



# RULES OF BIBLE STUDY

DR. CARROLL KENDRICK

Issued  
by THE OLD PATHS BOOK CLUB  
5646 Rockhill Road  
Kansas City 4, Missouri

Printed by Citizen Print Shop, Inc.  
Los Angeles, California

COPYRIGHT, 1946  
BY THE OLD PATHS BOOK CLUB

---

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

DEDICATION

This edition of Rules of Bible Study by  
Dr. Carroll Kendrick is dedicated to  
his granddaughter, Pattie Leigh  
Phillips (Mrs. W. A. Phillips),  
of Los Angeles, California,  
by THE OLD PATHS  
BOOK CLUB.

## WE DID NOT EDIT

The reader should bear in mind that the Editorial Committee has not presumed to make editorial changes, but has confined its activities to proof reading. Some peculiarities in style, grammar and punctuation may be noticed. These remain just as they were in the original work, which was published in 1890.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE.

# CONTENTS



*Page*

FOREWORD ..... 1

PREFACE AND INTRODUCTION ..... 3

## CHAPTER I

CHRISTIANITY ITS OWN MORAL DEMONSTRATION ..... 15  
How we judge men—Generals, judges, etc.—Medicines—Civil governments, societies, nature, art and science—So try the Church, the Bible—Errors and Truths, understand them, and let them plead their own cause, relying on their own merits.

## CHAPTER II

IMPORTANCE AND COMPLETENESS OF REVELATION ..... 20  
We know nothing of God, Spirit, Creation;—Of God's will, our duty, or of a future existence, but by Revelation; and this Revelation, so absolutely necessary, claims to be perfect for the unconverted, and for the converted; for all classes; and by the most rigid trial, proves its claim; and the importance of understanding Revelation.

## CHAPTER III

HOW TO STUDY THE BIBLE ..... 27  
The Bible, subject to rules, like other books—Reasons for failures in studying it;—Rules; love of truth, pure motives and rightly dividing it; with exemplifications; dispensations, persons and things;—Moral, positive and ceremonial laws;—Other divisions and exemplifications.

# CONTENTS

*Page*

## CHAPTER IV

THE SPEAKER, THE PERSON ADDRESSED, ETC . . . . .	38
Cause of the address, what was to be accomplished, the circumstances connected with it; exemplifications; —The three parables, (Luke 15, John 3)—Conversation with Nicodemus;—Applying the rules and explaining the passages;—Collect all the testimony,— The new birth by this rule; Sum of the testimony,— Conclusions.	

## CHAPTER V

DOUBTFUL PASSAGES . . . . .	51
Tenth rule;—Doubtful scriptures and exemplifications;—Of women speaking or being silent in the Church;—Scriptural rights and duties of women, according to these rules;—Paul justified, the Scriptures harmonized, and order preserved.	

## CHAPTER VI

MEANING OF WORDS, SENTENCES AND PARAGRAPHS . . . . .	62
Analysis of words, sentences and paragraphs;—Exemplifications;—Sermons on the wrong pronunciation and meaning of words, (Titus 3:5, Rom. 8:8) — Religion; Convert and conversation;—The four items in conversation;—Meaning of Life and Death;—The Prodigal Son, dead and alive;—Present Life and Death;—Eternal Life and Death;—Sanctification, its meaning in the Bible exemplified.	

## CHAPTER VII

MANNER OF DOING DIVINE COMMANDS . . . . .	79
Doing God's will in God's way;—Exemplifications in the civil law and in the divine law;—Manner of observing the Lord's supper;—Carrying the Ark of the	

## CONTENTS

*Page*

Covenant;—Bringing water out of the rock;—Manner of teaching the Jews;—Romans, Mohammedans, protestants and Bible plans for evangelizing the world;—Manner of observing the Lord's day; other cures, and the conclusion according to these Rules.

### CHAPTER VIII

IMPORTANCE OF SOUND SPEECH . . . . . 85  
Imperativeness of this rule; Its true meaning shown by many exemplifications; The same idea in other words: Many ordinances but no sacraments; We must call Bible things by Bible names, when we can; Not add to or take from; It requires the only course that can give us union; Forbids what will cause division, classes, strife, etc.

### CHAPTER IX

IMPORTANCE OF CLEAR TESTIMONY . . . . . 90  
Special reason; — Meditation; — Exemplifications; Soul Sleeping and Infant baptism both rest on confessedly doubtful testimony and are unsafe; Special reasons for observing the Sabbath, for destroying the Canaanites, and for sparing, and for punishing the wicked, and for the suffering of the righteous; Why Jesus told the disciples beforehand; Why he died; Importance and naturalness of meditation; Counting the cost; Thinking.

### CHAPTER X

FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE . . . . . 98  
Figures a necessity; Three manners of teaching— types, parables and literal; What writers on Rhetoric say of figures; Specimens of the hyperbole; The Bible manner of stating these things; Meaning of types and

## CONTENTS

*Page*

parables by various authors, etc.; Rule 1 exemplified —Luke 15—Rom. 9:20-21, Jer. 18, etc.;—The Potter and clay—Mat. 22;—The King's wedding feast; Blair's Rhetoric; warnings and instructions.

### CHAPTER XI

FIGURES FOUNDED ON FACTS . . . . .	111
Figures and facts, with exemplifications; How to find the literal meaning; The Steward, Luke 16.; Rich man and Lazarus; Meaning of facts stated; Lessons taught; Shadows and substances; Rule third; Must harmonize figures with literal teaching; Various exemplifications and expositions of Scriptures; Parable of the tares. Mat. 13. Withdrawing from the incorrigible. Rule fourth; All have one leading point of likeness; Exemplifications and expositions of many passages; How to determine when language is figurative; (3) Three rules for this—Ernesti, Campbell; Observing the context, scope, analogy of Scripture; Many passages explained; Little children brought to the Savior; Analogy of faith; Allegorical language; Symbolic and mystical action.	

### CHAPTER XII

FIGURES CONTINUED . . . . .	134
Etymological meaning; types and antitypes; Five important items noted; Deliverance of Israel; The leading facts; The nature of their bondage; Their numbers in Egypt; How they came to believe in Moses; Three facts as to the relation of testimony to faith; The character of the miracles wrought; True and false miracles; Effect of their faith in Moses; Not saved when they believed; Passing through the sea; What Paul calls their baptism into Moses; Five facts noted; When they were saved; Israel in the wilder-	



## CONTENTS

*Page*

ness; Four other facts; Their crossing Jordan and entering into the promised land; The application to Christians.

### CHAPTER XIII

THE JEWISH TABERNACLE . . . . .	153
Stackhouse on early places of worship; The importance of understanding the type; Six items we can not be certain about; Description of Tabernacle and some of its furniture; The Ark; The altar of incense; The incense; The table of shew-bread; The candlestick; First holy place; Second holy place; Outer court; The laver; The altar of burnt offerings, and their antitypes in the New Testament; From Calmet, Brown, Sherwood, Watson and Jones; Six important items; The water of separation and its antitype; Holy oil and its antitype, etc.	

### CHAPTER XIV

CONSECRATION OF JEWISH PRIESTS . . . . .	172
The offerings; Sprinkling on them the water of Separation; Washing them with water; How this holy water was made and used, and its antitype; How they washed; never sprinkled or washed the clean; Always the unclean, to cleanse them; They were clothed with priestly garments; anointed with holy oil; How it was made and its antitype; The Holy Spirit; The antitype of these four items—to make Christian priests; Qualifications and duties of Jewish priests; Cain and Abel; Their worship, and why Cain's was not acceptable; A lesson to us; Priests before Moses; Idol priests, etc.; Age and personal qualifications of Jewish Priests; Their duties, to offer sacrifices, teach, take down, and carry, and put up the Tabernacle; A lesson for Christian Priests; They aided the government; Application to us; Moses' great mistake; The emolu-	

## CONTENTS

*Page*

ments of the priests; The financial tithings; The triennial tithings; The feasts of the Lord; Sabbath, new moon, passover, feast of weeks, feast of Tabernacles, three annual feasts, and their antitypes, in detail; Conditions on which the offerings of Jewish Priests were accepted and the antitype in detail.

### CHAPTER XV

ATONEMENT AND GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL . . . . .	210
Annual atonement day;—items;—tradition and Bible teaching as to Tabernacle types and antitypes;—first or Sinaitic Covenant; use of the term Tabernacle; —Golden Censer; things not yet made manifest; the veil, figurative;—Redemption from transgression under the old Covenant;—the government of Israel, primary and permanent; Judges, wise men from among the elders;—Shall judge righteously;—fear God, not man—Fear a gift to blind the mind;—Judges for the Lord and Judges for the city; elders, not necessarily officers;—never equivalent to any office; —officers chosen from among them—New Testament elders;—bishops being called elders, no proof of their sameness;—duties of elders;—duties of officers; absurdity of young men being officers—elders;—preachers not congregational officials.	

### CHAPTER XVI

JEWISH FREEWILL OFFERINGS AND FINANCES, ETC . . . . .	230
Voluntary offerings and their antitypes; no antitype for constrained offerings; all voluntary in Christ; Collecting funds for special cases; How Paul raised special collections; How the Jews were able to give so liberally; why so much expense for the Tabernacle; not to encourage pride but to teach moral worth from natural; mistakes of commentators, etc.	

CONTENTS

*Page*

CHAPTER XVII

THE FLOOD AND NOAH'S ARK . . . . . 241  
 Analysis of 1 Peter iii:18-21 (after reading Gen. vi, vii); Christ suffered for sins; guided by the Spirit; went and preached to spirits in prison through Noah; while the Ark was preparing; the Ark; saved from the wicked by water; saved in and by the Ark, from drowning; the like figure, or antitype, even baptism saves us; meaning of the filth of the flesh; the answer of a good conscience; by the resurrection of Christ; the synthesis, after a general and accurate acquaintance with Gen. vi, vii, viii, and 1 Peter iii, and seeing that all this is typical of developments in Christ; Ruinous effects of sin; Noah's faithfulness; but one Ark,—but one Church; A fable of the giraffe, and how he got in; but one door,—how Christ is the door; the literal entrance; safety in the Ark only; all food, etc., in the Ark—the Church; All light-came from above and does now; all comfort, good society, good government in the Ark; its final landing; delivering up the Kingdom; landing of the Old Ship of Zion.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE WORSHIP OF Go . . . . . 253  
 Meaning of worship, at length, critically; heart reverence manifested by bowing and obedience, as God manifested his love by Christ; True Worship; what is necessary to it; false or vain worship, and what it is, in detail; mixed worship and what it is, exemplifications and warnings; the objects of worship,—to please God and share his blessings; importance of pure worship; transforming his blessings; importance of pure worship; transforming us into the image and likeness of the object worshiped; Kinship to God and fitness for heaven.

CONTENTS

*Page*

CHAPTER XIX

THE CHURCH IN PROPHECY . . . . . 262  
Meaning of prophecy;—cases of miraculous prophetic teaching;  
Moses at Mt. Sinai; prophetic teaching concerning Christ; new  
covenant; Church and Kingdom; durability and triumphs of  
Christianity; its establishment and organization; apostasy foretold;  
meaning of the dragon, heaven, etc.; other apostolic teaching on the  
apostasy; how this was brought about; agencies and instrumentalities;  
warnings for us and confirmation of our faith.

## FOREWORD

When the Editorial Committee decided upon an edition of "Rules of Bible Study" by Dr. Carroll Kendrick, many things were to be considered. First of all, we had to investigate the copyright on the volume originally issued in the "gay nineties," under the fuller name of "Live Religious Issues of the Day," and with the sub-title which is used as the main title of this edition. That matter, after considerable delay, was cleared with the Register of Copyrights, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. In the second place, it became necessary to decide upon whether to use the whole of the original volume which contained some live religious issues of that day, but some of which are no longer very much alive. Then, too, Dr. Kendrick seems to have put together the best thoughts of his life, and sometimes those thoughts were unrelated. The final decision, therefore, was to take the main section of the original, which was the gem of the whole, the lengthy treatise of more than three hundred pages on the subject of "Rules of Bible Study." Since we are using a smaller type with narrower margins, we are able to compress this great wealth of material into less space.

Sister W. A. Phillips, wife of one of the elders of Central Church of Christ, Twelfth and Hoover Streets, Los Angeles, and a granddaughter of Dr. Carroll Kendrick, has brought to the attention of the Editorial Committee the following facts concerning her illustrious grandfather.

Dr. Carroll Kendrick was born in Tennessee in 1815. He was educated in medicine and practiced that profession for about twenty-five years. Franklin College, headed by the great Tolbert Fanning, conferred on him the degree of Master of Arts in 1851. He became a strong advocate of the Restoration Order and was known all over the South. In 1845-46 he edited the Christian Journal, Louisville, Kentucky, with great success. Later he was editor of the Eccle-

siastical Reformer, Harrodsburg, Kentucky. Up to the time he left Kentucky in 1851, he had witnessed from his labors about ten thousand additions to the church—in the year 1842, mostly in Lincoln County, Kentucky, he was instrumental in bringing into the church about one thousand souls. During the twenty-five years he spent in Texas the fruits of his labors included approximately another ten thousand additions to the church. Wherever the journals and papers of the brethren were circulated in those days he was known as an able and forcible writer.

At the time of his death, Dr. Kendrick lived in Downey, California. Until a few days before he died he was engaged in a gospel meeting at Monrovia, California. L. P. Phillips, the father of W. A. Phillips, and grandfather of Albert A. Phillips (the only living relative of Dr. Kendrick preaching the ancient gospel) preached the funeral, assisted by Elder W. R. Lawrence and an old gospel preacher who was called Father Piatt.

Dr. Kendrick assures us in the "Preface and Introduction" that he pored long years over the subject. We can well gather that from the material which it contained. He had completed it only a short time before he died, in 1891, and left it as a posthumous volume to the world.

We feel that a genuine service is rendered to the saints generally who may come to read this volume through issuing it as an "Old Paths Book Club" selection.

JOHN ALIEN HUDSON.

## PREFACE AND INTRODUCTION

Houses have porches and vestibules, and books have prefaces and introductions. The tabernacle Moses built had only an outer court, which was entered from the outside world. From this outer court the entrance was directly into the first holy place, which may be regarded as the vestibule of the *most* holy place, as the church is the vestibule of the "House not made with hands." This seems to be a good example. Luke gives us a preface or introduction, without calling it either. And as this is designed to be the entrance to a Bible book, reference is made to Bible examples. Mortal man will never improve on these.

For thirty years Christians, whose judgment deserves respect, have urged me to publish my Rules for Bible Study, with certain exemplifications; and many discourses have been demanded for publication. Those regarded as our wisest men have encouraged me to publish a book containing these matters. Before the war I made some preparation. In fact, one part of the work was ready for the press. For years after the war I was so occupied providing for my family, that I could do little more than evangelistic work, write some for the papers, etc., and, of course, I gave *some* attention to reading and study. After coming to California, and measurably giving up the practice of medicine, I gave increased attention to study and writing, with special reference to my long-contemplated work. In the meantime, the condition of the churches was changed materially; and, desiring to adapt my book to the case in hand, I re-studied, and, in the last two years, have re-written the whole, except the extracts.

Perhaps modesty will not be offended, if I state here, that, as a preparation for such a work, I have made it a rule to read carefully and consecutively the whole of the Old and New Testament every year for over fifty years, in our morning and evening family worship, besides far more in the special, critical and general investigation of the main themes

there presented. In my investigations I have had the principal aids the learned employ in such investigations.

In these careful, long protracted, and repeated investigations and reviews, I have sought to know no Calvinism, Arminianism, Arianism, Socinianism, or any other ism. I have sought neither to agree nor disagree with Luther, Calvin, Wesley, or any other man,—or even with my own previous utterances; and, in some instances, I have found it necessary to change, and oppose my former views. Believing that the Bible, and no other book contains the will of God concerning us, and all we need to know, and can know of his worship and service; that God addresses man in his own language, meaning by his words just what the people addressed meant by them, and that these words can be understood only by applying to them the same rules of interpretation we apply to other communications; that the right of private judgment is a *sacred* right; that; we owe it to ourselves, in view of our frailties and the fearful results of "perverting the holy scriptures," which some did "to their own destruction," to make the most candid and thorough investigations possible on all these points,—I have labored much to learn the divine will. When—as in many instances, I have failed to understand the inspired word; or if there was a remaining doubt, I have rested on the subject for a time, and then renewed the investigation. Some questions are still in abeyance. They may never be *clear to me*, and till they are I shall not trouble others with my uncertain conjectures concerning them.

Not understanding what *is* written leaves *us as* if it had *not been* written. It is not a revelation to us except so far as we understand it.

Moses E. Lard was one of the most intellectual men of his age, or of any age or country—he was also a learned and true man. In the preface to his translation and commentary on Paul's letter to the disciples at Rome, he utters some truths concerning that letter and his purpose, which I would apply to *my* purpose and to the *whole Bible*, thus:



"I greatly felt the need of a work, the sole aim of which should be, to determine precisely what Paul means, regardless of what that meaning favors or disfavors. Such a work I could not command. . . . The sole aim, then, of the present commentary is to ascertain the exact sense of Paul, and to express it in terse, clear English. How far this has been accomplished, I dare not venture to say. Of what I have aimed to do, I am a perfectly competent judge; of what I have really done, I may be a very poor one. ... I have studied the former (difficult) passages still I have not been able to realize additional light from further study. I have then, but not sooner, set down my conclusions. . . . The reader will note that I have never seemed to think whether my expositions were favoring Calvinism, Arminianism or any other ism, and this is strictly true. Indeed I have been concerned solely with the sense of Paul, and neither the sense nor non-sense of others. . . . My ambition has been, so far as practicable, to make a book for the common reader. I have, therefore, refrained from unintelligible allusions, the use of foreign words, and citations of unfamiliar authors; in fine, from everything which would wear the appearance of mere display, without being at the same time, positively necessary. ... In regard to Lexicons to the New Testament, I feel it a duty to say, that I have not always found them as trustworthy as I could have wished. They, like commentaries are usually very perceptibly tinctured with the peculiar sentiments of their authors. The same remark applies to grammars. ... I have endeavored to ascertain the sense of each separate passage, by whatever means seemed fullest of promise of success, without slaving it especially to any one method."

No partisan can be a correct and reliable translator or commentator. No one with a special theory or party to serve, can be safely trusted as a commentator or translator, or in collecting testimonies and drawing conclusions.

In endeavoring to make what I have ventured to call a *Bible book*, I not only determined to find, as far as possible, and set forth the true meaning of the inspired record, but, also, to *stop where that record stops*. Beyond the rays of light from this luminary, all is darkness, and I would neither lead others nor go myself into it. Those who walk in the dark are equal to the blind, and, like them, are ever liable to "fall into the ditch."

What is not written we cannot know, and what is not made plain we cannot be certain about,—and, therefore, should not affirm. Many professors and writers affirm various things which they cannot prove to be true; as, that Peter ever resided at Rome, that James was the Bishop of Jerusalem; that a cubit is eighteen inches; the precise position of several articles of furniture in the Tabernacle, the exact chronology of certain events recorded in the Bible, etc. Hence the lesson in this work on "what we do *not* know." It is generally right to tell the whole truth, but might it not be safer to stop short a little, sometimes, than to venture beyond, and say things we cannot *prove* to be true?

Many of the most important matters I trust are, in the following pages, very clear. Others are rather suggestive than demonstrative. My space rendered it impossible to bring forward all the testimonies, or note all the fair conclusions. Of the rules laid down I could give but a few exemplifications, when I would have given many—both for the sake of showing the importance of the rules, and for the sake of understanding the subjects which exemplify them.

Nor could I investigate *all* the "live religious issues of the day." Hence I marked out the word *the*, after it was written, and call it simply "Live Religious Issues." If this volume is favorably received, I shall, if the Lord will, soon issue a second volume under the same title. The matter for this is now measurably ready. In this volume I publish as much as it is safe to put into a two-dollar book. Even a second volume of equal dimensions cannot contain a full

and what I take to be a much needed investigation, of *all* the live religious issues of the day.

Even a careful reader may, at first, fail to see the force of testimony, or the correctness of conclusions. I went over these and others many times, before I clearly understood them, or ventured to set down my conclusions. I would have no one to adopt my opinion, my word, or my conclusions. Each one should think and judge for himself. But I would caution those who really desire to know the truth, to be very careful, and as *thorough* as possible in their investigations, before coming to any settled conclusions. Many use the right of private judgment very unwisely. They decide, and are very positive often, when they have done nothing deserving to be called investigation.

I have *quoted* more Scriptures because I feared the reader would not *turn and read* a simple reference. Very seldom is this done. And instead of occupying much space in foot *notes*, I have put into the body of the manuscript whatever seemed necessary to the understanding of the subject; because notes, like references, are seldom read; and the notes would occupy much the same space. If a thought or a testimony is material to the subject, it should be placed where it will be most surely read. If it is not material, it does not deserve even a note. Notes may, however, sometimes be proper;—certainly they are often convenient for the author,—as are appendices; but not generally.

I cannot hope to avoid criticism. Indeed, I can not hope to avoid somewhat deserving it, though I have labored hard for this, and I have a comforting assurance that the Judge, in the great day, will smile upon this whole effort. That he may, is the highest of my ambition.

Had my purpose been to please man, or to make money, certainly I should have written differently. I have *some* idea what kind of preaching and writing will please men and get money, though I have not studied the subject much. I have

studied to *please God* and to *benefit man*, both by preaching and writing.

The one great cause for mourning and care, in all the true Zion of the Lord, is a *lack of true piety*,—a lack of *heart devoting*. This includes a lack of Bible knowledge, of Bible study, of prayer, and of abounding liberality and good works. Hence the prevalence of weakness where strength should abound; of worldliness, worldly conformity, worldly devices, and *worldlyisms* generally in the work and worship of the Church. Numbers, wealth, and popularity with denominationalists and a world that would crucify afresh the Son of God, are more popular and more sought than true piety and conformity to the divine will. Multitudes *claim* to take the Bible alone, and put on this claim as much emphasis as Chillingworth did, and then follow their own ways, or the devices of men. It was of this class of men that Jesus said: "How can ye believe, which receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from God only?" (John v. 44; xii. 43). "For they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." Of the same class Paul said: "Do I seek to please men? For if I yet pleased men"—*such men*—"I should not be the servant of Christ" (Gal. i. 10). The approbation of good and intelligent men is next to the approbation of God. Paul sought to please all such. But James iv. 4 says: "The friendship of the world," (which does not include the good,) "is enmity with God. Whosoever therefore, will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God." How many really and practically believe this?

There may be among the erring leaders some faith and piety, some fear of God and some desire for the salvation of souls. I hope so, though skepticism is fast cropping out among them. But their lives indicate, even to the world, a dominance of love for place and power, for money and worldly honor, for ease and comfort. Hence they claim success for the gospel when they have only gained numbers and popularized *themselves* with the world and with worldly minded church mem-

bers. They say the world is getting better, far better, and, to prove this, they count the numbers of nominal believers in Christ, in all lands, including Romanists and all sects and parties! They overlook the well-attested fact that, perhaps the greatest calamity that ever befell true Christianity was, the making of what Constantine called Christianity, the religion of the world—*making it popular*; conforming it to the world till Satan himself could have little if any objection to it! Constantine promoted the preachers, and made them what the world called great men. The devil would, no doubt, do that now. From that corrupt mass true Christians had to withdraw, and suffer the bitterest persecution. True Christians could not persecute, retaliate, or render evil for evil; but they could "avoid them," in obedience to Paul (Rom. xvi. 16, 17). They could "come out from among them, and be separate," as "saith the Lord" (2 Cor. vi. 17). They could heed the voice that said: "come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues" (Rev. xviii. 4).

*Popular* Christianity has always been a deadly persecuting power, revengeful and unscrupulous. And so it will be till the world is converted to the humility of the gospel. The true copyists and followers of Jesus "are not of the world." "If ye were of the world the world would love its own, but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you" (John xv. 19). See also John xvii:14-16. The contrast is like that between light and darkness. Union with a corrupt mass, however numerous and popular, is not Christian union. Calling on the faithful to "come out from amongst" those who "cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them," is the work of Paul—not of a sect-maker. "For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches, deceive the hearts of the simple" (Rom. xvi. 17, 18).

The separation of the righteous from the wicked has been the fixed purpose of the Almighty in all his dealings with man, as appears in every book in the Bible. This work will not be entirely completed till the final judgment. But it is our duty to work to this end, as the Lord and his apostles evidently did. To divide *good* people is wicked in the extreme. But to separate the righteous from the wicked, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats, is the righteousness of God (Matt. xxv. 31-33).

It is well to hold very firmly to the first principles of the gospel. No true man can yield an item at this point. But true Christianity reaches out after *Christian life* in all its details, and we need not deceive ourselves by supposing we are safe because we are right in first principles. The Mormons and many others are measurably right as to these. We *must* look to the daily life of those who have rightly observed first principles. At this point is our failure. And so has it been in the history of the Church. Let us correct this sad mistake.

Another fact of the utmost importance is this: "The ways, means and agencies now generally employed, *are not equal to the work to be done* The cause is not equal to the effect sought. As well might we look to raising wheat by planting tares. These means and agents may make a national church again, and make a profession of Christianity popular with "the world, the flesh and the devil;" but they cannot convert *the Church*, and therefore can never convert the world to the *true spirit and life of primitive Christianity*. As worshipers will not become more holy than the objects they worship, so converts will not be better than the agents and instrumentalities which make them. We must have the true, pure gospel, as it was preached and taught at first—all this, and no more. This will do the work, so far as it *can* be accomplished. Where this fails "they would not be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

Hence, now, to sum up, I have had in all my labors, and have distinctly noted in my long meetings, the four following

objects, which are constantly apparent in the following pages, viz:

1. An increase of piety, prayer, brotherly love, scriptural knowledge, and abounding in good works among those who claim to be Christians. This includes "setting in order the churches," qualifying men to be officers, etc.

2. Reclaiming of straying sheep—prodigals from the Church—with all that is necessary thereto, and with all that might hinder departures, and make every disciple "strong in the Lord."

3. The Union of all sincere Christians—"Christian union on Christian principles;" moulding all in the same mould, filling all with the same spirit, arming all with the same armor, and making all "of one heart and one soul," the union Jesus prayed for, and which is exemplified in the union of the Father and the Son, Paul and Apollos, and all the first Christians.

4. The conversion of the world,—Jesus has made no provision for this except through this union and devotion of his "*friends*."

If the standard of piety was properly elevated, backsliders reclaimed and Christians united, we might look for the conversion of the world to this "pure and undefiled religion." Then *what a world!* "The days of heaven on earth," the coming down of the New Jerusalem, and the dwelling of God with man again, as in Eden. A failure in the accomplishment of these ends would give the will of Satan and the days of hell on earth! *And what a hell!* In proportion, too, as we succeed or fail, so will there be the will of God and the days of heaven, or the will of Satan and the days of hell on earth. To aid the right, in this immense struggle, is the object of this volume. And it proposes *God's* ways, not man's. Shall it aid in rallying the good and the true to the standard of the cross, for the grandest struggle known to mortals, and for the best ends ever contemplated on earth or in heaven! The Lord prosper it on its mission!

C. KENDRICK,  
Downey, California, 1890.

RULES AND PRINCIPLES OF BIBLE  
STUDY



## CHAPTER I

### CHRISTIANITY ITS OWN MORAL DEMONSTRATION

How we judge men—generals, judges, etc., medicines, civil governments, societies, nature, art and science; so try the church, the Bible—error and truth; understand them, and let them plead their own cause, relying on their merits.

"Unto him be glory, in the church, by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages" (Eph. iii:21).

"Every part maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love" (Eph. iv:16).

We say of a general, a judge, a governor, or president: "He has proved himself capable and worthy," or "he has proved or shown himself unworthy." We all say, without knowing the particulars, that a domestic system which makes the woman a slave, and the man a lazy lord, is a bad system. We say, too, that a civil government which impoverishes, enslaves, enfeebles, makes base, ignorant and miserable the common people, is a bad government. All say this on being assured of the condition of these people, and when we know nothing of the rulers, or the plan and particulars of the government. Our convictions may be much intensified by an acquaintance with the laws and rulers themselves.

No man needs evidence of majestic grandeur and power in the ocean, after gazing upon her restless waves. The soul is to be commiserated who needs evidence of the beauties of nature, after looking upon a California flower garden. How could one better prove the sweetness of music than by witnessing a good exhibition of its harmony and power? How could one better prove the beauties of light than to witness the glories of the sun in a cloudless sky? What would we think of one who, after witnessing such an exhibition, would

demand proof of its reality, and beauty, and worth? Would not all the people say, he is a simpleton, and not to be reasoned with?

We say of certain medicines—they are good, owing entirely to their effects. Yet the effects are not *all* good, nor are they *always sufficient* to cure disease. Sometimes, perhaps, they even kill. What would be thought of a medicine—could such a one be found—whose effects were *all* good, and always sufficient to cure? What would we think of a man who, after witnessing its effects in ten thousand cases, without variation, would ask for proof that it was a good medicine? How would a community of intelligent people, who had witnessed its effects all their lives, regard a man who would come amongst them lecturing, at fifty cents admittance, to prove that it was a miserable humbug? What would be their emotions when he undertook to ridicule it, and to persuade them that it was even dangerous? Think of one who would undertake to prove that the government of the United States is a dangerous caricature of human rights, and ought to be abolished, and yet offer nothing half so good in its place! Would not our wisest and best citizens think of a lunatic's home for him? If he could offer some *amendments* to it he might be heard, for it is not perfect, and does not pretend to be. But when he proposes to abolish it outright, and has nothing better—or even half so good, to put in its place, he is regarded as a madman. How would a virtuous and intelligent people regard a man who would abuse and destroy our civil government, because some of our high officials have acted very badly? Would they not, with one voice, say, blame the officials, not the government? Even a divine and perfect government, when administered by incompetent or unfaithful officials, must fail of its purpose, if indeed, it does not work evil. The evil comes from the officials, and the remedy is in removing them, and putting competent and faithful men in their places—not in changing or abolishing the laws. Why not apply this to the divine government and its officials and citizens? All these things

have been abused, and are capable of being abused, and we need to distinguish the abuse from the things abused.

Now, let us consider a system more beautiful than the tinted rainbow, or the flowers of the garden of paradise; more sweet than the perfection of all earthly harmonies; more curative than all medicines; more majestic than the roar and might of the ocean's waves; more valuable, safe and just than all earthly governments; more to be desired than gold, or the cattle upon a thousand hills—one perfect in all its parts, for all men, for time and for eternity! Can we pause to examine carefully this system?

This system claims for itself, and recommends to all men —"Whatsoever things are *true*, whatsoever things are *honest*, whatsoever things are *just*, whatsoever things are *pure*, whatsoever things are *lovely*, whatsoever things are of *good report*." It leaves out not one virtue, nor one grace. It furnishes every possible caution, and warning, and promise. No man has ever discovered one desirable thing that it does not provide and promise to the faithful. Its Founder never made a mistake, and never turned away empty any one, or refused a kindness to the needy. And his system, like himself, perfect in all its parts, makes its adherents "complete in him," and "thoroughly furnishes them to all good works." And while there is not a virtue it does not provide, commend and encourage, there is not a vice nor evil it does not condemn, denounce and discourage. Its officials and adherents may go far wrong, as the officials in our American government, and our citizens have often done, but the system here commended condemns all the wrongs of its friends as well as its enemies. It condemns error and wrong *wherever found!* It smiles on truth and virtue in every land and in every age.

Men have made the very shallow mistake of blaming this system with what King David did, and with what Solomon, Samuel, Saul, Jephthah, and others did. These men alone are to be blamed, and this system blames them as much as its mad opposers can blame them. The churches and preachers, and

the elders and deacons often do very wrong, as do the members; but not by leave of this system—and not without its condemnation. What a wrong and injustice men commit, therefore, when they blame the system and its Author for the errors and failures of men who only *profess and pretend* to follow these perfect and just rules! The wrong is in *not following* them. *Justice* requires that complaint shall be made against the *wrong doers!*—not against the right system, any more than against the right doers.

Not only does this system commend and encourage all truth, virtue and justice, and denounce all error, vice and wrong, but it presents *motives* of the very highest and most controlling nature, to encourage the good and discourage the bad. It punishes sin now, and threatens unutterably fearful and eternal punishment in the world to come! Could it possibly do more to restrain vice and error? It rewards every good and virtuous act here, and promises an eternal and most glorious reward hereafter! May not its author triumphantly ask: "What more could have been done to my vineyard, that I have not done in it? Wherefore when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes?" Why blame the vineyard or its Maker for the failures and errors of the keepers? He himself complained of them, and will punish them according to their wrongs and crimes. Does justice require more? Can it be satisfied with less?

Skeptics "and ungodly men denounce selfish and wicked preachers, and hypocritical church members; but they are not as severe and ready in their denunciations as this system and its Author. They cannot afford to be, because in denouncing wrongs in others they condemn themselves. These men would not tolerate or endure the putting of their neighbors' sins on themselves. Let them not, then, put the sins of preachers, or others, who claim to be the servants of God, upon the divine system or its Author. And when we have this point clearly in mind, and are constrained to admit the cleanness and perfection of Christianity; that it denounces all error and wrong,

enjoins and encourages all truth, justice and virtue, and presents the highest possible motives, inducements and rewards to put forward the good and prevent the bad, may we not most triumphantly claim that infinite wisdom, power and goodness *could do no more!!!!*

And can such a system need external or any other evidence, endorsement or commendation? More readily and rationally might we complain of the air we breathe, the water we drink and the light we enjoy! More plausibly might we require proof that they are blessed realities.

With this understanding, let us examine and exemplify Christianity, as it was exemplified in the lives of the first Christians, and as it is portrayed in the holy Scriptures, believing it will prove *its own moral demonstration*. Men may reject and denounce Bible officials, and perversions of divine teaching, such as Calvinism, Universalism, and a score of other isms, and be justified in so doing. But can they reject and denounce Christianity itself, in its own spotless garments of glory and beauty? If so, then there is no system—can be none, even in the most extravagant and wild fancy, that we will receive and approve—unless, indeed, we love the bad because it is bad, and hate the good because it is good. This, it is presumed, men claiming to be moral and rational creatures will not readily do or admit.

This is a very broad and bold-putting of the case; but if the reader will candidly examine the following pages, it is believed that he will not again complain of the confidence here expressed, or of the divine system.

## CHAPTER II

### IMPORTANCE AND COMPLETENESS OF REVELATION

We know nothing of God, Spirit, Creation—Of God's will—Our duty, or of a future existence—but by Revelation—and this Revelation so absolutely necessary, claims to be perfect for the unconverted and for the converted—for all classes; and, by the most rigid trial, proves its claim, and the importance of understanding Revelation.

"No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him" (Matt. xi:27).

"And no man knoweth who the Son is, save the Father; and who the Father is, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him" (Luke x:22).

This seems to mean that no one knows either the Father or the Son but by revelation. Those who think *nature* teaches God (see Dr. Paley, etc.,) and that we are not dependent on revelation for the idea of a God, try to construe this language differently, and quote Ps. xix:l. etc. But David only said, "The heavens declare the *glory* of God"—not God himself. And no candid and just criticism can be made on the quotations here made. They plainly mean that we *are* dependent on the Bible for all we know, or can know about God. This is one way of showing the *importance* of revelation. We can verify this declaration thus:

"And many other signs truly did Jesus, in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book" (John xx:30).

Now, let some of those who do not feel their dependence on revelation tell us about at least *some* of these other signs. What were they? Where were they given? And what were the immediate effects of their performance? No one could answer either one of these questions, or tell anything about

them, if heaven depended on it! We would not know the miracles he did perform if they had not been *written*; and beyond what is written we can know nothing of them.

"To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the hidden manna, and will give him a white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth it" (Rev. ii:17).

Tell us, then, what is that hidden manna? And what is that new name? Neither is revealed; and no man can answer. But for revelation we would not know there is, or is to be manna or a new name in the future state, and beyond revelation we can know nothing of either.

In Isa. lxii:2, about 700 B.C., we have a promise of a new name for the people of Christ, *when the Gentiles* should come in. But for some 745 years, i.e., till the disciples were called Christians at Antioch, Acts xi:26, no man knew what that new name was. Even Isaiah did not know. All people were as to that just as all now are concerning the hidden manna and the new name in the white stone. We shall know in due time. "Secret things belong to the Lord, our God; but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law" (Deut. xxix:29).

Accordingly, no one can tell, with any certainty, the names of the thieves who were crucified with the Savior, or which one repented. No one can tell the material of which the Savior's garment was made, or how the garment of John the Baptist was made. We know, that the former was woven from the top throughout, and was seamless; and that the latter was of camel's hair; because we so read. But beyond revelation we know nothing. No spiritist or others who claim revelations can tell with assurance, anything that is not in the holy Book of God.

Men have ever been disposed to speculate about *unrevealed* things. What an abnormal curiosity to know things they *cannot* know, and that could do them no possible good if they did know them! Hence we are forbidden to strive about

such things. As the boy cannot shoot and bring down the moon with his bow and arrow, and as it could do him no good if he had it here; so it is folly and vanity for us to "seek to be wise above what is written." Had we mastered a moiety of what *is* revealed, we should doubtless be less inclined to seek after unrevealed things.

A little boy asked for a new book.

The father said, "Why, what have you done with the book I gave you? Have you lost it, or torn it up?"

"No, pa."

"Well, why do you want a new one?"

"Well, pa, I have read all the sense out of that one."

He got the new book. And when we have read all the sense out of the Bible, we may venture to ask for another book. Not before.

Where revelation seems imperfect and dark to a candid inquirer, it is pretty safe to conclude that the importance of the matters referred to is not very great. Matters of no importance to us religiously are left out entirely. Matters of small importance are shadowy, or less clear. Matters of the first importance are made clear as the sun. Everything is made plain in proportion to its importance. But this is realized only by honest and earnest seekers for the will of God. And we should remember that *we* are not always proper judges of what is good for us, or of importance to our best interest. When the little girl said, "Father knows best," she showed her faith in him, and her lack of confidence in herself. This is a great lesson for us all.

If it could be necessary to offer further evidence for the importance of Revelation, we might refer to the deaf and dumb. No class of people are more thoughtful or ready in their discoveries. And yet not one of them has given evidence of having any idea of God, Spirit, or a future life till they learned it from Revelation. Cases are on record where the brightest of them have shown ruinous sadness at the sight and prospect of death, and how they rejoiced when, from the



blessed Bible, they learned about God, the resurrection and the future life.

And at least one experiment has been made of raising a bright boy to manhood where he never heard human speech, or anything about God or Spirit. He was equally and entirely destitute of words and all ideas concerning God and the great matters of Revelation.

#### THE COMPLETENESS OF REVELATION

Were we left to *reason* on this subject, and should we consider the character of God and the nature of the case, we would conclude that, a revelation from such a being to such creatures as we are, would be both true and complete, having everything to make it reliable, adaptedness, and all fullness, so as to accomplish all the good for man that could be accomplished by revelation. We have two sources of proof that it is complete, viz:

1. *It claims this perfection for itself.* King David, Ps. xix:7, when looking forward to the gospel of Christ, says: "The law of the Lord is *perfect*, converting the soul." This must refer to the unconverted—the wicked, who need conversion. It is perfect for them; perfect to convert them. So Paul says (Rom. i:16). The gospel is the "power of God *unto* salvation to every one that believeth." Not a power, but *the* power,—not of men, but of God; not to call attention to salvation simply, not part of the way, but *unto all the way to salvation*;—"the power of God *unto* salvation." This is just equal to David's declaration—"perfect, converting the soul."—So, 1 Thes. ii:13—"Ye received the word of God, ••• which effectually worketh also in you that believe." An *effectual* work is a *complete* work, a finished or perfect work.—If one says it works only in the *believer*, let him read Rom. x:17. "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Also, John xx:31—"these are written that you might believe." There is no evidence that any one ever believed without this evidence, or was converted without this

power. Not only is this power complete for converting sinners, but it is, so far as we are able to see, the *only* power for this purpose, seeing that, without it, men have not been converted in all the ages since the gospel began.

*Besides the unconverted, we have but one other class, and Revelation is complete for them.*

Paul, 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17, says: "All Scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." No one can be more than "thoroughly furnished," and "the man of God" does not desire to be furnished to *any* but "good works." "*All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable.*"

There is not one redundant word. Revelation has nothing to spare. It has just enough at every point, and on every subject, and not one word too much. On this basis the severest anathema is pronounced against those who would add to or take from it. Read this, Rev. xxii:18, 19, thus:

"If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things written in this book."

God has a book, or something answering to a book—"the book of life,"—in which the names of the righteous are written. See Ex. xxxii:33; Ps. lxxix:28; Rev. iii: 5; xiii:8; xx:12, 13. And so sacred is this revelation that one whose name is written in God's "book of life," shall have that name *blotted out*, if he dares impiously, to take from it! One who would presume to add to it—as though it were not complete, shall have the plagues written therein added to him. Is not this a fearful warning to those who claim new revelations, and to those who make human creeds, governments, laws or ordinances for the church?

II. *We may examine this revelation, and discover if it has any evil thing, or if it lacks any good thing.*

Whatever evils or failures there may have been in its officials and professed friends, the revelation or law of God, contains no evil, unjust, immoral or unwise thing. The claim is as safe on the other hand, that it lacks no good thing. Here the system stands in its own fullness, beauty and strength, absolutely defying all opposition!

If, then, this divine law *claims* perfection for itself, and when we come to examine it candidly we find the claim *true*, we can see no need, or room, or apology, for human legislation in the divine service, or for new revelations. We see, too, why they ceased. When the Infinite Jehovah completed a revelation, so that it can do all that can be accomplished by revelation, he gives no more. More would be a redundancy, supererogation, which infinite wisdom never does or requires us to do. Let us, therefore, "be content with such things as we have," because (1) we *need* no more; (2) we *can get* no more; (3) and it is *dangerous* to tamper with God's sacred Revelation.

#### IMPORTANCE, OF UNDERSTANDING REVELATION

Though God's Bible contains "everything necessary to life and godliness," and is perfect in all its parts as a revelation, it is no revelation at all to those who do not *understand* it. A mystery is something not revealed, and though the mystery is taught in the Bible, it is no revelation to those who have it not. And to have it and not *understand it* are much the same. It can be a revelation only *so far as* it is understood.

The *importance of understanding* revelation is, therefore, just equal to the importance of revelation itself.

It would, perhaps, be difficult, to determine why those who *love* the Bible understand so little of it. Still the fact remains. God's perfect revelation is poorly understood, even in Bible countries. Even the divine conditions of remission are not generally understood. Church government is not

generally understood. God's plan for doing missionary work is not understood. Some even contend that he has provided no organization or government for the church, and no way to do missionary work. Hence all the party strife about matters which it would seem revelation *should* settle—and, doubtless *would* settle, if it were *understood*.

We cannot say that man is incapable of understanding a plain revelation, since he can understand his fellow man, nor can we say either that God could, and would not, or would and could not give a plain revelation of his will to man. If he is wise enough, good enough, and able to do this, then he *has* done it. If man can understand his fellow man, he can understand God. And still the fact remains that even those who really *study* the Bible are far from understanding a large part of it, and are honestly doubtful, very generally, whether they rightly comprehend its most vital parts. Some persons, with insufficient faith and great lack of candor, hesitate to admit these things, (though they cannot really deny them) lest the admission aid infidelity. It is always safe to admit that which is manifestly true, whether we can account for it or not.

The following investigation will presume to explain *why* the Bible is not more fully and correctly understood. It has not been read and studied *sufficiently*. It has been read *without rules*, without suitable *heart* preparation, without proper thought, and with minds already occupied by other and different matters, which the holders were not ready to surrender. The correctness of these allegations will appear as the investigation proceeds.

## CHAPTER III

### HOW TO STUDY THE BIBLE

The Bible is subject to rules, like other books—reasons for failures in studying it—Rules; love of truth, pure motives, and rightly dividing it, with exemplifications, dispensations, persons and things; moral, positive and ceremonial laws—other divisions and exemplifications.

This precious Book is as subject to *rules and principles*, general and specific, as any other book. And these rules and principles *must be observed* while studying it, if we would understand and appreciate it.

Persons who take up the book, open it at random, read a chapter, perhaps hastily, and with little thought; and only after about a week or more do about the same thing, making a dozen or more hasty and careless readings in a year, will never understand, or rightly value the Bible. This course would never acquaint them with any science, or with any history. Even the recent and thrilling history of the United States could never be understood that way—nor with Fourth of July speeches added—and especially by an alien or an enemy. The king of Israel was to read the Law of Moses "all the days of his life," and to "meditate in the law of the Lord, day and night."

The following rules are given, with brief exemplification here; other developments and applications may be found further on.

#### RULES FOR BIBLE STUDY

RULE ONE—*Cherish the love of Truth.*

Paul, 2 These. ii:10, says the enemy came—"And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved."

The last clause, "that they might be saved," implies the importance of "*The love of truth*," in order to be saved. It negatives the idea that an untruthful way of worshiping God will be a *saving* way. It accords with John iv:23—that "The true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth";—that is, in the true *spirit* of worship, and *according to truth*. And it agrees with Paul (2 Tim. ii:5): "And if a man also strive for mastery, yet is he not crowned except he strive lawfully,"—i.e., according to law, or as truth directs. It agrees also with the words of Jesus (John viii:31, 32): "Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word, *then* are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Error has bound us in chains of sin and darkness. God has provided truth to break these chains and make us free; and, so far as we know, he has provided no other means to these ends. Hence, we must receive the truth, the love of truth, and *abide* in the truth, that it may make us free. Every man is in *bondage* in proportion as he is in *error*. And every man is *free* in proportion as he is in the *truth*. All error would give us the days of hell on earth! All truth would give the days of heaven. How we should love the truth!— even as we love the grand results to be accomplished by the truth!—*Pure* truth, unmixed truth!

RULE TWO—*We must act from proper motives when we search for truth.*

Jesus said to the selfish Jews (John vi:26): "Ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled." They were following him from wrong motives. These he sought to correct as a preparation for their learning the saving truth. They were like those of whom Jesus said (John v:42): "I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you."

If a man destitute of the love of God and the love of truth, searches the Scriptures to pick flaws, find imaginary contra-

dictions, etc., he will not probably learn the truth. Jesus will appear to him "as a root out of dry ground, having no form or comeliness, and when they shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him." Whereas, had their hearts been filled with the love of truth, they would have found Jesus "the fairest among ten thousand, and altogether lovely."

The love of truth in the heart makes it the "good ground" — "the honest and good heart,"—of the parable of the sower (Luke viii:15; Matt. xiii:23; Mark iv:20). The same seed sown on the wayside, the stony and thorny ground, brought no fruit to perfection, though it had the same sunshine, showers and breezes. The cause of the failure was entirely in the *condition of the ground*—which means, the heart.

We should, therefore, "examine ourselves," when we approach the Bible, whether we really love the truth, and are prompted by pure motives, as we examine ourselves preparatory to worship and the Lord's supper.

RULE THREE—"*Rightly divide the word of Truth*" (2 Tim. ii:15).

This rule, like the others, is of absolute importance. To go alternately and indiscriminately to the Old and New Testaments for precepts, laws, ordinances, etc., as many do, is to confuse, discourage, and perhaps deceive ourselves.

*The first* division to be observed is that between the Old and New Covenants.

1. The law of Moses was given at Mt. Sinai, about 2,500 years after creation, and 1,500 years before the birth of Christ.

2. It was given to the Jews only—not a Gentile was present, and Moses tells them the covenant was not made with their fathers, the patriarchs (Deut. v:3; Ex. xx).

3. "It was added to (the patriarchal laws) because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made" (Gal. iii:19).

Thus, it was given at a *special time*, to a *special people*, for a *special reason*, and for a *limited time*;—not at the first; not to all the people; not to last beyond the coming of the promised seed, which seed is Christ (Gal. iii:16). All this is true of the ten commands and the whole law of Moses. God gave but one law by Moses, and this included the decalogue. The president is sworn into his office *till* March 4th, four years hence. People are married "*till* death"—not longer. *Till* is a little word, but it "boasts of great power." This law was given *till* Christ should come—no longer. Hence,

4. We read that the law (of Moses) was our schoolmaster *to bring us to* Christ, . . . "but after that faith (i.e. the gospel) is come, we are no longer under the schoolmaster" (Gal. iii:24, 25)

5. That Christ, "having *abolished* in his flesh the enmity, *even* the law of commandments *contained* in ordinances, . . . came and preached peace to you who were afar off (the Gentiles), and to them that were nigh," (the Jews, etc.) (Eph. ii:15-18).

6. In 2 Cor. iii:3-15, it is said that the law was "written in tables of stone,"—"written and engraven in stones"; that it "*was to be* done away"; that it "*is* done away"; and that it "*is* abolished." And we know that this refers to the ten commandments and the two tables of stone, because no other law was ever "written and engraven in stones." The writing of the law in the *plaister* on the *undressed* stones (Deut. xxvii:2, 3; Josh. viii:32) was not "written and engraven *in* stones. The writing was in the plaister, not in the stones. No law of God, save the decalogue, was ever "written and engraven *in* stones."

7. Hence, while on the cross, Jesus said: "It is finished" (John xx:30). And Paul (Col. ii:14), says: "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross."



This certainly abolished, and takes out of the way, the whole law of Moses, including the decalogue. But it does not so certainly abolish the law that *preceded* Moses, the patriarchal law. Nor does it annul holy and just principles. *Principles* can never change or be abolished. Hence, from the death of Christ to the memorable Pentecost, fifty days, the world was not "without law to God." They were just as all were before the giving of the law of Moses, and as all except the Jews were afterwards till the gospel came.

The claim urged by Sabbatarians and Adventists, that it was only the glory of the law that was abolished, is too shallow to require notice. It was the *law* that was abolished, as these references clearly show. They pretend that there were *two* laws—one, the law of God, i.e. the ten commands; the other, the law of Moses; and that it was the law of Moses and not the law of God that was abolished. But God was just as clearly the author of the latter as the former. Is it not continually said, "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying," etc.? The only difference is, God first spoke the decalogue *directly* to the Jews, and afterwards, at their request, he spoke to them only through Moses and the other prophets (Ex. xx:19-21; Deut. v:27, 28; xviii:16; Gal. iii:19, 20; Heb. xii:19). "The law," sometimes called the law of Moses, and sometimes the law of God, was one law, and included the decalogue and all the precepts and ordinances following it.

The world had out-grown the law of Moses, till Peter could say (Acts xv:10) that "neither our fathers nor we were able to bear" its burdens; and Paul (Gal. v:1) refers to Christians being *made free* from this yoke of bondage.

Everywhere the Sinaiatic covenant is spoken of as one, not two covenants. And it is very clearly stated, not that the Patriarchal was abolished, but that this Mosaic law was added to it. Gal. iii:19: "Wherefore then serveth the law? \* was added because of transgressions, till the seed should

come to whom the promise was made"; "which seed is Christ" (Gal. in: 16).

