



The Kingdom
of
Promise
And
Prophecy

By

ROBERTSON L. WHITESIDE

1956

Published By

Miss Inys Whiteside

Denton, Texas

Copyright 1956,
by Miss Inys Whiteside,
Denton, Texas

Printed in the United States of America

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preach the Word	7
Part I—Questions	
Have All Prophecies of Old Testament Been Fulfilled?	21
Information On Old Testament Kingdom	23
Promise to Abraham	25
Jews and Their Kingdom	27
Will Jews Return to Jerusalem?	32
Prophecy of Amos 9:13-15	41
Matthew 16:28 Explained	43
Matthew 19:28; 25:31; Luke 22:28-30; I Corinthians 6:2	46
The Jews, The Kingdom and Salvation	51
Some Questions Considered	54
The Olive Tree Figure of Romans 11	59
Ends of The Ages	62
The Four Beasts	63
Points in Revelation 12	64
Questions on Revelation 20	67
Several Questions	69
Part II—Discussions	
Prediction or Prophecy	73
Prophecy	75
Shall We Look for a Literal Fulfillment of Prophecy?	79
Abraham and the Land Promise	84

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
The Time of Promise	88
Rebellion of Israel—A Kingdom Born	91
"Neither . . . Nor"	94
Future Kingdom Doctrine Reflects on Integrity Of God	100
The Old Testament Prophets and Christianity	102
Future-Kingdom Perversions and Dislocations Of Prophecy	106
Your Faith and Your Confession	116
The Christ of The Future-Kingdom Advocates	119
Is Salvation Now Offered to All?	120
The Coming of the Lord	122
The "Two Stages" Theory Examined	126
Hope of The Lord's Coming	130
Paul to the Thessalonians on the Lord's Return	134
Resurrection From the Dead	139
Theory of Two Resurrections Considered	143
Church Ages	147
Philadelphia and The Hour of Trial	149
Nebuchadnezzar's Dream	155
Milligan on Nebuchadnezzar's Dream	160
A Leading Doctrine of This Current Reformation	163
Is the Church the Kingdom?	166
This Government and Jehovah's Witnesses	168
The New Testament Word Flesh	173
Future-Kingdom Doctrines	177
A Proposition and Its Proof	187

PUBLISHERS PREFACE

In editing and arranging the writings contained in this book, I used some lifted from religious journals and some that was still in manuscript form. For their courtesy extended to me in allowing me to lift from their papers the writings of my late father, Robertson L. Whiteside, for publication in books, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to the present managements of the: GOSPEL ADVOCATE, GOSPEL GUARDIAN, and FIRM FOUNDATION.

To the many who have encouraged me in this effort, thanks. Your comments have been a source of great joy and inspiration.

It is my hope that this "Kingdom of Promise and Prophecy" will, along with the "Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Saints at Rome" and "Doctrinal Discourses," fill the present need for sound and careful Bible teaching. To these will be added, as soon as time will permit, a compilation of questions and answers for which I have had many requests.

INYS WHITESIDE

INTRODUCTION

Robertson L. Whiteside was a native of Hickman county, Tennessee, born December 27, 1869, died at his home in Denton, Texas—where he had lived more than forty years—January 5, 1951. Early in his life (17 years of age), he dedicated himself to the Lord's service. He was student, educator, and preacher and was ever on the firing lines in the fight against innovations and error. The Bible was his standard of faith and practice. With him, "to live was Christ." Like Jeremiah of old (a character he so loved and admired), there was a burning fire in his heart he could not contain.

I might write a conventional biography as introduction to this book; however, it seems to me that the following lesson from his pen is more revealing of the purpose of the life that he lived.

PREACH THE WORD

"I charge thee in the sight of God, and of Christ Jesus, who shall judge the living and the dead, and by his appearing and his kingdom: preach the word; be urgent in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and teaching. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but, having itching ears, will heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts; and will turn away their ears from the truth, and turn aside unto fables. But be thou sober in all things, suffer hardship, do the work of an evangelist, fulfill thy ministry." (2 Tim. 4:1-5.)

An old theme, do you say? What about it is old? God, Christ, truth, sin, salvation, duty, destiny—these never grow old. There is something wrong with one who thinks any Bible theme is old or out of date. If there were a cure for all fleshly ailments, would it ever be "out of date"? Would any sufferer say of it, "O, that is too old for this progressive age"? But there is no such cure known to man.

But man has a nature more important and enduring than his flesh, and ailments more far reaching in their results than any fleshly ills. And the gospel of Christ is a sure cure for all spiritual and moral ills. As long as there are moral evils to be corrected, sins to be forgiven, sinners to be saved, and downtrodden and discouraged to be inspirited, sorrowing hearts to be comforted, just that long will the gospel be fresh and "up to date." And what else is up to date?

We have made great advancement in material things, but these do not meet the needs of the soul. Science has made great strides in material things, but it has no remedy for sin and crime. In fact, it has put forces into the hands of the world that the world does not know what to do with. In truth, I think it can be safely said that science has made crime more plentiful and daring, and has enabled the criminal to escape a hundredfold more easily. I am not unmindful of the comforts science has brought to those who know how to use them; it has also done wonders in combating disease. But it has put powers in the hands of man that he does not know how to handle. Even now scientists are seeking ways and means to destroy whole cities with one blast. Science has just about perfected means

by which civilization will destroy itself in the next great war. It cannot cure one moral evil, nor generate one spiritual force for the world's regeneration. And when, a scientist tries to become a philosopher, he becomes a great injury to the world; for he usually leaves God out of any scheme of philosophy that he tries to construct. And psychology and sociology, or any of the moral philosophies, are equally helpless. Jesus is the Great Physician, and the gospel is his remedy, his only remedy, for the evils that afflict the world.

Nothing is up to date that does not meet the needs of the times. Many things are up to date in, meeting our material needs, but nothing that man has ever thought out or planned is up to date in a moral and spiritual sense. Along these lines man's theories are out of date before they are announced. The most advanced person in the world along moral and spiritual lines is the one who adheres most closely to the word of God and relies most firmly upon it as the one and only remedy for sin and crime. And the man who says that such a man is behind the times is himself so far behind that he does not know that any one has gone on before! The one who faithfully preaches the word is far in advance of him who preaches something else. And yet the majority of the people have never wanted the plain truth told. They prefer things that please.

Because some professed Christians would not want the pure word of God preached is one of the reasons assigned by Paul as to why the word of God should be preached the more diligently. "Preach the word... For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine." At first thought it might seem that this

statement was true in Paul's day; for did they not persecute and kill preachers then? But Paul was not here speaking of outsiders. He had in mind the time when professed Christians would not endure sound doctrine. Growing tired of the gospel they would long for something else. "Having itching ears," they "will heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts; and will turn away their ears from the truth, and turn aside unto fables." It is plain that he was talking about people who would accept the truth, but later become tired of it, and would employ preachers that would tickle their itching ears. It is a dark picture, but it is not a new picture.

After God's people came out of Egypt, they frequently drifted into the condition Paul here mentions. Read the historical books of the Old Testament and also the testimony of the prophets, and you will find that God's people never remained true to him very long at a time. Against them Jeremiah testifies: "For my people have committed two evils: they have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters, and have hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water." (Jer. 2:13.) They had turned from the fountain of living waters as spoken to them by God's prophets, and had procured for themselves false prophets. And that was their folly and their sin. Isaiah delivers a terrific rebuke: "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib: but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider." (Isa. 1:3.) They did not know as much about where safety and food could be found as did the ox or the ass.

Is there not a need now for straight gospel preach-

ing? Of course, a preacher should be a Christian gentleman at all times, but he should not become too polished to preach the unadulterated word of God. He may suffer for it, but what of that? And some misguided souls may say that plain preaching keeps people away and injures the standing of the church, but the faithful preacher knows that that makes it the more binding upon him to preach the gospel straight. Because Jeremiah spoke the word of God faithfully, the people said: "This man seeketh not the welfare of this people, but the hurt." (Jer. 38:4.) And yet he was the best friend the people had. But they wanted smooth things spoken to them. They wanted him to tell them that no evil would come upon them. It appears that Jeremiah at times grew weary, and felt as if he might as well give up the strife, but he could not quit. "I am become a laughing-stock all the day, every one mocketh me. For as often as I speak, I cry out; I cry, Violence and destruction! because the word of Jehovah is made a reproach unto me, and a derision, all the day. And if I say, I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name, then there is in my heart as it were a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I am weary with forbearing, and I cannot contain." (Jer. 20:7-9.) Jeremiah loved his people, and could not be quiet as he beheld them plunging into ruin. A more heroic figure than Jeremiah does not grace the pages of Old Testament history.

These are perilous times. Man's schemes have broken down and the world is in chaos. Human wisdom has come up against a blank wall, beyond which man cannot see. The people are saying to their erstwhile leaders, "Cry"; and the leaders call back, "What shall

we cry?" We have left God out of our scheme of things. We have dabbled in this monkey business till conditions have made monkeys out of our wisest men. But there is balm, there is healing, there is a physician. Preach the word.

We want to convert sinners and edify saints, but there is danger that we put the main emphasis on the wrong things. We may become so busy as herdboys that we forget to feed the sheep. We may become so absorbed in keeping the young folks interested that we forget to fill them with the word of God. We may become so engaged in building fine meeting houses, that we forget to build fine Christian characters.

It is a fine thing for a church to have a house suited to its needs, but a house is not one of the essentials. The early Christians owned no meetinghouses, but they made the gospel ring throughout the land. It is a sin for brethren to burden themselves with a church-house debt that requires all their energies and resources to meet. Some churches have so burdened themselves with debt that they have ceased any worthwhile effort to preach the word. It is feared that pride contributed much to their present humiliation. Some of these monuments to pride or mistaken zeal will never be paid out, and the church will be discouraged and weakened, and all because they forgot that their main mission was to convert sinners and edify saints. In, trying to "put things over" they have gone under. **PREACH THE WORD.**

Do not worry about science. It has its legitimate field, and in its field it has done wonderful things. We reap its benefits and are glad. The average preacher

knows little about science, and the average scientist knows less about the Bible. The claim that science and the Bible do not agree should disturb no one. What is called "science" is not static. Each generation brings new light; most of the old theories have been exploded by scientists themselves. Yet each generation of scientists boldly announces that science has disproved the Bible. But it can as easily be proved that science has disproved itself. With all their dogmatism about the Bible and science, there are few theories that real scientists are willing to take their stand upon and say: "Here is ultimate truth; no future discoveries will contradict this." So long as they cannot afford to affirm that they have arrived at ultimate truth, how can they with honor say that science disproves the Bible? Besides, if the Bible fully agreed with the scientific theories of one age, it would not agree with the theories of the next age. The Bible is unchangeable and cannot keep up agreement with that which constantly changes. Some of the foremost scientists recognize the limitations of science and are firm believers in the Bible. **PREACH THE WORD.** No known truth contradicts the Bible.

But why preach the word? Why did the early Christians preach the word in the face of such fiery persecution? Why did Paul, then about to be put to death for preaching the word, urge upon, his beloved Timothy a course of action that was bound to bring suffering? Why do we now sacrifice that the word may be preached? We notice some reasons why the word should be preached.

The word of God is the seed of the kingdom. The

parable of the sower sets forth this truth as plainly as language can do so. "The sower soweth the word." That parable sets forth the truth that the word of God is to the spiritual kingdom exactly what seed is to the vegetable kingdom. The word produces plants in, the spiritual kingdom just as seed produces plants in the vegetable kingdom. If this be not so, then no one can tell what the Savior meant to teach by this parable.

Life is in the word just as life is in any other seed. If the seed be not planted, life will not spring up. No matter how well the soil may be prepared, there will be no life there till the seed be planted. No matter how much the heart may be prepared by education, culture, sorrow, or whatever may come, there will be no spiritual life in the heart till the seed—the word of God—is planted there.

Seed is able under suitable conditions to transform dead elements of the soil into life. In nature, this is the process of reproduction. Those who contend for a direct operation of the Spirit in regeneration base their contention on the fact that the sinner is dead. It is claimed that dead sinners must be made alive by this direct work of the Spirit before they can obey the Lord. This is the heart of their contention. Grant their premise, does their conclusion follow? Is the sinner's heart any deader than the soil into which the farmer sows his seed? The farmer knows that the life inherent in the seed is able to transform dead soil into a living, growing plant. If the theologians were as wise as the most ignorant farmer, they would sow the seed, which is the word of God, knowing that

the deadness of the soil—the sinner's heart—is no barrier to an abundant harvest. **PREACH THE WORD.**

There is saving power in the word. An angel said to Cornelius: "Send to Joppa, and fetch Simon, whose surname is Peter; who shall speak unto thee words, whereby thou shalt be saved, thou and all thy house." (Acts 11:13, 14.) "Wherefore putting away all filthiness and overflowing of wickedness, receive with meekness the implanted word, which is able to save your souls." (James 1:21.) "I am not ashamed of the gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." (Rom. 1:16.) Of course, no one thinks there is power in the material of which the Bible is made. The power that leads men to Christ is the thoughts, the ideas, the motives, presented in the word of God. There is power in a thought; and power in a motive. By words men move men, even whole armies and nations. Men's thoughts have been powerful enough to overthrow kingdoms. If we want men to act a certain way, we try to fill them with thoughts and motives tending to lead them in the direction we want them to go. We stir up action along certain lines by filling the people with certain thoughts and motives. In this way we work in people to induce them to will and do as we think they should. A man lives out in his life the thoughts he has in his heart. If we can fill people full of God's ideas, God's thoughts, we will induce them to do God's will. In this way God works in people to get them to live different lives. This helps us to understand what Paul says in Phil. 2:13: "For it is God who worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure."

It is through the mighty power of the word that men are drawn to Christ. I fear that many preachers will never get forgiveness for the way they have treated what the Lord says in John 6:44, 45. They so often read verse 44 and stop for their usual argument on the direct drawing put forth by the Spirit. Of course, when God draws, he draws by his power. If they would read both verses, they would defeat their argument made on verse 44. Is that honest? Is that handling aright the word of truth? Read both verses: "No man can come to me, except the Father that sent me draw him: and I will raise him up in the last day. It is written in the prophets, And they shall all be taught of God. Every one that hath heard from the Father, and hath learned, cometh unto me." {John 6:44, 45.} It is through God's word that we hear and learn of the Father; in that way God's drawing power is brought to bear upon us. The gospel is God's power to save, because it draws men to Christ, who alone can save.

It is not necessary to put in much time following the rambling efforts of the debater to prove man's depravity. Some years ago I had a discussion with Mr. Ben M. Bogard. On the Spirit question, he made the usual arguments on the depravity deadness of the sinner. In my first reply I made the statement: "I object to Mr. Bogard's theory because it limits the power of God. He has the sinner so dead that God could not make a gospel that would reach him. I object to a theory that makes God so helpless." Mr. Bogard, with more than usual bluster, replied: "It is not a question of God's power. God can do anything he wants to. He could have made a gospel that would

reach the dead sinner's heart, if he had wanted to do so." I replied: "The sinner is not so dead, then, as we have been hearing he was. Even this personal contact for which he contends would not have been necessary if God had made the right kind of gospel. So the trouble is not in the deadness of the sinner, but in the inefficiency of the gospel. But God could have made a better gospel, if he had wanted to. My contention is that he made the very gospel that Mr. Bogard says he could have made. Why waste further time discussing, the deadness of the sinner?" Of course, I paid due attention to Mr. Bogard's total-depravity notions, but he did not recover from his admission. God made a gospel that is perfectly adapted to man as he is. **PREACH THE WORD.**

Pointed Paragraphs:

If you become a little squeamish about denouncing false teachers, read Jeremiah. If you think people are so hardened in sin that they hate you for preaching the word, read Jeremiah. A careful study of Jeremiah is good tonic for anyone.

Jeremiah has been unjustly called the "weeping prophet," as if he were a sort of weakling; whereas there was never a more heroic soul. Nothing turned him aside from his duty. If he wept, it was because he loved his nation, and his heart was torn with the knowledge of what was coming to his people. He would have been cold-blooded had he not wept.

Part I
QUESTIONS

HAVE ALL PROPHECIES OF OLD TESTAMENT BEEN FULFILLED?

1. Have all the prophecies of the Old Testament been fulfilled?—Beaumont

And I might ask: When is a prophecy fulfilled? Some prophecies are fulfilled in a simple act, or event. The prophecies concerning the birth of Christ were fulfilled when he was born, and the prophecies concerning his death were fulfilled when, he was crucified. Other prophecies concerning single events will occur to the reader. But some prophecies spoke of conditions that were to prevail over a long period of time. Study the prophecies concerning Babylon and Tyre. (Isa. 13:17-22; Jer. 51:60-62; Ezek. 26:7-14.) These cities were destroyed, as foretold; but they were to remain in desolation forever. That part of the prophecy is still being fulfilled. Certain prophecies concerning Christ, which began to be fulfilled on the first Pentecost after his resurrection, will go on being fulfilled as long as time shall last. He was to establish a kingdom; that prophecy has been fulfilled. But the prophecy further says: "Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it with justice and with righteousness from henceforth even for ever." (Isa. 9:7.) This prophecy began to be fulfilled when Jesus took his seat upon David's throne and established his kingdom. But the prophecy says he was to reign upon that

throne forever. That prophecy covers the whole period of time, from the time Jesus began to reign till he surrenders up the kingdom to his Father. And he is still saving the people, as the prophets foretold that he would.

But the prophecies concerning the Jews that the future-kingdom folks harp on so much have been fulfilled.

Pointed Paragraphs:

One fact is made to stand out clearly in the New Testament—namely, that the Law of Moses, with all its legal enactments, all its forms, ceremonies, and penalties, ended at the cross; and it is surprising that any one who professes to believe the New Testament should think otherwise. If interested, read Rom. 7:1-6; 2 Cor. 3:4-18; Gal. 3:11-22; 4:21-31; Eph. 2:14-16; Col. 2:14. A thoughtful reading of the letter to the Hebrews will convince any one that the old covenant passed away and that we now have a new and living way.

Christ loved the church, bought it with his own blood, and prayed for its oneness. So far as we can, we should love the church as he loved it.

GIVE US SOME INFORMATION ON OLD TESTAMENT KINGDOM

It is some times difficult to determine just what information is wanted. There are, however, some things about "the Old Testament kingdom" that should be carefully considered.

When God called Israel out of Egypt, he said to them: "Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be mine own possession from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation." (Ex. 19:5, 6.) For a long period of time after they settled in Canaan they had no king but Jehovah; they were, therefore, Jehovah's kingdom. But there came a time when they wanted a change; they wanted a centralized government, with a man as their king. At that time they had an, excuse for demanding a king. Read carefully the eighth chapter of First Samuel. Samuel was old, and his sons were corrupt. "Then all the elders of Israel gathered themselves together, and came to Samuel unto Ramah; and they said unto him, Behold thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways: now make us a king to judge us like all the nations. But this thing displeased Samuel, when they said, Give us a king to judge us. And Samuel prayed unto Jehovah. And Jehovah said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee; for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not be king over them."

Samuel was commanded to show them the nature of the government they were demanding. When Samuel had done so, the people said: "Nay; but we will have a king over us, that we also may be like all the nations." Jehovah selected Saul as their first king. When the day of his anointing came, Samuel said to the people: "See ye him whom Jehovah hath chosen, that there is none like him among all the people? . . . Then Samuel told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book, and laid it up before Jehovah." (1 Sam. 10:24, 25.) Thus Israel became a kingdom among kingdoms, and was then reckoned as such.

Israel had not only sinned against Jehovah, but had rejected him as their king. The kingdom thus established was not Jehovah's kingdom. While Saul reigned, it was the kingdom of Saul. (1 Chron. 12:23.) It was transferred to David because of Saul's sins; it was then David's kingdom. Any time thereafter it was the kingdom of the man who was king.

It is strange that some people yet look for that kingdom to be restored—a kingdom that was conceived in sin and brought forth in rebellion against Jehovah! On one occasion, when Israel was in great distress, Jehovah said to them: "Where now is thy king, that he may save thee in all thy cities? and thy judges, of whom thou saidst, Give me a king and princes? I have given thee a king in mine anger, and have taken him away in, my wrath." (Hos. 13:10, 11.) With what emotions do they expect the Lord to restore that kingdom?

PROMISE TO ABRAHAM: GEN. 13:14, 15 AND ACTS 7:5

Since Abraham bought even a burying place for Sarah, and Stephen, in Acts 7:5, says, "He (God) gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on, in what sense, if any, did he receive the promise contained in Gen. 13:14, 15?—Mrs. Mary B. Robins.

Personally, Abraham did not receive actual title to the land of promise, though the Lord, in some sense, did give him the land, as will be seen by reading Gen. 28:4; 35:12. He enjoyed its productiveness as fully as if he had been its actual owner. His vast herds fattened on its grass and drank water from the wells which his servants digged. Had God driven out-all the nations and turned the land over to Abraham, he could not have possessed it nor have made any more use of it than he did. Stephen certainly did not mean to say that God had failed in his promise to Abraham. It seems that Stephen's point was that the promise was not to Abraham as an individual, but to him as the founder of a nation—to his seed. The time for the promise to be fulfilled would come when Abraham's posterity became sufficiently numerous to possess: the land. That was clearly Stephen's point, for he adds: "But as the time of the promise drew nigh which God vouchsafed unto Abraham, the people grew and multiplied in Egypt." (Acts 7:17.) This shows that the time for the fulfillment of that promise was when the people grew and multiplied, and that the time for its fulfillment was not in Abraham's day, nor is it yet in the future. It was fulfilled when the nations were

driven out of Canaan and the land divided between the tribes of Israel. "So Jehovah gave unto Israel all the land which he swore to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein.....There failed not aught of any good thing which Jehovah had spoken unto the house of Israel." (Josh. 21:43, 45.)

Yet in the face of all this, it has been argued that the land promise to Abraham must yet be fulfilled, and that Abraham must be raised and the Jews restored to Palestine in order for this promise to be fulfilled. But the argument is mixed. It starts out to prove that the land must be given to Abraham, and winds up with his sharing it with the Jews. But Stephen's language destroys that conclusion, for his language shows plainly that Abraham and his seed were not to possess it jointly at the same time. Notice the language: "He promised that he would give to him in possession, and to his seed after him." Not with him, but "after him." The future-kingdom folks will have a hard time showing how Abraham will possess the land of Canaan during a millennium and then his seed possess it after him.

Pointed Paragraphs:

There are only two things that a person can do with a command—he can obey it or disobey it. One whose heart is right toward God will do whatever God commands him to do.

THE JEWS AND THEIR KINGDOM

For some time I have had on hand some letters from an aged Texas brother, an ardent advocate of the future-kingdom theory and its allied theories. These letters contain seven closely written pages—too much for this page. In his last letter the brother says: "You answer questions for others, but it seems that my questions are a little too hard for you... We recall that some months ago you said that the kingdom of David and the kingdom of Jehovah were the same kingdom, and that Solomon sat on the throne of Jehovah. Solomon sat on the throne of David." (1 Kings 2:12, 24.)

When a person asks for information, I give his question attention as soon as possible; but when a person is merely trying to flunk me on what he considers a hard examination, I take the examination when it suits me. Besides, those who ask for information should have first consideration. The editor assigned me the task of answering questions, and not to carry on debates; but I must break over this time and stand the examination, and also do a little debating.

But the brother's memory seems to be at fault. I do not recall saying that the kingdom of David and the kingdom of Jehovah were the same. At least, that is not my idea at all. In a general sense God rules in all the universe, but in a special sense he ruled Israel for a time. At Mount Sinai, Jehovah said: "Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my

covenant, then ye shall be mine own possession from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation." (Ex. 19:5, 6.) Later they rejected Jehovah as their king. Jehovah said: "They have rejected me, that I should not be king over them." (See 1 Samuel 8:4-22.) God permitted them to have a king. The resultant kingdom was conceived in sin and brought forth in, rebellion against Jehovah. The people dethroned Jehovah, so to speak, and organized a kingdom of their own. "It is thy destruction, O Israel, that thou art against me, against thy help. Where now is thy king, that he may save thee in all thy cities? and thy judges, of whom thou saidst, Give me a king and princes? I have given thee a king in mine anger, and have taken him away in my wrath." (Hos. 13:9-11.) And yet all the time of that kingdom the right to rule the people was Jehovah's. The king sat on Jehovah's throne over Israel.

But our brother does not think Solomon sat on Jehovah's throne, but on David's throne. It is strange that these future-kingdom advocates can see 1 Kings 2:12, 24, but cannot see 1 Chron. 29:23: "Then Solomon sat on the throne of Jehovah as king instead of David his father." This language shows also that David had sat on the throne of Jehovah. It was really Jehovah's throne, but was called David's throne because he occupied it. And while Solomon occupied it, it was also his throne. Concerning Solomon, Jehovah said: "I will establish his throne forever." It was Jehovah's throne, David's throne, and then, Solomon's throne. Hence, God had allowed the people to have their way

and put a king on his throne. The management of the affairs of the kingdom was in the hands of the king. "Now when Saul had taken, the kingdom over Israel." (1 Sam. 14:47.) The whole organization of the kingdom was in the king's hands. But enough of this. Here are the questions:

1. "Was the kingdom of David a material, visible kingdom, or an invisible spirit kingdom?"

It was a kingdom like other kingdoms. The people said: "We will have a king over us, that we may be like all the nations." And Jehovah said to Samuel: "Hearken unto their voice." (I Sam. 8:18-22.) That settles it. It was a kingdom patterned after other kingdoms. That kingdom was destroyed and how any sane person should expect God to restore a kingdom that was organized in rebellion against him is one of the mysteries.

2. "God destroyed it, but said he would restore it as in the days of old. (Amos 9:11-15.) Has it been restored as it was?"

God did not say that he would restore that rebellious kingdom as it was. The tabernacle of David was the royal family of David. The royal house, or family, of David fell. It was set up again when Jesus, of the royal family of David, was exalted at God's right hand and made both Lord and Messiah. (Acts 2:29-36.) According to James, this had to be done before the gospel could be preached to the Gentiles. (Acts 15:13-19.) That prophecy of Amos has been fulfilled.

3. "Have all Israel been gathered from the nations

and given possession of their land, with David as their king, as prophesied in Ezek. 37:10-24?"

Ezekiel uttered that prophecy while Israel was in captivity. Any Israelite who heard or read that prophecy would understand him to be referring to their then existing captivity. Our brother does not believe that the same David of old would be again their king, but that one of the seed of David would be king. Jesus was of the seed of David, and is now king. Neither are the Jews now in captivity. It is strange that any one would take a passage that speaks of delivering the Jews from captivity and apply it to the Jews of today or of tomorrow. In the prophecy referred to, Jehovah said: "I will take the children of Israel from among the nations, whither they are gone." They were among the nations at that time, and from that condition Jehovah would deliver them. As to whether they then became a glorious nation would be determined by their own conduct. "And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if they do that which is evil in my sight, that they obey not my voice, then will I repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit them." (Jer. 18:9, 10.) This prophecy was spoken direct to Israel as a warning to them.

4. "If the kingdom was restored at Pentecost, why did every apostle after Pentecost that spoke of the return of Christ put it in the future?"

The old kingdom was not restored, but the kingdom of God was set up on Pentecost. Christ is on the

throne, where he will sit till all his enemies are subdued. (Acts 2:35.) The last enemy to be abolished is death. (1 Cor. 15:26.) Death will be destroyed when the whole human family is raised from the dead. Jesus will occupy his present throne till that event is consummated. He will deliver up the kingdom to the Father. (1 Cor. 15:26-28.) That leaves no room for Jesus to reign, on another throne before all the dead are raised. Yes, the apostles spoke of the return of Christ as future; but, unfortunately for the future-kingdom theory, they did not put the establishment of his kingdom in the future. Neither did these ambassadors for Christ tell us that the Jews would yet be restored to Palestine.

Pointed Paragraphs:

Instead of recognizing that God was working out through them his plan for the redemption of the world, the Jews concluded God cared for no other people. The promise to Abraham and their own prophets should have taught them the truth, but they were too much wrapped up in themselves to see the truth.

