted at every point of character, so is it necessary that we also be so tempted. These temptations strike our strong and weak points of character; and we must fight faithfully, if we would win out. If we have any envy, covetousness, malice, resentment, revengefulness, hypocrisy, cowardice, laziness, vanity, pride or unholy ambition in our hearts, which we do not suppress or destroy by the graces, especially by faith, hope, love and obedience, these temptations will surely bring them to external expression. Only then are we victorious in the trial when we suppress their efforts to control us, and more and more extirpate them from our dispositions; and the Lord allows these temptations to strike us at every one of these points of character, so that it may be determined whether we built upon Christ as the Rock or Sand. And only those who built upon Him as the Rock will have the strength amid these battles to overcome the temptations that as figurative winds beat hard and often on these points of character. And those who built upon the Rock are amid these battles sustained, stayed, supported and strengthened, so that they can beat back the attacks made upon the integrity of their characters and emerge from their wars victorious. Thus amid their battles, strengthened by the Rock, they will stand victoriously the beatings of the symbolic winds against them and come out of the warfare stronger than when they entered it, holding aloft the banner of victory (Cant. 6:10). The Faithful can from many a hard battle give testimony of the reality of this warfare and

of its outcome. The inner strength of character that they developed during the Parousia time, supplemented by Christ's sustaining grace, enables them to come off more than conquerors in these wars!

(55) But how otherwise is it with those who built the character part of their house upon Christ as Sand? They lack this inner strength of character able to resist in the evil day, not having built character faithfully as they should on Christ, and hence built upon Him in this respect as Sand. In their characters are the *disgraces* more or less in the ascendancy, with the graces too weak to suppress their efforts at control and to destroy them. Hence, the temptations that come to them do not find the strength of their graces sufficient to overcome. Rather, the appeals that the temptations make to their faults stir up the latter to such activity as to bring them into successive stumblings and falls. Hence, some of the crown-losers are living predominantly in the filthiness of the flesh; others are living predominantly in the filthiness of the spirit; and still others are living in more or less of a combination of both. Tempted and falling; tempted and falling; tempted and falling—such is a summary of their experiences, as they are exposed to the beatings of the symbolic winds. Bro. Wise in 1928, while pilgriming in Florida, without realizing what his language betrayed, said at various places in one of his sermons, "Brethren, I do not know myself any more. In former days I was full of the victories of the spirit, but now I find myself continually falling in my temptations." He further said, "My experience is not at all unique. Everywhere the brethren confess to the same experience. This has especially been the case since that article came out in the Tower on Covenant or Character Development—Which? Since then all the bars have been let down; and the brethren are running riot in sin." A certain Society sister remarked after that article came out, "How glad I am that I do not have to

develop character; that all I have to do to attain the Kingdom is to sell books!" The blowing and beating of the winds of our text upon the house built on the Sand accounts for the works of the flesh, the devil and the world among many of the crown-losers—that part of God's people who failed to develop a Christ-like character.

(56) Perhaps some illustrations of the blowing of the winds on various representative leaders among the Truth people might clarify the operation of these symbolic winds on both kinds of builders. In the three British managers the spirit of power-grasping was acted upon in temptations, both in Bro. Russell's absence while alive and in his inactivity when dead. Instead of resisting this temptation in various ways, though in some things acting in opposition to one another, they more or less unitedly sought to gratify it, resulting in their bringing more or less confusion upon one another and upon others. In our relations to them as the Society's special representative, we were tempted not to oppose them, on the ground that we might ruin our work in Britain through their opposition. Then the specious pleas of keeping peace were brought to bear upon us, even though it meant a relaxing of our attention to our duties. Threats of ruining our work were brought to bear upon us. But by God's grace we were enabled to overcome these temptations, and as a result under the Lord and in co-operation with various brethren succeeded in leading all three of these managers with their partisan supporters to the gate. When J.F.R. knew that he had enough votes to elect him president of the Society, he was confronted with the possibility of humbly accepting only the few and unimportant extra privileges of service that the presidency of the Society would give him above the other six directors, or the possibility of plotting and grasping for powers additional to these. In the temptation his desire for pre-eminence proved the greater. He, therefore,

worked out with their degrading details all the plots necessary to deceive or browbeat others into giving him exclusive managerial and executive power in all the business and other affairs of the Society. Confronted with the offer of being groomed for the presidency of the Society, we immediately set the proposal aside and, preferring J.F.R. in honor, supported him for that office as against ourself, and rejoiced in his election.