This Sinaiatic covenant is called "the Old Testament" (2 Cor. iii: 14). In Hebrews viii: 7-13, we read, "In that he said a *new* covenant" (or Testament—for it is from the word rendered testament), "he hath made the first *old*. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away." Reference is made here to Jeremiah xxxi: 31-34. This prophecy, given B.C. 606, compares the Sinaiatic, which he called the *old* covenant, with the gospel, which he called the *new* covenant—always a unit. This prophecy of Jeremiah is, by Paul, quoted and applied to the new or gospel covenant. Hence we cannot be mistaken as to this. Observe then:

- a. The *new* covenant is the *gospel* covenant.
- b. The *old* covenant is the *Sinaiatic*, not the Abrahamic or patriarchal covenant.
- c. It is this old, or Sinaiatic covenant that is abolished; not the patriarchal or Abrahamic.
- d. The Sinaiatic covenant was an addition to an old law, which old law had been in force upon all nations and peoples for 2,500 years.
- e. The Sinaiatic covenant was given to only a part of the people, *one* nation, the Jews, and only for a limited time, till Christ should come. All the other nations were under the law of the fathers, which had been in use since creation, more or less. The Jews, also, were still under it, and were also under the added Sinaiatic law, till it was abolished.
- f. But the gospel covenant was not added to anything. It was to be a

#### NEW COVENANT

It was to be not only *new*, but *unlike* the old one. Hence, when the Jews sought to bind the traditions of the fathers on the Savior, he gave them to understand, not only that he was "Lord of the Sabbath," but that "no man putteth a piece of new cloth unto an old garment, for that which is put in to

fill it up taketh from the garment, and the rent is made worse.

Neither do men put new wine into old bottles: else the bottles break, and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish. But they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved" (Matt. ix:16, 17). We have, then, a *new* covenant—not an old one patched up. We have a *new* bottle, or wine skin, and *new* wine in it. Nothing belongs to it simply because it is in any of the old laws. Let us note here:

1. This new covenant claims for itself *perfection*, as we have seen.
2. Hence, it must contain all the permanently good things that belonged to the Sinaiatic and patriarchal dispensations, and whatever else the Redeemer desired in it.
3. We must find, therefore, in the gospel, every good principle, and every right thing whether formerly enjoined or not.
4. And when we *examine* the gospel, we find every just principle, and every permanently good law the world ever had incorporated into and made a part of it. Just as, in making a new constitution for a state or government, all the good and appropriate parts of the old are incorporated into the new, and made part of it, and nothing in the old is binding except what is so incorporated and made a part of the new.
5. We find, accordingly, that nine of the ten commands in the Sinaiatic covenant are in the new covenant, the fourth, i.e., the Sabbath law, only is left out.

No man can imagine why the sabbath was not put in the new covenant, unless it was, the King did not want it in. It will not do to say it was so well known and established that it was not necessary to put it in, or name it formally; since the nine that are put into the new covenant were even better known than the law of the sabbath. And has it not been fully shown that nothing belongs to this new covenant that is not in it? The case stands this way:

The new covenant is a perfect law; no one is to add to or take from it; and hence, whatever is not in it belongs not to it, and has no authority under it.

The fourth command in the decalogue (the sabbath) is not in the new covenant.

Therefore, the fourth command of the decalogue is no part of the law of Christ, and is not binding on any people.

#### MORAL, POSITIVE AND CEREMONIAL LAWS

*Moral* laws make nothing right. They are given to *enforce* duties already existing, as speaking the truth, and all acts of mercy, justice, etc.

*Positive* laws are such as make things right that were not right before; as the sacrifices under the law, rearing the brazen serpent, and whatever we cannot see a reason for without a command; as the law for Christian baptism, etc. Some things may be partly moral and partly positive; that is, we can see *some* reason for parts of them, and none for other parts, as in the Lord's supper. We can see propriety in *memorial* institutions, but not in the particular *manner*, or items in each.

*Ceremonial* laws are such as are not explained, and may be observed without faith, or piety, or religious profit; they are outward and formal, not of the heart or spirit. They are mere bodily acts.

The gospel has positive ordinances; as the Lord's supper and baptism. And it has every moral principle intensified that belonged to the old covenant, and many that are not in the old at all. But the gospel has *no* laws or ordinances that are merely or especially ceremonial. The sabbath of the old covenant was largely, if not entirely, ceremonial. There never was any ground for the claim that it was especially moral. Those who object to our calling it the Jewish sabbath, or the sabbath of the Jews, have not the least foundation for their objection, seeing it was never enjoined on any

people till at Mount Sinai, and then only on the Jews, and on them for only a limited time.

And that the true condition may be more clearly and certainly understood, let it be remembered that, in what has been termed the *interregnum*; i.e. the time between the abrogation of the old covenant, and the beginning of the gospel reign, fifty days, the Jews were under the patriarchal laws and principles, as they and all the world were *before* the giving of the law; and all the world, outside of the Jews were from the patriarch to the beginning of the gospel reign. And, as the gospel could not be preached to all the world in a day, all the world, Jews and Gentiles, continued under the same patriarchal laws and principles till the gospel did reach them.

#### SOME CONCLUSIONS

I. If we desired to make Jews, we would preach Moses and the Levitical law. The patriarchal law never made a modern Jew. And neither the patriarchal nor Jewish law— nor both of them together—ever made, or ever can make a *Christian*

II. If we would make *Christians*, we must preach Christ and the law of Christ.

#### OTHER DIVISIONS

Besides noting the division between the Old and New Testament, there were three divisions or departments in the Old Testament, viz: 1. The law. 2. The Psalms. 3. The prophets And there are in the gospel, three departments, viz: 1. The gospels, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. 2. Acts of Apostles, the only really historic book in the New Economy. 3. The epistles (22) addressed to Christians.

If we would give or strengthen faith, we must go to the prophets and the first division of the New Testament. "These are written that ye might believe."

If we would learn what to do to become Christians, we must go to Acts. There we learn what and how the apostles preached, and what the people did to become Christians.

If we would learn how to *live* Christians we must go to the letters addressed to them.

Then there were the old and young, the male and female, the husband and wife, the parents and children, etc., and we need to rightly divide the word of truth to each. How very rich and important is this rule.

If we find a man who has not heard and believed the gospel, desiring eternal life, as all men do, we will give him the gospel and the testimonies, and tell him to believe on Christ, as Paul told the jailer (Acts xvi:31).

If we find those who have heard, believed and been cut to the heart, we will, rightly dividing the word of truth, tell them to repent and be baptized, as Peter did (Acts ii:38).

If we find one who has heard, believed, repented, and confessed Christ, we will tell him to "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins," as Ananias told Saul (Acts xxii:16). We will not go back and tell him to do what he has already done.

If we find one who has heard, believed, repented, confessed Christ and been baptized, and who still realizes that he is not in heaven, we will tell him to "hold fast his begun confidence to the end"; to "give all diligence," and "work out his own salvation with fear and trembling."

If we find an old disciple, trembling on the borders of death, we will tell him "a little longer!" "Be thou faithful unto death." "Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed."

Yet, preachers quote and take to themselves: "Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you, in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God" (2 Cor. v:20), which Paul rightly applied to himself and his fellow apostles, who were the only ambassadors the Savior had. He has none now.

So, also, when they desire to prove a special and mysterious call to preach, they quote: "And no man taketh this honor to himself but he that is called of God, as was Aaron" (Heb. v:4)

This was true of Jesus and the high priest—not at all of preachers now. I have asked many, and never yet found one of these preachers who was able to tell how Aaron was called! They do not know that they are not Aarons! They do not know what Aaron's call was, and it might not be uncharitable to conclude that they are about as far from knowing themselves. At least, they very much need to learn "rightly to divide the word of truth."

## CHAPTER IV

### THE SPEAKER AND THE PERSON ADDRESSED

Cause of the address, what was to be accomplished, the circumstances connected with it; exemplifications—The three parables (Luke xv; John iii), conversation with Nicodemus—Applying the rules and explaining the passages—Collect all the testimony—The new birth by this rule—Some of the testimony—Conclusion.

RULE FOUR—*Observe who is the author of the passage under consideration.*

Failing to observe this rule, one preacher took his text in the language of the devil, in order to preach the gospel of Christ! That might, in John Smith's style, be called a very *devilish* gospel.

We shall be much better prepared to understand when we see whether it was Job, Abraham, Moses, David, Jesus, Paul, or Nicodemus. Before further application or elucidation of this rule, let us note four others.

RULE FIVE—*See who is addressed.*

Observing this would have saved the zealous saloon man from applying to his former customer what Paul said to *Timothy*. It would also save preachers from applying to themselves what was applied to the Savior and the ancient high priests only. "Thou art the man," was well said to David once, but how absurd to apply it to every one now!

RULE SIX—*Find, if possible, what was intended to be accomplished by the passage under consideration.*

Most passages that require careful consideration have, as may be seen, a special object to accomplish. It may be to prevent an error, or to correct one already fallen into. It may be to remove a special difficulty, or to prompt to particular duties All of which will soon appear more fully.



RULE SEVEN--*Find, if you can, what gave rise to the lesson under consideration.*

This can generally be done by observing the context and circumstances connected with it, and will go far to elucidate the end aimed at, and everything pertaining to it.

RULE EIGHT—*Consider, carefully, all the surrounding circumstances*

This rule includes the time, the place, the persons engaged and their special conditions and positions, and goes far to intensify and amplify the other rules, and the whole lesson; all of which will be exemplified by the following cases:

1. Luke 15 has three parables:—the lost sheep, the lost piece of money, and the prodigal son. All these parables, and especially the last, have been sadly, and often ruinously perverted. These perversions and mis-applications need not be noted here. To understand this chapter, it is of the highest importance that we observe the rules here given,—and especially, *what gave rise to it, and what was intended to be accomplished by it.*—See then verses 1, 2. All the Pharisees and publicans surround the Savior, and unite in what *they* regarded as a very grave charge against him, viz: "This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them." This is the *cause* of the three parables. Jesus is the speaker. The Pharisees and scribes are the persons addressed. The end to be accomplished is the answer and exposure of their complaint. The character and condition of the complainers should be observed. They are abundantly apparent.—*They would not associate with sinners,*—especially they would not *eat* with them; and they would judge, or measure Jesus by themselves. Hence, he does not tell them, as he did some others, that he had come "to seek and to save the lost." They were not prepared to appreciate this. It would have had no weight with them. He considered their peculiar condition, and defended himself by exposing *their inconsistency*. They knew

what it was to be *shepherds*, and that when a sheep went astray, they would go in search of it "*till they found it.*" They would not cease; and when they found it, they rejoiced. Some of his complainers were, no doubt, women—at least, they all knew that when a woman lost a piece of money, she dropped everything, searched for it, and rejoiced when she found it. This struck them squarely in the face. Sortie of them were fathers, and all of them knew of prodigal sons; how gladly the prodigal was received when he returned, and how they all scorned one, like the elder brother, who was not willing to receive him, and join in the rejoicing. How overwhelmingly they must have felt this! Thus, Jesus would make them see and feel, that in complaining of him they were condemning themselves—the fathers, the shepherds, the women—and all who had lived before them!

All the parables of the Great Teacher are founded on matters of fact, and serve, in the same way, to illustrate important truths and principles, as will appear, when we reach the consideration of parables.

2. As a further exemplification of these rules, see John iii—the conversation between our Savior and Nicodemus. Perhaps no passage has presented more difficulties, or offered grounds for more controversies. Now, by observing these rules, it will appear that, with only a few exceptions, no passage is more plain and clear. — Observe: Jesus is the teacher, and Nicodemus is the inquirer and learner. Think of the quiet night scene, and carefully consider, 1, the character and condition of Nicodemus; 2, what gave rise to this interview; and 3, what was the Savior's object.

There were two kinds of natural men. One was the man who would receive nothing he could not account for on natural principles. The other was the man who was under the dominion of his carnal nature. Nicodemus was a natural man in both senses. This appears in the facts narrated. He shows himself to be a *psukikos*, an animal man (in contrast with a *pneumatikos*, a spiritual man, 1 Cor. ii:15. And it

appears from his own lips that he would believe nothing he could not reconcile with natural law, and account for on natural principles. Hence (v. 4) he said, "how can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter his mother's womb a second time and be born?" On common principles he could not believe or understand this, and his carnal and unsubdued nature spurned the idea. He had no just conception of a spiritual birth, of a spiritual kingdom, or of the true and living God.

To understand why John narrated this conversation, and the other writers did not, remember that John was writing mainly, or largely, for a people who had not a correct conception of the character of the true God. They did not understand or believe that *any* God knew the secret intents and purposes of the heart—that "there is not a word in my tongue, but lo! Thou knowest it altogether"; and John desired to impress his readers with this trait in the divine character. Hence, looking to the closing part of the preceding chapter—which should never have been separated from this third chapter as it is, we read:

"Now when he was in Jerusalem at the passover, in the feast *day*, many believed in his name, when they saw the miracles which he did. But Jesus did not commit himself to them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man."

*"He knew all men"; "knew what was in man."* Here is the affirmation, which John would impress. Nicodemus was not a believer in such a God; or, at least, he did not understand or believe this, and his was a typical case. If it were reached, others like it would be reached. Hence, we have the narrative. Leaving out the chapter mark, for the present, see Nicodemus in a night interview with the Savior; and hear him say—"We know you are a teacher sent from God; for no man can do the miracles that thou doest, except God be with him." This reads well, and would indicate *to us* that he was ready to be taught. But Jesus knew his heart;

knew that he was a *natural* man, and not ready to receive anything he could not account for on natural principles; and to bring him out before his own eyes, Jesus said: "Except a man be born again, or from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God." This brought him out; at once he replied— "How can these things be? How can a man be born when he is old," etc. Then Jesus partially explained (v. 5) by telling him he must be born of water and spirit. This was equal to saying, "It is not a *natural* birth." It is "a birth of water and the spirit." Then he added: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Then he tells him he should not wonder at this, and further, to aid him to understand the lesson to be taught— that God is Spirit; that all these things are spiritual—not natural—that God does know all that is in man; and to make Nicodemus willing to yield his naturalism, and take revelation, he gives him a case *in nature* which, on natural principles, he could no more understand than he could understand the new birth, though *with* revelation it was sufficiently plain— he gives him v. 8, which I will, for the present, paraphrase thus:

"Nicodemus, the spirit breathes where he pleases, and you, Nicodemus, hear his voice, or the report of him, through the prophets; but you, on your natural principles, cannot tell whence it comes or whither it goes. So it is as to every one that is born of the Spirit, with you, Nicodemus, on your natural principles."

That is, you must abandon your naturalism, and learn the true character of God and his worship. This had the desired effect, and Nicodemus was afterwards numbered with the disciples (John vii:50; xix:39). Everything, to Nicodemus, depended on lifting him off of that hitch, and putting him on the correct road. We have not many Nicodemuses among us now. The common mistake is, applying to people a passage precisely suited to Nicodemus, but not suited to us, or the masses about us. True, we must all be born

again; and there are other particulars of likeness; but to apply this scripture to those who are not natural men, and not troubled with naturalism, is to *mis-apply* it, and create confusion. No man understands this chapter without observing the character and condition of the party to whom it was applied at first, what gave rise to it, and what was intended to be accomplished by it. To apply it indiscriminately is ruinous.

Though we are not Nicodemuses, we would like to understand this passage, at least so far as to get rid of the difficulties a misconstruction of it has encumbered us with. Hence, note:

1. The Greek *pneuma* here rendered *wind*, in the common version, is found 384 times, and is nowhere else rendered *wind*. It means *spirit*; and instead of there being something in this context to *require* a change, the context *forbids* rendering it *wind*, even if it were its ordinary meaning, by the fact that *will power*, is attributed to it. "Breathes where it, or rather he, *wills*," ascribes to the thing here meant will-power, a quality that does not belong to wind.

2. "So is every one born of the spirit"—with you, on your natural principles—not otherwise. So soon as you abandon your naturalism, and receive revelation, you can understand the new birth, where the spirit comes from, and where it goes to; where the wind comes from, and where it goes to, etc. Only by revelation can you account for the spirit's voice, or breathing; and only by revelation can you understand the new birth.

"He bringeth the *wind* out of his treasure" (Ps. cxxxv:7).

"Who hath gathered the *wind* in his fists" (Prov. xxx:4).

"Whose spirit comes from thee" (Job xxvi:14).

"If he gather *to him* his spirit," etc. (Job xxxiv:14).

"The spirit of man that goeth upward" (Ec. iii:21).

"The spirit shall return to God who gave it" (Ec. xii:7).

So we can understand the new birth by gathering up the divine teachings, as will appear under another rule.

RULE NINE—*Collect all the divine testimonies on the matter under consideration; find just what each clearly means; claim all that, and no more.*

A very little thought will enable any one to see that there is, in a perfect book like the Bible, no redundancy of evidence on any subject. -So, when we have it all before us, we have none too much, in order to reach an intelligent and safe conclusion. Nor can we possibly do better than to get the true meaning of each testimony, claim all this, and no more. The rules here given will aid materially in this. Why should we leave out anything? Why should we pervert any testimony, or seek to get more out of it than there is in it? If, when we have taken this course, the subject is still nebulous, or not as plain as we would desire, we may safely conclude that it was not intended we should fully understand it; and we must content ourselves with what we have, till the veil is rent again, or another revelation is given. We should not speculate, or draw conclusions not clearly warranted by the testimony.

But let us be sure that we do get all the testimony in our reach, and that we understand the true import of each item. Failing here, and assuming a position, or coming to a conclusion from only a part of the testimony—and that, perhaps, not well understood, is the common and fruitful source of error and evil. No one has a right to an opinion, or judgment *without* the testimony, or *beyond* the testimony, any more than *against* the testimony.

A Presbyterian D.D., in Perryville, Ky., almost fifty years ago, took for his text John iii:3. From that passage—and *without understanding it*—he evolved, or gave out his entire theory of the new birth. Now, an examination of that verse will satisfy any candid inquirer that it proves *only one thing*, viz. the *importance* of the new birth. It does prove this. "Except a man be born again he cannot see God." This is indisputable. But it says nothing at all about what the new birth is, or how it is brought about. For all information as to

these we are entirely dependent on *other testimonials*. If they do not make these clear, then they cannot be clearly understood. Let us see, in exemplification of our ninth rule. We may not exhaust the testimony, in this case, for lack of space, and consequently, may not make the subject so clear, but we will better understand the *rule* and the subject under consideration.

Job v:7. "A man is born to trouble."

Job xiv:1. "Man that is born of a woman," etc. Also xv:25; xiv:4.

Mat. xi:11. "Among them born of women," etc.

Ps. Ixxxvii:4. "This man was born there."

Isa. ix:6. "Unto us a child is born."

Isa. lxvi:8. "Shall a nation be born at once."

John i:13. "Who are born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

John iii:3. "Born again."

John iii:5. "Born of water and Spirit."

John iii:6. "Born of the flesh."

John iii:8. "So is every one that is born of the spirit."

1 John iv:7. "Every one that is born (begotten) of God overcometh the world."

1 John v:1. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born (begotten) of God."

1 John v:4. "For whosoever is born (begotten) of God overcometh the world."

1 John v:18. "Whosoever is born (begotten) of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten (born) of God keepeth himself," etc.

1 Peter i:23. "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God," etc.

1 John iii:9. "Whosoever is born (begotten) of God sinneth not."

James i:18. "Of his own will begat he us with the word or truth," etc.

1 Cor. xv:8. "Born out of due time."

1 Pet. ii:2. "As newborn babes, desire," etc.  
 Job iii:3. "Let the day perish wherein I was born."  
 Prov. xvii:17. "A brother is born for adversity."  
 Ecc. iii:2. "A time to be born."

See *begotten*, in the common version, where we have the same word here rendered born (as in the places noted by parenthesis). Ps. ii:7; Acts xiii:33; Heb. i:5; v:5; 1 Peter i:3; Job xxxvii:28; 1 Cor. iv:15; Phil, i:10.

#### SUM OF THE TESTIMONY

1. The *importance* of the new birth.
2. We are born of *women*.
3. The *place* of birth.
4. Children are born *to us*.
5. *Nations* may be born—at least figuratively.
6. We are born of the *will* of man, and of the flesh.
7. We are to be born *again*, or a second time.
8. We are born of water and the Spirit.
9. We are born, or begotten of God.
10. Those born, or begotten of God do not sin; i.e.— God does not beget, or prompt us to sin. Those who sin are begotten or prompted by another power.
11. We are born or begotten by the word of truth, the *seed* of the kingdom. And if this seed shall remain in us, and continue to control us, we cannot sin: i.e., *it* will not prompt us to sin.
12. There is *a due* time for birth.
13. When born again we are as new born babes.
14. Being born again, we are to love as brethren.

A birth is a *bringing forth*. But before this there is what is called *begetting*; the birth includes the begetting, and follows it as a consequence, in the natural order. Begetting is enlivening, making alive, quickening. That which is not alive before birth will not be afterwards. Birth does not give life. It only enables us to enjoy life. In nature—



after the flesh—substances are sometimes born dead. Why not in the spiritual world?—At least dead to spiritual devotion. Paul (Eph. ii:2), tells us of the "prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." To two great moving powers all our acts are traceable. These are this evil spirit, ever working in the children of disobedience, and the Spirit of God, which works through the gospel. Two young men, near Stanford, Kentucky, wrongly taught, and begotten, or prompted by the evil spirit, went down into the water, and mutually baptized each other. Here was a birth of water—and of spirit,—*the evil spirit!* And those born were dead to spirituality—dead in sin; *i.e.* by, or on account of sin; but nevertheless, *born* of water and of the evil spirit which prompted and caused the solemn mockery. Not long after this, in less than one year, a thousand persons, in the same community, and some of them in the same stream of water, were born of water and of God's Spirit. They heard the blessed gospel, believed and were quickened, or begotten and prompted by it—"the word of God, the seed of the kingdom." Hence it is said we are born, or begotten of or by the word (1 Cor. iv:15). Paul says: "For in Jesus Christ I have begotten (born) you through the gospel." "Born or begotten again by the word of God" (1 Peter i:23). The part in the new birth which God's Spirit does is to beget persons through, or by the gospel. See hundreds of people lining the water's edge; hear a song of earnest praise to God, a devout and fervent prayer, and some words of admonition, teaching and exhortation; and then see persons walk solemnly down into the water, to a suitable depth, hear the calling of the sacred names of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and then see the body of the newly quickened soul buried beneath the yielding water, and raised up again! And can any one say this is not a birth of water? Witness the unutterable joy—so far as mortal eye can see, or human intellect understand it; can any one say it is not of or by the Divine Spirit? Here, then,

is the birth of the water and Spirit. Even a Nicodemus can understand it.

Dr. Wall, himself a pedo-Baptist, and the author of the most elaborate and learned history of pedo-baptism ever written, says he examined all the writings of the fathers for the first four hundred years, and there is not any one of them that does not understand that John iii:5—"born of water and Spirit"—refers to baptism, which he says was immersion. And he adds: "If it be not so understood, it would be difficult to tell how one can be born of water any more than born of wood."

In collecting the testimonies on any given subject, we are not to confine ourselves to passages containing the *principal word* in the subject; as born, faith, repentance, election, the resurrection, etc. Many other testimonials bear on the subject and sometimes more forcibly.

THE EFFECT *of the new birth identifies it with baptism.*

The *effect* of the new birth is to bring persons into the Divine family, and give them equal rights and privileges with the other children; to make them "heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." Without it they *cannot enter*.

The *effect* of baptism is to bring persons into Christ. "So many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (Gal. iii:27).

Therefore the new birth—of water and Spirit—is equal to baptism, at least in its effects, or results. Things equal to each other are equal to the same.

Unless there are *two* ways of getting into Christ, and so becoming heirs of God, they must be the same for *all* practical purposes.

But there is only *one* way of getting into Christ and becoming heirs of God. Does not Jesus say, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he *cannot enter* into the kingdom of God" (John iii:5)? Man here is *generic* and includes all men. "*He cannot enter*" limits his entrance

to this way, and is equal to saying there is no other way by which he can enter the kingdom of God.

Yet we are *baptized* into Christ, the king. It would be absurd to talk of being in the king and not in the *king-dom*, which means the reign of Christ. It rather means into the very head and center of the kingdom.

And therefore Christian immersion is the consummation of the new birth. We must, however, keep always in mind the difference between being begotten, or quickened, by faith in the word of truth, and the new birth, or baptism.

The promises to those born again and to those baptized are the same; and in this way also, identify them.

Is it not said "ye shall be heirs of God"; "ye shall inherit all things"; and "I will be your God and ye shall be my son" ? And do we not read in the great commission—"he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"—"shall be saved" is equivalent to being heirs of God, etc. All God's children are saved; all are heirs.

And therefore the new birth, and baptism, as the consummation of the birth of water and Spirit are the same. And so all the ancient fathers taught, without exception.

Jesus spoke to Nicodemus of the new birth in a parable. "Without a parable spake he not unto them" (Mark iv:34). But Jesus told his disciples that "the time would come when he would speak no more to them in parables, but would show them plainly of the Father." See John xvi:25. That time came, as the history of facts proves, when the apostles first began to preach the gospel of Christ. Otherwise, when the penitents, on the memorable Pentecost, asked what they should do, Peter should, and would have answered: "You must be born again—born of water and the Spirit." But because the time for the change in the Divine manner of teaching had come, and Peter knew very well that they would . at once inquire what he meant by being born again, he just gave them the *literal* of the figure, saying, "Repent and be baptized," etc. So afterwards they never told people to be

born again—never used the figurative style in such cases, but told the inquirers plainly—without a figure.

And therefore, the new birth and Christian baptism, as the literal of the figure, are the same. |

We shall have other exemplifications of this rule in the investigation of various subjects. It would be easy to show how readily we come to wrong conclusions, when we have only part of the testimony, while the whole testimony makes the case perfectly clear, and the conclusions safe beyond question.

## CHAPTER V

### DOUBTFUL PASSAGES

Tenth Rule—Doubtful Scriptures and exemplifications of Judging;— of women speaking or being silent in the church—Scriptural rights and duties of women, according to these rules; Paul justified, the Scriptures harmonized, and good order preserved.

RULE TEN — *Doubtful passages, which are capable of more than one construction, must be so construed as to harmonize with those which are positive, and can have but one meaning.*

#### EXEMPLIFICATIONS

1. Matt. vii:1 says: "Judge not, that ye be not judged."

Luke vi:37: "Judge not, and ye shall not be judged."

Rom. ii:1: "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art, that judgest, for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things."

Rom. xiv:4: "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth," etc.

These, and some other passages, are understood by many to forbid our judging others in any way. And they are often so quoted and applied. But we are, in other passages, *required* to judge, and are told how to do it.

Luke vii:43: Jesus gave Simon a case to decide, and when the judgment was announced, he said, with evident approval: "Thou has rightly judged."

John vii:24: "Judge not according to outward appearance, but judge righteous judgment."

Isa. i:17: "Judge the fatherless."

Matt. vii:16-20: "Ye shall know them by their fruits." "Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them."

1 Cor. xiv:29: "Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge."

These clearly make it a duty to judge. Do these Scriptures contradict each other? So say the opposers of the Bible. How shall we reconcile them? Can we understand them? Let us see.

The terms "judge" and "judgment" have several meanings, as most words have, and in the Scriptures particularly, to judge is frequently to condemn. Hence the Savior said: "With what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged." "The measure *you* mete shall be measured to you again." "Judge not that you be not judged," is equal to saying condemn not —i.e., do not willingly, readily, or hastily condemn. This is the sense in which we shall not judge. And this does not in the least conflict with the command to judge righteously. That we must judge is clear. It is even imperative. "The saints shall judge the world. And if the world shall be judged by you, are you unworthy to judge the smallest matters? . . . Is it so that there is not a wise man among you? No not one who shall be able to judge between his brethren?" "Ye shall judge angels" (1 Cor. vi:2-5). We must, therefore, so construe the doubtful passages that they will harmonize with those positive ones, which can have but one meaning. Otherwise they will conflict.

2. WOMAN'S WORK IN THE CHURCH.—Paul, in 1 Cor. xiv:34, 35, says: "Let your women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak, but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for women to speak in the church "

And in 1 Tim. ii:11-14, he says: "Let the women learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression."

If we would understand these Scriptures we must observe the undisputed fact that the Greeks and the Romans, to that time, held woman in the most abject servitude, with only a few exceptions. The Jewish system had somewhat redeemed her from this bondage, and it was clearly prophesied that, in the Christian dispensation, she should be further redeemed and elevated. See Dr. A. Clarke's testimonies on these passages, and 1 Cor. xi:1-5. Some of the women thus newly enfranchised made too much of their liberties in Christ, and Paul sets them down Dr. A. Clarke says that, previously: "Women were not permitted to teach in the assemblies, or even to ask questions," etc. "It is evident from the context that the apostle refers here to asking questions, and what we call dictating, in the assemblies. It was permitted to any man to ask questions, to object, altercation, attempt to refute, etc., in the synagogue; but this liberty was not allowed to any woman." "It is evident that it was the disorderly and disobedient that the apostle had in view." "The Jews would not allow a woman to read in the synagogue, though a servant or a child had this permission." "The apostle refers to irregular conduct; such conduct as proved that they were not under obedience." "Whatever may be the meaning of praying and prophesying, in respect to man, they have precisely the same meaning in respect to woman. So that some women, at least, as well as some men, might speak to others to edification, and exhortation, and comfort." See Joel ii:28; Acts ii:16.

Instead of "silence" we may read "quiet," as in the R.V. and others; *i.e.*, not boisterous, disorderly, or dictatorial. And if we supply the ellipsis and read, "not permitted unto them to speak" in a disorderly manner, as some were evidently doing, we get the true idea of Paul. And we may paraphrase 1 Tim. ii:11: Let the women learn in quietness with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, or, in other words, to usurp authority over the man; but to be quiet, not necessarily silent. That is, she must not so teach

as to usurp authority over the man. It is a shame for her to speak in that style. (This is not a quotation. It is so paraphrasing the passage as to more fully set forth Paul's idea according to all the facts in the case.)

We know that, under the typical dispensation, woman prophesied, judged Israel, and led an army. See Judges 4th and 5th chapters, Deborah's song of triumph after the battle. Also Huldah, 2 Kings xxii:14; Miriam, Ex. xv:20; Anna, Luke ii:36; Philip's four virgin daughters "which did prophesy," Acts xxi:8, 9. See also Joel ii:28—"Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy," which is quoted by Peter on Pentecost, Acts ii:17, 18, etc. In Acts xviii:26, we read that Aquila and Priscilla "took unto them" the eloquent Apollos and "expounded unto him the way of the Lord more perfectly." Here the wife has as much credit for teaching the teacher, Apollos, as the husband has. Paul, Heb. x:24, 25, admonishes all the Hebrew Christians to "provoke one another to love and to good works"; to "exhort one another," etc. This admonition is as much and as clearly to the sisters as to the brethren. In Heb. iii:13 we have the same command—not to any class, but to the whole mass. In Eph. v:19, the saints, without distinction, are taught to speak to each other in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, and so "make melody in their hearts." In Col. iii:16, Paul says: "Teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs," etc. Here the sisters certainly were to take part—all to prophesy, all to exhort. How natural that we should think here of Paul's declaration that in Christ there is "neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female, but all are one in Christ."

These are positive and clear. The women were indiscriminately inspired, prophesied, exhorted, sang, and prayed as certainly as the men. 1 Cor. xi:17 corrects the manner of the women's praying in the assembly. They did it with their heads uncovered. They were, sometimes, not careful to have either long hair or the long veil that Ruth carried



home barley in, and that Rebecca put on when she was about to meet Isaac; and some persons complained of this as an innovation. Paul says, verse 5: "Every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoreth her head," *i.e.*, her husband. Then, verse 13, says: "Judge in yourselves: is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?" *i.e.*, without a veil. Some persons now say it is uncomely for her to pray at all, covered or uncovered; but this seems to have been settled then. No one objected to her praying in the assembly of the saints. The only objection was to her doing so uncovered. Paul, like his Master, was accustomed to correct errors in his brethren, and had it been an error for women to pray in the assembly he would have said so, for the same reason that he corrects the only error complained of—her praying uncovered. And verse 16 says: "If any man seem to be contentious we have no such custom neither the churches of God." The idea seems to be, to let them pray anyhow, even with their heads uncovered; but it is more respectful for them to wear a veil—at least long hair, and not expose themselves to the charge of trying to usurp the place of men, or of being bad women. But the right of women to pray in the assembly was not questioned. Nothing but the *manner* of doing so was questioned, and as this was not a material error, Paul would not very earnestly urge its correction. Had it been wrong for women to pray in the assembly, Paul would have settled the case by saying so; as he does concerning their manner of observing the Lord's Supper, in the after part of this chapter, and as he does as to their manner of settling difficulties in the sixth chapter. "Now, therefore, there is utterly a fault among you," etc. But Paul does not say there is "utterly a fault" in that the women prayed even uncovered; nor does he once intimate that there was any wrong in their praying in the assembly! In fact, no one had so claimed or charged to that time.

In Titus ii:3 Paul says the aged women should be "good teachers," not simply "teachers of good things," as the common version has it, but "*good* teachers," or instructors—that they may "teach the young women to be husband lovers, children lovers," etc. And this is not necessarily confined to private teaching, as some suppose. The ancient manner was much like our best Bible classes or Bible readings in the church, where all take part. And for young women, especially, they are the very best teachers. They are, indeed, now the best scientific and literary teachers often. What an outrage, then, to say they shall not be permitted to do that which Providence has so bountifully qualified them to do! What a robbery of the church to say they shall not teach! What a wrong to them, when their hearts are overflowing with a desire to do good! And what an opportunity it gives to the enemy to say they shall not use the capacity God has given them! How inconsistent it would be!

Let us sum up the leading things that women have certainly done with the Divine approval:

1. Under the typical dispensation, if not as a rule, still they judged Israel, led an army, and prophesied. And it may be stated here that prophesying always involves the idea of teaching. Miraculous prophesying teaches as to the future. This is its peculiarity. But all prophesying was teaching—of the past, the present, or the future.

2. The old prophet said God would cause his "handmaids," as well as his "menservants," to prophesy under the Christian dispensation.

3. We see this prophecy fulfilled in the case of the four virgin daughters of Philip. And there is no clear evidence that they were miraculously qualified. To say they were is a bare assumption. There is nothing said as to this. But they did prophesy—which means teaching. Nor is there a word said of their teaching privately or at home.

4. It is not possible for us to mistake as to their singing, and so teaching—and that publicly,—or as to their exhorting,

and praying. There is just as much evidence that the women did these things as there is that the men did them—in the assembly and in private. For all were commanded to do them, not any special class.

5. Ten thousand facts demonstrate that they are often as capable of doing these things as are the men. Hence the robbery of them and the church to say they shall not, and the advantage given to the enemy to complain of the inconsistency of the Scriptures. If this were the teaching of the New Testament no man could defend it against the charge of infidels that it is inconsistent and unjust to woman!

The difficulty is in the wrong construction of the Scriptures first quoted from Paul to the Corinthians and to Timothy at Ephesus. One thing is certain, viz., if Paul meant to deny the women these rights, he contradicted himself and other teachers, both in the Old and New Testaments. For these teachings will bear no other construction. Here, then, we need our rule. Either these two Scriptures contradict all the rest, or we must construe them so as to harmonize with the rest. If we cannot harmonize them, then the contradiction remains. Let us see.

Observing the other rules given, let us remember that there was great disorder both at Corinth and at Ephesus at that time. Many were speaking at once; getting up and interrupting the speaker, no doubt rudely. And especially would women interrupt their husbands, taking greater liberty with them. And Paul would correct all disorder. Hence, with these facts before him, he said: "I suffer not a woman to teach, or usurp authority over the man," (the Greek is *or* or *nor*). The thing Paul would not suffer was her "usurping authority over the man." This is all. And he gives the reasons. Adam was first formed, and the woman was first in the transgression. The first time she usurped the ruling power she erred, bringing sin into the world with all our woes. Hence she ought to be modest as to this. If she would learn anything "let her ask her husband at home." This shows

that he had a special case before him. All did not have husbands. "It is a shame for women to speak in the church," *i.e.*, as they were doing, not otherwise. It is always a shame to be in disorder, and for a woman to usurp authority over the man. This is all that Paul had before him, and all he forbids. In the same connection (1 Cor. xiv:31) he says: "Ye may all speak one at a time, that all may learn, and all may be edified." But you shall not speak disorderly. And in verse 26 he says: "What is it, then, brethren: When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine (*i.e.*, teaching), hath an interpretation," etc. Note, the first is a question; the second are facts—"every one of you hath," etc. Does not this include the women? And this was "when you come together" in the assembly. "Every one" thought of it before, and went prepared with something to edify the meeting. These two verses, 26 and 31, in the same passage, and just preceding the supposed inhibition to women, certainly show that "every one" was at liberty to take part in the meetings, and were expected to do so, if they would proceed "decently and in order." Surely Paul did not contradict himself right in the same passage! The woman shall not so teach as to "usurp authority over the man," and no one, man or woman, should so proceed as to be in disorder. There is no other prohibition here, and the latter is as applicable to the men as to the women.

Paul nowhere makes another limit or prohibition for women as compared with men. The men have no more right to be disorderly than the women have. The single prohibition peculiar to women in these two passages is that they shall "not usurp authority over the men." "It is a shame for them to speak" so as to do this. And this leaves them free to do all the things we have seen they did do. Therefore, there is no conflict.

That women should not be rulers in the church appears in this inhibition. They are not to rule the men. And they are nowhere appointed to do so. Not all men are rulers. Only

seniors, who have certain very marked qualifications, can be rulers. The preachers were not rulers as preachers, or because they were preachers. Being a preacher never gave anyone ruling authority. As a class they, like the women, have shown great incapacity for ruling, though they do claim much, and may sometimes lord it over God's heritage.

There is, in the two passages under consideration, nothing to hinder women from being preachers! Look closely, and see. Yet we conclude, with great confidence, that they should not be preachers because they were not in the days of the apostles. This is a sufficient prohibition. Hence, while a woman may perhaps make a talk on special occasions, may be a missionary aid, may teach in any orderly and becoming way, etc., she cannot be what we usually call a preacher or an evangelist, pastor or ruler in the church, so long as we follow the apostolic and ancient examples, as we are commanded to do. They were not pastors, or preachers, or rulers then, and therefore cannot be now. Phoebe was a servant of the church in Cenchrea (Rom. xvi:1). The word here rendered *servant* is *diakonon*, the word for *deacon*; and some think she was a church officer, an official deacon. But this word is often used with no reference to office; and hence it is not at all certain that she was any more a servant than other faithful sisters. Paul was a servant, or deacon, of all the churches; and yet he never held the office of deacon or bishop in any church or congregation. There would be no inconsistency, however, in a woman being an official deacon, or servant. For deacons were not rulers. They neither usurped nor exercised authority over anyone. They *served*.

This investigation covers all the ground in these passages (1 Cor. xiv:34, 35; 1 Tim. ii:11-14; 1 Cor. xi:1-3), which are the only ones construed to forbid women's praying, singing, teaching (in some way), exhorting, etc., in the assembly. They are to be in subjection. As a rule, man is head naturally, and must be so religiously. There is the most abundant room for the best activity of women without their

"usurping authority over the men" Let us not put on her a restriction the divine law does not authorize. This leaves Paul in harmony with himself, and with all the divine record; relieves us of all difficulty, and encourages women as the true and divinely appointed helpers of men. They are better singers, better teachers often, warmer in their devotions, more heroic in suffering, more "patient in tribulation," and on the whole, do more very generally for the church. They are more persevering and more prompt: "Last at the cross and first at the sepulcher." They have angelic capacities, and are the best representatives of true Christianity. And to restrict them beyond what Paul put on them is an outrage and a shame! A cruel wrong to them, and a ruinous robbery of the church. Still, they are not to be rulers of men, in the family or in the church, and they are not to be preachers; but anything else. Call on them, and they will show the wisdom of God in their rich endowments for usefulness, for being happy and making others happy. "Let all things be done decently and in order," and to edifying. Let us all "strive together"; be "workers together," "bearing one anothers' burdens." The women will often bear as many and as grievous burdens as the men.

To make *preachers* of them is a wrong almost equal to refusing them the right to do what they certainly did in the first churches. Let each one stand in his lot, do his and her part, and not the work of others. Then will the church "make increase of the body to the edifying of itself in love." Souls will be saved and God will be honored.

---

One of our strongest men, and one of my best special friends, after examining this, suggests my revising it, and adds: "I would not say that women may teach in the church."; This reaches a tender place. I would really like to gratify this brother, and all who, with him, take Paul's prohibition to be entire, and do not, as I think, consider the circumstances and the special object before Paul, and who, without design-

ing it, put Paul in conflict with himself. Has it not been fully shown that Paul recognized the right of the sisters to pray in the assembly, having their heads covered ? Has it not been shown that Paul would have the sisters to sing, exhort and teach (prophesying and singing) in the church, of course, in an orderly and becoming way? Did not Paul say you (Corinthians) may all prophesy, one at a time, and that everyone had a teaching, etc.? (1 Cor. xiv:26-31). Now, if I construe Paul, in another place, to mean that they shall not speak *at all*, am I not putting him in conflict with himself?— and needlessly; for I can construe him so as to be consistent.

I would be glad to agree, also, with those who would have a woman for president, preacher and pastor. But it is impossible to agree with both classes. In fact, I cannot agree with *either* without disagreeing with Paul, and bringing him in conflict with himself. Has it not been fully shown that women are not to be rulers in the family or in the church? Now, if I allow that she may, by Paul's authority, preach and rule over men, and over the whole church, as scriptural pastors do, am I not misconstruing Paul as to bring him in deadly conflict with himself?

Hence, I am constrained to fall back on my original purpose, to agree only with harmonious scriptures, if I must disagree with myself and all around me.

No man should hold a theory which he cannot reconcile to all parts of the Bible; a theory with which any part of the New Testament conflicts. And the doubtful passages *must* be so construed as to harmonize with the positive, which can have but one meaning. Otherwise we would have numerous irreconcilable conflicts. Let the Bible stand if all men's views and preferences fail.

## CHAPTER VI

### MEANING OF WORDS, SENTENCES AND PARAGRAPHS

Analysis of words, sentences and paragraphs—exemplifications; sermons on the wrong pronunciation and meaning of words; Titus iii:5; Rom. viii:9; religion; convert and conversion—the four items in conversion; meaning of life and death—the prodigal son dead and alive—Christians both dead and alive—present life and death; eternal life and death; sanctification—its meaning in the Bible exemplified by many cases.

RULE ELEVEN—*Consider the meaning of each word, sentence and paragraph.*

#### EXEMPLIFICATIONS

This is so manifestly important that it should not need exemplification. For, if we do not understand the several parts, how can we understand the whole? Many instances might be given where men have given ludicrous expositions of themselves by misunderstanding certain words in their "*texts*." As when "the text" was, "Thou art an *austere* man," and the preacher taking that to mean an *oyster* man, said: 1. Jesus is an oyster man. 2. The church is an oyster boat. 3. The gospel is the oyster tongs. 4. The preachers are oyster catchers. He was then ready, as the sable divine expressed it, to "put on the rowzens" for catching "oyster sinners!"

Here we need all the books and rules by which we understand the words, sentences, etc., of other books. When we have made the proper analysis, we will be prepared to make the right synthesis.

Following this rule will enable us, at once, to understand Matt. xix:28; Titus iii:5; Rom. viii:28-30, and other passages which, otherwise, will remain dark, if not to us inconsistent. Acts xiii:48, "ordained to eternal life," fifty years ago, was, among the Calvinists, read as if it was *fore*-ordained,



and was construed to favor what they called fore-ordination. It simply means prepared, arranged, made ready. And so, elect was construed to mean about the same. It just means, *to choose*. "The foreknowledge of God," 1 Peter i:2, was another proof of extreme Calvinism. It means only what God made known before it came to pass. God did not know one thing before he knew another, but he did make known many things before they occurred; many things he knows which he has not yet made known to man. More than one person has failed to understand the word *sylllogism*. They sometimes imagine they see the *silly* of it, and no more. Sometimes in their silliness they do not see themselves. Many writers try to make syllogisms, and fail. Real syllogisms are not very plentiful. When I have called attention to the difference between strait and straight, between there and their, as "their angels are always beholding the face of my Father" (Matt. xviii:10), I have been told I should "preach the gospel, not teach spelling." Yet these complainers were the very persons needing the lessons, and till they learned them they could never understand many important passages of Scripture. The world is made of little things, and he who fails to master these particles can never comprehend or appreciate the whole.

Let us consider religion, conversion, life, death, immortality and sanctification, defined somewhat incorrectly in our dictionaries, because they give the sense in which words are now used by the people for whom the dictionaries are made; as in the case of baptize, baptism, etc. Without the proper understanding of words, as they are used in the Scriptures, we are bewildered and discouraged at every step.

1. *Religion*.—People now speak of "getting religion," "seeking religion," etc., under the impression that it means pardon of sins and salvation. Frequently they speak of "getting more religion"; as though it was a tangible quantity, which might be possessed in larger or smaller proportions. Who has not heard it said of certain persons that they "have

very little religion," or "have not much religion," etc.? Religion is generally derived from the Latin *religio*, and means, to bind anew,—*re* and *ligo*, to bind. Etymologically, it means to rebind, or bind back. In this sense there can be no religion in heaven among the angels who never sinned; nor was there religion in the garden of Eden before the fall; since that which was never loosed cannot be rebound, just as that which was never lost cannot be found, and he who is not sick, and never was, cannot be cured. It "seems originally to have signified an oath or vow to the gods." It consists "in the performance of all known duties to God and our fellowmen." In its appropriated sense, it means, "any system of faith and worship." In this sense, religion comprehends the belief and worship of pagans and Mohammedans. "Thus we speak of the religion of the Turks, of the Hindoos, of the Indians," etc. Hence, we have a popular book, styled "All Religions." And it is said that in China there are more religions than people; since each one has a variety of gods, and the manner, or system by which each God is worshiped, is the religion of that God. In this sense there is religion in heaven, and there was religion in the garden of Eden before the fall. This is the sense in which the term is used in the Scriptures. It is a system of worship

The Greek for religion is *threskia*, and is defined: "Religious worship, service, observance of usage, religion." It is found in Acts xxvi:5, "the strictest sect of our religion"; Col. ii:18, "and worshiping of angels"; James i:26, "vain religion"; James i:27, "pure and undefiled religion." And religious—*threskos*—found in James i:26, "seems to be religious"; Acts xiii:43, "many of the Jews and religious proselytes." The word rendered "Jews' religion" (Gal. i:13), is *Joudaismo*, and is now rendered *Judaism*, *i.e.*, the Jewish system of worship.

Here we are observing our ninth rule—collecting the divine testimonies on the subject under consideration.

We see, then, most clearly, what a wonderful mistake is made by many religionists, on account of misunderstanding the plain meaning of the word religion. Those who understand its meaning will never speak of getting or seeking religion, of having little or much religion, etc. And they will be free from other embarrassing and discouraging difficulties in their scriptural investigations

*Convert and Conversion* are now used largely as equivalent to "getting religion," "getting more religion," "getting saved," etc., and are supposed to be the work of an immediate power sent directly down from heaven, often called "converting power." Hence we find people praying for this power to be sent down while persons "kneel at the altar," or "mourners' bench." They kneel, and pray, and agonize, and the preachers with them, to induce the Lord to send this converting power. Sometimes we have heard the call almost in the *peremptory*, or *commanding* style, thus: "Lord, we have done all we can, and here are these anxious, penitent souls waiting and praying. Come down now, *right now*, Lord, and convert them." One man actually prayed that the Lord would "send converting power right down through the shingles," adding, "and I will pay the bill!" He was deeply anxious. But the Lord did not disturb the shingles, or send the power otherwise, and they had to close without the conversions! How sad and discouraging this was! And how different from apostolic teaching! Yet this seems to have been the idea of the translators in 1611, when they rendered Acts iii:19, "Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out," etc. That is, repent, and pray, and God will, or *perhaps* he will, send converting power. But this scripture proof of that theory is entirely exploded by the modern, and certainly correct rendering, which makes the converting active, not passive; thus: "Repent and turn." This makes it the work of the sinner to convert, or turn, and leaves no ground for waiting for power to be sent down. This is not only the meaning of the word here used, but it is the common style. Matt. v:39,

"Turn the other also." 2 Tim. iii:5, "From such turn away." Many references might be given. The gospel is God's converting power, and has been here since the "beginning." How strange to pray for another converting power, as though this was not sufficient. David says (Psl. xix:7): "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." Do we really believe this? Convert (from *con* and *veriere*, to turn, *Lat.*), means to turn, to "change or turn from one religion to another, or from one party or sect to another, or from a bad life to a good one." Sam Jones, in his peculiar and very un-commendable style, was right when he said to hypocrites: "Quit your meanness and do right. That is conversion." Paul's commission, Acts xxvi:18, was "to open their eyes, and turn them from darkness to light"; that is by preaching the gospel entrusted to him, he would enlighten their minds, and so turn, or convert them, or cause them to turn, etc., for the act of turning was theirs, not his. In conversion, no powers are blotted out, and none are imparted. The powers and faculties hitherto devoted to sin are purified, turned to God, and consecrated to his service, in purity, according to truth, and with zeal and earnestness, constantly and forever.

Thus, we see, that the plain meaning of convert, conversion, etc., relieves us of all the difficulties thrown around the subject, and enables us to read and understand free from embarrassment. Nor is there any other way to get out of this mist and fog of superstition. Learn the meaning of language.

There are, in conversion, four important items. Let us note them here:

1. The converting power, or instrument — the gospel, which was committed "to earthen vessels," and does not need to be sent down from heaven now. It does need to be sent to "all the world." It "works effectually in them that believe," and in giving faith to candid hearers. It needs no aid, and has no substitute.

2. The act of conversion—the voluntary turning of the soul to God. Voluntary, because he will not compel anyone to turn.

3. The person or system to which we are converted— whether to Moses, Mohammed, the pope, the preacher, to a religious sect, or to Christ and his inimitable scheme of redemption. This conversion has salvation in it. The others have not.

4. The importance of being wholly converted. For one may be turned half way round, more or less, like the hands of a clock, and yet not set right. One may have his feelings converted, and not his head or his life and state. He may have his head converted, and not his heart, or affections, state and life. The gospel proposes to convert sinners, or cause them to convert or turn, wholly to God, yielding up their bodies, souls and spirits; changing their state and their lives, and making them truly "new creatures in Christ." Nothing short of this is gospel or saving conversion! Alas! how many church members are not even half converted, as shown by their lives! And alas! that many who seem to be wholly converted do not stay converted. Some are converted to the big meetings but not the little ones—not to Christ!