From the things we learn from God's dealings with nations, it can be safely said that no nation falls so long as it serves a purpose in God's plans. That was true anciently, and it is true today.

WILL JEWS RETURN TO JERUSALEM?

From Tennessee comes this question: "Do the Scriptures teach that the Jews will return to Jerusalem and then Christ will come and rebuild the temple there?"

We learn from a note accompanying the question that a Holy Roller or some similar kind of preacher is creating a little confusion by teaching that the Jews will return to Jerusalem and Christ will soon come and rebuild the temple.

There is no way to keep fanatics from making wild guesses, nor to keep speculators from perverting the word of God. But if people studied the Bible as they should, such fellows would create very little confusion. It is hard to tell just why such a high fever has lately developed about the future of the Jews. Some preachers seem not to have much thought for any one but the Jews.

God promised Abraham to make of his seed a great nation and to give to them the land of Canaan. (Gen. 12:1-3; 13:14-17.) After Israel came out of Egypt, God entered into a covenant with them, promising to make of them a kingdom of priests and a holy nation, on condition that they obeyed his voice and kept his covenant. (Ex. 19:5, 6.) But as they neared Canaan, Jehovah said to them: "And it shall be, if thou shalt forget Jehovah thy God, and walk after other Gods, and serve them, and worship them, I testify against you this day that ye shall surely perish. As the nations that Jehovah maketh to perish before you, so

shall ye perish; because ye would not hearken unto the voice of Jehovah your God." (Deut. 8:19, 20.) The nations spoken of perished permanently, never to inhabit Canaan again. Israel was to perish as they did, if they turned from Jehovah in rebellion against him. I think one can safely say that not a future-kingdom advocate believes that Scripture just as it reads.

Some, at least, of those who look for the return of the Jews to Palestine and the restoration of their old kingdom tell us that the land promise to Abraham and his seed was an unconditional promise. If so, why have the Jews been, deprived of their land for eighteen and a half centuries? If the Jews were driven out because of their conduct, then the land covenant, or promise, was conditional. It seems to me that their theory virtually charges God with a failure to carry out an unconditional promise. Just here the interested reader should read carefully Deut. 27 and 28. But some will tell us that the land promise and the national promises have not yet been fulfilled to the Jews; but in so contending they run squarely against plain statements of Scripture.

After Israel had conquered the land of Palestine and each tribe had entered into its inheritance, Joshua called the people together and made an address to them, in which he said: "And behold, this day I am going the way of all the earth: and ye know in all your hearts and in all your souls, that not one thing hath failed of all the good things which Jehovah your God spake concerning you; all are come to pass unto you, not one thing hath failed thereof." (Josh. 23:14.) Joshua had already declared: "So Jehovah gave unto

Israel all the land which he sware to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein... There failed not aught of any good thing which Jehovah had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass." (Josh. 21:43-45.) Hence, they had come into possession of all that God had sworn to their fathers to give them. All of God's promises to them have been fulfilled, even though they never again see the land of Palestine.

Some centuries after they came into possession of Palestine the Israelites became so corrupt and rebellious that they were carried into captivity. Many of the prophets foretold this carrying away into captivity, and there were numerous prophecies that they would be brought back into their own land. These prophecies, long ago fulfilled, are now brought forward to prove that the Jews will again be brought back into their own, land. It is a miserable perversion of prophecies that have had their fulfillment in the restoration of the Jews from their Babylonian captivity. Why should any one call it speculation about unfulfilled prophecy?

The contention that the Jews are yet God's chosen people, and that he yet has in store for them special blessings that are not obtainable by other people, is in direct contradiction to God's whole plan of salvation through Christ. The plain teaching of the New Testament is against such an idea, and yet it is God's final revelation to man, and shows the full development and perfection of all the plans and purposes which God began in the Old Testament to outline in promise, prophecy, and type. Hence, if God has yet in store

some special blessings for the Jews, he certainly would have told us about it in the New Testament; but instead of giving us such information, the New Testament distinctly and emphatically teaches that now fleshly relations count for nothing. Although Paul was "of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews," he counted such fleshly relations as but refuse, and declared that he had no confidence in the flesh—that is, in any fleshly relations. (Phil. 3:2-8.) In 2 Cor. 5:14, 15, Paul declares that Christ died for all, and because of that fact he adds, "Wherefore we henceforth know no man after the flesh"—we give no distinction to any man because of his nationality. "Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more." (verse 16.) No one thinks of Christ as a Jew with a Jew's narrow nationalistic traits, but as a world savior. That he so often referred to himself as the *Son of man*, and not as a Jew, is more significant than many think. It sets him before us as equally related to all men and as equally interested in all men. Jehovah is not a tribal God and Jesus is not a tribal king, as most of the future-kingdom folks seem to believe.

Jesus himself gives us a picture of the latter end of the Jews. Read Matt. 12:43-45. The unclean spirit, having been driven out of the man, returns to the man with seven other spirits worse than himself. "And the last state of that man becometh worse than the first. Even so shall it be also, unto this evil generation," If the word here translated *generation* means *race*, as it often does, the future of the Jewish race is dark indeed.

In applying the lesson of the parable of the householder, Jesus said: "Therefore I say unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." (See Matt. 21:33-43.) This nation is the new Israel of God, the church. Christians are now the circumcision. (Phil. 3:3.) Christians are now "Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise." (Gal. 3:29.) The promises and prophecies that have not been fulfilled to fleshly Israel are to be fulfilled to the church, which is now God's Israel.

It has already been shown that there is no ground for expecting the Jews to return to Palestine. Instead of finding any teaching to that effect in the New Testament, as we would expect to find if such is to take place, we find the weight of New Testament teaching to be against such an event.

The return of the Jews to Palestine, the rebuilding of the temple, and the restoration of the Jewish kingdom are all so interwoven in the program of the future-kingdom advocates that they stand or fall together. It is a significant fact that the prophecies relied on to prove the fore-going propositions were all uttered before the Babylonian captivity or during that captivity. The Babylonian captivity had often been foretold. Therefore, when any prophet spoke of the regathering of the Jews to Palestine and the rebuilding of their temple, every Jew of that time would understand the prophet to be speaking of their return from Babylonian captivity and the rebuilding of their temple then. Ezekiel prophesied during the captivity, being himself one of the early captives. Of course, anything he said

about the return of the Jews and the rebuilding of the temple would be understood by every Jew of that time as referring to their deliverance from their present captivity. Without some special words of explanation they could not have understood it otherwise. But no such words of explanation were given. The prophets knew how the Jews would understand them, and yet they let it go at that. Are we to understand that God, through his prophets, deceived the Jews? Surely not. The prophets foretold the return of the Jews from captivity. The Jews would understand them to refer to their return from Babylonian captivity. What then? Sound principles of exegesis demand that these circumstances and conditions be taken into consideration in the application of these prophecies. This the future-kingdom advocates fail to do. But they tell us that some of the promises in these prophecies concerning the return of the Jews from captivity have not yet been fulfilled. But such an affirmation ignores the conditionality of God's promises. It is the same blunder that is made by the advocates of the impossibility of apostasy. Even if it could be shown that some things promised to the Jews on their return to Palestine were never fulfilled, that would not prove that they will yet be fulfilled. The human side must be taken into consideration. Hear the Lord through Jeremiah: "Behold, as the clay in the potter's hand, so are ye in my hand, O house of Israel . . . And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if they do that which is evil in my sight, that they obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit them." (Jer. 18:5-10.) This is God's warn-

ing to Israel, but it has no weight with the future-kingdom advocates.

The Lord brought the Jews back from captivity and planted them in their land. They would have had God's choicest blessings had they obeyed his voice; but they failed him, and plunged into the grossest sins. This criminality culminated in their murdering the Son of God and many of his saints. It was not the crimes of individuals here and there, but the deliberate crimes of the nation. Death is the punishment for deliberate murder. National murder demanded national death. The Jewish nation suffered that death in the destruction of Jerusalem.

When God sent his Son into the world, he did not send him to reorganize the Jewish kingdom, but to open up a way of salvation for sinners. He did not fail to accomplish what he was sent to do, as the future-kingdom advocates claim. Hear his own words: "I glorified thee on the earth, having accomplished the work which thou hast given me to do." (John 17:4.) That statement should settle a lot of speculation about the rejected king and the postponed kingdom.

When Jesus comes again, he will not come to rebuild the temple in, Jerusalem, but to render judgment. (Matt. 25:31-46; 2 These. 1:6-10.) His temple is here now. "Upon this rock I will build my church." (Matt. 16:18.) That church is his temple. "Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of

God is holy, and such are ye." (1 Cor. 3:16, 17.) "Being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone; in whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit." (Eph. 2:20-22.) In the old material temple, animal sacrifices and other material sacrifices were offered; in this new spiritual temple, spiritual sacrifices are offered. "Ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." (1 Pet. 2:5.) Can any one believe that we are to give up this glorious spiritual temple for the old material temple? this spiritual worship for the carnal ordinances of the material temple? If so, he has poor taste for the spiritual.

The temple in Jerusalem was but a type, a shadow, of this glorious spiritual temple. (Heb. 9:1-10.) This spiritual house is a "greater and more perfect tabernacle." (Heb. 9:11.) Now, we are gravely told that in the millennium we will exchange this glorious spiritual temple for the material temple with its animal sacrifices, give up the substance for the shadow, give up the gospel of grace for the law of the temple, which means the law of Moses. That temple, we are informed, will be again sanctified by the blood of animals. Such material conceptions as this whole future-kingdom idea suits very well such materialists as the Russellites, but has no place in the thinking of one who glories in the cross of Christ and in his blood-bought church.

As a sample of the passages relied on to prove that the Jews are yet to be restored to Palestine and their temple rebuilt, read Ezek. 34:11-31; also chapters 37; 39:21-29, and to the close of Ezekiel. Remember, as you read, that Ezekiel prophesied while he and his nation were in captivity. In the temple of which Ezekiel speaks there were to be all the offerings and ceremonies required by the law of Moses. The blood of the animal sacrifices served the same purposes as the law specified. The priests were of the tribe of Levi. This cannot refer to the future, for no Jew now knows to what tribe he belongs. With the blood of animals atonement was to be made for the people. If a man can believe all this is yet future, he can believe anything that suits his fancy; facts will be no barrier to anything he wants to believe.

Pointed Paragraphs:

From Alabama comes this request: "Explain Ezek. 37, concerning the dry bones and sticks. When did this take place?"

The children of Israel were then in captivity; from that captivity they were to be delivered. (See verses 21, 22.) The dry bones coming to life represented their return from captivity. Their return would be as if they were coming alive from the dead. Their captivity was their burial; their return would be as if they were coming from their graves. They had been divided into two kingdoms. Joining the two sticks into one stick represented the joining of the two peoples into one nation after their return. Their return is told in Ezra and Nehemiah. After that return they were one people. And they would have had a glorious kingdom had they obeyed Jehovah. The prophecies of the Old Testament concerning the fate of the Jews in their disobedience are being fulfilled all down the ages.

PROPHECY OF AMOS 9:13-15

Has the prophecy in Amos 9:13-15 been fulfilled?— Mrs. X, Detroit.

Amos 9:13-15: "Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that the plowman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed; and the mountains shall drop sweet wine, and all the hills shall melt. And I will bring back the captivity of my people Israel, and they shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof; they shall make gardens, and eat the fruit of them. And I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be plucked up out of their land, which I have given them, saith Jehovah thy God."

Amos had gone from his home at Tekoa to Bethel to prophesy against the kingdom of Israel, which had become very corrupt, and to warn the people of their coming doom. (Amos 1:1; 7:7-17.) They were to be sifted, scattered, among the nations. As Amos was speaking of their captivity, which they later suffered, it seems reasonable to conclude that the verses in question referred to their return from that captivity. All who wanted to return from that captivity to their own land had abundant opportunity. There is no evidence that the Jews will again be carried out of their own land into captivity, so as to be brought out of captivity in the future. All the prophecies that speak of a return of the Jews out of captivity have been, ful-

filled. One thing is sure: they are not now in captivity; therefore, they could not now be brought out of captivity, unless again carried into captivity.

Pointed Paragraphs:

ALL THINGS THAT PERTAIN

"Seeing that his divine power hath granted unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that called us by his own glory and virtue." (2 Pet. 1:3.) We are in the habit of saying that God has given us in the gospel everything that is essential to life and godliness; but Peter goes a little farther than that and affirms that God has given us all things that pertain to life and godliness. There is a difference. To illustrate: There are certain things that are essential to an automobile; and there are other things that pertain to an automobile; but are not essential to it. When you have all things that are essential to an automobile, you can go to a supply house and purchase a lot of extras that pertain to an automobile. But suppose you have all the essentials of an automobile, and then you add all the things that pertain to an automobile, nothing else could be added that would make it any more complete. God has not only given us all things that are essential to life and godliness, but he has given us all things that pertain to life and godliness.

But do religious people believe it? If so, why all these flummeries that God has said nothing about? If you will read the verse again, you will notice that he has given us all these things through the knowledge of Christ. The knowledge of Christ means the knowledge that has been revealed about him—the gospel of Christ. Hence, through the gospel God has not only given us all things that are essential to life and godliness, but all things that pertain to life and godliness. If there is, therefore, anything in your religion that did not come to you through the gospel, it does not so much as pertain to life and godliness. Is it not time to check up on our religion and see if we have anything that we cannot find in the New Testament? Any person of intelligence can do that for himself.

MATTHEW 16:28 EXPLAINED

Please explain Matt. 16:28. I have to contend with the Boll theory. What I want to know is how the disciples were to "see" the Son of man coming in his kingdom.—W. C. Anderson.

Matthew 16:28.

"Verily I say unto you, There are some of them that stand here, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son, of man coming in his kingdom."

In this verse it is stated that some would *taste* of death—some of them would *see* the Son of man coming in his kingdom. *Taste* and *see*—are these terms used literally? A little study of both words will help. "Oh taste and see that Jehovah is good." (Ps. 34:8.) "Sweet are thy words unto my taste." (Ps. 119:103.) "Tasted of the heavenly gift"; "tasted the good word of God." (Heb. 6:4, 5.) If you make *see* represent the actual functioning of one of the five senses, why not make *taste* do the same? No man actually tastes death as he tastes food. The future-kingdom folks stress giving words their literal meaning, but even they will not say that a man tastes Jehovah, his word, or death, as he tastes food. So also the word *see* has a variety of meanings, or uses. To see often, means to know. "Taste and see (know) that Jehovah is good." To see often means to experience. We see joy and we see a good time; we see trouble and sorrow. Taste death—experience death, or suffer death. The parallel passages, Mark 9:1 and Luke 9:27, say: "Verily I say

unto you, There are some of them, that stand by, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power." "But I tell you of a truth, There are some of them that stand here, who shall in no wise taste of death till they see the kingdom of God." To see the Son of man coming in his kingdom and to see the kingdom of God come with power and to see the kingdom of God are different expressions of the same idea. When the kingdom of God came with power, it was Christ coming in his kingdom. Just as certain as some of those standing by would die before the kingdom came, or the Son of man came in his kingdom, just that certain some would live till that event occurred. Ye—those standing by, not those of some future date—shall see the Son of man coming in his kingdom, or see the kingdom of God come with power, and they would see it before they died. The future-kingdom folks do not see that part of what Jesus said; they see only "see the Son of man coming in, his kingdom." And yet no man literally sees a kingdom, as he sees a material object; for the "kingdom of God cometh not with observation"—that is, not in such a manner that it can be watched with the eyes; i. e., in a visible manner. (Luke 17:20.) Jesus made that statement in answer to the Pharisees' question as to when the kingdom of God would come. Hence, some of the disciples to whom Jesus was talking would see Jesus coming in his kingdom; yet they would not see with their eyes. Jesus himself declared that his kingdom would not come in that manner.

The future-kingdom folks put stress on the statement: "They shall see the Son of man coming on the

clouds of heaven with power and great glory." But notice the change in pronouns—"ye shall see," "they shall see." They tell us that this coming on the clouds will be when he comes in his kingdom. They also tell us that when he thus comes the wicked dead will not see him, for they will not be raised till the end of a thousand years. But there is a hitch in that. Certainly the high priest who condemned Jesus to death belongs in the class of the wicked dead yet Jesus said to him and to the court: "Ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven." Notice the word *henceforth*—from now on. Notice, too that this wicked court was henceforth to see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power. No man sees him sitting with his natural eye. The word *see* here has two objects, *sitting* and *coming*; or, rather, the same persons shall see Jesus sitting and coming. Even a child should be able to see that the word *see* could not here mean a mental conception as to one of its objects and an actual seeing with the eyes as to the other object. A word may have several meanings, but it cannot have two meanings at one and the same time. As some of the disciples then living were to see Jesus coming in his kingdom and the Sanhedrin were to see him sitting on the right hand of power, the Lord came in his kingdom during the lifetime of these people.

Pointed Paragraphs:

The apostles were practical men. Some were fishermen; one, a tax collector. Both callings teach a person not to believe all he hears.

**MATTHEW 19:28; 25:31; LUKE 22:28-30;
I COR. 6:2 EXPLAINED**

Matthew 19:28; 25:31; Luke 22:28-30; I Cor. 6:2, 3. Please explain—Owen W. Smith.

1. Matt. 19:28: "And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, that ye who have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of Man, shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye shall also sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Read the context. The rich young man had refused to follow Jesus. Peter said: "We have left all, and followed thee; what then shall we have?" The reply of Jesus does not mean that they had followed him in, the regeneration, for Jesus had passed through no regeneration. Luke says they had followed him in his temptation. Jesus was telling his apostles what they would have in the regeneration. The regeneration is that period of time in, which people are being regenerated. The other passage in which the word "regeneration" occurs shows that people are being regenerated in this dispensation. (Tit. 3:5.) But it was during this time of regeneration that Christ was to sit on the throne of his glory and the apostles were to sit on thrones. Hence, both Jesus and his apostles are now on their thrones, for all were to sit on thrones at the same time. On Pentecost, Peter declared that God had raised up Jesus to sit on David's throne and had made him both Lord and Christ. (Acts 2:30-36.) Jesus himself declared that all authority had been, given to him. Those

who say that he has all authority, but is not exercising it, overlook the *therefore* in the next verse. Suppose Jesus had expressed that idea, it would have read something like this: "All authority has been given me, but I am not exercising it; and because I am not exercising it, go into all the world and make disciples of all the nations." The command was based on his having all authority. Some have overlooked the *therefore*. As Jesus is on his throne, so are the apostles on their thrones. But how are they judging? McGarvey says on this point:

This statement of Paul that "the saints shall judge the world" (I Cor. 6:2) has led many to suppose that the judging here mentioned is to take place at the final judgment. But clearly the judging and the sitting on the thrones are declared to be contemporaneous with the regeneration and with Christ's sitting on his throne; and, therefore, they must be regarded as now in progress. If we are correct in this, of which we entertain no doubt, the judging consists in pronouncing decisions on questions of faith and practice in the earthly kingdom, and the twelve are figuratively represented as sitting on thrones, because they are acting as judges. During their personal ministry they judged in person; since then they judge through their writings. True, we have written communications from only part of them, but judgments pronounced by one of a bench of judges with the known approval of all are the judgments of the entire bench.

On the *twelve tribes* he remarks:

The apostles have sustained no such relation to the twelve tribes of Israel, literally so called, as the text indicates, nor is there any intimation in the Scriptures that they ever will. Their work is with the true Israel, and not with Israel according to the flesh; consequently, we are to construe the terms metaphorically, the twelve tribes representing the church of God of which they were a type.

In judging, the apostles declare who is free from guilt and who is condemned. This is made plain in John 20:23: "Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are

forgiven unto them; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."

2. Matt. 25:31: "But when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory." This verse is incomplete, and is really explained by the rest of the chapter. He shall sit on the throne of judgment, and before him will be gathered all nations for judgment; but the people will be judged as individuals and not as nations. It is not a judgment of nations, or governments, as has sometimes been said. Even a little attention to the gender of the Greek words of the passage will show how ill-founded is that assumption. "Nations" is neuter in the Greek; it cannot, therefore, be the antecedent of *them* in verse 32, for it is masculine. And so is *ye blessed* in verse 34, and *ye cursed* in verse 41. Both *these* and *the righteous* in verse 46 are masculine. It is, therefore, not a judgment of nations, as such, but of the people. The passage is in perfect harmony with 2 Thes. 1:6-10. Here he comes to take vengeance on the wicked and to be glorified in his saints. It is, therefore, the judgment at the last day.

3. Luke 22:28-30: "But ye are they that have continued with me in my temptations; and I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Read the context. They had just eaten the Passover and the Lord's Supper. A contention had arisen between the disciples as to who would be accounted the greatest; and Jesus had told them that there was to be no one among them exercising lordship

over the others, but that service would be the thing that counted. The apostles had faithfully followed him in his temptation; he would, therefore, appoint them a kingdom, and they would eat and drink at his table in his kingdom. On account of the fact that they had just eaten the Lord's Supper we naturally associate the Lord's table with the Lord's Supper. They, therefore, would eat the Lord's Supper in his kingdom. But the Lord's Supper will not be eaten after he comes again. But as they were to eat it in his kingdom, it is certain that they ate it in his kingdom while they lived. The kingdom now in existence is, therefore, the kingdom he appointed them. In Luke 12:32, Jesus said: "Fear not little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." The Father was to give this kingdom to the "little flock." This cannot mean, that he will give his kingdom to his followers at the end of this dispensation, when the little flock shall have swelled into "a great multitude, which no man could number, out of every nation and of all tribes and peoples and tongues." (Rev. 7:9.) No; it was to be given to a little flock and not to a numberless host, and the language clearly shows that it was to be given to those who were then present. And that was the kingdom which he appointed to them, and in which they sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. On this last point, see comments above on Matt. 19:28.

4. I Cor. 6:2, 3: "Or know ye not that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world is judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that ye shall judge angels? how much more, things that pertain to this life?"

Commentators have had no end of trouble over these verses, and there is little agreement among them. In some sense saints judge the world and angels, but how? and when? It is a hazardous and foolish thing to build a theory on a difficult passage, especially when little, if any, light on the point can be gained from other Scriptures. But it does not seem possible that Christians will be judges in the last day, when all shall be judged. From Matt. 25:31-46 we learn that the righteous will be judged along with the wicked. Saints will not then occupy judgment thrones, but will be gathered before the judgment throne. They cannot be judges while being judged. After that they cannot judge the world, for the world will already have been judged. And there is no Scripture that teaches that the heavenly angels will then be judged by any one. But the gospel is God's law, and every time it is preached sinners are judged as guilty, as are also the devil and his angels. And saints have this same law by which to judge among themselves. These are facts, whether the passage in question has that meaning or not. This view has the merit of not being out of harmony with the general teaching of the New Testament. But let us be sure not to build a theory on a difficult passage of Scripture, nor use it in support of a theory. We might be found wresting the Scripture to our own destruction.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE JEWS, THE KINGDOM AND SALVATION

Tell me: When, or how, did Christ offer the Jews the kingdom? What passage, or passages, or teaching as a whole do you think the earth-kingdom advocates rely on to prove the statement that the kingdom was offered the Jews?

Was the kingdom offered the Jews in any sense that *salvation* was not offered them?

Did they reject the kingdom in any sense they did not reject salvation?

If the kingdom was offered the Jews, and they rejected it, and the Lord for that reason postponed the kingdom, why is it he did not also postpone the salvation offered?—X

Perhaps I might as well answer the foregoing questions as a whole as to answer each one separately. The querist has been, doing some close thinking, and his questions open up a field for some profitable investigation.

The querist evidently refers to the Jews as a nation, and not as individuals. It is claimed by the kingdom speculators that Jesus offered the kingdom to the Jewish nation on condition that the rulers and people alike repent, but the assertion is not backed up by any definite proof. The advocates of that notion arrive at such a conclusion by assumptions and deductions.

They assume that the prophets foretold the restoration, of the old kingdom of Israel, a kingdom that was born in rebellion against God and in rejection of him as King! They assume that Jesus offered the kingdom to the Jews as a nation, but they gave no proof that Jesus, offered that kingdom or anything else to a national Israel. But as such a kingdom did not come into being, they conclude that both the king and his kingdom were rejected. Matt. 3:2 is quoted in this connection, but they do not show how that Scripture proves their contention. John was preaching to individuals, and not to the nation as such. The fact is that he never did go and preach to the rulers, nor did they come to him. They did send a committee to inquire into his work.

I see no way to separate the kingdom from salvation, nor can I see how one can exist apart from the other. Of course the old kingdom had citizens who were not in a saved state, but I do not see how that could be true of the kingdom of Christ. However, we are told that only Jews who are born again will be citizens of the kingdom which they suppose Christ will set up when he comes again. In that respect, as well as in many others, this supposed kingdom will not be like the old kingdom.

That the future-kingdom advocates realize they have no certain proof of their rejection and postponement theory is shown by the fact that they do not agree on any certain Scripture, nor as to the time of this supposed rejection and postponement. John R. Rice puts it in the tenth chapter of Matthew; Scofield, in the eleventh; R. H. Boll, in the twelfth. John R. Rice says the kingdom at hand was never preached after

the tenth chapter; the offer was then withdrawn. He should have read what Jesus a year later instructed the seventy to preach. (Luke 10:11.) In a note on Matt. 11:20-24 Scofield says: "The kingdom of heaven announced 'at hand' by John the Baptist, by the King himself, and by the twelve, and attended by mighty works, has been *morally* rejected. The places chosen for the testing of the nation—Chorazin, Bethsaida, etc.—having rejected both John and Jesus, the rejected King now speaks of judgment. The final official rejection is later. (Matt. 27:31-37)." On verses 28-30 he says: "The new message of Jesus. The rejected King now turns from the rejecting *nation* and offers not the *kingdom*, but *rest* and *service* to such in the nation as are conscious of need. It is a pivotal point in the ministry of Jesus." R. H. Boll says: "In chapter twelve the antagonism of the Pharisees, stirred to its height by his Sabbath healing, came to a terrible climax: they went out and took counsel against him *how they might destroy him*. (12:14.) This was a great turning point." As they find no Scripture which says what they claim, they depend on assumptions and deductions, and their deductions do not agree.

A PROPOSITION: The gospel plan of salvation is the scheme of redemption foretold in promise and prophecy.

SOME QUESTIONS CONSIDERED

A brother has presented to me a few questions for my consideration. The questions are about matters that are being much agitated these days. The first question indicates that somebody thinks the Lord refused some people the privilege of believing, lest he might get more followers on his hands than he needed for future rulers! But to the questions:

1. "Was there ever a time when God refused any one the privilege to believe in Christ, as indicated in John 12:39, 40? If so, has he revealed the purpose thereof?"

The passage mentioned says: "For this cause they could not believe, for that Isaiah said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and he hardened their heart; lest they should see with their eyes, and perceive with their heart, and should turn, and I should heal them." The quotation is from Isa. 6:10. In Isaiah's day the people of Judah had become very corrupt, and were growing worse. To these people Jehovah said: "All sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil-doers, children that deal corruptly! they have forsaken Jehovah, they have despised the Holy One of Israel, they are estranged and gone backward." (Isa. 1:4.) They had reached the point where they were utterly unfit to manage their own affairs of government. The great majority were beyond the hope of reformation. They would not even consider Jehovah, and were more senseless as to their own good

than the ox or the ass. "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib; but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider." (Verse 3.) When people reach that stage, there is nothing to do but to hasten them on to their doom. Hence, Jehovah said to Isaiah when he sent him to prophesy to the people of Judah: "Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and turn again, and be healed." (Isa. 6:10.) Isaiah could do this only by his teachings and warnings. They were so determined in their rebellion that the more Isaiah warned them, the harder their hearts became. Their sinfulness resulted in the Babylonian captivity. The Jews had again become so sinful that a worse calamity was soon to come upon them. The leaders rejected the preaching of John and dogged the steps of Jesus every move he made. *They* were so rebellious that the miracles and teaching of Jesus hardened their hearts instead of converting them. There was no direct operation on their hearts to keep them from believing. The things that made believers of some hardened the hearts of others. The Lord never did keep any honest heart from believing. The prophecy quoted in John 12:39, 40 is quoted by the Savior in Matt. 13:14, 15 in such a way as to show that the people were responsible for their hardness of heart. When people will not believe the truth, God sends them strong delusions that they may believe a lie and be damned. (See 2 These. 2:8-12.) The reason there are so many fool notions believed now is because people will not believe the truth. God will have all men to be saved, but they will not.