(57) When we learned that the Lord had given us the leadership of the priestly work, both as teacher and executive, though we, at the time, mistook the name for the office, in the guilelessness of our heart, believing that he would be as happy for our privilege as we were for his; we told him of it. Confronted with the possibility of being magnanimous or envious, unable to endure a supposed rival, he deliberately, wickedly and deceitfully, before the whole Church, assassinated us whom he claimed to love above all other pilgrims, in order that he might have the pre-eminence. Confronted with the possibility of being subject to the Society's Board, as he should have been, or unlawfully ousting an opposing majority, he chose the latter that he might retain his illy gotten power, even if it meant the division of the Church. Confronted with the possibility of opposing such a usurpation, in the prospect of losing much that was dear to us, or quietly submitting to it as the price of being a great one in the Society, we boldly stood for the right and endured great loss. But out of these trialsome temptations came a transparent manifestation from the Lord, the subsequent events lending confirmation to it, that J.F.R.'s faith and character structure had been built upon Christ as Sand.

(58) As a reward, somewhat later the Lord gave us to see that the separation of 1917 was the separation of antitypical Elijah and Elisha. This was while the so-called opposition put up candidates for the Society

offices. Menta Sturgeon was its candidate for president. We were no candidate, refusing to consent to be a candidate for a director. During the Jan., 1918, Convention at Pittsburgh, in connection with which the election of the Society officers and directors was held, we told him of our understanding of the separation, supposing he would be happy to know it. Confronted with the choice of being magnanimous or envious at our having been favored by the Lord with this understanding, he, as Mr. Paton showed envy at Bro. Russell because the Lord had favored the latter and not the former with the light on Lev. 16, gave way to the spirit of envy, which carried him to such extremes as alienated from him almost all "the opposition," whereas in the trial we were kept sweet in the love of God, who used us and others to lead him to the gate and fit man. Four of the members of the Fort Pitt Committee, confronted by the possibility of continuing to exercise the very modest powers given that committee or to form a corporation which would give them the powers that the Society directors had, in the temptation succumbed to power-grasping and became manifested as builders on Sand, while we, confronted by the same possibilities, refused to corrupt the organization of the Church, though we knew that it meant further loss and suffering. Confronted by the choice of preaching the advancing Truth on Elijah's and Elisha's last related acts and on that evil servant (which truths they had accepted), or of winning adherents by hushing these subjects, they for popularity's sake chose the latter, and sought to force us to be quiet on those subjects on pain of being out of harmony with (the majority of) the committee. Confronted with the choice of remaining silent on seasonal Truth or lose the favor of that majority, with its attendant losses, we spoke out the Word and suffered the loss, but overcame the temptation.

(59) These few examples will illustrate some of the

blowings of the winds. Each builder in his own case can study its manifold operation, and therefrom learn its lessons. Upon the house built upon the Rock the winds have no ill effect. They sometimes rattle its doors and windows and even shake it somewhat; but in the end they leave it intact. But not so do they affect the house built on the Sand. We have already seen how the rain had wrought devastation with its ceilings, walls, floors and furniture, and how the floods had partly filled it, removed its Sand foundation and carried it away from its place, swaying it from side to side, swirling it around and around, turning it over and over and tossing it about until it creaked and cracked. This house, so woefully beset and weakened, is finally struck by the winds, whose repeated blasts and blows finally break the house up and dissolve it into debris, which floats scattered over the waves of the flood. The inhabitant finds himself in the water, unmercifully beaten by the rain, waves and winds. Fortunately, he seizes hold of a rafter—some good quality of his—which providentially floats within his reach. To this he clings for dear life. But many a submerging in the water does its repeated turning over give him. As time slowly drags on, he floats aimlessly with the tide, now under, now above the water. His strength approaches exhaustion. He seems not much longer able to cling to the rafter, and as he is slipping off, his feet strike the ground, whence he sees that the land is nearby. Favored by the Lord, and gathering together all his remaining strength, he laboriously makes his way to the shore and his life is saved—with everything else lost! Are we like him or like the one who built on the Rock—which? As the coming of tomorrow is sure, so time and the rain, floods and winds will reveal which.

(1) Of what does our text consist? What are they called? How many and what interpretations did our Pastor give of them? What thought will harmonize completely

these three interpretations? What are the likenesses and differences between these parables?