#### LIFE AND DEATH

These are correlates and are understood better in contrast. They should, therefore, be treated together.

It is easy to see that our dictionaries are at a great loss in defining life and death. Webster says life is, "That state of an animal or plant in which its organs are capable of performing their functions." And of death, he says: "That state of a being, animal or vegetable, but more particularly of an animal, in which there is total and permanent cessation of all the vital functions." Total privation or loss; extinction; as the death of memory. Blackstone defines civil death to be "the separation of a man from civil society, or from the enjoyment of civil rights, as by banishment."

But the Bible only can explain life and death. No man can account for life, any life, but by the Bible. No man can at all understand life or death but by the Bible.

When God said to Adam, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," what did he mean? Let the events show. In the evening of that day he went out from the garden of Eden, he was separated from it. He lived 930 years. That death, then, did not mean ceasing to exist; nor did it mean inability. He made his "bread in the sweat of his face, after this," tilling the ground.

When the prodigal son returned, the father said (Luke xv:24): "This my son was dead and is alive again; he was lost, and is found." Dead and alive, and lost and found, express the same idea. The prodigal had been separated from his father; but he had not ceased to exist, nor was he totally disabled.

Some 700 years B.C. God sent Isaiah to say to the Jews: "Your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you, that he will not hear" (Isa. lix:2). They were as dead to God then as Adam was when he was separated from God morally, by his guilt, and physically, by being driven out of the garden. They were as dead to God as the prodigal was to his father—for the same reason, and the same sense. Still they existed and had much ability.

Paul said of certain widows: "But she that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth" (1 Tim. v:6). Here the widow had not ceased to exist, nor was she disabled as to a life of pleasure. But she was dead. She was not in union with God. Her "iniquities had hid his face from her." Her sins were as a separating wall between her and God.

So Paul says (Eph. ii:1), "And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and in sins." This is rendered *in* or *by* trespasses and sins. Both are true, in fact, and to the original. These Christians *had been* dead, then, and *were* dead till they heard the gospel. Yet they certainly had not ceased

to be, nor were they without ability. They heard the gospel, understood it, and turned to God. Even while dead in and by sin, they were able to serve the most terrible task-master—the devil! And no doubt they pleased him well.

Rom. vi:11 reads: "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." These Christians were, then, dead and alive at the same time: dead to sin, and alive to God; separated from sin, and united with God and the holy hosts about him!

In Col. iii:3, Paul explains this, thus: "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." You are dead to sin, i.e., separated from it, and "your life is hid with Christ in God." Mortal eye does not see your union with God, which is life; hidden and preserved life.

In the final judgment, it is said (Rev. xx:14), "And death and hell (hades) were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." It is, and will be a final separation of the wicked from God. "This is the second death," implies a state, or condition of being, away from God, like Adam, like the prodigal son, and like all Christians before their conversion; worse, but the same as the separation from God. And Rev. xxi:8, says of all the wicked, they "shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." The second death is, then, a state of being separated from God, "where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched." They will never cease to exist, and will never be unable to suffer. What a terrible and palpable mistake to conclude that death, first, last or middle, ever meant ceasing to exist or disability! While we read the Bible with an idea so erroneous as to the meaning of death, we can never understand it. And this prepares us for considering—

#### LIFE, PRESENT AND ETERNAL

When God had made Adam, and he *was* Adam, still he had no life till "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Life came from God,

and from God alone can life come. It is divine and sacred. If man could create matter and organize it (which he cannot do) still no man or set of men can give life to a monad, a triad, or any combination of matter. It comes from God. This is a fact which cannot be too strongly emphasized. When the life which God gave Adam left him, or was separated from his body, his body was dead, dead like it was before God gave him life, dead as our friends are when we bury them. Human life, then, is the union and fellowship of the body and spirit. This is the most tangible illustration of life, and we should consider it well. We may not understand how this union is effected or maintained, but we see the teachings and we see the fruits of the union or indwelling, dwelling together of our bodies and our spirits. Call this natural life, animal life, or temporal life, and still it is *life*. Beasts have souls or lives, but not such as God gave man—not spirits. The present inquiry is more particularly for *spiritual* life, and life eternal. This term is found in the Bible over four hundred times. Of course, it would be too much to copy all these here; but a few sample cases will give the correct idea:

1. Matt. vii:14: "Narrow is the way that leadeth unto life." Why, one may be ready to say, we are living now. And the Universalist is precisely ready to say we are all on the way to eternal life and cannot miss it. But the meaning of this language is that life was something his disciples here addressed did not then have, and something that even they might fail to secure. ;

2. Matt. xviii:8, 9: "It is better for thee to enter into life with one eye," etc. "Why," shouts the Universalist, "you need not be uneasy about this in the least; you cannot possibly miss it." And the thoughtless say, "We are alive now." But this Scripture conveys a very different idea to all the candid.

3. Matt. xix:17: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." Of this, and more than a hundred other passages, the same might be said that has been just said



of Nos. 1 and 2. But here we have the idea of state or condition of being—not simply existence; so also,

4. Mark x:17: "What shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" Here is not only a state of being referred to, but one to be inherited, to be entered into or upon, and which depended on something he might do. This case is found also in Matt. xix:16, 17. Had the Savior been a Calvinist he would, according to his manner, have said: "My dear man, you are much mistaken; your eternal life does not depend on anything you can do. God fixed that before the foundation of the world, if you are one of the elect; and if not, all you can do will not alter the case at all." Had he been a Universalist he would have eased all his fears by telling him that "all will have eternal life, do as they will." But he answered just as if (1) eternal life was a happy and glorious state of being; (2) to be entered into or inherited; (3) on condition that he obeyed God. These three ideas lie on the very surface of this answer.

5. John i:4: "In him was life"; 1 John v:12: "He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life"; 1 John v:11: "God hath given to us eternal life," by promise, "and this life is in his Son." *In Christ*, then, is life, life present and life eternal; and to enter into life is to enter into Christ, in whom the life dwells. And to be in Christ is to be in union and fellowship with him. This is that state of being called *life*—to be in Christ and in union and fellowship with him.

6. 1 John iii:14: "By this we know we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." And we know we love the brethren when we love God and keep his commandments, and not otherwise (1 John v:2). We know we are in this state of life by keeping his commandments, and not by our feelings.

7. John iv:14: "But the water I will give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." And this is explained in John vii:38, 39: "He that believeth on

me, as the Scriptures hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified? Then, as the result of union with Christ, we have the Holy Spirit as a fountain of water in us springing up to eternal life. It "sheds abroad the love of God in our hearts" (Rom. v:5). By it we are sealed to God (2 Cor. i:22; Eph. i:13; iv:30). 8 1 John iii:15: "But no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him" (Gal. v:21; Rev. xxi:8). Of course, no one who hates his brother, and is a murderer, has eternal life "abiding in him." But this shows also that eternal life does abide in the new creatures in Christ as certainly as it does not abide in murderers.

9. 1 John v:13: "And these things have I written unto you . . . that ye may know that you have eternal life." How strange this, if they could know this by their feelings, sensations, or by special revelation! This language clearly means that they were dependent on God's written revelation for a knowledge of their condition, or whether they had eternal life or not They walked by faith, not by sight, or by animal feeling, or mental emotion, or by any special excitement or direct personal revelation.

10. John vi:47: "He that believeth . . . *hath* everlasting life." He is *now* in Christ, in union and fellowship with him, and the well of water *is now* springing up in him. This is life, the life of God in the soul. And he has the promise of the future life also. It is offered as a final and all-glorious reward to the faithful

11. Rom. ii:7: "Unto those who seek for glory, honor, and immortality,—eternal life." That is, he promises to the faithful as the great reward—eternal life! Just as he threatens the wicked with eternal death or banishment. Surely this cannot be simply eternal being, or—existence! Satan will have that. All the wicked will have that. Life is more than being. It is dwelling in God's "presence, where there is

fullness and joy, and at his right hand, where there are pleasures forevermore." "To *be* or *not* to be" is not the greatest of all questions, then, if Cato did hold this idea. To be in God's presence and share in all the riches of his glory—this is eternal life! this is heaven! Glorious and blessed heaven!—life forevermore ! It is in contrast with the second death.

"There is a death whose pang  
Outlasts the fleeting breath!  
O what eternal horrors hang  
Around that awful death!"  
And "there is a life above!  
Unmeasured by the flight of years!  
And all that life is—*Love!*"

Here again we see how a right understanding of life and death clears away difficulties and enables us to understand the Scriptures as we never could without this understanding, with all our research and study. Errors in definitions put a veil before us and enshroud us in mist and fog impenetrable. Correct definitions remove all these, and enable us to go forward, walking in the light, "in the blessed light of God," the blessed truth of Heaven.

#### IMMORTALITY

Many critical investigators are troubled as to the teaching of the Bible on *immortality*. This trouble comes from the fact that we have two Greek words rendered immortality, only one of which means deathlessness—*Athanasia*.

1 Cor. xv:53: "This mortal must put on immortality," or a body that cannot die—deathlessness.

1 Cor. xv:54: "Shall have put on immortality," or deathlessness.

1 Tim. vi:16: "Who only hath immortality"—deathlessness

*Aphtharsia* means *incorruptible*. It is found in Rom. ii:7. "Seek for glory, honor, and immortality, or *incorruptibility*."

1 Cor. xv:42: "It is raised *in incorruption*." After the resurrection the body can never be corrupted again It will be incorruptible.

1 Cor. xv:50: "Doth corruption inherit incorruption?" 1 Cor. xv:53: "Must put on incorruption."

1 Cor. xv:54: "Shall have put on incorruption." Eph. vi:24: "Love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity," i.e., without corruption.

2 Tim. i:10: "Brought life and immortality (incorruptibility) to light."

Titus ii:7: "Uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity," or uncorruptness in teaching.

*Aphthartos*—Rom. i:23: "The glory of the incorruptible God." God is glorious because incorruptible.

1 Cor. ix:25: "But we (seek) an incorruptible crown."

1 Cor. xv:52: "The dead shall be raised incorruptible."

1 Tim. i:17: "Unto the king eternal, immortal," or incorruptible.

1 Peter i:4: "To an inheritance incorruptible"; the true riches.

1 Peter i:23: "Incorruptible (seed) by the word of God."

1 Peter iii:4: "That which is not corruptible; a meek and quiet spirit."

The idea is, God can neither be corrupted nor destroyed. Hence he only has immortality. But man can be corrupted and his body can be destroyed. He is mortal and corruptible. But, in the resurrection, God proposes to give him immortality. Then, like his Maker, he can die no more, and he can be corrupted no more. While in the flesh he is imperfect, not perfect, and liable to ruinous corruption Hence, as in contrast with man in the flesh, Paul (Heb. xii:23) refers to "the spirits of just men made perfect" in the spirit world. Corruptible here, incorruptible there. What a mistake to suppose man can be so perfect here that he cannot be corrupted or made to sin! Jesus said to the young man (Matt. xix:17) "There is none good but one; that is God"; none absolutely

good, free from sin, and incorruptible, but God. This divine attainment awaits man at the resurrection. If, while here, he "seeks for glory, honor, and incorruptibility," he shall have eternal life. That is, he shall dwell with God, sin no more, and die no more.

How easy to learn when we proceed aright! Thus we teach and learn the Bible while learning how to learn! Learning the meaning of language.

#### SANCTIFICATION

This word is not properly understood, and therefore the subject which it designates is nebulous and unsatisfactory. Lange, in the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, says: "Sanctification is treated of now as an act of God, or Christ, or the Holy Spirit, not as an act of man God sanctifies (John xvii:17), and man enters into the redeeming, justifying, sanctifying economy of God (Eph. i:4; 1 Pet. i:15). ... By the act of God's justification the believer is made a creature of God; in sanctification he carries on what God has begun, and realizes the Christ in his own life. Justification is the germ of our new life, a single act; sanctification is a gradual process, the development of this new life." A large class of those called sanctificationists affirm that sanctification like justification, is an instantaneous act of God. They pray for God to come and sanctify them, and many profess this immediate sanctification at the altar, or during their protracted meetings.

Now it is worthy of observation that not one of the Scriptures referred to by Mr. Lange or others has the slightest reference to an immediate act of God to sanctify. The first reference (John xvii:17) says: "Sanctify them (the disciples) through thy truth." The other references have neither the word nor the idea, as anyone can see. And this is the very best that the strongest writers can do for this instantaneous sanctification! Cruden defines sanctification thus:

1. "To separate and appoint anything to a holy and religious use. God sanctified the seventh day (Gen. ii:3). The

first-born were sanctified (Ex. xiii:2). And thus the tabernacle, the temple, the priests, the altars, the sacrifices, etc., were sanctified under the law. 2. To cleanse a sinner from the pollution and filth of sin, to free him from the power and dominion of sin, and indue him with a principle of holiness; thus God by his Spirit sanctifies the elect, or true believers." 1 Cor. vi:11: "And such were some of you, but you are washed, but you are sanctified," etc.

The only passage that Cruden gives in proof of God's "induing him with a principle of holiness" (1 Cor. vi:11), just quoted—has for the word *sanctified*, *heegiastheete*, which simply means *separated*, and is rendered by this or an equivalent word by Conybeare and Hawson, Meyer, Doddridge, and others. It has in it nothing at all in reference to "induing with a principle of holiness," or "immediate sanctification" by a direct act of the Spirit. Of course, these are the best proofs they could find, and as they have nothing at all in them on the subject, we must conclude that there is no evidence favoring such a sanctification. It is not in the meaning of the word, in the connection, or in any other passage of Scripture. If these writers could find no such testimony in the Scriptures it was because there was none such!

Let us examine a few typical testimonies in the Holy Scriptures, and see the sense in which *sanctify* is used there.

1. "Every creature of God is good, etc., for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer" (1 Tim. iv:45). Yet these creatures were not *all* made holy, if any of them were. They were set apart to a special use; this was all.

2. God was sanctified at the waters of Meribah (Num. xx:13). Surely God was not made holy. He was *honored* there.

3. The Father sanctified Christ himself (John x:36). This could not be to make him holy. He just separated him to a special work.

4. The people were commanded to sanctify themselves (Num. xi:18; Josh. iii:5). These people did not become

very holy. They just consecrated, separated, or devoted themselves to the work before them.

5. The people were to sanctify God (Isa. viii:13). This would be entirely paradoxical and absurd, if sanctify meant to make holy.

6. All the first born were sanctified (Ex. xiii:2). They were not all made holy. They were just appointed to a special purpose.

7. Houses and fields were sanctified (Lev. xxvii:14-16). Were the houses unholy before ? Did this sanctification make them holy?

8. The church was to be sanctified (Eph. v:25, 26). Only a part of the church was made holy, and that not entirely so.

9. Our whole person, body, soul, and spirit, was to be sanctified (1 These. v:22, 23). Yet Paul said he found another law in his members warring against the law of his mind. "The carnal mind" was not taken out of him. His flesh was not dead. He was just separated to God, and devoted to his service.

10. God is to be sanctified in our hearts (1 Peter iii:15). This cannot mean to make him holy.

11. The tabernacle, altar, garments, vessels and sacrifices were sanctified (Lev. viii:10-15; x:3; Num. vii:1-6). Were these made holy in the true sense of the word ?

12. The disciples at Corinth were once wicked, but they were sanctified, or, as some render this, sanctified themselves (1 Cor. vi:11). Here we are plainly enough told *how* they were sanctified, and hence, what sanctification was and is. They were consecrated to Christ by obeying his gospel. In this process they had not become incorruptible, or absolutely holy, but they were devoted to a cause that would, if they were faithful, give them in the resurrection incorruptibility and deathlessness, or immortality and eternal life.

Here again we see how easy it is to understand a *subject* when we understand the *language used concerning it*. And we

are learning important Bible lessons while exemplifying the rules for Bible study. If the true meaning of *baptize* was understood, all disputation as to what is baptism would cease. So, if we all understood the .simple and true meaning of faith, repentance, confession, prayer, etc., what a wonderful result would follow!



## CHAPTER VII

### MANNER OF DOING DIVINE COMMANDS

Doing God's will in God's way; exemplifications in the civil law, in the divine law; manner of observing the Lord's Supper—carrying the ark of the covenant—bringing water out of the rock— manner of teaching the Jews, Romans, Mohammedans, Protestants, and Bible plan for evangelizing the world; manner of observing the Lord's day; other cases; and the conclusion, according to these Rules.

RULE TWELVE.—*When the law gives the manner of doing a thing, then every other manner is excluded, and the manner of procedure is as binding as the thing to be done; it is part of the law.*

#### EXEMPLIFICATIONS

When the law says hang a man by the neck, on a specified day, till he is dead, the officers are not at liberty to shoot or burn him. Nor can they hang him by the feet. They must *hang* him; they must hang him by the *neck*; they must hang him till he is *dead*. It might, perhaps, be said the end to be reached was his death, and it did not matter how that end was reached. And this might be true, if the command had been to kill him, or take his life, and no manner of doing it given. But when the order is hanging by the neck, the manner is part of the law, and just as important as any other part. The order to King Saul (1 Sam. xv) was to slay all the sinners, the Amalekites, and the manner of doing it was not given. Saul might, then, do it as he chose, only he should not violate any other law, such as that forbidding cruelty. When Aaron and his sons were required to wash their hands and their feet at the laver, before entering the holy place, and the manner of doing this washing was not specified, they could dip them or pour water on them, but it must be done at the laver, before entering the holy place. When Elisha

commanded Naaman to go and wash in Jordan seven times (2 Kings, 5th Chap.), and gave no directions as to the manner of doing it, he could do it as he pleased; only it must be in Jordan. He chose to do it by dipping, and it was accepted.

When the Savior gave the Lord's Supper he prescribed the manner of observing it at length. Now, then, who can suppose that it would be acceptable if we should take the wine first, or follow any other course besides the one ordered, or if we did it for any other purpose? And in the assembly of the saints, everything as to manner shall be done decently and in order. This is important and is strictly commanded. Some minor particulars are generally not given. In these we may exercise our own judgment and feelings, so we do not violate some other law: such as unnecessarily offending "one of these little ones," or not doing to others as we would have them do to us.

In 2 Sam., 6th Chap., we read of David's mistake in bringing up the ark, the death of Uzzah, and the anger of David. In 1 Chron., 15th Chap., when the ark had remained three months in the house of Obed-edom, David, having learned why the evil fell upon them, made another, and a successful effort to bring it up. And he said to the priests: "Sanctify yourselves," etc. For (v. 13) "because ye did it not at the first, the Lord our God made a breach upon us, for that we sought him not after the due order." The manner of doing it was sacred, and for lack of observing it the Lord "made a breach" upon Uzzah, etc.

The ark of the covenant was to be *borne*, or *carried* by the sanctified priests (Ex. xxv:14; xxxvii:5), etc. The fatal mistake in the manner of bringing it up was in putting it on a cart and hauling it (2 Sam. vi:3). This disregard of the prescribed manner of conveying the ark cost Uzzah his life, and brought other evils. The wrong use of the ark caused the death of fifty thousand three score and ten Philistines of Bethshemesh (1 Sam. vi:19)—a warning to all who would

disregard the sacredness of the divine law in any manner or thing.

The success of Noah in building the ark was in this: "Thus did Noah, according to all that God commanded him, so did he" (Gen. vi:22; vii:5).

The success of Moses in making the tabernacle was in this: He followed the divine directions in all particulars (Ex. xxv:9-40; xxvi:30; Num. viii:4; 1 Chron. xxviii:11-19; Acts vii:40). And his failure to enter the promised land was in this: He did not proceed in the prescribed manner in bringing water out of the rock the second time (Num. viii:8-11). The command was to *speak* to the rock, and he *smote* it twice. On the first occasion he was to smite the rock, but not this time. This was not long before his death.

The careful Bible student knows that many pages might be filled with examples of this class, all showing that the manner, so far as it is prescribed, is as important as the thing to be done. All the blessings connected with the Lord's Supper depend on the manner of observing it. Departing from the right way of doing it brings condemnation. It is eating and drinking damnation to ourselves. Paul was careful as to his manner of preaching Christ, and it was not the manner of men (1 Cor. ii:1-7).

The manner of teaching the Jews was not what we call preaching, but reading the law every sabbath day, and at the annual feasts, etc. Thus Moses "took the book of the covenant and read in the audience of the people," etc. (Ex. xxiv:7). So Joshua read it all to the people, the women and the children (Josh. viii:34, 35, and Neh. viii:3-18). And Ezra "read therein before the street that was before the water-gate from morning (Heb. from the light) until midday before the men and the women, and those that could understand," i.e., about six hours each day of the feast. "Also (v. 18) day by day from the first day until the last day he read in the book of the law." Here were about forty-two hours of reading, giving the sense, and causing the people to under-

stand the reading, during one feast. Afterwards it is said

(Neh. ix:3): "And they stood up in their places and read in the book of the law of the Lord their God one-fourth part of the day, and another fourth part they confessed, and worshiped the Lord their God." Hence we read, Acts xv:21, "For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day." Their reading and commenting, or giving the sense, was what we call *expository* preaching; not at all the modern textuary, of clergy style. Jesus followed this expository style (Luke iv:16). Hence Paul (1 Tim. iv:13) commands that he "give attendance to reading," etc. Why not? The type read Moses and the prophets. We read Christ and the apostles every Lord's day in the congregations now. Why not read, give the sense, and cause the people to understand the reading? This would teach them more than the best modern preaching of the strongest hired preacher in the land. So much for our departure from the Bible manner of teaching the disciples. Why not adopt the Bible manner? How dare we depart from it?

And the manner of raising funds, of church cooperation, and of doing missionary work is clearly given—the latter fully exemplified in the life of Paul. And we are repeatedly and expressly charged to copy Paul's example. How dare we, then, adopt any other plan or manner of doing these things? Should we not feel that, as Moses suffered when he departed from the manner prescribed for bringing water out of the rock, so we may suffer for departing from the apostolic manner of doing missionary work, etc.? And that as Nadab and Abihu died before the Lord, when they offered strange fire on his altar (Num. iii:4; xxvi:61, etc.) so are we in danger when we depart from the divine manner of doing the work of the Lord in any of these things?

The Roman hierarchy and the Mohammedans have de-parted from the divine plan for spreading the truth, and over-coming enemies, so far as to take the sword. Many have de-

parted from the divine plan for governing the churches so far as to make human creeds and disciplines. Some of them, when pressed with their departures, have presumptuously claimed that God has provided no plan of government for his church! So manifest is it, that when God makes provision as to *how* his work is to be done, it is *rebellion* to depart from it! Some now, pressed in the same way, pretend that the manner of raising funds, preaching, doing missionary work, etc., is not given in the New Testament! Because they feel that, if it is given, it is sacrilegious to depart from it. They, it appears, cannot see how Paul did these things, or the commands to copy his example! Hence all the disturbing church governments, missionary societies, etc., etc. And hence, too, all the fallacies of arguments and efforts to sustain and justify them. Let us learn this: "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord, For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts" (Isa. lv:8, 9). Let our self-will, self-confidence, and rebelliousness be broken down and swallowed up in the will of God. Then we will not desire our own ways; we will, as Jesus did, say and feel, "not my will, but thine be done" in all things! Then will truth triumph! Not before!

#### THE LORD'S DAY

We have precisely the same reason for a particular manner of observing the Lord's day that we have for observing it at all, viz., the example of the first Christians. Hence, we are just as firmly bound to observe it after their manner as we are to observe it at all. The authority for the *manner* is the same as the authority for observing the day at all. It is nowhere called a sabbath, and it cannot be truthfully, for it is not properly a day of rest. And if we were to rest from our own work, stay indoors, kindle no fires, etc., after the Jew's manner of observing the Sabbath, we would not be observing the *Lord's* day. We must "not neglect the assem-

bling of ourselves together," etc. Then, by the same potent authority, we must attend to (1) the apostolic teaching; (2) the fellowship; (3) the breaking of bread;

(4) the prayers;

(5) teaching and admonishing one another in holy songs;

(6) exhorting one another; (7) withdrawing from the incorrigibly wicked; (8) receiving the worthy. In *this manner* did the ancient churches observe the first day of the week. Not a word is said about our modern pastor or his sermonizing. How we deceive ourselves if we imagine we are observing this holy day when we simply cease from our ordinary work, or when we listen to an eloquent sermon, and perhaps put a few dimes into the church treasury! "These ought ye to have done, and not to have left the others undone." And what of those who observe the day scripturally once a month, once in three months, or once a year! Is this the measure of their obedience? Is this their Christianity? It is: not apostolic Christianity!

This rule is based on the grand principle that, whatever in manner or work the Master is sufficiently interested in to order and direct, we should be sufficiently interested in to practice to the letter, so far as we are able. Short of this we are poor servants, and should not expect him to say "well done." Half-hearted servants are not good or faithful serv-ants. Three-fourths servants are not good or faithful, or nine-tenths servants, nor even ninety-nine hundredths servants! The Master calls for all the heart, and has not proposed to receive less. Shall we observe the Lord's way of doing the Lord's work?

(Only enough is said here of these several matters to exemplify the rule. The Lord's day, raising money, missionary work, co-operation, etc., are examined more carefully further on.)

## CHAPTER VIII

### IMPORTANCE OF SOUND SPEECH

Imperativeness of this rule—its true meaning shown by many exemplifications—the same idea in other words; many ordinances, but no sacraments; we must call Bible things by Bible names, when we can—not add to or take from; it requires the only course that can give us union—forbids what would cause divisions, classes, strifes, etc.

RULE THIRTEEN—"*Hold fast the form of sound words*" (2 Tim. i:13).

In justification of this rule, see 1 Cor. i:10. There Paul commands that all the saints "in every place" (see verses 1, 2) "shall speak the same thing," and so be "perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment" (Col. iv:6). "Let your speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt, that ye may know how you ought to answer every man." Certainly there can be neither grace nor salt in unscriptural words, names and phrases; there is not even obedience. 1 Tim. vi:3, 4: "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine that is according to godliness; he is proud," etc. In Titus ii:8, Paul commands "sound speech that cannot be condemned," etc. To call Bible things by Bible names, is sound speech, beyond question, and has all the grace and salt there is in obedience. Can we—dare we add to this, or take from it? Dare we rearrange or modify it?

### EXEMPLIFICATIONS

The word rendered *form* in 2 Tim. i:13, is *hupotupooisis*, and means an outline. It is found, also, 1 Tim. i:16, and is rendered *pattern*, "for a pattern," etc. It is, there-tore, more forcible in this case than the word (*tupon*)

usually rendered *form* would be. The idea is that Paul gives an outline of the manner in which we should speak, and commands Timothy to copy, or follow it as a form or pattern. (1) We must, therefore, call the first day of the week, "the Lord's day" and "the first day of the week," for only these names are given to it in the New Testament. This is "sound speech," and cannot be spoken against. But whenever we call it "the Sabbath," or "the Christian Sabbath," we depart from the outline, or pattern and do not use sound speech. Here begins controversy. (2) When we speak of "the Lord's supper," and the "breaking of the loaf," we use "sound speech which cannot be condemned." No other name is given to that ordinance in the New Testament. When we call it the "sacrament," or the "sacrament of the Lord's supper," we do not use sound speech, and are condemned as disobedient. Sacrament means an oath, and is never applied to any Christian ordinance. (Oaths are forbidden.) It is from Rome, not from the apostles. (3) When we speak of the ordinances of the gospel, we are scriptural. Ordinances mean things ordered, and is rightly applied to whatever Christ has ordered; as preaching the gospel, faith, repentance, baptism, the Lord's supper, prayer, etc. The pope has seven sacraments; some protestants have two. The New Testament has none. But it has many ordinances. "Zacharias and Elisabeth walked in all the ordinances" (Luke i:6). How strange that we cannot be content with these Bible names! (4) When we speak of the messengers of the churches, we use sound speech. When we use delegate, in the sense usually attached to it, we depart from sound speech, and disobey Paul. (5) When we speak of "the elders," or "the bishops" of the church, and of the "deacons," we use "sound speech, that cannot be condemned." But when we speak of "the pastor," after the modern style we depart from the faith, and disobey. (6) When we speak of preachers as of other men, without a prefix or an affix we are copying the apostolic example. So the apostles spoke



of themselves; so their brethren spoke of them—as "James, a servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of John." But when we prefix Rev., or affix D. D., we widely depart from the divine example, and "are convicted as transgressors." This course can never enable us all to "speak the same thing," and to "be perfectly united" These humanisms have neither grace nor salt in them, and can only create strife and evil. They mean a higher class, and lording it over God's heritage. (7) When we pray and give thanks "in the name of Jesus," we observe the prescribed form. This is sound speech. But when we pray "for Christ's sake," we are far wrong. This is *unscriptural*, and conveys, as most unscriptural words and phrases do, a wrong idea. It means, for the love the Father had for Christ. It means to go before the Father in our own persons, and plead the merits of Christ! It means to get in his place and do his work! He ever lives to intercede for us, pleading his own merits. Again: Why not follow the scriptural form? This is indisputably right, and can offend no one. As well might we presume that we can improve on the Bible ideas as on the Bible manner of expressing them. Can we hope to improve upon infinite wisdom? Do we presume to disregard the apostolic injunction? Does it not seem that if we need unscriptural words and phrases, it is because we have unscriptural ideas to express? If our ideas are scriptural, no words or phrases can so well express them as those found in the Scriptures. Hence the conclusion that these unscriptural words and phrases mean unscriptural ideas, and dissatisfaction with the Bible manner and style. (8) This is all applicable, also, to the names of the church and of the followers of Christ. There are, indeed, some special reasons why we should wear only scriptural names. The church is the Bride, the Lamb's wife, and should wear his name alone, as a good wife wears her husband's name alone. Why needs she another, if she is satisfied with his? All sects and parties wear this, but not it alone. Mrs. Smith may still

be called Mrs. Smith, but whenever she desires to be called Mrs. Jones also, there is trouble. And the excuses for these denominational names are equal to the names themselves. The prevailing one is, to distinguish the wearers from other Christians. And that is the very thing that brotherly love does not want. It bears heresy, sect and sin on its fore-front! It wants to be distinguished and separate from other Christians! This is the spirit of sectism. It is schismaticism. And nothing is more directly anti-Christian. Party names serve this evil spirit. Brotherly love serves to unite, and "keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." As regards our carnal relations, we need different names; as Peter, Paul, etc. But in our spiritual relations we need only the same names, and can wear no other without sin. (9) The vexing unitarian-trinitarian question, since the days of Arius and Athanasius, can only be settled by this rule. No one can object if we "hold fast the form of sound words" as to this. And we can speak of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and their relations, in the language of the Scriptures, which all believe, and which perhaps, on this subject none fully understand. Indeed, Paul seems to affirm that, after all the revelations we have, this remains mysterious; thus, 1 Tim. iii:16, "And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness." *Eusebeia*, here rendered godliness, means piety, and involves our direct relations with the God-head, the revelations of the Father, the Son and Holy Spirit, and with each other. Man is a grand trinity, also. Has he not "body, soul, and spirit?" (1 These. v:23). But no man fully understands these, or their relations to each other. "Who by searching can find out God," or the relations of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit? Christians are united by faith, and in faith— not in knowledge, opinions, or understanding. They have never been, and cannot be one in opinions, or their understanding of difficult passages of Scriptures. We all believe these scriptures, whether we understand them or not. In

faith we are one. And we may have no trouble if we will speak of these mysterious matters as the Scriptures speak of them, and not urge our opinions of their meaning upon others.

How important, then, is this rule! It gives us union, harmony, peace, joy and success. It settles our difficulties, and makes us all safe, useful and happy. The departers from it "sow discord among brethren," and are "an abomination" to God (Prov. vi:16-19;. "These six things doth the Lord hate: yea, seven are an abomination to him!" And the seventh is, "he that soweth discord among brethren." Shall we do this for opinion's sake?

Let us, therefore, not only "speak where the Bible speaks, and be silent where the Bible is silent," but let us, also, speak as the Bible speaks on all these difficult and dividing matters. We cannot always give Bible language in giving our opinions and preferences, but we can, and we must, if we would please God and have union, speak of matters of faith, and of all these difficult and disturbing matters, in the words of the Spirit. These are "wholesome words," and "minister grace"; they are "sound words," the "form of sound teaching," and have in them "the bond of peace," and the saving salt of obedience to divine authority.

## CHAPTER IX

### IMPORTANCE OF CLEAR TESTIMONY—THE SPECIAL REASON—MEDITATION

Exemplifications; Soul sleeping, infant baptism, both rest on confessedly doubtful testimony, and are unsafe; especial reasons for observing the Sabbath; for destroying the Canaanites; for sparing and punishing the wicked; for the suffering of the righteous. Why Jesus told the disciples beforehand—why he died; importance and naturalness of meditation — counting up the cost — thinking.

RULE FOURTEEN—*No important teaching or practice is to be based upon doubtful or ambiguous Scriptures.*

#### EXEMPLIFICATIONS

1. In a debate, when the object was to prove that the spirit of man has no conscious existence from death to the resurrection, the affirmant quoted Ps. xxxvii:20: "But the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away." This entire Psalm shows a *present* contrast between the righteous and the wicked, and has no direct reference to the future state. Only by the saddest and most palpable perversion can any part of it be made to serve the soul-sleeping doctrine in the least. Similar passages are found (Ps. cii:3; cxix:83; Jas. iv:14), "For my days are consumed like smoke, and my bones are burned as an hearth." And still he was able to write, "For I am become like a bottle in the smoke; yet do I not forget thy statutes." All these clearly refer to *this* life. Then he referred to Isa. xxxviii:18: "For the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth." This refers to that part of man that goes to the grave. His spirit "goes to God who gave it." Ecc. xii:7: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall re-

turn unto God who gave it." He quoted also Ps. vi:5; xxx:9; Ixxxviii:11; cxv:17, and Ecc. ix:10: "For there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." This is the meaning of all the other references under this head. That which goes into the grave does not work, and has no knowledge, etc. But the spirit does not go into the grave. How absurd to found a doctrine and build a sect on such passages when, to say the least, they are doubtful!

When they desire to prove that the wicked will be blotted out or annihilated after being raised from the dead, they quote 2 These. i:9: "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." The literal is, "age—during destruction," or punishment. The "age—during," or everlasting destruction, is eternal banishment from his presence, and forbids the idea of ceasing to be. The person must exist as long as the punishment, i.e., forever.

2. Infant baptism is based entirely on Scriptures of this doubtful class. When, in a debate in Palestine, Texas, in 1854, it was proved by pedo-baptist authors that baptism is a positive ordinance, and that for all positive ordinances we must have positive authority, and that this authority must be taken in its primary, literal sense, and all this was fully admitted, the speaker called on his opponent for the positive authority for infant baptism. He was not answered, till, after many calls, when the pressure became unbearable, he finally referred to Matt. xix:13-15; Mark x:13; Luke xviii:15. But here there is not one word about baptism. "Little children were brought" to the Savior, and it is *inferred* that he baptized them. But the context is against the inference; for it is said that they were carried to him "that he should put his hands on them and pray." And "he laid his hands on them." This was the object and design; and this the end gained; not baptism. If we were not told what they were carried to him for, or what Jesus did, the inference could be no authority for a positive ordinance like baptism.

Then we read of *households* baptized, as in 1 Cor. i:16; Acts xvi:15, etc.; and of greetings sent to various households, as Rom. xvi:10. And from these it is *inferred* that infants were baptized. But many living preachers have baptized far more households than are named in the New Testament, and yet never baptized an infant! We all know that many households have no infants. Besides, the circumstances do not favor the presence of infants in any of the households baptized. There is no evidence that Lydia ever had any children, and if she had, it is not probable that she would have them with her on a distant business tour. Her servants constituted her household. And it is clearly said that Paul preached to the jailer's household, and that they rejoiced, as it is said that they were baptized. If the jailer had children large enough to be preached to, and to rejoice (implying that they believed and obeyed), there could be no objection to their baptism.

Is it safe or wise to found an important doctrine and practice upon such passages? Are they not, to say the least, very doubtful? Surely they afford not sufficient authority for a positive ordinance. And yet these are the best that can be found for infant baptism. Hence, R. Baxter says: "I know of no one word in Scripture that giveth us the least intimation that ever man was baptized without the profession of a saving faith, or that giveth the least encouragement to baptize anyone on another's faith."

Erasmus says: "Paul does not seem in Rom. v:14 to treat about infants. ... It was not yet the custom for infants to be baptized."

Dr. Field says: "The baptism of infants is therefore named a *tradition*, because it is not expressly delivered in Scripture that the apostles did baptize infants, nor any express precept there found that they should do so."

Whately (A. b. p.) says: "The silence of the sacred! writers on the subject is, at least so far as any express directions are concerned, admitted on all hands."

So say Bishop Taylor, Hagenbach, Hahn, Lindner, Neander, Olshausen, Schliermacher, Von Coclin, Chillingworth, De La Roque, Dr. Owen, Salmasius, and Snicerus, and many others—all pedo-baptists.

This rule, which is not questioned by any party, and not to be denied by any candid investigator, forever excludes infant baptism; and would save us from many errors which have greatly troubled the church and hindered the gospel.

RULE FIFTEEN—*Observe the special reason given, if any, for the thing said or done, or to be done.*

#### EXEMPLIFICATIONS

1. *The Sabbath.*—Why keep the sabbath? There may be other reasons, but *three* are distinctly given, either of which was sufficient. 1. It was to be a *sign* between the children of Israel and God (Ex. xxxi:13; Ezek. xx:12-20). 2. God *rested* the seventh day, and therefore he required the Jews to rest (Ex. xx:11). 3. God *delivered* Israel, and therefore they should keep his sabbath in remembrance of this (Deut. v:15).

Besides being disobedience, to neglect to keep the sabbath was to disregard the divine example, to be forgetful of their deliverance, and to be careless as to the signs that distinguished them from all other people as the servants of the living God.

2. *Why destroy the inhabitants of Canaan, etc.?* The Jews were not only to destroy the people, and make no league with them, but also to break down their altars, cut down their groves, etc., and so far as possible remove the very name of their idols and a knowledge of their worship. This was not intended as *cruelty*. They deserved all they could suffer. The Supreme Ruler was far from being under obligation to them. He was not under obligation to bring them into being, or to keep them on the earth. There was no superior to whom he could be under obligation. But the reason

assigned for this stringent course is plain and commendable. It is: "For they will turn away thy son from following me (Deut. vii:4). "Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and go lewdly after their gods (Ex xxxiv:15, 16). "For surely they will turn away your heart after their gods" (1 Kings xi:2).

This precaution, while it worked no injustice to anyone was a wise precaution of a very gracious Father for his children. It establishes the principle that temptations should be removed, as well as resisted, when they are not removed God *tries* his people, as he tried Abraham, but never beyond what they should be able to bear. He does it for their good i.e., that they may not be deceived in themselves. He "tempts no man" to evil. Paul, in 1 Cor. xv:33, says: "Evil communications corrupt good manners." The idea is, evil associations. And in Phil, iii:2, he says: "Beware of evil workers." Rom. xvi:17 says of evil workers, "Avoid them." 2 These. iii:6, 14, says: "Have no company with him." We can all see the wisdom of avoiding evil company, temptations and dangers, and seeking all the aids we can get. If the Bible did not teach this, its enemies would have reason to complain of it. They complain now that it does this; their complaint is against all reason and all facts.

3. *Sparing and Punishing the Wicked.*—God sometimes spares the wicked long after they are ripe for destruction, that he may make an example of them, and so make them a warning to others, as in the case of Pharaoh (Rom. ix:22): "The vessels of wrath fitted to destruction." Ex., 1st to 15th chapters, show all this very fully. God would be honored in all this. 2 Pet. iii:9 says: God "is long suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." He would give them a further chance to repent and live.

4. *Why do the righteous suffer?*—King David says (Ps. cxix:67-71): "Before I was afflicted I went astray; but now have I kept thy word." . . . "It is good for me that



I have been afflicted, that I might learn thy statutes." These afflictions brought him back when he had gone astray; and they caused him to learn God's statutes. This is a good and very merciful reason. See also Jer. xxxi:18-19. Then Heb. xii:9, 10 says: "We have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence. Shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits and live? For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness." God's chastisements are all in mercy. In 2 Cor. xii:7, Paul says: "And lest I should be exalted above measure, through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan, to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure." Here we have two good and sufficient reasons given for the sufferings of saints, viz., 1. To keep them from being exalted, or otherwise going astray. 2. To bring them back when they have gone astray. This is not cruel. "As a father pitieth his child so the Lord pitieth those who put their trust in him." Blessed and hallowed Father! Our Father who art in heaven! Let us ever believe that he will make all things work for our good. We may not always see his hand or understand his purpose in allowing us to be afflicted, but we shall know hereafter.

5. *Why Jesus told the disciples beforehand.*—"Now I tell you before it come, that when it is come to pass you may believe that I am he" (John xiii:19). Jesus was careful to aid their faith. He would feed and strengthen it. And John xx:30, 31 tells of other signs, and why these are written. "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." How plain and sensible these reasons are! With his reason before us for doing or not doing, for requiring us to do, or forbidding our doing given things, we are far better prepared to understand these cases.

It is said that a sensible man always has a good and sufficient reason for what he does. When we read Acts

viii:38, 39, and see Philip and the eunuch wading down into the water, we may feel inclined to ask for the reason. If we remain silent, and witness Philip sprinkle a little water on the eunuch's head, and then come up out of the water, we might break silence and ask why they waded down into the water! No sensible reason could be given. But if we see Philip, after reaching a sufficient depth, *bury* the eunuch in the water and raise him again, and then come up out of the water, we would, without asking, see a good and sufficient reason for their going down into the water. Peter says (1 Peter iii:15): "But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts; and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear." As God gives us reasons for what he does, and largely for what he requires us to do or not to do, so he would have us to be ever ready with a good and sensible reason for what we do, etc.

6. *Why Jesus died.* He is very careful to tell us. "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself" (John x:17, 18). Luke xxiv:46, 47 tells us his death was a necessity. Man could not be saved without it. "Without the shedding of blood there was no remission" (Heb. ix:22).

RULE SIXTEEN—"*Meditate upon these things*" (1 Tim. iv:15).

#### EXEMPLIFICATIONS

Thoughtlessness, or lack of proper meditation and consideration, has been the ruin of the world. It is one great reason why people do not understand what they read. Gen. xxiv:63: "Isaac went out to meditate in the field"; and Rebecca came. Josh, i:8: "Thou shalt meditate therein day and night." Ps. i:2: "In his law doth he meditate day and night." Ps. lx iii:6: "And meditate on thee in the night watches"; cxix:15: "I will meditate in thy precepts"; cxliii:

5: "I meditate on all thy works." 1 Sam. i:16: "Out of the abundance of my meditations." Ps. cxix:97: "I love thy law, it is my meditation all the day"; cxix:99: "I have more knowledge than all my teachers, for thy testimonies are my meditations." Phil. iv:8: "Think on these things."

This is the one thing needful in the study of the holy Scriptures, when we are fairly at the work. Think, meditate, compare, reconsider, and correct; always holding the mind ready to see errors, new truths, or a better way of putting them. Count up the cost, look to the end, and the account there to be rendered.

Not long since a minister assigned as a reason for a very absurd and unjust course, that he had to account to his elder and bishop. Some one suggested that it might be well to remind him of the account he would have to give to his *Judge*. We are building for eternity. Let us count up the cost, "be circumspect," "vigilant," "earnest." This is "the one thing needful," and the danger is all on one side; that we will not give it sufficient consideration.

## CHAPTER X

### FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE

Figures a necessity; three manners of teaching—Types, Parables and Literal; what writers on Rhetoric say of figures—specimens of the hyperbole—the Bible manner of stating these things; meaning of Types and Parables, by various authors, etc. Rule I, exemplified, Luke xv; Rom. ix:20, 21; Jer. xviii, etc. The potter and clay, Matt. xxii; the king's wedding feast; Blair's Rhetoric, warnings and instructions.

Figurative language was a necessity. "The barrenness of language made it necessary to use words in a figurative sense; and to use figures." "An Indian chief, in an ordinary harangue to his tribe, uses more metaphors than a European would employ in an epic poem." "As a language progresses in refinement, precision is more regarded, and there is a tendency to give every object a distinct name of its own." The first writing for those at a distance was by making pictures on smooth surfaces. All ancient languages abounded in pictures and figures, as do the languages of all the wild tribes now. To understand these pictures and figures was and is, a study, and seldom yields complete satisfaction. We can learn more from them in a brief time; as from a globe or map of the world; but we cannot learn the minutiae.

Another reason for pictures and figures is, they serve very powerfully to impress the mind. Hence, we are returning to this style in our dictionaries and most scientific books, notwithstanding the refinement of our language and style.

The Bible, the most ancient of all books, abounds in types and figures from first to last, especially in the Old Testament, and during the personal ministry of the Savior. "Without a parable spake he not unto them" (Mark iv:34). The listening disciples did not understand all of these and asked explanations in private. Of course they are a study

for us, and we need all the aid we can get in this investigation. If we fail to understand them, the failure is not to be remedied.

#### THREE MANNERS OF TEACHING IN THE BIBLE

There are in the Bible, as will more fully appear further on, three ways of teaching; not three teachings, but three ways of teaching one great lesson:

1. The Types of the Old Testament.
2. The Parables of the Savior.
3. The literal teaching of the apostles.

These harmonize most happily; and to understand God's revelation we must study each. No Christian should be content without mastering at least several of the most important Old Testament Types; then as many at least, of the Savior's incomparable parables; and then the literal teaching of the apostles will be easier, clearer and more forcible.

#### WHAT WRITERS ON RHETORIC SAY OF FIGURES

Writers on rhetoric speak of "figures of orthography, etymology and syntax." These they arrange under "Figures of orthography, figures of etymology, figures of syntax, and figures of rhetoric." "Rhetoricians have devoted much attention to defining, analyzing, and classifying them; and, by making slight shades of difference sufficient grounds for the formation of new classes, have succeeded in enumerating more than two hundred and fifty." Such minuteness is of no practical use. It is affirmed that "Every figure of words, and every figure of speech, whether belonging to the poet, the orator, the historian, to the plain unlettered swain, or the more polished scholar, is found in the sacred writings." *Campbell*.

There are seven principal tropes (which mean, turning), viz.: the metaphor, the allegory, the meronymy, the synec-

doche, the irony, the hyperbole, and the catachresis. And we may safely say, "there is a great analogy and relation between them all." Hence it is not important, in this place, to dwell upon them in detail. The first president of Bethany College says, concerning figures of speech: "There are about twenty, which are regarded as principal." One of our leading works on rhetoric—Quackenbos—now used in our schools, says: "The sixteen principal figures are, simile, metaphor, allegory, meronymy, synecdoche, hyperbole, vision, apostrophe, personification, interrogation, exclamation, antithesis, climax, irony, apophasis, and anomotopoeia."

It would be easy, and rather a pleasant task, to follow these authors, give definitions of each figure, with various illustrations and facts in prose and poetry, and perhaps entertain the reader. But this would be out of place here. These matters are in reach of all who would study them. What is aimed at here is not scientific detail, but Bible teaching for the common people.

You see how standard authors vary in numbering and naming these figures. Let it be remembered that they all agree in saying "these minute distinctions are not so important." But if all kinds of figures are in the holy Scrip-lures, then we should acquaint ourselves with them, as we may be able. President Campbell says:

"A very superficial reader of the New Testament will observe that many errors were committed by the contemporaries of the Messiah and his apostles, from supposing them to speak without a figure, when they spoke figuratively. For example: Jesus said, 'Unless you eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, you have no life in you.' This occasioned some of his disciples to stumble and desert him. 'How,' said they, 'can this man give us his flesh to eat?' Again, 'Destroy this temple,' said Jesus, 'and in three days I will raise it up again.' The Jews understood the words *temple*, literally. Even some of the apostles erred in this way. 'If I will,' said he, 'that he (John) tarry till I come, what is that to you? follow me.' They understood him to speak of his literal coming in person; and reported that John would never die. The Samari-

tan woman made the same mistake when she said, 'the well is deep, and you have no bucket to draw, whence then have you this living water?' Hence we may learn that much depends on our being able to decide when words are to be understood figuratively, and when literally."

This learned author says at another time:

"The rankest error in the business of interpreting the Scripture, will be found to exist in confounding the figurative meaning of words, with the literal; or the literal with the figurative. Enthusiasm has two extremes—the one literalizes every thing; the other extreme spiritualizes every thing. The Romanist says the Savior literally meant what he said, when he said of the loaf, 'this is my body,' and of the cup, 'this is my blood.' And hence originated the doctrine of transubstantiation. A lady in New England, some time since, said that Jesus literally meant what he said, when he said to his disciples, 'If your right hand offend you, cut it off and throw it away.' Her right hand having offended her, she literally cut it off and threw it away! This is one extreme; the other consists in making words figurative which are not so; thus, 'The walls of Jericho fell down,' means that the arguments which sustain false religion were demolished before the approach of the new church of God under Jesus. 'And they blew the trumpets seven times,' means that the divine truth was brought down upon the bulwarks of error, complete and perfect," etc.

#### THE HYPERBOLE

Take a few scriptural examples of hyperbole (excess). "The mountains and hills shall break forth before you into singing; and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands" (Isa. lv:14). "His breath kindleth coals, and a flame goeth out of his mouth. His eyes are like the eyelids of the morning" (Job xli:18). So, "thy seed shall be as the sands of the sea, the dust of the earth, the stars of heaven." "Saul and Jonathan were swifter than eagles, they were stronger than lions" (2 Sam. i:23). "I make my bed to swim." "Rivers of waters run down mine eyes" (Ps. cxix:136). "If these should hold their peace the stones would cry out," etc.

These instances, while they might be indefinitely continued in illustration of all the principal figures of speech, may be sufficient to accomplish two ends:

1. To show the importance of understanding the figures of the Bible, and, consequently the rules and principles by which they may be understood.

2. To induce those who really desire to learn, to secure and study those works on rhetorical language which explain them. They are found in our schools of learning, and many other books, as Ernesti, Horn, Stewart, partly in our Bible dictionaries, and largely in our various encyclopedias, etc.

#### THE BIBLE MANNER OF PUTTING THESE MATTERS

While the Bible uses all the figures freely, it speaks especially of types and parables; the types of the Old Testament and the parables of the Great Teacher. And it may be sufficient here to speak only of these. The others, so far as they are not included in these, will be easily comprehended by the same rules that enable us to understand these.

Had the Bible been intended for the learned, no doubt all these figures would have been arrayed in very exact and imposing order. But it was designed to suit the common people. Hence as few as possible of learned distinctions are given. This work is designed to be like the Bible in this, as in other respects, and hence it will not go over these nicer and less important distinctions. It will carefully consider Bible types and parables; for here we need to be careful.