2. "Did the crucifixion of Christ depend upon the Jews' rejection of him?"

Jesus came at a time when everything was ready for the working out of God's plans. "But when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the Law." (Gal. 4:4). God was not experimenting to see if his plans would work out. He knew what would be done, and was not bothering his mind as to what he would have to do about it, if the Jews did not reject and crucify Jesus, for he knew what they would do. Then why should I worry my mind about it? I cannot entertain an idea that implies that God did not know enough to know when to send his Son, or that he did not know what would happen when he did send him. Why people raise such questions is a puzzle, for no one can do anything about it, no matter what might or might not have happened.

3. "Did God anticipate their acceptance universally?"

Suppose he did or did not, what can we do about it? People raise questions that, in various ways, reflect on God. Being the all-wise God, he knew that the Jews would not all accept Jesus as the Messiah, the Son of God. Jesus himself said that only a few would find the narrow way. Paul showed that the prophets taught that only a remnant of Israel would be saved. (See Rom. 10:16-21; 11:1-10.) But what gives rise to such questions? It grows out of the new speculation that Jesus came to establish an earthly kingdom, or rather to restore the kingdom of Israel, but failed in his purpose because the Jews rejected him. God knew the

Jews would crucify Jesus. (See Acts 2:23; 4:27, 28; 13:27.)

4. "If they had, would he have set up an earthly kingdom?"

There is not the least indication that God did not accomplish what he intended to accomplish by sending his Son into the world, nor that the kingdom he set up was not what he intended to set up. On the other hand, there is plenty of evidence that he inaugurated the very system he had in mind, and which he had foretold through the prophets. To say that his plans did not work out as he intended is equal to saying that the things he foretold through the prophets turned out to be false. If it be replied that the prophets said nothing about what some call "the church age," it only shows that some people have read the Scriptures with little profit. The evidence is abundant that the apostles and other inspired preachers and writers taught that Christianity, or the gospel plan of salvation, is exactly what the prophets foretold. On Pentecost, Peter referred to certain prophecies as fulfilled on that day. Again: "Yea and all the prophets from Samuel and them that followed after, as many as have spoken, they also told of these days." (Acts 3:24.) In preaching the gospel of Christ, Paul said nothing but what the prophets and Moses did say should come. (Acts 26:22.) Paul also affirms that the gospel which he preached God had "promised afore through his holy prophets in the holy scriptures." (Rom. 1:2.) But why offer more proof? The apostles knew what they were talking about, or rather the Holy Spirit, who spoke through them, knew. Yet the future-kingdom advo-

cates generally contend that the Old Testament prophecies center in an earthly kingdom, and say nothing about Christianity as revealed through the apostles. One writer said: "But the Old Testament knows nothing whatever of Christianity." Ponder this question: If God did not set up the kingdom which they say the prophets foretold, but instead gave them something the prophets said nothing about, is it any wonder that the Jews rejected it? The wonder would be that any of them accepted it.

Pointed Paragraphs:

Notice the prayer of Asa; notice other prayers in the Bible. With the exception of Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple and the prayer of Jesus on the night of his betrayal, all are very short. Notice the manner in which they addressed Jehovah. No endearing terms are used, but terms expressive of reverence for the power and majesty of God. Such expressions as "our dear heavenly Father" are not found in the Bible. Such expressions should have no place in our prayers today. Christians need to know how to pray, and a study of the prayers of the Bible will help us to pray as we ought.

"Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father who is in heaven." (Matt. 18:19.) Here it is supposed that they agree on what to ask for before they pray. Would it not be a good thing for a group of worshippers to know what they are going to pray for, rather than for someone to lead out in a long, rambling prayer that is supposed to be appropriate to all occasions, and is, therefore, never appropriate to any occasion? Delivering an oration to the Lord, under pretense of praying, is not praying at all.

THE OLIVE TREE FIGURE OF ROM. 11

I wish you would give an explanation of Rom. 11. The part that I am the most interested in is the figure of the olive tree. Is there anything in this chapter, or in any other, that teaches that the Jews as a nation will ever accept Christ?—Oklahoma.

We cannot at present give space to a discussion of the entire chapter. The verses containing the olive-tree illustration read as follows:

But if some of the branches were broken off, and thou, being a wild olive, wast grafted in among them, and didst become partaker with them of the root of the fatness of the olive tree; glory not over the branches: but if thou gloriest, it is not thou that barest the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, Branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well; by their unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by thy faith. Be not high-minded, but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches, neither will he spare thee. Behold then the goodness and severity of God: toward them that fell, severity; but toward thee, God's goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou shalt be cut off. And they also, if they continue not in their unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graft them in again. For if thou wast cut out of that which is by nature a wild olive tree, and wast grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree; how much more shall these, which are the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree? (Rom. 11:17-24.)

Care should be used in dealing with another man's illustrations and figures of speech. The language quoted is an illustration of God's dealings with Jews and Gentiles. Because of unbelief the Jews had been severed from God's favor; by faith the Gentiles had been brought into union with God. Neither Jew nor Gentile has any special favors from God; the standing of each depends on their faith. That is the point Paul is mak-

ing, and to make his illustration do service beyond the point illustrated is to do violence to his language.

But what is the olive tree? It is God's favor. Read the connection. The Hebrews had been in God's favor all along till they were broken off because of unbelief. Their fall, mentioned in verse 12, is the same thing as this cutting off. But now, to both Jews and Gentiles alike, God's favor is manifested in Christ, and may be obtained by faith in, him.

No people as a nation will or can accept Christ. Any people as a nation must act as an organized government; those in authority determine what shall be done. But no constituted authorities can decide that the nation shall accept Christ; that is an individual matter. But even if a nation could through its proper authorities accept Christ, the Jews could not do so, for they have no one with authority to speak for the whole people on anything.

It is hard for some to see that God totally and finally rejected and destroyed the Jewish nation, but did not irrevocably reject the Jews. Paul gives himself as an example that God had not irrevocably cast off the Jewish people. That he referred to himself as an example shows that he had in mind the Jews as individuals and not as a nation. His case shows that the door of salvation had not been closed against the individual Jew. And his olive-tree illustration shows that he was speaking of the individual Jew and not of the nation. Both Jews and Gentiles were grafted into the same olive tree, and both by the same process. Paul's conclusion—"and so all Israel shall be saved"—has

been greatly perverted. The future-kingdom folks put the emphasis on *all Israel*; Paul put the emphasis on *so*. *So* is an adverb of manner. He had been showing how the Jews might be saved, and not that the nation would be restored. He had shown that Gentiles were grafted in by faith—saved by faith in Christ. "And so"—in like manner—shall all Israel be saved. Peter had made the same point before the Jerusalem brethren: "But we believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, in like manner as they." (Acts 15:11.)

How many Jews may yet be converted to Christ, no one knows; but those who are converted to Christ will be in the one body with all converted Gentiles, "where there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman; but Christ is all, and in all." (Col. 3:11.)

Pointed Paragraphs:

Much is said about preaching the truth in love, and so it should be preached. But in love of what? The preacher should so love the truth that he will not sacrifice any of it nor pervert it, and he should so love people that he will not withhold from them even an unpleasant truth. He that does either of these things loves neither the truth nor the people. We frequently fool ourselves; we think we do thus and so to spare the feelings of others, when it is our own feelings that prompt us. "Preach the word; be urgent in season, out of season; rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and teaching."

ENDS OF THE AGES

What does Paul mean in the expression, "Upon whom the ends of the ages are come?—

The dispensations are referred to as ages. There have been the Patriarchal age and the Mosaic age, and also we now have the Christian age. The ends, or aims, of both the Patriarchal age and the Mosaic age looked forward to the Christian age. Christianity is the end of the ages—it is the last. Yet the future-kingdom advocates would have us believe that Paul was mistaken; that Christianity is not the end of the ages, but there will be at least two more ages. But Paul, being inspired, was right, and Christianity is the end of the ages. And that settles the future-kingdom claims. This is the ends of the ages.

Pointed Paragraphs:

"Here am I; send me." To know the Lord and to realize our dependence upon him makes us willing, even anxious, to do whatever he wants us to do. There is something fearfully wrong with the heart of one who inquires concerning any duty. Will it pay? Is it pleasant work? Will I be thrown with the right sort of people? Will it enhance my reputation? Is the work below my dignity? The true servant of the Lord, like Isaiah, says: "Here am I; send me." Like his Lord he can say, "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to accomplish his work." (John 4:34.) "I delight to do thy will, O my God; yet, thy law is within my heart." (Ps. 40:8.)

THE FOUR BEASTS

Will you please give a scriptural answer as to who or what the four beasts refer in Rev. 4:6-9? Or give your idea as to what is meant by the four beasts.— Lee Chumbley.

The Scriptures do not tell us who or what the four beasts represent. Instead of *beasts* the American Standard Version has *living creatures*. It could as well be translated *living beings* or *living ones*. But that does not tell us who or what they represent. If the querist will read on through the sixth chapter, he will find some of the things these living beings did. For one thing he will find that they had the power of speech. But the person who tells who or what they represent tells that which he does not know to be true. Brother Chumbley can find preachers who will tell him, and he will also find that they do not agree.

Pointed Paragraphs:

A tragedy, to have any unity of action when played on the stage, must be planned and written by one person—at least under the direction of one person. Imagine, if you can, a play written by several men, neither of whom knew what the other was writing, or that he was writing at all. Yet the tragedy of the trial and crucifixion of Jesus was so written by the prophets. And then the play— none of the actors in the drama, save Jesus, knew that the part he was playing had been written, yet each played his part according to the record. God knew what would be done, and had the prophets to write it down.

POINTS IN REVELATION 12

A letter of some length from a good sister, Mrs. L. E. Jones, tells about some things that came up in a class of which she is a member. The teacher holds to the future-kingdom theory. The class is going through the book of Revelation, The letter mentions several things that came up in their study of Chapter 12, and from the letter I glean the following questions:

1. Is the accuser of verse 10 the devil? Is it because of this accuser that Christ intercedes for us? It was so stated by a member of the class, who also said that as God was not human, he did not know what Christ suffered. Is that true?

2. Our teacher said that God was protecting: and keeping the Jews, and that he had something special in store for them (something nice). I want you to answer in the Gospel Advocate as soon as convenient.

3. Does the woman of verses 1-6, 13-17 represent the Jews? That was our teacher's idea.

1. From what is said in the context it seems clear that the devil was before God as the accuser of the brethren; but as he was cast down from heaven to the earth, how can anyone figure out that he is now before God accusing the brethren? He is, however, doing all he can to lead them into sin. Hence, the admonition: "Be sober, be watchful: your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." (I Pet. 5:8.) He is busying himself here on earth now. Jesus is our advocate with the Father, but I would not think he was before God engaged in a talk contest with the devil.

2. As God is no respecter of persons, how can any believer in Christ argue that a Jew, because he is a Jew, is yet to enjoy blessings that a Gentile cannot hope to receive, no matter how faithful he is, simply because he is not a Jew. The theory contradicts the fundamental principles of the gospel. Those who hold to that theory judge after the flesh—a thing Jesus condemned. (John 8:15.) The theory encourages the Jew to glory in his fleshly descent from Abraham—to glory after the flesh. Such glorying Paul said was foolishness. (2 Cor. 11:17, 18.) It teaches the Jew to have confidence in the flesh, his Jewish flesh. Paul had no such confidence; to him such relationship was but refuse. Or, as the King James Version has it, he counted such dependence on Jewish flesh as but dung. (Phil. 3:2-8.) Such is your teacher's theory. Christ died for all. (2 Cor. 5:15.) Now notice the next verse (verse 16): "Wherefore we henceforth know no man after the flesh." Notice the force of the word *henceforth*—from now on. Yes, the Jews are still in the world; so are the Japanese and Chinamen. So what does that prove? The person who assumes to know what God knows or does not know is about like a worm assuming to know what Solomon knew and did not know.

3. Any theory about the woman of chapter 12 is merely a guess, for the record does not say who she was. Some commentators, perhaps the majority of them, say she was the church, the dragon was the Roman Empire, and the child was Constantine. I do not know. But if the woman was the Jewish nation and the child was Jesus, then she was a very unnatural

mother, for she killed her child! But that leaves the dragon out of the picture, and leaves us wondering about verse 6.

Pointed Paragraphs:

CREATING A DEMAND

Sometime ago a Christian man asked a gospel preacher: "Why do we not have great gospel sermons like those we used to hear?" The reply was: "There is no demand for them." Do that question and answer reveal conditions as they are? Have we reached the point where preaching is trimmed down to fit the demands of the times? Is preaching thus reduced to a matter of trade?

Some factories make only those articles that are in demand. But occasionally an article is offered for sale for which there had been no demand, but the makers of such articles proceed to create a demand. They do extensive advertising; they extol the uses and virtues of their article till people want it. And cannot we in the same way create a demand for the pure gospel in communities where there is no demand? We cannot do it by dealing in religious soup. There is a demand for the unadulterated gospel, for great gospel sermons; but the demand is not as extensive nor as intensive as it should be. Even in some churches of Christ there is not as strong demand for gospel sermons as there should be. When an elder can say, as some of them have said, "So far as I am concerned, I do not care whether our preacher can preach or not," it is time we were waking up.

QUESTIONS ON REVELATION 20.

E. B. Taylor asks seven or eight questions on the twentieth chapter of Revelation. To give answer to all these questions would require an exegesis of the chapter. For me that is impossible. The chapter abounds in figures of speech. Many have read into that chapter things that are not in it. They also make some of it figurative and the rest literal, as the needs of their theory require. With them a day in some of the prophecies is a year, but they take the thousand years as literal. Yet they will not say that the devil is a real snake, nor that the chain is a literal chain, nor that the beast is a real four-footed animal. Here are some of the things in this chapter that I do not know: Who the angel is, what the key is, the great chain, why the devil is called a snake, what the binding means, the thousand years, when the thousand years end, the abyss and how it was sealed, length of the "little time," who sat on thrones, what judgment was given them, the extent of that judgment, what the beast is, the image, mark of the beast, the war of verse 8, Gog and Magog, the camp of the saints, how devoured by fire, the lake, the beast of verse 10, who the false prophet is, nor how there can be day and night in eternity. Yet the chapter makes some plain statements.

We may not know who the martyrs are, yet it is affirmed of them, and of no one else, that "they lived, and reigned with Christ a thousand years." When or where this reigning is, was, or is to be, is not stated.

But it is stated in verse 6 that those who have part in the first resurrection "shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." Hence, they are to be priests and to reign at the same time—a royal priesthood. It is plain that they were to reign while they were priests, but Christians are priests now. Leaving out *to be*, words supplied by the translator, Revelations 1:6 reads thus: "He made us a kingdom, priests unto his God and Father." Being kings and priests, Christians are a royal priesthood. (See I Pet. 2:9.)

In 20:12, John saw the dead standing before the throne. *The dead*, not a part of the dead. This is in perfect harmony with the Savior's description of the judgment in Matt. 25:31-46. It is argued by some that this is a judgment of nations—kingdoms—instead of individuals. But nations in the Greek is neuter; but the pronoun *them* in verse 32 is masculine, and, therefore, refers to people, and not to nations as such. At the judgment, therefore, all—the small and the great —will stand before the throne. This is also made clear in 2 Thes. 1:7-10. There it is declared that Jesus will take vengeance on the wicked "when he shall come to be glorified in his saints." And the last verse in the twentieth chapter of Revelations shows that some will be at that judgment, whose names are written in the book of life.

SEVERAL QUESTIONS

1. Do you believe in the "secret rapture" theory?

2. Will there be any life on the earth during the millennium period?

1. The word *rapture* is from a Latin word that means "to carry off by force." By some strange aberration some religious folks applied that term to the Lord's taking saints from the earth, as if they will have to be forced to go or somebody or power will have to be forced to let them go—a sort of seizing and carrying away. But I could not believe in the "secret rapture" unless I had some evidence. That evidence is lacking.

2. I have found no evidence that there is to be a thousand-year period in which there will be no life on the earth. There is evidence, however, that there will be life on the earth so long as the earth continues. "While the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease." (Gen. 8:22.) A careful reading of 2 Pet. 3:1-14 will show that so long as the earth remaineth Christians are exhorted to be "looking for and earnestly desiring the coming of the day of God, by reason of which the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat." Any student can find other evidence to the same import.

But suppose one believes the affirmative of both

these questions, what is practical about such belief? If you hold to a notion that helps neither your faith nor your practice, why waste time with it? Why disturb others with it?

Pointed Paragraphs:

Jesus came to save sinners, not to make sinners. People were sinners before Jesus came, and they would have continued to be sinners had not Jesus come. If people do not believe in him, they continue sinning just as they would have done had he not come.

Though Jesus was moved with compassion at the sight of human suffering, his miracles of healing were not performed primarily to relieve suffering. If that were so, he would cure all sick folks even now, or cause that no one would ever be afflicted in any way. His miracles were performed as signs that God was with him.

Jesus put a higher value on man than on animals. "How much then is a man of more value than a sheep! Wherefore it is lawful to do good on the sabbath day." (Matt. 12:12.) There is something of vast worth in man, else God would not have been mindful of him.

Part II

DISCUSSIONS

PREDICTION OR PROPHECY

The word "predict" comes from a compound Latin word that means, "to say," or "tell before"; hence, to prophesy. But many words in the course of time have somewhat changed in meaning; "predict" is such a word. In giving synonyms under "foretell" Webster says, "Foretell" (Saxon) and "predict" (Latin) are often interchangeable; but predict is now commonly used when inference from facts (rather than occult processes) is involved." Hence when a man considers facts and trends and draws a conclusion as to what will be the outcome, that is prediction. Did Bible prophecies originate that way? No; "... knowing this first, that no prophecy of scripture is of private interpretation. For no prophecy ever came by the will of man: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit." (2 Pet 1:19-21).

Verse 21 really explains verse 20. Prophecy was never a forecast of events based on, conditions and trends of the times; it was not a private interpretation of the culmination of trends. It did not come (Greek, "was not brought") by the will of man; "but men. spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit." Hence, no prophecy came as a result of a man's own private interpretation of trends and events of the times. If a man should draw a conclusion from facts and trends, such conclusion could, in a loose sense, be called a prophecy, a prophecy of private interpretation, a prophecy that came by the will of man; but

Peter speaks of the prophecy of scripture. Such prophecy is not of the private interpretation of facts and trends. Notice the contrast—"no prophecy of scripture is of private interpretation . . . but men spoke from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit." The passage has no reference to what should be done about prophecy that had already been written, but to weave together a mass of prophecies, most of which have been fulfilled, and make a scheme for the future, practically amounts to a man-made prophecy—a prophecy that comes by the will of man. Even the prophets did not understand their own prophecies—did not know but that "the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow them, "was meant for themselves, till God revealed to them "that not unto themselves, but unto you did they minister these things" (I Pet. 1:10-12). But it seems that a host of preachers and editors today think they know more about the prophecies than did the prophets who uttered them.

Pointed Paragraphs:

A privilege is a right which we may exercise or not, as we choose. Attending the annual feasts of the Jews was a privilege with the women. They could stay at home or go, without guilt. To the men, attending these feasts was not a privilege, but a duty. To fail brought guilt. Christians should do some serious thinking to determine their privileges and their duties. To say that a certain thing is both a privilege and a duty is about as sensible as to say that a certain thing is both black and white. To be baptized, to attend the Lord's-day worship, to give, to study God's word, and to obey all other commands are duties, and are not privileges in any proper sense of the word.

PROPHECY

A prophecy is anything God reveals through an inspired spokesman. It might be concerning future events or present duties and warnings. But in this article I shall use the word in its common acceptation —namely, as a revelation of things future as to the time the prophecy was given.

It was no uncommon thing for prophecies to be delivered in highly figurative language. In such cases the prophecy was to be fulfilled in the sense conveyed by the figurative language. It is a common saying that the Bible means exactly what it says, but that is never true when things are spoken in figurative language. We all use figurative language. When Paul said, "Be ware of the dogs," no one thinks he referred to literal dogs. When Jesus called Herod a "fox," he used figurative language, and no one thinks he meant that Herod was a literal fox.

In his recent book on prophecy a certain brother says: "Expect a literal fulfillment. This is God's way of fulfilling prophecy Every prophecy which the Bible says has been fulfilled has been fulfilled literally." That is a broad statement. Can he make proof? Let him try his dictum on Isa. 40:3, 4: "The voice of one that crieth, Prepare ye in the wilderness the way of Jehovah; make level in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low; and the uneven shall be made level, and the rough places a plain." A literal

fulfillment of that prophecy would require mountains and hills to be torn down and valleys to be filled up. Now, Luke (3:4, 5) quotes this prophecy and applies it to the work of John the Baptist. And Matthew distinctly says that John, the Baptist was the one of whom Isaiah prophesied. (Matt. 3:3). This one fulfillment of prophecy completely upsets his dictum, unless the author contends that John had a contract to construct a literal highway, and literally leveled mountains and hills and filled up valleys, as highway builders do. But we had never thought of John the Baptist as a road contractor!

Another highly figurative prophecy is the following: "And the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the adder's den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of Jehovah, as the waters cover the sea." (Isa. 11:6-9). But we are told that this must have its literal fulfillment, and that the time will come when all beasts of prey shall be thoroughly changed and gentled. If all prophecies must be literally fulfilled, what about the first verse of this chapter? Will a literal shoot and branch come up from the literal stock and roots of Jesse? And Isaiah (55:12) spoke of a coming time when "the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing; and all

the trees of the field shall clap their hands." And we are gravely admonished to expect a literal fulfillment of all prophecies!

But what about the animals? The kings of Assyria and Babylon are called "lions." (Jer. 4:7; 50:17.) The princes in Jerusalem were called "roaring lions," and the judges "wolves." (Zeph 3:3.) The princes of Israel were called "whelps," and their mother "a lioness"; and one of these whelps became a lion! (Ezek. 19:1-9.) David referred to certain of his enemies as "bulls" (Ps. 22:12), and Amos refers to certain people as the "kine of Bashan" (Amos 4:1). Jesus called certain people "wolves" (Matt. 7:15; 10:16), and Paul said to the elders of Ephesus: "Grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock" (Acts 20:29). Will the future-kingdom advocates contend that this prophecy of Paul's was literally fulfilled? Had our brother been present, would he have looked for literal wolves to destroy that church? If so, he would have missed the force of Paul's words entirely. If these elders had been guided by the above dictum, they would have gone out on a literal wolf hunt!

Men of ferocious disposition are to be tamed and gentled by the gospel of Christ; but even that will not be universal, so far as this prophecy indicates. The prophecy does not make any affirmation, concerning the whole world. The key to a proper understanding of the prophecy which is quoted above is found in the last verse: "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of Jehovah, as the waters cover the sea." It is in Jehovah's holy mountain where this gentleness shall be

—where no hurt shall be done. The mountain of Jehovah, in Isaiah's language, refers to Jehovah's government: "And it shall come to pass in the latter days, that the mountain of Jehovah's house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many peoples shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of Jehovah, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem." (Isa. 2:2, 3.) It is in this holy mountain, this church, or house, of God, where "they shall not hurt nor destroy"; and the reason is given: "For the earth shall be full of the knowledge of Jehovah, as the waters cover the sea." Certainly no one will contend that wild beasts will be so full of the knowledge of God that they will not hurt nor destroy. But ferocious men do become gentle under the influence of the gospel; they must be thus gentled before they can enter Jehovah's holy mountain.

One more thought. If, in studying prophecy, we are to expect a literal fulfillment, and if that is God's way of fulfilling all prophecies, then what are we to do with Isa. 2:2, 3 and 40:3, 4? The mountains and hills are to be leveled down, and yet Jehovah's mountain is to be established on the top of the mountains and exalted above the hills. How can both things take place literally? So it appears that their dictum on the literal fulfillment of prophecies makes it impossible for prophecies to be literally fulfilled.

SHALL WE LOOK FOR A LITERAL FULFILLMENT OF ALL PROPHECY?

The future-kingdom advocates put great stress on the literal application of Old Testament prophecies. A Prophecy concerning Israel must be applied to Israel in the flesh, and Jerusalem means the Jerusalem in Palestine. Zion must have its literal application, and so with "throne" and "kingdom", etc. With them, there must be no "spiritualizing." The lamb and the lion must refer to literal lion and lamb. But will they stick to that line? Hardly. Isaiah said: "Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low; and the uneven shall be made level, and the rough places plain." (Isa. 40:4.) Now, the inspired historians of the New Testament applied that Scripture to the work of John the Baptist; yet we are told by the future-kingdom advocates that every prophecy must have its plain, literal fulfillment. If so, the inspired New Testament writers were mistaken on this point, and that prophecy has not yet been fulfilled.

But we are told that the prophecies mean, exactly what they say. Now, is that really so? Then, what about the four beasts in Daniel 7? "Four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from the other." Yes, it is true that these matters were interpreted for us, but it is also true that the interpretation shows that the four beasts were not actually four beasts. It also shows, as do other passages, that many prophecies are couched in highly figurative language. The prophecy

concerning the work of John (Isa. 40) shows how highly figurative some prophecies are. Or will the future-kingdom folks say that even this prophecy must yet have its literal fulfillment?

But it is contended that the throne of David means the rule over the fleshly house of Israel in the land of Palestine, and that unless Christ rules over the Jewish nation in the land of Palestine he does not occupy the throne of David. He must have a civil government, with Israelites as citizens and the land of Palestine as the territory; otherwise, he does not occupy the same throne David did. This would imply that the kingdom over which Christ rules must be an exact replica of the kingdom as it was in the days of David. If not, why not? If it can be changed in one particular, why not in others? It is argued that God's oath to David (Ps. 89:34, 35) precludes the possibility of any change in the kingdom. But even after so arguing, do our future-kingdom advocates outline a kingdom just like the kingdom of David? They do not. Here are a few points wherein the kingdom of David differs from the future kingdom as outlined by its advocates:

David's reign, was local; Christ's reign to be worldwide.

Every kind of Israelite, good and bad, citizens in David's kingdom: only regenerated Israelites to be citizens in Christ's kingdom.

Fleshly birth made citizens of David's kingdom; a Jew must be born again to be a citizen of Christ's kingdom.

Every child of Hebrew parents was in David's kingdom; children must be old enough to voluntarily accept Christ to be in the future kingdom.

David was king, family of Aaron were priests then; Christ to be both King and Priest.

Some rather unruly men were helpers in David's kingdom; only true and tried Christians are to reign with Christ. (Here the future kingdom as outlined by its advocates radically differs from David's kingdom.)

David's kingdom was constantly beset by its enemies; no enemies to the future kingdom.

David's kingdom constantly organized for war; nothing like that in the future kingdom.

In David's kingdom they learned war; in the future kingdom they shall learn war no more.

David reigned while the devil was loose and doing his worst; we are told that Christ cannot begin his reign till Satan is bound.

Moses was the lawgiver of the old kingdom; Christ is to be the lawgiver for the future kingdom.

And that is not all; but we grow weary of the task of enumerating the differences. Yet we are told that, if there is any alteration, the throne of the kingdom cannot be the throne of David.

When Jehovah called Israel out of Egypt, he told them that, if they would obey his voice, they would be unto him "a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation." (Ex. 19:5, 6.) But had not God always exercised uni-

versal dominion over all the works of his hands? Certainly, but now he was to rule in a special way over a special people. As this people were to have no earthly head, they were not to be like the nations around them, and were not to be reckoned among the Nations. God made their laws, and gave direction for their execution. This state of things continued till the days of Samuel. Then the people asked for a king that they might be like the nations around them. That was a rejection of Jehovah as their king. Saul was put on the throne, and the kingdom became his. He was rejected and the kingdom given to David. These men and the descendants of David occupied the throne that belonged peculiarly and specially to Jehovah. Jehovah occupied that throne before Saul or David, and that throne continued after the last son of David reigned. The royal family of David fell into decay, but did Jehovah's rule over Israel cease? Did not his throne continue as it did before Saul became king? It is true that the Jews were rarely independent, but were they any less under the rule of Jehovah when they were subject to other nations? Did not the kingdom continue with them? Before becoming excited at these words, read Matt. 21:43: "Therefore say I unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof," How could the kingdom be taken from them, if it was not then with them? The Lord was then, developing that nation to whom the kingdom was to be given, and to whom it was given on the first Pentecost after his resurrection.