(2) In what sense is the word *heareth* used in our text? What three meanings does it have in Biblical and current language? What seeming contradiction is solved by using its first and second meaning? What case illustrates its third meaning? How is the second meaning proved to be used here? What is a necessary antecedent to the building process in our text? What kind of a building is not referred to here? Why? What proves the twofold definition of the text's building?

(3) What do the rock and sand represent? How is this proven? What is the first reaction to the thought that the sand represents Christ? Why? How is this impression to be removed? In what respects is Christ represented by the rock and the sand? What do the Scriptures teach on this head? What passages teach it?

(4) How are our text and 1 Cor. 3:9-15 related? How do they present the same general subject. In what three respects do they show different aspects of this subject? How are these differences not to be regarded? How are they to be regarded? What Biblical principle is illustrated by these differences?

(5) Where is no difference brought out in the building process? Where is it brought out? What is the chief difference between the two builders? How do the parables bring this out? What is purposed in this article? What passage will help in realizing this purpose? What two characteristics does this passage have? Of what does it treat? In what way is the passage useful for our purpose? How will we use it?

(6) What is meant by Christ's being made our wisdom? What does teaching mean? What two things are implied in teaching? Why? What does our Lord as our Teacher do to us? In what two ways do the Faithful take Him as Teacher? Who presents Truth and who error to them? What does He give them as tests of Truth? What is the heart of these axioms? How many are these axioms? What are they? How do they manifest error? Truth? How do the Faithful build their faith structure in relation to these axioms? What Scriptures prove these

axioms? What two things do the Faithful do as a result? What is this in relation to our text?

(7) Wherein do crown-losers fail as to Christ as their wisdom? In what two ways do they do this? What five qualities are antecedent to one's getting the Truth? Which Scriptures prove this? Why do the Faithful get the Truth? Why do the measurably unfaithful fail to get the Truth? What, instead, do they imbibe? What has a blinding effect upon them? What other fault do they commit in this connection? To what extreme have some of them gone? Where? What reasoning is given for such a course? Toward whom even was this fault exercised? How did he treat this course? How has the Society been in this respect? What do such build as to Christ in wisdom?

(8) What are the details of a certain sister's view on this point? What mistake did this sister make? Contrary to whose repeated teachings did she and many others do this? What is such a course in reality? In what two bad things has this resulted? How should our faith structure be as respects our faith helpers? What typical Scripture describes the crown-forfeiting result of this wrong course? What do the 32,000 followers of Gideon type? The fear of the 22,000? Their separation from the 10,000? What do these 10,000 type? The 9,700 and the 300? What is typed by the drinking on the knees? The drinking erect? What are the antitypes of the details of these two postures in drinking? What two results come from these two ways of receiving the Truth?

(9) What is the second way of building on Christ? How is Christ our righteousness? How is this Biblically proved? What are God's, Christ's and faith's part in this? From what two standpoints may justification be viewed? What two classes have Christ as righteousness? What do they not do alike as to Christ as righteousness? What two reasons prove this? What does Christ's righteousness do with us justiceward? How so? What does this imply? What does this prompt the Faithful to do? What is done in case of measurably wilful sin on their part? What different parts in this structure are erected by wisdom and justice? What results from such building?

(10) How do crown-losers build as to Christ as

righteousness? Before what is no building done? Why not? How did eventual crown-losers act toward righteousness before Spirit-begettal? How do we know this? What follows from this as to the time of building as implied in our text? When do these begin to build on Sand? How are they related in time to one another in such building? What are the steps of such building? In what does this result in character? As to foundation?

(11) What third office as Savior does our Lord exercise toward us? How many functions has this office of His? What is the first of these? How does He perform it in us? How does He consecrate us? How do the crown-retainers and crown-losers comparatively respond to this function of Christ's sanctifying work? How can we prove this? What conclusion follows from this fact? When only can the building of our text begin?

(12) What is our Lord's second function as Sanctifier? How does He perform it? What response to this work do the Faithful make? What two things does this mean? What two effects do these two things have on the heart? What does this manifest of our Lord's part in His second sanctifying function? Of the Faithful's part therein? Amid what contrasted conditions do they do this? What do they do in case of sin therein? What quality will they especially exercise in this connection? What results from this?