#### MEANING OF TYPES AND PARABLES

A *type* is "an emblem; that which represents something else; a sign, symbol, or figure of something to come; as Abraham's sacrifice and the paschal lamb are types of Christ. To this word is opposed antitype. Christ, in this case, is the antitype."—*Webster*. ,



Type is from the Greek *tupos*, and is found in the New Testament fourteen times. John xx:25; Acts vii:43, 44; xxiii:25; Rom. v:14; vi:17—"that form of doctrine"; 1 Cor. x:6, 11; Phil. iii:17; 1 Thes. i:7; 2 Thes. iii:9; 1 Tim. iv:14; Titus ii:7; Heb. viii:5; 1 Pet. v:3. And it is rendered *print, figures, fashion, manner, form, examples, en-samples, pattern*, in the common version. Other translations do not materially vary from these renderings. *Tupos* is traced to *tuptoo*, to strike; as when the metal type strikes the paper. The impression made on the paper is the antitype, or the thing set over against the type. It has in it always the idea of likeness, resemblance; and hence, comparison. Thus, Abraham's sacrifice is compared with Christ's sacrifice; the paschal lamb, with Christ as its antitype. In this a type resembles a parable.

"Parable is from *parabolee*, from *paraballoo*, to throw forward or against, to compare, and means an allegorical relation or representation of something real in life or nature, from which a moral is drawn for instruction; as the parable of the ten virgins" (Matt. xxv).—*Webster*.

*Parabolee* is found forty-eight times, and is rendered *parable* or *parables* forty-four times, comparison once, proverb once, figure twice.

The use of this term shows that it takes something real; as a vineyard, a wedding feast, a sheep-fold and shepherd, etc., with which the people were acquainted, to illustrate an unreal something, with which the people were not acquainted. Thus, "the kingdom of heaven is like unto a husbandman," etc. (Matt. xx:1). The kingdom of heaven was not then in existence; it was unreal. No one had ever seen it. And the best that could be done was to tell the people it was, or was to be, like something real and tangible, with which they were acquainted. In Matthew 13th chapter we have seven of these likenesses. The kingdom of heaven is like a sower; like a man sowing seed in his field; like a grain of mustard seed; like leaven; like treasure

hid in a field; like a merchant man seeking goodly pearls; like unto a net. With all these realities the people were acquainted; but with the kingdom of God, which was not then a reality, the people were not acquainted. And these parables were intended to give them the best idea possible concerning it.

But the likeness is not complete in any of the forty-eight instances. Each one illustrated at least one feature of the on-coming kingdom, sometimes indirectly a few others; but in several particulars in each there was no likeness; there were, indeed, marked points of *unlikeness*. "All flesh is as grass," but not in all respects. The grass soon withers and dies, so does all flesh. This, then, is the point of likeness here. The grain of mustard seed was like the kingdom in its smallness and its rapid growth to large proportions. But the kingdom is not like a grain of mustard seed (1) in being round; (2) in being decaying; (3) in being pungent. The kingdom of heaven is not now like a grain of mustard seed at all. Certainly it is not now small like a grain of mustard seed; nor is it so rapidly growing. Hence, we must consider the time and circumstances of all these great lessons, *what was, and what is*. Jesus is like the lord of the unjust steward in commending a preparation for the future; not in any thing unjust. The treasure hid in the field and the merchant man seeking goodly pearls illustrate the value of the kingdom. They sold all they had to secure that pearl, that goodly treasure; and never made so good a bargain before. It cost them all they had, but it gave them all they needed. It is surely wise to exchange all one has of earthly riches for all he can ever need of heavenly riches. The point of likeness in the parable of the net is, the final separation of the good and bad fish, or the righteous and wicked. The parable of the leaven shows the permeating nature of the heavenly Kingdom and its teaching. It "leavens the whole mass" In the parable of the sower, the principal point is the importance of good and honest hearts; illus-

trated by good ground. The wayside, the stony ground and the thorny ground brought no fruit to perfection, though the same seeds were sown there, and the same sunshine, showers and breezes were upon these that were on the good ground. The failure is accounted for entirely by the conditions of the ground. There are, perhaps, some other points of likeness, as the hard heart, by the wayside; the stony ground, the lack of understanding; the thorny ground, the cares of the world, the deceitfulness of riches, etc. But these are secondary, and not so plain. Hence,

FIRST RULE.—*While observing the rules for understanding unfigurative language, determine, by the context, principal point of analogy in each parable.*

#### EXEMPLIFICATIONS

In the three parables, Luke 15th chapter, the lost sheep, the lost piece of money, and the prodigal son, the object was the vindication, or justification, of the Savior in receiving sinners, which the scribes and Pharisees complained of. They show, also, the kindness of the father, the unkindness of the older brother, and the extreme folly and inconsistency of the Jews in their complaints.

2. In Rom. ix:20, 21; Isa. lxiv:8; Jer. xviii:6-10, we have the potter and the clay. The Lord is the potter, and the sinner is the clay. A preacher, who believed in total depravity, unconditional foreordination and election, and the utter inability of man to do anything towards his own salvation, said, "Why, here the sinner is the clay; can clay do any thing?" And his manner showed that he really thought that forever settled the question! Notice that God is as distinctly compared to the potter as the sinner is to the clay. Is God altogether like the potter? Is he frail, erring and dying? Of course not. Then the sinner is not altogether like the clay. God is like the potter in that he is the workman. The sinner is like the clay in that he is the

material worked. The workman can make of any lump of clay a good or bad vessel, as he chooses, or wills. Is there then any way by which man can control the divine will, and so cause God to make of him a good vessel? No man can carefully read Jeremiah xviii:1-10, and not see that this question is there answered. When God is about to make a man a good vessel, if he rebel, the workman makes him another vessel, "as it seems good to the potter to make him." And when he is about to make a bad vessel, if he repent, he turns and makes him a good vessel. Each one has, therefore, his own destiny in his own hands. Accordingly Paul says (2 Tim. ii:20, 21): "But in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and earth; and some to honor and some to dishonor. If a man, therefore, purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honor," etc. "If a man purge himself from these," vessels of dishonor, i.e., if he repents and turns to God, God will yet make him a good vessel. Every man may then be a good vessel if he "is willing and obedient." The point illustrated is, the supremacy of God, and the dependence of man. But, while God is altogether supreme, and man is entirely dependent, the Great Workman would make good vessels of every son and daughter of Adam, if they did not rebel against him. He is the true Master Workman, and holds us all in his hand. How happily it is said, "he delights not in the death of him who dieth, but rather that he repent and live!" Do not say that he would make a bad vessel of one soul, made originally in his own image! He wept over their folly! He died to save them, and will save all who are not "stubborn and rebellious," after all his forbearance, warnings and mercies! "He waits to be gracious," not willing that any should perish, but that all should turn and live.

3. In Matt. xxii:1-14, the king's wedding feast, the Teacher does not say his kingdom is like every marriage feast. Far from it. It is like one well provided and ready,

when the people invited would not come. This is the point of likeness: the extreme folly of refusing to come, and the evils that must follow. A secondary point seems to be, the manner in which we come. The man found without the wedding garment was cast out, unceremoniously, into outer, or utter darkness. He had shown disrespect for the king's house by coming without the wedding garment. If we attempt to come, we must come in the king's way, and with the king's requirements. But this man was as literally in the king's dining room as were the other guests. It may thence be argued that men may get into the church without the wedding garment. They are, in that case, *bastards*. "But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all (sons) are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons" (Heb. xii:8). These bastards are really in the family, but God is not their father. And, like the bad fish in the net, they are to be thrown away (Matt. xiii:47-49). The kingdom was and is like a drag-net. It gathers of every kind, but in the judgment the bad are all cast away. The church has bad fish, bastards, unworthy guests or members; but in the judgment they will be cast out. In Rev. xix:7, 8, we have the great marriage supper of the Lamb, the antitype of the king's marriage feast, Matthew xxii. The church is the bride, the Lamb's wife. "And to her it was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness (the righteous acts) of the saints." Verse 8. "The righteous acts of the saints"; not the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, as Calvinists and others say. This reading is too plain to admit of mistake. This man really in the king's dining room, the bastards really in the family, and the bad fish really in the net, certainly prove that people may be really in the church, and be like the bastards, bad fish, and the man without the wedding garment, i.e., without pure hearts and lives; right acts towards God and man; which are the final "fine linen, wedding garments of the bride, the Lamb's wife." But if a

change of heart were the entrance into the church and the new birth, the birth of the Spirit, then we should never catch any bad fish, or bastards, and no unworthy guests could ever enter the king's dining room. For, however bad they were the moment before, the entrance, if it were the change of heart, would make them good fish, real sons and worthy guests! This, however contrary to our former ideas, seems indisputable. It follows, then, that the way of entrance into the net, into the family, into the king's dining room, and into the church, is an external and bodily act, which a hypocrite can perform. Otherwise, hypocrites could never enter; and these bad people were as really in as were the worthy ones. As a foreigner can take the oath of abjuration and naturalization, and so become a citizen of our government, when his heart is in his fatherland, and he is loyal only to that land, so one may confess Christ (this is abjuration of Satan and sin), and be baptized (the oath of allegiance to the King eternal), when his heart is not in the divine service. He is, then, a bad fish in the net, a bastard in the family, and an unworthy guest at the king's marriage feast, a hypocrite in the church. But he is in. This is the point of analogy in these parables. After entering, with all due preparation, one may become an unworthy citizen, and a hypocritical church member; but entrance is the point of likeness secondarily illustrated in the feast for the marriage of the king's son. We must enter prepared, and live prepared, "keeping our garments unspotted from the world," or we will not have on the wedding garment at the great marriage feast, the grand antitype of all earthly feasts and honor. *First.*—We must come. "They would not come," and should never taste of the king's supper. *Second.*—They must come prepared, and live prepared, *i.e.*, according to the King's law, or never profit by all the rich provisions of the gospel. These are the points of likeness, as appears by the connection and circumstances.

4. In Luke xviii:10-14, we have the publican and the Pharisee; one stood and prayed, with much pharisaical self-importance, "thanking God that he was not as other men, or even as this publican," while the poor publican "standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes to heaven, but smote upon his breast saying, "God, be merciful to me, a sinner." Here, the single point of illustration is, the importance of humility and purity of heart. This is plain from the entire context and the circumstances. Without this humility and purity of heart, no prayer will avail, no worship will be accepted. This was the lack in the unworthy guest, the bastard and the bad fish. The attitude of the body is no more under consideration here than was the *justice* of the unjust steward, Luke xvi. The single point there illustrated is, the wisdom of preparing for the future. Verse 8, "He commended or approved the unjust because he had done wisely," not because he had acted unjustly toward his lord. How absurd to pretend, as haters of the Bible do, that God approved injustice. The only point of analogy was and is the wisdom of preparing for the future, which sinners are not doing. Hence their folly (Matt. vii:26). And just as absurd is it to claim the erect bodily posture for prayer from Luke xviii:10-14. The bodily attitude is not the point of analogy. It is manifestly the humility of heart; yet, if the bodily attitude was a point of analogy, it would utterly fail to prove the erect bodily attitude for prayer, which is that which it is summoned to prove; for, the fact that the publican stood, is no proof that he stood erect. It was the prevailing custom, "to bow with their faces towards the ground." And they often stood for hours on their knees, as thousands do now, before idols. Besides, the publican evidently bowed. He felt humbled, and "would not so much as lift up his eyes to heaven." Bowed low towards the earth, not daring to look up, he smote on his breast, and confessed that he was a sinner! How different

from the proud Pharisee. No wonder the poor and humble publican "went down justified rather than the other."

Blair's Rhetoric cautions the student against making "figures run on all-fours." He who pretends to find points of likeness where there are none, gets into the brush, and wounds himself with briars and thorns. Many striking examples might here be given. These may suffice to show the importance of finding, by the context, the points of likeness, and not insisting on other points, or urging points clearly not analogous. When we have the point or points of likeness we are safe, if we investigate these points carefully.



## CHAPTER XI

### FIGURES FOUNDED ON FACTS

Second Rule; Figures and Facts; Exemplifications; how to find the literal meaning; the steward, Luke xvi; rich man and Lazarus; meaning of the facts stated; lessons taught; shadows and substances; Third Rule; must harmonize figures with literal teaching; various exemplifications and expositions of Scriptures; parable of the tares, Matt. xiii; withdrawing from the incorrigible; Rule Fourth; all have one leading point of likeness; exemplifications and expositions of many passages; how to determine when language is figurative; three rules for this; Ernesti, Campbell; observing the context; scope, analogy of Scripture; many passages explained; little children brought to the Savior; analogy of faith; allegorical language; symbolic and mystical action.

SECOND RULE.—*Figures are founded on real or supposed facts, and have a meaning as real and literal as the facts themselves.*

It is important to understand this. For how common it is to hear persons say, in answer to testimony they cannot otherwise dispose of, "O that is *figurative* language!" And they seem to think that this fact, if it is a fact, is entirely sufficient to destroy its force! For all correct figures there is a solid foundation in facts; and then there is meaning in them as real and important as in literal language.

#### EXEMPLIFICATIONS

*As to the foundation:* Were there not literal vineyards, sheep-folds and shepherds, seed-sowing, wedding feasts, tares or darnel coming up with the wheat, wise and foolish virgins, armies, armor, weapons, commanders, and soldiers? Were there not literal prodigal sons, lost pieces of money, and sheep straying from the fold? Were there not literal vines and orchards, with fruitless branches and trees? Were

there not fish nets, the catching of bad and good fish, and their separation on the shore? Were there not rich and proud men, and poor and humble men, like the rich man and Lazarus? Was there not literal leaven, and did not women then as now put leaven into the meal or flour to leaven it? Where is one of the parables of the Savior that has not a real fact for its foundation?

*As to the meaning of each parable:* Was not the *effect* of the leaven as real as the leaven itself? Did not owners of vineyards hire laborers in their vineyards, and pay them their hire? Did not vine dressers and orchardists cultivate their vines and trees, and remove the barren trees and branches? And so of all the others? If these Bible figures had a real foundation and a real meaning and purpose, let us inquire as to their meaning and purpose. When we get these we will have the literal of the figures. This will be reducing the figurative to the literal.

1. In Luke, 16th chapter, we have the parable of the unjust steward, to impress the disciples with their responsibility and danger; and it is applied to them with great plainness and force from the 9th to the 13th verse. Then verse 14 says: "And the Pharisees also, who were covetous, heard all these things; and they derided him." From 15 to 18, Jesus replies directly to these proud, deriding Pharisees; and then gives the case of the rich man and Lazarus from the 19th to the 31st verse. Read carefully, for there never was and cannot be a more emphatic historic record of matters of fact:

"There was a certain rich man, and he was clothed in purple and fine linen, faring sumptuously every day; and a certain beggar named Lazarus was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table; yea, even the dogs came, and licked his sores. And it came to pass that the beggar died, and that he was carried away by the angels into Abraham's bosom; and the rich man also died, and was buried. And in hades he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried, and said, Father

Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue, for I am in anguish in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou, in thy life time, received thy good things, and Lazarus in like manner, evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art in anguish. And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, that they which would pass from hence to you may not be able, and that none may cross over from thence to us. And he said, I pray thee, therefore, father, that thou wouldst send him to my father's house, for I have five brethren, that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. But Abraham saith: They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. And he said, nay Father Abraham: but if one go to them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him, if they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, if one rise from the dead." (R.V.)

Note here a few things:

1. All this is plain, historic style. The statements must be *facts*, or the narrative is *false*.

2. There is nothing in the narrative contradictory, absurd, impossible, or paradoxical, to hinder us from receiving it as true in all its parts. Observe other facts stated: It is not more clearly stated that "a certain king made a marriage feast for his son." Was not that feast a literal matter of fact? It is not more clearly stated that "a certain man went in search of goodly pearls." Was not that a literal matter of fact?

3. Parables state facts, and then the teacher *compares* the things to be taught with these facts. The facts stated illustrate the lesson to be taught; as, "a man had a hundred sheep, and one of them went astray." The shepherd "goes in search of it till he finds it," and then rejoices. This fact illustrates the care and the course of good shepherds.

4. The lessons taught by the Savior to the proud Pharisees, in this case, are (1) the folly and vanity of earthly riches and pleasures; (2) that there is a future life, where rewards and punishments will be just and equal; (3) that the dead still have a conscious existence, and "know each

other there"; (4) that there can be no change after death; (5) that there was no power equal to Moses and the prophets to bring sinners to repentance; surely there can be none now equal to Christ and the apostles, though one came from the dead; (6) that the wicked in torment remember their friends on earth, are concerned about them, and would send missionaries to them if they could.

5. All these things are presented as facts in this case, and they furnish a lesson nowhere else given so forcibly to rich and proud Pharisees. For, as it was with this rich man, so will it be with others who die in their sins! And what an unspeakable comfort to all the poor Lazaruses of earth, if they are true servants of God! For their *poverty* will not save them.

6. There is not the slightest reason for so spiritualizing this very forcible parable as to refer it to the Jews and Gentiles, or to anything but the case in hand; the lesson that the proud Pharisees needed, and that all the wicked need now to remind them of the vanity of all earthly things, the deceitfulness of sin, the necessity for listening to Moses and the prophets, to Christ and the apostles, and preparing for the future life.

7. As shadows go out from substances, as from an erect pole in the bright sunlight, so these facts shadow forth unerringly the future state of the righteous and the wicked. This is the meaning and this the end to be accomplished by this narrative of the facts in the case of the rich man and Lazarus.

8. While all these matters were *facts*, it does not follow that none of the language of the narrative is figurative. There is no reason for concluding that there was or is any literal flame or fire in hades, or in hell, or that there can be any literal water there. But there is something there that is real and literal answering to these, and that is best illustrated by these. We read of a "book of life" in heaven, and no one supposes there is any such *literal* book there;

but there is something literal there which answers to a book, and is best illustrated by a book. We read, too, of gold-paved streets, jasper walls, pearly gates, etc. No one presumes these things are literal. But these represent something real that is there. So of many other things. The place and its glory are real and eternal. The things used to illustrate these may not be eternal. We may find riches and glories infinitely beyond all gold and pearls. Figurative language is used to describe matters of fact; as when it is said of Saul and Jonathan, "They are swifter than eagles; they are stronger than lions." The literal strength and swiftness of Saul and Jonathan are illustrated by this simile.

9. The common mistake in this case is, in concluding that, because there is some figurative language used in the narrative, as gulf, fire, flame, water, etc., there is no reality at all in it. The facts are real, and the meaning is real; but some of the language is figurative; as in the case of Saul and Jonathan. This is true of the narrative before the death of either the rich man or Lazarus. "He desired to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table," we all understand does not mean simply literal crumbs, and no more than crumbs. He desired food. "Go and tell that fox" is figurative language forcibly describing Herod. Was he not a literal man? So hades and its punishments are literal facts, though described in figurative language; i.e., illustrated by literal facts used as figures or comparisons.

THIRD RULE.—*Figurative language must be so construed as to harmonize with unfigurative language that is clear and plain.*

#### EXEMPLIFICATIONS

However plausible the construction given of the rich man and Lazarus, it might be objected to if it could be shown to conflict with the plain, literal language of other Scriptures. But the plain, literal language of many passages teaches the same. Thus:

"The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God" (Ps. ix:17).

"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal" (Matt. xxv:46).

"When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven . . . taking vengeance on them that know not God and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction (banishment) from the presence of the Lord," etc. (2 These. i:7-9).

A construction different from the one given would bring it into conflict with these and all the numerous Scriptures of this class.

The parable of the tares, Matt. xiii:24-30, is construed by some so as to keep all the bad people in the church till the judgment! They quote verse 30: "Let both grow together till harvest," the end of the world. But this plainly conflicts with various passages ordering the church to put such away; as 1 Cor. v:5, "to deliver such an one to Satan," etc.; and "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly" (2 These. iii:6); "If any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed" (2 These. iii:14).

And when we look at the parable of the tares again, and read the Savior's explanation of it, we at once see its beautiful harmony with these and all other Scriptures. See Matt. xiii:38, where Jesus says: "The field is the world," not the church. This parable has reference to the *territory* of the kingdom, and hence is as wide as the world; and when Jesus said, "Let both grow together until harvest," etc., he simply forbade the use of carnal weapons to spread his gospel. If the people of the world will not accept of it, let them alone till the judgment. Do not try to root up and destroy the tares, lest you destroy the wheat also. "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord." But he

commands withdrawing fellowship from unfaithful church members.

FOURTH RULE.—*All parables, tropes, similes, metaphors, etc., have one particular point of analogy; often but one; and all other seeming points of analogy are secondary, and generally less clear and forcible.*

#### EXEMPLIFICATIONS

"All flesh is as grass" (1 Pet. i:24). "As the flower of the grass he shall pass away" (Jas. i:10). This last clause gives the point of likeness: "he shall pass away." There is no other point of likeness. What would be thought of one who would claim that the likeness here was in the color, shape, or size of the grass?

In Matt. xiii:44-47, we have the parable of the treasure hid in a field, and of a merchant man seeking goodly pearls. These present a single point of likeness, the *value* of the kingdom. It is wise to secure it, if to do so we must sell all we have, owing to its real value.

Some narratives, like that of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke 16, and the young man who called on the Savior (Matt. xix:16-26), give us several points of likeness, but beyond the first they are not generally so clear. Many other exemplifications might be given here.

#### HOW TO DETERMINE WHEN LANGUAGE IS FIGURATIVE

President Campbell, after showing how to determine the meaning of words and figures, says: "A more difficult lesson is yet to be learned with respect to figurative language, and that is to know certainly when it *is* figurative, or to be understood figuratively." If we construe unfigurative language as tropical we make utter confusion and uncertainty. And if we take figurative language to be literal, we render it practically impossible, and otherwise absurd. Hence he makes out, from Ernesti and Morus, the following rules:

"The literal meaning is not to be deserted without evident reason or necessity. But this necessity occurs in the following cases:

*First.* When the literal meaning involves an impropriety or an impossibility; such as Isa. i:25. 'I will purge away thy dross, and take away all thy sin.' This applied to the Jews would be literally impossible. 'I have made thee (Jeremiah) a defenced city, an iron pillar, and brazen walls, against the whole land.' This, again, would literally involve an impossibility, and must therefore be taken figuratively.

*Second.* The literal must be given up, if the predicate (or that which is affirmed) be incompatible with or contrary to the subject of which it is affirmed. 'Hear this word, O you kine of Bashan, that are on the mountains of Samaria, that oppress the poor and crush the needy; that say to their masters, Bring, and let us drink' (Amos iv:1). Now if the subject, viz., the kine of Bashan, be understood literally of cattle, the predicates to *oppress*, *crush*, and *slay*, cannot possibly apply to it; but taken figuratively, of the luxurious matrons of Samaria, they do apply and make good sense.

*Third.* When the literal meaning of words is contrary, either to common sense, to the context, to parallel passages, or to the scope of a passage, it must be given up. 'Awake, why sleepest thou?' *Sleepest* cannot literally apply to God; for David, who thus speaks, Ps. xlv:23, says in another Psalm, 'He that keeps Israel does not sleep.' In Isa. xlv, 'filth of the daughter Zion,' from the scope of the passage, which immediately speaks of the blood of Jerusalem, must be understood figuratively. 'To change night into day' is a moral impossibility; therefore Job xvii:12 must be taken tropically."

**It may be better to give also what Ernesti and Stewart, of Andover, say on this point, thus:**

"We may commonly understand at once, whether a word is to be understood tropically or not, by simply examining the object spoken of, either by the external or internal senses, or by renewing the perception of the object. To judge of figurative language in such cases is very easy; and, in uninspired writings, it very rarely happens that there is any doubt about it; because the objects spoken of are such as may be examined by our senses, external or internal, and therefore it may easily be understood.

"In the Scriptures, however, doubts have frequently arisen from the nature of the subjects there treated; which are such as cannot be subjected to the examination of our senses. Thus, the divine nature, divine operations, etc., are subjects beyond the scrutiny of



our senses; and the question whether the language that respects such things is to be understood literally or tropically has given rise to fierce controversies, which are still continued. . . .

"To the language which respects God and his operations may be added, all that respects the invisible things of a future state, i.e., heaven, hell, etc. The controversy whether descriptions of this nature are to be literally or tropically understood is by no means at an end. One of the things which the human mind learns very slowly is, to detach itself from conceptions that arise from material objects, and to perceive that in *all* descriptions of a future state words are of absolute necessity used which originally have a literal sense, *because language affords no other*. Even the internal operations of our mind, we are obliged for the same reason, to describe in language that of necessity *must* be tropically understood. Almost all men, indeed, now allow that most of the language employed to describe God and his operations is necessarily to be understood as tropical. Most men will allow that the language which respects the heavenly world may be so considered; but what regards the day of judgment or the world of woe, they would strenuously contend must be literally understood. There is indeed, sufficient inconsistency in this, and it betrays no small degree of unacquaintance with the nature and principles of interpretation; but as it is productive of no consequences especially bad, the error is hardly worth combating. The motive no doubt may be good that leads to the adoption of this error. The apprehension is, that if you construe the language that respects the day of judgment or the world of woe,, figuratively, you take away the *reality* of them. Just as if reality did not, of course, lie at the basis of all figurative language, which would be wholly devoid of meaning without it. But how inconsistent, too, is this objection! The very person who makes it admits that the language employed to describe God and his operations, and also to describe the heavenly world, is *tropical*, and that it must of necessity be construed so. But does this destroy the *reality* of God and his operations, and of the heavenly world?

"Who is ignorant of the innumerable controversies that have arisen about the tropical and literal sense of a multitude of passages in the sacred writings? Almost all the enthusiasm and extravagance that have been exhibited in respect to religion have had no better support than gross material conceptions of figurative language; or, not unfrequently, language that should be *properly* understood, has been tropically construed. There is no end to the mistakes on this ground. Nor are they limited to enthusiasts and

fanatics. They develop themselves not unfrequently in the writings of men, grave, pious, excellent, and in other parts of theological science, very learned. Indeed, it is but a recent thing that it has come to be considered as a science, and a special and essential branch of theological science, to study the nature of language, and above all, the nature of the oriental biblical languages. Long has this been admitted as respects the classics, and all works of science in ancient languages. But in regard to the Bible, the most ancient book in the world, and written in a language the idiom of which is exceedingly diverse from our own, it seems to have been very generally taken for granted that no other study was necessary to discover its meaning than what is devoted to any common English book. At least, a Bible with marginal references, studied by a diligent and careful use of these references, might surely be understood in a most satisfactory manner. In very many cases the *first* thing has been, to study theology; the *second*, to read the Bible, in order to find proofs of what had already been adopted as matter of belief. This order is now beginning to be reversed. The nature of language, of Scripture language, of figurative language, and of interpretations, is now beginning to be studied as a science, the acquisition of which is one of the greatest ends of study; as it is the only proper mode of leading a theologian to a knowledge of what the Bible really contains. Here, too, is a common arbiter of the disputes that exist in the Christian world. The nature of language, and of tropical words thoroughly understood, will remove from all intelligent and candid men, who really love the truth, a great part of all the diversities of opinion that exist."

These learned authors do not exaggerate the difficulties in understanding the language and the figures of the Bible, or the necessity for rules and extensive investigation; nor do they overestimate the importance of this attainment when they say, "The nature of language and of tropical words thoroughly understood will remove ... a great part of all the diversities of opinion that exist." They might have added that nothing else can ever remove these diversities of opinion, or heal the divisions that have grown out of them. The importance of this knowledge is therefore apparent. Nothing can take its place or do its work. The reader should, consequently, be patient with these somewhat tedious rules and

principles of investigation, and be as thorough as possible in his investigations.

When we have decided that a word or passage of Scripture is to be understood figuratively, the next point is to interpret the metaphor by corresponding and appropriate terms. To do this, in addition to what has been said on the subject, let us for a moment hear the learned Home. He says that in doing this: "We must inquire in what respects the thing compared, and that with which it is compared, respectively agree; and also in what respects they have any affinity or resemblance; for as a similitude is concealed in every metaphor, it is only by diligent study that it can be elicited; by carefully observing the points of agreement between the proper and the figurative meaning." To have the contrast properly before us, we should notice carefully the points of disagreement. This contrast will give the literal of the figure, the lesson taught.

And the proverbs and figures drawn from the ancients must be considered historically. That is, the age of the world, the character of the people, the place and circumstances must all be considered. In the region of the trade winds a man of uniform habits is said to be "as steady as the wind." With us, an inconstant man is said to be "as fickle as the wind." The metaphors are reconciled by observing the history of the winds where these figures are used. Jesus said the kingdom of heaven was like a mustard seed, and so it was at first. It is not now, and never will be again. He said, also, of the "strait and narrow way," "few there be that find it." This, too, was strictly true then. It is by no means true now; and never will be true again in any future age.

FOURTH RULE. THE CONTEXT.—*In very difficult passages we should more carefully observe the context.*

The habit of isolating words and phrases, so common in the early part of this century, was a great barrier to Bible knowledge. A man took the word "malt" for a text, and

with no reference to the context, made his sermon on *m-a-l-t*. It had much more fun than gospel in it. One class of people can see almost their entire system in the word "sanctify," or "sanctification." They not only do not look to the context but misunderstand the meaning of the word. Another class see "baptize" in the word "sprinkle" wherever it occurs. Several times in debate, we have heard Ezek. xxxvi:25 quoted to prove baptism, and that sprinkling was baptism. Here, too, is an overlooking or mistake as to the meaning of the word "sprinkle," and an entire disregard of the context and circumstance which appear in the context. In Num. xix the holy water is given, and its use, *to cleanse*; and it was never sprinkled on the clean, but always on the unclean, "to cleanse them." And the Jews were at the time Ezekiel wrote this lesson in bondage to their enemies, on account of their sins. Ezekiel was one of the captives, and wrote this there by the river Chebar, giving a promise from God that he would restore them to their own land. And then would he sprinkle this holy water upon them to cleanse them. This, when understood, makes it very plain. But to isolate "sprinkle" here is to leap in the dark, and to fall into the ditch. One of the learned writers who has already given us some good lessons, says:

"Another most important assistance for investigating the meaning of words and phrases is the consideration of the context, or the comparison of the preceding and subsequent parts of a discourse. If we analyze the words of an author, and take them out of their proper series, they may be so distorted as to mean anything but what he intended to express. Since, therefore, words have several meanings, and consequently are to be taken in various acceptations, a careful consideration of the preceding and subsequent parts will enable us to determine that signification, whether literal or figurative, which is best adapted to the passage in question.

"To investigate the context of a passage, it will be desirable to investigate each word of every passage; and as the connection is formed by particles, these should always receive that signification which the subject matter and context require"

## THE SCOPE OF A PASSAGE OR BOOK

A very learned author, just at hand, gives six rules for determining the scope of a passage or book. All these are well included in our other rules and examples, and need not be detailed here.

## ANALOGY OF SCRIPTURE

By this is meant the parallel passages. It is not intended to assert that any two words are exact synonyms; still it cannot be denied that many words are analogous. Some of them mean almost precisely the same. To say the least, many passages and books are very much like others: they are analogous. This is true of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Still they are not precisely alike in all respects. They never conflict, but one is fuller at one point; another is fuller at a different point. The analogy of Scripture requires us to consider together, connectedly, all the Scriptures on the same subject. No one can understand the birth, life, miracles, death, and resurrection of the Savior so well from reading Matthew alone. We need to study the other biographies also. No one can so well understand a subject from the study of it as it is presented in a single passage as he can by studying all the analogous or parallel passages.

## EXEMPLIFICATIONS

Matt. xix:23 says: "A rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven."

Mark x:23 says: "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God."

Luke xviii:24 says: "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God."

Matt. xix:24 says: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God."

Mark x:24 says: "How hard it is for them that trust in riches to enter the kingdom of God."

Now, with all these analogous narratives before us, can we not better understand the danger of riches than we could from any one of them? Studying them all, we conclude,

1. They all teach the same; they do not conflict.

2. Therefore (1) a rich man; (2) they that have riches; (3) they that trust in riches, all mean substantially the same. The rich are they that have riches, and the manifest reason why it is dangerous to have riches, or be rich, is, "where your treasure is there will your heart be also"; that is, you are almost sure to love and trust in riches if you have them. And this is made more plain by other analogous Scriptures; as, Matt. xiii:22; Mark iv:19. "The cares of the world, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lust of other things entering in, choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful." Luke viii:14 says they "are choked with the cares and riches and pleasures of this life."

Paul, in 1 Tim. vi:9, says: "They that will be rich (the improved and correct rendering is, those who *wish* to be rich) fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition." He does not say there is danger, or a tendency to fall into these ruinous errors and sins; he says they *do this*, and he does not make any exception. Often have we all heard men say, with a dry and meaning smile at this point, "Well, maybe so, but we would like very much to risk it." This shows how weak their faith in Christ is, how blindingly strong their love of money is, and how very little they know of themselves and the deceitfulness and danger of riches!

#### LITTLE CHILDREN ARE BROUGHT TO THE SAVIOR

Matt. xix:13-15 says "that he might put his hands on them and pray"; "and he laid his hands on them." Mark x:13 says "that he might touch them." Luke xviii:15 says "that he would touch them." Now, if the object in carrying the children to Jesus was not given, or anywhere alluded to, it would be wholly con-

jectural. No one would have a right to say what it was— baptism, healing them, or making them great people when grown up. But the object is distinctly stated, and these several passages make it most clear. This was according to a well-established patriarchal custom and faith, that wise and godly men could cause a blessing to come on children by laying their hands on them. Hence, Jacob laid his hands on Ephraim and Manasseh, and on his own sons near his death, etc. How wonderfully wrong to build a custom on children being brought to the Savior that is not only not mentioned or alluded to, but is contrary to the reason clearly mentioned! And Jesus says, as a reason for permitting the little children brought to him, "Of such is the kingdom of God" (Luke xviii:16, 17); and "verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein." Here is a parable, a comparison. Little innocent children are compared to the right condition of heart for entering the kingdom. Wherein is the point of likeness? Certainly not in their size, age, or avoirdupois. Little children are morally pure and entirely innocent, and feel their dependence on a stronger arm. They are not guilty of Adam's sin, or of any other sin. No law was ever given to infantile innocence. They have transgressed no law, and therefore cannot be sinners. They are the best representatives of the moral purity, of heavenly dwellers that the earth affords. The lamb is the emblem of innocence; and Jesus is "the lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world." Little children are, by universal habit, called lambs, because they represent entire innocence and purity. To be thus morally pure is the preparation for entering the kingdom. It is not being in it, but the preparation for entering it. What a beautiful point of analogy! To those aspiring to greatness among men, Jesus, calling a little child, said: "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye cannot enter the kingdom of heaven"; those thus humbled are "the greatest in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. xviii:1-4). And very young

persons were believers in Jesus, not infants, as in the other cases; and hence this notice. (See Matt. xviii:6.) "Whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck and that he were drowned in the depths of the sea" (Mark ix:42; Luke xvii:2). Here, though the language is somewhat analogous, the meaning is different. The point here made is, the sacredness of Christian feeling, even of the humblest believer in Jesus. What must be the terrible fate of those church rulers who, for the sake of a humanism not necessary to the worship, will offend both the weak and the strong believers in Christ! For their simple preference they cast them out, as did Diotrephes of old! (3 John 10).

Reference Bibles are valuable in finding analogous passages, but it should be remembered that they are far from being exhaustive; and that many of their references are incorrect, i.e., not analogous. Many persons take for granted that they are both complete and reliable, and are led far astray. Cruden's large Concordance is good, and Young's Analytical Concordance is better.

#### HUMAN ANALOGIES OF FAITH

Humanly devised systems of theology have much to say of the "Analogy of Faith." Dr. G. Campbell says that with every sect "the analogy of faith is their own system alone." Then he adds: "In vain do we search the Scriptures for their testimony concerning Christ, if, independently of these testimonies, we have received a testimony from another quarter, and are determined to admit nothing, as the testimony of the Scriptures, which will not perfectly quadrate with that formerly received. This was the very blindness of the Jews in our Savior's time. They searched the Scriptures as much as we do; but in the disposition they were in, they could never have discovered what that sacred volume testifies of Christ. Why? Because their great rule of interpretation was 'the analogy of faith'; or, in other words, the system of the Phari-



sean scribes, the doctrine then in vogue, and in the profound veneration of which they had been educated. This is that veil by which the understandings of that people were darkened, even in reading the law; of which the apostle observed that it 'remained unremoved in his day,' and of which we ourselves have occasion to observe, that it remains unremoved in ours."

"When a Lutheran tells you, 'you are to put no interpretation on any portion of Scripture but what perfectly coincides with "the analogy of the faith," ' sift him ever so little on the import of this phrase, and you will find that, if he means anything, it is that you are to admit no expositions that will not exactly tally with the system of his great founder, Luther Nor is he singular in this. A Calvinist has the same prepossession in favor of the scheme of Calvin, and an Arminian of that of Arminius. Yet they will all tell you with one voice, that their respective doctrines are to be tried by Scripture, and by Scripture alone. 'To the law and to the testimony,' is the common cry; only every one of them, the better to secure the decision on the side he has espoused, would have you previously resolve, to put no sense whatever on the law and the testimony, but what his favorite doctor will admit. Thus they run on in a shuffling circular sort of argument, which, though they studiously avoid exposing it, is, when dragged into the open light, neither more nor less than this: 'You are to try our doctrine by the Scriptures only. But then you are to be very careful that you explain the Scriptures solely according to our doctrine.' A wonderful plan of trial, which begins with giving judgment, and ends with examining the proof, wherein the whole skill and ingenuity of the judges are to be exerted in wresting the evidence, so as to give it the appearance of supporting the sentence pronounced beforehand."

There is a complete harmony in all the holy Scriptures, and therefore "the whole system of revelation must be explained, so as to be consistent with itself. When two passages seem to be contradictory, if the sense of the one can be clearly

ascertained, in all such cases, that must regulate our interpretation of the other." Thus, "If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (1 John i:8). This is equal to saying: If we say we never sin, etc. And this was addressed to all the Christians in the world, A.D. 90. Then it is said: "He that committeth sin is of the devil"; and "whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin"; "we know that whatsoever is born of God sinneth not" (1 John iii:8, 9; v:10). Here is an apparent contradiction. The first quotation expresses a truth very often and very clearly expressed, both in the Old and in the New Testaments. Peter dissembled ten years after he was baptized in the Holy Spirit; and Paul did not count himself to be perfect. He, when far advanced in life, "found another law in his members warring against the law of his mind," etc. This accords with the experience of others, and with Solomon's declaration that "there is not a just man upon the earth that liveth and sinneth not." The other two seem to assert that the righteous do not sin. But the first is plain and certain, and the others must be construed to agree with it, or we have a contradiction. Look again at the two last quotations, consider the context; and you will readily see that the very common idea is the correct one, viz., that those born, or rather, begotten of God, do not sin habitually. They may sin occasionally, but it is not their habit. This beautifully harmonizes with the other, and with all the Bible on the subject. Thus, all obscure, ambiguous, and figurative words and sentences may be construed so as to harmonize with the plain and unambiguous, whether they agree with Luther, Calvin, or any other man or men. "All opinions, doctrines, and practices, which are founded on a single word, or a sentence or two, contrary to the general scope and repeated declarations of the holy Scriptures, are to be wholly repudiated. Of this class are 'auricular confession' to a priest, 'extreme unction,' the building of the church on Peter, purgatorial fire, etc., of the Roman sect." . . . But we have much reason for gratitude, that everything necessary

to our acceptance with God, to religion and morality, is so often repeated and so fully expressed, that no honest mind can possibly err, who will apply himself to what is written; and, as Dr. Doddridge says, "I am more and more convinced, that the vulgar sense of the New Testament, that is, the sense in which an honest man of plain sense would take it on his first reading the original, or any good translation, is almost everywhere the true general sense of any passage; though an acquaintance with language and antiquity, with an attentive meditation of the text and context, may illustrate the spirit and energy of a multitude of passages, in a manner which could not otherwise be learned." See also our rule nine, and the exemplifications there given

#### ALLEGORICAL LANGUAGE

It is said of the allegory that, "In it one thing is expressed, and another, entirely different from it, is meant." An allegory turns a true history into a symbol, and makes it represent another subject; as when Paul allegorized the history of Hagar and Ishmael, and Sarah and Isaac, owing to their aptness to picture out, or represent the two Testaments, and the people under them (Gal. iv:24-31).

The Egyptians are accredited with the invention of picture writing, and the allegorical style of communicating their sentiments. And MacKnight gives five reasons for their doing so. These do not much concern us. Nor is it, to us, a matter of importance to find where the Jewish prophets got this style. They had it; and to understand it should be our purpose.

Learned authors tell us of four kinds of allegories: 1. The proper allegory. 2. The apologue, or fable. 3. The parable. 4. The enigma.

The enigma, or riddle "was a mysterious assemblage of different symbols, set forth either in verbal discourse, or by presenting the symbols themselves to the eye. Either way exhibited, the meaning of the assemblage was so dark that it required the greatest ingenuity to discover it. Of the verbal

enigma, Samson's riddle is an example" (Judges xiv:12). Another example is found in Ezek. xvii:2-11. "Of the symbolical enigma Herodotus has recorded a remarkable instance, Hist. Lib. 4. 128-130, where he tells us, that when Darius Hystaspes invaded Scythia, the Scythian king sent him a present, of a bird, a mouse, a frog, and five arrows. This Gobryas, one of Darius' generals, considering it as an enigma, interpreted it in the following way: That unless the Persians could fly through the air like birds, or hide themselves in the earth like mice, or swim through the lakes like frogs, they should not return to their own country, but be slain by the arrows of the Scythians."

All allegories have two senses: *First*, the literal sense exhibited in the verbal description, or in the visible symbol. *Second*, the remote sense concealed under the literal sense, or under the invisible symbol. Wherefore, in every allegory, the first or literal sense is itself the sign of the second or hidden meaning, called the figurative sense of the allegory. And this figurative sense should be as distinctly manifest by the literal sense of the allegory, as the literal sense is exhibited, whether by the verbal description, or by the visible symbol. Properly speaking, therefore, the first or literal sense constitutes the body of the allegory, and the second or figurative sense, its soul. In compositions of this kind, if rightly formed, the literal sense ought to be perfectly plain; and the only exercise of one's ingenuity ought to be, not in understanding the literal sense, but in finding out its concealed meaning. See Hab. ii:6; Micah ii:4; Isa. xlvii; Ezek. xxix. Those wishing to study allegories will find other examples in Ezek. xxxii:2; xx:46-49; Isa. iii:1, 2, xxiii:15-17; xiii:10; Joel ii:31, 32, etc. Examples of the allegory set forth in dreams and visions are found in Gen. xli:17; Dan. iv; Ezek. i; iv:28, etc.

This style is not so common in the New Testament, and no more space is occupied with it than really seems necessary. See MacKnight on the epistles, Vol. VI: pp. 242-245.

## SYMBOLIC OR MYSTICAL ACTION

In all ages and countries, and among all people, it has been a custom to accompany words with corresponding gestures and actions. This was more common when words were less copious and expressive, and especially in the east. The Scriptures abound in this, and a few examples will sufficiently set it forth.

In Gen. xxiv:2, Abraham required his servant to put his hand under his thigh, and swear that he would not take a wife for Isaac from among the Canaanites. Jacob, before his death, required Joseph to put his hand under his thigh, and swear (Gen. xlvii:29). On seeing Joseph's coat, Jacob "rent his clothes" and mourned. Renting the clothes was common on such occasions, and always signified great grief "When Ahab heard Elijah's words, he rent his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his flesh," etc (1 Kings xxi:27). These actions were symbolic of great distress. Ahijah caught Jeroboam's mantle and rent it in twelve pieces, saying, "take thee ten pieces," etc. (1 Kings xi:30). Zedekiah made him horns of iron, and said, "thus saith the Lord, with these shalt thou push the Syrians," etc. (1 Kings xxii:11).

Elisha said to the king of Israel, "smite upon the ground," and he smote three times, and stayed. And the man of God was angry, and said, "Thou shouldest have smitten five or six times; then hadst thou smitten Syria till thou hadst consumed it, but now thou shalt only smite it three times" (2 Kings xiii:18). In this case the king did not understand the symbolic action. "I shook my lap, and said, so God shake every man out of his house, and from his labor, that performeth not this promise; even thus be he shaken out and emptied" (Neh. v:13). And Ezek. xxi:6, 7, "Sigh, therefore, thou son of man, with the breaking of thy loins, and with bitterness sigh before their eyes And it shall be, when they say unto thee, wherefore sighest thou? that thou shalt answer, for the tidings; because it cometh, and every heart

shall melt, and all hands shall be feeble, and every spirit shall faint, and all knees shall be weak as water," etc. Acts xxi:10, 11: "There came down from Judea a certain prophet named Agabus. And when he was come unto us, he took Paul's girdle, and bound his own hands and feet, and said, thus saith the Holy Ghost, so shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles." John xiii:4-17: Jesus washed his disciples' feet, as an example for them, saying: "I have given you an example that you should do as I have done unto you," i.e., "wash one another's feet." This action, on the part of the Savior, was worth more to impress humility and brotherliness than anything else he could have said or done. Isa. xx:2-4: "And the Lord said like as my servant Isaiah hath walked naked (i.e., without the upper garment), and barefoot three years for a sign and wonder upon Egypt and upon Ethiopia; so shall the king of Assyria lead away the Egyptians prisoners," etc. This symbol, when explained as it was, must have been very impressive. Jer. xviii:1-10; xix:1-11. Having Jeremiah to see the work of the potter was for him; but breaking the potter's vessel, in the valley of the sons of Hinnom, in the presence of the elders of the people, and its explanation served to impress the elders and all the people as nothing else could.

Jer. xxvii:2. The Lord said to Jeremiah, "make thee bands and yokes, and put them on thy neck," etc. This was explained to mean that the Lord would cause all the surrounding nations to put their necks under the yoke of Nebuchadnezzar. And Jer. xxviii:10, 11: "Hananiah took the yoke from off the prophet Jeremiah's neck, and brake it, saying, even so will I brake the yokes of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon from off the necks of all nations." The remainder of the chapter keeps up the symbol of a yoke. "The yoke is a symbol of bondage, affliction and servitude. So, in Ezekiel, 4th and 5th chapters, the prophet was directed to take a tile, and portray the city of Jerusalem on it, etc.,

requiring him to lie on one side, to eat polluted bread, to shave his hair, etc., all to impress the Jews by these symbols, with their impending evils.

So likewise, all men in all ages and countries, bow down to signify humility, reverence, supplication; sometimes as a token of respect, they bow their heads and add a salutation. Then, in worship, they bow with their faces to the earth, or kneel, or fall prostrate on their faces in times of greatest trouble and danger. This bodily action symbolizes reverence, submission, supplication. Many wives and others, in our own time have knelt before the governor or king, before offering a word of supplication for the life of husband or friend. Satan required Jesus to "fall down and worship him," if he would gain his wealth; because this bodily act symbolized inferiority and submission. So, too, we have in the Lord's Supper and baptism, most forcible symbols of death, burial and resurrection from the dead. Thus symbolic action is continued in the church; and Paul tells the disciples at Rome to present their bodies living sacrifices before God (Rom. xii:1-3).

## CHAPTER XII

### FIGURES CONTINUED

Etymological meaning — types and antitypes — the important items noted; Deliverance of Israel—the leading facts—nature of their bondage—their numbers in Egypt—how they came to believe in Moses; three facts as to the relation of testimony to faith; the character of the miracles wrought — true and false miracles; effect of their faith in Moses—not saved when they believed— passing through the sea — what Paul calls their baptism unto Moses—five facts noted; when they were saved; Israel in the wilderness; four other facts, and their crossing Jordan and entrance into the promised land; the application to Christians.

#### THE NATURE AND OBJECT OF TYPES FURTHER CONSIDERED AND EXEMPLIFIED

In carrying out the plan already indicated, two of the three manners of teaching have been considered, viz.: The parables of the Savior and the literal teaching of the apostles, their exact harmony and force, etc. It now remains to examine the types of the Old Testament. Let us understand the meaning and object of scriptural types. Other types need not now be considered, except to aid in understanding these.

Type is from *tupos*, and this from *tuptoo*, to strike, and means:

1. A stroke, or blow.
2. The impression made by a blow; as "the print of the nails in his hands" (John xx:25).
3. A model set before us for our imitation. Phil iii:17: "Ye have us for an example"—type. Heb. viii:5: "Who serve under the example and shadow (type) of heavenly things." 1 These. i:7: "So that ye were ensamples (types) to all that believe in Macedonia and Achaia."
4. In printing, that which makes the impression—the type.



5. In the Scriptures, it means, "a shadow of things to come," e.g. Col. ii:16, 17. "Let no man judge you in meat, or drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days, which are a shadow (type) of things to come; but the body (substance) is of Christ." Also Heb. x:1, "For the law having a shadow (type) of good things to come, and not the very (or exact) image of those things," etc. 1 Cor. x:6, 11, Paul, having noted very distinctly their deliverance from Egyptian bondage, and their sins in the wilderness, adds: "Now these things were our examples (types) to the intent that we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted." And, "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples (types): and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world (or Jewish age) are come."

Here, besides telling us the meaning of scriptural types, we have named as types, their meat, drink, holy days, new moons and sabbaths; then, their deliverance, their sins and punishments in the wilderness, etc. And we may add here, that in Heb. ix:1-9, Paul describes the Tabernacle and its service in detail, and adds: "which was a figure (type) for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices," etc. This gives us almost the whole history and service of the Jews as types for us. We are strictly correct, then, when we say, with Stewart, Home, Bishop Lowth, etc., that almost every thing, certainly every prominent thing, in the law of Moses was typical of something in Christ.

"The word antitype (*anti*, against, over against, and *tupos*, type), denotes the substance, or that which is prefigured by the type, e.g., the paschal lamb was the type of which Christ was and is the antitype. The word *archetype* (*archiee*, beginning, and *tupos*, pattern), is used in nearly the same sense. It simply means the original pattern or model, according to which all the types were constructed."—*Milligan*.

Several items should here be noted:

I. There is always a resemblance, or analogy between the type and the antitype.

II. The likeness is only partial, and care must be exercised to avoid pressing it too far; i.e., imagining points of likeness where there are none. Moses resembled, and was a type of Christ, as a deliverer, mediator and law giver, not in any frailty or imperfection. Canaan was a type of heaven, or of the new earth, though the resemblance was slight. Adam was a type of Christ, but the points of difference, as in the previous cases, were much more numerous than the points of likeness.

III. The points of likeness were chosen, pre-ordained and are identified and made manifest by Paul.

IV. Every type is a prophecy. They all point to the future. In this they are in contrast with most symbols, which relate, generally, to things present.