On Pentecost, Peter preached that God had raised up Jesus to sit on David's throne. It has been argued

that Peter does not say that he then sat upon that throne. If not, what point was there in mentioning it? After mentioning it, Peter says: "Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted," etc. If that is not a conclusion from what he said about the throne of David, why the "therefore"? Would Peter—would any speaker—make an argument about the throne of David, and conclude that "therefore" Jesus had been exalted to something else, something he had not even mentioned? Are we seriously expected to believe such absurdities?

Pointed Paragraphs:

By faith Noah built the ark. Faith only—that is, faith without works—is dead. Such faith never would have built the ark; neither does it ever accomplish anything nor bring any blessings. Faith prompted and guided Noah in building the ark, and so it is said that he built the ark by faith—a faith made perfect by works.

God has always tested man's willingness to do his will. To be a real test, the thing commanded must be such that the person can see no connection between the thing commanded and the result to be obtained. Examples: The brazen serpent (Num. 21:4-9); Naaman's dipping in the Jordan (2 Kings 5:1-19). Baptism is such a test.

"Religion" is a broad term. There are many religions, but only one true religion. It would be better now to speak of "The place of Christianity in a nation's life."

ABRAHAM AND THE LAND PROMISE

When God called Abraham out of the Chaldees, he made certain promises to him, one of which is this: "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." (Gen. 12:1-3). Then when Abraham stood the test about offering up Isaac, God added this to the other promises: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." That this promise refers to Christ is made clear by Paul: "Now to Abraham were the promises spoken, and to his seed. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ." (Gal. 3:16). Paul's language shows clearly that the promised seed of Abraham was none other than Christ Jesus. It is a perversion of the promise to make it refer to all fleshly children of Abraham or to those who are children by faith. Christians are blessings to others only as they allow Christ to use them as his instruments.

Universalists use the promise to Abraham in an effort to prove that all people will be saved, but they ignore the conditionality of promises. It is not my purpose to discuss Universalism, but call attention to these statements: "Ye will not come to me, that ye may have life." (John 5:40). "He that disbelieveth shall be condemned." (Mark 16:16). "And these shall go away into eternal punishment." (Matt. 25:46). A person who will not believe these scriptures, and others that might be cited, will not believe anything he does not want to believe.

The future kingdom folks have twisted the land-promise in support of their future plans for the Lord. The' land-promise to Abraham did not produce the speculation about the future return of the Jews to Palestine; but their return, is an essential part of the future kingdom theory, and that made it necessary to claim that the land promise still holds good. Let us look into this matter briefly.

"And Jehovah appeared unto Abram, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land." (Gen. 12:7). "And he said unto him, I am Jehovah that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give you this land to inherit it." (Gen. 15:7). But Abram did not believe Jehovah, and said, "O Lord Jehovah, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?" For that unbelief, God required him to prepare three animals and two birds for a sacrifice, and then Jehovah did not honor his sacrifice with fire from heaven; and Abram had to protect his sacrifices from birds of prey. Then he fell into a deep sleep; "And lo, a horror of great darkness fell upon him." Then Jehovah revealed to him the future bondage of his seed, and their deliverance. This showed Abram how God was displeased with Abram's unbelief. It is significant that God left Abram out of his next promise: "In that day Jehovah made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land." You see, Abram would have died long before they returned from Egypt. As we proceed it is well to remember the wording of this covenant-promise, and that Abraham is not included in it. Yet so long as Abraham lived, he was included in the land promise. (See Gen, 17:8). And of course, when the

land-promise was made to Isaac and to Jacob after the death of Abraham, he was not included (Gen. 26:2, 3; 28:13).

It is urged by some that God promised the land to Abraham as an individual, yet Stephen says that God "gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on." (Acts 7:5). It is affirmed that this promise must yet be fulfilled; yet Abraham had all the grazing rights he needed. The land therefore was his to use. But the future kingdom advocates overlook another statement Stephen made: After mentioning Israel's going down into Egypt, Stephen said, "But as the time of the promise drew nigh which God vouchsafed unto Abraham, the people grew and multiplied in Egypt." (verse 17). This was the land promise which God made to Abraham—"God vouchsafed unto Abraham." The time for the fulfilling of that promise to Abraham had drawn, nigh. The language cannot be twisted to mean anything else: So the Lord led Israel out of the land of Egypt and into the land of Canaan. Was this land promise which was "vouchsafed to Abraham," and which had drawn nigh fulfilled? Joshua answers that question. "So Jehovah gave unto Israel all the land which he swear to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, dwelt therein.....There failed not ought of any good thing which Jehovah had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass." (Josh. 21:43-45). In his farewell address Joshua said, "And, behold, this day I am going the way of all the earth: and ye know in all your hearts and in all your souls, that not one thing hath failed of all the good things which Jehovah your God spake concerning you; all are

come to pass unto you, not one thing hath failed thereof." (Josh. 23:14). Language could not be plainer; or more emphatic. And a man. who will not believe what Joshua says will not believe anything he does not want to believe.

We have been told that the land promise was unconditional; but the fact that the Jews were carried into captivity because of their sins and the further fact that they are not now in Palestine, and also the fact that at the beginning they had to drive the nations out, show how foolish it is to say that the land promise was not conditional. The Jews increased in their wickedness till they crucified Christ and tried to destroy his church. For these crimes they lost the land and their national existence; and now they have no more right to Palestine than to Italy, or any other country.

Notice the wording of God's promise to Abraham: "I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land of thy sojournings, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession." (Gen, 17:8). "After thee"—does that preposition "after" mean any thing to you? The land was given to Abraham, and to his seed after him—a succession of ownership, first Abraham and after him his seed. So if that promise is yet to be fulfilled, then Abraham will first occupy the land, how long no one knows, then it passes to his seed. Look at the language carefully, and it will mean something to you. You cannot ignore that preposition "after." It is clear enough if you recognize the fact that Abraham had full use of the land while he lived, and that after him his seed had the land.

THE TIME OF PROMISE

In the discussion, about the land promise made to Abraham, one plain statement seems to have been overlooked. But, first, let us get before us an argument that some make on that promise. It is argued that the promise was made direct to Abraham and was meant to be fulfilled to him in person, and yet Stephen informs us that God "gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on." (Acts 7:5). Assuming that the promise to Abraham meant that he would have title and right to the land in his own person, it is therefore argued that he must yet have it in his possession. It is therefore argued that the Jews must return to Palestine, so that the promise to Abraham may be fulfilled. But in, thus making Abraham and the nation of Israel joint-owners of the land at the same time—they overlook the promise as Stephen stated it: "and he promised that he would give it to him in possession, and to his seed *after* him." Notice that word *after*—first to Abraham, then to "his seed *after* him." Notice again this word *after* in Gen. 17:8 "I will give unto thee, and to thy seed *after* thee, the land of thy sojournings, all the land of Canaan." Abraham first, then his seed *after* him. I wonder how long these future kingdom folks think Abraham is to possess the land before it comes into the possession of his seed *after* him! The emphasis the future kingdom folks place on their idea that the land was to be given to Abraham in person will not allow them to concede the truth that the promise was made to him as the head or father of a nation to be possessed by the

nation of whom he was the father. The head or father of a nation is sometimes put for the nation—is sometimes spoken of as a nation. Before Jacob and Esau were born, Jehovah said to Rebecca, "Two nations are in thy womb, and two peoples shall be separated from thy bowels: and the one people shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger." (Gen. 25:23). These statements or promises concerning these unborn sons were to be fulfilled centuries after they were born—fulfilled in their descendants. To rebellious King Saul, Samuel said, "Jehovah hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbor of thine, that is better than thou." (I Sam. 15:28.) Yet that threat was never visited upon Saul in person, for he continued to be king so long as he lived. Now, that threat to Saul was as personal as was the land promise to Abraham. Why does not some wild scribe argue that Saul must be raised again and put on the throne of Israel, so God can fulfill his threat?!! The threat was fulfilled in the family of Saul just as the land promise to Abraham was fulfilled to his descendants. And that is exactly the way the land promise to Abraham was fulfilled. After Stephen spoke of this land promise, he said, "But as the time of the promise drew nigh which God vouchsafed unto Abraham, the people grew and multiplied in Egypt." (Acts 7:17.) "The time of the promise" can mean nothing else than the *time for the fulfillment of the promise*. That time had drawn nigh, and things began to shape up for the fulfillment of that promise. Those who claim that the promise has not yet been fulfilled have a quarrel with Stephen.

At the proper time Moses was sent to lead Israel out of Egypt. In giving instructions concerning the passover, Moses said, "And it shall come to pass, when ye are come to the land which Jehovah will give you, according as he hath promised, that ye shall keep this service." (Ex. 12:25.) Hence when they should come into their possessions in Canaan, that was exactly what God had promised. Again Moses refers to Canaan as the land which Jehovah "swear unto thy fathers to give thee." (Ex. 13:5.) This same promise is referred to many times in Deuteronomy. A few of the many passages: (6:3, 10, 18, 23; 8:1; 31:20.) These passages teach plainly that the possession of the land of Canaan by Israel would be the fulfillment of the land promise made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Joshua so understood it; for when the tribes of Israel came into possession of the territories allotted them, he said, "And behold this day I am going the way of all the earth: and ye know in all your hearts and in all your souls, that not one thing hath failed of all the good things which Jehovah your God spake concerning you: all are come to pass unto you, not one thing hath failed thereof. And it shall come to pass, that as all the good things are come upon you of which Jehovah your God spake unto you, so will Jehovah bring upon you all the evil things, until he have destroyed you from off this good land which Jehovah your God hath given you." (Josh. 23:14, 15.)

REBELLION OF ISRAEL—A KINGDOM BORN.

When Jehovah led the Israelites out of Egyptian bondage, he said to them, "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be mine own possession from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation." (Ex. 19:4-6.) Of course, God, in a general way, ruled over all the works of his hands, but in a special sense he ruled over the nation of Israel. For a long time Jehovah was their only king. In emergencies he raised up judges to deliver them from their enemies. But in the course of time they became dissatisfied with that sort of thing. Their sins brought them into trouble, and they thought that it was the efficiency of the governments surrounding them.

"Then all the elders of Israel gathered themselves together, and came to Samuel unto Ramah; and they said unto him, Behold thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways: now make us a king to judge us like all the nations. But the thing displeased Samuel, when they said, Give us a king to judge us. And Samuel prayed unto Jehovah. And Jehovah said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee; for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not be king over them." (I Sam. 8:4-7.) Nevertheless, Jehovah told Samuel to inform the people fully as to how the king

which they desired would oppress them, and Samuel did so. "But the people refused to hearken unto the voice of Samuel; and they said, Nay; but we will have a king over us, that we also may be like all the nations, and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles." (Verses 19, 20.) Saul was selected as king, though some were not pleased with the selection.

Soon after being made king, Saul smashed the armies of the Ammonites in a great battle. Then Samuel knew that it was an appropriate time to gather the people together and "renew the kingdom." They were called together at Gilgal, and there Samuel resigned as judge in a solemn address to the people. He told them that, although they had asked for a king when Jehovah was their King, Jehovah would bless them and their king, if they and their king obeyed his voice. His speech and the rain that came at Samuel's call so impressed the people that they said: "We have added unto all our sins this evil, to ask us a king." (I Sam. 12:19.)

This kingdom, which was conceived in a desire to be like other nations, born in open rebellion against God, and tolerated through the forbearance of God, is the kingdom that some people would have us believe God yet intends to restore and enlarge. That kingdom restored is, we are told, the hope of Israel! That is the kingdom over which Jesus and the church will yet rule, and through which all the world will be blessed! Who can believe it?

I am aware that a question like this may occur to some one: If that kingdom was established in rebellion

against God, how is it that Jehovah promised the throne of David to the Christ? But if we were unable to give a satisfactory answer to that question, it would not change what the Lord says as to the spirit that brought that kingdom into existence. But the question presents no real difficulty. Before the people called for a king so as to be like the nations, Jehovah was their king; he alone occupied the throne. Of course you understand that "throne" means authority to rule, rulership, kingly authority. When Saul, David, or Solomon ruled over God's people, he occupied the throne of Jehovah. It was called David's throne because he occupied it, and not because it was his by right. If people could ever get it settled in their minds that David really sat on Jehovah's throne, it would save them from some confusion. But these two quotations show that the throne of David and the throne of Jehovah are the same: "And Solomon sat upon the throne of David his father." (I Kings 2:12.) "Then Solomon sat on the throne of Jehovah as king instead of David his father." (I Chron. 29:23.) It is plain that Jehovah's throne was called David's because he occupied it. He who rules over God's people occupies the same throne that David occupied. No one will deny that Jesus now rules over God's people or, if you like the expression better, rules in the hearts of God's people. To acknowledge that he does so rule is to acknowledge that he sits on the throne on which David sat. This truth has nothing to do with the fact that the people of Israel sinned in wanting a king so as to be like the nations around them. "I have given thee a king in mine anger, and have taken him away in my wrath." (Hos. 13:11.)

NEITHER—NOR

In the May issue of *Word and Work*, Stanford Chambers writes under the above caption as follows:

One was recently heard to say publicly: "I am neither a premillennialist nor a postmillennialist." I think I saw the same from the pen of some writer. It is difficult to see how one can avoid being one or the other. A man might say: "I am neither an immersions nor a nonimmersionist." How could that be, unless he disregards baptism entirely? Just so in regard to the return of our Lord; it is either before the millennium, that is, premillennial, or it is after it, that is, postmillennial. Whoever disavows the event of his coming until the close of the millennium, whoever puts the millennium anywhere preceding the coming, is a postmillennialist, whatever he disavows or denies.

Just because the Lord Jesus may come at any time, and because it is an event he has commanded us to watch for and to pray about, I dare not put a thousand years between me and the fulfillment. Hence, I am a premillennial, and can no more help it than I can help being an immersions.

"But what difference does it make whether I am 'pre' or 'Post'?" I should say not enough in and of itself, merely, for it to be made a test of fellowship as has been attempted even by some "Neither . . . Nor's." But it might make a great deal of difference for a man to put a thousand years between him and the coming of Jesus. Our Saviour himself shows the likely effect for one to say: "My Lord delays his coming." Again, it might make a great deal of difference for him to teach men so. It is a serious thing to oppose any one's quoting, "The Lord is at hand," or "The Judge standeth before the door," or "The end of all things is at hand," or "When ye see these things, know that he is near." Too much store is being set by this "what difference does it make?" The postmillennial error has many attendant malinterpretations it were well to avoid. As every truth of God's word is helpful, so every error is harmful, and *any* error *may* lead to fatality. "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good."

Yes, I have said publicly, both orally and in print,

that I am neither a premillennialist nor a postmillennialist. The Gospel Advocate has been all along-making a heroic effort to steer clear of all party, or class, names. But Brother Chambers thinks it cannot be done. He does not see how a man can keep from being a premillennialist or a postmillennialist. In his estimation a man cannot be simply a Christian; he must have some sort of a descriptive term to designate what sort of Christian he is. And so we have premillennial Christians and postmillennial Christians. Here, then, is partyism in religion, the beginning of new denominations. It will not help the situation any to say that these are merely descriptive words, and not party names. Why the need of these descriptive terms, if they are not intended to describe different parties? *Methodist* was first a descriptive term, and then a party name. Premillennial Christian, postmillennial Christian, and Baptist Christian; in principle, what is the difference? And herein we see one of the evils of preaching speculative theories that create groups, classes, or parties in the church. What right has any man or set of men to create two parties, and then tell me that I must belong to one of them? That these brethren of Word and Work have created conditions that make it necessary in their judgment to use descriptive terms to designate groups of brethren condemns the whole movement as divisive in nature and sectarian in principle. If they think they have created conditions in the church that make it necessary for the Gospel Advocate to line up with one of these parties and be labeled, they are decidedly mistaken. If, as Brother Chambers says, he cannot help wearing a party label, he needs the help the Gospel Advocate is

trying to give him. But if he is just bound to be what he is, and cannot help it, what will he do about it when the Lord comes, if the Lord does not follow the program these brethren have marked out for him? And herein is another danger to these brethren. Before Jesus came to earth, the learned Jews had things mapped out; and because Jesus did not follow their program, they believed him to be an imposter. Yes, there were program makers for his first coming, and there are program makers for his second coming; and the fatal blunder of the first program makers should be a warning to the present program makers.

But Brother Chambers thinks that neither "pre" nor "post" should be made a test of fellowship. There is something pitiful and shaky about a plea that one's teaching or practice be not made a test of fellowship. The plea itself is a confession of divergence. We have often heard that same plea from the "progressives." No matter from whom it comes, it sounds like a plea for forbearance and mercy. The Gospel Advocate has never, in its long history, felt the least need of making such a plea. Can you imagine J. C. McQuiddy, T. B. Larimore, E. G. Sewell, or David Lipscomb begging the brethren not to make some theory or practice of theirs a test of fellowship?

There has been a good deal of loose talk about tests of fellowship. To raise the question as to an opinion or theory without giving any attention to what is done with the opinion or theory does not meet the issue. An opinion or practice might be very innocent, and yet a man might make a great deal of trouble with it. It is not then his opinion you must consider, but the use he

makes of it. Suppose some man should decide that dark clothing is conducive to piety and sober-mindedness, and that light clothing makes the wearer light-hearted and gay, and that flashy dress makes the wearer frivolous and giddy. Would you feel disposed to make his notion or his practice a test of fellowship? But suppose that peculiar notion of his becomes such an obsession with him that he feels that he must advocate it everywhere? He becomes so carried away with the idea that he becomes a nuisance, a trouble maker, and a divider of churches; what then? What would Brother Chambers do about it? Suppose he, while dividing churches with his peculiar theory, pleads that the sort of dress a fellow wears should not be made a test of fellowship; how would Brother Chambers answer him? It is supposed, of course, that Brother Chambers cares enough for the peace and unity of churches to do something about such a situation, but what would he do? Would he fellowship the fellow, bid him Godspeed, and call him to hold meetings? And it would be much worse if the fellow divided churches by preaching hurtful and untrue theories.

If brethren press a theory to the dividing of churches and then tell us that we must let them alone, else they will have no fellowship with us, what can we do about it? They have drawn the line, and issued a "manifesto." And yet they keep talking about tests of fellowship.

What is their object in talking so much about tests of fellowship? Do they live up to their plea? When has a church which indorses whole-heartedly the Word

and Work theory ever called one who opposed such theory to hold their meeting? What fellowship do they extend to preachers who do not indorse them? Why do they not call Foy E. Wallace, Jr., C. R. Nichol, or men like these, to assist them in meetings? No longer ago than last year some friends of mine wanted me to teach a Bible class of nights in their meetinghouse. Two of the elders are ardent admirers of Brother Boll and his teaching; they refused to allow the class to be taught in the meetinghouse. Look at the matter any way you please, and it was worse than a refusal to fellowship me. And the only grounds of refusal was the fact that I was not a "pre." Now, until they show some fellowship toward those who oppose their theories, all clear-thinking brethren will conclude that their talk about "tests of fellowship" is indulged in merely to create prejudice in their favor. Such a thing is cheap politics.

"Our Savior himself shows the likely effect for one to say: 'My Lord delays his coming.' " Brother Chambers here quotes from the parable found in Luke 12:42-48. These brethren quote, "My Lord delays his coming," as if that was the real crime of that wicked servant; whereas he merely took advantage of his lord's delay to give expression to the villainy that was already in him. The use these brethren make of this seems to indicate that they think the only thing that keeps people out of all meanness is the expectation that the Lord might come any moment. But I have never said that the Lord delays his coming, and, therefore, do not belong in the class with that wicked servant. The word translated *delayeth* means "to linger,

delay, tarry."—Thayer. "*To spend time; to continue or last long, hold out; to persevere in doing; especially, to tarry, linger, delay, be slow; to prolong, put off.*"—Liddell and Scott. This word would not be used concerning an event that was not delayed beyond the time it was expected. Now, these future-kingdom advocates tell us that the first Christians were taught to expect Jesus to come again while they lived. But he did not come then. According to their teaching, the Lord has delayed his coming several hundred years beyond the time expected. Who is it that says the Lord did not come at the time he was expected? They are the ones, according to their own teaching, who say: "My Lord delays his coming."

Brother Chambers says: "It is a serious thing to oppose any one's quoting, 'The Lord is at hand,' or 'The Judge standeth before the door,' or 'The end of all things is at hand,' or 'When ye see these things, know that the end is near.'" Who opposes his quoting the Scriptures referred to? When a man makes an implied charge of that nature, he is honor bound to name the parties, when called on to do so. Will Brother Chambers give the name of the person to whom he refers, or is he merely insinuating things to create prejudice?

Pointed Paragraphs:

To write the word of Christ upon the heart, or, what is essentially the same, to let it dwell in us richly, means more than to commit it to memory. It is to make it the dominant factor in our thinking and in our plans and purposes.

FUTURE KINGDOM DOCTRINE—REFLECTS ON INTEGRITY OF GOD

Sometimes a wrong theory does not look so bad till you begin to examine its consequences and the side issues that are its necessary supports. And sometimes theories so warp our thinking as to develop in us a wrong conception of Jehovah and of his attitude toward man. Such theories are extremely hurtful. There are some things about this future-kingdom theory that are hurtful in more ways than one.

The Theory Reflects on the Integrity of God.

In his tract, "The Kingdom of Heaven," page 13, Arthur W. Pink says: "From a number of reasons which we shall state we are compelled to believe that our Lord's message, 'Repent; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,' signifies that *an offer of the Messianic kingdom*, as foretold by the Old Testament prophets, *was then being made to the Jews*. Let us remark that it is of the utmost importance that we pay careful attention to the word 'repent' here. In this call to repentance, our Lord, as the Baptist before him had done, *laid down the fundamental terms on which the kingdom was being offered to Israel*." Others, make the same plea. If they are correct, then God offered them the kingdom on condition that they repent. Thousands of them did repent; but we are told that God deferred the establishment of the kingdom because not all repented. But what about his promise to them who did repent? God made them a promise on

condition; they performed that condition, but God did not give them what he promised! It does not help any to say that the nation rejected him. What about his promise to those who accepted him? It will not do to say God dealt falsely with some because others dealt falsely with him. We are told that the offer of the kingdom was made in good faith. Some accepted the offer in good faith, but we are told that they did not get what God had promised them. There is a serious defect in a man's faith who can thus reflect on the integrity of Jehovah.

Pointed Paragraphs:

Grubbing up false doctrines and unscriptural practices is as essential as grubbing up noxious growths in the field, but a farmer can impoverish himself by putting in all his time grubbing. And the man who puts in all his time in opposing false doctrine and exposing wrong practices will impoverish his character. The fundamental doctrine, or teaching, is the framework around which the Christian character is built. The framework must be there, or the character will not stand up; the gentler graces must be built around the framework, or the person is harsh and unattractive.

Every time we judge a doctrine or another person, we judge ourselves. In condemning evil, we declare ourselves righteous. In condemning righteousness, we declare our sinfulness. In other words, every judgment we deliver shows what sort of person we are. Our judgments on others reveal our own standards. The character of the Jews was revealed in their blaspheming the gospel.

THE OLD TESTAMENT PROPHETS AND CHRISTIANITY

In his kingdom tract, page 15, Mr. Arthur W. Pink says: "The Old Testament *knows nothing whatever of Christianity!*" So, then, there is not a type or a prophecy in the Old Testament that points to the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ! But that idea is not peculiar to Mr. Pink; it is a part of the future-kingdom doctrine. To the ordinary reader of the New Testament it sounds strange to hear some one argue that the prophets of the Old Testament tell us nothing of the gospel of Christ, the New Covenant (or New Testament), the kingdom as it now is, or anything else that pertains to the present plan of salvation through Christ. But such teaching is one of the necessary supports to the future-kingdom theory. It must be made to appear that the entire plan of God for the world's redemption centered in a material kingdom, in which the Jews would be the citizens and over which Jesus would rule on the throne of David in Jerusalem. It would be the kingdom of David literally restored. Other nations would be blessed only through Israel and in subservience to them. Of course the theory contemplates the return of the Jews to Palestine and their conversion to Christ. And we are taught by the future-kingdom advocates that the Old Testament prophets speak only of that sort of thing.

Let the reader think closely as he reads the following quotation:
"About the middle of Acts occurs an event

of first importance. The acceptance of the Gentiles into the church—into the favor of God as joint sharers of the blessings of Israel's Christ—was a most terrible perplexity to all believing Jews. It was, in fact, a *mystery*. It had never been revealed that such a thing would happen. (Eph. 3:4-6.) That the Gentiles were to be blessed in Messianic days was no mystery; *that* had been previously revealed. But the observant reader of the prophets will notice that it is always after the national restoration and exaltation of Israel, and always through restored Israel and in subservience to Israel that the Gentiles were to be so blessed." ("The Kingdom of God," by R. H. Boll, page 63.) So they would have us believe that the Old Testament prophets said nothing of the gospel as revealed in the New Testament, nothing of the new covenant of which the apostles are ministers and of which Christ is mediator, and that the covenant of which Jeremiah prophesied (chapter 31) has not yet been made. Yet Paul quotes that prophecy in the eighth chapter of Hebrews, and informs us that Christ is now the mediator of that covenant.

But the theory is wrong, absurdly wrong. In Luke's record of the great commission (24:46, 47) Jesus said: "Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem." Here Jesus plainly declares that it had been written that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations. Paul declares that he had been "separated unto the gospel

of God, which he promised afore through his prophets in the holy scriptures." (Rom. 1:1, 2.) Here Paul plainly declares that the gospel which he preached had been promised through the prophets. In reporting Paul's preaching at Berea, Luke says: "Now these were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, examining the scriptures daily, whether these things were so." (Acts 17:11.) How could they determine that Paul was preaching in harmony with the prophets, if the prophets said nothing of the gospel which he preached? In that case, would not their searching the Scriptures cause them to reject his preaching? If Paul had held to the future-kingdom theory, his honesty would have led him to tell these honest-hearted Bereans that they could not find anything in the Scriptures about the gospel which he was preaching. At the house of Cornelius, Peter said: "To him bear all the prophets witness, that through his name every one that believeth on him shall receive remission of sins." (Acts 10:43.) Peter (I Pet. 1:10-12) tells us that the prophets searched diligently to understand their prophecies concerning this salvation, "To whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto you, did they minister these things, which now have been announced unto you through them that preached the gospel unto you by the Holy Spirit sent forth from heaven." Paul preached the gospel—preached Christianity in its fullness, and yet he affirmed that he said "nothing but what the prophets and Moses did say should come." (Acts 26:22, 23.) He preached salvation through faith in Christ, and that there was no distinction between Jew and Gentile: "But now apart

from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe; for there is no distinction." (Rom. 3:21, 22.) So this very plan of salvation which Paul preached, in which there was no distinction between Jew and Gentile, was foretold in both the Law and the prophets. Paul quotes Moses as prophesying that disobedient Israel would be provoked to jealousy by the obedience of a people other than the Jews. (Rom. 10:19.) Paul applies that prophecy to the obedience of the Gentiles. And then he shows that Isaiah foretold that the Gentiles would be blessed while Israel remained rebellious: "And Isaiah is very bold, and saith, I was found of them that sought me not; I became manifest unto them that asked not of me. But as to Israel he saith, All the day long did I spread out my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people." And yet we are told that the prophets foretold that only through restored Israel were the Gentiles to be blessed.

Pointed Paragraphs:

We can know that Deity united with humanity in the person of Jesus, though we cannot understand just how the two natures were united. But we can believe what the Bible says and adjust our lives to its teaching. Herein lies our salvation.

We can know that there are three persons in the Godhead, though we cannot comprehend their nature and unity. The finite cannot understand the infinite.