(13) How do the crown-losers act in this respect? Why for awhile do they go right in this matter? What results from non-enforcement of this momentum? What differences appear herein among crown-losers? Wherein do they all do alike? What produces this course? In what two things does it result? What kind of a course do they follow? What do they not like? To what does this lead them? What figures illustrate their course? What words describe them? What results therefrom?

(14) What is Christ's third function as Sanctifier? What does this function produce, positively and negatively? What is Christ's relative relation to this double result? What means does He use therefore? What is required in this work from the involved new creatures? What three things must they do in response? Amid what

conditions? What results from this? What kind of builders does it make them?

(15) What ideal did crown-losers have set before them? What did Christ do toward them in this respect? What varied responses did they temporarily make? What similar response did all of them finally make? In what five things did they fall short? What course made them double-minded? By comparison and contrast with the Faithful, in what did this result for them?

(16) What is Christ's fourth office work toward us in the salvation process? What is meant by His being made to us deliverance? In what two different times does He execute this office? What work of deliverance will He do for us after this life? Why will we not discuss this further here? To what phase of His delivering work will we limit our present discussion? Why? What two features does this phase of His delivering work have? How only does He offer to do this work? Why so?

(17) What will manifest this? With what are these implications associated? What is implied in warfare? Who are the chief and subordinate commanders of the army of evil? How many corps has this army? Of what do the first, second, third and fourth corps consist? Who are the chief and subordinate commanders of the other army? Of how many corps does it consist? Of what do its first, second, third, fourth and fifth corps consist? What are the conditions of their deliverance from their enemies' ambushes, etc.? In what does the fulfillment of these conditions also result?

(18) What is the battle ground of the Spirit? What kind of a warfare is there waged? What results therefrom? What guarantees these results? How are these victories not achieved? How are they gained? How must the sentinels act? What must the soldiers endure? Above what must they rise? What must they maintain? How must they act in reverses? In drilling? In sickness and wounds? Yea, in all things? What results from such a course? What supplies deficiencies therein? What is the eventual result?

(19) How do the crown-losers not wage war? How do they temporarily at first fight? What then sets in? How comparatively as to time? How do they view the

conditions of the warfare? In what does this result? What couplet do they at times attempt to act out?

(20) In what does this couplet acted out in earthly warfare often result? In heavenly warfare? To what do yielding and flight lead in this warfare? To what do they expose their doers? Why? How does one prove vulnerable in this warfare? What two evils to their doers result from yielding and flight? What are their effects on the other soldiers? What are the near and final consequences of such a course? What negative, and what positive thing happens to such soldiers? If finally delivered from captivity, what does such a soldier not become? How does he build in deliverance?

(21) What has our study covered as to building? The four salvation processes? The classes of builders? What two things were seen throughout the study? By what did the Faithful build on the Rock? By not doing what did the measurably faithful build on the Sand? What makes the difference in the foundation? What does the Faithfuls' doing Christ's teachings make Him to them? What does the measurably unfaithfuls' not doing Christ's teachings make Him to them? How have we built, as to Christ? Have we built on Him as the Rock? Or as Sand?

(22) Of what did the previous portion of this chapter treat? What will we now discuss? In what is the building set forth? In what the testing? Who built on the Rock? On the Sand? What have there been from the beginning of the Age? When did the Great Company as such not begin? When did it begin? How do Rev. 7:14 and 2 Tim. 4:1 prove this? How does the atonement day service type this? How do corroborative Scriptures prove this? What two works belonging to this line of thought occur simultaneously? How does this prove the point under consideration?

(23) How does the Gospel-Age application of the tabernacle prove this? If no Great Company existed until the Epiphany, what related persons did exist during the entire Age? How must they have been regarded by God? What conclusion must from this consideration be drawn? Why for this study must this be kept in mind? What for awhile were all builders? Why? What do these thoughts prove as to the day of testings and of 1 Cor. 3:12, 13?

What testings preceded these? What did they effect? What does Mal. 3:2, 3 teach on this line of thought? Rev. 7:14? 2 Tim. 4:1? What, then, as respects the classes as such, was the building time of these parables? Their testing time? What in principle, according to the parable, was done with individual crown-retainers and crown-losers throughout the Age? Why was it then done? What conclusions are to be drawn on this line of thought? What proves them? To what view of these parables does the foregoing not apply?