V. Two objects were to be accomplished by types: (1) To give a pictorial outline representation of grand future events; especially the scheme of redemption by Christ. (2) To serve as a demonstrative proof of the divine origin of the antitype. Heb. iii:5: "And Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after, etc. Deut. xviii:15, 18, 19. Hence we have in the types of the Old Testament, and their antitypes in the New, the moral demonstration of the divinity of Christ and his scheme of redemption. The antitype is the fulfilled prophecy. As the glove fits the hand; as the atmosphere is suited to the lungs, etc., so are the types of the Old Testament to their antitypes, the great facts of the gospel. As a substance corresponds with its shadow, so the religion of Christ corresponds with the types of Moses, and shows that it was pointed to by those types.

Paul's definition of a type, Heb. x:1, is a happy one. He calls it "a shadow of good things to come." If we look to the rising sun, and a man is approaching us, his shadow

first reaches our eyes. It gives a general idea, but not "an exact representation of his person." As the sun ascends and he draws nearer, the shadow becomes more distinct; but it never gives an "exact representation of his person." Jesus came from the gates of the morning; but his shadow, or type, reached the world four thousand years before his person was seen. So all the sacrifices, figures, or types of him, were distant, shadowy representations of his person, offices, character and wonderful works. They were the shadows (types) of the substance or antitype.

It is not always safe to conclude that a thing or event is an antitype simply because it happens to fit the type True, when there are many fitting points, not otherwise to be accounted for, we conclude they were shadowed forth in the types, and are antitypes But the only certain way of determining when a thing is an antitype, is to have one of the New Testament writers say so, as we have seen Paul does of almost every leading thing in Judaism.

This principle holds, also, as respects other prophecies We may think that certain ancient prophecies referred to events in our own day, or in past ages, but we may err, as many have; and the only certainty is where the New Testament writers identify them; as Peter, on the day of Pentecost does the prophecy of Joel (ii:28, 29), and as Paul does, Jer xxxi:31-34, in Heb. viii:8-12.

In interpreting types, the same rules obtain that are used in interpreting symbols, parables, metaphors, etc. Hence, we are now prepared to investigate several of the principal types of the Old Testament, according to these rules and principles These, and like investigations of other subjects, will serve as further exemplifications of the rules given.

#### TYPES AND THEIR ANTITYPES

We are now ready to consider the Old Testament types and their corresponding New Testament antitypes The first in order is

## THE DELIVERANCE OF ISRAEL

Now, according to the rules and principles given and exemplified, let us try to understand the Mosaic system. And, in this investigation, let it be remembered that we are giving, not the traditions of the Rabbis, or the opinions of men; nor will we draw any important conclusions from doubtful passages of Scripture. Having fully determined to stop where the Bible stops, and to go where it leads, even "through floods and flames," we are simply inquiring for its plain teaching, by direct precept, by primitive example, or by necessary inference. All beyond are incidental and un-authoritative.

## THE TYPICAL NATURE OF THIS DELIVERANCE

Paul said of this deliverance, "Moreover, brethren, I would not that you should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud; and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat," etc. . . . "Now these things were our example (figures or types) to the intent we should not lust after evil things as they also lusted. Neither be ye idolaters," etc. "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples (or types), and they are written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world (the Jewish age) are come" (1 Cor. x:1, 2, 6, 7, 11, etc.).

Two facts need to be observed here: 1. That this is applied by Paul to the Gentiles, and leaves no chance for doubt that it belongs to us. 2. That it refers directly to the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage. Their bondage was a type of our bondage to sin. Their deliverance was a type of our deliverance from sin. We are not following a "cunningly devised fable," therefore, when we carefully note

## THE LEADING FACTS IN THEIR DELIVERANCE

According to Bishop Usher's chronology, which is most generally received, though it is not infallible, God's call to Abram, Gen. xii:1-6, was B.C. 1921. Perhaps about six years after this he appeared to him again, Gen. xv:13, 14, and said:

"Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance." About four years after this God appeared to Abram again, changed his name, and instituted circumcision; after this he appeared to him again with fuller assurances. See Genesis xvii. And B.C. 1872, forty-nine years from his first appearance, he appeared to him yet again, when he would not withhold even Isaac. In all these cases God renewed his promises to Abraham; Gen. xxii:15-20. But the calculation is from his first appearance in Ur, of the Chaldees, B.C. 1921. Their deliverance was B.C. 1491. Take this from that, and we have just 430 years. "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years" (Ex. xii:40; Gen. xv:13). This does not say they were sojourners in Egypt 430 years, but simply that they dwelt in Egypt, and they were sojourners 430 years. So they were. They had no settled place from the call of Abram to their entrance on the land of Canaan, which was 430 years. The mistake has been in commencing to count from their going down into Egypt, instead of from the call of Abram. Stephen, Acts vii:6, 7, counting only the hundreds, says: "And God spake on this wise, that his seed should sojourn in a strange land (not all the while in Egypt); and that they should bring them into bondage, and entreat them evil four hundred years. And the nation to whom they shall be in bondage will I judge, said God; and after that shall they

come forth, and serve me in this place." It was only about 215 years from the going down of Israel into Egypt, to their coming out under Moses. See chronology of Genesis xlvii, and Exodus i.

#### NATURE OF THEIR BONDAGE

It was not the slavery of such as were captured in war, and bought and sold. They had many personal rights, owned much personal property, and were remarkably prosperous in many respects. They lived mainly together, and in the best part of Egypt. But, "The Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with rigour: And they made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar, and brick, and in all manner of service in the field: All their service wherein they made them serve, was with rigour" (Ex. i:13, 14). See Ex. ii:23; vi:5; Num. xx:15; Acts vii:15, 34; Ps. lxxxix:6.

#### THEIR NUMBERS IN EGYPT

In 215 years in Egypt, they increased from three score and fifteen to 603,550 twenty years old and upward, that were able to go forth to war (Num. i:46). This was a vast army. And when the women, children and all were counted, there must have been about 3,000,000.

They were encamped around the Tabernacle, three tribes east, three west, three north, and three south. The Tabernacle was in the center, and Moses, Aaron and the priests camped at the east, or front of the Tabernacle, which was covered by a pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night. This cloud was so manifest that it could no more be mistaken than the sun in cloudless mid-day. The tribes were summoned to march on the lifting of the cloud, by the sounding of the trumpets. In all this there was no chance for mistake, unless they might mistake day and night. Still they needed faith in the words of men supported by miracles, since some of them could not see when the cloud arose,

or hear when the trumpet sounded, being from four to eight miles distant from the Tabernacle. They had faith in God, in Moses and in the priests, on divine testimony.

#### HOW THEY CAME TO BELIEVE IN MOSES

The Israelites had a constant and comforting assurance that God would deliver them from their bondage; for they knew something of the Abrahamic covenant, its prophecy and its promises, which included all this, as we have seen. Joseph lived 110 years, and governed Egypt perhaps about eighty years (unless the king that "knew not Joseph" arose sooner, concerning which we have not certain testimony). When he was about to die he "said unto his brethren, I die; and God will surely visit you, and bring you out of this land, unto the land which he sware to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob. And Joseph took an oath of the children of Israel, saying, God will surely visit you, and ye shall carry up my bones from hence" (Gen. i:24, 25).

They doubtless thought the time long; and when the wonderful story of Moses was known among them, they looked, we may presume, with some degree of hope all the forty years of his life in Egypt. But when he fled from Egypt, and during his forty years' absence, they must have lost hope in him. When God appeared to Moses in the bush, and proposed to send him, "Moses answered, and said, but behold they will not believe me, nor hearken to my voice; for they will say the Lord hath not appeared unto thee" (Ex. iv:1). (See, also, the preceding chapter, and the following history.) This was a most reasonable conclusion. How were the "elders of Israel," and the whole people to believe that Moses was the long promised and anxiously hoped for deliverer? Nearly fifteen hundred years after this, the Jews and all nations were looking for the promised Messiah; but how could they know that Jesus of Nazareth was that Messiah? The answer is: By his miracles (John xx:30, 31). So now, the Lord said to Moses, "Cast down your rod." He did so, and

"it became a serpent, and Moses fled from before it." Then he said, "take it by the tail." He did so, and "it became a rod in his hand again." "Put your hand in your bosom." He did so, and "took it out leproused white as snow." "Put it back." He did so, and when he took it out it was "restored whole as the other." Now, said the Lord, go down, gather the elders of Israel, and perform these two miracles before their eyes, "and it shall come to pass that if they believe not the voice of the first sign, they will believe the voice of the second sign." (See Ex. iv:2, 3, 4 and on.) Moses did so, and "the people believed" (Ex. iv:31). In this way, then, the people of Israel got faith in Moses; not by a direct and mysterious operation, but by plain and unmistakable manifestations of miraculous power, God's word, supported by miracles. But Moses had to perform other very signal miracles, culminating in the death of the first born in every Egyptian house, before Pharaoh would let them go. And then his faith failed, and he followed Israel to his own utter destruction in the Red Sea (Ex. 5th to 14th chapters).

Here we have three great facts very distinctly made out and established, viz.:

I. That faith rests on testimony, the testimony being of the same nature of the truth or proposition to be believed; thus, an extraordinary proposition must have extraordinary testimony, such as Moses gave.

II. More testimony is required to cause some people to believe than others. The Jews were ready, glad and easy to believe, and did believe on two miracles, while Pharaoh required ten others, and then had not strong and profiting faith.

III. There is testimony enough to make Pharaoh and his court, doubting Thomas, and all the world believe. This is a manifest and glorious truth, and cuts off all excuse or apology for disbelief.



## THE NATURE OF THESE MIRACLES

I. The difference between what soothsayers could do, rightly called "wonderful works," and true miracles, appears in the fact that "Moses\* rod swallowed up their rods." They could not only see this, but it was so manifest that they could not fail to see it. So it was with the healing of the lame man (Acts iii), and with Simon the sorcerer (Acts viii). The people saw the difference between the true miracles performed by Philip, and the wonderful works performed by Simon, and they "believed Philip." There was no dark lantern, or curtains, or dim lights to obscure the vision. All was in open day, and the utmost scrutiny was invited. Not so of the false prophets, or wonderful workers, magicians, or astrologers.

II. The manner of stating these true miracles is direct and emphatic as in the Bible, and as in all the prophecies. Not so with false prophets or deceivers.

III. Then the fact that these miracles were a part of the history of the Jews from their deliverance from Egypt would expose the record to contempt and ridicule, if they had not been real. The fathers would have said: "We were there, and we know that nothing of the kind ever occurred. Moses wrought no such miracles, the Red sea was not parted," etc. But instead of this, every Jew then, and till today, believes in the reality of these miracles. And these Jews were the very best, and, in fact, the only witnesses; and their testimony cannot be invalidated. As well might we tell a man he was deceived in the light of a cloudless day, as to tell these three millions of people that they were deceived concerning these miracles, including their passage through the Red sea, the quails and manna, the pillar of cloud and fire, bringing water out of a rock for all the host, the opening of the earth and swallowing of Korah and his company, the falling of the walls of Jericho, etc. If they could, by any possibility be deceived as to these, there is nothing certain, even our personal existence! and we must be universal skeptics. And if these

Jews did not, like Paul, give evidence of honesty and sincerity as to their faith, then can no man give evidence of honesty or sincerity in anything! This is taking the highest ground. This ground the Christian defiantly occupies. Nothing of the same nature ever was or ever can be better proved. Hence, if these miracles, and the truths they attest, are not proved, nothing is proved or can be proved. (See the conversion of Paul, etc.)

#### THE EFFECT OF THEIR FAITH IN MOSES

Without faith in Moses they would not have been willing to follow him. With it, they were very desirous to go under his leadership. Faith in him as a man, worked in them this willingness. So now, faith in the Great Antitype of Moses, "works by love," "purifies the heart," "and makes us willing to follow Him." And when Paul tells us (Phil, ii:13) that God "works in us to will and to do of his good pleasure"; this is the way. He gave them faith by giving them testimony, and that faith worked in them the will to serve God.

#### STILL THEY WERE NOT SAVED

This should be noted as a distinct and important fact. They had all the needed faith. The evidence of this is:

1. In the statement before cited, that "they believed in God"; they "believed also in his servant Moses."
2. That faith had done its work; it had made them willing and ready to obey. This is the office of faith.
3. There is not the slightest intimation of a lack of faith till after they started. They are reproached all through the wilderness for lack of faith; but not before, nor when they started to follow Moses out of Egypt. If faith could save them, then, without a trial of faith, and the obedience of faith, they would have been saved in Egypt. Yet they were not saved there. They never felt that they were saved there. They never claimed to be saved there. They never rejoiced

there. Hold a little. We shall see precisely when and how they were saved, after

#### THEIR PASSING THROUGH THE SEA

See Exodus, 12th chapter. The beginning of the year is changed from the civil to the sacred, and the new year begins with this wonderful deliverance. This, as an indisputable fact, shows the greatness and certainty of the event. No man can account for this change without allowing that it was the work of God. What could now change the beginning of our year from the first of January to any other period? No rational man will claim that human power could do this. The birth of Christ changed the chronological index of the world; and today every infidel in the land writes "the year of our Lord 1890!" Perhaps he does not think of this when he dates his letters! No human wisdom can even imagine how this change was made from *Anno Mundi* to *Anno Domini*, that is, from the creation, to the redemption of the world by the death of Christ, without admitting that the hand of God was in this. The flood made no such change. Only the deliverance of Israel, and the resurrection of Christ changed the world's chronology! If the miraculous inspiration of the holy Scriptures was our theme, here we should occupy several pages. It may serve the purpose in hand to simply note the facts, as they appear, uncontradicted and unquestioned.

They kept the paschal lamb from the tenth to the fourteenth, killed it at evening, and started out on the fifteenth of the first Hebrew or sacred month; Abib or Nisan, answering to our March and April. "They were about six hundred thousand men on foot besides women and children, and flocks, and herds, even a very great multitude (Ex. xii:37, 38, 42). Starting from Rameses they reached Succoth. From Succoth they went to Etham (Ex. xiii:20). Then they "camped before Pi-hahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, over against Baalzephon" (Ex. xiv:2). So far all went well. The pillar of fire and of cloud went with them day and night. This camp,

the last before their crossing the Red sea, is of great interest. Still, many things about it are not very clear. The language quoted is certain, but not clear. Matthew Henry says:

"On one hand was Pi-hahiroth, a range of craggy rocks un-passable; on the other hand were Migdol and Baalzephon, which, some think, were forts and garrisons upon the frontiers of Egypt; before them was the sea, behind them were the Egyptians, so that there was no way open for them but upward, and thence their deliverance came."

Watson says:

"The Hebrew *pi* answers to the modern Arabic word *fum*, signifying 'mouth'; and is generally applied to passes in the mountains. . . . The whole word (Pi-hahiroth) would imply the mouth or pass of Hahiroth or Hiroth. . . . The place where this miracle is supposed to have happened, is still called Bahral-Kolsum, or the sea of destruction; and just opposite to the situation which answers to the opening called Pi-hahiroth, is a bay, where the north cape is called Ras Musa, or the Cape of Moses. That part of the western or Heroopalitan branch of the Red sea where, from these coincidences, the passage most probably took place, is described by Bruce as about three leagues over, with fourteen fathoms of water in the channel, nine at the sides, and good anchorage everywhere. The farther side is also represented as a low sandy coast, and an easy landing place"

Those regarded as the best authorities say, on Ex. xiv:2; Num. xxxiii:7, that "Pi-hahiroth signifies the mouth of the ridge, or chain of mountains, which line the western coast of the Red sea, called Attaka, 'deliverance,' in which was a gap, which formed the extremity of the valley of Beda, ending at the sea eastward," etc. "Migdol signifies 'a tower.' Baalzephon signifies 'the northern Baal.'"

But whether these definitions and historic statements are strictly correct or not, it is evident that the Israelites were effectually shut in, and without a way or means of escape from the pursuing enemy, till the Lord intervened. Their camp was probably about twelve miles square, each tribe under his own banner. They were sorely distressed. So was

Moses; till God ordered him to say to the people, "stand still," or wait "and see the salvation of the Lord." Moses stretched out his hand, the wind came, blew out the way, and then came the order to "go forward" (Ex. 14th chapter). "And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground; and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand, and on their left. And the Egyptians pursued, and went in after them to the midst of the sea, even all Pharaoh's horses, his chariots and his horsemen. And it came to pass that in the morning watch the Lord looked unto the host of the Egyptians, through the pillar of fire and of the cloud, and troubled the host of the Egyptians," etc. (Ex. xiv:22, 23, 24). In the meantime, the Israelites passed over, and stood on the other shore. This is what is referred to (1 Cor. x:1, 2): "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea," etc.

#### WHAT WAS IT PAUL CALLED THEIR BAPTISM UNTO MOSES?

Note the facts:

1. A way was opened in the waters for an army of about three millions of people, with an immense quantity of stock, etc., to pass hastily through. It must have been a very wide opening. Very few of them, if any, could have been reached with sprays of water from the unstanding walls. And they went through "dry shod."

2. "The depths were congealed (frozen) in the heart of the sea" (Ex. xv:8). No sprays could, therefore, go from the frozen walls. Not a drop of water touched them.

3. "The Lord looked upon the Egyptians through the pillar of cloud." The cloud was, therefore, over them.

4. It was not a rain cloud, but a "cloud of the glory of the Lord." No water fell from it.

5. That cloud, which gave the Israelites light by night and shade by day, and which guided their way, removed and went behind them so the Egyptians came not near them all that night. This cloud was, of necessity, in some measure before them also. Thus, the cloud over them, before them, and behind them, and the walls of water on each side completely boxed them up, buried them! Hence, Paul says, they were baptized—not in the cloud, nor in the sea, but "in the cloud and in the sea." Both were required to baptize them unto, or into, Moses. This, then, is what Paul calls their baptism. Some of us have seen persons buried in the clay and on the soft rock; and sometimes, in the sand and in the clay. Both were used to complete the burial, by shovels full of earth.

It is claimed by one class of writers that Ps. lxxvii:15-20 refers to this baptism. This is by no means proved. If it were it would not disprove the facts here noted. It is always unsafe and unfair to draw an uncertain conclusion contrary to certain facts. Josephus says that something like the narrative in the 77th Psalm occurred after the Jews gained the other shore. Possibly in this way Pharaoh was drowned; but certainly the Jews were boxed up or buried in the cloud in the sea.

#### BUT WHEN WERE THEY SAVED?

Well, it is evident that they did not consider themselves saved in their camp before Pi-hahiroth. They were in the deepest mourning. The Red sea was the boundary of Pharaoh's dominion, and they must get beyond that border. Even after that they might have fear of Pharaoh.

But so soon as the narrative of their baptism is recorded, and they stood on the farther shore, it is said: "Thus the Lord saved Israel *that day* out of the hand of the Egyptians; and Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the seashore" (Ex. xiv:30). Then, in the following chapter, comes the grandest song that had, to that time, been sung or heard by mortals!

It is even connected with the final triumph over death, and reaching of the golden shore! (Rev. xv:3). Here, then, we find the time and place where, and how they were saved; and the circumstances and results all concur.

It has already been fully proved by the language of Paul, that their salvation from bondage in Egypt was a type of our salvation from bondage in sin. No one questions this. No one, perhaps, ever did question this. We should, therefore, understand well and minutely *how* they were saved, the consummation being found in their baptism unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. The antitype precisely corresponds with this. No one, in the days of the apostles, claimed to be saved before baptism. They had the faith and repentance, the right state of mind and heart, as the Israelites did before their baptism into Moses, but as the Israelites were not saved while yet in the dominion of Pharaoh, so these people were not saved till they were "translated out of the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son" in baptism. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (Gal. iii:27). How precisely this accords with the great commission: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark xvi:16). If some of the Israelites had refused to be baptized in the cloud and in the sea, and had remained behind, while the host followed Moses (and we do not know but some did refuse, for it was a fearful undertaking!) but one fate awaited them, falling into the hands of Pharaoh. And now, if some persistently refuse to receive Christian baptism, the clearly marked and fully admitted antitype, what must be their fate? This inquiry does not include those who *cannot* be baptized, but only those who *refuse*, and persistently *will not*.

#### ISRAEL IN THE WILDERNESS

But being saved from their sins was not equal to reaching heaven; just as being saved from slavery in Egypt was not reaching the promised land on the part of the Jews. It

was *on the way*; this was all to them, and is all to us. They were in the wilderness yet, and Jordan was between them and Canaan. So are we in the wilderness, and the Jordan of death must be passed before we stand on the golden shore and sing of final salvation.

They were very happy when they were saved from Pharaoh, and perhaps thought they would never doubt, or complain of God any more. But three days' journey in the wilderness of Shur without water, convinced them that they were in the flesh still, and quite a distance from "the land that floweth with milk and honey." And when they found water, at Marah, they could not drink it, "and they murmured." When Moses cast in the tree, and sweetened the water, it would seem they should have been content, and murmured no more. Then they reached Elim, on the way to Sinai, "on the fifteenth day of the second month after their departure from the land of Egypt" (Ex. xvi:1, 2, etc.). And here they murmured desperately for flesh. Thus, as they started, so they continued forty years in the wilderness, till the numbered men were all dead, save Caleb and Joshua. What a type of our wilderness life! Have we not often rebelled, and murmured against God in our hearts, if not otherwise? "Wherefore I was grieved with that generation, and said, they do alway err in their heart; and they have not known my ways. So I swear in my wrath, they shall not enter into my rest. Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God. But exhort one another daily," etc. (Heb. iii:10-13). See Heb., 3d and 4th chapters, for Paul's forcible and clear application of that wilderness type to Christians. He would excite our fear, lest we fail as they did. He says that we, too, entered into rest, a great rest, when we entered into Christ, and were saved from our sins. But he adds that, as there was a better rest for them, in Canaan, so "there remaineth, therefore, a rest unto the people of God. Let us labor, therefore,



to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief" (Heb. iv:3-11).

Often were the Jews marched to the borders of Jordan, as if they were to pass over; and many of them, doubtless, thought they would then go over; many who never did reach the good land! And how many of us have stood on the brink of Jordan, our feet dipped in its waters, and we and our friends thought we were going over! But as the Israelites turned and marched away, so we were raised up, and are still for a little while yet in this wilderness. But, finally, they did pass over; so, too, shall we. How soon we know not.

THE TYPES AND ANTITYPES HERE PRESENTED

I. The bondage of the Jews in Egypt, the type of our bondage in sin.

II. Moses their deliverer, and the type of Christ, our deliverer.

III. The miracles of Moses in Egypt, the foundation of their faith, and the type of the miracles of Christ, the foundation of our faith.

IV. Their baptism into Moses in the cloud and in the sea, the type of our baptism into Christ.

V. Their being saved from Egyptian bondage, the type of our being saved from sin.

VI. Their wilderness life the type of our life in Christ, in this "wilderness of woe."

VII. As they sinned, after being really saved, and failed to reach the promised land, so we sin after being saved in Christ, and may fail to reach the everlasting rest. What a type! and what an antitype!

VIII. Their crossing Jordan a type of our death. Everybody speaks of the Jordan of death, and sings: "On Jordan's stormy banks I stand."

IX. The land of Canaan a type of heaven.

Some of these types are more striking and impressive; but they were all the best that could be found. Material things typified spiritual things. Temporal things typified eternal things. And all "these things are written for our admonition" (1 Cor. x:6-11). Shall we profit by them as we ought? Or will we be stiff-necked and rebellious, after all, as that wonderfully typical people were? It would seem that the case could not be more clear; so that we are, and must be, forever "without excuse." The Lord help us to be wise, and so improve the opportunities graciously offered us!

## CHAPTER XIII

### THE JEWISH TABERNACLE

Stackhouse on early places of worship; importance of understanding the type; six items we cannot be certain about; description of the tabernacle and its furniture, the ark, the altar of incense, the table of shew bread, the candlestick; first holy place, second holy place; outer court, the laver, the altar of burnt offerings, and their antitypes in the New Testament; from Calmet, Brown, Sherwood, Watson, Jones; six important items; the water of separation and its antitype; the holy oil and its antitype, etc.

Stackhouse's history of the Bible, p. 310, says:

"From the first beginning of time, God had always some place appropriated to the solemn duties of religious worship. Even in the small space of his continuance in Paradise, Adam had where to present himself before the Lord (Hooker's Ecc. Polity, Book V); and after his expulsion from thence, his sons, in like manner, had whither to bring their oblations and sacrifices (Gen. iv:3). The patriarchs, both before and after the flood, used altars, and mountains, and groves for the selfsame purpose (Gen. xiii:4, xxii:1). Here they had their *proseuchoe*, or places for prayer, which were certain plots of ground, encompassed with a wall, or some other enclosure, and open above. But since the first place of this kind, that made any considerable figure, was the tabernacle which God ordered Moses to erect in the wilderness, as an habitation for his majestic presence to reside in, it may not be improper, in this place, to give some account of it, and the other holy things appertaining to it."

Without seeing and understanding the type we could not see or appreciate the antitype. We must be well acquainted with the *shadow*, if we would see how it fits and adumbrates the *substance*.

And it may be well to suggest that neither of the three temples was, in all respects, like the tabernacle which Moses built at Mount Sinai, and neither of them was so extensively and manifestly typical as the tabernacle. And it is a fact, also,

that a number of things about this tabernacle, which we might all be glad to know, are not in the divine record. Let us note some things we cannot be certain about:

1. Whether the silver sockets, into which the tenons on the lower ends of the upright boards entered, had any foundation but the earth. One hundred talents of silver were used in making these sockets (see Ex. xxviii:27); a talent to each socket, which is probably about \$150,000, or 9,370 pounds avoirdupois.

2. Whether the laver was at or near the door, or entrance into the first holy place. The only Bible statement is, that it was "between" the altar and the entrance to the tabernacle (Ex. xxx:18; Ex. xxxix:7).

3. Nor can we be certain as to the exact place of the altar of incense, or the table, the candlestick, or the ark. Their relative position is given, but not their precise place.

4. Whether the roof was flat, oval, or conical, like most of our modern roofs. It is represented in pictures, books, and papers in each of these styles. The Bible has no direct statement on the subject.

5. The thickness of the boards is not given. Conjecture and tradition say it was half a cubit; but the Bible says nothing on the subject.

6. Modern papers and books generally give eighteen inches as a cubit. Others say a cubit is nineteen inches, and some say twenty-one, some twenty-two inches. The table in A. Campbell's Living Oracles says "a cubit is equal to 21.888 inches." This is only a little less than twenty-two inches. It is agreed that the Hebrew cubit was greater than the Roman, and that the length of the forearm was a cubit. We have no reason for concern about this or any other indefiniteness, however, since we lose nothing of importance by it. For instance, if we adopt eighteen inches for a cubit, then all the tabernacle is measured by the same rule; and so of the furniture, etc. But it cannot be right for us to be positive and definite, where the Bible is neither positive nor definite. If we follow the

Bible, we should stop where it stops, and be positive only where it is positive and clear. And yet writers are both definite and positive on all these and other points, where it is not possible for anyone to be certain. Thus, the exact size, position, etc., of the tabernacle and its furniture are given, and differently given by different authors; and the common reader does not know who is right, or whether either is right. Let us follow the Bible in style and manner, as well as in facts and truths; respecting its silence as well as its utterances. Let these things be remembered while examining the following:

#### DESCRIPTION OF THE TABERNACLE AND ITS FURNITURE

The tabernacle was thirty cubits long, ten broad, and ten high, and was made of boards a cubit and a half broad and ten cubits long, completely covered or plated with gold. Counting 18 inches for a cubit, it was 45 feet long, 15 wide, and 15 high (Ex. xxvi:15-30).

It had four coverings (Ex. xxvi:1-14; xxxvi:8-20). The first was of fine twined linen, and was to be made of ten curtains, each 28 cubits long and four cubits wide. This, when complete, was 60 feet long and 42 feet broad, and would extend from the east, or front part, over the west end, and down to the ground. It would lack 18 inches of reaching the ground on the north and south sides; that is provided the top was flat. The other three coverings, of (1) goat's hair, (2) ram's skins dyed red, (3) badger skins, were to be 30 cubits, or 45 feet long, 4 cubits, or 6 feet broad, and there were eleven of them. When put together it was 66 feet long and 45 broad, and would extend from the ground at the west end to the front, or east end, and hand over about 6 feet; and would reach to the ground on each side. The east end was covered by elaborately-figured curtains. (See Ex. 26th and 36th chapters.) On the first day of the first month of the second year after their deliverance, the tabernacle was set up (Ex. 40th chap.). Aaron and his sons were set apart, and the tabernacle and all its furniture were sanctified, or set

apart. Still it is not necessary, and might not be safe to affirm, that the tabernacle was flat on top, though there is no other apparent way of accounting for the size of the coverings.

It is not so distinctly stated, but it is agreed that the most holy place was a cube, 15 feet square every way. It was separated from the first holy place by curtains, and the first holy place was the same width and height, but thirty feet long. The outer court was 100 cubits long, or 150 feet; and fifty cubits, or 75 feet wide, and was inclosed by fine twined linen, supported by posts all around; counting 18 inches as a cubit.

#### THE FURNITURE OF THE TABERNACLE

The ark was three feet nine inches long, two feet three inches high, and the same in breadth. In a recent sermon Dr. Talmage puts the ark at "about five feet long," when he compared it to the "ballot-box." (What great mistakes great men can make, for lack of close investigation!) (See Ex. xxxvii:1, etc.) It was overlaid with pure gold, and had a pure gold mercy seat above of great weight, and two cherubims fastened one to each end, their wings, one of each, extending toward the walls north and south, the others crossing, and their faces turned as if looking steadily into the ark, or upon the mercy seat, probably suggesting what is referred to in Peter i:12: "Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister the things that are now reported to you by them that have preached the gospel to you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into." There were in the ark the tables of the testimony, Aaron's rod that budded, and some of the manna (Ex. xxv:17-20). The book of the law was by its side (Deut. xxxi:26). There was nothing else in the most holy place, except the golden censer. It seems certain that it was placed midway between the north and south walls, but how far from the west wall, and how far from the veil, we have no means of knowing. The interest

involved in that ark and its mercy seat might well interest angels! How unaccountable that man is not more thoughtfully interested in it! It is the emblem, or type of all that mercy by which sinners may be saved!

On the tenth day of every seventh month, and during their third annual feast, the high priest entered, with his censer, taking fire from the altar of incense, and putting incense thereon. This he held under the mercy seat and so made atonement for the people and for himself. He was arrayed in his priestly robe, with its bells, his mitre, urim, thummim, etc., and was careful to purify himself before entering. The people were without, praying in deep humility and reverence. The Hebrew *Kaphar*, translated "atonement," means *to cover*; as the four coverings of the tabernacle shut out all light, and effectually hid from the gaze of men everything under them; and as the mercy seat covered the fiery law. The English word *atonement*, i.e., at-one-ment, expresses the effect; the reconciling of men to God, and so making them one! How rich is this type! Its antitype is in heaven, where Christ sits on the mercy seat, at the right hand of God, ever living to make intercession for the saints; that is, pleading his own "sake" or merits; so that we are to ask only in his name, or by his authority—not "for his sake"; not pleading his merits, since he does that himself. It might be presumption for us to get in his place before the Father. He said: "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father *in my name*, he will give it you (John xvi:23).

*The candlestick.* This, with its tongs, snuffers, and dishes, was made of a talent of pure gold, beaten (Ex. xxv:39; xxxi; xxvii:31; xxx:8). The talent of pure gold used in making the candlestick and its furnishings was worth at least \$22,000. It occupied the south side of the first holy place (Ex. xl:24). As there was no light in the most holy place, except that which emanated from the divine presence over the mercy seat and between the cherubims, so there was no light in the first holy place but what came from the

seven golden candlesticks, or lamps, with their pure and typical oil. So the Christian priests have no light in the church except the light of truth, which David says is "a lamp to my feet and a light to my path" (Ps. cxix:105). All outside of this is darkness and uncertainty. So are all the commandments and ordinances of men, so far as concerns worship, pleasing God, or profiting man religiously (Matt. xv:9; Mark vii:7). This rich candlestick, with its sacredly prepared oil, gave literal light, and was the type of *truth*, the true light. "For whatsoever doth make manifest is light (Eph. v:13). (See the references.) There could not be a more beautiful type, or a more certain and manifest antitype. Still this lamp must be like the type, trimmed morning and evening, and kept supplied with oil.

*The table.*—This was two cubits, or three feet long, a cubit, or eighteen inches broad, and a cubit and a half, or twenty-seven inches high, and was covered with pure gold. All its dishes, spoons, covers, and bowls were pure gold (Ex. xxv:23-30; xxxvii:10-16). Twelve loaves, each having in it two-tenth deals of fine flour, remained on it from one sabbath to the next, then were replaced by others, and the priests alone should eat these in the holy place (Lev. xxiv:5-10). Here is the type of the Lord's table, in the holy place, the church, and at it only the priests shall eat. Here we have but one tribe, and but one loaf, emblematic of one body broken for us. How rich and important the lesson in this type!

*The altar of incense.*—This was a cubit, or 18 inches square, and 2 cubits, or 3 feet high, covered with gold, and it had horns at the corners, "and a crown of gold round about" (Ex. xxx:1-6). It was in the first holy place, between the candlestick and the table of presence bread, before the veil that separated the holy from the most holy place, and "before the mercy seat"; which would be about midway from south to north of the holy place, but precisely how far from the veil is not stated. "And Aaron shall burn thereon sweet incense every morning; when he dresseth the lamps he shall burn



incense upon it. And when Aaron lighteth (or dresseth) the lamps at even, he shall burn incense upon it, a perpetual incense before the Lord, throughout your generation" (Ex. xxx:8-10). And in Ex. xxx:34-38, we have a recipe for making this incense: None was to be made like it, and it was to be used only as directed. What a wonderful type of the prayers of the saints! How costly and precious, pleasant and effective!

This altar was the type of what is usually called "the altar of prayer." Its antitype is the *place* of prayer, not any literal, raised altar. This is also one of the types which has a double meaning; an antitype, which itself has an antitype. For while the family altar, or night and morning family prayer, closet prayer, and congregational prayers are clearly antitypes, i.e., the *places* are; and the prayers themselves are the antitypes of the incense offered on this altar, there is a reference to a "golden altar" in the visions of John. Rev. viii:3 reads: "And another angel came and stood by the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it, with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne." The "odors" were "the prayers of the saints" (Rev. v:8) There is, then, *something*, in the heavenly state, called "the golden altar," which is typified by this altar of incense in the tabernacle; and there is something there called "odors," which is explained to be "the prayers of the saints." The prayers of the saints are, then, the antitypes of the "sweet incense," or odors, offered on the altar of incense in the tabernacle; and so important and expressive is this, that it is carried forward into the future state, at least into the millennial, if not into the final state of the saved!

Here we have taught more plainly and impressively than anywhere else in all the Bible, the need of morning and evening prayers; "a perpetual offering before the Lord." These prayers are typified also by the morning and evening burnt offerings. Is there not much meaning in our having *two*

types, and they so wonderfully expressive, of our morning and evening devotions, and of all that can be meant in "pray without ceasing, and in everything give thanks"? the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name? How dare we claim to be "kings and priests to God," if we make not these offerings according to the type?

Now, having described the furniture in the most holy place, and in the first holy place, let us remove the curtain at the east end of the tabernacle, and come out into the "outer court," which was inclosed by pillars and curtains, and was 75 x 150 feet, the tabernacle occupying the west portion, leaving a space on each side, and in front a space, probably about 75 x 105 feet. This outer court had in it the laver and the altar of burnt offerings.

*The laver.*—This was of brass, and was, in some way, unexplained, made of, or had connected with it, the looking-glasses of the women. These were of polished brass (Ex. xxx:18). "And thou shalt also make a laver of brass, and his foot also of brass, to wash withal; and thou shalt put it between the tabernacle of the congregation and the altar, and thou shalt put water therein. For Aaron and his sons shall wash their hands and their feet thereat" (Ex. xxx:18, 19). (See also Ex. xxx:28; xxx:9; xxxv:16; xxxviii:8; xxxix:39; xl:7-30; Lev. viii:11.) We are not taught its size, or its shape, though our modern literature gives a very nice picture; of it, according to their supposing. This is misleading the candid inquirer. No man knows its form or size, or where it stood, except as we read, "between the altar and the tabernacle." It had water, common water, to wash the hands and feet of the priests, not the holy water described in Num. xix, called "the water of separation."

Its use shows that cleanliness was necessary in the worship of God. These washings are regarded as typical of Christian baptism. This is not very clear, as may appear in the "consecration of the priests." It is enough for us to note that it sets forth the bodily, as well as the spiritual cleanliness

and purity of the divine service. Cleanliness, decency, order and purity become the worship of the Infinite One! Were we investigating the temple which Solomon built, it would be easy to tell of ten lavers, give their size, form, etc., at great length. But this investigation is of the *tabernacle*, which God himself ordered, and which is declared to be typical in almost all its parts; and where the record is silent, we cannot speak, however our natural curiosity may desire to know more.

*The altar of burnt offerings*—An article in Brown's Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, made up from Calmet, Watson, Sherwood, and Jones, commences thus: "*Altar*, the place on which sacrifices were offered; sacrifices are nearly as ancient as worship; and altars are of nearly equal antiquity. Scripture speaks of altars, erected by the patriarchs, without describing their form, or the materials of which they were composed. The altar which Jacob set up at Bethel was the stone which had served him for a pillow; and Gideon sacrificed on the rock before his house. The first altars which Cod commanded Moses to make were of earth, or of rough stones; and the Lord declared that if iron were used in constructing them they would become impure (Ex. xx:24, 25). The altar which Moses enjoined Joshua to build at Mount Ebal was to be of unpolished stones (Deut. xxvii:5; Josh. viii:20). And it is very probable that such were those built by Samuel, Saul, and David."

In giving the law, God said to Moses: "And thou shalt make an altar of shittim (or acacia) wood, five cubits long and five cubits broad; the altar shall be four square; and the height thereof shall be three cubits." It was to be overlaid with brass, and all its vessels were to be of brass (Ex. xxvii:1-9). This altar was the first thing to meet the eye on entering the "outer court," and it is presumed that it was very near the east, or entrance way. Hitherto God had not given very full and specific directions for his worship, so far as we read. Now he is more particular. And he told the Jews that, in the promised land, he would select a place (Jerusalem) to

put his name there, and that they should not sacrifice, or have altars elsewhere (Deut. xii:11-14). Joshua directed that twelve chosen men should each take a stone out of the midst of Jordan, where the priests' feet stood, and with them he built an altar at Gilgal, which is in the east border of Jericho (Josh. iv:3, 4; xix:20). This altar seems to have remained over four hundred years, as we find King Saul preparing offerings for it (1 Sam. xv:21). (There was another Gilgal, but this is probably the one here referred to.)

The altar of burnt offerings received two kinds of offerings: 1. Legal, or constrained offerings; 2. Freewill offerings. The antitype for the first is not so clear, if there is any; but the freewill offerings find their antitype in all the Christian worship and service; for here nothing is acceptable that is constrained.

The gospel calls only for freewill offerings. If people were induced to unite with the church, or to give of their means, in unscriptural ways, or from unscriptural motives, God would not be pleased. Paul, at one time, refused to permit the church at Corinth to support him, and went to work tent-making. This can be accounted for only by the fact that he saw their liberality would not be so willing, hearty, and voluntary as he liked. "The Lord loveth a cheerful (or voluntary) giver." Paul did not retain Onesimus, because it might be a constrained benefit; though he was confident Philemon was willing to do even more than he would ask (Phile. 14-21). To get money out of the unwilling is to rob them; for they will get no reward hereafter. The call is only to the willing, and voluntary offerings only are acceptable.

The offerings to be presented on this altar were not to be the lame, or the blind, but of the best of the flock, and "without blemish" (Lev. i:3; iii:1). The freewill offerings were brought to the door of the tabernacle, and he who brought an animal was to lay his hands on its head, and kill it. Then the priests offered it. The sin offering was burned "without the camp," after Aaron and his sons had laid their

hands upon it at the door of the tabernacle (Ex. xxix:10-15). Hence, Paul says Jesus "suffered without the gate (Heb. xiii:12). Jesus is, in this way, presented as the antitype of all the sin offerings under the law. And his was a freewill offering. "I lay down my life." "No man taketh it from me." Their peace offerings were devotional. Their sin offerings were to obtain forgiveness. "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission." There could be no merit in, the blood of beasts, but their blood typified the blood of Christ "shed for many for the remission of sins."

No man should bring an offering before the Lord, except such as he had himself appointed. All others would be an abomination. Nor could such offerings as he had appointed be acceptable, unless they were offered *just as he directed*. All his directions were to be observed. The wrath of God was upon all presumptuous pretenders! What a lesson for worshiping God now as he has directed, and only so! For "if a man also strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned, except he strive lawfully," or according to law (2 Tim. ii:5). If an unclean animal were brought, or anyone not appointed by law, it was an abomination. Or, if a divinely-chosen offering were brought, and offered contrary to the law, it was an abomination. God's law was sacred, and must be regarded in all its parts.

#### SUMMARY OF THE FURNITURE, ETC.

Let us be careful to have the size and proportions of the tabernacle and its three departments well in mind.

I. The most holy place, in the west end, a type of heaven, the home of God, and "the home of the soul." It had in it the ark of the covenant, the mercy seat, and cherubims. It was entered by the high priest alone, the tenth day of every seventh month, the day of atonement.

Paul, in Heb. ix:24-26, says: "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures

(or types) of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us; nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place, every year with the blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world (or Christian age); but now once in the end of the world (the Jewish age), hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself"— "once for all" (Heb. x:10). (See also Heb. ix:11, 12, etc.) And we may pause here to note that, according to the rules given and the investigations made, we see here a few points of likeness, and many points of unlikeness. The high priests entered with the blood of *others*, Christ entered with *his own* blood. The high priest, the type, entered *every year*, Jesus entered "*once for all*." The high priest entered the most holy place *in the tabernacle*; Jesus entered *heaven itself*. And as the high priest annually stood before the mercy seat, offering holy incense, and so pleading for mercy and atonement, the covering of the sins of the people, and of his own sins, as the mercy seat covered the law; so Jesus "ever lives to make intercession for us." He would cover the sins of the world, and reconcile man to God! (2 Cor. v:18, 19). How faint and feeble and imperfect the type, though the very best that could be found! How glorious and complete the antitype, ever present, ever ready, ever abundant in merit and mercy, for "all who come to God by him."

II The candlestick in the first holy place, the type of the church. Placed to the left, as the priests entered from the east, it gave abundant light in all that department. They needed no other, and they had no other; for the walls, the covering, and the curtains effectually shut out the light of day. As there was no light in the most holy place, except that which radiated from the divine presence over the mercy seat and between the cherubims, so there was no light in the first holy place, except that which radiated from the golden candlestick. If there is any meaning at all in the type, then we have no light, or knowledge of Spirit, of God, or how to worship him,

except by his word. "For the commandment is a lamp (or candle, margin); and the law is a light, and reproofs of instruction are the way of life" (Prov. vi:23). Yet the word of God will lighten no one's pathway, except as it is understood.

III. Still in the first holy place, or the church, we have, just in front of us, as we enter, and as the first and most prominent object, the altar of incense. And we have seen (1) that *altar* means not necessarily an elevated structure, but any place of prayer and worship; (2) that it is approached only by the pure and clean; never by the unclean or impure; (3) it was *in* the holy place, and must be in its antitype the church. It was approached, not only with "clean hands and pure hearts," but reverently, devoutly, humbly. Jesus refers to this in Matt. v:23, 24, while addressing his disciples on the Mount: "Therefore, if thou bring thy gift to the altar (to any place of prayer, or when you are about to pray), and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought (or just ground of complaint) against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." He may not be reconciled to you, perhaps, and will not be, for the present, if he is at a distance, etc., but you can be reconciled to him. That is, you can forgive, and love, and be right yourself. This position in the church, or first holy place (for this altar is divinely placed there, and no man is to remove or change its place!) and this condition of mind and heart is necessary to the acceptance of our prayers. David said: "If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me" (Ps. lxxvi:8). This idea David amplifies in Ps. xv and xxiv. "Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? Who shall stand in his holy place? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart; who hath not lifted up his soul to vanity, nor sworn deceitfully. He shall receive the blessing from the Lord, and righteousness from the God of his salvation." It is no matter of surprise to the intelligent, therefore, that a very large portion of the prayers offered are not heard.

IV. *The table of the shew bread*, or presence bread, stood to the right, perhaps on a line with the candlestick and altar of incense. Several items need to be noted here, for no one questions that this was the type of the Lord's table in the church.

1. It was in the first holy place, not in the outer court.
2. Only the sanctified priests were to eat this bread.
3. They were to eat it *in* the tabernacle.
4. This was a weekly business. Every sabbath the twelve loaves were removed and eaten, and fresh ones put in their place.
5. While we have such a marked point of likeness in the weekly eating of bread, we have also a noted point of unlike-ness in that there were twelve loaves there, and but one in the antitype. All this further intensifies the importance of continually observing the rules laid down for understanding types and figures of speech.
6. The priests who neglected the Lord's table in the first holy place of the tabernacle could not have the smiles and favor of God; and the Christian priest who neglects the Lord's table in the church, on a single Lord's day, without a good and sufficient reason, has no right to expect the Lord to say, "Well done, good and faithful servant." And the unfaithfulness of the Jewish priests should be a warning to us. They suffered for neglect of duty. We will suffer in like manner. God has not changed.

V. Coming east, and into the outer court, we reach the laver. The place it occupies must be carefully observed. It is not in the first holy place, not in the church. It does not, therefore, typify a church ordinance. It belongs to the outer court. The priests washed before entering. Hence Paul says: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water, by the word." Dr.



Clark *and* Mr. Wesley concur in the idea that we should read "having cleansed it with a bath of water by the word," i.e., according to the word. Heb. x:22 gives even clearer light on one branch of this subject, thus: "Let us," Christian priests, "draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having," or having had, "our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water," or simple water, not the holy water, or water of separation (Num. xix). That water was to purify. Num. viii:7: "Thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them: sprinkle water of purifying upon them," etc. It was never sprinkled on the clean. It was "to cleanse" the unclean. Hence we read, 1 Peter i:2, of "the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." And, also, Heb. xii:24, of "the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel." And the explanation is, Acts xv:9, "Purifying their hearts by faith." The holy water typified the blood of Christ, and as the sprinkling of that water was to purify ceremonially, so faith in the antitype, the blood of Christ, purifies (or sprinkles) the heart. Hence it is said to be sprinkled with the blood of Christ, putting the effect, purification, for the cause, sprinkling, a meronymy. And this use of this typical water gives force to the expression of Paul (Heb. x:22), describing the water that washed the body, viz.: "pure water," nothing but water. The preparation for drawing near to God was the pure heart and the washed body. Without these no priest could enter the tabernacle Without these no one can enter the church, the altar or the table of the Lord. (All this will be amplified under consecrating the priests.)

VI. *The altar of burnt offerings.* This was met on entering the outer court; and only after offering, or having offered, the required sin offering, could anyone approach nearer to the holy place. He could not be washed, or enter, but for this altar. Christ's sufferings "without the gate"; "bearing our sins on his own body on the cross," is the procuring, or meritorious cause of our salvation. Without it we

could not be washed, and could not enter his holy place, "the church of the living God, the pillar and support of the truth." The offering of Christ once, being perfect forever, we have no offering to make on this altar. We simply accept of Christ by faith and obedience, and are forgiven and saved because he made the necessary offering for sin, the only meritorious offering that could be made, still, if we do not accept of it, it will avail us nothing. He died to make it possible that God "might be just, and yet the justifier of him that believes in Jesus" (Rom. iii:26), putting believing for the entire course of obedience. For he is the "Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him," not to the disobedient (Heb. v:9; 2 These. i:8, 9, 10). While the altar of incense typified devotion, worship, and hence, so much and so constantly interests us, the altar of burnt offerings interests us, bringing to our minds the great sufferings of Christ for us; the antitype of all the blood shed under the law. Though we have no offering to make on this altar, and make none, none is needed, owing to the one offering of Christ. (See "the atonement.")

Now we have before us the tabernacle, its furniture and their antitypes. But, in this place, it is important to note four other items: 1. The water of separation; 2. The holy oil; 3. The consecration of the priests; 4. The duties of the priests; because these were clearly typical, and their importance to us is great.

VII. *The water of separation* A red heifer without blemish, and upon which never came a yoke, was given to the priest, and was to be slain without the camp in the presence of the priest; and the priest should sprinkle of her blood seven times before the tabernacle; and she should be burned, and the priest should cast into the fire cedar wood, hyssop and scarlet; then the ashes were preserved. They were put into a vessel and running water added to them. This was the holy water, or water of separation (Num. xix:2-22). Its use was to cleanse the unclean. If one had touched a dead body, or the bone of a dead man, or had otherwise contracted

legal defilement, this water was sprinkled upon him, and he was to bathe himself in water, before he could be clean. Taking this as a type of the blood of Christ, we have two types of this holy blood: the blood of the sacrifices and this water of separation. And they must have needed a great quantity of this holy water. See the vast numbers of cattle, beeves and persons killed and captured in the destruction of the Midianites (Num. xxxi). Then all the warriors had to purify themselves according to the law. (See Num. xxxi:19, 20, 35). The ashes of the red heifer had to be kept in quantity to make this water of separation.

This water is referred to in Ezek. xxxvi:24, 25. Israel was polluted, and for their sins were sent into Babylon. But the Lord appeared to Ezekiel by the river Chebar, in Babylon, and told him to say to the suffering captives: "I will take you from, among all the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land. Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean," etc. Had they been purified before they would not have been sent into Babylon. Surely they needed purification when they returned; and a part of the process of purification is put for the whole; for they were to wash their clothes and bathe themselves in water in all such cases, as appears in many places in Leviticus and Numbers. Perhaps the reason for this water of purification was, that they could not always have blood at hand, while this water was ever ready. And then, matters of such infinite importance well deserved two types; just as the value of the kingdom deserves two parables (Matt. xiii:44, 45, 46).

VIII. *The holy oil.* The Lord said to Moses: "Take thou also unto thee principal spices of pure myrrh, five hundred shekels, and of sweet cinnamon half as much, even two hundred and fifty shekels, and of sweet calamus two hundred and fifty shekels, and of cassia, five hundred shekels, after the shekel of the sanctuary, and of oil olive an hin." Of this, a holy anointing oil was made—none other was to be made

like it, and it was to be used only as directed; that is, to anoint the tabernacle and its furniture, the priests, at their consecration, etc. This oil was used, it is presumed in anointing their kings. David refers to it as an impressive emblem (Ps. xxiii:5): "Thou anointest my head with oil, my cup runneth over," i.e., with blessings; so Ps. xcii:10, etc.