THE FUTURE-KINGDOM PERVERSIONS AND DISLOCATIONS OF PROPHECY

Much is said these days about modernism and fundamentalism. I hope to be allowed to live in a modern world without being called a "modernist" and to hold to fundamental truths without being dubbed a "fundamentalist." These "fundamentalists" have formed a program for the Lord, mixed in a few truths, and named the mixture "fundamentalism," and its advocates "fundamentalists." If their theory is as old as the Bible, why the new names for it and its advocates? Old ideas and doctrines do not require new names: anything new requires a new name. Now, "modernism" and "modernist" are older words than "fundamentalism" and "fundamentalist." Religiously, I am no "modernist"; and the term "fundamentalism" is too new for a Bible lover to accept. It is even newer than the term "modernism." It would be interesting to hear Mr. Rice explain how his doctrine is so ancient, since the name of it is more modern than is the term "modernism." In name, they out modern the modernists! When a doctrine is more modern than modernism, it is too modern for me.

In Mr. Rice's tract, "Christ's Literal Reign on Earth from David's Throne at Jerusalem," he claims to prove "from the Scriptures the premillennial coming of Christ; that he has not yet set up his kingdom on earth, but that he will reign from a literal throne at Jerusalem, in his literal human body, over the entire

earth." He assumes much, argues little, and makes many scattering assertions. It would be easier to review his tract, if more care and thought had gone into its making.

The trouble with him and his future-kingdom advocates, is not speculating about unfulfilled prophecies, but a perversion and dislocation of prophecies that have been fulfilled. When a man takes prophecies that have been fulfilled and makes them do service in some future program, he is not speculating about unfulfilled prophecies. To call such perversion "speculation about unfulfilled prophecies" is to yield to him his claim that they have not been fulfilled. This is not, therefore, a discussion on "unfulfilled prophecies," but an effort to show that Mr. Rice and others have, in the interest of a theory, dislocated promises and prophecies, some of which have been fulfilled.

Mr. Rice quotes Gen. 13:14,15; 17:8, and comments: "You will notice from the context that it was the literal land over which Abraham walked and which he saw, called by the name, 'the land of Canaan.' The promise is unconditional, and utterly without time limit. It is 'for an everlasting possession'." And if Mr. Rice will read Josh. 21:43-45; 23:14, he will notice both from the text and the context that God fulfilled this promise to the letter—not one thing failed of all that God had promised. Yet the Jews are not in that land now. Why? Mr. Rice says the promise of the land to Abram's seed was unconditional and without time limit. Who broke the covenant? If Mr. Rice is correct, the seed of Abraham did not break the land covenant, for there were no conditions for them to

break. If Mr. Rice is correct, God was the only one that could break the covenant. God promised them unconditional possession of the land, and then dispossessed them of it. That is a reflection on the integrity of Jehovah.

Mr. Rice says: "The Lord foretold in Deut. 28:63-68 the dispersion of Israel 'among all the peoples, from one end of the earth even unto the other;' but in Deut. 30:1-6, the regathering of Israel to their own land to possess it is plainly foretold." Why did Mr. Rice refer to so small a part of each of these chapters? Was he afraid the reader might discover something in the rest of these chapters that would upset his theory? Their dispersion was one of the curses that would come upon them if they disobeyed the law Moses gave them. (See Deut. 28:15.) Read Deut. 30:8, 10, and you will see that their return was conditioned on their keeping the commandments which Moses commanded them, and that after their return they were to keep all the commandments of the law of Moses. This condition is now impossible of fulfillment, for the law of Moses is not in force. If Mr. Rice will read Neh. 1:8, 9, he will find that the regathering here spoken of took place when the Jews returned from Babylonian captivity. Surely he will not take issue with Nehemiah. The other passages relied on to prove the future gathering of the Jews to Palestine refer to the same event.

Moses plainly told the Israelite* that if they forgot God and turned from his commandments, they would as surely perish as that the nations whom they drove out of Palestine perished. (Deut. 8:19, 20.) These na-

tions perished utterly as nations, and Moses said the nation of Israel would perish as they did. Because of their sins they were carried into captivity. Later, all who desired to return to Palestine were permitted to do so. They again fell into sin; and in John's day they had again grown so corrupt that he told them the ax then lay at the root of the tree. (Matt. 3:10.) Then the Jewish nation murdered the Son of God—that is, the high court of the nation procured his murder. Under God's law the penalty for murder was death. As this was murder by the nation, nothing but national death would satisfy divine justice. The tree had become wholly bad, and God used the Roman armies as the ax with which to cut down that tree. According to these future-kingdom advocates, the most glorious period of Jewish history is yet to be; but Jesus tells us that the last state of that race will be worse than the first. (See Matt. 12:43-45.)

The Jews were broken off from God's favor because of sin—unbelief. Now both Jew and Gentile stand on an equal footing before God. God is not a respecter of persons. Religiously, we know no man after the flesh. These future-kingdom folks seek to keep up this racial distinction which Christianity was meant to destroy. In Paul's allegory (Gal. 4:21-31) the handmaid and her son represented Jerusalem and the Jewish nation, and Paul uses that allegory to show that the handmaid and her son were cast out. Christians are children of the free woman. Paul then affirms: "The son of the handmaid (Jewish nation) shall not inherit with the son of the freewoman." Hence, the Jewish nation, as such, is left out of any further inheritance. Jesus plainly told the Jews:

"Therefore say I unto you, The Kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." (Matt. 21:43.) Believers in Christ are now "sons of Abraham" (Gal. 3:7) "and heirs according to the promise" (Gal. 3:29). The Jewish nation, as such, is not now an heir of anything. By unbelief the Jews were broken off from God's favor. (Rom. 11:20.) Gentiles were grafted in by faith. "And so"—in the same manner—"all Israel shall be saved."

There is not a hint in the New Testament that the Jews will be restored to Palestine and be the only citizens of this fantastic future kingdom, with other people subject to them. That would be fleshly distinction with a vengeance. "Behold, now is the acceptable time; behold, now is the day of salvation." (2 Cor. 6:2.) Think of the nature of this kingdom these men set forth as the object of our highest hope: "The kingdom of Christ is to be as literal as David's kingdom ... It is to be as literal and earthly as Babylon, Medio-Persia, Greece, and Rome." So says Mr. Rice. That would please well the carnal nature of man. It is a pitiful thing to see men delude themselves with such false hopes.

Mr. Rice says: "Jesus, David's son, is to restore David's kingdom." Yet he says: "The present world system will have to be destroyed before Christ can have his kingdom on this earth." David ruled without having the present world system destroyed. If Christ is to have the same kingdom, why cannot he do the same? Is it possible that Mr. Rice thinks David could

do a thing that Christ will be unable to do? The theory belittles Christ.

Here are two statements from Mr. Rice: "Jesus will restore all Israel to their own land, the land of Canaan, and will rule over them from David's throne." "Jesus is not now sitting in his throne, but in his Father's throne, according to Rev. 3:21." His idea is that when Jesus comes again he will descend from that universal throne which he now occupies with the father and sit on David's throne as king of the Jews, thus exchanging a higher for a lower. And they call that exaltation of Christ! Exalted to a lower place! "Throne" means kingly authority. David's throne and Jehovah's throne are the same. In I Kings it is said that "Solomon sat upon the throne of David his father." In I Chron. 29:23 it is said that "Solomon sat upon the throne of Jehovah as king instead of his father." That which was called David's throne was Jehovah's throne. It was called David's throne simply because he ruled over God's people. The effort to make a distinction between God's throne and David's throne is a miserable perversion of Bible truth. As Jesus now rules over God's people, he occupies the same position that David occupied.

When did Jesus begin his reign? On Pentecost, Peter reminded his hearers that God had promised David to place one of his seed upon his throne, and that David, foreseeing this, spoke of the resurrection of Christ. Jesus was therefore raised up to sit on David's throne. Read Acts 2:29-38. Verse 33: "Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath

poured forth this, which ye see and hear." To Peter the coming of the Holy Spirit on that day was proof that Jesus had been exalted to David's throne. From John 7:37-39 we learn that the Holy Spirit would be given when Jesus was glorified. Read Mat. 20:20, 21 and Mark 10:35-37, and you will see that sitting with Jesus in his kingdom and sitting with him in his glory mean the same thing. As the giving of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost was proof that he had entered into his glory, it is also proof that he had been exalted to rulership in his kingdom.

But it has been said that Jesus was then anointed, but did not then begin to reign, just as David was anointed some time before he began his reign. But here is a fatal defect in that illustration: Not one thing was done in the name of David as king till he actually assumed the reins of government. Acts were to begin to be performed in the name of Christ at Jerusalem when the Holy Spirit came. (Luke 24:46-49.) On that day Peter commanded the people to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. (Acts 2:38.) Was Peter guilty of forging the name of Christ to a pardon proclamation? He had no right to so do, and his act was forgery, if Jesus had not authorized him to do so. And Jesus could not have authorized him to proclaim pardon in his name, if Jesus was not then occupying the throne. Not one future-kingdom advocate, nor all of them together, can answer this one argument, neglected or overlooked though it has been. It settles the whole matter as to the fact of his reigning now and as to when his reign began.

Mr. Rice says: "John the Baptist came preaching 'Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.' (Matt. 3:2.) Jesus began to preach from the same text in his early ministry. (Matt. 4:17.) We find that the command to repent is repeated many times on through the rest of the New Testament, but the statement, 'The kingdom of heaven is at hand,' was dropped and not repeated any more, though the kingdom is mentioned dozens of times. The reason is that the Jews rejected Christ, their King, and the kingdom was postponed. (Luke 13:34, 35.)" "At hand" means "near." In the third year of his public ministry Christ sent the seventy out to preach, "The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you." (Luke 10:1-10.) That was during the last year of his ministry. Certainly, after the first Pentecost after the resurrection the kingdom was not preached as "at hand" any more, for the simple reason that it had come. Paul says that Christians have been "delivered out of the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of the Son of his love." (Col. 1:13.) Christ is now "The blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords." (I Tim. 6:15.) As he is the "only Potentate," he alone rules in this kingdom. Hence, it is his kingdom, and the throne is his throne.

But Mr. Rice would have us believe that when John and Jesus announced that the kingdom had come nigh they missed it a long way. Jesus also preached "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of heaven is at hand." (Mark 1:15.) If Mr. Rice is correct, the kingdom was not at hand—the time for it to come was not fulfilled. He would have us believe that Je-

Jesus did not know what he was talking about. But that is not the worst reflection on Jesus that this theory makes. They were assured of the kingdom on condition that they repent and believe the gospel—that is, that they repent and accept Christ. Some of them, in good faith, trusting the words of John and Jesus, did repent, and accepted Christ. But, according to the adherents of the future-kingdom theory, they did not get what God had promised them. It will not relieve the situation to say that most of them rejected him. What about his word to those who did accept him? They did their part; did God do his? Mr. Rice says he did not. I am unalterably opposed to any theory that thus makes out God a liar to those who faithfully do his commands and trust his promises.

The postponement theory belittles the church and makes it an afterthought, a sort of emergency measure. According to Mr. Rice, God meant to establish a material kingdom just like other world kingdoms, but the Jews did not make it possible for him to do so. The church was then established to continue till the time was ripe for the kingdom, according to the theory. The church, then, was not God's original plan. But what saith the Scriptures? Was that God's original intent? "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Eph. 3:10, 11.) Thus we see that it was the eternal purpose of God to make known his wisdom through the church. And how long will this continue? "Unto him be the glory

in the church and in Christ Jesus unto all generations forever and ever." (Eph. 3:21.) The church, then, will not be superseded by another institution so long as generations come and go.

Mr. Rice quotes Acts 15:13-16 to prove that "the restoration of the kingdom of David is to be after this Gentile church age." Had he given the full quotation James made from Amos, it would have proved the very opposite of what he claims. James was justifying the acceptance of the Gentiles, and quoted Amos to prove that since the royal family of David was re-established the Gentiles might come into the church. Read verses 17 and 18 and see how miserably Mr. Rice perverts the argument of James.

Pointed Paragraphs:

A life spent in entertaining and/ being entertained is an empty and useless life. The satisfaction that comes from knowing that one is of help to his fellow man is some reward within itself. How useless must a person feel who never does anything useful! How boresome such a life must be!

People sometimes say that this plan or that plan will not work. Certainly not; no plan will work. But people may work a plan, or work according to a plan, or they may work without any prearranged plan. A plan is not as necessary as a purpose.

YOUR FAITH AND YOUR CONFESSION

The promises and prophecies recorded in God's revelation to the Jews led them to confidently expect the coming of *a* Deliverer, the Messiah. They have planted that expectation in the hearts of many Gentiles. (Of course the reader understands that "Messiah" in Hebrew is the same as "Christ" in Greek.) But the Jews had no clear conception as to what the Christ would be and do. In fact they had many very erroneous ideas about the promised Christ. Hence, when Jesus appeared in their midst, they were so blinded by their theories that they rejected him as the Christ—that is, the majority of the Jews would not accept him as the Christ, while many of them believed on him as the Christ. To the most of them Jesus was a puzzle, a stone of stumbling. They could not deny his mighty miracles nor controvert successfully his teaching. Denying the only truth that would have explained him, they dealt in many conjectures as to who he was. Some said he was Elijah; some John the Baptist; others, that he was Jeremiah, or one of the prophets. But when Jesus put the question direct to his disciples, "But who say ye that I am?" Peter unhesitatingly answered: "Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God." But the majority of the Jews refused to believe that Jesus was the Christ, and looked forward to the coming of the Christ.

Upon the great truth that Jesus is the Christ the church is built; upon that truth the whole system of Christianity rests. If he be not the Christ, the gospel

is a baseless fabrication and the church is without excuse for existence. It is this foundation truth that we believe and confess.

There was no controversy among the Jews as to whether the expected Christ would be called "the Son of God." Any Jew would confess that he believed the expected Christ to be the Son of God. But they deny that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God. Any of those Jews who rejected and crucified Jesus would have readily said: "I believe the Christ is the Son of God." I was startled to hear a preacher ask a number of candidates for baptism this question: "Do you believe that Christ is the Son of God?" Now that question misses the point entirely. Any orthodox Jew could give an affirmative answer to that question; but ask him if he believes that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and he will answer with an emphatic "No." The great question is: "Do you believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God?" The great answer, the great confession of faith is: "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God."

That confession should not be so abridged as to leave any doubt as to who you believe is the Christ, the Son of God. If you believe that Jesus is the Christ, say so. To say that you believe that Christ is the Son of God is really no confession at all.

The confession should not be extended so as to include more than this great truth. Mr. Russell extended that confession. He taught that the Christ is Jesus and the church; with him, Jesus was only the head of a body that is called "the Christ." With him,

it took both the head and the body to constitute the Christ. Some gospel preachers took up with that idea and thus weakened their faith by extending their confession. Certainly, if *a* man believes that theory, his confession is not full and complete when he says: "I believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God." That is really not what he believes. If he makes his confession as broad as his faith, he will say: "I believe that Jesus and the church is the Christ."

Do the foregoing points seem to you to be matters of small import? If so, I envy not your discernment. Notice carefully the purpose for which John wrote: "Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name." (John 20:30, 31.)

Pointed Paragraphs:

"For ye were going astray like sheep." The idea expressed in the original Greek is not that they were going astray, but they were astray. When a living thing is astray, it is lost; at least, it is not in its proper place, not where it belongs. Sin is not the proper element for people; they do not rightly belong there; it is not their natural habitat. Righteousness is man's natural habitat; that is where God originally placed him. When he wanders off into sin, he is on foreign soil.

The Hebrew kingdom never would have been divided if all had adhered strictly to the law of God. People do not divide when all are determined to do right. When churches divide, there is unrighteousness somewhere.

THE CHRIST OF THE FUTURE-KINGDOM ADVOCATES

One of the great evils of the future-kingdom advocates is their idea as to the Christ. When I first read Pastor Russell's idea of the Christ, I was astonished, but later I found that others had adopted his idea. Mr. Russell says: "Thus the saints of the gospel age are an anointed company—anointed to be kings and priests unto God (2 Cor. 1:21; 1 Pet. 2:9); and together with Jesus, their chief and Lord, they constitute Jehovah's Anointed—the Christ." ("The Divine Plan of the Ages," pages 81, 82.) Also "The Christ includes all anointed of the Spirit." Now note the following from "The Book of Revelation," by R. H. Boll: "That the man-child of chapter 12:5 is none other than the Christ; but not the individual Christ alone, but his body, the church, also, seen as connected with him." Page 44: "This mystic man-child is not simply the Child that was born at Bethlehem, but the Christ as including both himself, the head, and the church, his spiritual body, which is one with him." In the estimation of these writers the Christ is composed of Jesus and the church. If a person espouses that theory, he should make his confession as comprehensive and extensive as his faith. If he says, "I believe that Jesus is the Christ," his confession is not full. To fully confess his faith in the Christ, he must say: "I believe that Jesus and his church is the Christ." That is evident to any one who will read carefully what these writers say. Read the quotation again. Now, shall we revise our confession to make it fit this future-kingdom idea?

IS SALVATION NOW OFFERED TO ALL?

A man does not always realize fully the consequences of his doctrine. It seems to me that a person cannot believe the future-kingdom theory as now advocated and also believe that God now seeks the salvation of all men. If I understand this theory, and I think I do, the faithful Christians are to be rulers with Christ, and that to each one will be given territory commensurate with his development as a servant of God. Some, at least, seem to take the parable of the pounds (Luke 19:13-27) in a very literal sense. "Have thou authority over ten cities"; "Be thou also over five cities." As there will be a limit to the number of cities, there will, of necessity, be a limit to the number of rulers needed. Mr. Russell was consistent and bold enough to plainly and openly declare that God is not now seeking to convert the mass of mankind, but is only getting a ruling class ready. His position on this point is so well known that I shall not here take space to quote from him. Some do not speak so plainly on this point as Mr. Russell, and yet they speak plainly enough to be understood, as the following from Brother R. H. Boll will show: "That the 'new song' of Rev. 5.9, 10 views the work of purchasing unto God with his own blood men out of every nation as finished. The selection is seen as completed; the full number of the chosen ones seen as constituting a kingdom of priests unto God, as reigning on earth. This then prophetically foreviews the time when God shall have done visiting 'the Gentiles' (the nations) to *take out*

of them a people for his name. (Acts 15:14.) The church is an election, *called out.*" Again: "He has a mystery—that is, a secret—to tell us: to wit, that Israel's hardening is limited as to extent and as to time: as to extent, for it is 'in part;' as to time, for it is 'until' something is accomplished—namely, until the full count of the elect Gentiles shall have come in. Then Israel's tide shall turn." So it seems that the Lord has a certain number of Gentiles to be called, and the present order must continue till the "full count of the elect Gentiles shall have come in." But all such teaching is essential to the future-kingdom theory as now advocated. The theory necessitates the doctrine that now is the time of salvation for only the needed number of rulers.

Pointed Paragraphs:

That the gospel succeeded so well in superstitious Ephesus need not surprise anyone. In superstition there is reverence for supernatural things. In fact, superstition is ignorant reverence. By teaching these people the gospel, Paul guided their reverence to the right objectives. Superstition is reverence without reason; rationalism is reason without reverence. It is easier to enlighten ignorant reverence than it is to reestablish reverence in a heart from which it has been banished.

With some religionists of today custom and tradition have greater weight than the plain word of God. Assail baptism, a thing positively commanded, and they applaud; assail their unscriptural teachings and practices, and they become greatly offended. Some churches of Christ have had troubles over customs and traditions.

THE COMING OF THE LORD

In the Christian Standard of March 19, 1932, Brother H. H. Peters, secretary of the Illinois Christian Missionary Society, says: "As already intimated, the plan of the Millennial Harbinger was different from that of its predecessor. It was unique in the journalism of America, religious or otherwise. Its very name indicates that its editor partook somewhat of the spirit that was abroad in the land, which expected the immediate return of the Lord and the establishment of his millennial reign. Mr. Campbell never became a dogmatist on this point, nor did the brotherhood ever take up any of the fantastic views of Miller and others, but it was impossible in that day to do any kind of religious work without partaking somewhat of the spirit that expected the immediate return of the Lord." It would be hard to crowd into fewer words more historic errors than the foregoing extract contains. Mr. Campbell did not believe that Jesus would return to earth and then reign a thousand years. He did believe that, before the coming of the Lord, there would be a thousand years of universal peace and righteousness. Mr. Campbell was not a premillennialist; neither did he believe the Lord would return immediately. On these matters he wrote extensively. He cited a number of prophecies which he believed had not been fulfilled, but must be fulfilled before the coming of the Lord. One wonders where Mr. Peters got authority for his statements. However, when a person gets intoxicated with the future-king-

dom idea, he can see authority for statements that no sober-minded person can discover. They even tell us that the apostles taught the early Christians to expect the immediate return of the Lord.

Because some do not hold to the theories propagated by the premillennialists, they are charged with not believing in the second coming of the Lord at all. From one writer we have the following: "The thought of his coming has faded out of the minds of men." Again: "In the eighteenth century, however, there came a man named 'Daniel Whitby.' . . . He taught that the gospel would spread and spread until the whole world would be converted; then would follow a thousand years of blessedness and peace, and after all this Jesus would come and wind things up. Then the hope of his coming died again everywhere as this doctrine became the general teaching." That is such a manifest misrepresentation of the great body of Christians that I shall make no attempt to disprove it. As Mr. Campbell was accused of holding the same views as Whitby, it will be seen that Mr. Peters misrepresents him in the quotation at the beginning of this article.

We are told that "they were hoping for him, and they were looking for his return in the days of the apostles." We are asked to believe that the Christians began to expect his return any moment after he went away, and that they were taught by the apostles to do so. They think they find such teaching in what the apostles said about looking for his coming and hoping for his coming; but the theory discredits the inspiration of the apostles. Jesus did not come again during that period. If the apostles were mistaken on that

point, how can we be sure they taught the truth on anything? If the infidel were to point to this as evidence that the apostles were not infallible in their teaching, how would these men meet the argument? On this point the learned commentator, James McKnight, says: "Grotius, Locke, and others, have affirmed that the apostles of Christ believed the end of the world was to happen in their time, and that they have declared this to be their belief, in various passages of their epistles. But these learned men and all who join them in that opinion have fallen into a most pernicious error. For thereby they destroy the authority of the gospel revelation, at least so far as it is contained in the discourses and writings of the apostles; because, if they have erred in a matter of such importance, and which they affirm was revealed to them by Christ, they may have been mistaken in other matters also, where their inspiration is not more strongly asserted by them than in this instance. In imputing this mistake to the apostles, the deists have heartily joined the learned men above mentioned, because a mistake of this sort effectually overthrows the apostle's pretensions to inspiration. It is therefore necessary to clear them from so injurious an imputation."

Such use has been made of the parable recorded in Luke 12:42-48 as to make it appear that the servant was unfaithful, in that he said: "My Lord delayeth his coming." But they miss the point. As a matter of fact, the Lord has delayed his coming far beyond the time they tell us the inspired apostles said he might come. There was certainly nothing sinful in what the

servant said, when it was true that his lord had delayed his coming. There could be no unfaithfulness in his saying what was actually true. But his unfaithfulness consisted in his taking advantage of that delay to do wrong. His wrong doing was his unfaithfulness. Not what he said about that delay, but what he did during that delay, constituted his unfaithfulness. But their use of this parable illustrates the strained interpretations men will put upon the Scripture to propagate a theory.

But another statement in that parable has some bearing on the matter under discussion: "The lord of that servant shall come in a day when he expecteth not, and in an hour when he knoweth not, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint his portion with the unfaithful." This statement applies to all unfaithful servants, and not simply those who will be alive when the Lord comes again. To make this apply only to those who are alive at the Lord's second coming would leave many unfaithful servants that would not suffer the fate that this one did, for more shall have died before the Lord comes again than will be alive when he does come. It can apply to all unfaithful servants only in the sense that the Lord comes to all at death.

Pointed Paragraphs:

Instead of being afraid of our enemies, let us trust in Jehovah. Why worry overmuch about the evils that we cannot possibly remedy? "Fret not thyself because of evil-doers, neither be thou envious against them that work unrighteousness." (Ps. 37:1.)

THE "TWO STAGES" THEORY EXAMINED

It would not be fair to myself nor to the reader to charge that any Christian does not believe that the Lord will come again. That event is so plainly taught in the Bible that no one who believes the Book thinks otherwise. But some have engaged in so much speculation about what will occur when the Lord does come that, so it seems to me, their theories virtually deny much of what has already taken place. In some respects the various angles of their theory fail to connect, or even to harmonize.

I have a rather artistic diagram, prepared by a Baptist preacher of some ability, in Houston, Texas. In this diagram the Lord is represented as coming to the air surrounding the earth, where he is met by the living saints, now changed, and the dead saints, now raised from the dead; and there the diagram represents them as remaining some years, or during the time of the "great tribulation" on earth, after which they come on to the earth. Brother R. H. Boll has a diagram in which he sets forth the same idea. The coming of the Lord is thus represented as composed of two "stages"—coming for his saints, and then coming on to earth with his saints. But another angle to the theory does not fit into this, as will be seen.

The theory has the Lord with his saints back in heaven between the two "stages" of his coming. Because we so represent matters, some, who do not consider all the angles of the theory, say we are guilty of

serious misrepresentation. Let us not be too hasty. There is another angle to this theory.

The theory represents the whole of the book of Revelation from the beginning of the fourth chapter to the close as dealing with things yet future, and that from the beginning of chapter four to the end of chapter nineteen it tells of things that will occur between the "two stages" of the Lord's coming; and that is at the time another angle of the theory has the Lord with his saints in the air surrounding the earth. If a man believes that Rev. 4:1 to chapter 19, inclusive, speaks of what is to occur between the two "stages" of their theory, he cannot believe that the Lord remains in the air with his saints during that time. Brother Boll himself does not so believe. "To see these future things John is called up to heaven. For it is in heaven that the plans and counsels of God are laid; and the things that transpire on the earth have their secret source and origin there. ... So all the great events of which the book of Revelation tells come from above, first decreed and decided on in God's council chamber in heaven." John first saw God sitting upon his throne surrounded by twenty-four other thrones, upon which sat twenty-four elders. "That these are saints, representatives of all saints, seems perfectly evident." And so there were saints in heaven, around the throne of God, while another angle of the theory has them in the air that surrounds the earth. Then John saw in the right hand of God as he sat on the throne a book, close-sealed with seven seals. None other than the Lord Jesus Christ was found that could open that book. He came and took the book out of the hand of him who

sat on the throne. So Jesus was up in heaven, in the presence of the throne of God, at the very time one angle of the theory has him in the air. And Brother Boll believes he was there, for he says: "When John lifts up his eyes to see the mighty Lion, he discerns, for the first time, in the midst of the central glory of the Throne, the figure of 'a lamb standing.' " From that time on we see Jesus taking an active part in all that transpires around the throne in heaven. And then we come to chapter 19. We here quote some comments made by Brother Boll on that chapter: "With him are armies—the armies which are in heaven. . . . But who are these 'holy ones' (that is, saints), and who are these armies of heaven that follow in his train 'upon white horses clothed in fine linen, white and pure'? The answer is indicated to us a few verses above (1-9). In heaven, the saints previously taken up, have joined their Lord in an eternal wedlock. . . . It is in this 'fine linen, white and pure,' that we see the armies of heaven arrayed, who follow him as he comes forth. These armies are not angels; they are his saints composing His Bride, 'the Lamb's wife.' " Here, then, we have Jesus in heaven with his saints ready to come forth from heaven, but another angle of the theory has the Lord and his armies of saints in the air ready to make the second stage of his journey! Again: "So from heaven, riding forth for Israel's help, comes their Messiah at the head of the heavenly host."

I do not refer to these matters to provoke any controversy, but to show that we have not misrepresented any one, and also to show that one angle of the future-

kingdom theory does not harmonize with another angle of the theory. If a theory contradicts itself, we should be excused if we contradict the theory. Both angles of this theory cannot be true, and no man can put these angles together in such a way as to make the theory look good to one who knows that God's truth is in perfect harmony with itself.