(24) For what did the above study prepare us? By what means is the testing accomplished? How are these means not to be understood? What three reasons prove this? What procedure should be followed to find out what the rain, floods and winds mean? What does rain usually represent in the Bible? How is this proved by Deut. 32:2? What is meant by the small rain on the tender herb? Showers on the grass? How does Ps. 72:6 prove rain to represent Truth? What does its grass represent? What is the teaching of its first clause? Its second clause? What other passages use rain for Truth?

(25) What does the rain of our text symbolize? What things are implied in its falling on both houses? What do facts prove of three things in this respect? What has been done with the Parousia Truth since our Pastor's death? With the Epiphany Truth? Why is the Parousia Truth being reasserted? What are Satan's mouthpieces doing? How do they differ in their attacks? What will happen by the time the 60 Levite groups are formed? What has been done on this line by the Tower? The P.B.I. Herald? The Olsonites? The B.S.C. of Britain? The Adam-Rutherfordites? What have all groups of Levites done with the World's High Priest doctrine? What have individuals done herein?

(26) To what have these attacks led? Who even have taken part in this? What are some examples of this? What have individuals done in this respect? Who especially as to the Pyramid? Wherein has this been mainly done? Why? How has it fulfilled one of its professed missions? Accordingly, what has it been doing? How has it sought to make its expositions, proofs and refutations?

In what has it succeeded? By whose grace? Of what do and will its contents consist?

(27) How do some think of the author in this connection? What has been and is his attitude on controversy? Whose courses have gradually increased his readiness to enter these controversies? What parallel course of Satan marked the times after the death of the Apostles and that Servant? What effect did the knowledge of this have on the author? What other knowledge animates him? Why does he cry aloud and not spare? How do these things affect him? Who do not fault him? Who for the most part do fault him?

(28) What does such reassertion of the Parousia Truth prove to be? To whom? Why? What is the first reason for this? How do they think the sifters should be dealt with? What occasions them so to feel? What shows that they are illy advised on this subject? Who else are similarly affected? How does this course test the partisanship, servility and pride of some followers of Levite leaders? How does such reasserted Parousia Truth prove testful to swallows of Truth and error?

(29) What other things in its presentation make it trialsome? Why? How does their leaders' stand affect others? Why? What parts of Scriptural forms of Truth in elaboration of Parousia Truth try others? How does the length of the Truth articles affect some? Why? What in The Present Truth tries some? Why? The absence of what feature of Truth work in the Epiphany people tries some? What two reasons make this trialsome? What attitudes toward the Parousia Truth by the few and the many test others? How is "fellowship" as affected by the downpour of Truth trialsome? How is the spirit of their having received the Parousia Truth tested by this downpour? What has this investigation proved the Parousia Truth to be in these Parables?

(30) What other Truth has been presented, as implied in the parables' rain? In what literature has it been presented? What is the Parousia Truth? The Epiphany Truth? Since when has the latter Truth come out? What similarity is there in the giving of both Truths by their respective messengers? Who is the source of both? What is the highest privilege of their messengers?

(31) What suggests the trialsomeness of the Epiphany

truths? What are the main ones of these? Which two of these are especially trialsome? What two time features as to consecrators are trialsome? What about this has been trialsome to the Faithful? Why has it been trialsome to the measurably unfaithful leaders? To their followers? What is the most testful feature of the Epiphany Truth? Why so to the Faithful? To the measurably unfaithful? How have they sought to evade its truthfulness? What are the main teachings so denied? How does the teaching as to the Priest's threefold work with Azazel's Goat affect them?

(32) Whose unpopularity makes this Truth trying to both classes? What should such unpopularity not occasion? Why not? What illustrations make this plain? In what change of work has this principle not changed? What follows from this? How does this affect the Epiphany messenger? What would follow, if he were not unpopular? What is this unpopularity to the two kinds of builders? What other thing is herein trialsome?

(33) What Epiphany teaching is one of the sorest tests? What does its presentation occasion? What wrong is thereby done? Why? What is overlooked by this course? What passage in this connection do they misapply? How do they treat it? When did our Lord return? What three stages of manifestation does it have? What manifestations take place in its first stage? Its second stage? Its third stage? What does this passage forbid in each of its stages? Before what? What does it command in each of its stages? After what? What could we therefore properly do after the pertinent manifestation in the Parousia? In the Epiphany? What must result from this procedure to those who apply to the Epiphany the form of prohibition that applies only before the Epiphany manifestations?