This is regarded, on all hands, as a most beautiful and important type of the Holy Spirit, "which God hath given to them that obey him" (Acts v:32). Isa. lxi:1, says God would anoint Christ, and in Luke iv:18, Jesus says, "he hath anointed me to preach the gospel," and hence the Spirit was upon him. For this anointing was with the Holy Spirit, the antitype of the holy anointing oil in the law of Moses. The servants of Christ are also said to be anointed with the same Holy Spirit. They are said, also, to be sealed by the Holy Spirit. 2 Cor. i:21, 22: "Now he which hath established us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." 1 John ii:20, 27, addressed to all Christians about the year A.D. 96, says: "But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you," etc. See, also, Eph. i:13; iv:30: "And grieve not the Holy Spirit by which you are sealed to the day of redemption." "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Rom. viii:9).

As we cannot have a literal sprinkling of the blood of Christ on our hearts, and must, therefore, understand this to be figurative language, according to the rule exemplified on this subject; so we cannot have any kind of oil literally poured on our hearts, and hence must regard this also as figurative. And when we consider the subject of the sprinkling of the water of separation—to purify; and the object of anointing with holy oil to consecrate and seal to God and his service; we are able to understand and admire both the types and the antitypes. As every Jewish priest was anointed with holy oil,

before he could officiate in the tabernacle, so every Christian king and priest must be anointed and sealed by the Holy Spirit, the antitype of the holy oil, before he can officiate in the Christian tabernacle, or church.

We are now better prepared to consider the consecration of the Jewish priests.

## CHAPTER XIV

### CONSECRATION OF JEWISH PRIESTS

The offerings; sprinkling on them the water of separation—washing them with water—how this holy water was made and used, and its antitype; how they washed—never sprinkled or washed the clean, always the unclean, to cleanse them—they were clothed with priestly garments; anointed with holy oil—how it was made, and its antitype, the Holy Spirit; the antitypes of these four items made Christian priests; qualifications and duties of Jewish priests; Cain and Abel—their worship, and why Cain's was not accepted—a lesson for us; priests before Moses—idol priests, etc.—age and personal qualifications of Jewish priests; dress of these priests; their duties, to offer sacrifices, teach, take down, carry and put up the tabernacle—a lesson for Christian priests; they aided the government; application to us; Moses' great mistake; the emoluments of the priests; the financial tithings; the tri-ennial tithings; "the feasts of the Lord"—Sabbath, new moon, the passover, feast of weeks, feast of tabernacles—three annual feasts, and their antitypes in detail; conditions on which the offerings of Jewish priests were accepted, and the antitype in detail.

IX. As we consider the different departments, the articles of furniture and their antitypes, we become more impressed with the typical nature of almost everything about the tabernacle, and our faith must grow with our knowledge of the types. But there is no one more striking or important than the manner in which Aaron and his sons first, and then the Levites, were consecrated to the service of the tabernacle. Let us carefully note what was done on this important occasion. This is found in Exodus, 29th chapter and 40th chapter; Leviticus, 8th chapter; Numbers, 8th chapter.

As the bullock and two rams, and the accompanying sacrifices have their antitype in Christ, we need not enumerate them here.

1. *The sprinkling of the water of separation upon them.* It is said of the Levites, Num. viii:7: "Thus shalt thou do

unto them to cleanse them, sprinkle water of purifying upon them." And we have seen, from Num. xix, and other Scriptures, the recipe for making this holy water of separation, and that it was sprinkled on the people to cleanse them. It was never sprinkled on a clean person or thing. We have seen, too, how this type of the blood of Christ is referred to in the New Testament, i.e., that it was sprinkled on the heart to purify the heart; the heart being purified by faith in the blood of Christ, is called the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ (1 Pet. i:2; Heb. x:22). Aaron and his sons needed this purification as much as the Levites; they all needed it. Hence, we conclude that it was sprinkled on them also. But this purification was not all that was done in the type, and it is not all that must be done in the antitype.

2. In the presence of all the congregation Moses washed them with water. Dr. Young's translation says, "bathe them with water." The Bible society translation of 1849 says, "bathe them in water." When one had a running issue, and was cured, before he should come into the assembly, he should "number to himself seven days for his cleansing, and wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in running water" (Lev. xv:13). Four times in this chapter is it said "he shall bathe himself in water"; but only once do we read that this should be in running water. Running water was to be put on the ashes of the red heifer, to make the holy water of separation (Num. xix:17). All the unclean, after having the holy water sprinkled on them, were to wash or bathe themselves in water; frequently they were to shave off all their hair, and wash or bathe themselves in water (Lev. xvi:20; Num. xix:19; Lev. xiv:8). When running water was to be used, we know the reference cannot be to the water in the laver. It was not necessarily running water when it was put into the laver, and afterwards could not be. Running water must refer to a running stream.

Still, in all this, we have no direct reference to the manner in which they washed or bathed. The washing was clearly

of the body, however. This is repeatedly stated. And we have one case showing how they obeyed the command to bathe or wash themselves (2 Kings v:8-15). The command of Elisha was strictly according to the law (except he said seven times), "go wash in Jordan seven times." Naaman went and dipped himself seven times in Jordan, and was cured. This was, therefore, at least, an acceptable way of washing or bathing himself. The most learned Jewish Rabbis, as Maimonides, say this was their uniform way of obeying this command. The word for baptism is used here, and is rendered "*dipped* himself"; as it is in Lev. xiv:16, etc. What a misfortune that the king's translators were not so faithful to the original in the New Testament!

That the antitype of this washing, as a part of the consecration of Jewish priest, is Christian baptism, is not a question with anyone; and hence need not be proved here. It is important, however, that it shall be held carefully in memory.

And it is a fact, that Christian baptism is, in the New Testament, often called a washing, a washing of the body in pure water, or simple water, and it is called a bath. See Eph. v:25, 26: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word," or, according to the word. Mr. Wesley renders this: "Having cleansed it with a bath of water by the word." Heb. x:22: "Let us draw near to God in full assurance of faith, having (or having had) our hearts sprinkled (or purified) from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." 1 Cor. vi:11, after referring to the worst characters, says: "And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God."

The only difference noted between the ordinary Jewish washing, or bathing, in order to cleansing, and Christian baptism is, that there they washed or bathed themselves, as Naaman did: "go wash yourself in Jordan." This was a self-



baptism. And this was not the order at the consecration or ordination of the priests; for we distinctly read that Moses was to wash them (Ex. xxix:4; Lev. viii:6). If, therefore, one would be consecrated to the Christian priesthood, he must *be* washed, and this washing is performed by dipping.

3. *They were to have put on them the holy priestly garments.* "And Moses brought Aaron and his sons and washed them with water. And he put upon him the coat, and girded him with the girdle, and clothed him with the robe, and put the ephod upon him, and he girded him with the curious girdle of the ephod, and bound it unto him therewith," etc. "And thou shalt bring his sons, and put coats upon them. And thou shalt gird them with girdles, Aaron and his sons, and put the bonnets upon them," etc. (Ex. xxix:8, 9).

In the antitype, the Christian priest is commanded: "Take unto you the whole armor of God." "Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand" (Eph. vi:11, 13). And while it is the duty of each one to "put this on," or "take it unto himself," there is meaning in this item in the type, viz.: Moses clothed the priests. Should not the evangelists and elders put this armor on the new converts, i.e., teach them their Christian duties, and in every way possible, aid them in being fully clothed, armed and equipped for the Christian life?

4. *They were anointed with the holy oil.* Ex. xxix:7: "Then shalt thou take the anointing oil, and pour it upon his head, and anoint him." Ex. xxx:30: "And thou shalt anoint Aaron and his sons, and consecrate them, that they may minister to me in the priest's office." The tabernacle and all its furniture were anointed with the same holy oil, to set them apart to their special service.

This holy oil, as was shown while describing the things belonging to the tabernacle, was a type of the Holy Spirit. So all commentators and critics agree. As Aaron and his sons were anointed with this holy oil at their consecration to the Jewish priesthood; so Christian priests are anointed with the

Holy Spirit at their consecration to the service of Christ. Hence, Peter, at the beginning, promised the gift of the Holy Spirit to those who repented and were baptized (Acts ii:38), i.e., the Holy Spirit as a gift; a comforter. And its reception is called a sealing. Eph. i:13; iv:30: "Ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is an earnest of our inheritance," etc. "And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God whereby you are sealed unto the day of redemption." Sealed *with*, and sealed *by* the Holy Spirit of promise. 2 Cor. i:22: "Who hath also sealed us, and given us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." (See 2 Tim. ii:19.) This Spirit was in the promises as well as in the types. (See Luke xxiv:49.) "And behold I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high. Isa. xlv:3; Joel ii:38: "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh," i.e., the Jews and the Gentiles (John xiv:16, 26; xv:26; xvi:7; Acts i:4; ii:1, etc.). He saw the disciples full of sorrow, and said to them: "I will not leave you comfortless," or orphans; without a comforter. Hence he added: "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another comforter that he may abide with you forever." Jesus was about to leave them, but the promised comforter should never leave them, and should be better than his personal presence. This must be the meaning of—"It is good for you that I go away, for if I go not away the comforter will not come." "Whom the world cannot receive." The world could receive both Jesus and his word, but they could not receive this Holy Paraclete. Some would apply all these promises to the apostles alone, because they were given to them personally; but really no more than all the other promises, laws and ordinances were given to them personally— for the church. Hence, we need to distinguish between the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, given to the apostles and a few others, and the Holy Spirit as a comforter promised to every disciple, to all flesh, i.e., the Jews and the Gentiles. And

we read, Acts v:32: "And we are witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him." John vii:39: "But this spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive." This means all who believe on him; and it was the Spirit, and not a miraculous gift of the Spirit. It was to be received and was sent. Hence, it could not be our spirits purified. We do not receive them on our obedience to Christ. "To them that obey him," means to all that obey him. And just before his ascent to heaven, "he breathed on them, and saith unto them, receive >e the Holy Ghost" (John xx:22). This was literally keeping his promise that he would not leave them comfortless. And this referred not to the miraculous power of the Spirit. This miraculous power was given a few days after this—on Pentecost (Acts, 2nd chapter): "In your body and in your spirit" (1 Cor. vi:20), distinguishes *man's* spirit. The other references are to God's Spirit. And 1 John iii:24 says: "And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us." This was said to all Christians living A.D. 90. God had given to every one of them *his* Spirit. Hence Gal. iv:6 reads: "And because ye are sons God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." This could not be man's spirit purified. It was sent forth from God, because their spirits were purified. And, therefore, Paul says (Rom. viii:9): "Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." This might safely close this testimony but the subject is of the gravest magnitude, and more may be added.

Rom. viii:9, 11, "The Spirit dwells in you"; and our bodies are to be raised "by his Spirit which dwelleth in you." This dwelling was literal, actual. No one can "dwell" in any place by proxy. It is a personal dwelling, therefore; and by that divine person which dwells, lives, abides in us, our bodies are to be raised up and immortalized. Surely this cannot be the work of man's spirit, however purified. The church was built for "a habitation of God through the Spirit" (Eph. ii:22)

just as the tabernacle was inhabited by God through the pillar of cloud and fire. J 1 Cor. vi:19: "Know you not that your body is the < temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you, which you have of God, and you are not your own." And, Rom. v:5: "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." And the holy anointing oil was the chosen type of this Holy Spirit; as the holy water, and the blood of the sacrifices were types of the blood of Christ, etc.

#### QUALIFICATIONS AND DUTIES OF JEWISH PRIESTS

Gen. iv:3, 45, tells us of *Cain and Abel and the first formal priestly offering*. This is the first detail of formal worship, and must be of great interest on this account.

"And in process of time it came to pass that, Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord. And Abel, he also brought the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering: but unto Cain and his offering he had not respect. And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell." Several items should be noted here:

1. Cain and Abel "brought" offerings. This implies a *place* of worship.
2. It implies that it was not a new thing to worship God by sacrifices, though we have no previous detailed account of anything of the kind. They had probably seen their father do so, and he doubtless had prepared the place. All such places of worship by sacrifice were afterwards called *altars*.
3. It implies that Abel's offering was by faith, and according to God's command. And so we read (Heb. xi:4): "By faith Abel offered to God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." He must, therefore, have had instruction, and evidence, or it could not have been "by faith." Where there is no evidence there can be no faith.

4. All this implies that Cain had no instruction, command or evidence as to bringing the fruit of the ground, and was serving his own convenience only, when he did so; and hence was not accepted. God accepts the worship he requires; not anything and everything man may choose to bring or do. Long after this God did require the fruit of the ground; and then it was accepted (Ex. xxii:29; Prov. iii:9). It seems probable that Cain's heart was not right; and this might have hindered the acceptance of his offering; but his having no command or direction to bring the fruit of the ground was sufficient to cause its rejection. Had his heart been right he would have obeyed the command, as Abel did.

5. It implies that, unless God has changed, he will not accept of worship now which he has not commanded or directed. Here we have a great lesson for all who would worship God acceptably. Worship cannot be by faith, unless we have authority for faith; and without faith it cannot be acceptable. It is *mil* worship, and as displeasing to God as it is unprofitable to man. (See Col. ii:18-23.) *Will* worship is self-imposed worship, the invention of man. This was Cain's worship.

When Jacob left Laban, and Laban followed him, it is said, on their separation (Gen. xxxi:54): "Then Jacob offered sacrifice upon the mount, and called his brethren to eat bread; and they did eat bread, and tarried all night in the mount." This was patriarchal worship. The other case was individual worship. And so, for about twenty-five hundred years individuals and families worshiped.

The first formal altar we read of was built by Noah, when he came out of the ark, B.C. 2348 (Gen. viii:20). "And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean beast, and every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar." This was acceptable to God (v. 21; Gen. xii:7). There Abraham built an altar to the Lord. Gen. xxxv:1, Jacob built an altar at Bethel. Gen. xvii:15, after the battle with Amalek, "Moses built an altar, and called the name of it

Jehovah-nissi"; i.e., "the Lord my banner." So worshiped Abraham, Laban, Isaac, etc.

There were priests in the idol worship in (the days of Joseph in Egypt (Gen. xlvii:22). But we read of no formally appointed, or special priests in the divine worship, till the Aaronic priesthood. At Mount Sinai, before the covenant was ratified, Moses "builted an altar under the hill." And he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt offerings and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen unto the Lord" (Ex. xxiv:4). When the covenant was ratified, then God chose Aaron and his sons, Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, to be priests (Ex. xxviii:1), and the priestly office ever afterwards belonged to them, and to their sons. "And thou shalt appoint Aaron and his sons, and they shall wait on the priest's office, and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death" (Num. iii:10). God would punish those who interfered with *his* order of worship.

#### ETYMOLOGY OF THE WORD PRIEST

President Milligan says: "The Hebrew word for *priest* is of doubtful etymology. The English word is generally supposed to be a contraction of *presbyter* (*presbuteros*); but there can be no doubt that the native power of this word differs essentially from that of the Hebrew. The meaning of the word will, therefore, be best understood from the duties and functions of the office."

Webster derives "priest" from "presbyter," and says it means an "elder," "who is authorized to consecrate the host," etc.

"New 'presbyter' is but old priest writ large."—*Milton*. But it never meant what is now meant by preacher or evangelist. Scriptural evangelists are not the antitypes of the Jewish priests. Paul's definition is better: "Every priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins" (Heb. v:1). Hence, all Christians are priests, and are so

denominated (1 Pet. ii:5; Rev. i:6, etc.). Christ is our *high* priest (Heb. vii:17; ix:11, 12, 24, 25). Christians are sons of the high priest. And as Christ is clearly the antitype of the high priest under the law, so Christians are the antitypes of the sons of the Jewish high priests. There is no room, in the Christian system for any other priests or priesthood. Christ can have no successor, since he "ever lives." His one offering of himself was a perpetual sufficiency for the earth, and he ever lives in heaven to plead for us. There can, therefore, be no place for the pope or his high priests. Christians are all children of God, and heirs of immortality. "All ye are brethren." No one is to lord it over another. Hence, the only officers in the church are appointed to perform clearly defined works, all of which are as different from the Jewish priests as are their names from the names of the Aaronic priesthood. Settle it, then, that on earth there can be no priests except as all Christians are alike "Kings and priests to God and our Father," and the claims of others who would be antitypical priests are entirely without foundation. The claim of preachers to be antitypes of the Aaronic priests was in the first apostasy, second century, and it is now in our apostasy.

#### AGE AND PERSONALITIES OF JEWISH PRIESTS

The Levites were to be thirty years old to enter the office; and at fifty they were to go out (Num. iv:3). In Num. viii:24, the Levites were to enter upon, and aid the priests at twenty-five years of age. 1 Chron. xxiii:3, 24, 27, the Levites were to enter on the service at twenty years old. But they were in the attitude of aids, or apprentices, and only entered on the priest's office really when they were thirty. At least this is the common understanding, and seems to be the correct one.

Two points especially, already noted, should, perhaps, have more attention here:

1. It is a fact that, with all our care, we may *be* too confident, and may use too strong language in stating our conclusions; e.g.: While it is not specifically said of the high-priest and his sons, the priests, that they became priests at thirty years of age, and ceased to officiate at fifty, we conclude that they did, because this is plainly said of the Kohathites and others. (See Num. iv:34-43.) The service of the Kohathites was next in sacredness and importance to that of the priests. Some of the Levites entered on the service of the tabernacle at twenty-five, and some of them at twenty, as has been shown. And, although the sons of Aaron were the priests, and the rest of the Levites the servants and helpers of the priests (Num. viii:19; Num. iv:22, 29, 30), we conclude that they often offered sacrifices, and did almost every-thing the priests did; because it is said they were to "do service," and "minister in the tabernacle" (See the verses already cited and the references); and because it is said that they *helped* the priests in the sacrifices (2 Chron. xxix:34; xxxv:11); and especially because we have this plain language concerning the Levites (1 Chron. xxiii:26-30): "Because their office was to wait on the sons of Aaron for the service of the house of the Lord, in the courts, and in the chambers, and in the purifying of all holy things, and the work of the service of the house of God; both for the shew bread and for the fine flour for meat offerings and for the unleavened cakes, and for that which is baked in the pan, and for that which is fried, and for all manner of measure and size; and to stand every morning to thank and praise the Lord, and likewise at even; and to offer all burnt sacrifices unto the Lord in the sabbaths, in the new moons, and on the set feasts, by number, according to the order commanded unto them, continually before the Lord," etc.

What more could the priests do? Yet the Levites, as a class, were servants and helpers of the priests; but they did the work.



2. The claim is set up now by many Roman, Greek and Protestant preachers, to sacerdotal or priestly rights and powers. So long as this is yielded, the church will virtually belong to the clergy, and will be ruled by them. Read the following, p. 972, Brown's Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, made up from many celebrated authors:

"But sacerdotal dignities are never ascribed to Christian presbyters, and the principles in which the appropriation originated may be evidently traced to the working of that anti-Christian power which produced at length 'the mystery of iniquity and the man of sin.'

"The conclusions involved in this argument are subversive of all those 'high church' pretensions which, in more than one hierarchy, have been immediate sources of arrogant and unholy dominion. The doctrine of prerogatives, whether regal or pontifical, has been for ages upheld by the advocates of despotism on most indefensible grounds; and the 'divine right' by which kings reign and priests lord it over God's heritage, has been indebted for its main support to the same assumption and analogy! Judaizing, in one form or another, has been the (*proton-pseudos*) first delusion under the dispensation of Him who was 'meek and lowly of heart" The first disciples required special illumination to emancipate their minds from the secular spirit they had imbibed. The first errors that troubled the churches and perverted the gospel arose from the notion of amalgamating Judaism with Christianity. The decree of 'the apostles, the elders, and brethren,' though 'it seemed good to the Holy Ghost,' did not eradicate the tendency that led to the 'beggarly elements' of the abolished economy. One of the earliest indications of the rising spirit of anti-Christ appeared in the principle that made one class of ministers superior to another, and found its convenient prototype in the high priest's supremacy. The analogy led to its consummation by most appropriate (or cunning) encroachments, till *one* bishop became the supreme pontiff, and the imagined resemblance was complete. Judaizing is the basis of Protestant hierarchies; and the Old Testament, abused and perverted, furnishes the principal sources, both of the illustrations and the authority, by which the mighty operations of ecclesiastical polity and priestly dominion is supported. (See Stratten's Book of the Priesthood; Howitt on Priestcraft; Dwight's Theology; Cong. Mag., Feb., 1831— Calmet; Hend. Buck.)"

Never was anything better put or more certainly true. The preachers, basing their claims on the ancient priesthood, brought about the first terrible apostasy in the church. The preachers are causing Protestants to apostatize now on the same false grounds. Some of them also claim a direct and special call, and the mass of the people do not like to resist and oppose such pretensions, and will not, unless they understand the New Testament teaching. Those who, more than others, seem to glory in their claim to follow "the Bible alone," are largely following the preachers almost "alone!"

Preachers are grand agents for the promotion of truth. No one class of people can do so much. But when they assume sacerdotal and ruling power, when they assume to be English "clergymen" or American "pastors," they corrupt the worship, pervert the Scriptures, become lords instead of servants of the church, as Paul was, and enslave their brethren, their equals, instead of enlarging their divine freedom and promoting their usefulness and happiness. Jesus said: "Ye have one Father, God; and all ye are brethren." "Be not servants of men"; call no man master," i.e., teacher. And he referred to just such masters and teachers as modern clergy preachers. (See the duties of preachers elsewhere in this work.)

The priests were to be without blemish (Lev. xxi:17-21). They must have no blemish as blindness, lameness, flat nose, or anything superfluous. They must not be broken-footed, or broken-handed, or crook-backed, or dwarfs, etc.

The priests were to be of the tribe of Levi. Others might be more capable and more desirable, but even King Uzziah could not offer incense. 2 Chron. xxvi:18: "It appertaineth not unto thee, Uzziah, to burn incense unto the Lord, but to the priests, the sons of Aaron" (I Sam. xiii:8-15). Saul "forced" himself, and "offered a burnt offering"; but he lost his kingdom for his presumption and disobedience.

Their moral integrity and capacity were safely presumed from their age and freedom from all blemishes and imperfections.

## THE DRESS OF THE PRIESTS

See Ex. xxviii:40-43. They were to have coats, girdles, and bonnets, "for glory and beauty," and white linen breeches, to cover their nakedness, "to reach from the loins to the thighs." (See Rev. xix:8.) The "righteousness of the saints" is here, as elsewhere, indicated by the "linen garments clean and white." White is and has been in all ages and countries the emblem of purity. The priests were, therefore, to be a pure white and holy people.

Besides the ordinary priestly garments, the high priest, when in full dress, wore four other golden adornments, viz.:

1. The robe of the Ephod (Ex. xxviii:31-35; xxxix:22-26)

2. The Ephod (Ex. xxviii:6-14; xxix:2-7).

3. The breastplate of judgment. On this was engraved the names of the twelve tribes. In it were the urim and thummim (Ex. xxviii:15-30).

4. The plate of gold. On this was inscribed "*Holiness to the Lord*" (Ex. xxviii:36-38; xxix:30). (See also Ps. xciii:5; Zech. xiv:20, 21).

As a further indication of the purity of the priests, they were not to marry a woman of ill-fame, or one divorced (Lev. xxi:7, 8). The high priest was to marry only a virgin of good report, from a family of his own people (Lev xxi:13-15)

## THE DUTIES OF THE PRIESTS

These were numerous, and of great variety. Assisted by the Levites, they were:

I. To offer sacrifices, burn incense, and perform all the other service peculiar to the tabernacle (Ex. xxvii:20, 21; xxx:1-10). See Lev. i:5-17; Luke i:9; Heb. viii:4; x:11; Num. iii:5-10; iv:4-15; xviii:1-7, and the references.

II. They were to teach the people, and to act in all respects as God's messengers of mercy, and as examples for

others (Lev. x:8-11; Jer. ii:8; Mal. ii:1-9; Luke x:31, 32). Their manner of teaching was principally reading the law, and brief comments. (See "Reading the Law," with references and exemplifications.)

III. The priests should take down, carry, and put up the tabernacle. In Num. iv:5-17, we read full instructions for taking down and bearing, or carrying the tabernacle. (See Ex. xxv:13-15; xxxvii:5, 14, 15, 27; xxxviii:7.) Here we see the rings and bars for carrying the ark, the table, the altars, etc. Ex. xl tells of putting up the tabernacle. In Num. vii:2-10 we read of six wagons and twelve oxen. Two wagons and four oxen were given to the sons of Gershon, and four wagons and eight oxen were given to the sons of Merari. "But (v. 9) the sons of Kohath he gave none; because the service of the sanctuary belonging unto them was, that they should bear upon their shoulders. (See Num. iv:15.) These wagons "were to do the service of the tabernacle of the congregation" (v. 5). But "the sanctuary" was to be carried on the shoulders of the sons of Kohath. "And when Aaron and his sons have made an end of covering the sanctuary, and all the vessels of the sanctuary, as the camp is to set forward; after that, the sons of Kohath shall come to bear it; but they shall not touch any holy thing, lest they die" (Num. iv:15).

We see, then, why God smote Uzzah at "the threshing-floor of Nachan, when the oxen stumbled, and *Uzzah* put forth his hand to the ark of God " 1. It should have been carried on the shoulders of the sons of Kohath, not put on a cart. 2. It was not to be touched, even by the sons of Kohath; it was carried by bars in rings. 3. *Uzzah* and Ahio, who drove the cart, were not sanctified. (See 1 Chron. xv:2-15.) During the three months the ark remained in the house of Obededom, David learned how the ark should be treated and, when they proceeded according to law, they were blessed. He says to the priests: "For because ye did it not at the first, the Lord our God made a breach upon us, for that we sought him not after the due order So the priests and the Levites

sanctified themselves to bring up the ark of the Lord God of Israel. And the children of the Levites bare the ark of God upon their shoulders with the staves thereon, as Moses commanded according to the word of the Lord" (Verses 13, 14, 15). What a lesson for those now who imagine they may serve God any way they please, so they are sincere! David and these people were evidently sincere when Uzzah was smitten; but they were not proceeding "after the due order." God's law is sacred, and must be regarded. Pause and note the examples here given.

IV. The priests had much to do with the judiciary department of the government In Lev. xxvii:8, 12, 15, 19, 23, 27, we have in detail their appraising, or valuing many things. "As thou valuest it who art the priest, so shall it be" (v. 12). They judged the value of property. And the Levites had forty-eight cities with their suburbs, six of which were cities of refuge, where one who slew his neighbor might flee, and be protected from "the avenger of blood" till he "stood before the congregation" for judgment. If he was guilty, he was punished; if he was not, he remained in the city of refuge till the death of the high priest. And when such an one presented himself at the gate of one of these cities of refuge, and declared his cause, the elders should receive him, etc. This implies government by the elders, which was common in other cities. The murderer being "brought before the congregation" for judgment, is not explained fully. Evidently the elders, who were all priests in these cities, probably retired priests, i.e., priests over fifty, were prominent in these trials, and they decided the cases. The priests, therefore, at least in these instances, judged in cases of life and death. (See Num. xxxv; Deut iv:41; Josh. xx:2, 7, 8; xxi:3-38.)

We know that the priests exercised judicial authority very largely on many occasions. (See Samuel, Eli, and others.) The judges of Israel were not always priests, but they were in many instances; and when others were judges the high priest especially was consulted, and exercised a very

great influence in the government. We are not so much concerned, however, about the high priest in this investigation, because we have on earth no high priest now. Our high priest is in heaven. We have only the antitype of the sons of the high priest, i.e., Christians; and the great purpose in these lessons is, to learn their duties, etc. Let us not speculate, but earnestly inquire for *our duty now*. To this all these inquiries are directed. No Christian should feel uneasy about the duties of the high priest. They will be faithfully performed, whether we understand them or not. And they have no antitype on earth. We need not fear as to the work of the Holy Spirit, either. That will be faithfully done. Our understanding all about it will be of little importance. Nor need we concern ourselves about the "deep things of God before the foundation of the world." We should feel assured that the "Judge of all the earth will do right." This is enough. But we do need to be concerned about our personal duty. A wise writer said he feared nothing, except that he might fail to understand, or do his duty. A great general said to his son: "Duty is the sublimest word in our language."

From the investigation as to the duties of the Aaronic priests, four things are abundantly apparent:

1. That the sons of the Jewish high priests were types for Christians; i.e., that Christians are the antitypes of the sons of Aaron and their descendants.

2. That they had peculiar and specific duties to perform.

3. That on the faithful performance of these duties depended their safety and happiness, and also the safety and prosperity of those for whom they ministered. Indeed, the whole world, in all ages, was interested in their faithfulness.

4. That so far as they were faithful, they and others were blessed; and so far as they failed of duty, they and others suffered. This last item needs exemplification.

- (1.) Ex. xxxii tells us of the sin of Aaron in making the golden calf, and the death of three thousand people as a result, and great discouragement to all the people.

(2.) The rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, who secured two hundred and fifty princely followers, and who were swallowed up in the earth (Num. xvi). This is a fearful example of priestly unfaithfulness. The whole congregation suffered by this.

(3.) While Samuel was yet a boy, and Eli was old, a man of God came to Eli to tell him of his errors in the management of his sons, etc., and that he would cause him to suffer. "For them that honor me will I honor, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed." See 1 Sam. ii:30, and all that chapter and the next. Then see 1 Sam. iv:16, 17, and read: "And the messenger answered and said, Israel is fled before the Philistines, and there hath been also a great slaughter among the people, and thy two sons, Hophni and Phineas, are dead, and the ark of God is taken!" And Eli fell over and died. (See also 1 Kings ii:27.) Surely God punishes sin!

Every careful Bible reader knows that many cases of unfaithfulness on the part of the priests might be noted here, and that this unfaithfulness was terribly punished, as a warning to others. So, too, the unfaithfulness of the judges, kings, and of all people is noted "for our admonition" (1 Cor. x:6, 11). "Now these things were our examples (types) to the intent we should not lust after evil things as they also lusted." "Now all these things" (the evils they suffered for disobedience) "happened to them for ensamples (types), and they are written for our admonition." Paul said this to Gentile Christians and all the saints in A.D. 59. (See 1 Cor. i:1.) Surely these examples are for us. This is Paul's explanation of the type. So, too, he writes Hebrews, third and fourth chapters, as examples for us.

Will we, then, be warned? or will we, after all these admonitions and warnings, go on in disobedience? And, remember, neglect of duty is disobedience. If under Moses, "every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward, how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord,

and was confirmed to us by them that heard him" (Heb. ii: 23). Transgression is passing over, or trampling upon the law; as when God says, "Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth," and we not only use slang phrases, vulgar and corrupting words, but even blaspheme the name of God! Disobedience is non-obedience; as when Paul says, "not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is, but exhorting one another; and so much the more as ye see the day approaching" (Heb. x:25). Are we disobedient to this; that is, do we neglect assembling ourselves together, and do we neglect to exhort one another? With all these recorded examples of unfaithfulness, which so much abound in the Bible, how can the unfaithful presume to hope that they can escape ? They have not the least ground for hope. It is vanity, and will be a vexation of spirit forever!

#### MOSES' GREAT MISTAKE AS A WARNING

If there ever was a man with whom God would be patient and forbearing, that man was Moses. "Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men that were upon the face of the earth" (Num. xii:3).

Before Moses had reached Mt. Sinai with his people, while they were in Rephidim, they murmured for water, and the Lord directed Moses to go on before the people, taking with him some of the elders and his rod; and "behold, I will stand before thee there upon the rock in Horeb; and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it, that the people may drink. And Moses did so in the sight of the elders of Israel" (Ex. xvii:5, 6). This was well, for Moses did just what God told him, and no more.

But some twenty years or more afterwards, while they were in Kadesh, there was no water again, and the people "chode with Moses." "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, take the rod, and gather thou the assembly together, thou



and Aaron, thy brother, and speak ye to the rock before their eyes; and it shall give forth his water, and thou shalt bring forth to them water out of the rock." . . . "And Moses lifted up his hand, and with his rod he smote the rock twice; and the water came out abundantly," etc. His smiting the rock twice was not commanded. He was not told to smite it even once on this occasion, though he was directed to smite it before; he was only told to *speak* to the rock. He had made another mistake, which is recorded thus: "Hear ye now, ye rebels; must we fetch you water out of this rock?" (Num. xx:1-11). Moses did more than was commanded, and took to himself and Aaron some of the honor which belonged to God alone. These were grievous errors. "And the Lord spake unto Moses and Aaron, because ye believed me not, to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore, ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them" (Num. xx:12; Deut. xxxii:50-52). Moses and Aaron both died in the wilderness. What an example of punishment for unfaithfulness! And if God would treat Moses and Aaron so, how will he treat us if we are unfaithful ?

Moses was very desirous to go over and see the promised land, and said: "I pray thee, let me go over and see the good land that is beyond Jordan and Lebanon. But the Lord was wroth with me for your sakes, and would not hear me; and the Lord said to me, let it suffice thee; speak no more to me of this matter. Get thee up into the top of Pisgah, and lift up thine eyes westward, and southward, and eastward, and behold with thine eyes; for thou shalt not go over this Jordan" (Deut. iii:25-27. See also Deut. i:27; iv:21; ix:20). God had forgiven Moses, and loved him, as God only can love; but he must make an example of him, to warn the children of Israel and all succeeding generations, lest they sin and suffer for it. Let them not close their eyes, or refuse to profit by these examples. God has not changed. If he punished sin then, in his best friends, he will punish it now.

## THE EMOLUMENTS OF THE PRIESTS

The division of the tribe of Joseph into Ephraim and Manasseh left twelve tribes without the Levites. The Levites were taken instead of all the first-born, and were devoted to the service of the tabernacle. "Because all the first-born are mine: for on the day that I smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt, I hallowed unto me all the first-born in Israel, both man and beast, mine they shall be; I am the Lord" (Num. iii:13. See also Ex. xiii:11, 12; Deut. xv:19, 20). Of course, this tribe must live. They did not share with the twelve tribes in the division of the promised land, but they had given to them, out of the portions allotted to the others, forty-eight cities and their suburbs, two thousand cubits on each side from the walls of the cities. (See Num. xxxv:1-9, etc.; and Joshua, 21st chapter.) Aaron and his family were the priests; the rest of the Levites were helpers in the service of the tabernacle. The priests had thirteen cities; the rest of the Kohathites had ten cities; the children of Gershon had thirteen cities; and the children of Merari had twelve cities. These cities, with their villages and suburbs for stock, were a rich possession. Out of these forty-eight cities six were cities of refuge. When the suburbs are given as a thousand cubits only, it may be that what they called the *sacred* cubit is meant, "the cubit of the sanctuary," which was double the ordinary cubit.

The second emolument of the priests was the first-born. "Everything that openeth the matrix in all flesh, which they bring unto the Lord, whether it be of men or of beasts, shall be thine; nevertheless, the first-born of men shalt thou surely redeem, and the first-born of unclean beasts shalt thou redeem (Num. xviii:15). This was a very rich endowment.

A third very rich revenue for the priests was the heave offerings: "All the heave offerings of the holy things, which the children of Israel offer to the Lord, have I given unto thee, and thy sons and thy daughters with thee, by a statute forever" (Num. xviii:19). These heave offerings were very

numerous, and might be eaten anywhere. They generally furnished a bountiful living for all their families. (See Num. xviii:11-18, etc.)

Fourths What is called *sin money*: i.e., money gotten by fraud or wrong. When the sinner desired to be forgiven, he must confess, and restore the principal, and "add to it the fifth part thereof, and give it unto him against whom he hath trespassed. But if the man have no kinsman to recompense the trespass unto, let the trespass be recompensed to the Lord, even to the priest; besides the ram of the atonement, whereby an atonement shall be made for him" (Num. v:5-8). "The trespass money and sin money was not brought into the house of the Lord: it was the priest's" (2 Kings xii:16. See Lev. v:15-18). "As the sin offering is, so is the trespass offering; there is one law for them; the priest that maketh atonement therewith shall have it" (Lev. vii:7). And Num. xviii:8-10 says: "And the Lord spake unto Aaron, Behold, I also have given thee the charge of mine heave offerings of all the hallowed things of the children of Israel: unto thee have I given them by reason of the anointing, and to thy sons by an ordinance forever. This shall be thine of the most holy things, reserved from the fire; every oblation of theirs, every meat offering of theirs, every sin offering of theirs, and every trespass offering of theirs, which they shall render to me, shall be most holy for thee, and for thy sons" (Lev. vi:16, 18, 26, 27; Lev. vii:6). Here we are plainly taught that all should eat of these offerings, but only in the holy place, not everywhere as they might the other offerings. Except a few, the burnt offerings were not wholly burned. They burned only "the fat that covereth the inwards, and the caul that is above the liver, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon them," and the head. (See Ex. xxix:13-17; Lev. i:8-12; Lev. iv:8-10).

Fifth: The freewill offerings were numerous, and embraced what are called meat offerings, drink offerings, and offerings of the first fruits; all without leaven or honey, but

having salt. The priest, after burning on the altar a memorial portion, ate the remainder. (See Lev. 2d Chap.; also Num. 15th chap., and Num. xviii:5; xxviii:12, 13.) For the drink offerings, see Num. xv:5-13; xviii:14. "And also the burnt offerings were in abundance, with the fat of the peace offerings, and the drink offerings for every burnt offering" (2 Chron. xxix:35).

Surely the priests were well provided for, without noting their other advantages and revenues. But they were continually dependent on the people. They had nothing, except their cities and suburbs, and a few perquisites, and what the people brought. If the people were faithful, the priests lived well. It was, therefore, the interest of the priests to teach and cause the people to be faithful. In this we have a striking type of the dependence of evangelists, bishops, and deacons upon the church for support and encouragement. If the church is faithful, her servants will be sustained, and will have no need to resort to any special methods or efforts for what is justly due them. If the church is not right, her servants must abandon their work, or adopt unscriptural methods of "living of the gospel"; just as it was with the Jewish priests and people. If the priests were unfaithful, as were Hophni and Phinehas, the sons of Eli, and many others, it is no more than reasonable that we should look for unfaithfulness among the people. Unfaithfulness in the priests caused unfaithfulness in the people. Then the priests resorted to unbecoming methods, went to other employments, or hired themselves out to do service to idols, mixing some of the divine order with their service. See Judges xvii:7-13; Micah's young hireling. He made a bargain to serve Micah a year, as priest for his idols, for ten shekels of silver, a suit of clothes, and his victuals. But see the next chapter, Judges xviii. When the Danites, on their way to Laish, called on the young hireling, he left Micah, connived at the stealing of his idols, and went with them for better wages, etc. So it has been with hirelings ever since. "The hireling fleeth because he is

an hireling" (John x:13). The man who makes money his object in preaching is very likely to "flee when the wolf comes," and to break his covenant under some pretense or other, whenever a larger salary is offered.

And as the priests were dependent on the people, and hence were personally interested in their faithfulness, so the people were dependent on the priests, and were personally interested in their faithfulness. For the people could not offer an offering of any kind. The priests alone could do this. If the priests failed to make a sin or trespass offering, as they often did, the sinners were not forgiven. (See Lev. fourth and fifth chapters, etc.) One of the objections strongly used against baptism for the remission of sins has been, and is, that it puts remission of sins in the hands of preachers, who may, and do refuse to baptize sometimes. But this was as applicable to the Jewish law, the priests and the people. No one was there to make his own offering. No one here is to baptize himself. And the administrators might refuse, and *did* refuse sometimes. But we cannot deny the law in the case of the Jewish priests and people. No one pretends to deny it. Why pervert the plain meaning of language in the Gospel to get rid of a difficulty that is confessed in the law, the type? What the Judge will do finally as to holding the priests and preachers accountable, and excusing the people when they did all they could, we may not affirm further than this "The Judge of all the earth will do right."

#### THE TRIENNIAL TITHING

This is not so fully explained. But we read: "At the end of three years thou shalt bring forth all the tithes of thine increase the same year, and shall lay it up within the gates" (Deut. xvi:28). "When thou hast made an end of tithing all the tithes of thine increase the third year, which is the year of tithing, and hast given it to the Levites, the stranger, the fatherless and the widow, that they may eat within thy gates and be filled; then thou shalt say before the Lord," etc.

(Deut. xxvi:12, 13; Amos vi:4). "Tithing all the tithes of thy increase," and "tithes of thine increase," may mean that the whole people were to tithe their three years' increase, besides the annual tithes; or that the priests were to tithe all the tithes they had received for the three years; or both, which is more probable. This was to be piled up at the gate, or door of the tabernacle, and shared equally by the Levites, the fatherless and widows, the strangers and the poor, during their third annual feast; and they should eat and rejoice before the Lord, confessing his goodness and faithfulness, cultivating their devotional nature, their social nature, getting personally acquainted, and profiting by the past in all their future labors.

"THE FEASTS OF THE LORD"  
(Lev. xxiii:44)

1. *The Sabbath.* See Lev. xxiv:2, 3. This and all their feasts were "holy convocations to the Lord," and no "servile work" was to be done in them. Of the manner of observing this day, and the reasons for it, more may be said under "The Sabbath and the Lord's day."

2. *The New Moon.* "Also in the day of your gladness, and in your solemn days, and in the beginnings of your months, ye shall blow with the trumpets over your burnt offerings, and over the sacrifices of your peace offerings; that they may be to you a memorial before your God; I am the Lord your God" (Num. x:10). "Likewise the people of the land shall worship at the door of this gate before the Lord in the sabbaths and in the new moons" (Ezek. xlvi:3) "And in the day of the new moons, it shall be a young bullock without blemish, and six lambs, and a ram; they shall be without blemish" (Ezek. xlvi:6) "And David said unto Jonathan, behold, tomorrow is the new moon, and I should not fail to sit with the king at meat" (1 Sam. xx:5, 18, 24). "And she called unto her husband, and said, send me, I pray thee, one of the young men, and one of the asses, that I may run to

the man of God, and come again. And he said, wherefore wilt thou go to him today? it is neither new moon nor sabbath. And she said, it shall be well" (2 Kings iv:22, 23).

This was a standing feast, like the others, and if it is not so fully explained, we will be safe when we note just what we read about it. We cannot make plain and clear by our conjectures, or the opinions of the Rabbis or others, that which is left dark or uncertain in the holy Scriptures. It is safer to be silent where the Bible is silent.

3. *Feast of the Passover.* "Observe the month Abib, and keep the passover unto the Lord thy God; for in the month of Abib the Lord thy God brought thee forth out of Egypt by night," etc. (Deut. xvi:1). "In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the Lord's passover." On the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the Lord, seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread (Lev. xxiii:5, 6. See Ex. xii:3, 13, 15, 20; Ex. xiii:3-10).

The loaf on the Lord's table is the emblem, pointing us back to his suffering, as the paschal lamb pointed the Jews forward to his death as the antitype of the paschal lamb.

4. *The feast of weeks.* Deut. xvi:10, 11. "And thou shalt keep the feast of weeks unto the Lord thy God, with a tribute of a freewill offering of thine hand, which thou shalt give unto the Lord, according as the Lord thy God hath given thee; and thou shalt rejoice before the Lord," etc.

This was their "*Pentecost*," fifty days after the passover.

"And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering; seven sabbaths shall be complete" (Lev. xxiii:15; Ex. xxxiv:22; Num. xxviii:26).

The New Testament makes these two feasts very prominent (Matt. xxvi:17-30; Mark xiv:22; Luke xxii:19; Acts, first and second chapters). Here we have the last paschal lamb and the antitype, and the wonderful events connected with that historic Pentecost, and the beginning of the reign of Christ.

5. *The feast of tabernacles.* "And thou shalt observe the feast of tabernacles seven days, after that thou hast gathered in thy corn and thy wine." (See Deut. xvi:13-16.) "Three times in a year shall all thy males appear before the Lord thy God, in the place which he shall choose" (which was Jerusalem); "in the feast of unleavened bread" (the pass-over), "and the feast of weeks" (the pentecost), "and the feast of tabernacles" (the feast of booths; and of ingathering). "And they shall not appear before the Lord empty" (Verse 17). "Every man shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the Lord thy God which he hath given thee." See almost the same, Ex. xxiii:14-17.

#### THE THREE ANNUAL FEASTS

"Three times thou shalt keep a feast unto me in the year" (Ex. xxiii:14). "Three times in the year all thy males shall appear before the Lord thy God" (v. 17). "Thrice in a year shall all your male children appear before the Lord God, the God of Israel. For I will cast out the nations before thee, and enlarge thy borders: neither shall any man desire thy land when thou shalt go up to appear before the Lord thy God thrice in the year" (Ex. xxxiv:23, 24). "Even after a certain rate every day, offering according to the commandment of Moses, on the sabbaths, and on the new moons, and on the solemn feasts, three times in the year, even the feast of unleavened bread, and in the feast of weeks, and in the feast of tabernacles" (2 Chron. viii:13). (The manner of keeping these feasts will be found under "The Sabbath and the Lord's day," and "Reading the Law.")

Several of these feasts are called by other names, and there were other less noticeable feasts, and some not of God; as the feast of *Purim*. Esther ix:20, 21; Isa. xxix:13, 14; and Col. ii:22, refer to these appointments and precepts of men, and declare them null and void. So does Matt. xv:9; Mark vii:7, etc. The object in this investigation is to find out the *principal* matters in the Jews' typical religion; so that



we may discover their antitypes, and have the advantages these types were intended to give us.

#### THE ANTITYPES OF THESE FEASTS

These feasts are among the most prominent matters in the religion of Moses; and it has been fully proved, by direct quotations, that almost everything there was typical. See Hebrews, 9th chapter, where all these things are called types, and where Paul gives, largely, their antitypes, even to "meats and drinks," etc. See 1 Cor. x:6, 11; also Col. ii, where these very days are referred to as holy days, and shadows of things to come. And in 1 Cor. v:7, 8, read: "Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened, for even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast not with the old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." Here reference is rightly made to Ex. xii:15; xiii:6; Deut. xvi:3; Matt. xvi:6, 12; Mark viii:15; Luke xii:1. There are, then, in the Christian system, antitypes of those feasts of the unleavened bread, etc.

1. Jesus is the antitype of the paschal lamb, which was slain at the beginning of the first of the three annual feasts. (See Isa. liii:7.) John i:29 calls him the "Lamb of God," evidently alluding to the paschal lamb. 1 Peter i:19: "But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" (Rev. v:6, 9, 12; xiii:8). We have, therefore, Jesus clearly presented as the antitype of the principal item in the first annual feast. What a wonderful lesson this affords us! We see that the Divine Being in designating the paschal lamb in Egypt, had in view the principal item in the grand scheme of redemption. The Jews could not fully understand or appreciate it then. Well does the apostle say of these ancients, 1 Peter i:12: "Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have

preached the gospel unto you, with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look- into" (Ex. xxv:20; Dan. viii:13; xii:5, 6; Eph. iii:10). If angels are so much interested in this, surely we should be. If they desired to "look into it," surely we should not be content without an effort to understand these grand antitypes.

2. There must be, in the Christian system, an antitype of these feasts themselves, at least the principal ones; the new moons or beginning of their months, their regular seventh day sabbaths, and their three annual "solemn feasts"; for these were not what we now call *festivals*, for mirth and fleshly enjoyments, but for worship, teaching, learning, and religious rejoicing, etc. And nothing in all the grand programme meets this, fitting it as the glove to the hand, but the meetings of God's people. Note the rules and exemplifications given to show that we must not look for points of likeness everywhere, and yet must we find a likeness somewhere, or the type would be a failure. And as there is no other, we must conclude that the antitypes of these feasts are the assemblings of the saints, which we are told we must not neglect (Heb. x:25). This is rightly applied to our first day assemblings, but the type had other assemblings, besides those of their sabbaths. Should not Christians have others also? If the Jews met in "holy convocations" monthly, made their offerings and had their special worship, if this was safe and necessary for them, how is it that we do not need something of the same nature, at least frequent "holy convocations," besides the Lord's day meetings ? And if it was safe, economical and necessary for all the males to assemble, at the place divinely appointed, three times every year, why is it not safe, economical and necessary for Christians to meet frequently every year, from all parts of the land, and spend "seven days," or double that time, as the Jews did sometimes, in getting personally acquainted, cultivating our social nature, worshiping, teaching and learning? And I would emphasize this question—*why not?* Were the Jews not as liable to abuse or mis-use these meetings as we

are? That they were capable of being abused, and were abused sometimes, there is no doubt. But the same was and is true of every other meeting. Every good thing may be abused. Have we yet to learn that this abuse is no evidence against the thing itself? The abuse of these meetings should be corrected and avoided.

While we may not claim an exact and universal likeness in the antitype, we must still allow, in all candor and truth, that there is some likeness. The principle is certainly established. God's people needed to assemble from distant parts frequently. Why do they not need this now? It cost them far more in time and means than it costs us now, with our facilities for travel. And though we have books, papers, etc., there is no way of cultivating our social nature, and gaining other important advantages, without being together.

"Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another, and the Lord hearkened and heard it; and a book of remembrance was written before him for them, that feared the Lord, and that thought upon his name" (Mal. iii:16). It is as true today as in the days of Solomon, that: "Iron sharpeneth iron; so a man sharpeneth the countenance of his friend." "As in water face answereth to face, so the heart of man to man" (Prov. xxvii:17, 19). We meet our brethren from a distance feeble and discouraged, it may be, and separate strong and ready for the fiercest battles of life.

3 These meetings were entirely for social, religious worship, service, teaching, learning, rejoicing, and strengthening one another. They were not law-making assemblies. The laws were made already. They were to obey laws. They were not *society* assemblies, to hear reports, elect officers, and "devise ways and means" for the work of the Lord. ALL these were "devised" before by infinite wisdom. We read of no resolutions passed, except in one case, if this may be so denominated. It was at the third annual feast, "the feast of booths," under Nehemiah, on their return (about 50,000 of them") from Babylonish captivity, and when they had spent

the half of every day for seven days, reading the law, giving the sense and causing the people to understand the reading, "the ears of all the people being attentive"; when they had learned, by this reading, many of their errors and duties. (See Neh. 8th chapter and ix:3, etc.) Nehemiah exhorted and admonished them, and they saw and felt that they and their fathers had gone far astray, and suffered much for their sins and follies. "And because of all of this we make a sure covenant, and write it; and our princes, Levites and priest's seal unto it" (Neh. ix:30). Then the names are given in the 10th chapter. We, then, may and should have our general meetings, read, learn, etc. And when we are sure we understand our former errors, and our present duties, we may enter into a "sure covenant," write it, and sign it, that we will keep the law of God for the future. So did the fathers of this reformation, and so are many doing now. See their church records. Yonder was the type; here is the antitype. But we must forever abandon law making, society forming, "devising ways and means"; as if the "perfect law of liberty" was not perfect! We must at once and forever abandon the idea of making these assemblies subservient to the special interests of preachers or any special class. They were for the *masses*; not for the *classes*. They were for worship and religious service; not what we are now wont to call "business meetings." The priests might, perhaps, according to our way of reasoning, have had their "priestly institutes," or their "priestly meetings," for the better qualifying themselves, and for "devising ways and means" to secure for themselves place and power. But the type furnishes us nothing of the kind, as the New Testament does not. The priests learned their duties directly from the law, as we can ours from the gospel; and they taught the people their duties by reading to them the law, and explaining it to them; not by sermonizing from *scraps* of Scripture as clergymen do now, with as much of self and of human learning, and human eloquence as possible.