But the theory has the marriage of Christ to his bride yet future. According to the theory, the church is only *engaged* to Christ now. If that be so, in what sense is he now Lord of his bride?

Pointed Paragraphs:

The Bible does not idealize humanity—not even its heroes. It impartially records the good and the bad. It records the drunkenness of Noah and the falsehood of Abraham, and gives us a full picture of the awful sin of David. It tells of Peter's denial of Christ and of his hypocrisy at Antioch. It tells how Moses tried to find a way to keep from carrying out God's orders. No human productions are so impartial.

There is something radically wrong with a man's religion when it drives out of his heart all sympathy, kindness, and mercy. The hatred of the lawyers and the Pharisees toward Jesus was greater than their desire to see a sufferer healed.

Forbearance is characteristic of a Christian. It is to lie exercised toward those who in some way make themselves unpleasant in a personal way.

HOPE OF THE LORD'S COMING

Inspired men did teach that the Lord is coming again; but when men affirm that the Holy Spirit taught the early Christians to expect the Lord to come the second time in their day, they virtually accuse the Holy Spirit of raising hopes that they knew would not be realized. We would expect infidels to argue that inspired men taught things that turned out not to be true. But the idea is so abhorrent to any one who believes in the infallibility of the Holy Spirit and the absolute truthfulness of everything he taught that it seems that no one could for a moment regard it as a harmless guess or as a matter about which we need not be concerned. However, if the apostles did teach such doctrine, we will have to acknowledge that they did, even though it leads us to discredit the certainty of their teaching. But did they teach it? Is there any justice, reason, or foundation for putting them under such a cloud of suspicion? Emphatically, no!

An argument to support the theory is built on a misunderstanding of the word "hope." We are told that the apostles taught the early Christians to hope for the Lord's coming, and that hope is made up of desire and expectation, all of which is true. But they assume that to hope for a thing is to expect it immediately, or at any moment. Their own contention on the word "hope" robs them of any hope of a millennial kingdom; for they all contend that the Jews must return to Palestine, Rome be developed again into a

great empire, and then some years of great tribulation must pass before the millennial kingdom is set up. With their idea of hope, they can hope for nothing except that which may occur at any moment. But they are wrong in their contention on hope. We plant a crop, hoping for a good harvest; but no one is simple enough to think the harvest may come at any moment. The man who gives a large sum of money to build a college or hospital hopes to benefit generations unborn. We may lend, hoping to receive. Certainly no one makes a loan expecting the return at any moment. They are, therefore, wrong in assuming that imminency inheres in expectancy. And they are wrong also as to the basis of expectation. Expectation must have more than conjecture, more than mere probability, for a basis. I earnestly desire the Lord to come while I live, but I do not expect him to do so, for I have nothing on which to base such an expectation. But you ask, "Do you not think that the Lord might come while you live?" Certainly, but expectation must be based on something more substantial than what may or may not be. If the Lord should plainly tell me that he would come while I live, I would have grounds for expecting him to come before I die. But the Lord has never told any generation that he would come during the life of that generation, and for that reason no one has ever expected the Lord to come while he lived. If the apostles had taught the early Christians that the Lord would come in their day, then they could have expected him to come. But if the apostles had so taught, they would have taught falsely, for the Lord did not come then. But they did not so teach, and therefore the early Christians did not

expect his return in their day. And yet they did, as do all Christians today, expect him to come at some period, for he said he would. They may have desired that he come in their day, and we may desire him to come in our day; but they had no grounds upon which to expect him to come then, neither have we any grounds for expecting him to come in our day.

The coming of the Lord is to be earnestly desired, and yet the thought of his coming fills one with dread and awe. Yet we are told that such feelings indicate that there is something wrong with us, just as there is something wrong with a wife if she feels uneasy at the home-coming of a good husband. We are reminded that the faithful wife gladly meets the devoted husband when he returns from a journey, and that children joyfully run to meet their father when he comes home, and this should be our attitude and feeling when the Lord comes. If we tremble at his presence, there is something wrong! Is it possible that any one so thinks? Does any one really think that we can meet the Lord on the same basis that one human being meets another? To teach that we should have such feeling of familiarity as a wife has toward her husband or as children have toward their father is hurtful to piety and reverence. If the author of the foregoing illustrations does not mean all this, his illustrations do not mean anything. For years I have had an earnest desire that the Lord come while I live, and yet I know that when I appear before him in his majesty and glory, I shall, like the beloved John, fall at his feet as one dead. (Rev. 1:17.) I cannot think that any Christian will feel otherwise. When Jehovah

spoke to Moses out of the burning bush, "Moses trembled, and durst not behold." (Acts 7:32.) Was there something wrong with Moses and the beloved John? But the author who presented the aforementioned illustrations is wrong, as he himself will learn when he appears in the presence of the Judge of all the earth.

Pointed Paragraphs:

Perhaps you have wondered what people do in heaven. The redeemed are before God's throne, ready always to do his bidding. In teaching his disciples how to pray, Jesus put in this petition: "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth." Heaven is not, therefore, a place of idleness. But obedience is a thing that must be learned. "Though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered." The service of God in this life is the school in which we learn obedience; we must learn to serve here, or we will not have the joy of service over there. "He that sitteth on the throne shall spread his tabernacle over them." They will be secure in his service—have his constant care.

Are all people subject to their environs in the development of their character? Yes and no. Environment makes some people what they are; others, like Asa, get busy, and make their environment.

PAUL TO THE THESSALONIANS ON THE LORD'S RETURN

These Thessalonians had "turned unto God from idols, to serve a living God, and to wait for his Son from heaven." To wait for the coming of the Lord does not mean that we are to remain in idleness till he comes. To wait on the Lord in any matter is to remain steadfast in the hope that he will fulfill that which he promised. It is a forward-looking attitude of mind and heart, with confidence that God will fulfill his word, whether soon or late.

In reading the Bible, we frequently allow the chapter divisions to influence our conclusions. We forget for the time that writers of the Bible made no division into chapters and verses. In our study we should absolutely disregard the chapter divisions, for the discussion of a point begun in one chapter frequently runs into the next. In the first Thessalonian letter Paul's discussion of the events connected with the Lord's return begins with the thirteenth verse of the fourth chapter and ends with the eleventh verse of the fifth chapter. If we ignore this fact, we deal unfairly with Paul.

When Paul planted the church at Thessalonica, he did not have time to fully instruct the new converts, for he was soon driven away by fierce persecution. Before he wrote his first letter to them, some of their number had died. They did not know what would become of these at the Lord's coming. Concerning them,

they had no hope; for they had no information upon which to base any hope. Paul's purpose in writing the section under consideration was to teach them that they would "sorrow not, even as the rest, who have no hope." Through or by Jesus, God would bring these dead saints to heaven; for the dead saints would be raised from the dead, and, together with the living saints, would be caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air. "Wherefore comfort ye one another with these words."

Then Paul says that it is not necessary to say anything to them about the times and seasons. "The times and the seasons" of what? Of that concerning which he had just told them about—namely, the coming of the Lord and the resurrection of the dead saints, and the ascension of all saints to meet him in the air. But that day would come as a thief in the night; then what? "When they are saying, Peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child; and they shall in no wise escape." So, then, in that day in which the Lord comes to gather to himself his saints, sudden destruction will come upon the rest of mankind. "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief." What day? The day of which he was speaking, the day in which the saints shall be taken up and the wicked shall suddenly be destroyed. Some would have us believe that the saints will be secure in the day when sudden destruction is visited upon the wicked, because they shall have already been taken up to meet the Lord in the air some years before that day of destruction of the ungodly. But Paul tells us that that

day of destruction will not come upon them as a thief, for they are all sons of light—they are ready and watching. To fit the theory, Paul should have said that that day would not overtake them, because they would not be there, having already been caught up to meet the Lord in the air.

Some people look at this Scripture so carelessly that they actually think that Paul says the dead saints will be raised before the wicked are raised. One good brother, a friend of mine, quoted Scripture, to me as follows: "The dead in Christ shall rise first, and the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years are passed." But Paul was not contrasting the resurrection of the saints and the wicked, but was speaking of the dead saints and those living when Christ comes. Will the living saints leave the dead in their graves? No, the dead saints will be raised first—that is, before the living ascend; and then all shall be caught up to meet the Lord. Whether the wicked were to be raised then, or were never to be raised, was not so much as hinted at. But the passage does teach this: When the Lord comes, the saints will be caught up to meet him in the air, and the wicked will be destroyed in that day. And that agrees with what Paul says in his second letter to the Thessalonians.

In Paul's second letter to the Thessalonians he gives some additional information concerning the coming of the Lord and our gathering together unto him. From the first verse of the second chapter we learn that the coming of the Lord referred to is that coming in which the saints are gathered together unto him. Paul would not have them troubled by thinking that that day was

"just at hand." One writer, well known to the Gospel Advocate readers, makes this comment on the phrase, "at hand": "In every translation known to me, except the Douay, the King James, and the American Revised Version, this reads 'the day of the Lord is now present.' Some one had made those Thessalonians believe that the day of the Lord had already broken in upon them." I know that some translations have "present" instead of "at hand", but they are not so numerous as the foregoing quotation would have us believe. The following translations have "at hand": Latin Vulgate, Bible Union, Living Oracles, Sharpe, George R. Noyes (Harvard University teacher), Anderson, Syriac, Sawyer, and James MacKnight. So far as scholarship goes, it is very likely that the scholarship back of the American Standard Version outweighs the scholarship of all the translations referred to in the foregoing quotation, with the exception of the English Revision.

But it matters little to us what those Thessalonian brethren thought about the matter; it does not affect Paul's teaching on the subject. Paul tells us that a falling away must come first and the man of sin be revealed. This must be, he tells us, before the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ and our gathering together unto him. But the theory that is now so attractive to some people has this man of sin developed after the saints are taken up to meet the Lord in the air; the man of sin is then to be destroyed at what is termed the second stage of his coming. But Paul plainly says that the coming he is here talking about is the coming in which the saints are gathered together unto

the Lord. It is strange that a theory will so blind people that they cannot see a plain statement in the very passages from which they claim to deduce their teaching.

Pointed Paragraphs:

Jesus and Paul were not contentious, yet they contended earnestly for the truth. They were the greatest fighters of all time. They were moved by two Loves. They loved man so much that they fought with determination anything and everything that would hurt man. They loved the truth so much that they fought everything that was in the way of its progress. And they stirred people as none others ever did.

It has been said that it is useless to quote the Bible to one who disbelieves it. But Jesus quoted it to the devil. There is power in an appropriate passage of Scripture that even a disbeliever cannot evade.

Before following any advice it is better to find out the character of him who gives the advice and what possible interest he may have in our following his advice.

RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD

The following question came to me recently:

Brother Whiteside: Do you not think that the expression, "resurrection from the dead," has reference to the death state, rather than the meaning that some will come "out from among" the other dead ones? Say something to us in the Gospel Advocate along this line. John S. Clark.

In the growth of language it is common for words to take on additional meanings. This, of course, is common knowledge and needs no proof.

In the phrase, "from the dead" (*ek nekron*), the word "dead" is plural in the Greek, but by a sort of figure of speech, or extension of the meaning of the word, it applies to the state of death; at least, some passages of Scripture set forth that idea. In Rom. 6:13 we have the phrase, "alive from the dead," and in I John 3:14 we have the phrase, "passed out of death into life.". In both passages the meaning is the same; yet in Romans the Greek word from which we have "dead" is plural, and in John we have another word in the singular. The Romans had been dead in sins, but were made alive from that death. The Cambridge Greek Testament has this note: "*Ek nekron*, as men that are alive after being dead." Bloomfield: "*Ex nekron zontas*, as those who, after having been (spiritually) dead, are now alive." Thayer: "*Zeen ek nekron*, tropically, out of moral death to enter upon a new life, dedicated and acceptable to God (Rom. 6:13.)" In defining "*ek*," Thayer has this: "5. Of the condition or state out of which one comes or is brought: . . .

zontes ek nekron, alive from being dead—i. e., who had been dead and were alive again (Rom. 6:13.)" It is plain, therefore, that the word "dead" in Rom. 6:13 refers to the death state. It is true that it refers here to spiritual death, but its use in describing the state of the sinner is a figurative use of the same expression that is applied to the state of those who are dead physically.

We have the same phrase in Rom. 11:15—"life from the dead" (ek nekron). On this passage Thayer has this: "Zoa ek nekron, life breaking forth from the abode of the dead." Bloomfield gives the following as the sense of the whole verse: "If their *sin*, which occasioned this casting away, has been the means of reconciling the world, by bringing about the death of Christ, what shall the *receiving of them again into the divine favor be* (whenever it shall take place), but so happy a change, both to themselves and to the Gentiles, as may, in a manner, be said to raise the whole world from death to life? Zoe ek nekron, by a figure common to all languages, denotes (as Turretin and Stuart explain) something great and surprising, like what a general resurrection from the dead would be." So, according to Bloomfield, "life from the dead" is life from death.

But it is contended by all the future-kingdom folks that the phrase, "resurrection from the dead" (ek nekron), applies to the righteous and never to the wicked. Their cause depends upon their repudiating the idea that the word "dead" refers to the death state. They tell us that the righteous are raised before the wicked, and are, therefore, raised "out from

among" dead ones. But their contention is not conclusive, even if "ek nekron" should be rendered "out of the dead ones." In the first place, to make "ek" mean *out from among* is stretching that little word too much. Again, before the resurrection, the dead ones are made up of both the righteous and the wicked. Their contention will not allow that the righteous come "out from among" the righteous dead. They do not, then, come "out from among" the dead, but "out from among" only a part of the dead. But "out from among" is not even good English.

Again, granting, for argument's sake, that "from the dead" means "out of dead ones," their contention then does not hold good. We view the field of the dead; they are all there—the righteous, the sinners, the infants, and all irresponsible people. They all arise at once; have they not come out of the dead? They were dead ones, now they are live ones; out of the dead ones came the living ones. The apostles preached a resurrection of both the just and the unjust. (Acts 24:15). In Acts 4:2 "ek nekron" is used in connection with the resurrection of all the dead. The Sadducees were sorely troubled because the apostles "proclaimed in Jesus the resurrection from the dead."

I have never seen any provision, or place, for the resurrection of infants and irresponsible in the future-kingdom theory, nor have I seen any place for such in their future-kingdom. They cannot be rulers, for they have not been tested and proved worthy of such place; the most of them cannot be citizens, for

they are not Jews. Will they be raised before the millennial kingdom begins? If so, what will be their status in that kingdom, or will they be any part of it?

Pointed Paragraphs:

Contrary to all human tendencies, God would have us celebrate the death of Christ instead of his birth. Had he wanted us to celebrate his birth, he would not have left its date in obscurity. A little attention to the history or manner of shepherding in Palestine will convince anyone that December 25 is not the correct date. In the Lord's Supper, we celebrate his death; in observing the Supper on the Lord's day, we celebrate his resurrection. We honor Jesus by following in his steps and by doing his will; we dishonor him and disgrace his cause by celebrating his birth in the way it is usually done.

Abraham did not want Isaac to marry any daughter of the heathen surrounding him; neither did Isaac and Rebekah want their two sons to do so. The marriage relation is so close that no Christian should marry a person whose influence would be hurtful instead of helpful.

THEORY OF TWO RESURRECTIONS CONSIDERED

In a former article it was shown that the word "dead" in the phrase, "resurrection from the dead," sometimes, at least, refers to the death state. People are raised from the dead—that is, the death state. But it is contended by the future-kingdom folks that there will be two resurrections—the righteous to be raised from among the dead, and the rest of the dead will be raised later. They insist that the phrase, "from the dead," shows that some of the dead will be left. But their arguments have never seemed conclusive to me.

It would be hard to get two resurrections more than a thousand years apart out of the following language of the Savior: "Marvel not at this: for the hour cometh, in which all that are in their tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment." (John 5:28, 29.) There is to be an hour, or period, in which all, both good and bad shall come forth from the dead at the call of Jesus. The same thought—that is, that both will be raised at the same time—is presented in Acts 4:1, 2: "And as they spake unto the people, the priests and the captain of the temple and the Sadducees came upon them, being sore troubled because they taught the people, and proclaimed in Jesus the resurrection from the dead." Here we have the phrase, "resurrection from the dead" (ek nekron). The priests and the captain of the temple were Sadducees. The Sadducees

did not believe in the resurrection of anybody. With them death ended all. Are we to believe that they stirred up all this trouble because the apostles taught that the righteous would be raised before he wicked? That point did not concern them, but to preach that the dead would be raised did disturb them. The apostles preached in Jesus a universal resurrection from the dead. "For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive." (I Cor. 15:22.) Before Felix, Paul preached that he had hope toward God that there would be a resurrection both of the just and the unjust. (Acts 24:15.) It was that sort of preaching that so exasperated the Sadducees. Hence, when the apostles at Jerusalem preached that all would be raised from the dead (ek nekron), it infuriated the Sadducees. But the Pharisees believed in a universal resurrection. Paul took advantage of this difference between the Sadducees and Pharisees, when he was brought before the council in Jerusalem, and said: "Brethren, I am a Pharisee, a son of Pharisees: touching the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question." (Acts 23:6.)

The two-resurrectionists seek to make a point on Paul's effort to "attain unto the resurrection from the dead." (Phil. 3:11.) After quoting Phil. 3:10-14, Charles M. Neal says: "To present and emphasize this thought, Paul invents a new word. This word, 'exanastasis,' occurs but this one time in the New Testament. The phrase 'resurrection from the dead/ is translated by Rotherham as 'out-resurrection from among the dead,' and in the Emphatic Diaglott as 'resurrection from among the dead'." It is true that

the word occurs in the New Testament only in this one place. But we become somewhat doubtful of one who quotes as authority the Emphatic Diaglott, a translation that is printed and sold by the Russellites. And surely no one would seriously put Rotherham up against the great body of scholars who gave the American Standard Version.

But to seek to make "exanastasis" mean *out-resurrection from* is to venture beyond the lexicons. Liddell and Scott gives the New Testament meaning as the *resurrection*. Thayer: *a rising up; a rising again; resurrection*. Thus it is seen that Thayer, though himself a premillennialist, gives no support to the idea in defining the word. When a man gives a definition of a word that is not sustained by either of these lexicons, nor by the greatest body of scholars that was ever gathered for any purpose, he puts entirely too much stress upon himself.

It is true that "ek" or "ex" when standing alone as a preposition, usually has the general meaning of "out of"; but when used as a part of a compound word, as in 'exanastasis', it sometimes merely intensifies the meaning of the word to which it is joined, giving the idea of "utterly, entirely." See Thayer and Liddell and Scott. If one has the time and opportunity, he may also examine Winer (page 429) and Robertson's Grammar of the Greek New Testament (pages 562-4, 598). If "ex" adds any meaning to the word here, it merely means that Paul was striving to obtain a complete resurrection, a perfect resurrection—that is, a resurrection to life that is life indeed. In that respect there is a decided difference between the resurrec-

tion of a faithful Christian and a sinner, for a sinner is not raised to real life.

Sometimes the preposition adds nothing to the meaning of the word with which it is compounded— that is, so far as we can see. Take, for illustration, the verb from which we have "exanastasis." It occurs in Mark 12:19 and Luke 20:28—"raised up seed unto his brother." Here we have "ex" joined to the verb; but in the parallel passage in Matt. 22:24, where the meaning is bound to be exactly the same, the preposition "ex" is left off. If adding "ex" to the verb does not change this verb, how can one dogmatically argue that it changes the noun that is derived from the verb? The argument built on "exanastasis" is about as flimsy an argument as one could find. A cause that depends on such arguments cannot have a substantial basis. But a wild theory is often supported by very tame arguments.

Pointed Paragraphs:

One preacher can do very little toward establishing a church in a great city. It is perhaps harder now than ever. We have seen it tried. It would be better to take Antioch as an example. Notice the number of workers that concentrated their efforts on that city. They got results. Paul generally had a group of helpers with him. Together they did work in cities where one man would have failed, or practically so. Ignoring this divine example and putting one man in a city without real help, we have wasted much effort.

CHURCH AGES

When a man tries to sustain a false theory in religion he cannot do so by correct application of the scriptures. He will make false arguments and pervert the scriptures. A striking example of this is seen in the efforts of some to find prophetic symbolisms in the letters to the seven churches in Asia. These letters were written to seven churches in seven cities of Asia Minor, and they are recorded in the second and third chapters of Revelation. Here is what Scofield says in his Bible: "The messages to the seven churches have a fourfold application: (1) Local, to the churches actually addressed; (2) admonitory, to all churches in all time as tests by which they may discern their true spiritual state in the sight of God; (3) personal, in exhortations to him "that hath an ear," and in the promises "to him that overcometh"; (4) prophetic as disclosing seven phases of the spiritual history of the church from, say, A. D. 96 to the end."

Of course, when these men talk about the church they include all that they call branches of the church. They claim that we are now living in the period symbolized by the church at Laodicea. There is not even a hint that there were any prophetic symbolisms in the condition of these churches. Of course they do not claim that the condition of the church at Ephesus was prophetic of a future period—its condition merely portrayed the condition of the churches then. That is absurd, for the six other churches mentioned were not like Ephesus—in fact, there is not a hint that the Ephe-

sus church was like any other church of that day, and yet the theory requires that the condition, of the church at Ephesus correctly represented all the churches of that period. And then the other six churches are said to represent, or symbolize, or forecast the condition of the church at certain periods. The marking off the period that each church is supposed to represent is purely arbitrary. No one can prove, even if the theory were true, that we live in the Laodicean period. But the whole theory is fantastic, absurd, and a reflection on God.

Think what the theory involves. How could a church then determine the character of the whole church during a certain period hundreds of years later? Or did God by direct miraculous power make these churches to be like what he knew the whole church would be at different periods? Or did he by direct power make the periods to be like the churches of Asia? In either case people had to be what God by direct power chose to make them. Where then is there room for freedom of will, or freedom of action? Any one who can believe that each of these churches was a forecast of the whole church at a certain period can believe any foolish, fantastic, absurd thing that the wildest imagination can conceive. He does not have to have any evidence—he just lets his imagination run riot. I would like for some of its advocates to tell me when that notion was hatched out, and by whom.

PHILADELPHIA AND THE HOUR OF TRIAL

Foy E. Wallace, Jr., passes over to me a document which was written in Detroit with a request that I say something about it. The document would fill my page. As much of it has no special bearing on the points sought to be made, I will make liberal and fair quotations from it. The passage commented upon first is Rev. 3:10: "Because thou didst keep the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of trial, that hour which is to come upon the whole world, to try them that dwell upon the earth." I quote:

"The promise. 'The hour of trial' was ahead, but Philadelphia was to be kept from it. Not saved through it, but kept from it. ...

"That Hour. (1) It is the 'hour of trial' with emphasis on 'the'. (2) It is the 'hour of trial' with emphasis on 'trial', for it is 'to try them that dwell upon the earth.' (4) It is yet future; 'to come upon the whole world.' Nothing has since occurred in history filling out this picture. ... (5) the Philadelphia type of saints will escape. . . . Those who keep his word are of the Philadelphia type of saints. The church that is true to the word is a church of the Philadelphian type and can lay claim to this same promise."

John wrote seven letters, dictated by the Lord, to seven churches in Asia; the church at Philadelphia was one of these churches. The Lord made a definite

promise to the church at Philadelphia. Naturally the members of that church would understand that the promise was to them; but that church long ago ceased to exist. And yet we are told that the promise made to those brethren is yet future. If that be so, then that promise was not for those brethren at all! They are all dead; was that the way the Lord was going to keep them from the hour of trial? No, no; according to the foregoing quotation, the promise was not meant for the church at Philadelphia at all, but for the churches of the Philadelphian type! Such juggling with the record is both taking away from and adding to the words of the book. The promise was not made to the "Philadelphian type of saints", but to the church at Philadelphia. It is true that some promises, general in their nature, though not to one individual or group of individuals, are to be enjoyed by all who fulfill the conditions; but certainly the ones to whom the promise is directly made are included in the promise! But, strange to say, according to the foregoing quotation, the church at Philadelphia to whom the promise was made was not included in the promise made directly to them! That promise is yet future, so we are told.

But the implication of the quotation is that the promise was made to the Philadelphian type of churches, and that it is to be fulfilled in "the rapture." And what is it that a person cannot prove, if he is allowed to juggle words to suit his theory? If the hour of trial is yet future, the Lord Kept Philadelphia from it by deferring it till all those saints died. But he conjures up a peculiar method of escape for those saints who long ago died: (7) "The method of escape

is found in such passages as 1 Thes. 4:16, 17. It is often called the rapture, and properly so, from the expression 'caught up,' which rapture means." But would not the saints of Philadelphia escape that supposed three and a half years of tribulation if they should remain in their graves?

I quote again: "Other Designations. Jesus used the term 'that day.' also the term 'tribulation.' Daniel calls it 'a time of trouble' such as is unequalled and never repeated. In Jer. 30:7 it is 'the time of Jacob's trouble; but he shall be saved out of it.' Here is a parallel to the escape of the three Hebrews from the fiery furnace. Those who are 'saved out of it' are distinct from those who are kept from it. John has a vision of a number who 'come out of the great tribulation,' but the Philadelphians are kept from it!"

He affirms that the various terms he names applies to one certain period that is yet to be; but he gives not one word of proof. The terms, "that day," "in that day," "day of trouble," "tribulation," "tribulations," "that hour," are used many times in the Bible, and certainly do not all refer to the same period of time. Why then pick out a term here and there and arbitrarily apply them to one certain time? THE REASON: a certain theory demands it. And if the writer will examine the Greek in Jer. 30:7 and Rev. 3:10, he will find apo, from, in Jeremiah, and ek, out of, in Revelation, which completely reverses the point he seeks to make on the use of prepositions.

Again I quote: "Chronology. . . . The order of some outstanding things foretold is revealed. To get

this order saves confusion. From Jesus' prophecy on the mount (Matt. 24 and 25; Mark 13; Luke 21) avoiding all forced interpretations, we learn 'the tribulation of those days' leads up to the darkening of the sun and moon, the falling of the stars of the heaven, the powers of the heaven being shaken, and the glorious appearing of the Son of man. Note the expression 'immediately after' in Matt. 24:29. Note also Mark 13:24-27. . . even up to the tribulation there are foretold 'wars and rumors of wars,' and 'nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom.' Again, attention is called to the fact that those days of unprecedented tribulation 'shall be shortened.' Obviously they are terminated by the Son of man in connection with his appearing. The times foretold in this connection constitute 'the days of the Son of man.' (see Luke 17:26.) The 'rapture' precedes 'the tribulation of those days,' 'the days of the Son of man.' And the rapture awaits nothing that is foretold."

There are difficulties in the discourse Jesus delivered to the disciples on Olivet; but it is certain that no one will get a correct idea of what was said if he ignores the questions that gave rise to the speech. Jesus was answering questions put to him by the disciples. The disciples had called his attention to the temple and its adornments. Jesus said: "As for these things which ye behold, the days will come, in which there shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." When they had crossed to the mount of Olives, Peter, James, John, and Andrew said to him: "Teacher, when therefore

shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when these things are about to come to pass?" Put yourself in the place of these disciples: would you not understand that everything Jesus said was in answer to those two questions? Would Jesus confuse them by saying a lot of things which they would understand to be in answer to their questions, but were not? In Mark's record we have: "Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when these things are about to be accomplished?" To say that most of the answer Jesus gave related to something about which they had not inquired is to accuse Jesus of not dealing fairly with them. In Matthew's record we have: "Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" For the last clause the marginal reading has, "*Or, the consummation of the age.*" To say that Matthew's report of these questions does not mean the same as the reports of Mark and Luke is to accuse some one of making a false report of the questions.*

It is singular that so many commentators take it for granted that the disciples were, in Matthew's report, asking about the second coming of Christ; but that could not be. Jesus had not taught them anything about his second coming; besides, they had never believed that he would be put to death! The Jews held to the idea that when the Messiah came, he would abide, forever, ruling as a great king in Jerusalem. How then could the disciples have been asking questions about the second coming of Christ, when

*For a full discussion of these questions, see "Doctrinal Discourses" pp. 294-298.

they did not believe he would go away? It is astonishing that commentators have overlooked this plain fact. The disciples referred to his coming in judgment on Jerusalem. The tribulation was the suffering of the Jews when the Romans destroyed their nation and Jerusalem. The temple was utterly destroyed. The Jewish nation ended; darkness and gloom settled down over the people. The fulfillment of what Jesus had said was a sign that he was what he claimed to be—that the Son of man was also the Christ, the Son of God. For the natural phenomena mentioned you get some explanation by reading Isa. 13:1-10.