(34) What has heretofore been seen? Comparatively, how have these trials affected the two kinds of builders? What kind of an effect *did* they not have on the Faithful? What kind of an effect *will* they not have on them? Why not? As to the Parousia Truth? As to the Epiphany Truth? What results therefrom to the Faithful? What illustrates this?

(35) What contrasted effect does the downpour of Truth have? What five conditions make this effect set in?

What does this Truth find in those who build upon Sand? What proves the presence of these? What are the chief repudiated truths? What Truth do they reject almost entirely? How is it related to the Parousia Truth? What state of mind exists among crown-losers? In what circles especially? How does it act? Whose statement illustrates this state of mind? What was this statement in its particulars, giving each in its turn?

(36) In what capacities does this devastation go on? What results from this among the Truth groups? What group is an exception to this? What proves the truthfulness of this description? Even what class of Levites have experienced this devastation? What truth have the Kohathites without exception repudiated? What is their claim in this connection? What do the Scriptures teach on this subject? What proof texts show this? How do they show it? On what is the rejection of this truth based? Who else beside groups reject various Parousia truths? What kind of brethren often exemplify this? In what ways do they show their Parousia Truth rejections?

(37) What does the course of the repudiators fulfill? In what particular? However roofed, what are in the roofs of the houses built on sand? What do these prove to be? What does the rain do with them? What does it do with the attic's slats and plaster? What effect does this have on the plaster? On the carpet and furniture? What does the rain do with this house's walls and paper? To what does this add? What effects does the repeated rain have on the house's lumber and air? What is a summary of the effects of the symbolic rain?

(38) In order among the testing means how does this rain stand? Of how many others does our text treat? To what conclusion does a careful examination of these tests lead? How does the Rock-founded house meet the tests? How does the Sand-founded house meet them? What under them is its final condition?

(39) What is the second means of testing the two houses? What kinds of floods are implied in the text? Of what do they consist? What will condition their color? Of what kind of waters do such floods not consist? What does pure, transparent water represent in Biblical symbols? Why? How is this shown in Rev. 21:6; 22:1, 2, 17?

Quote and explain this symbolic use of water in the other proof passages given in the paragraph under study. Of what other symbolic waters does the Bible treat? Where and how does it so do? What does Ezek. 34:18, 19 suggest as to the flood waters of our text? Specifically, what is the second tester of the two houses? If this understanding is true, what should we expect to see about us?

(40) What do we see in this respect? What is Satan too shrewd to do? Why? On what is his hope of deceiving any of the Lord's people based? Among whom else does he use this method? What do we accordingly see? Whom does Satan use as his agents in such deception and by what methods? What printed and oral means does Satan use herein? What are these doing to all new creatures? What is not the character of all the Tower articles? What is also in them? Especially in whose writings? What attempt is continually made therein?

(41) Read in turn and comment on each one of the many errors cited in this paragraph as coming from J.F. Rutherford's pen. Of what are these errors a selection? What do these prove as to fouled waters?

(42) Through what other channel do fouled waters flow? What erroneous interpretations do they give on Revelation? What special illustration applies here? What erroneous interpretations do they give on Daniel? What false chronology do they give? What does this disable them from doing? What special dates for noted events do they reject? What do they tentatively give as the date of the Harvest's beginning and ending? What disproves this thought? What effect do these errors have on their attitude toward the Pyramid? What books do they reject almost entirely and what one partly? What error on the World's High Priest do they teach? On corporations as to the Church's organization? On the last related acts of Elijah and Elisha? On that Servant? What do these errors prove of the P.B.I. leaders?

(43) On what lines of thought have the Olsonites gone astray? Zion - Messengerites? Adam - Rutherfordites? Standfasts? Elijah Voice Society? Eagleites? Bolgerites? What others have introduced errors among the Truth People? Who else? What prominent brother who has done good work has added to this error? What other

more or less prominent brethren have advanced error? Even who else has done this? What other means do some use to spread error? Where is this error seen? How is it in comparison with former times? In what, for example?

(44) What does St. Paul say is the source of such errors? Why do most of those who presume to address the general Church have no right to do so? What brothers violate this arrangement? What do they thereby become? Despite what do they continue their usurpations? In what has this resulted? Whose warning example should have deterred them? What lack and what evil in them effected their power-grasping? What even did not restrain them?