4. These three annual meetings show a divine and gracious providence and care of his people, which must have its antitype in God's care for his people now. The twelve tribes of Israel were scattered far abroad, and were surrounded by hostile savages. How dare they, then, leave their homes and families at three stated periods of each year, and go up to Jerusalem, being absent from fourteen to twenty-one, or thirty days each time? Their enemies, whose land they had "possessed," knew the times of their absence. What assurance had they that they would find their families and homes intact on their return? This assurance they had in these words: "For I will cast out the nations before thee, and enlarge thy borders; neither shall any man desire thy land, when thou shalt go up to appear before the Lord thy God thrice in the year" (Ex. xxxiv:24. See also Gen. xxxv:5; 2 Chron. xvii:10; Acts xviii:10). "When a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him" (Prov. xvi:7). *How* he does this is not the question here. The fact is enough for the true believer, if he never understand how the promise is made good. The consolation that Peter gave the scattered and persecuted Jewish Christians was: "Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time; casting all your (anxious) care upon him; for he careth for you" (1 Peter v:6, 7). "He careth for you," does not mean that he once cared for you, and sent his Son to die for you, but that he cares for you now. "For the eyes of the Lord are over the righteous and his ears are open to their prayers" (1 Peter iii:12). And there was nothing miraculous in all of this. And what of his caring for us, and his eyes and ears being open to us if he is not present with, or ready to help us? All these Scriptures imply a gracious and constant providence, which is set forth in the type, and in all the dealings of God with his faithful servants. In this we now may safely "trust and not be afraid."

CONDITIONS ON WHICH JEWISH WORSHIP AND OFFERINGS  
WERE ACCEPTABLE TO GOD

No question can be of greater importance than this; for if our worship is not accepted it is useless. Some people imagine there is but one condition of acceptance, viz., sincerity. And the importance of sincerity cannot be exaggerated. But we are trying to learn the teaching of the Bible and our *whole* duty. Let us note,

1. An offering, to be accepted, must be just what God appoints or commands. He has pointed out many things he will not accept; as the unclean beasts, fowls, etc., and the lame, the halt and the blind. It must be "without blemish"; and it must be what God has appointed. Hence, Cain's offering was not accepted (Gen. iv:3-5).

2. All offerings must be presented in the way God directs. Num. xxvi:61 tells us of the death of Nadab and Abihu because "they offered strange fire before the Lord" (1 Chron. xv:13). David, referring to the death of Uzzah, etc., says it was because "we sought him not after the due order." This order was that none but the purified Levites should carry the ark, and *they* should not *touch* it. And the *unsanctified* had it on a cart, and touched it.

3. None but the pure could offer acceptably. Owing to their uncleanness the Lord said: "I will not smell the savor of your sweet odors" (Lev. xxvi:31).

"The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord; but the prayer of the upright is his delight" (Prov. xv:8).

"The sacrifice of the wicked is abomination to the Lord; how much more when he bringeth it with a wicked mind" (Prov. xxi:27).

"They have chosen their own ways, and their soul de-lighteth in their abomination" (Isa. lxiii:3).

"They sacrifice flesh for the sacrifices of mine offerings, and eat it; but the Lord accepteth them not" (Hosea

"Though ye offer me burnt offerings and your meat offerings, I will not accept them; neither will I regard the peace offerings of your fat beasts" (Amos v:22, 25).

"To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord. I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats. . . . Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination to me. The new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth! And when you spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you: yea, when you make many prayers, I will not hear; your hands are full of blood" (Isa. i:11, 13, 14, 15).

"If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me" (Ps. lxvi:18). Many other passages might be given of the same nature.

In these passages we have the *fact* very clearly stated, and the *reason* for it. God is holy, and he will be worshiped by a holy people only. David, in Ps. xv and xxiv, asks, "Who shall abide in thy tabernacle?" And "Who shall ascend into the hill of God? Who shall stand before the Most High?" And he answers: "He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart." Clean hands refers to dealings with our fellow men; clean hearts, to God.

But under the typical dispensation God *did* accept of worship, hear prayers and bless, when (1) the required offerings were brought; (2) when they were offered according to the form in his law; (3) when they were presented with "clean hands and pure hearts." But evidently very much of the Jewish worship was entirely unacceptable. And we may easily find in each particular,

## THE ANTITYPE IN CHRISTIAN WORSHIP

God is the same now. He has changed the forms and ordinances in his worship, but not the *principle*. *Principles never change*. Hence, those who would worship acceptably must:

1. Do the things he commands in the gospel. It will avail nothing to observe the commands and ordinances of men, or to follow our own ways. We must do what he orders, and not more nor less. Even Balaam, a selfish man, ready to curse Israel for Balak's gold, said: "I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord my God, to do less or more" (Num. xxii:18). And Micaiah acted on the same principle (1 Kings xxii:14; 1 Chron. xviii:13). And in the New Testament, we have, in its close, the most solemn warning, and denunciation of those who would add to or take from the word of God (Rev. xxii:18, 19). Paul (Gal. i:8, 9) denounces every man, and even angels who would preach any other gospel, saying: "Let him be accursed."

2. We, like the Jews, must do God's commands as he directs. Paul covers this whole ground in 2 Tim. ii:5. Noah builded the ark just as God commanded (Gen. vi:22, vii:5). And Moses prepared the tabernacle according to the pattern shown him in the Mount, and according to the divine word-painting. "Thus did Moses: according to all that the Lord commanded him, so did he" (Ex. xl:16). Had Noah or Moses turned aside, departed from, added to or taken from the *manner or form* of their structures, there is no reason for concluding that they would have been accepted of God, or served the purposes for which they were made. Of prayer John says: "And this is the confidence that we have in him, that if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us" (1 John v:14). "According to his will" implies that if we ask anything *not* according to his will, he will not hear us. Thus, should we ask forgiveness without repentance, or doing what we could to comply with his law of pardon, he would



not hear us. If we should ask God to forgive and save a dear friend whose heart is yet sinful, he would not hear us. If we should ask God to convert one forcibly, i.e., without consulting *his* will, he would not hear us; or should we ask for vengeance on our enemies, or for quails and manna, as these were given to the Jews, he would not hear us. Also, since God has provided a Mediator, we read from him: "No man cometh unto the Father, but by me" (John xiv:6). We must, therefore, approach the Father in the name of Jesus (John xvi:23, etc.). We cannot force ourselves by him, or disregard him, and still get near the Father., Jesus said to the Samaritan woman: "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth" (John iv:24). To worship "in spirit," is to worship spiritually, heartily. To worship "in truth" is to worship according to truth, or as God has directed.

3. We, too, must come humbly and with "clean hands and pure hearts." Otherwise, instead of pleasing God, while observing the very thing he has commanded, and in the order and manner directed, we may "eat and drink damnation to ourselves," i.e, eating from an impure motive—the love of the bread and wine, and not for the Lord's sake (1 Cor. xi:29). "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily" (in an unworthy manner), "eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body."

"Jesus answered them and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracle, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled" (John vi:26). This was a very unworthy motive, and gave character to their action. Jesus reprov'd the motive, and sought to correct them.

Jesus, while instructing his disciples in the Mount, said: "Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee (or just ground of complaint against thee), leave there thy gift before the altar and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother,

and then come and offer thy gift" (Matt. v:23, 24). "Be reconciled to thy brother" does not mean that you may not pray before *he* is reconciled to *you*. *You* must be right in your own heart, and so be reconciled to *him*, and to all men. "And there rememberest," implies self-examination as we approach the altar, or place of prayer; just as we are to examine ourselves when we approach the Lord's table. If we make no self-examination, or if we know our brother has "just ground of complaint" against us, or that we are not reconciled to him, we need not expect to be heard, however loud and long we may pray.

After noting the wickedness of the man who had been forgiven, and would not forgive his fellow servant, and was imprisoned till he should pay all of the very money that had been forgiven him, Jesus said: "So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if you, from your hearts, forgive not everyone his brother their trespasses" (Matt. xviii:35). And in the prayer Jesus taught his disciples to pray, he said: "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors" (Matt. vi:12). If we pray, therefore, without forgiving others, i.e., without a forgiving heart, we are really praying that God will not forgive us! For this is the meaning of "forgive us as we forgive our debtors." If we do not forgive at all, we are praying that we may not be forgiven at all!—deceived by the blindness of an unforgiving heart.

The man who had been blind, in his controversy with the Pharisees, said: "Now, we know that God heareth not sinners: but if any man be a worshiper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth" (John ix:31). The Pharisees did not venture to call this in question. They did know both: (a) that God does not hear sinners; and (b) that he does hear his true and obedient worshipers. But they cast this man out of the synagogue. This kind of power they could use when foiled in argument. Were they not sinners then? And would their prayers be heard?

How very encouraging to be thus warned and taught, in the type and in the antitype, that we may not be accepted unless we worship aright, but that we certainly will be heard, answered and accepted, if (1) we do what Jesus commands; (2) if we obey as he directs; and (3) if we come with clean hands and pure hearts! The Lord help us to "examine ourselves whether we are in the faith" properly, and to worship him in spirit and in truth.

## CHAPTER XV

### ATONEMENT AND GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL

Annual atonement day; items—tradition and Bible teaching as to tabernacle types and antitypes; first or Sinaiatic covenant; use of the term tabernacle; golden censer; things not yet made manifest; the veil figurative; redemption for transgression under the old covenant; the government of Israel, primary and permanent—judges, wise men from among the elders—shall judge righteously—fear God, not man—fear a gift to blind the mind; judges for the Lord, and judges for the city; elders not necessarily officers—never equivalent to any office—officers chosen from among them; New Testament elders—bishops being called elders not proof of their sameness; duties of elders; duties of officers; absurdity of young men being officers—elders—preachers not congregational officers.

#### THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

The three annual feasts have been noted: (1) The *pass-over*, in the month Abib, which included the last of March and the first of April, the time they began to "put the sickle to the corn." (2) The *pentecost*, or feast of weeks, and the feast of the first fruits (Num. xxviii:26; Ex. xxxiv:22). (3) The feast of *booths*, in the seventh month. But this seventh month and its feasts require some special consideration. (See Lev. xxiii:23-38). On the first day of this month came the usual feast of the new moon (their months were lunar months), blowing of trumpets over their sacrifices, etc. On the fifteenth day of this month commenced the feast of booths. But on the tenth day of this month came the annual atonement. (See Ex. xxx:10-17.) Everyone over twenty years old should give half a shekel, which should be "appointed for the service of the tabernacle." (See Lev. xvi:1-29, for the manner of procedure. And Lev. xvi:29-31, et sq.) The people should stand in the outer court, and afflict or humble themselves before the Lord, while the high priest went into the most holy place to make the atonement.

Lev. xxiii:26-44, and Deut. xvi:1-17, give again these feasts, and the day of atonement. Every soul that would not afflict and humble himself on the day of atonement, should not only be unforgiven, but cut off from the congregation (Lev. xxiii:29, 30). "And this shall be a statute forever unto you: that in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, ye shall afflict your souls and do no work at all, whether it be one of your own country or a stranger that sojourneth among you: for on that day the priest shall make an atonement for you to cleanse you, that you may be clean from all your sins before the Lord. It shall be a sabbath of rest unto you, and ye shall afflict your souls, by a statute forever."

It would be convenient to note here over a dozen particular details in the programme for the observance of this day, as given by the Rabbis, from the Mishna and other traditions; but no one could feel certain of their correctness, further than they are given in the passages just referred to. And they are not practical. We are looking for our duty. Hence, the noting of just what pertains to duty. In this search it is deemed best to copy largely from the holy record, instead of simply giving references, lest the references may not be examined. And having been far more deeply impressed with the importance of the *types*, by a close and thorough examination we are constrained to ask the careful reading of the following quotations, in proof and explanation of the

#### TABERNACLE TYPES AND ANTITYPES

"Then verily the first covenant (the Sinaiatic) had also ordinances (or ceremonies, *marg.*) of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made, the first within was the candlestick, and the table, and the shew bread; which is called the sanctuary. And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the holiest of all; which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant, overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the

covenant; and over it the cherubims of glory shadowing the mercy seat; of which we cannot now speak particularly. Now, when these things were thus ordained (set in order) the priests went always into the tabernacle (i.e., the first holy place), accomplishing the service of God. But into the second (i.e., the most holy place), went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people: the Holy Ghost thus signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation (i.e., the beginning of the New Covenant). But Christ being come, an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands (as the type was), that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works (the unmeritorious and merely typical sacrifices under the law of Moses), to serve the living God? And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament (i.e., the Sinaiatic covenant), they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance" (Heb. ix:1-15). . . . "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy

places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us" (Heb. ix:23, 24). The careful student should closely study the whole of the ninth and tenth chapters of Hebrews. A few notes on some of these clauses will aid our study: *The first Covenant*. This evidently refers to the Sinaiatic covenant in contrast with the gospel, or Christian covenant, which is called the new covenant. (See Heb. viii:8-11; Jer. xxxi:31-35.) There was a well marked covenant with Noah (Gen. viii:20-22). Also with Abraham (Gen. 12, 13, 15, 17 and 22nd chapters). But the Sinaiatic and the Christian covenants are called the old and new in contrast. They might be also denominated, the temporal and the spiritual, or the partial and universal.

2. "*The tabernacle*" is here applied to the first holy place, and then to the most holy place. Generally this phrase designates the entire structure.

3. "*The golden censer*" was carried by the high priest into the most holy place, on the atonement day, and left there, it seems, till the following year. The high priest entered several times, and his first entrance would afford him an opportunity to carry it out with him. Then, when ready to make the atonement, he took burning coals from the altar of burnt offerings, put them into the censer, and putting the sweet incense on these, the smoke arose over the mercy seat, and God spoke to him (Ex. xxv:6; xxxi:11; xxxix:38; Lev. xvi:12).

4. "*Not yet made manifest*"; it was not opened. The veil had not been rent, and till it was rent, no eye but that of the high priest could see into that holy place.

5. "*The veil, that is, his flesh*." The flesh ever serves as a veil; and none of us can at all fully see or understand the future while in the flesh. Our flesh, also, hinders us from seeing many things earthly in their true light.

6. "*Which was a figure for the time then present*." Also in verses 23, 24, patterns of things in the heavens; figures of

the true; and Heb. x:1: "The law having a shadow of good things to come," etc., all go to put beyond question the idea that all that tabernacle and its service, including "meats and drinks, divers washings," and the offerings, *were typical*. We cannot too well settle this in our minds. We may fail, at first, to find the antitypes, perhaps, but they are in the church, and we should search for them till we do find them. When we understand them well, we will see why no more is said on various points—as the morning and evening sacrifices of incense, trimming the lamps, the weekly loaf, etc.

7. *"Redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament,"* the Sinaiatic covenant. There could be no merit in "the blood of bulls and goats," etc. That blood could only typify the truly meritorious blood. It could not purge, or satisfy the conscience (Verse 9). They knew and felt that there was no merit, or expiatory value in it, and that it typified something not fully revealed.

8. *"Remembrance again made of sins every year."* This is clearly taught. (See Heb. x:3.) As there was no expiatory merit in the offerings, their sins were only put forward for a year, and then "remembered again every year." Hence the annual atonement. But when Christ came, he made an offering of merit "once for all." And now pardon is both real and perpetual. To this, however, there may be one exception, or condition, viz.: that we persevere in the divine life, and turn not again to sin. (See Matt. xviii:23-35.) "The kingdom of heaven is like"—a king who forgave ten thousand talents, and afterwards changed this, and required the servant to pay it all, because he refused to forgive a man who owed him a hundred pence. Jesus adds, verse 35: "So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if you, from your hearts, forgive not everyone his brother their trespasses." We need no yearly atonement; no more expiatory blood; but we need to forgive as we are forgiven, and to live the Christian life. "For after if they have escaped the pollutions of the world, through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior



Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning" (2 Pet. ii:20. See also next verse.) (See "*The Atonement*," for meaning of word, etc.)

#### THE GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL

All classes of people are interested in this, and especially in so far as it is typical and practical. It is at the foundation of all the good governments of the earth. Civil governments are safe and prosperous in proportion as they are mainly conformed to this divine model.

The government of Israel was both civil and ecclesiastical. This union was clearly intended to be for the Jews only, and was to cease when the promised seed should come. Christians are especially interested in the ecclesiastical, or religious part of this government, so far as it is typical; and it is confidently believed that when it is well understood, its antitype, the government of the church, will appear much more plain and wise. And as this is a *Bible* investigation, let us see just what that book says. Take the following specimens:

"And Moses chose able men out of all Israel, and made them heads over the people, rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens. And they judged the people at all seasons; the hard causes they brought to Moses, but every small matter they judged themselves" (Ex. xviii:25, 26).

And Moses said: "You are as the stars of heaven for multitude. How can I myself bear your cumbrance, and your burden, and your strife? Take you wise men, and understanding, and known among your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you" (Deut. i:10, 12, 13, 14, etc). When this was done, Moses charged them, saying: "So I took the chief of your tribes, wise men, and known, and made them heads over you, captains (i.e., heads) over thousands, captains over hundreds, captains over fifties and captains over tens, and

officers among your tribes. And I charged your judges at that time, saying, hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the stranger that is with him. Ye shall not respect persons in judgment; ye shall hear the small as well as the great; ye shall not be afraid of the face of man; for the judgment is God's: And the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me, and I will hear it" (Deut. i:15-18). This was for Moses' lifetime. But he told them how they should proceed after they reached the promised land; thus:

"Judges and officers shalt thou make thee in all thy gates, which the Lord thy God giveth thee, throughout thy tribes; and they shall judge the people with just judgment. Thou shalt not wrest judgment; thou shalt not respect persons; neither take a gift; for a gift doth blind the eyes of the wise, and pervert the words of the righteous" (Deut. xvi:18, 19, sq.). Hence 555 years after this, when Jehosaphat would reverently honor this law, it is said: "And he set judges in the land throughout all the fenced cities of Judea, city by city, and said to the judges, Take heed what ye do, for ye judge not for man (only), but for the Lord, who is with you in judgment. . . . Moreover, in Jerusalem did Jehosaphat set of the Levites, and of the priests, and of the chief of the fathers of Israel, for the judgment of the Lord, and for controversies, when they returned to Jerusalem. . . . And behold, Amariah, the chief priest, is over you in all matters of the Lord; and Zebadiah the son of Ishmael, the ruler of the house of Judah, for all the king's matters. Also the Levites shall be officers before you. Deal courageously, and the Lord shall be with the good" (2 Chron. xix:5-11).

And 440 years later, 457 years before the birth of the Savior, and when the Lord moved Artaxerxes to favor the Jews in their return to Jerusalem, and he sent Ezra, etc., we read, Ezra vii:25: "And thou, Ezra, after the wisdom of thy God, that is in thine hand, set magistrates and judges which may judge all the people that are beyond the river,

all such as know the laws of thy God, and teach them that know them not." (See, also, Ex. xxiii:3, 6, 7; Lev. xix:18; xxv:1; Prov. xvii:15; xviii:5; xxiv:23; 2 Chron. xix:6-10; Deut. xvii:10-13; Ezra vii:26, etc.)

Now let us note a few items clearly set forth in these testimonies, the negative and positive:

1. *"Take you wise men," etc. "And Moses chose able men," etc.* At one time the people were to take, or look out their rulers and judges; and then it is said that Moses did this. This was the style then. Moses did it; but he did it through and by their agency, and according to their wishes. The people selected them according to Moses' instructions, and Moses appointed them, charged them, etc. So in the antitype (Acts vi:3, 5, 6). The people chose according to the instructions of the apostles, and the apostles ordained or appointed. (See Acts xiv:23.) The apostles "ordained," no doubt, the persons chosen by the multitude. And Titus was to "ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee" (Titus i:5). Doubtless, the multitude chose them according to Titus' instructions, and Titus ordained them. Thus the type and antitype agree.

2. *"Wise men"—"able men."* How careful Moses was to give the character and qualifications of the judges and rulers the people were to choose. And so it is in the antitype. The exact character and qualifications of bishops and deacons are given at length (1 Tim. 3rd, and Titus 1st chapter). None others could be church officers. The character and qualifications for voters in our civil government, and for our officers and judges, are given in our civil government code, and none others can vote or hold office. They are given for baptism; and none other can be baptized.

3. *"Judge righteously."* Everywhere in the type and in the antitype, justice must be done; righteousness must be practiced. Those who object to the Bible, object to justice and righteousness!

4. *"Ye shall not be afraid of the face of man."* God's people can afford to be brave. They fear to offend God, not man. This enables them to do justice. "The fear of man bringeth a snare: but whoso putteth his trust in the Lord shall be safe" (Prov. xxix:25).

5. *"They shall judge the people."* The people having chosen their judges and rulers, were not called on to decide cases. The judges decided, and the people submitted, and carried out their decisions. This also appears in the antitype—in the church.

6. *"A gift doth blind the eyes of the wise, and pervert the words of the righteous."* (See also Deut. xxvii:18; Matt. xv:14; Isa. lvi:10; xlii:19; Matt. xxiii:16; Rom. ii:19; 2 Cor. iv:4; 1 John ii:4; Rev. iii:17.) Many Pharisees were "blind guides"; and the "blind led the blind" (Matt. xxiii:16, 17, 26; John ix:40, 41). Some were physically blind, some were morally blind. The first were commiserated, the second were blamed. Their blindness and ignorance were their sin. They had "closed their eyes" (2 Pet. i:9). "He that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off," etc. (Rom. xi:7; 2 Cor. iii:14). "Their minds were blinded." "Blindness of heart" (Mark iii:5). "Blindness in part hath happened to Israel" (Rom. xi:25). Hence, when Samuel was "old and gray-headed," when he had anointed a king for Israel and was about to retire, he said, in demonstrable sincerity and truth: "Behold, here I am. Witness against me before the Lord" (i.e., before the tabernacle, wherein the Lord dwelt), and before his anointed (King Saul), whose ox have I taken? or whose ass have I taken? or whom have I defrauded? whom have I oppressed? or of whose hand have I received any bribe to blind mine eyes therewith? And I will restore it to you. And they said: thou hast not defrauded us, nor oppressed us, neither hast thou taken aught of any man's hand," etc. (1 Sam. xii:3, 4). This was a grand close to a magnificent official life. The antitype has a case much like this in Paul. To the Corinthians, some of whom, being blind of

heart, had slandered and wronged Paul, he said, demanding: "Receive us: we have wronged no man, we have corrupted no man, we have defrauded no man" (2 Cor. vii:2). This was for himself and Timothy, who joined him in this letter. Spiritual, or moral blindness, induces wrongs to others, the perversion of judgments and holy Scripture. It grows out of, or is, an abnormal state of the heart. That state or condition may be superinduced by bribes, gifts, salaries, worldly honors, love of worldly pleasures, etc. We might speak of judicial blindness thus brought on; of political blindness, blindness of preachers by high salaries, etc., blindness of sectarians, who love party more than truth, etc. But Solomon's admonition covers the whole ground: "Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life" (Prov. iv:23). Of the same nature is this: "O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh" (Matt. xii:34).

7. He *"set of the Levites, of the priests, and of the chief of the fathers of Israel, for the judgment of the Lord, and for controversies."* These were the best qualified for the work; part of them were Levites, part were priests, and part, the chief of the fathers of Israel. No wiser arrangement could be imagined. But this shows that the priests were not the only judges, if indeed they were judges at all by virtue of their priestly office. They were not excluded or neglected, however. The best fitted for the important work were chosen from all classes and conditions of the people. The same is true as to teachers. The priests were teachers, but not the *only* teachers. The chief business of the priests was ministering in the tabernacle. They became teachers, judges, and governors only as they were better qualified than others, not by virtue of being priests. Their greatest kings were not of the tribe of Levi, and could not be priests.

8. *"And behold Amariah, the chief priest, is over you in all matters of the Lord, and Zebediah, the son of Ishmael, the ruler of the house of Judah for all the king's matters."* The

chief priest, then, was the final appeal in matters of the Lord, and Zebediah was chief in the king's matters, the civil department of the government. They served somewhat the place of our supreme judges, and their decisions were final, unless the king interfered. This appellate power was used by Moses, Joshua, the miraculously inspired judges, and, in their absence, largely by the high priests. Their *extraordinary* judges, Samuel, Eli, Samson, Gideon, Jephtha, etc., were especially raised up and miraculously qualified. They certainly had appellate power. From their decision there was no earthly appeal in their dominion. In their absence the chief priests occupied that place. But in this place we need to consider more carefully:

#### THE ELDERS OF ISRAEL

The elders now seem not to be understood, and to have them occupy their proper place in the church it is necessary to look at them in the typical dispensation. This may require precious time and space, but the importance of the subject, as may yet appear, *demand*s both the space and time. Let us be altogether candid and fair, and as brief as possible. Those who cannot afford to go through this investigation may live and die in very damaging error. And those who imagine they understand this subject without having done more than barely enter upon the borders of a proper investigation of it are needlessly deceiving themselves; and some of them are deceiving others. These suggestions are designed to encourage the investigation that will cut the very tap-root of errors now bearing deadly fruit in the congregation of the saints. Some of our leading writers tell us that elders and bishops mean the same persons, and are synonymous. Others tell us that elders, bishops, deacons, and *preachers* are the same, or so nearly so as at least to get the preacher in as a bishop whether he has the scriptural qualifications or not. When we understand the elders, we shall be better prepared to understand the

Scriptural pastors of the churches. Let us have *typical* cases, beginning with the first:

In Gen. 1:7 it is said that, to bury Israel, "All the servants of Pharaoh, the elders of his house, and all the elders of the land of Egypt went up." Observe here the Egyptians had elders as well as the Israelites. They never confounded elders with officers. No heathen nation did, and they all had their elders.

Ex. iii:16: God said to Moses: "Go and gather the elders of Israel together, and say," etc. The Egyptians were officers over them; but the Jews had elders, and they were measurably and naturally heads and representatives of the people. Hence when Moses assembled them, and spoke to them, they reported to the masses. In this way Moses reached all the three millions of Israelites.

Ex. iv:29; and xii:21 "Gather together all the elders"; "and Moses called for all the elders of Israel."

Ex. xxiv:1-9: "And he (God) said unto Moses, come up unto the Lord, thou and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel, and worship ye afar off." "Then went up Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel." Here seventy are chosen from among the elders of Israel for a special service. (See v. 14.) Of course, they were still *elder* or *older-men* (Lev. iv:15). "And the elders of the congregation shall lay their hands on the head of the bullock before the Lord."

Lev. ix:1: "Moses called Aaron and his sons and the elders of Israel."

Num. xi:16: "And the Lord said to Moses, gather to me seventy men of the *elders* of Israel, whom thou knowest to be the elders of the people, and officers over them."

Observe here. The Jews had officers over them; one man at the head of each tribe, and then "captains of thousands, captains of hundreds, captains of fifties, and captains of tens" (Deut. i:15; Num. xxxi:14; Ex. xviii:25, 26; Num. i:5-16. These captains were officers, to "judge the

people at all seasons." And the seventy especial helpers of Moses, who should bear a part of the burden of responsibility with him, were to be chosen from among these elders and officers. There were many, very many elders who were not of this special seventy, and who were not captains or officers at all, but simply elders. From among the elders all important officers were chosen. Yet elders, though not officers, had an important work, and a great and controlling power. Hence, Moses, the judges, the high priests, and even the kings consulted them, as we will see.

Num. xxii:4: "And Moab said unto the elders of Midian," (v. 7): "The *elders* of Moab and the *elders* of Midian."

Deut. v:23: "The heads of your tribes and your elders." The heads of the tribes called on the elderly men to aid them, as on many occasions. Deut. xxi:2: "Thy elders and thy judges shall come." They co-operated. See vs. 4, 6, 19, 20; chap. xxii:15-18; xxv:7-9; xxvii:1: "Moses with elders of Israel commanded the people." All this the elders did by virtue of being elders, or elderly men, and without any special office.

Deut. xxxi:28: "Gather unto me all the elders of your tribes, and your officers, that I may speak these words in their ears, and call heaven and earth to record against them." xxxii:7: "Ask thy elders, and they will tell thee."

Judges xi:5: "The elders of Israel went to fetch Jephthah."

Ruth iv:2: Boaz "took ten men of the elders of the city." They acted for the city in the sale of land.

1 Kings viii:1: "Solomon assembled the elders of Israel." This, too, was for conference.

1 Sam. xvi:4: "The elders of the town trembled at his (Samuel's) coming." xxx:26: David "sent of the spoil to the elders of Judea." 2 Sam. iii:17: "He communicated with the elders of Israel." v:3: "The elders of Israel came unto the king." 1 Kings viii:3: "The elders of Israel came and the priests." xx:7: "The king called all the elders of the land." xxi:11: "The elders and the nobles did," etc. 2 Kings



x:5: "He that was over the house, and he that was over the city, the elders also, and the bringers up of the children," etc. Here, as elsewhere, the elders were a class of people having great influence, but not necessarily officers; there were special officers over the king's house and over the city, xix:2: "The scribes and the elders of the priests." Ezra x:8: "The counsel of the princes and the elders." x:14: "The elders of every city." Isa. xxxvii:2: "The scribes and the elders of the priests." When Israel had apostatized, it is said (Lam. iv:16): "The priests, they favored not the elders." v:12: "The faces of the elders were not honored." v. 14: "The elders have ceased from the gate." Ezra vi:7: "The governor of the Jews and the elders."

#### CONCLUSIONS

Thus we see that: 1. The elders are nowhere called officers. 2. Officers were chosen from among the elders. Elders had to be *chosen* to make them *officers*. The officers were elders, but the elders were not necessarily officers. 3. The term *elder* is *never* equivalent to any office among the Jews. It is a distinct term for a distinct and very large class of people—not officers. 4. From their age and accumulated wisdom and knowledge, the elders had great power with the people, with the judges, and with the kings, and were largely consulted and regarded. Among the patriarchs they were chief rulers. This seems to have been the case in cities and communities till they chose regular officers. No more can be claimed for the elders of Israel. Elder never was an official term, and was never used as an equivalent of any official term—as king, judge, captain, etc. It sets forth age and wisdom, which require respect and regard; and in the absence of regular officers, they took the lead, and did everything by virtue of their age without special appointment.

#### ELDERS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Matt. xv:2: "Transgress the traditions of the elders." xvi:21: "And suffer many things of the elders, and chief

priests, and scribes." xxvi:3: "The scribes and elders of the people." "Priests and elders of the people" are found frequently in the New Testament. Matt. xxvii:20: "But the chief priests and elders persuaded the multitude that they should ask Barabbas." The power of *persuasion* was all they had. (See Mark vii:3, 5; viii:31; xi:27; xiv:43, 53; xv:1.) "Held a consultation with the elders and scribes and the whole council." The elders took part by virtue of age and wisdom (as the scribes did by virtue of their knowledge of the law, from copying it)—not officially. Luke vii:3; ix:22; xx:1; xxii:50: "And the captain of the temple and the elders." Acts iv:5: "That their rulers and elders and scribes." Who ever thought of the office of a scribe? See vs. 8, 23; vi:12; xi:30; xiv:23: "Ordained elders in every church." That is, they ordained elders to the offices of bishop and deacon. Had they been officers by virtue of being elders, they would have needed no appointment or ordination, xv:22: "Then pleased it the apostles and elders." Even the apostles conferred with the elders, as the judges and kings of Israel did. See also Acts xv:2, 4, 6, 23; xvi:4; xx:17: Paul "called the elders of the church." But after they reached Miletus, in his address to them, he gives them their official title—overseers or bishops (Verse 28). While bishops, they were still elders, and it is no marvel that they are sometimes called elders; that is, they have not always their official name given them. So our presidents and governors are often called generals, because they were generals before. Yet no one understands that general and president or governor mean the same, or are equivalent terms. Men are called judges, governors, generals, etc., very generally, because they were once governors, judges, generals, captains, etc. It is difficult for a man to get rid of a title once acquired. Here is the mistake of modern critics—calling elder an official title, equivalent to bishop, because the bishops are *sometimes* called elders. (Acts xxi:18; xxiii:14; xxiv:1; xxv:15). 1 Tim. v:1: "Rebuke not an elder, but entreat him as a father." The same

respect was shown elderly women, except they were not consulted as were the men in governmental matters. Age must be respected. Lev. ix:32: "Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head." Prov. xvi:31: "The hoary head is a crown of glory, if it be found in the way of righteousness."

Titus (i:5) was to "ordain elders in every city." They had elders, but they did not have bishops, and Titus was to ordain some of their elders to make them bishops and deacons, if he found any elders properly qualified, and not without. Paul could not ordain men to be officers if they were already officers. We nowhere read that bishops were ordained. Bishops *had been* ordained. They were not properly bishops and deacons till they *were* ordained. They ordained *elders*, to make them bishops and deacons. This is the proper way to state the facts, and so they are uniformly stated in the scriptures. While it is true that in one place in the New Testament (Acts xx:17, 28), and perhaps in one place in the Old Testament, the officers are called elders, and while it is possible that the officers were called elders in several other places (though this cannot be proved), it cannot be shown that elder was ever used as an official designation, or as an equivalent to office or officer. The word translated elder (*presbuteros*) cannot be translated bishop or deacon, and is not the equivalent of either in any passage in the Old or New Testament, yet very common reference is made to Acts xv:4, 6, 22; Heb. xiii:17; 1 Peter v:1, to prove their identity. In Acts xv we find the elderly men acting with the apostles, as they did with the kings and judges of old, on account of their age and wisdom. Had they been bishops they would have been called bishops, as in other places they are. This passage only proves the transference of the Jewish habit of conferring with the seniors, to the church of Christ. So in Heb. xiii:17, the word rendered "have the rule over you" is *heegoumenos*, which means leaders—not bishops. And in the absence of bishops the elders did rule and lead, by virtue of natural fitness, but not as officers. And these *presbuteroi*, elders or

seniors, are commanded to take unto them this work—shepherd "the flock of God that is among you, taking the oversight thereof; not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind. . . . Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves to the elder." (See 1 Peter v:1-5.) Elder and younger are here in manifest contrast. Neither is official. No class of men are ever directed to take to themselves the office of bishop or deacon. They were elected or ordained to these. There is a bold contrast between the elders voluntarily taking to themselves this work for the present, and the officers being chosen and ordained to it. The one was primary, the other regular. Had the elders been officers, the natural contrast would have been between the *officials* and *unofficials*; or, as modern theology has it, between clergy and laity. Peter put it between the elder and the younger. This was true and proper.

The letter to the Hebrews, the two letters of Peter, and the letter of James were addressed to the Jewish Christians in their dispersion. They had been upwards of twenty years "scattered abroad" — far from their homes and their own country — into "Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia" (1 Peter i:1), and there is no evidence that they could have congregations with regular bishops and deacons. Their condition and circumstances forbid the idea that they had. And it was strictly natural, and according to the typical dispensation, that the elderly men should take the oversight of the flock, wherever they were. The apostles in Acts xv, adopt the Jewish custom of calling the seniors into their conference. No more is proved here.

The elderly men are, then, by nature, and by Peter's appointment, to take to themselves the oversight of the flock, in the absence of bishops and deacons, and not by constraint, or congregational appointment. And another important lesson is here presented; viz., the elders were called into the apostolic council, as they had been called into the council of

the priests, judges and kings of Israel. Hence the necessary conclusions, not that they were officers, but that—

I. In the absence of officers the elderly members should *now* take the lead, and do everything in the church to the best of their ability, without waiting for any congregational appointment. This divine provision supersedes the necessity for haste, and cuts off the apology for putting into office unqualified men.

II. After churches are scripturally organized, the officers shall take the elders into their councils, and profit by their aid. Not to do so is contrary both to the type and the antitype, as we have seen; and it looks too much like self-importance, and "lording it over God's heritage." (The word heritage here means the unofficial church members.) Men have not all the wisdom in the world just because they are *officials*. No doubt one great reason for the failures of church officials is found just here. Often calling the elders together for consultation with the officials, not only shows respect and cultivates confidence and brotherly love, but also gives important aid in very many cases.

III. While all the elders have duties, prerogatives and responsibilities by virtue of age, and that wisdom that should be found with age, *some of them have far more than others*. They are all of one class—*elders*; but they did not commence life each with the same amount of capital, nor have they all been equally diligent and successful in improving their talents. Hence, some are *chief* elders; that is, they are greater in knowledge and power with the people. So it was in other classes of men. The Sanhedrin had its "chief men." While all held the same office, *some* were chief in knowledge and power with the masses. Gamaliel on one occasion, controlled the whole council. And "Peter, James and John seemed to be pillars," or were chief men among the apostles. So it is and has always been with preachers. While all are preachers, one man often has more power than forty others, though they are all preachers Webster, Benton, Calhoun,

Clay, etc., were chief men in the Senate of the United States. This special power may be called personal power, or moral, or mental power, magnetic power, or the power of knowledge, for "knowledge is power," but it cannot be merely official power, as we have seen. For men having the same office have not always the same power by far; and men who have no office often exercise more power over the people than the highest officials. There is a "power behind the throne," and often all around the throne that is not in the throne, and that is superior to the throne. By this power, elders, preachers and others control very largely. It is a great mistake to conclude that we can do nothing because we are not officials; and both a great and ruinous mistake to suppose that officers can do everything. There is official power, and it carries with it vast responsibility. But there is personal power, not dependent on office; and to this reference is made in the phrase—"the duties, prerogatives and responsibilities of the *ciders of Israel*." These three words convey three distinct and very important ideas. 1. They have special duties. 2. They have certain prerogatives, and are not to be slighted or disregarded. 3. They have fearful responsibilities.

IV. Think of a *young* man, perhaps fresh from college, *hired* to make pretty speeches to the church, from which no one will ever learn much of the Bible or of duty, and hear him called "the pastor," a maw-devised office and officer; for the Bible authorizes each church to have a *plurality of elder-pastors*, called bishops. No *young* man, however learned, pious and endowed with personal power, can be a New Testament *pastor*. And no old man, possessing all the qualifications named by Paul, can be more than *a* pastor, *i.e.*, *one* of the pastors. See such a hired young man assuming control of church worship, teaching and ruling, while the elders sit quietly around, often do nothing, and never do much. "The pastor" is hired and paid to do this work, and they leave it for him to do—and *he likes it*, especially if the *pay* is good. Often he does not allow the elders to pray, or say a word.

Occasionally they are called on to give thanks, and they may be sent to perform some unpleasant duty. Yet many of them started with more capital, knew more of the Bible, and have more power with God than six score of such young speechmakers! Still we talk about following the scriptures!!! Some of us have known repeated cases where one, two, or more faithful men and women have built up churches, without any "official authority," which have done well, till "the hired pastor" came, and then the churches suffered, sometimes to utter ruin! Hence, now, the importance of a better understanding of the duties, prerogatives and responsibilities of *the elders*.

These hired pastors tell the churches that they cannot prosper with their home elders and bishops; that they must have a *regular preacher*, though they cannot deny that God's provision for the prosperity of the churches does not include any such hired functionary; that *he* provides only bishops and deacons; and that anciently they *did* prosper with these alone. *We* tell them that, even now, with all our incorrect education on the subject, more churches prosper, in the true sense of this word, without the hired pastor than with him; and we call for the count—*but have no answer*. In this we mean to say, 1. That this hired pastor is not of God: and here the pastors themselves do not take issue with us! 2. That we prefer God's way, and will defend and practice it at any and all cost.

*Preachers are not officials in the congregation at all!* Except as *man*, in disregard of God's word, makes them so! And then their office is of man—not of God; and they get their reward, if at all, from man.

## CHAPTER XVI

### JEWISH FREEWILL OFFERINGS AND FINANCES, ETC.

Voluntary offerings and their antitypes—no antitypes for constrained offerings—all voluntary in Christ; collecting funds for special cases; how Paul raised special collections; how the Jews were able to give so liberally; why so much expense for the tabernacle—not to encourage pride, but to teach moral worth from natural—mistakes of commentators, etc.

The dualism of the Mosaic law has been noted. The civil part we are not so much interested in. It has no antitype in Christianity, unless it is the civil laws of our land. There was no worship in the civil service of the Jews, as there is none in our civil government. The people were compelled to pay certain amounts to the government, and to do certain things. We need to understand their freewill, or voluntary offerings and service. In this there is a great lesson for us.

"Ye shall offer at your own will a male without blemish, of the beeves, of the sheep, or of the goats. But whatsoever hath a blemish, that shall ye not offer: for it shall not be acceptable for you. And whosoever offereth a sacrifice of peace offering unto the Lord, to accomplish his vow, or a peace offering in beeves or sheep, it shall be perfect to be accepted; there shall be no blemish therein." Lev. xxii:19-21. See also, Num. xv:3; xxix:39; Deut. xii:6, 17; xvi:10; xxiii:23; 2 Chron. xxxi:14; Ezra i:4; iii:5; viii:28; Ps. cxix:108.

Here we have the three items noted under another head: 1. Only the thing required must be offered; and it must be perfect, i.e., without blemish, to be accepted. 2. It must be offered, as these references prove, just as God directs—not anywhere or anyhow. The thing pointed out must be brought



to the place designated, and then offered according to God's law. 3. It must be brought with a perfect or sincere heart, "with clean hands and pure hearts."

In the antitype *all* our worship is voluntary. Forced or constrained worship cannot please God, or be acceptable to him. But the invitation is limitless: "whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely." God is always willing, and as we would express it, *anxious* for us to come— "waiting to be gracious"; "not willing that any should perish." Yet he accepts nothing but the voluntary or freewill offerings of our whole bodies, souls, and spirits. This is the offering. "The cattle on a thousand hills" would be useless. He accepts the offerings he calls for, if they are offered according to his direction, and with sincere hearts. The difference in the type and the antitype is, in the offerings called for, and the manner of offering them.

#### HOW THEY COLLECTED CONTRIBUTIONS FOR SPECIAL CASES

Besides the usual demands for money, etc., which were regularly provided for, the Jews, like all other nations, had special demands for liberality.

At Mount Sinai, soon after their deliverance from Egypt, in order to the building of the tabernacle and providing its furniture, Moses issues this call: "Take ye from among you an offering unto the Lord, whosoever is of a willing heart, let him bring it, an offering of the Lord, gold, and silver, and brass, and blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen, and goats' hair, and rams' skins dyed red, and badgers' skins, and shittim wood, and oil for the lights, and spices for anointing oil, and for the sweet incense, and onyx stones, and stones to be set for the ephod, and for the breast plate." He designated the receivers of these materials, and the workmen. Ex. xxv:2-7; Ex. xxxv:5-9, also, verse 21: "And they came, every one whose heart stirred him up, and every one whose spirit made him willing, and they brought the Lord's offering to the work of the tabernacle of the con-

gregation and for all his service, and for the holy garments." Then Moses called for voluntary workers thus: "And Moses called Bezaleel and Aholiab, and every wise-hearted man in whose heart the Lord had put wisdom, even every one whose heart stirred him up to come unto the work to do it" (Ex. xxxvi:2, 3). "And they (the workmen) received of Moses all the offerings which the children of Israel had brought for the work of the service of the sanctuary, to make it withal. And they brought yet to him free offerings every morning." And verses 4, 5: "Then all the wise men that wrought all the work of the sanctuary, came, every man from his work which they made; and they spake unto Moses saying, the people bring much more than enough for the service of the work, which the Lord commanded to make." Then Moses gave commandment "and the people were restrained from bringing." Verse 6.

We could not have a better example of free, liberal, prompt and abundant giving, for a special purpose. But one call was made; and that was rather in the form of a permit: "let" those who have, and those whose hearts prompt them, give. Then came the restraining order; for the "people brought much more than enough." Not often do we find such ready and abundant liberality, even among Christians.

In the building of the temple we have another case of great voluntary and prompt liberality, for a special purpose. See 1 Kings and 2 Chronicles. In 1 Chron. xxix:4, 6, etc., we see the wonderful liberality of David and his princes. And Solomon and his princes were no less liberal for this house of God. So, too, when the temple was to be rebuilt under Ezra, we have the same special call, and great liberality for a special purpose. See Ezra and Nehemiah. So it was in building the wall long afterwards.

Here we have, in the typical dispensation, regular contributions for the regular, or ordinary expenses of the Lord's service; and we have as distinctly the special contributions for special purposes. Both of these have their well-marked

antitypes in Christ. The Lord's day or weekly contributions into the church treasury, as God has prospered each one (Acts ii:42; 1 Cor. xvi:l, 2), for the ordinary expenses, including the poor; and special demands for special occasions, as in Acts ii:44-47; iv:32-37. Also the women who voluntarily aided Paul; Rom. xvi:2, and to the end of the chapter, and Paul to Philemon, etc. A special collection was raised for the poor saints at Jerusalem, twice. Acts xi:27-30; Rom. xv:25-29; 1 Cor. xvi:1, 2, 3; 2 Cor. viii; ix:3. We can, therefore, have no excuse or apology for "devising ways and means" for getting funds for the Lord's work, unless we are displeased with the Lord's way, and think we can improve upon it! Surely we cannot be excused for not understanding God's plan for raising money, since it is fully given both in the type and antitype. Why then resort to any human device? The Lord will not accept offerings that are not made willingly. Shall we, then, "devise" means that will cause the people to give when they are not willing? Shall we constrain them, by a policy of our own? God did not and will not do this; nor will he accept or bless such devices.

Any departure from these ways, i.e., any human device, or plan for raising money for the work of the Lord, is to be accounted for:

1. By supposing *ignorance* on the part of the leaders. And this ignorance cannot be excusable in leaders, since the law is plain.

2. By supposing the leaders are *not pleased* with the divine way, and prefer one of their own. This would show lack of faith in God, and lack of reverence for his word.

If such departures are to be tolerated, there is no telling what changes may be made in the divine system. Soon it would be with us, as it was with the Jews, when it was said: "Every man did that which was right in his own eyes." God's will was despised, and man's will prevailed! And yet they called this serving God! To avoid this seems

to be the leading purpose in the New Testament. It is the fixed purpose of this volume that the will of God be done on earth as in heaven, and man's will entirely subjected to it.

#### HOW THE JEWS WERE ABLE TO GIVE LIBERALLY

Many are willing to give, and not able; and many are able to give, and not willing. The Jews were both able and willing. But they had long been slaves to Pharaoh, and this building of the tabernacle, for which they gave so readily and abundantly, was the second month after their deliverance. And they were traveling and spending—not making. Hence, it is a question with many, where they got their wealth.

They were then, as ever since, and to-day, peculiarly successful in money-making; and while in Egypt, they had much cattle and other property, which, of course, brought much money. They were slaves to Pharaoh, not to individuals. And the providence of God is very clearly marked in making the Egyptians very anxious for them to leave. They said, after the death of their first born: "We be all dead men." The king, too, was urging them to start. Taking advantage of this anxiety on their part, "the children of Israel borrowed," or Dr Young says, "asked (or demanded) of the Egyptians, jewels of silver and jewels of gold, and raiment": for it seems they were otherwise poor. "And the Lord gave the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians: so that they lent," or rather gave, "them such things as they required. And they spoiled the Egyptians" (Ex. xii:35, 36). They could make a good plea to the Egyptians, for they had served them under taskmasters, and were unrequited. Now if their former masters were so desirous to get rid of them, let them give or pay them their dues—the wages long kept back. "*They spoiled the Egyptians*" indicates that they received very largely of them. And it is said, they had "flocks, and herds, and very much cattle" (Ex. xii:38). They had the wealth of Egypt.

Besides, before reaching Mount Sinai they had war with Amalek; "and Joshua discomfited Amalek and his people with the edge of the sword" (Ex. xvii:8-13). The Amalekites had great wealth, which fell into the hands of the children of Israel. They had, therefore, their own, and the wealth of the Egyptians and the Amalekites; and were well able to give abundantly. But,

#### WHY SO MUCH EXPENSE ABOUT THE TABERNACLE?

Various writers have made estimates of the cost of the tabernacle; and these guesses or proximal estimates might be given here. They are not given for two reasons: 1. It is impossible to determine the cost of this structure. 2. It could do no good if we had it by inspiration. We know it was very great; and this is sufficient. The Bible does not give us unnecessary things, and we should be wiser than to desire them.

But why this enormous expense? Why not a plain, inexpensive tent, such as Abraham had? We have no evidence that he had a house, or that his tents were costly. This seemed to be a good example for a rich man to set. He moved from place to place, as the necessity of his herds demanded; and Israel moved, also, not only while in the wilderness, but also long after they entered the promised land—till Jerusalem was divinely chosen, and became, under David, the permanent abode of the ark. And it would have been much more convenient and economical to have a plain tent, one more easily taken down, carried, and put up again.

The elaborate cost of the tabernacle and temple, which became the recipient of the sacred utensils and the divine presence, has been referred to often as an example favoring, and sometimes as evidence proving, that our houses of worship, etc., should be very fine and costly. The fine and costly garments of the priests have been appealed to as authority for the costliness of preachers' garments, etc. Some even have gowns somewhat in imitation of the Jewish

priests, and the Savior's glorified apparel (Rev. i:13-17). But this would be in direct conflict with both the letter and the spirit of the gospel of Christ. Neither Christ nor any of his ancient ministers or servants were ever arrayed in gaudy or costly attire. The probabilities are that Peter preached the gospel in his fisher's garments; and there is good reason for concluding that Paul never had what most preachers now would call a "decent suit of clothes," from his conversion to his martyrdom. Had he been thus supplied he might not have so far turned aside from his life work as to do manual labor for a support for himself and his co-laborers. Besides, he would not have enjoined on others that which he did not practice himself; he was an example, and called on his brethren to follow his example. And he says: "I will therefore that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting. In like manner, also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with braided (or plaited, m.) hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array; but (which becometh women professing godliness), with good works" (1 Tim. ii:8-10). Certainly Paul would require as much of the brethren. And Peter has the same to his brethren in the dispersion: "Whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel; but let it (the adorning) be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is, in the sight of God, of great price" (1 Peter iii:3,4). Few passages of Scripture are less popular than these. Few have been more sadly and manifestly perverted by those they hit squarely in the face. They would like to construe them to mean something that does not condemn them. The meaning is very plain to an humble and contrite heart. No apparel is the adorning "of great price before" God that is put on the body, or worn on the head. It is a "meek and quiet spirit." All "costly array or clothing are forbidden."