Pointed Paragraphs:

The treatment Joseph received at home would tend to make him arrogant and overbearing. To serve the purpose God had in view, these traits had to be toned down. A period of slavery, followed by a rather long stay in prison, would reduce his pride and feeling of importance. In both slavery and imprisonment he learned to work under men, and at the same time he learned to manage men. He also learned business principles. A petted son does not have much opportunity to learn any of these useful things. Joseph had to be torn away from his father in order to learn to be useful.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S DREAM

Nebuchadnezzar had a wonderful dream, and required, on penalty of death, that the wise men tell him the dream and its interpretation. None but Daniel could do so. To the king Daniel said: "Thou, O king, sawest, and, behold, a great image. This image, which was mighty, and whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee; and the aspect thereof was terrible. As for this image, its head was of fine gold, its breast and its arms of silver, its belly and its thighs of brass, its legs of iron, its feet part of iron and part of clay. Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon its feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them in pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken in pieces together, and became like chaff of the summer threshing floors; and the wind carried them away, so that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." (Dan. 2:31-35.)

Before we read the interpretation of this dream, let us observe: (1) that Nebuchadnezzar saw the complete image, as if all its parts existed at the same time; (2) that the stone smote the image on the feet; (3) that the whole image from feet to head was broken in pieces and scattered as dust; (4) and that no place was found for them—no place for such parts as composed that image.

The Interpretation—"Thou art the head of gold. And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee; and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth. And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron, for as much as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things; and as iron that crusheth all these, shall it break in pieces and crush ... And in the days of those kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, nor shall the sovereignty thereof be left to another people; but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever. For as much as thou sawest that a stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter." (Verses 36-45.)

This dream and the interpretation have furnished a starting point for many sermons by gospel preachers. Till recently they all contended that the kingdom of this prophecy was set up in Jerusalem on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, and then and there entered upon the work which Daniel said it would accomplish. It is now argued by a few brethren that when Jesus comes again the kingdom of this prophecy will then have its real beginning, and will then destroy the image of Nebuchadnezzar's dream. But is there anything in the interpretation to warrant such a radical change from a century of gospel preaching?

The four world kingdoms represented in the image —Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome—came and

fell in the order mentioned. Yet Nebuchadnezzar saw them in the image, as if all existed at the same time. The stone is represented as breaking in pieces the whole image—that is, the kingdom of God is represented as destroying all of the four world kingdoms. "It broke in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold." In truth, it was an image of world empire, and that was broken in pieces, never to be made whole again. Every attempt at world empire, since Rome, has ended in failure, and will continue to fail.

It is also plainly stated that in the days of these kings—that is, while the image still remained—the God of heaven would set up a kingdom, and that this kingdom would destroy the image. The Roman Empire embodied all that was in the other three kingdoms of the image. So long as Rome existed the image stood. The stone smote the image on the feet, but destroyed every part of the image. Every kingdom represented in that image has ceased to be; the image has been entirely destroyed—not a vestige of it remains. It follows, then, with the force of a demonstration, that the kingdom of God has been set up. Even though it be claimed that another world empire is yet to be, it cannot, by any juggling of words or flight of the imagination, be made a part of the image of Nebuchadnezzar's dream. In that image each kingdom merged into the one following it till Rome; then the stone smote the image and destroyed it. As the kingdom was to be set up during the existence of that image, and as that image has been destroyed, it proves

beyond a doubt that the God of heaven has set up his kingdom.

So far as the interpretation of the dream shows, the kingdom of God was to destroy only the kingdoms of the image; and it could destroy the first three only as they were represented in the Roman Empire. World Empires died with Rome. The principles of the kingdom of Christ have so modified human thinking as to destroy the possibility of world empire.

But we are told that Daniel's language shows that these kingdoms are to be destroyed suddenly, and by violent impact. But it cannot be shown that Daniel's language requires such method of destruction. The kingdom was to grind them to dust. Does that only imply destruction? Besides, the future-kingdom idea is that the kingdom of God will be ushered in in full power; whereas the dream represents it as a stone that destroyed the image and then grew into a mountain that filled the earth. If you still insist that Daniel's language shows that the kingdoms are to be destroyed by violent impact, then I ask you to consider carefully the language of Jer. 1:9, 10: "Then Jehovah put forth his hand, and touched my mouth; and Jehovah said unto me, Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth: see, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to pluck up and to break down and to destroy and to overthrow, to build and to plant." That is as strong language as Daniel uses in describing the work of the kingdom of God; yet we know that Jeremiah destroyed nothing by violent impact. Yet how these future-kingdom advocates would have stressed this language if it had been used to

describe the work of the kingdom instead of the work of Jeremiah! It would be interesting to see them try to show how Dan. 2:44, 45 requires violence, but Jer. 1:9, 10 means "peaceful penetration."

Pointed Paragraphs:

A thing gained through deceit or fraud cannot bring contentment and satisfaction. Jacob never enjoyed any real happiness in possessing the birthright, and the blessings he obtained from Isaac by fraud made him an exile and caused him much worry and distress. One cannot see wherein it was any real satisfaction to him.

We get into trouble when we scheme and plan to help God work out his plans. When God announced, even before Esau and Jacob were born, his purposes concerning these two prospective sons of Isaac and Rebekah, Rebekah should have realized that God would work out his plans in his own way; but she thought she must do some scheming to help God work out his plans. In so doing she lost the company of her beloved son and caused him untold misery.

MILLIGAN ON NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S DREAM

After I wrote my recent article on "Nebuchadnezzar's dream and its interpretation," I found a series of articles on the kingdom, written by Robert Milligan and published in the *Millennial Harbinger* of 1858. That the reader may see that the positions set forth in my article are neither new nor fanciful, I quote some extracts from Bro. Milligan's articles. Concerning the establishment of the kingdom foretold in Daniel's interpretation of the dream, Mr. Milligan says:

The prophet limits the chronology of the event to "The days of these kings." But who are they? When did they reign? What was the beginning, the duration, the end of their administration?

Many writers on prophecy, and even some of our own brethren, for whose opinions we entertain very great respect, refer all this to the future. They suppose by "*these kings*" are meant the ten kingdoms into which the Roman Empire was divided, and which they suppose were symbolized by the ten toes of the image . . . But with all due respect for these good brethren, we are constrained to dissent from such an interpretation of the passage. To us there appear to lie against it many objections, some of which are the following:

1. The notion that the toes of the image were designed to represent the ten fragments of the Western Roman Empire is a mere hypothesis. It may possibly be true; but certain it is that the evidence is wanting . . . But ten toes on one foot would be rather incongruous.

2. But even if it could be satisfactorily shown that the ten toes were designed to represent the fragments of the ten kingdoms that arose out of the Western Empire, it would by no means follow that these are identical with the kings named in the text. The reverse of this is certainly true. The limiting adjective, "*these*," implies that

the subject to which it refers had been clearly designated ... But the only kings fairly implied in the Whole connection are those of the four universal monarchies . . .

From these premises we infer that the phrase, "*these kings*," has no reference to the monarchs of modern Europe. Nor does it, as some have supposed, refer exclusively to the Caesars. These are not in this connection made the subject of a distinct prophecy. The phrase evidently refers to all the rulers of the four universal monarchies, and comprehends the kings of Babylon, and Persia, and Macedonia, as well as those of Rome.

The meaning of this passage, then, is simply this: that at some epoch during the lifetime of that human monster, or between the time of Nebuchadnezzar and the fall of the Roman Empire in the year of Christ 476, the God of heaven would set up a kingdom in the world.

After some discussion of the events of the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, Brother Milligan says:

According, then, to the testimony of Peter, Jesus Christ was, on the day of Pentecost, seated on the throne of David, not in Jerusalem, as the Jews anticipated, but in heaven at the right hand of God. He was exalted to the rank and dignity of a Prince as well as a Savior. And hence, for the first time in the history of the world, those who gladly received his word were commanded to be baptized in *the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of their sins*.

In his second article Brother Milligan quotes Nebuchadnezzar's dream and Daniel's interpretation thereof, and then comments as follows:

The image was then smitten upon the feet. The wound was mortal. The tyrant that had governed the world from the days of Nebuchadnezzar till that hour was slain. His spirit was subdued, and his whole physical organization, consisting of gold, and silver, and brass, and iron, and clay, was then broken into fragments.

Since that time Charlemagne, Napoleon, and many others, have attempted to revive the spirit and reunite the scattered fragments of this fallen image. But all such attempts have been in vain ... It is true, the spirit of war still exists: blood is often shed for the most trivial causes.

But let any prince or potentate now attempt to revive the spirit of this fallen image; let him attempt, like Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus, Alexander, and Caesar, to subdue the world, and to govern it on the principle that "might makes right;" and if not treated as a maniac by his own subjects, he will, at least, find arrayed against him the combined powers of Christendom.

In view of what happened to the Kaiser when he tried to conquer the world, the last statement of Brother Milligan looks almost like prophecy. But it was not a prophecy, but merely a statement based on Daniel's interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream.

I invite the future-kingdom advocates to consider the following:

1. The image, as it stood before Nebuchadnezzar, represented four world empires. That is, of course, admitted.

2. The kingdom of God was to be set up while that image stood, and was to destroy the image. On that point no one can mistake what Daniel says.

3. That image has been destroyed—there has not been a world empire since the days of Rome.

4. It is certain, therefore, that the kingdom of God has been established, and that the principles of that kingdom have broken down and destroyed world empires.

It is a pity that a man will become so obsessed with a speculative idea as to say that the image has been destroyed, but the kingdom of God had nothing to do with its destruction. To me it looks like a flat denial of what Daniel says.

A LEADING DOCTRINE OF THIS CURRENT REFORMATION

When I was a young man, the gospel preachers who were then active in preaching the ancient gospel preached often on the establishment of the kingdom. As I recall those sermons, they usually began with the dream of Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel's interpretation thereof, as recorded in the second chapter of Daniel. It was argued that the kingdom foretold in verse 44 began on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. That was one position on which there was no disagreement among "Christians only" in those days. It is true that there had been some speculations to the contrary in the days of Alexander Campbell. One Dr. John Thomas was a leading spirit in that agitation. It was contended that the restoration of the Israelites to a kingdom of their own in Palestine was the hope—the Elpis—of Israel. While we do not recognize Mr. Campbell as authority in matters of faith, we do recognize him as a teacher of great ability. It will do us good to read carefully some things Mr. Campbell wrote on the kingdom question. Note how the following fits into the present agitation on this question:

I will receive it as a favor from any person, to be informed of any people or preacher, on this continent or in the European world, that clearly or definitely stated or announced, in unequivocal affirmation, that the Christian church did not commence, and, consequently, was never organized, till the first Pentecost after the crucifixion, death, burial, resurrection, ascension, and glorification of the Lord Jesus Christ; that then placed upon the throne of David, and upon the throne of God, he commenced his

reign *personally* in heaven and *spiritually* upon the earth, by the mission of the Holy Spirit to his apostles, and through them to his church, which is now his natural and earthly body—the fullness, or manhood development, of Him who fills all things, in all places, with life, and beauty, and happiness."

The foregoing is taken from the Millennial Harbinger of February, 1852. In a footnote to the foregoing quotation we have the following from Mr. Campbell:

To prevent misconception of this allusion to the throne of David, I simply remark for the present, to be developed, probably more fully again, that the *throne of David* was, in fact, the *earthly throne of God*, in the midst of ancient Israel. David was his viceroy—that is, *the Lord's anointed*—a fact not well understood by the church, and still less by some untaught and unteachable dogmatists of the present day. It was necessary to the plans of Jehovah, which are all sublimely grand and wonderful, that he should have two thrones—one on earth and one in heaven—for a time occupied one above, by himself, and one below, by his viceregent, called or constituted by him; and therefore his solemn oath or covenant with David, that he would raise out of his person, in fullness of time, one that would occupy both thrones. Hence, said the inspired bard of Israel, "Jehovah said to my Jehovah, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thy foes thy footstool." It is beautifully in accordance with this fact that Mary the Virgin was the last bud on the tree of David which could blossom and fructify, and bring forth a representative of David. So that, if Jesus be not the heir of David's throne, there never can be one born, and God's covenant has failed. This is a death blow to Jewish infidelity, if their eyes were not closed and their ears sealed. But Jesus was the Son of David, and born to be a King, as he told Caesar's representative. On the throne of David, as King of kings, he now sits, and also on the throne of God; for he has all crowns upon his head, and affirms that all authority in heaven and on earth is given him.

Any one who desires to peruse the most conceited, consequential, and dogmatical treatises, based upon hallucination, and parody of the words "Elpis Israel," will, if he have a dollar to throw away, have a demonstration of a disease called in Kentucky "the *big head*," probably unequaled in this century; making the *hope of Israel*—indeed,

the hope of the gospel in full development—to consist in raising up again a throne of David in Palestine in Jerusalem; as if that throne had been vacant now for eighteen hundred years, or as if Jesus Christ would remove his throne out of the heavenly Jerusalem, to rebuild and locate it in old Jerusalem, and there to aggrandize the empire of the universe! But this only in passing, as one of the specimens of the power of the love of notoriety or of the marvelous, in wrecking and bewildering the human mind. We regard this development of the passion for notoriety as one of the most admonitory dispensations in our immediate circle of observation. It has made a man, that might have been useful, worthless to himself, worthless to 'his friends, and worse than worthless to the world.

In the January Harbinger (1851) Mr. Campbell reports a sermon which he preached at Bloomington, Ind., from which I glean the following excerpts:

"On Saturday night our subject was the promised advocacy of the Spirit, after the return and coronation of the Messiah in heaven; the commencement of his kingdom, and the peculiarities of the Christian dispensation, in contrast with the patriarchal and Jewish institutions. We gave reasons why Christianity, or the kingdom of Christ, could not be developed till he received all authority in heaven and earth—till he received the kingdom and government of the universe." "The kingdom has come, and the king has been on the throne of David now more than eighteen hundred years: still, myriads are yet praying, 'Thy kingdom come!'" "Thus Jesus, after he had expiated our sins on earth, entered heaven, and basing his intercession, *as our high priest*, upon his sacrifice, he sat down a priest upon his throne, 'after the order of Melchizedek;' a high priest forever, 'according to the power of an endless life.' This, as set forth, is a leading doctrine of this current reformation ... It is pregnant with great revolutionizing and regenerating principles."

If Jesus is not now our anointed Prophet, Priest, and King, he is not yet the Christ. Do you believe Jesus to be the Christ now, or the Christ that is yet to be?

IS THE CHURCH THE KINGDOM?

Bro. Ira C. Moore, in F. F. of June 17, (190?) says "No." He reasons that because these two words are from Greek words of different meanings, and because the two words themselves have no meaning in common, therefore they can not apply to the same thing. He says the meaning of a word may be substituted by the word and make sense, and refers to our use of this principle in reference to baptism and sprinkling. The principle is true in the main, but Bro. Moore's reasoning from it is as fallacious as can be. No one claims that the words kingdom and church mean the same. To describe or define a specific act words must of necessity be synonymous, yet words very different in meaning may be applied to the same person or thing, owing to the different relations that a person or thing sustains to the world. Man, husband, father, citizen, author, and president are words very different in their meanings, yet all of them apply to one person Theodore Roosevelt. In the different positions of life he occupies the relation that each of these words indicates. Because all these words are appropriately applied to him does that mean that you can take a sentence in which one of them is used and replace it with either of the words and make sense. "I, Theodore Roosevelt, husband, or author, or father of the United States, etc. How is that? "Nonsense," did you say? Just so.

Apostle, Author, Shepherd, Bishop, Bread of Life,

Bridegroom, Star, Captain, Christ, Corner Stone, Counselor, Governor, Head of the Church, High Priest, King, Master, Mediator, Prophet, Physician, and a number of other names and designations apply to one Being yet they differ in meaning. In different relations different words apply to Him. Just so with the church. It is called body, family, temple, house, kingdom, etc. Viewing it from different standpoints, you use different scripture words. Being "called out," it is the church, as an organization, it is the body of Christ; as a government, having Christ as its King; it is the kingdom of Christ.

This is enough—you see the point.

Pointed Paragraphs:

People spend much time and energy in worrying about things that are entirely in the hands of God. We worry about the weather, and we worry about how God will work out his plans in the final windup of all earthly matters. If we believe in God and in Christ, why worry?

Wherein God invites us to trust him, he will not betray us. To doubt him is sin. He is not slack concerning his promises. He rewards abundantly those who put their trust in him—those who love him serve him.

If by faith we could see the Lord as he is and could realize our own weakness and dependence upon him, all the praise and adulation that men could heap upon us would seem empty and vain. To know that our Lord looked upon us with favor would be sufficient.

THIS GOVERNMENT AND JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES

Dear Brother Whiteside:

It seems to me that we ought not to oppose any move upon the part of the government to respect the conscience of sincere individuals. There are too many people in this country who would like to see us stop preaching for us to help further any movement which would deny the right to preach to certain religious groups.

There have been efforts in some cities to make it illegal for the "Jehovah's Witnesses" to distribute their literature or to sell it on the streets. These, in so far as they have come to my attention, have been declared unconstitutional. For this I am thankful, for I know once such laws are placed upon the books that they will be used by people against us in certain sections of the country. I have met people who would have invoked legal aid, if they had the power to do so, to prevent us from preaching in certain places by means of the tract. It seems to me that laws which might be passed and used against "Jehovah's Witnesses" could be easily used in the hands of vested interests and tricky lawyers to rob the church of Christ of the liberty of free speech.

Then, too, it would be easy for an intense patriot to label the teachings of the New Testament, and thus of the church of Christ, as subversive. They could point out that the New Testament teaches that—

1. Christians are kings and priests. (Rev. 1:6.)
2. That we are endeavoring to establish a kingdom in the United States which is world-wide in its mission and which acknowledges as its supreme ruler Jesus Christ instead of Washington.
3. That this kingdom has been antagonistic, to say the least, to some governments of the past. (Dan. 2:44.)
4. That members of this kingdom believe that it was prophesied by Isaiah, who said that, among other things, its members would beat their swords into plowshares and cease to learn the ways of war. (Isa. 2:2-4.)

5. That they are not allowed to take vengeance. (Rom. 12:19.) From this they could draw conclusions which would lead many people to take steps to curtail our religious freedom.

For these reasons, if for no other, it seems to me that your article in the Gospel Advocate for March 26, 1942, was unnecessary. It helps encourage a movement which could easily result in opposition to the gospel.

Of course I do not accept the peculiar doctrines of the "Jehovah's Witnesses." I think we ought to teach them, among other things, Paul's teaching concerning the proper attitude to civil powers. (Rom. 13:1.)—James D. Bales.

Brother Bales surely has not thought this thing through. As I see it, if "Jehovah's Witnesses" are to be allowed unmolested to distribute their literature of opposition to all human governments, neither should a rabid German propagandist be molested in this country.

I made no effort to "oppose any move on the part of the government to respect the conscience" of any citizen of this government. So far the government has been as considerate as could be expected. But suppose a citizen of Germany, one wholly loyal to his government, were doing propaganda work on the streets of our cities, he would certainly be conscientiously opposed to doing military service for this government. Would Brother Bales think this government should so respect his conscience as to let him go on with his subversive activities? He is an individual, and he has a conscience, and he would certainly be sincere in his devotion to his government. Brother Bales makes no exceptions when he speaks of "the conscience of sincere individuals.' ' Do you say he was speaking of citizens of this government? If so, he leaves "'Jehovah's Wit-

nesses" out, they themselves being witnesses, as a glance at their teaching will show.

Both Russell and Rutherford taught that "the times of the Gentiles," of which the Bible speaks, is the time in which God permitted the Gentiles to rule in the governments of the earth. Their language is too plain to admit of any misunderstanding. Mr. Russell taught that the saints should be submissive to Gentile governments up to the close of the times of the Gentiles, or to the limit of their right to rule. With these people the times of the Gentiles began "when the diadem was taken from Zedekiah," and lasted till A. D. 1914. In the 1912 edition of *The Time Is at Hand*, Vol. 2, ("copyright 1889"), Mr. Russell says: "In this chapter we present the Bible evidence proving that the full end of the times of the Gentiles—i. e., the full end of their lease of dominion—will be reached in A. D. 1914; and that date will be the farthest limit of the rule of imperfect men." (Pages 76, 77.) "So, then, Gentile rule had a beginning, will last for a *fixed time*, and will end at the time appointed." (Page 78.) During the times of the Gentiles the saints were to "render to them due respect and obedience," but "to keep separate from the kingdoms of this world as strangers, pilgrims, and foreigners." That eliminates them from citizenship in any government of the world, in so far as one can eliminate himself. "Foreigners" are not citizens. And their submission to Gentile governments was to end when the times of the Gentiles ended, when this new order would enter in full force. In the "Finished Mystery," published in 1917, we have this: "Their united testimony is that the times of the Gentiles have

expired, the reign of Christ has begun, all earthly potentates—civil, social, ecclesiastical, and financial— must give way to the new order of things, and will not give way peaceably, but must be ejected." (Page 231.) This volume was written and published after Russell's death. After all the date setting for the end of Gentile governments, we have this: "There is evidence that the establishments of the kingdom in Palestine will probably be in 1925, ten years later than we once calculated." ("Finished Mystery," page 128.)

In "Our Lord's return" Rutherford says: "The word 'world' means the social and political order or rule governing the people." (Page 35.) "The end of the Gentile rule, therefore, would mark necessarily the legal end of the present order; therefore, the end of the world"—that is, the end of the "social and political order or rule governing the people." (Page 37.) "This does not mean the end of trouble, but it does mean, according to Jesus' words, that the old world legally ended in 1914." ("Millions Now Living Will Never Die," page 19.) Hence, according to Rutherford, no government now has any right to exist; they are all usurpers and in rebellion against the world's rightful ruler. Who is the rightful ruler? In passages too numerous to quote they tell us that Christ would be the universal king when the times of the Gentiles ended in 1914. But who is the Christ of Rutherford? "The Christ consists of Jesus glorified, the head, and the members of his body, which constitute the church." (Page 76.) Russell taught the same. The church and Jesus constitute the Christ, and they are now the rightful rulers of the world; no

other government has any right to exist. That is their teaching. They, therefore, claim to owe no allegiance to any human government, but are opposed to all human governments. If any of our brethren who are conscientious objectors hold to positions similar to the foregoing, then they should have registered as aliens, as should all followers of Rutherford.

At the risk of making this too long, I wish to notice by number the items listed by Brother Bales.

1. Read the American Standard Version on Rev. 1:6, then look at the Greek. "Kingdom," not "kings."

2. I am not endeavoring to establish a kingdom in the United States.

3. I know not what Brother Bales means by "antagonistic"; that is a strong word.

4. We have not space here to discuss this passage. (Isa. 2:2-4) but trust to do so later.

5. No individual is allowed to take vengeance; even this government forbids that. God takes vengeance through his appointed channel, the human government.

Pointed Paragraphs:

Israel fell because of its own internal corruption, and so has many another nation fallen. That is the greatest danger facing our nation today. When God is ruled out of the educational, social, and business life of a nation all sorts of corruption follows, and corruption means decay and death.

THE NEW TESTAMENT WORD FLESH

In the New Testament the word *flesh* does not always have the same significance. Sometimes it refers to our material bodies, and sometimes to the bodies of other living things. (I Cor. 15:39.) It sometimes refers to that state or condition in which the gratifying of the appetites and passions of our bodies is our chief concern—strictly a worldly life. (Romans 7:5, 8:6-9.) It is to mind the flesh—a contrast with a spiritual life. And some times the word *flesh* refers to a race or nation, as distinguished from another race or nation. Paul speaks of the Jews as "my flesh". (Rom. 11:14.) "As concerning the flesh", Christ was of the fathers of the Jewish race—that is, as to his flesh he was a Jew. After stating that Christ died for all, Paul adds, "Wherefore we henceforth know no man after the flesh: even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now know him so no more." In Christ there are no fleshly distinctions—no race discriminations. "For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek: for the same Lord is Lord of All-" (Rom. 10:12.) And as Christ is the savior of both Jew and Gentile, and is Lord of all—king over all, we can no longer regard him as a Jew—we no longer think of him as a Jew, or in any way identified with fleshly Israel. Yet the future Kingdom advocates still identify him with fleshly Israel and speak of him as "Israel's Christ," "Israel's Messiah," "Israel's King." They encourage the Jew to glory in the fact that he is a Jew. They would have the Jew to believe

that the Jewish nation is even yet God's chosen people, a nation with glorious future, exalted above all others subservient to them. But not so with Paul.

Some of the early professed Christians gloried in the Jewish nation with all its traditions and every thing Jewish, and tried to bind these on Gentile Christians. Concerning their attitude and his own ideal Paul said, "For not even they who receive circumcision do themselves keep the law; but they desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh. But far be it from me to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world hath been crucified unto me, and I unto the world. For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. And as many as shall walk by this rule, peace be upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God." (Gal. 6:13-16.) These Judaizers gloried in the flesh, gloried in the fact that they were Jews: and they were prototypes of those who now encourage the Jews to glory in the fact that they are Jews; but Paul gloried only in the cross of Christ, and pronounced peace upon all who followed his rule. Disturbance and strife followed those ancient Judaizing preachers, as it does those today who glory in the modern version of that nation. The Judaizers did so much harm in the churches of Galatia where Paul had done so much labor, that it so stirred Paul's feelings that he said, "I would that they that unsettle you would even go beyond circumcision," or as the marginal reading has, "*Greek, mutilate themselves.*" (Gal. 5:12.) Concerning this same class of men, he said to the Philippians, "beware of the dogs, beware of the evil workers,

beware of the concision," and then adds, "for we are the circumcision, who worship by the Spirit of God, and glory in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." The context shows plainly that Paul had no confidence in his Jewish flesh—no confidence in the fact that he was a Jew, even though he had more grounds for such confidence than did the Judaizing disturbers. ". . . if any other man thinketh to have confidence in the flesh, I yet more." And then Paul gives the grounds on which he might, if it were worth anything, have more confidence in the flesh than his Judaizing enemies: "circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of Hebrews." In his fleshly relations he had all the advantages that any Jew could have had. "Howbeit what things were gain to me, these have I counted loss for Christ. Yet verily, I count all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but refuse, that I may gain Christ, and be found in him." (Read Phil. 3:2-11.) Paul gave up his fleshly connection and all that pertained to it, as refuse, or dung, that he might gain Christ; he could not gain Christ and justification by faith in him without so doing. And yet all over this country, in the press, in the pulpit and over the radio, men are teaching that to the Jew belongs the glory of that supposed kingdom. In that kingdom only the Jews will be citizens; other people will be subservient to them, and will have to come to the Jews for favors! That really teaches the Jew to have confidence in the flesh—to glory in the fact that he is a Jew. It cannot develop in him a spirit of humility,

and therefore hinders his conversion. He must, as Paul did, give all that up, or he can never gain Christ.

Recently I heard David L. Cooper, who, Dr. Weber said, is the greatest living Bible scholar, answer some questions in a radio speech. In giving answer to a question as to the setting up of the kingdom, he said that the spiritual kingdom which John announced as at hand was set up on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ, but that when Christ returns to earth he will set up his visible kingdom, and that there would be no peace on the earth till that was done. In answering another question he said that Christ will not come till national Israel confess their national sin of rejecting him. If this last statement is true, then the coming of Christ is not imminent, but likely it is far in the future, for there are no signs now that the Jews will ever make such a confession. And if Cooper is right the Jews have the peace of the world in their keeping; for according to him the peace of the world depends on Christ's second coming, and his coming depends on the conversion of the Jews. So Christ's second coming is not imminent, and the Jews hold the destiny of the world in their hands! And I see no chance for the Jews to act nationally in anything— how can they?