(45) What are the floods doing with the two houses? How contrastedly? What qualities open the Faithful to these tests? How does each one do this? What do these qualities ultimately do for them? At most what do these trials effect in them? From what are they delivered? What can the flood waters not do to them? Why not? What can and what cannot these flood waters do to them? Through what and by whom are they sustained?

(46) When did some of these get their deliverance? How in point of time are others delivered? What will the Lord not allow to happen to any of the Faithful? Throughout the trial what will the Faithful experience? What passage applies to his comfort and stay? In what Psalm is his security promised?

(47) What other house is tested by the floods? What difference do they manifest? Why? What are some of the 13 things in the crown-losers responsible for this? What do the floods accordingly do with their house?

(48) Who are prominent examples of those injured by the floods? In what four lines of teachings have they gone wrong? Who furnish other prominent examples of such? On what two special lines of thought do these go wrong? Who form a third set of such? In what three respects have they gone wrong? Who form a fourth group? In what four respects have they gone wrong? Who form a fifth group? In what three respects have they gone wrong? Who form a sixth group? In what respects have they gone wrong? What flood water is rising in Germany, Poland and Switzerland among

many P.B.I. adherents? Who is letting this flood water loose? Who gave the impetus to this error? How?

(49) Who else is responsible for opening the flood gates of error? What in them makes them amenable for such work? What is the process of their development into error teachers? What Scripture proves this of them? How does it prove this? Who is on the watch for such? What does he do to win them for his purposes? Who ultimately is the source of this flood?

(50) What effect do these flood waters have on the house built on the Sand? In the picture and the thing pictured forth what are the first and second effects of such flood waters? What is the third effect in the picture in the thing pictured? The fourth and fifth effect?

(51) What was the third means of testing the two houses? What kind of winds were they not? Why? What kind must they be? What does wind in the Bible symbolize? How is this shown in 1 Kings 19:11? In Rev. 7:1? In Ps. 48:7? Read and explain this use of the word in the other cited passages.

(52) What were not these symbolic winds? Why not? To what do the text's winds refer? What kind of wars are these? Against whom are they waged? What special two things do they require? How does our Pastor designate them? What proves that these are the wars referred to in our text? What things do we know of them by experience? Under what condition does the warfare often go on? What does it finally manifest?

(53) On what do the winds mainly act as a test? How did we build character? On what do the rain and floods mainly act as tests? How did we build the faith structure? What, accordingly, is tested in this symbolic house? How varyingly? Accordingly, what kind of tests should we expect to see? What are our spiritual battles? What do experience and observation on this head reveal? How do our times compare with others as to temptations? What conditions make them so? What does sin now do? Satan? In what does this result?

(54) On what do these temptations act? Who have had similar experiences? On what kind of qualities do they act? What does this make necessary? What qualities make one prone to temptation? What qualities will

suppress and destroy evil characteristics? If these do not do these things, what will result? When only will we be victorious? Why does the Lord allow such temptations? Who only will overcome them? What enables them to gain the victory? How will they come out of this warfare? Of what can the Faithful give testimony? What two things enable them to gain the victory?

(55) How do things stand contrastedly with the crown-losers? What do they lack? Why? What are in their characters? In what measure, contrasted with the graces? How do their temptations find them? How do their temptations affect them? In what three conditions do they varyingly live? What is a summary of their experiences? What is Brother Wise's testimony in this connection? On what did he lay the responsibility for pertinent Society conditions? What was the pertinent expression of a certain Society sister? What accounts for the works of the flesh, the devil and the world among crown-losers?

(56) What will help clarify the experiences connected with the symbolic winds? Illustrate this by the experiences of the three British managers. By the Society's special representative who dealt with them. By J.F. Rutherford's seeking extra-charter powers as president. By another brother's attitude toward the presidency.

(57) How did J.F.R. act when a supposed rival as teacher and executive appeared? When tested as to subjection to the Board? How did another act amid the temptations of the resultant conditions? What manifestation was made as to J.F. Rutherford amid these experiences?

(58) How was faithfulness amid the temptations of the separation rewarded? How did this test Menta Sturgeon? In what two respects? Like whom under similar conditions did he act? What was the outcome of the temptation to him and to another? What two trials came to members of the Fort Pitt Committee? What temptations accompanied them? How were they met by the involved persons?

(59) What can each builder do as to these symbolic wars? What near and ultimate effects do the winds have on the Faithful? On the unfaithful? Like to which builder is each of us? What will surely reveal it?