It does not commend us to God, or to sensible men and women; and it does serve to make the heart proud and vain. And if this were not so, we can surely make a better use of our means and time. The hungry need feeding, the naked need clothing, the orphans and widows need aid and comfort, and the heathen need the gospel. So do many all around us. Alas! for that man or woman who can imagine that adorning their poor perishing bodies in "costly array" is more important than these several good works—the best representatives of "pure and undefiled religion before God and the Father." If there are any such it would be useless to exhibit to them the true light, or beauty, or glory of heaven.

No! Both the letter and the spirit of the gospel forbid all unnecessary expense, and all show of pride or vanity, as certainly as any vice or wrong is or can be forbidden. To reason with those who are not willing to give up these things, and are of "those who justify themselves before men," is to "cast pearls before swine," homely and crude as this comparison may seem. And they will "trample under" their unsanctified feet all the evidence heaven can give, and then "turn again and rend you." Let them alone, unless they may be converted. "Ephraim is joined to his idol." We may only hope to profit those who have "another spirit," like Caleb (Num. xiv:24). Do we not hear these "lovers of (worldly) pleasure more than lovers of God" say, "Oh! Then we must not put on 'apparel' at all? We ought to be decent." How often they say, "I like to see" this and that—even while the case is so plain, "That none by comment could it plainer make." They will not reason so, or feel so, when the rottenness of the grave is about to envelop them. Alas! "their minds are blinded" now.

Now, if both the letter and the spirit of the type and the antitype of the religion of Christ are supremely characterized by humility, self-denial, crucifying the flesh, cross bearing, caring for the welfare of others, and so transcribing

into our own lives the life of him "who, when he was rich, for our sakes became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich"; who "went about doing good"; who never turned away one humble soul, or refused one favor humbly and properly asked; who "had nowhere to lay his head"— the Creator and Possessor of the universe poorer than the foxes and the fowls! If this is the religion of the New Testament, how can we imagine that its type in the Old Testament was intended to justify, foster, and encourage all that is selfish, proud, strengthening to the flesh, and in disregard, or at the expense of suffering humanity! It cannot be! *No, never!* The gold and pearls, and all the great expense and show of the tabernacle and the temple were for another purpose. To so construe it is to bring it into deadly conflict with the divinest features of Christianity, and to "deceive our own souls."

President Milligan says:

"The gold, the silver, and the fine linen seem to denote merely the great value and purity of all that is in God's presence. See Revelation 21st and 22nd chapters."

These two chapters describe heaven—"The home of God and of the soul."

"The city was pure gold, like unto clear glass. And the foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones, etc. No place on earth, or in the imaginations of men without the Bible, can even faintly approach its grandeur and magnificence! It had its tree of life, and its fountain of water, etc., all earthly and material.

Still, commentators, the most learned and profound, on this undenominational question, where there is nothing personal to pervert their judgment, do not contemplate seeing any literal gold there, or any walls of any kind, or any trees, or anything material, as a fountain of water.

Why, then, all this imagery? For the best reason in the world! This was the very best way to give to man the most exalted idea of the real value and importance of heaven.



These materials were and are the richest of all the wealth of earth, of all that was known to man. And a city composed of them is chosen to represent heaven, no more could be done to give to the finite mind of man a correct idea of the true immaterial heaven.

When the divine being would give us an idea of an intangible, immaterial something which we never saw, he just points to something we have seen and are acquainted with, and tells us it is like that. Thus, when the Savior would give his hearers the best idea of his kingdom, which, at that time, no man had seen, he said: "It is like a wedding feast for a king's son; like a vineyard; like a sheep fold," etc , with all of which his hearers were familiar. So Satan was "like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour"; Jesus is like a shepherd—the good shepherd, and his disciples are like sheep, in some particulars. Thus Jesus illustrated and taught spiritual and eternal things by carnal and temporal things So he does when he describes heaven as a city of gold, etc. Because such a literal and material city best represents a spiritual, immaterial and eternal city. And intelligent Christians expect to find, in that heavenly state, something as far superior to gold and pearls of earth as the spiritual is superior to the animal; as God is superior to man; as heaven is superior to earth in its best estate! How glorious, uplifting and strengthening is this view of the case! The animal sacrifices under Mosaism but poorly illustrated and adumbrated the true sacrifice—Christ; and yet they were the best nature afforded. No more could be done. And v hen the Lord would show us the excellencies of "the true riches," the wealth of "a meek and quiet spirit in the sight of God," he chose the material riches of earth to represent, illustrate and adumbrate the spiritual riches and glory in Christ—not the "gold and pearls and costly array" which the proud wear on their poor dying bodies!—not the fine and costly houses called churches, built largely of the hard earnings of the poor, and in whose shadow the poor toil and

suffer for bread and clothes! No! no! True wealth is a heart purified by faith in Christ, and consecrated in holy obedience to the gospel. Wealth of heart, wealth of wisdom and knowledge, wealth of usefulness, of kindness, etc., are in bold and wonderful contrast with the poverty of sin, of ignorance, of vice and of death! The Lord give us the true riches!

And just as material things were, during the entire ministry of the Savior, chosen to illustrate and teach spiritual things; as carnal and temporal things were chosen by Moses to set forth spiritual things in Christ; and as a material city of gold is given to teach us, and illustrate to us the true spiritual and eternal—the third and only true heaven; so a literal valley, the valley of the sons of Hinnom, near Jerusalem, the most terrible and loathsome place known to man, is chosen to teach and illustrate the final abode of the wicked. This literal valley had in it literal fire and brimstone—worms, etc. And hence that which is represented by these has in it that which is called fire and brimstone, "the worm that never dies, and the fire that is not quenched"; just as we have gold and pearls in the richest profusion referred to in heaven. And as we do not expect to see any literal gold, pearls, etc., there, but something infinitely better; so we may not expect to see in hell any literal fire and brimstone—or worms; but something best represented by these, and perhaps far worse.

## CHAPTER XVII

### THE FLOOD AND NOAH'S ARK

Analysis of I Peter iii:18-21 (after reading Gen. vi, vii); Christ suffered for sins; quickened by the Spirit; went and preached to the spirits in prison through Noah; while the Ark was preparing; the Ark; saved from the wicked by water; saved in and by the Ark, from drowning; the like figure or antitype, even baptism, saves us; meaning of the filth of the flesh; the answer of a good conscience; by the resurrection of Christ; the synthesis, after a general and accurate acquaintance with Gen. vi, vii, viii, and 1 Peter iii, and seeing that all this is typical of developments in Christ; Ruinous effects of sin; Noah's faithfulness, but one Ark,—but one Church; importance of being in the Ark—in the Church; A fable of the giraffe, and how he got in; but one door,—how Christ is the door; the literal entrance; safety in the Ark only; all food, etc., in the Ark—the Church; All light came from above, and does now; all comfort, good society, government in the Ark; its final landing, delivering up the Kingdom; landing of Old Ship of Zion.

The plan of this work requires the examination of one more *type* from the Old Testament; and the flood and Noah's ark is selected. Some things in this are rather scientific and speculative than practical; as the structure of the ark, whether the flood was universal or only local, etc. As these are not very clear, and are of little or no practical importance to us, they may be passed by, without serious detriment.

Let us read 1 Peter iii:18-21 (the revision): "Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit; in which also he went, and preached to the spirits in prison, which aforetime were disobedient, when the long sufferings of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing; wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved through water, which also after a true likeness (or antitype) doth now save you, even baptism, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh,

but the interrogation of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

*First*, let us have an *analysis* of this passage; and then a proper synthesis will give us the case.

Observe:—This was addressed to the *Jewish* Christians, who were acquainted with the Old Testament, with the flood, and with God's dealings with the ancients far better than others were.

*Christ suffered for sins*. It was always important to keep before the people the fact that, Christ suffered for *sins*, not his own. Sin has always caused suffering; and in this case there was no forgiveness, but by the suffering of Christ. How important that we keep this continually in mind, and the consequent obligations.

*Put to death in the flesh, quickened in or by the Spirit*. It was the *flesh*, not the *Spirit* of Jesus that died.

*Went and preached to the spirits in prison*. Here we have two questions. 1. What is the prison? 2. How did Christ by his Spirit, *preach* to the spirits there? The *prison* was the *world*, in which they were as effectually shut up as if the prison had been smaller. They could not fly to any other planet or world. God's spirit, *through Noah*, preached to these spirits. "And the Lord said my Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh; yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years" (Gen. vi:3. See Gen. vi, vii chapters, etc., and 2 Peter ii:5). Noah is called "a preacher of righteousness" (Isa. xlii:7; lxi:1, etc). God never preached to the wicked by his Spirit, except through those in whom the Spirit dwelt—never once. Note this.

*When once the long sufferings of God waited, in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing*. This gives the time, place and circumstances, and needs no comment or explanation. It is a rule in Biblical criticism and exegesis, that we shall not regard a passage as figurative or mystical, when we *can* understand and harmonize it literally. Nothing was more literal than that flood, ark, preaching through and by

Noah, etc. The fact that they are used as a type or illustration for us is not against this view of the case. The vineyard was literal, the sheep-fold, shepherd, etc. Still they are used as comparisons to illustrate *spiritual* things.

*The ark—in which eight souls were saved by, or through water. "Saved by water!"* And yet saved *"in the ark!"* It would not be too much to say they were saved *by* the ark. Yet there is no conflict. They were saved from *drowning by the ark*. Without it, and without being *in* it, they would have perished with the wicked. And by water they were saved from the wicked, from their scoffs and jeers and taunts, etc., for the waters *drowned* them. This was the first recorded case of salvation *by water*—and *such* a salvation! Yet they were not saved from drowning by the water. This was the office of the *ark*. The second case of salvation by water was at the Red sea, when the Israelites were "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." The water saved them from Pharaoh and his hosts by drowning their enemies. Let no man, therefore, speak lightly of being saved from the worst enemies by water. Water is a factor in human life and in salvation from enemies.

*The like figure, or antitype—baptism, now saves us.* Here also we have two ideas. 1. Baptism saves us. 2. It is an antitype of the flood. "The antitype or exact representation" seems to include the whole connection and circumstances, but especially baptism. "Fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail; and the mountains were covered" (Gen. vii:20). This was a pretty thorough burial, or overwhelming —immersion, as was that of Israel at the Red sea. The flood was a *type* of the *baptism*, which "saves us." So Peter says. The defense of Peter is not just now the matter in hand, we are trying to understand him, only. When we are baptized, having faith and repentance, we pass out of the world, away from our enemies, and into Christ, "in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins" (Rom. viii:1; Eph. i:7; Gal. iii:27). "Baptized *into* Christ." In Christ we also

receive the Holy Spirit, to comfort, aid and strengthen us to resist all our enemies, and do our duty (Acts ii:38; Gal. iv:6; Rom. viii:9). When, therefore, we have passed out of the dominion of sin, our sins are forgiven, and we have this helper, we realize the antitype here presented.

*Not putting away the filth of the flesh.* This baptism is not to cleanse the body, as were the "divers washings and carnal ordinances" of Moses. It is not one of the Mosaic washings, but a new ordinance of Christ. "The filth of the flesh" does not mean sins, but bodily defilement, as when one touches a dead body. (See Num. v:2; ix:6, 7; Jer. xix:13; Ezk. iv:13; Lev. v:13; xiii:46; xv:32; xviii:25, 27; Mark vii:2.) The disciples ate bread with defiled, that is with unwashed hands. The *leper*, after being cured, was to wash, bathe himself in water, and shave off all his hair, to be sure he was clean, before he could enter the congregation (Lev. xiv:8, 9). So of him who had a running issue (Lev. xv:5, 8, 11, 13, 21, 27; xvi:26). The word here rendered *filth*, is *rhupos*, which Dr. Young says means "*filth, dirt.*" See Prov. xxx:12; Isa. xxviii:8; 2 Cor. vii:1, "Cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit." There is a filthiness of the flesh, and also a filthiness of spirit. James i:21: "All filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness." God's people are to be clean physically and spiritually; decent, orderly, gentlemen and ladies in the best sense of these words. They are to allow "no unbecoming speech to proceed out of their mouths" (Eph. iv:29; Matt. xii:36). All this is strictly true, and of great importance; but *baptism* was not, and is not designed to cleanse the *flesh*. This is all that is here affirmed. And this is only to guard against error, and to *prepare* for the true design of baptism.

*The interrogation, seeking, or answer of a good conscience towards God.* The word (eperooteema) here rendered *answer*, in the common version, literally means seeking, interrogation, looking out for, i.e., seeking. Hence these various renderings. But in all the translations, we have the

same idea as to the *future* of the conscience. If it is the *answer*, we do not have it till we are baptized. If it is seeking, asking or looking after it, we have it not yet in possession—it is in or beyond baptism; never before. No translator or critic questions this. While baptism is not to cleanse the *body*, yet cleansing the soul or conscience is clearly connected with it. Hence, we read elsewhere of this same washing, or baptism to cleanse (Eph. v:25, 26). "That he might sanctify and cleanse it (the church) with the washing of water by the word," or as Mr. Wesley renders this, "having cleansed it with a bath of water by the word." Acts xxii:16, Ananias said to Saul: "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." The Corinthians had been a very wicked people; hence in 1 Cor. vi:11, Paul says: "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord," etc. So in Heb. x:22: Now, as Christians, "Let us draw near in full assurance of faith, having (or having had) our hearts sprinkled (or purified) from an evil conscience, and bodies washed with pure water"; simple water, not the Mosaic holy water. All this was for the conscience—the inner man; not the flesh.

*By the resurrection of Jesus Christ.* Paul continually brings up, and keeps before his readers the sufferings of Christ and his resurrection. Here the latter is well referred to; for their baptism, their faith, their repentance, their confession, prayer and everything else would have been in vain, had not Jesus risen from the dead. There is, and can be no merit in anything, or in all things that man can do or suffer; and hence, though Christ had died, "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins" (1 Cor. xv:14, 17).

#### THE SYNTHESIS OF THESE LESSONS

Two things are necessary to the proper appreciation of the facts and truths here developed:

1. A close and accurate acquaintance with the sixth, seventh and eighth chapters of Genesis, where we have the history of *Noah, the flood and the ark*.

2. Noting that all this was typical of matters developed in Christianity. This appears in the language of Peter already cited, and in the nature of the case; that is, the facts there precisely fitting and adumbrating the facts here. We may then rapidly sum up, synthesize and set forth the facts and the truths in the Christian system which are clearly taught in this type:

I. The ruinous nature of sin, the free agency of man, in that—"all flesh had corrupted his way on the earth" (Gen. vi:12), and so "bringing upon themselves swift destruction" (2 Peter ii:1). The conclusion must be that, as God punished sin then, so he must punish sin now; and, as God preserved the faithful then, in the wonderful destruction of "all flesh," so he will preserve the faithful in Christ in the general destruction of the world by fire, etc.

II. Noah was faithful in that he worked patiently on, "doing all that God commanded him"; and doing "*according* unto all that the Lord commanded him" (Gen. vi:22; vii:5). He not only did the things God commanded, but he did them *as*, or *according* as the Lord commanded him. He did not undertake to do the thing commanded in *his own* way. He did these things, and he did them in *God's* way. And the conclusion must be, that we must do just what Jesus commands, and that we must do this *in his way*, so far as the way is given; and when it is not given, or so far as it is not given, we must do them so as to avoid conflict with what is directed, and so preserve intact the divine will. To undertake to do the divine bidding in a way of our own, and differing from the appointed way, or in conflict with truth and duty, is equal to the worst form of disobedience. It is both *wow*-obedience and transgression. It does *not* do *as* God directs, and it undertakes an improvement on God's way. Had Noah taken this course there is no reason for concluding that the ark



would have served its purpose. And as that lesson was in the type, so is it in the antitype. Let us observe it carefully.

III. There was but one ark. There must, therefore, be but one church, the manifest and acknowledged antitype of that ark. How forcibly is this taught in the New Testament! See the prayer of the Savior, John xvii. The oneness prayed for is like that between the Father and the Son. So in Eph. iv:1-8; 1 Cor. xii, etc. If Paul were living now it is evident that he would not unite with any sect or party in Christendom: he would seek to be simply a Christian, and would strive "for the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," for Christian union on Christian principles—doing God's work in God's way. <

IV. It was not enough to have the ark and to believe in the ark and in God—they must *enter* the ark. When God commanded (Gen. vii:1), "Noah went in, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him into the ark" (Gen. vii:7). Had they refused they must have perished, as did all who did not enter. They *might* have said: It is no use. The ark cannot save us. God must save us or we are lost. God was the Savior, but he would save in his own way, in the ark, not out of it. And if the church is the antitype, which is never questioned, then we must go into the church. Though the church cannot save us, we must not look for *Jesus* to save us in rebellion. True, if some *cannot* come into the church, there is nothing in the Christian system inhibiting the Lord's saving them, if they do all they can. But he will not save those who can enter his church, and persistently will not.

A *fable* has come down to us, as to the beasts entering Noah's ark, to this effect: One of Noah's sons was in the mountains, and saw a *giraffe* Coming home, when the ark was about completed, he said to his father: Father, we have made one terrible mistake in building the ark. The father said, how is that, my son ? The son said: Why, you know we are to take in two of every kind of beasts, and I saw in the

mountains some beasts with heads twenty to thirty feet high. Now they can never get into the ark through that low door, never in the world, and we will have to alter it, or disobey this command. The father said: My son, I made that door just the *size* God directed, and just *as* he directed, and I propose to let it remain so. It will be right. The son said: Never, father. The beast I saw can never get in through that low door. The father said: Well, son, we will wait on God and see. And when the giraffes walked up to the door they were watched with intense interest. They halted and looked; looked into the ark, and looked at the howling storm and raging waters outside. Then the leader, by degrees, lowered his head and got on his knees, and *crawled* in, and the other followed. This is the humility that the high-headed need in order to come into Christ's church—the antitype.

V. *There was but one doorway into the ark.* And there can be but one door into the church. Jesus said to Nicodemus (John iii:5): "Except a man be born of water and the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." This proves three things. 1. That there is a way by which aliens can enter the kingdom of God. 2. That there is but one way; and this applies to all men. "A man" is generic. The more liberal rendering is "any man." 3. *Water* is somehow connected with this entrance, and also something here called a *birth*. But Paul says we are baptized into Christ (Rom. vi:3; Gal. iii:27). Now, if there is but one way, and baptism is one way of entrance, then this must be the meaning of "born of water and Spirit." Buried in the water, and coming up from it (born—*ek—from* the water, is the literal idea), is a birth of water. And when this is by the direction, and under the influence and prompting of the Holy Spirit, it is a birth of water and Spirit, not two births, one of water and one of Spirit, but one birth of water by the direction and begetting, or prompting of the Spirit through the gospel. Hence, Dr. Wall, the celebrated author of the most learned and elaborate history of infant baptism—himself a pedo-baptist, said he had

examined all the authors for the first four hundred years, and there was not any one of them that did not understand John iii:5 of baptism (and he meant *immersion*, for they all immersed then); and he adds: "If it be not understood of baptism, it would be difficult to tell how one can be born of water any more than born of wood."

But we are told that Jesus says (John x:9), that *he* is the door. "I am the door, by me if any man enter in he shall be saved," etc. How shall we understand this? Well, in the first place, it will not do to construe it so as to conflict with the unmistakably plain passages above quoted. The word (*thura*) here rendered *door*, is found in the New Testament thirty-nine times, and while it means the way or place of entrance, the shutter, it means also *opportunity, or privilege* of entrance. Indeed, it has this meaning always. The opening gives an opportunity, or renders it possible to enter. Acts xiv:27, "A door of faith was opened to the Gentiles," "for a great *door* and effectual is opened to me" (1 Cor. xvi:9). A door was opened to Paul at Troas to preach Christ (2 Cor. ii:12), i.e., a favorable opportunity. And Col. iv:3, He speaks of a door of entrance. Rev. iii:8, "I have set before thee an open door." (See verse 20.) Rev. iv:1, "A *door* (was) opened in heaven." That is, a way by which people might enter. Just so, Jesus is the door, the open way of entrance into the kingdom of God; not a literal opening like a door in a house or a wall, but an opportunity, an authority by which we may enter into God's kingdom and God's favor. None but Christ can point out the steps to be taken. And the passages quoted give these, and tell us there is no other way.

Some good people are not in this kingdom or church (for he is not here referring to the everlasting kingdom, i.e., heaven, but to the church); as in the case of Cornelius before his baptism. Indeed, people must be pure in heart *as a preparation* for entrance. This purity or change of heart does not *enter* them, however. It only gives them the *power or*

*privilege* to enter. Only to penitent believers is this privilege given. (See John i:12.) But some bad people did enter. See the bad fish in the net (Matt. xiii:47, 48, 49). They are *bastards* in the divine family; God is not their Father (Heb. xii:8). Like the man who forced himself into the king's dining-room without the wedding garment, they are as truly and literally *in* as are the good; but not by right, and they shall be put out. Matt. xxii:13, "Bind him hand and foot, and cast him out into outer darkness."

We may have to stoop very low, as the giraffes did, to get into the ark; but this is the doorway—a *birth of water and Spirit*. The door or entrance into *heaven* is another question, but one of infinite importance. For though we may, by *fraud*, get into the church, yet "without *holiness* no man shall see the Lord," that is, enjoy God in the "home of the soul."

VI. *There was safety in the ark*. There is safety in the church, if we "walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called." Those who imagine they can serve God and get to heaven out of the church, are as far wrong as would be a man who would conclude that being in the vine was not necessary to life and fruit bearing on the part of the branches. To live out of the church, when it is in our power to live in it, is to live in disobedience. The road to heaven was not made by man, and it is not disobedience.

VII. *All food, drink, society and every necessary thing, was in the ark*. Everything necessary to life and godliness is in the church. As the people in the ark needed not to go out, and could not with any safety; so those in the church need not go out of it for any good thing, and cannot with any propriety or safety. All the ordinances are in the church. All the promises are in the church. The divine order and arrangement for teaching, admonishing and helping one another, are in the church. The ways and means for preaching the gospel to the world, to the *whole* world, are in the church, and do not have to be "devised" outside of the church and

the Bible. So of "every good thing." Christians are complete in Christ.

VIII. *All the light in the ark was from above, through one window.* All the light needed for the Christian life and warfare is in the church, through the Bible. To the church is committed the oracles of God—the Bible; which is a light to our feet and a lamp to our path.

IX. *All the comfort Noah and his family had was in the ark.* All the comfort Christians have is in the church, including the Holy Spirit, "whom the world cannot receive."

X. *All the truly good society on earth was in the ark.* All the truly good society under heaven is in the church. The beasts, etc., in the ark were incidental to the situation, they were not *society* for Noah and his family, and were not typical. Christians are a peculiar people, separated from the world, and devoted to God. The best of all good things is in the church, and in the richest profusion. Let no one be tempted to go out of the church for any good thing. "The Lord is a sun and a shield, and no good thing will he withhold from them that walk uprightly."

XI. *There was a head, a captain, a government, and obedience in the ark.* Jesus is head of the church, his under shepherds, the bishops, are to keep order in the church, preserve purity of worship, defend, protest and feed the flock.

XII. *It was just as important to remain in the ark as to get into it.* To do so, obedience to the laws and authority of the ark was necessary. It is just as important *to remain in the church as to get into it*; and to do so we must respect and obey the laws and authority of the church. Otherwise we shall, even while in the flesh, be "delivered to Satan for the destruction of the flesh," etc.

XIII. *The ark had its final landing, and discharged its inmates.* The church will have her final landing, or will be "delivered up to God, even the Father" (1 Cor. xv:24). Till that time we are shut up to it, and in it. Its welfare is our welfare. Its safety is our safety. Its honor is our honor. Its

prosperity is our prosperity. Its joy should be our joy. Every member should be able to sing:

"I love thy church, O God,  
Her walls before thee stand,  
Dear as the apple of thine eye,  
And graven on thy hand.

For her my tears shall fall,  
For her my prayers ascend;  
To her my toils and cares be given,  
Till toils and cares shall end.

Beyond my highest joy,  
I prize her heavenly ways,  
Her sweet communion, solemn vows,  
Her hymns of love and praise."

## CHAPTER XVIII

### THE WORSHIP OF GOD

Meaning of worship at length, critically—heart reverence, manifested by bowing and obedience, as God manifested his love by Christ; true worship—what is necessary to it; false or vain worship, and what it is, in detail; mixed worship, and what it is—exemplifications and meanings; the objects of worship—to please God and share his blessings; importance of pure worship—transforming us into the image and likeness of the object worshiped—kinship to God and fitness for heaven. -

The Bible marks an important difference between mere worship and the worship of all other beings and things, and the true worship of God. To develop this subject properly we must consider: 1. What is meant by worship. 2. True worship. 3. False worship. 4. Mixed worship. 5. Objects to be accomplished by worship.

1. *Meaning of worship.* The word, in some form, occurs about one hundred and ninety times in the Bible, and fully authorizes the meanings given it in our dictionaries. Dr. Young, in his Analytical Concordance, finds it used to mean:

1. To bow down, do obeisance (H. *segad*), eleven times.
2. To make an idol (H. *estab*), one time.
3. To do, serve (H. *abad*), five times.
4. To bow self down (H. *shachah*), ninety-six times. Gen. xxii:5: "I and the lad will go yonder and worship." That is, "bow ourselves down." This is its leading meaning, worship, being used more frequently in this sense than in all others; and it never loses this leading idea.
5. Glory, esteem (G. *doxa*), one time.
6. To be reverential, pious (G. *eusebeo*), one time.
7. To serve, cure, heal (G. *therapeo*), one time.
8. Religious observance (G. *threskeia*), one time.

9. To worship publicly (G. *latreuo*), four times.
10. A temple sweeper (G. *neokaros*), one time.
11. To kiss (the hand) towards (G. *proskuneo*), fifty-eight times.
12. A worshiper (G. *proskunetes*), one time.
13. To venerate, reckon venerable (G. *sebazo*), one time.
14. To venerate (G. *setromai*), six times.
15. An object of veneration (G. *sebasmos*), one time.
16. Worshiper of God (G. *theosebes*), one time.

In all its forms, and in its derivations, it has the idea of worth and worthiness, and generally of bodily prostration.

Liddell and Scott define *proskuneo*, found sixty times in the New Testament, to mean, "To kiss the hand to another as a mark of respect; to do obeisance to another, especially the oriental fashion of making the *salam*, or *prostrating one's self, before kings and superiors.*" Thus, in the Old Testament, the Hebrew word (*shachah*) rendered worship ninety-six times, means, "to bow self down"; and in the New Testament the Greek word (*proskuneo*) sixty times rendered worship, means "prostrating one's self before kings or superiors." Thus the English word, worship must, one hundred and fifty-six times, mean to *bow down, prostrate self*, leaving but forty-four times for its use in other senses; and an examination of these will show anyone that they all have the same idea, also. So, indeed, they must, according to an established lexicographical rule, viz.: that a word shall never be used in a sense that conflicts with its root, or primary meaning.

We have fall, fell, falling, etc., five hundred and seventy times, favoring the same idea. Many of these are falling prostrate on the ground. This attitude is most expressive of the deepest humility and reverence. Thus, Saul "fell flat on the ground" (1 Sam. xxviii:20). And Num. xxii:31, "Bowed down his head, and fell flat on his face." We have about seventy of these cases. Jesus fell down, Paul fell down, Peter fell down, John fell down, Satan required that



Jesus should "fall down and worship him." And this is as natural as it is scriptural. All men bow down, kneel, or fall prostrate when they wish to show common respect, and especially when they worship their God. Rising up as "before the hoary head," may show respect, but is not the worship of God. There is no case on record where people rose up and stood erect to worship God.

But people cannot always kneel, or fall prostrate. Perhaps they' cannot always even bow their heads. And in the service that grows out of, and is a part of worship, as the breaking of the loaf, singing, the contribution, etc., the attitude of the body is not considered. But whatever of all this comes not from a bowed down, prostrate heart, and a meek and quiet spirit, is mere ritualistic, or bodily service, and not acceptable worship of God. The worship of God begins with a broken and contrite spirit—an humbled heart, and nothing is acceptable worship that does not come from this, though it were "the cattle on a thousand hills." God's worship never loses the idea of humility, and the manifestation of humility, even by the attitude of the body, when this is reasonably practicable. (See Ps. xlii:5, 11; xliii:5; xcv:6, etc.) From these testimonies we must conclude that:

1. God's worship is a *manifestation* of *our* faith, of repentance, and an humble, contrite, submissive spirit, of felt dependence and accountability, and of confidence in God. Hence,

2. Bodily prostration. A brave soldier about to be shot said:

"I *bow* to high heaven alone,  
And ne'er turn my back to the foe!"

3. Bringing sacrifices under the law; and under the gospel, cross bearing, pecuniary and personal sacrifices, all *manifest* the state of the worshiping heart, and are, therefore, called acts of worship.

"In this was manifested the love of God for us, that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." That love

existed before its manifestation. So prayer is the expression of the desire of the heart, not simply that desire. And thanksgiving and praise are expressions, or manifestations of gratitude and gladness—not gratitude and joy, but the manifestation or expression of them; as wailing is the expression of sorrow of heart. So we express our faith and humility by bowing down before God, and doing his commands. Obedience is both the trial of faith, and the manifestation of a worshiping heart.

II. *What is true worship?* "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship in spirit and in truth" (John iv:23, 24). "In spirit" must mean, spiritually, heartily. "In truth" means according to truth; that is, as truth directs. Not in a way devised by men; not in our own way, but in God's way—doing just what he commands, and as he directs. This is called "working the work of God," not the work of men. Paul, 2 Tim. ii:5, referring to their games and races, says: "And if a man strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned, except he strive lawfully," or according to law. (See, also, 1 Cor. ix:25, 26.) In Matt. xv:9, referring to the Pharisees, Jesus says: "But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men"; or as Dr. George Campbell renders this: "observing institutions merely human." Human ordinances are as dry wells, as broken cisterns. There is none of the water of life in them. God is not in them. But he said to the Israelites (Ex. xx:24): "In all places where I record my name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee." And James i:25 says: "Whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed." God's ordinances are, therefore, his means of grace to us. They are wells of living water. God is in them. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in their midst"—there now; always there (Matt. xviii:20).

The elements of true worship are, then:

1. Doing just the things God commands to be done, and just as he directs.

2. Doing these things spiritually, heartily, sincerely, with clean hands and pure hearts. (See Ps. xv:1-4; xxiv:3-5; lxvi:18.) "If I regard iniquity in my heart the Lord will not hear me." Also Isa. 1:15, etc. No man can worship God acceptably who does injustice to his brother. Matt. v:23, 24: "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." It will be sweet incense to God then. The correct idea is, "just ground of complaint against thee." And "reconciled to thy brother" cannot mean more than to do him justice with a loving heart. He may refuse to be reconciled to us, but we can resolve to do him justice, and so, in our hearts, be reconciled to him. Only then can we truly worship.

III. *What is false, or vain worship?* Matt. xv:9, just quoted, calls the observance of men's commands *worship*. So also, Mark vii:7. It is worship; but it is false worship, and therefore, vain. All man-made systems of worship are false and vain. There is a vain religion also, James i:26: "If any man among you seem to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion is vain." Some say, "he has no religion." He has a religion, but it is vain, because false. Religion is a system of worship, and is three times applied to Mosaism. One writer says the Athenians had *thirty thousand* religions. A true and profitable religion is a scriptural system of worship. A false and vain religion is a false or human system of worship. It is vain, or useless, because it is false. It is false because it is of man. Man cannot devise or provide a system of worship that will be pleasing to God, and therefore profitable to men. Hence, all false worship may be classified thus:

1. All human systems and objects of worship.
2. The observance of the divine system with impure hearts and unclean hands.
3. The imperfect or erroneous observance of the divine commands. As Saul did (1 Sam. xv), when he saved Agag alive, and the best of the sheep and oxen. We must "wholly follow the Lord," as did Caleb and Joshua, Enoch, Noah, Asa and others. For God is not to be deceived by partial or imperfect service. And we may undertake to do the thing God commands, in the way man devises. As when the ark was carried on a cart and not by the priests, as God had directed. Here the thing required was done, but not in the way directed; and God "made a breach upon Uzzah." In so far as God has not directed us how to do his commands, we may do as we please, provided only that we do not disregard any portion of the divine law, or the true spirit of worship. But when God tells us how to do a command, then the manner of doing is a part of the command, and is sacred. But to cut off occasion for stumbling here, it may be observed that no impossibilities are ever required. The whole law to every man is just what he can do. His ability is the measure of his responsibility. God is not a hard Master. But he is *just* to himself and to us; and he will not accept of what is done when "we keep back a part." He accepts and blesses when he can say of us as he did of the poor woman: "She hath done what she could."

The worship of an idol, however sincere, cannot be pleasing to God. And the worship of God after the systems devised by man, cannot please him, however sincere we may be. Saul was sincere and conscientious while the chief of sinners, persecuting Christians. We must worship as God directs; and must search his word to find his will. In this was Saul's mistake. In this was the great mistake of the murderers of Jesus. Had they searched the Scriptures properly they would have known God's will. Thousands are now making this same mistake, for the same reason. And they

blindly plead their sincerity—which cannot be greater than that of millions of idol worshipers today! How they "deceive their own hearts," by their *vain religion!* If we are not content to work and worship *in vain*, we should search for the right way, and walk in it. Sin has its "wages" such as no one desires. Why "serve sin"? "Godliness is profitable unto all things." No part of it is in vain. Its reward is the true riches, and shall not rust or be taken from us. All may be rich. All will be rich who are truly wise—rich towards God; rich in good works; rich in heaven; rich eternally, when all the riches of earth have rusted, and faded, and failed forever. God help us to be wise that we may be truly and always rich!

IV. *Mixed worship.* When one is partly right and partly wrong in his worship, he is like the iron and the clay, in Nebuchadnezzar's vision (Dan. ii:37-42): "partly strong and partly broken." This mixture may be:

1. In worshiping God partly in his way, and partly in man's way. A very large part of the worship of today is of this class. Men follow the Bible so far as they like it, and then take their own way for the rest. Take our great revivalists; they preach Christ, and tell sinners to believe, repent, give God their hearts and call upon his name very well; but they keep back a part. They do not tell them of baptism, of Christian union, the proper observance of the Lord's day, or many other clearly marked duties. They preach only what all denominations agree upon, and leave out the rest. This is a human system. It mutilates God's worship, and renders it largely inefficient and unacceptable. Why not preach and practice "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth"?

2. We have a badly mixed worship, when we serve God a little and sin a little—or much, as many do. They unite with the church, and do *some* of God's commands, but persistently trample on all the rest. They assemble themselves with the saints at distant intervals—often only at big meetings, instead of "every first day of the week." They pray a

*little, occasionally*, instead of "always, with all prayer and supplication in the spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints" (Eph. vi:18). And the measure of their prayers is the extent of their worship. They read the Bible carelessly, perhaps for controversy, and only occasionally; instead of "searching the Scriptures daily," as did the highly commended Bereans (Acts xvii:11). And they contribute to the church treasury a little, and only occasionally, instead of "every first day of the week as God has prospered them" (1 Cor. xvi:1, 2). But with the intelligent and sincere, the question as to their ever hearing the Master say, "well done," is not much mixed.

3. Worship is terribly mixed when we worship God on the Lord's day (if it is strictly according to his word), and then worship mammon all the rest of the week, often with a poor sense of justice to others in our business transactions; certainly trampling on the golden rule, in that we do not "do to others as we would that they should do to us." Such persons are clearly not observing either of the two great parts of heaven's religion, viz.: (1) Loving God with all their hearts; (2) loving their neighbor as themselves. Their worship is, therefore, vain, and they are "deceiving their own hearts." And it may be added here, that he is their best friend who would undeceive them before it is too late.

V. *The objects of worship.* These are without argument, to honor and please the Savior; and to do the very best we can for ourselves, for time and for eternity. To question these would not be consistent with a profession of faith in the Bible. In the first we gain God's favor and blessings. In the second, we qualify ourselves to enjoy these blessings.

The ancient people had a proverb to this effect: That a man is assimilated to the object he worships, and can never be superior to it. The Arabs have this yet, and we all ought to have it. Hence, the ignorance and debasement of idol worshippers. They can never be superior to their idol. He is their model. To be like him is the culmination of their ambi-

tion. Hence, too, the intelligence, spirituality and glory of the true and-faithful Christian. His model has all perfections; and "we shall be like him"; which will be to possess all intelligence, glory and worth, and to "inherit all things." Another well understood maxim is, that we become like those whose company we keep. We even become largely like the books and papers we read, because they are our company and associates. Hence we hear wise men say, tell us what company a man keeps, and what books he reads, and we will tell you what kind of a man he is. Husbands and wives, with geniality of spirit and life, are often so assimilated to each other—their features, voices, walk and general action— as to be sometimes taken by strangers to be brothers and sisters. Now, the highest purpose of the Christian is, to be like God. This will qualify us for enjoying his presence forever. Without this, we should not much, if at all, enjoy heaven. And the scriptural worship of God will, day by day, unavoidably and inevitably assimilate us to the divine being. It transforms and moulds us into his image and likeness. No other worship or course of life can do this. Therefore, as we would be prepared for the ills and enjoyments of this life, and for the bliss of the life to come, let us worship God in spirit and in truth. This course will produce the desired effect, and we shall have God's blessings and be able to enjoy them forever.

## CHAPTER XIX

### THE CHURCH IN PROPHECY

Meaning of prophecy, cases of miraculous prophetic teaching; Moses at Mt. Sinai; prophetic teaching concerning Christ; New Covenant church and kingdom; durability and triumphs of Christianity; its establishment and organization; apostasy foretold, meaning of the dragon, heaven, etc.; other apostolic teaching on the apostasy; how this was brought about, agencies and instrumentalities; warnings for us, and confirmation of our faith.

The church in the types has appeared to excellent advantage; and now, in the briefest manner possible, let us consider the church in prophecy, from fourteen hundred years before its establishment; and from its establishment to the millennium and the second personal coming of Christ.

#### MEANING OF PROPHECY

A close examination of the two hundred occurrences of this word, or its Greek representative, *propheetees*, will satisfy anyone that Webster is correct in his two general definitions. 1. A declaration of something to come; especially an inspired foretelling. 2. Public interpretation of Scripture; preaching; exhortation, or instruction. For the latter definition see 1 Cor. xiv:3, 4, 24, 34. Prophesying *always* means *teaching*. Miraculously inspired prophets taught, as to the future, "the things to come," frequently long before they transpired. This class of prophets we have not now. But we have the other class—teachers, preachers and exhorters. In this sense "all may prophesy," each as he is able.

#### CASES OF MIRACULOUS PROPHEPIC TEACHING

About 1920 years before the birth of the Savior, the Lord appeared to Abram, afterwards called Abraham, and made a covenant with him. (See Gen. xii.) In Gen. 13th,



15th, 17th and 22nd chapters this covenant is also referred to. Circumcision was the seal of this covenant. Abram was to obey God, and on this condition God was, 1. To be his friend and protector and guide. 2. To give him the land of Canaan, in which he was then a stranger. 3. To give him a seed numerous as the stars of heaven, or the sand on the seashore. 4. The seed in whom all the nations should be blessed—i.e., Christ. Each one of these four promises was literally filled full. But there were many items not properly called *promises*, because they were not to be desired; as the facts: 1. That his seed should be afflicted by their enemies 400 years. 2. That they should come out of their bondage. 3. That they should spoil their oppressors, and come out with great riches, etc. 4. That afterwards God would judge their persecutors, etc. (See Gen. xv:13, 14, etc.) All this prophetic teaching was verified. And B.C. 1490, we find this seed of Abraham and—

#### MOSES AT MOUNT SINAI

Here another covenant is made, in which Israel is to obey God, and God is to bless them, etc. Forty years after this, in Moses' valedictory (see Deut. 18th and 28th chapters), he tells them their history, which it would be interesting to trace. He gives a most graphic account of their rebellions and sufferings, even to their de-nationality, and their being scattered among all nations, and their return; then their second dispersion; and then he looks beyond the coming of Christ, to their finally returning to their own land, their conversion to Christ, etc. A volume would be filled with these details and their fulfillment thus far.

#### PROPHETIC TEACHING CONCERNING CHRIST

Moses (Deut. xviii:15) says: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken," etc. (See also Gen. xlix:10.) And it would be very convenient to note over *seventy* direct references to the coming of Christ, including

the *time* of his coming, his ascension, betrayal for thirty pieces of silver, by one of his friends, that none of his bones should be broken, his burial with the rich, casting lots for his vesture, conversion of the Gentiles, his crucifixion, death with malefactors, while in the prime of life, the convulsions of nature, descent into Egypt, desertion by his disciples, his divinity and glory, his dominion to be universal and everlasting, false accusations, his forerunner, his ministry in Galilee, offer of gall and vinegar; his human generation, insult, buffeting, spit upon, scourged, massacre of the innocents, his miraculous power, mission, being mocked, place of nativity, born of a virgin, patience, persecution, being pierced with a spear, prayer for his enemies, preaching, purchase of the potter's field, purification of temple, rejection by Jews and Gentiles, resurrection, silence when accused, spiritual graces, triumphal entry into Jerusalem, his sufferings for us, etc. Every important matter pertaining to his earthly life seems to have been fully before the prophets, and they all speak as with one voice, though in different countries and ages, and without personal conference.

But not to be tedious on this wonderful prophetic history, let us note especially a few points concerning

#### THE NEW COVENANT, CHURCH AND KINGDOM

As to the understanding of these prophecies, let us remember the rule setting forth the fact that, we consider their adaptedness, and especially do we rely on their application and appropriation by the apostles. In Jer. xxxi:31-35, about 884 years after the Sinaitic covenant, and 606 years before the birth of the Savior, the prophet names eight particulars as to the new covenant; and in Heb. viii:8-13, Paul quotes and applies all this to the gospel of Christ. Here is a history in detail, as to the facts and nature of the church, and an application by the apostle that cannot be misunderstood. It was to be a *new* covenant, and *unlike* the old one in given particulars. It is, therefore, not an addition to the old one;

not a revamping; not a new patch on the old garment; not new wine put into an old bottle (Matt. ix:16, 17; Mark ii:22; Luke v:37), but a *new covenant*—new wine cask, and new wine; new garment, *capapie*. Hence we must look to the new covenant for its laws, ordinances, etc., and not at all to the Old Testament, except as these are given in the types and prophecies.

#### TRIUMPHS AND DURABILITY OF THIS NEW ORDER

Daniel wrote some twenty-six years later than Jeremiah. In his explanation of the king's dream, Dan. ii:44, he tells us *when* this new kingdom should be established; that it "shall never be destroyed"; that it "shall break in pieces and consume all other kingdoms, and "stand forever." And passing over the other visions of Daniel and his explanations, we come to the seventh chapter. Here he distinctly notes several items concerning this new kingdom. Of the ancient of days, verse 14, he says: "And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." And verse 18, "But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever." Daniel saw, in this inimitable vision, verse 22: "Until the ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came, that the saints possessed the kingdom." And verse 27, "And the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom, under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." See Dan. ii:44; Luke i:33; John xii:34; Rev. xi:15; Ps. xxxvii:11; Matt. v:5. "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." See Rev. xxi. The final, complete and most glorious triumphs of the gospel are set forth also by Isaiah, chapters

54, 55, etc. In these testimonies (and many others), we have, in the plainest language:

1. The *establishment* of the new kingdom.

2. *Its durability.* "It shall stand forever." "It shall never be destroyed." Jesus seems to refer to this in Matt. xvi:18. If, therefore, there was a time since its establishment, when it did not exist, then all these prophetic teachings have failed. But no such time can be pointed to. And it is the business of the historian to trace this kingdom from the apostles to the present time.

3. *"Its universality."* "All shall serve and obey him." His will shall be "done on earth as it is in heaven" (Matt. vi:10; Luke xi:2). "The knowledge of God shall cover the earth as the waters the great deep" (Isa. xi:9; Hab. ii:14). And to make this more plain, if possible, Paul says (Phil. ii:9-11), "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth (i.e., in hades); and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." What a triumph! How complete! There will be no disputation then as to *confessing* his name, or bowing the knee before him. Oh! how expressive *then!* And why not now?

4. *The inheritance of all things by the saints.* See Rom. viii:17. "Heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." James ii:5; Jer. xl:1; Mich. i:15; Rom. iv:13. Adam was rich. He owned this world. But every child of God will own this world and the world to come also, forever and ever!!! Alas for all *earthly* pleasures, riches and honors!

#### THE APOSTASY OF THE CHURCH

As the apostasy of the Jews was prophetically made known, and was fully realized; so the apostasy of the church of Christ was made known even by Daniel. See Dan. viii:20-27; vii:12, 24, 25. Amongst protestants it is agreed and under-

stood that the Popish party is here referred to. The "little horn," etc., must refer to this antichrist power. "He shall, wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws, and they shall be given into his hands, until," etc. "He shall destroy wonderfully and shall prosper, . . . and shall destroy the holy people"; "shall cause craft to prosper, and by peace shall destroy many," etc. "But he shall be broken without hand." This shadow though distant and comparatively dim, all agree, refers to the man of sin of Paul, 2 Thes. 2nd chapter. Here, too, fortunately, protestants agree that this same little horn, or pope of Rome is referred to. His opposition to the will of Christ in the church, changing times and laws, exalting himself, using signs and wonders to deceive, etc., all point one way: "A repetition of the Sinaitic apostasy, when the people said to Aaron, 'up, make us gods,'" etc. But being agreed here, and awaiting a historic development of the manner and agents in this apostasy, in another chapter, let us hasten to Rev. 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th and 17th chapters. Protestants are not agreed as to the precise meaning of several items here, but all agree that the reference is to the same "little horn" of Daniel, and the man of sin of Paul—the Roman hierarchy. Note only a few plain items:

The *dragon* is the pagan persecuting power.

The first *beast*, which, like the dragon, came up out of the sea (civil powers in commotion), probably represents the pope; but—

The *second beast* certainly does. See the likeness of a lamb with two horns, one of which represents the mildness of Christ, the other, the fierceness of the roaring lion; "speaking great swelling words, having men's person in admiration, because of advantage."

*Heaven* here means the church, and elsewhere, the civil ruling power, where there was "war in heaven, and the *dragon* fought," etc. We know the dragon was never in the final, the real heaven. Heaven means a high, exalted

position or place. Hence we read of harps and harpers in heaven—not the final heaven, certainly.

This third beast, with two horns like a lamb, came up out of the *earth* (verse 11), whence have come all corruptions in the divine worship.

This power "*deceived* them that dwelt on the earth." Deception and fraud make up the leading characteristics of this antichrist.

In the 15th chapter we have the events which, as we shall see, transpired about A.D. 350—the raising of Constantine to the throne, the banishment or fleeing of the women (the church) into the wilderness (the valleys of Piedmont, etc., in France) for forty-two months, or 1,260 years; and, as in the other lessons, the final overthrow of the man of sin. Chapter 17: "These shall make war with the lamb, and the lamb shall overcome them." Verse 14. The 18th verse tells plainly who is this scarlet woman, "that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth," the civil, or temporal power of the pope. (Those who would better understand this subject should carefully read the first speech of A. Campbell in the Purcell debate, on the proposition: "She is the Babylon of John, the man of sin of Paul, and the empire of the little horn of Daniel's sea monster.")

#### OTHER APOSTOLIC TEACHINGS ON THE SUBJECT

Paul, 1 Tim. iv:1-3, gives largely the agents and manner, as well as the fact of the apostasy in the church. "The spirit speaketh expressly, that, in the latter times shall some depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats," etc.

*Expressly, i.e., plainly*—unlike the equivocal speech of false prophets. *The latter times* may refer to the destruction of Jerusalem and the practical end of Judaism; but it certainly reaches on to these latter times. *Teachings or*

*mutterings* (doctrines), of demons, just such as the peculiar and widely prevailing modern *spiritism* is claiming in these "latter times." *Conscience seared*, represents the very worst apostasy.

2 Tim. iii:1: "This know also, that in the last days, perilous times shall come." Why? (Verses 3-5) "For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce breakers, .false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof; from such, turn away." Once an able man said to a preacher at the close of his discourse: "Well, if you were not inspired to-day, inspiration could not have done better." So here: If this picture was not drawn for the present time, there can be no use for a "sitting." *Lovers of themselves*—i.e., selfishness. How it abounds all over the land! *Covetous!* No one trait more clearly distinguishes this age. *Disobedient to parents:* Who has not heard old people say, Alas! for the young people. It was not so in our youth. More than one strong man has said the precept requiring children to obey their parents had been reversed; and now it read, practically, "Parents obey your children." Passing over the others, each of which deserves special note, notice—"*Lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God.*" California is the place to see this. Preachers and people must take vacations, and seek "good times" all the year round; often with more zeal than they seek for souls. And—"*Having a form of godliness — not the power.*" Forms and ceremonies — and these devised by men, very formally observed, make up the religion of the popular masses! Are not the last days near ? Or have the signs failed?

2 Peter ii:1-3: "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even

denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious way; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they, with feigned words, make merchandise of you."

Here is a wonderful lesson for us; and we should observe, especially: "*There shall be false teachers,*" etc. This was certain. How precisely, and how early and constantly has this been fulfilled! It does not point to any particular period; and it has appeared in all the ages of the church. *Privately*, or secretly, i.e., by craft and fraud, by plotting and scheming, they will bring in these. This was and is religious *conspiracy* against the union, peace and purity of the church. "*Damnable heresies,*" or sects, denominations; just such as prevail today, by the secret and selfish scheming of the leaders. "*Many shall follow their pernicious ways.*" They strike the popular chord, and ride on the popular wave, and persuade themselves and their followers that they are right because they are many—the majority; though it is not so large as in the days of Noah, Elisha, Micaiah, etc. And have not "the many" followed them? "*The way of truth evil spoken of.*" Has it not been, and is it not, to-day, ridiculed, and spoken of reproachfully by these false teachers, sect makers? "*Through covetousness —make merchandise of you.*" Here we have the secret out. The church should have learned this lesson—should learn it now. *Covetousness*, on the part of the leaders, makes merchandise of the people. See the high salaries of preachers, and the base means resorted to, to raise them, all under the clause, "they that preach the gospel should live of the gospel." They *assume* that they are doing what Paul means by "preach the gospel," when, in fact, they are teaching sect-ism, mostly, and getting power and place and money for themselves. Under "live of the gospel," they manage, by various and unscriptural means, to get the largest salaries possible, whereas only a living is awarded them by the



passage. *Covetous* preachers, and making merchandise of the people, the denominationalism and worldliness now prevailing could not be more definitely described. See also 1 John ii:18; iv:1-3; 2 Peter iii:3, 4; and Jude 18. Here we have the "last days" again. But enough is given to show the prophetic teaching as to the falling away, or apostasy in the church, in vast numbers, in our day, by the agency of the teachers and leaders. We see, also that all these are to fail, and the gospel is certainly to triumph to the ends of the earth; and Jesus, the despised and mocked, is to rule heaven, earth and hades, as certainly as these prophetic teachings are true.