Pointed Paragraphs:

Here is one lesson that Israel never did learn, nor has the world yet learned it: "O Jehovah, I know that the way of man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." (Jer. 10:23.)

FUTURE-KINGDOM DOCTRINES

A brother in Tennessee wants to know the difference, if any, between the church and the kingdom of Christ. A brother in Florida writes an article about long enough to fill my page, seeking to prove that the prophets foretold a kingdom yet future. Occasionally a brother over in Arkansas has written me along the same lines. The scheme argued by these two brethren is along the same lines argued by other future-kingdom advocates.

In its broadest sense the church is that body of people who have been called out of sin into the service of Christ. As Jesus rules over this body of people, it is his kingdom.

"Now when John heard in the prison the works of Christ, he sent his disciples, and said unto him, art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?" In similar fashion let us ask, Is Christianity the scheme of redemption that was to come, or look we for another? The future-kingdom advocates have answered, No, we must look for another. On that point they speak in no uncertain terms. It is argued that, though Jesus came to establish his kingdom in Jerusalem and to deliver the Jews from oppression, they rejected him, and he postponed the establishment of his kingdom till the time of his second coming. On this assumption their use of the prophecies is a puzzle. If the prophecies foretold the establishment of his kingdom at his first coming, then they did not fore-(177)

tell its establishment at his second coming; and the future-kingdom advocates discredit the prophets by seeking to make it appear that their prophecies can be shifted from one period to another. And yet they have the audacity to tell us that if things do not work out according to their theory, no dependence can be placed in what the prophets say. Well, half of their theory has failed—the kingdom was not established, we are told, at his first coming! Now they must shift the prophecies to some future date.

Arthur Pink represents F. W. Grant as saying, in the "Numerical Bible," that Matthew shows, that because Israel rejected Christ, the kingdom of heaven would be taken from them, "and assume the mystery form in which it was unknown to the prophets of Israel." (page 2). Again (p. 13) Pink says, "But the Old Testament *knows nothing whatsoever of Christianity!*" All future-kingdom advocates from whom I quote hold this same idea. In fact their theory makes it necessary for them to deny that any Old Testament promise or prophecy referred to the scheme of redemption preached by the apostles. In the Word and Work (January 1945) J. Edward Boyd says, "The prophets had clearly seen and foretold the kingdom gloriously triumphant, all opposition crushed, universal in its sway; but this present aspect of the kingdom, the church, although in the mind of God all along, they had not been permitted to see."

It is a well known fact that the Jews expected the old kingdom to be restored and enlarged with the Messiah on the throne in Jerusalem; and R. H. Boll says, "Their expectations and conceptions of the king

and kingdom had their origin in these Old Testament prophecies." (Kingdom of God, p. 25.) "They saw in him that promised Coming One of David's line who would free his nation from the Gentile's yoke and reign over the house of Jacob, and through it over all the nations of the earth. For so it was promised." (p. 26). "The Old Testament prophecies and promises of the kingdom were the theme of our preceding studies By such predictions as those was the kingdom-hope of Israel created; and that most justly and nationally. When John the Baptist lifted up his voice in the wilderness of Judea and announced 'the kingdom at hand' he used a phraseology which was already common and current among the Jews, and which was perfectly understood by all." Read that again. If the phrase "the kingdom of heaven" was "common and current among the Jews," it was a phrase of their own invention, for no Old Testament prophecy contains the phrase. Matt. 3:2 is the first place it occurs in the Bible. Again (p. 34): "But if the Jewish expectations had been utterly wrong (which, as we have seen in our former articles, was not the case), even then a sense of justice would suggest that God would not have left the people under such misapprehension without a clear protest and correction." Read that again. Does he mean to say, that if God announced a kingdom different from what the Jews expected without telling them so, he did not have a proper sense of justice? Or does he mean that his own sense of justice would suggest that God should have made the explanation suggested? In either case, he crosses himself up; for he says that Jesus began in Matthew thirteen to talk about the

mystery form of the kingdom. But Jesus did not give any hint, that as the Jews had rejected him, the kingdom they expected was now postponed and an entirely new sort of kingdom would be presented. And strange to say, he kept on using the term "kingdom of heaven," without telling them he was now using the term in an entirely new sense. In fact the Jewish idea remained with the disciples up to the ascension of Christ. Now, what about that sense of justice?

AT HAND:—John the Baptist preached, "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." (Matt. 3:2). Jesus preached, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand." (Mark 1:14, 15). This plain language gives the future kingdom advocates a lot of trouble. According to John R. Rice, they soon quit preaching "the kingdom at hand." He presents this question: "Is there a single time after tenth chapter of Matthew . . . that they preached that the kingdom of heaven is at hand? I say it isn't there." Again, "After Jesus was rejected definitely by the nation, the kingdom was no longer at hand." He argues that the kingdom was postponed till the second coming of Christ. But he overlooked what Jesus told the seventy to preach. (Luke 10:1-11). Verse 9: "The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you." Verse 11: "nevertheless know this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh." This preaching was done during the last year of Christ's personal ministry. So what Rice says "isn't there," is there; and he would have seen it if he had been looking for truth instead of proof to sustain a theory.

The following sentence from Brother R. H. Boll

shows that he realized the difficulty and tried to hedge against it: "If it be felt a difficulty that the kingdom, though announced as 'at hand', has never yet appeared, we shall find an explanation unforced and natural, and one which will cast no reflection on the truth and goodness of God." (K. p. 34). That statement shows clearly that he realized some explanation was needed to keep his theory from casting reflection on the truth and goodness of God; but it seems to *me* that his attempt at an "unforced and natural" explanation helps not at all. Hear him: "Since the kingdom promise was national, the preparatory repentance must of course also be national: the rulers and the rank and file of the people to all of whom the kingdom was dear, must now sincerely turn and return to God." Passing by his assertion that "the kingdom promise was national," I call attention to the "national repentance" idea. No where is there even a hint that John and Jesus told the people that the establishment of the kingdom depended on "national repentance." Neither said, "The time is fulfilled and the kingdom is at hand, provided the nation repents; otherwise it will be postponed to some future time." But not a word about national repentance, not a word about national rejection and its results, not a word about postponing the kingdom; and yet in the absence of any such warning, we are told that the kingdom was postponed Now, what about that sense of justice? Quoting again: "The announcement of the kingdom thus became the basis of the call to repentance." One motive to cause them to repent was the promised kingdom. Vast multitudes were moved by that promise to repent and be baptized. (Mark 1:5; John 4:1, 2). Multitudes

did as commanded; and yet according to the future kingdom advocates none of them received what was promised of them. It seems to me that the explanation reflects seriously on their proposition, and really charges that God did not make good on his promises. The explanation does not explain. What about that sense of justice?

Paul preached the gospel to Jews and Gentiles without distinction. Boll says this was a terrible perplexity to all believing Jews. He adds: "That the Gentiles were to be blessed in Messianic days was no mystery; *that* had been previously revealed. But the observant reader of the prophets will notice that it is always *after* the national restoration and exaltation of Israel, and always through restored Israel and in subservience to Israel, that the Gentiles were to be blessed." But why quote more.

For a long time I have been preaching that all that the prophets said about a plan of human redemption is fulfilled in the plan of salvation preached by Christ and his apostles and is recorded in the New Testament. I have offered to affirm this proposition: **THE PLAN OF SALVATION SET FORTH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT IS THE SCHEME OF HUMAN REDEMPTION FORETOLD BY THE PROPHETS**; or, for *foretold by the prophets* substitute *foretold in promise and prophecy*. Here is a fair proposition that covers every point involved in the discussion of the future-kingdom theory. When it is proved to be true, then the whole future-kingdom theory is proved to be false. Why put in time showing that the various phases of the theory are false when one proposition

fully established proves the whole theory false? Why show that their use of this prophecy and that prophecy is wrong when you can with even more ease show that the New Testament contradicts their use of the prophecies?

Before giving the proof of the correctness of my proposition I wish to mention another matter. Perhaps a few personal words will not be out of place. When I was in the Nashville Bible School out on Spruce street, I had a family—my wife and two children. We had very little money, but we managed by much self-denial to pay rent on a little house, to buy enough groceries to keep us alive, and to pay every dollar of tuition. My youngest brother was with me, and he paid his part of board and rent, and his tuition. Some of the able bodied boys (students) paid neither board nor tuition.

During those days Brother R. H. Boll and I became good friends, and continued to be so for years. He played the mandolin and his pal Robert Mahan played the guitar. Frequently they would come to our little home and entertain us with music. We enjoyed their music, and was glad for them to come. I liked the two Roberts, but became more intimate with Robert Boll. Some years later he began to write for the Gospel Advocate, but a break came between him and the Advocate over what the Advocate called his "speculating about unfulfilled prophecies." Brother Boll started up his Word and Work, but I did not see many copies of it. There continued to be references to Boll's "speculating about unfulfilled prophecies." I remember distinctly that I thought, "Well, if speculating about *un-*

fulfilled prophecies is all that is the matter with him, why worry? What he said about unfulfilled prophecies might be as near right as what any body else said. No one could be sure about an *unfulfilled* prophecy. So why the fuss? You cannot imagine my surprise when I began to study his booklets to see what he did say. I found that "speculating about unfulfilled prophecies" was not what was the matter with him at all. With him the land promise to the Jews is yet to be realized, the Jews are yet to return to Palestine, the kingdom of Daniel 2:44 has not yet been set up, that Christ has not been seated on David's throne. To say that his teaching is speculation about unfulfilled prophecy is to concede the point. If his teaching that the prophecies concerning the throne of David are yet unfulfilled is speculating about *unfulfilled prophecy*, then Christ is not yet on David's throne. If he is on David's throne, then Boll is misapplying prophecy instead of speculating about unfulfilled prophecy. His trouble is speculating about fulfilled prophecy—making prophecies that have been fulfilled apply to some imaginary future scheme of things. Speculating about unfulfilled prophecy indeed! You have an argument with him about prophecies that you believe have been fulfilled, and he says they are yet to be fulfilled; and then you virtually give up your contention by calling it an argument about unfulfilled prophecy! It makes the heart sick. What unfulfilled prophecies has Boll been speculating about? When a man seeks to prove by the prophets that the Jews are yet to be restored to Palestine, that Christ is yet to be placed on David's throne, that the new covenant is yet to be established, that Christ is to be a world ruler with the Jews as

citizens of his kingdom and all others as serfs, that the Gentiles were to be blessed only through restored Israel and in subservience to Israel, that Christ is now seeking to convert and train only enough people to supply the needed number of rulers for a future kingdom, is he speculating about unfulfilled prophecy? It seems to me that Boll does very little speculating about unfulfilled prophecy compared with his use of prophecies that have been fulfilled. How can intelligent people be so dense?

In the early part of 1925 Brother C. R. Nichol and I made the first real attempt that was made to review Brother Boll's teaching. We worked together, and no two men ever tried harder to understand exactly what another man had written. And yet some people, who should have known better, said we misrepresented Brother Boll and did much to hinder the effectiveness of our work. An example: A few brethren were talking together on the sidewalk in Nashville. An aged preacher of considerable ability and fame charged that we misrepresented Brother Boll, and was very caustic in his remarks. One of the group, a friend of ours, said: "Did you ever read their review?" Critic: "No, no; I never read it." Friend: "Well, did you read what Boll said?" Critic: "No, no, I never read it." Friend: "Well, you are not in a position to say anything about it." And that ended the conversation.

No, we did not misrepresent Brother Boll. But herein is a peculiar thing. Many who said we misrepresented Boll said they did not believe his theories. If so, then they believed he misrepresented the Bible—misrepresented God; and yet in the estimation of some

of them he was a very godly and pious man, even though he did misrepresent God. But they fancied that we misrepresented Brother Boll, we greatly sinned! Can you beat it? I can honestly claim that we were as sincere and honest in dealing with Brother Boll's writings as his most devoted friends can claim honesty and sincerity for him in his dealings with the inspired writings.

One of the strangest, if not the zaniest things in all this controversy is that some brethren not only misrepresent themselves, but actually contradict themselves. An example out of many: A written discussion was had with Brother Boll in which Brother Boll contended that the land promise to Abraham is yet unfulfilled, that the prophecies concerning the seating of Christ on David's throne are unfulfilled, and so on. Then that debate was published in a book form with the title, "A Debate About Unfulfilled Prophecy!" And thus unwittingly the whole issue was surrendered, virtually saying to Brother Boll, "You are right; the prophecies we have been debating about are unfulfilled." Can you top that?

Pointed Paragraphs:

If you are inclined to think that denominations are the branches Jesus spoke of, a little reflection will show you how impossible that is. He meant individuals, not denominations. And the diversity among the denominations also shows that they are not branches of the vine. No one ever saw a vine with branches so different as are the denominations. They are not alike, and they bear different kinds of fruit. It is impossible for them to be natural branches of the same vine.

A PROPOSITION AND ITS PROOF

THE PROPOSITION: The plan of Salvation preached by Christ and his apostles is the scheme of redemption foretold in promise and prophecy.

This proposition needs no defining. I am aware of the fact that some future-kingdom advocates do not go so far as to say that none of the prophecies referred Christianity; but the ones from whom I quoted in the preceding article, as well as many others, boldly teach that Christianity is unknown to the prophets. In so arguing they commit themselves to the fact that only one scheme of redemption was foretold by the prophets. On this point we agree. Hence, to prove that Christianity was foretold by the prophets is to eliminate any other scheme yet to be. In establishing my proposition I shall rely solely on what is said in the New Testament, for Jesus and his inspired representatives are the infallible interpreters of the prophets.

They tell us that Jesus, in Matt. 13, began to set forth a new plan, the plan of which the prophets said nothing; yet in his speech Jesus said: "But blessed are your eyes, for they see; and your ears, for they hear. For verily I say unto you, that many prophets and righteous men desired to see the things which ye see and saw them not; and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not." (Matt. 13:16, 17.) Now how could these prophets and righteous men have desired to see and to hear what these disciples were then seeing and hearing if it had never been revealed to them that such things would be?

Late in the day on which Jesus arose from the dead two of his disciples went out to Emmaus. They knew that the body of Jesus was missing, but it seems that they did not know he had been seen alive. Along the way Jesus joined them, but they did not recognize him. They related to him what they knew of recent events, and added: "But we hoped that it was he who should redeem Israel." (Luke 24:21.) They had hoped for freedom from Rome—redemption for the nation from Roman rule. These are the opening words of a speech that Jesus made to them: "O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken!" (verse 25). Does not that virtually say that they, in thinking the prophets spoke of political deliverance, had not really believed what Moses and the prophets had foretold? They had believed that Jesus would give them an earthly kingdom; they had not believed what Moses and the prophets had foretold. They needed a better understanding of Moses and the prophets. "And beginning from Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." If we had that speech!

In the great commission Jesus commanded the apostles to make disciples of all the nations—to preach the gospel to the whole creation. This was a demand for world-wide evangelism, regardless of race or nationality. Had such evangelism been foretold by the prophets? What saith the Lord? In Luke's account of this commission he quotes Jesus as saying: "Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. Ye

are witnesses of these things. And behold, I send forth the promise of my Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high." (Luke 24:46-49.) Notice what Jesus says had been written in the prophets—his death and resurrection, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all nations, and that this preaching should begin from Jerusalem. So then, this world-wide evangelism, which was commanded by Christ and preached first by his apostles at Jerusalem, had been foretold by the prophets. And this began to be preached on Pentecost, the day the Holy Spirit filled them with power from on high. Here a plan of salvation was preached, and this plan had been foretold by the prophets. As only one plan was foretold by the prophets, they foretold no other plan than the one which began to be preached at Jerusalem.

In his sermon on the day of Pentecost, Peter showed that Joel had prophesied of that day. He also quotes a prophecy of David, which he interprets to refer to the resurrection of Christ and his being seated on the throne of David, and then draws this conclusion: "Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear." (Acts 2:33.) His argument was that Jesus had been raised up to sit on David's throne, and he concludes that he had, therefore, been exalted. Yet Boll says: "To him, and to him exclusively, the throne of David belongs by every right. But that he is now already occupying that throne is precisely that which

Peter does not say." What, then, is the connection between Peter's argument and his conclusion? Peter's argument followed immediately by *therefore* is significant. Can any one believe that Peter argued from David's prophecy that Jesus had been raised up to sit on David's throne, and conclude that he had *therefore* been exalted to something else?

On that day, and in the city of Jerusalem, repentance and remission of sins in the name of Christ began to be preached, and Jesus tells us that the prophets had foretold this very thing. Because he was now anointed—made both Lord and Christ—things began to be done in his name. Hear Boll again: "He is the anointed King of David's line, the Christ appointed for Israel. (Acts 3:20.) But neither is that saying that he now sits and reigns on David's throne. David had been anointed God's king long before he actually sat upon his rightful throne over Israel, suffering indignities and persecution at the hands of Saul, and rejection at the hands of the people; and he never took the government until the people themselves willingly sought his rule and chose him and submitted." But Bro. Boll overlooks the decisive point. Nothing in the kingdom was done in the name of David till he actually "took the government." When he actually became king, things began to be done in his name and by his authority. If Boll could show that nothing is yet done in the name of Christ, there would be some point in what he says about David. The fact that pardon was offered the enemies of Christ on the condition that they would repent and be baptized shows that he was then actually the reigning king. In Boll's theory Jesus is only the heir apparent.

When Peter first preached to the Gentiles, he went against the prejudices of all Jews, including himself. Could he quote any prophecy to fit the occasion? He was preaching to the Gentiles independent of Israel and against the prejudices of Israel, and yet he said: "To him bear all the prophets witness, that through his name every one that believeth on him shall receive remission of sins." (Acts 10:43.) This inspired apostle understood that the prophets foretold the very thing that he was then doing—namely, offering salvation to the Gentiles independent of Israel. Hence, the only plan of salvation foretold by the prophets was then in operation.

When the Jews of Antioch of Pisidia "contradicted the things which were spoken by Paul, and blasphemed," he said to them: "Lo we turn to the Gentiles. For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee for a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the uttermost part of the earth."

Hence, in preaching salvation to the Gentiles, Paul was carrying out the prophecy of Isaiah. (Acts 13:44-47.)

Paul preached to Jews and Gentiles alike, and affirmed that there was no distinction; and the people of Berea searched the Scriptures daily to see whether his preaching was so. This led many of them to believe. (Acts 17:10-12.) Now, if the prophets had said nothing concerning the plan of salvation Paul was preaching, but had always foretold that Gentiles would be blessed only through Israel restored and in subser-

vience to Israel, their searching the Scriptures would have led these Bereans to the conclusion that Paul was wrong.

Paul was sent to preach especially to the Gentiles; he was the apostle to the Gentiles. Not only did he preach to the Gentiles independent of the Jews, but in spite of them. "For this cause," said he to Agrippa, "the Jews seized me in the temple, and assayed to kill me. Having therefore obtained the help that is from God, I stand unto this day testifying both to small and great, saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses did say should come: how that the Christ should suffer, and how that he first by the resurrection of the dead should proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles." The gospel which he preached was foretold by the prophets and Moses, and he preached nothing that had not been foretold by them. Because of this he said to Agrippa: "King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest."

"Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, a called apostle, separated unto the gospel of God, which he promised afore through his prophets in the holy scriptures." Paul's call is recorded in Acts 26:12-20. Concerning this call he later said: "But when it was the good pleasure of God, who separated me, even from my mother's womb, and called me through his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles; straightway I conferred not with flesh and blood." (Gal. 1:15, 16.) And Paul fought hard to keep the gospel of Christ free from all taint of Judaism and to maintain his right to preach the gospel to the

Gentiles; and he pronounced a curse upon those Judaizing Christians who would corrupt the gospel by mixing it with Judaism (Gal. 1:6-9); and he affirms that this gospel which he preached was the gospel which God "promised afore through his prophets in the holy scriptures." The whole theory of the future-kingdom advocates, as well as some things they boldly affirm, is an emphatic denial of what Paul here says. It is plain to any thoughtful person that the plan of salvation which Paul preached is the scheme of redemption foretold by the prophets.

Notice the *now* in the following: "But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe; for there is no distinction." (Rom. 3:21, 22.) This righteousness of God, which had now been manifested, was to all believers without race or national distinction; and this righteousness through faith in Jesus Christ is witnessed by the law and the prophets; and as the law and the prophets gave witness to only one scheme of redemption, it is plain that the future-kingdom hopes have no basis.

Paul shows that the promise made to Abraham is fulfilled in those who are children of God by faith in Christ. (Gal. 3:22-29; 4:28-31.) And it seems that the book of Hebrews was written to counteract the teaching of the Judaizers of the church. That letter plainly shows that the types and shadows of the law pointed definitely to the church—to this plan of salvation through Christ. And in the eighth, ninth, and

tenth chapters the writer shows that the new covenant, or New Testament, foretold by Jeremiah is now in force; yet Boll says concerning the new birth: "It is the universal requirement of acceptance with God, and characteristic of the new covenant which now in its principle applies to the church, and which the Lord will make with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah 'after those days'." The new covenant now applies to us only in principle—it is yet to be made! To what extremes people will go to maintain a groundless theory! Jesus is now the mediator of a better covenant, "which hath been enacted upon better promises," not will be enacted. "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By which will we have been sanctified." (Heb. 10:9, 10.) The man who can read the book of Hebrews and not see that the types and shadows of the law pointed to Christianity as we have it now simply does not see what he reads. They desire to be teachers of the prophecies and the law, "though they understand neither what they say, nor whereof they confidently affirm."

"Concerning which salvation the prophets sought and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glories that should follow them. To whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto you, did they minister these things, which now have been announced unto you through them that preached the gospel unto you by the Holy Spirit sent forth from heaven." (I Pet. 1:10-

12.) While the prophets were foretelling the blessings that were to come, they were "searching what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto." Many of the future-kingdom advocates do not profess to know the time of the fulfillment of what they say these prophets foretold, but they, with one accord, profess to know exactly the manner of the time—a thing the prophets themselves did not know! They have that all figured out—oh, so much wiser than the prophets! They tell us in no uncertain terms the manner of that time, as they have it figured out. But Peter explodes their theory by telling us that these prophets were ministering to us, and that the things they foretold had been announced through them that preached the gospel by the Holy Spirit sent forth from Heaven. As the prophets foretold only one scheme of redemption, and that scheme has been announced through them that preached the gospel by the Holy Spirit, it is certain that there will be no future scheme in operation. Hence—

The plan of salvation preached by Christ and his apostles is the scheme of redemption foretold in promise and prophecy. Nor have I relied on my interpretation of the prophecies to prove the proposition.

SCRIPTURE INDEX

	Page	
GENESIS		12:19 92
8:22	69	14:17 29
12:1-3	32, 84	15:28 89
12:7	85	1 KINGS
13:14-17	32	2:12 93
15:7	85	2:12, 24 27, 28
17:8	85, 87, 88	II KINGS
25:23	89	5:1-19 83
26:2, 3	86	I CHRONICLES
28:4	25	12:23 24
28:13	86	29:23 28, 93, 111
35:12	25	NEHEMIAH
EXODUS		1:8, 9 108
12:25	90	PSALMS
13:5	90	22:12 77
19:4-6	91	37:1 125
19:5, 6	23, 28, 32, 81	34:8 43
NUMBERS		40:8 62
21:4-9	83	89:34, 35 80
DEUTERONOMY		119:103 43
6:3, 10, 18, 23	90	ISAIAH
8:1	90	1:3 10, 55
8:19, 20	33, 108	1:4 54
Chs 27 & 28	33	2:2, 3 78
28:15	108	6:10 54, 55
30:8, 10	108	9:7 21
31:20	90	11:6-9 76
JOSHUA		13:1-10 154
21:43-45	26, 34, 86, 107	13:17-22 21
23:14	33, 87, 107	40:4 79
23:14, 15	90	40:3, 4 75, 78
I SAMUEL		55:12 76
Ch 8	23	JEREMIAH
8:4-7	91	1:9, 10 158, 159
8:4-22	28	2:13 10
8:18-22	29	
8:19, 20	92	
10:24, 25	24	

4:7	77	MATTHEW	
18:5-10	37	16:18	38
18:9, 10	30	16:28	43
20:7-9	11	18:19	58
30:7	151	19:28	46, 49
Ch 31	103	20:20, 21	112
38:4	11	21:33-43	36
50:17	77	21:43	82, 110
51:60-62	21	22:24	146
EZEKIEL		25:31-46	38, 50, 68
19:1-9	77	25:31, 32, 41, 46	48
26:7-14	21	25:46	48, 84
34:11-31	40	MARK	
37:21, 22	40	1:5	181
Chs 37 to		1:14, 15	180
39:21-29	40	1:15	113
DANIEL		9:1	43
2:31-35	155	10:35-37	112
2:36-45	156	12:19	146
2:44, 45	159	16:16	84
2:44	163	LUKE	
Ch. 7	79	3:4, 5	76
HOSEA		9:27	43
13:9-11	28	10:1-10	113
13:10, 11	24	10:1-11	180
13:11	93	10:11	53, 180
AMOS		12:32	49
1:1	41	12:42-48	98, 124
4:1	77	17:20	44
7:7-17	41	19:13-27	120
9:11-15	29	20:28	146
9:13-15	41	22:28-30	48
ZEPHANIAH		24:21	188
3:3	77	24:25	188
MATTHEW		24:46, 47	103
3:2	52, 179, 180	24:46-49	112, 189
3:3	76	JOHN	
3:10	109	3:14	139
7:15	77	4:1, 2	181
10:16	77	4:34	62
12:43-45	35, 109	5:28, 29	143
13:14, 15	55	5:40	84
13:16, 17	187	6:44, 45	16
		7:37-39	112
		8:15	65
		12:39, 40	54, 55

17:4	38	11:1-10	66
20:23	47	11:12	60
20:30, 31	118	11:14	173
ACTS		11:15	140
2:23	57	11:17-24	59
2:29-36	29	11:20	110
2:29-38	111	I CORINTHIANS	
2:30-36	46	3:16, 17	39
2:33	111, 189	6:2, 3	49
2:35	31	15:22	144
2:38	112	15:26-28	31
3:24	57	15:39	173
4:1, 2	143	II CORINTHIANS	
4:2	141	3:4-18	22
4:27, 28	57	5:14, 15	35
7:5	86, 88	5:15	65
7:17	25, 86, 89	5:16	35, 65
7:32	133	6:2	110
10:43	104, 191	11:17, 18	65
11:13, 14	15	GALATIANS	
13:27	57	1:6-9	193
13:44-47	191	1:15, 16	192
15:11	61	3:7	110
15:13-16	115	3:11-22	22
15:13-19	29	3:16	84
15:17, 18	115	3:22-29	193
17:10-12	191	3:29	36, 110
17:11	104	4:4	56
20:29	77	4:21-31	22, 109
23:6	144	4:28-31	193
24:15	141, 144	5:12	174
26:12-20	192	6:13-16	174.
26:22	57, 104	EPHESIANS	
26:22, 23	104	2:14-16	22
ROMANS		2:20-22	39
1:2	57	3:10, 11	114
1:1, 2	104	3:21	115
1:16	15	PHILIPPIANS	
3:21, 22	105, 193	2:13	15
6:13	139	3:2-8	35, 65
7:5	173	3:2-11	175
7:1-6	20	3:3	36
8:6-9	173	3:10-14	144
10:12	173		
10:16-21	56		
10:19	105		

COLOSSIANS	9:11	39
1:13	10:9, 10	194
2:14		
3:11		
	JAMES	
I THESSALONIANS	1:21	15
4:13-5:11		
	I PETER	
II THESSALONIANS	1:10-12	74, 104, 194
1:6-10	2:5	39
1:7-10	2:9	68
2:1	5:8	64
2:8-12		
	II PETER	
I TIMOTHY	1:3	42
6:15	1:19-21	73
	3:1-14	69
II TIMOTHY		
4:1-5	REVELATION	
	1:6	68, 172
TITUS	1:17	132
3:5	3:10	151
	3:21	111
HEBREWS	4:6-9	63
6:4, 5	7:9	49
Ch. 8	Ch. 12	64, 65, 66
Chs. 8, 9, 10	20:8, 10, 12	67, 68
9:1-10		